THE

SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1994 - 99

THE SENATE

Wednesday, November 16, 1994

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Parliament Buildings, on Wednesday, November 16, 1994, at 11.10 a.m.

PRESENT

His Honour Senator Fred GOLLOP, (President)
His Honour Senator C. L. BOLDEN, (Deputy President)
Senator the Honourable R. FARLEY, (Minister of Industry, Commerce and Business) (Leader of the Senate);
Senator the Honourable G. MURRAY (Minister of State, Prime Minister's Office);
Senator T. E. BARKER, (Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs);
Senator Miss P. SYMMONDS;
Senator D. GILL;
Senator Miss J. ODLE;
Senator P. WELCH;
Senator J. WORKMAN;
Senator P. BERNSTEIN;
Senator K. LAURIE;
Senator Miss V. DAVIS;
Senator Miss A. THOMPSON.

Prayers were led by Fr. Errington Massiah.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The Senate is in session.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

SENATOR THE HON. R. R. FARLEY: Mr. President, I am commanded to lay the following documents before this Honourable Senate:

(1) Guarantees under the Exempt Insurance Act, Cap. 308A the following:

(a) Atlantic International Reinsurance Co. Ltd.;

(b) Atlantic Offshore Insurance Limited;

(c) European Atlantic Reinsurance Co. Ltd.;

(d) European International Holding Co. Ltd.;

(e) European International Reinsurance Co. Ltd.;

(f) Glenmaple Reinsurance Co. Ltd.;

(g) H. S. M. Insurance Limited;

(h) I. F. A. Insurance Limited;

(i) Monticello Insurance Limited;

(j) Phencorp. Reinsurance Co. Ltd.;

(k) Standard Reinsurance of North America Ltd.;

(l) Union Excess Reinsurance Company Ltd.

2. The Immigration Forms and Fees (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations, 1994.

3. The Annual Report of the National Housing Corporation for the financial year 1992-93.

MOTIONS RELATING TO THE BUSINESS OF SITTINGS OF THE SENATE AND MOVED BY A MINISTER

SENATOR THE HON. R. R. FARLEY: Mr. President, I beg to move that Standing Order No. 45(2) be suspended for the remainder of this sitting.

The question that Standing Order 45(2) be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting was put to the Senate and agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SENATOR THE HON. R. R. FARLEY: Mr. President, I beg to give notice of the Marriage (Amendment) (No. 2) Bill, 1994 which was passed by the House of Assembly on November 15, 1994. I beg, Sir, that this Bill be taken as read the first time.

Mr. President, also I beg to introduce the reading of the Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill, 1994 and propose that it be read in all of its stages.

The question that the Marriage (Amendment) (No. 2) Bill, be read a first time was put to the Senate and agreed to.

The question that the Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill, 1994 be read a first time was put to the Senate and agreed to.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 1 – TO MOVE THE PASSING OF A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT MAXWELL, CHRIST CHURCH FOR ROAD IMPROVEMENT

SENATOR THE HON. R. R. FARLEY: Mr. President, the Resolution before the Senate seeks its approval for the acquisition of a small area of land of 67.3 square metres at Maxwell, Christ Church for the purpose of road improvement. This matter, Sir, has its genesis in the 1985 Road Improvement Project which was designed to improve the safety of pedestrians by providing sidewalks along Highway 7 in the area of Maxwell and beyond. The land in question at Maxwell, Christ Church is the property owned by Miss Iola Yearwood.

In executing the project, Sir, a portion of land 20.6 square metres belonging to Miss Yearwood was used. The Cabinet had approved the compulsory acquisition of that land and it was so utilised by the Ministry at that time of Environment, Housing and Lands. However, Sir, it was discovered that a portion of the land that was used for the road itself of some 46.7 square metres needed to be acquired in order to avoid a situation where the land owner owned the land on the left and right of the sidewalk, but the Government owned the sidewalk. That is to say, Sir, if the matter had proceeded as originally planned, the land owner would have owned part of the roadway.

Sir, we are attempting to tidy up the situation and giving the Crown proper title to the road which in accordance with the Highways Act, Cap. 289 falls under its control. What we are doing with this Resolution is seeking to acquire the two parcels of land which would have been owned by Miss Yearwood, the part that has been used for the sidewalk and the part which forms part and parcel of the highway which the Crown will need to control under the Highways Act, Cap. 289. The House, therefore, is invited to approve this Resolution for the acquisition of some 67.3 square metres of land at Maxwell, Christ Church from Miss Iola Yearwood for the purpose of road improvement.

HIS HONOUR SENATOR Mrs. A. P. THOMPSON: Thank you, Mr. President. The Opposition supports the Bill in order that this problem be corrected in the area of Maxwell, Christ Church.

SENATOR C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. President, this Resolution deals with road improvement and I believe safety of pedestrians. I rise to query what the engineers or those persons at Public Works consider safety to pedestrians when you acquire land with the object of providing as much space as possible for motor vehicles, and at the same time providing sidewalks for pedestrians. Those of you who travel on that highway would recognise quite recently that there have been engineering works carried on at the junction where there are two gas stations, one at the bottom of Rendezvous Hill, and they have now placed a solid concrete section, a median, in the road and a traffic light. They have done the same thing that is happening by the bus stand over here, create a narrow space for cars or vehicles to manoeuvre through going towards the east and a double space for those travelling towards the west, or Bridgetown. At night it is very dark and before long there is going to be a serious crash at that junction.
11.20 a.m.

Engineers must stop the foolishness of reading books and articles which were written for the United Kingdom, the United States and countries with a lot of land and roads with six lane carriages where you can play with roads and recognise that in Barbados our roads are no more than 18 feet wide, and not create problems for motorists and then you hear of how many road traffic accidents there were in a year.

I want to send out a message that modern law places the liability on Governments who create such obstructions, and if anybody becomes involved in an accident at that

junction because of that solid block in the middle of the road, I am sure they have a perfect case against the Government of Barbados. Those of you who want to research it, there is a case in England that a large sign was placed several feet off the end of the M1 highway, a car coming down there ran off the road, crashed into the sign and it was held that Government was liable. They knew, or ought to have known, that there would have been the likelihood of a car leaving the road and they placed an obstacle that caused the accident. They were, I think, 70% liable for the accident.

I want the Ministry of Public Works to have another look at that junction and monitor what is happening. I think it is a dangerous situation. It is no use Government acquiring land, widening roads and then create obstructions in the road. It does not work in areas like ours where our land mass is small and we have to devote land to pedestrian and vehicular traffic at the same time to put obstacles in the road where that area of the road cannot be used.

SENATOR J. A. WORKMAN: Mr. President, like Senator Bolden I am very concerned about some of the dangers which have been placed on our highways, and like him I know that the major purpose of acquisition of land for road improvement is for safety for those who use the roads.

When we look at our ABC Highway, which is a good piece of roadwork that has been done to open up our country for development, in recent times what I term impractical and insensible placing of pedestrian crossings has arisen right in the very neck of a roundabout. As I understand it, the purpose of a roundabout is to assist in the free flow of traffic, but in most of the roundabouts for the convenience of pedestrians a pedestrian crossing is put as soon as the motorist is about to accelerate and come back on to the straight highway. Senator Bolden will know better than I do, but I believe that the Road Traffic Regulation states that if a motorist sees a pedestrian at or on the crossing, the motorist is obligated to stop. It causes bottle necks, it causes accidents, it is dangerous and I would be grateful if the appropriate authority could look into the sensible placing of these pedestrian crossings. It is only necessary to push it a little further down the highway where the pedestrians can walk and get a little more exercise, which is good for their cardiovascular development, but at the same time it will eliminate that particular danger.

A similar danger for pedestrian crossings arises at some of our traffic light junctions. At the junction at the corner of Jemmotts Lane and Bay Street and the junction in the Wildey area by the Shell gasolene station we have a situation that the traffic lights give you the go ahead and a pedestrian crossing is right there and an individual rushes across you, there is a big pile up. I would be grateful if the appropriate Ministry would look into these matters and correct them for the safety of all motorists and pedestrians.

SENATOR Miss O. P. SYMMONDS: Mr. President, in spite of having had a driver's licence for many years, I have to speak as a pedestrian and therefore this question of pavements or footpaths causes me much anxiety as it did when I was a teacher and had to consider the safety of children.

I understand that road design includes footpath design and this question of footpaths or sidewalks has been mooted for several years. A specific programme was started under a Barbados Labour Party administration between the years 1983 and 1984, but since then as I understand it footpaths are only constructed as part of a project, and I think that we need to restart a programme as soon as it is financially possible, particularly in areas like Highway 7, which is the one on which we are speaking today, and Highway 1 where there is high vehicular and pedestrian traffic. Some highways do have partial sidewalks, but then you are walking on the sidewalk and suddenly you come to the end and there is no longer any footpath, and this is hazardous not only for pedestrians but for vehicles as well.

It must also be confusing to visitors, Mr. President, who are accustomed to wider roads and standard sidewalks as a matter of course, and apart from the safety aspect, if you keep the same width and put a footpath even on one side you maximise the use of the existing road for traffic, thereby obtaining a freer and safer flow of traffic, both for vehicles and for pedestrians.

There is another aspect of this, Mr. President, which I wish to address very briefly. Standard worldwide procedure for designing footpaths and junctions includes accommodation for wheel chairs. At Rendezvous junction in Worthing, at the bottom of the hill, it has been designed specifically to accommodate a wheel chair from sidewalk to sidewalk, and I think that in future the designers of any junction or road improvement should take into account the use by disabled people.

I am glad that the Minister of Public Transport has stated that pedestrian crossings will be placed at every school in Barbados, and I understand that it is his intention to give serious consideration to sidewalks wherever there is a need. With that in mind, I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

11.30 a.m.

SENATOR P. BERNSTEIN: Mr. President, I rise to support the Bill, but I have a few comments that I thought I would like to make mention of.

First, I support Senator Workman. The pedestrian cross-walk is very hazardous to vehicular traffic, particularly at the top of Rendezvous and also near the Bussa statue. As the Senator says, when you are about to accelerate you just see somebody step off the pavement and you have to slam on brakes on the highway. To me, that is very dangerous and the authorities have to look at that.

Senator Bolden's points were good, but he has to realise that vehicular traffic in Barbados has increased over the years and in order to make sure there is an easy flow of traffic these concrete areas have had to be put in place so that we can turn left and make sure that people on the oncoming side would not collide. Perhaps we can look at putting reflectors on the road so that at night you can see these concrete areas and you would not have the situation that he said could happen.

I also want to say that we have a situation here on the roundabout by Simpson Motors. When you are going west towards the University of the West Indies there is a situation where if you are going left you have to go into the right lane and you only go into the left lane if you are going into a gas station. To my way of thinking, that is ridiculous. I think it should be seriously looked at. The people going towards the University of the West Indies should be allowed to go into the left lane and those wanting to go into the gas station should be allowed to go into the same left lane by just putting on an indicator to turn in. But to go right and stay right on the roundabout and then have to go left is confusing and people, even locals – forget tourists – are still not accustomed to it and we still have that situation arising every time.

I would also like to introduce something – and I know that here in Barbados people do not like change too much – but I would like to see, because of the amount of traffic we have in Barbados, a situation where on a red light, once there is no traffic coming from the right-hand side you are allowed to go left even on the red light. It is done in Canada, and I know Senator Bolden does not like the idea of these big North American countries, but where there is a heavy flow of traffic you would see that...

HIS HONOUR SENATOR C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order. The Honourable Member does not know what I like or what I do not like. I think the Honourable Member would be better to recognise that we have a highway which was built by Canadians and every marking on that highway is contrary to the Road Traffic Act of Barbados. Every junction in Barbados has different markings. It has been raised several times in the courts and nobody has taken the chance to look at it. It was built by Canadians, marked with partial Canadian markings in an English country. If they knew what they were doing, the things the Senator is saying, they would have been there. Not that I don't like them. It is that one has to follow the law as it is in Barbados.

SENATOR P. BERNSTEIN: Mr. President, I got the impression that Senator Bolden said that we were following the North American and large metropolitan countries like Great Britain and so.

HIS HONOUR SENATOR C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order. I said we cannot follow large countries like the United Kingdom, Canada and the United States where they have lots of land and the streets are wide so that you can have these concrete sections in the middle of the road. Our roads here are no more than 18 feet wide and if you then place a 2 foot concrete strip down one side of the road, you reduce the area that is available for both traffic and pedestrians.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I think Senator Bolden has made a valid point. Please proceed.

SENATOR P. BERNSTEIN: Mr. President, I would like to see the day when we could stop at a red light, especially where the traffic is a two-lane area or even single lane, and if there are no cars coming from the right hand side, a person wanting to go left, can turn left because once he stops and sees nothing coming from the right he can turn left. A perfect example is Jemmotts Lane coming from town. There is nothing coming from the right because there is no road so all the cars that are coming out of Jemmotts Lane and turning right simply means that any traffic coming out of Bridgetown can turn left. It will cause the traffic to flow quicker and easier.

My main point that I wanted to mention today on the Resolution is to make sure that a fair value is paid to the people from whom you acquire the land. There are instances in the past where you hear disgruntled people saying that they were not paid enough. I think it is fair that the people should be paid a fair amount, the fair value of the land you are acquiring and also I think the money should be paid within a specific time.

I have heard of cases where people say that the Government owes them money for acquisition of land and it has taken 12 to 15 months. Really and truly, the last two points in my speech are very important. A fair value for the price of the land acquired and people are paid within a sixty day or ninety day period. Thank you, Mr. President.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and agreed to.

ORDER NO. 2 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT LOWER ESTATE TENANTRY

SENATOR THE HON. R. R. FARLEY: Mr. President, the Senate is being asked today to approve the

compulsory acquisition of land at Lower Estate Tenantry, St. George for the implementation of an improvement scheme and for facilitating the purchase of lots by qualified tenants.

This matter is one that has a bit of history attached to it. You will recall that the intention of the Tenantries Freehold Purchase Act was to give the opportunity for ownership of lands which were previously rented for many years and to allow the tenants whom we have termed as qualified tenants, that is tenants who were resident on lands, both plantation lands and other private tenantries, to be able to make purchase of those lands.

Sir, you will agree that the act of ownership of property is an important right in this country. It has been one of the great stabilising forces in Barbados. It is a fact that Barbados is largely a country of property owners. It is a known fact, Sir, that people tend not to destroy that which they own. In keeping with that underlying philosophy this Resolution seeks to move to some point of concluding this outstanding matter in which the tenants of Lower Estate Tenantry in St. George have been up to this point unable to purchase their lots.
11.40 a.m.

The Resolution, Sir, pertains to the acquisition of some 63 143.1 square metres, that is 6.3 hectares of land, the property of Denzil McAlpine Power & Sons at the Lower Estate address mentioned. The development which is being contemplated for this property will be done under the Tenantries Development Act, Cap. 239A.

Now back in the 1980s after the passage of the legislation mentioned, efforts were made to have the land sold to Government. At that time, a decision was taken not to accept the proposal for sale of the land to Government because it was the view at that time as a means of the landlord avoiding the obligations under the relevant Act. The subsequent occurrences are that the development within the tenantry has proceeded in a disorganised and somewhat random fashion. The current situation is there are several tenants residing on the tenantry at Lower Estate who have to use dirt roads in order to gain access to their homes. This situation is one that has occurred even after Government had some years previously, at its own expense, and without any consideration for direct cost recovery, installed the usual sites and services, roads, water, electricity, and so on. After that was done, Sir, the owners continued to have more tenants on the land which further complicated the matter with respect to the qualification of tenants to make the necessary purchase under the Act.

What we are seeking to do today is to acquire this land, some 6.3 hectares, so that we can facilitate the improvements to the tenantry, that is, providing the necessary roadways to those tenants who still use dirt roads, and facilitate the sale to those qualified tenants.

Sir, I would simply ask the Honourable Senate to support this Resolution.

SENATOR Mrs. A. P. THOMPSON: Mr. President, I am very pleased to see that this matter has finally reach this Honourable Chamber. The residents of Lower Estate have, for some time, been agonising very much over the settlement of this particular problem. There are a few things I would like to draw to the attention of this House and the Government.

Firstly, I think I ought to laud the former administration for having drawn this document up and for having it ready that it could be here at this time. This matter was advertised in the newspaper of September, 1993 under the then Minister of Lands, Mr. Harcourt Lewis of Government's intention to compulsorily acquire the lands at Lower Estate. Some time in June 1993, one of the residents of Lower Estate received from the attorneys of the owner of that land a letter which claimed that he must pay to the owners of the land for approximately 3 470 square feet of land $17 352. What he was being asked to pay was $5 per square foot for that land.

I am very happy that Government recognised that these people ought to be able to own this land at the tenantry rate of 10¢ per square foot because it means that this gentleman could now have, as part of his own money $17 005, a saving he would actually realise by having this lot at the tenantry rate as opposed to the commercial rate, $17 005, monies which could now be used to further develop that home in which he and his family now reside or to get into some other area. I am very pleased that the residents at Lower Estate are going to have some relief.

There are some roads in that area but there is one road which needs to be done urgently. You have to swim to get through there when it rains. It is really very bad. It is just off the Sheffield Pasture. I hope that we would get around to fixing that road as soon as possible. The houses there are very smartly constructed. The people have no road. I actually witnessed someone spraining their ankle and getting a very bad fall there within the last two months so I hope we will correct that as soon as possible.

I believe the acquisition of this land to be more than the purchasing of a piece of land. I see it as the empowerment of our people. Here we have individuals with small lots but at least what they are doing, they will be having access to the title of property. We know that every Barbadian likes to have what we call "a title deed" in hand. What the title deed does is it gives one access to the commercial sector. You can go to the commercial bank and get some finance. When you produce your title deeds your land can be used as collateral. I believe this Resolution ought to be lauded in that it is empowering ordinary people.

One of the things that concerns me about this area – I think there are 109 lots – is it is very congested. I wonder if the Government can ensure that these people own lots. It should consider relocating some of these individuals. There are some houses, at least you can see two or three houses on what can be considered one lot. This needs to be addressed.

There are some people who do not qualify, I believe because they would have just moved in there. I hope they would not just be thrown off. Once the people who are entitled to the lots have been advised, I hope the Government will make sure that these people, some of whom have lived there for some time, can be relocated in areas where they can be comfortable.

I recognise that there is a rural development programme in the making. I believe St. George is a rural area. I think this is one of the areas which should be looked at for rural development. I feel that when a Government acquires a lot of this size that provisions should be made for recreational facilities. There are a number of very small children in that area and in order for them to have fun, to relax, they would have to go some distance. I know there is Sheffield pasture there but I need to ask of the Minister. I am not sure what is the position with Sheffield. I know the guys play cricket, dominoes and all kinds of things there but is Sheffield Pasture a part of the Lower Estate development or not because I know it has been a part of the whole lot. If it is, would it be possible then for the Government to have this incorporated into this housing development as a recreational facility for these young children in that area because they would have to walk quite a distance up by the St. George Parish Church or some where over there where there is a big pasture to relax.
11.50 a.m.

I do not believe people need housing only. They need recreation. When I recognize we have so many social problems that on a lot of that size there should be a church. I believe that as a part of the development, there should be a church. We are all right to think that we are children of God and we are very Christian people. Maybe I would like to encourage the members of the Senate to walk through that area. To speak of it from this distance you may say one thing but you should walk through the area for yourselves and I am sure you would agree that we need to do a few things to enhance the quality of life of the residents of that area.

Talking about tenantries there are also some people in St. George who now live on lots which do not qualify under the Tenantry Freehold Purchase Act because there are fewer than 5 houses on these lots. I believe Government has given a commitment to these people that they would be relocated by the Government of Barbados by January, 1995. I hope that this Government will follow through on that commitment given by the former Administration to make sure that these people who would have been considered qualified tenants before, under a previous Act, now to be relocated. I know there are some people who are agonizing over this matter. I hope that this Government would follow through on that commitment.

I believe that unless you have been raised in the country and you have lived either on a tenantry or next door to a tenantry you cannot really appreciate how much these things that look small mean to such people. I have lived next door to tenantries all my life. I was a little fortunate that my great grandfather worked in Panama and was able to purchase the lot that I was raised on but there are many people in these country districts who live on these tenantries.

I have no difficulty. I am extremely pleased to support this Bill, a matter which was drawn up under the former Administration and were the General Elections not called...

HIS HONOUR SENATOR C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. President, Sir, on a point of order, with all due respect the Senator has really gone mad and crazy now.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I do not think you can say that, Senator Bolden.

HIS HONOUR SENATOR C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to withdraw. But the Honourable Senator seems to have taken leave of her better senses when she says an Act drawn up under the former Administration. I think the Honourable Senator is trying to mislead this Senate because that is not so. I will tell her the history of this when she is through. If she does not know the history I will teach it to her in here today.

SENATOR Mrs. A. P. THOMPSON: Mr. President, I do not believe the Honourable Senator listened carefully to what I said. I said the document which is before us today. I heard the Attorney-General admit in the Lower House that this matter was on his table. I believe he found it there. All I am saying is that it is not something which was done overnight. I am not referring to the Act itself but to the matter which deals with the compulsory acquisition of lands at Lower Estate in St. George.

compulsory acquisition of land at Lower Estate Tenantry, St. George for the implementation of an improvement scheme and for facilitating the purchase of lots by qualified tenants.

This matter is one that has a bit of history attached to it. You will recall that the intention of the Tenantries Freehold Purchase Act was to give the opportunity for ownership of lands which were previously rented for many years and to allow the tenants whom we have termed as qualified tenants, that is tenants who were resident on lands, both plantation lands and other private tenantries, to be able to make purchase of those lands.

Sir, you will agree that the act of ownership of property is an important right in this country. It has been one of the great stabilising forces in Barbados. It is a fact that Barbados is largely a country of property owners. It is a known fact, Sir, that people tend not to destroy that which they own. In keeping with that underlying philosophy this Resolution seeks to move to some point of concluding this outstanding matter in which the tenants of Lower Estate Tenantry in St. George have been up to this point unable to purchase their lots.
11.40 a.m.

The Resolution, Sir, pertains to the acquisition of some 63 143.1 square metres, that is 6.3 hectares of land, the property of Denzil McAlpine Power & Sons at the Lower Estate address mentioned. The development which is being contemplated for this property will be done under the Tenantries Development Act, Cap. 239A.

Now back in the 1980s after the passage of the legislation mentioned, efforts were made to have the land sold to Government. At that time, a decision was taken not to accept the proposal for sale of the land to Government because it was the view at that time as a means of the landlord avoiding the obligations under the relevant Act. The subsequent occurrences are that the development within the tenantry has proceeded in a disorganised and somewhat random fashion. The current situation is there are several tenants residing on the tenantry at Lower Estate who have to use dirt roads in order to gain access to their homes. This situation is one that has occurred even after Government had some years previously, at its own expense, and without any consideration for direct cost recovery, installed the usual sites and services, roads, water, electricity, and so on. After that was done, Sir, the owners continued to have more tenants on the land which further complicated the matter with respect to the qualification of tenants to make the necessary purchase under the Act.

What we are seeking to do today is to acquire this land, some 6.3 hectares, so that we can facilitate the improvements to the tenantry, that is, providing the necessary roadways to those tenants who still use dirt roads, and facilitate the sale to those qualified tenants.

Sir, I would simply ask the Honourable Senate to support this Resolution.

SENATOR Mrs. A. P. THOMPSON: Mr. President, I am very pleased to see that this matter has finally reach this Honourable Chamber. The residents of Lower Estate have, for some time, been agonising very much over the settlement of this particular problem. There are a few things I would like to draw to the attention of this House and the Government.

Firstly, I think I ought to laud the former administration for having drawn this document up and for having it ready that it could be here at this time. This matter was advertised in the newspaper of September, 1993 under the then Minister of Lands, Mr. Harcourt Lewis of Government's intention to compulsorily acquire the lands at Lower Estate. Some time in June 1993, one of the residents of Lower Estate received from the attorneys of the owner of that land a letter which claimed that he must pay to the owners of the land for approximately 3 470 square feet of land $17 352. What he was being asked to pay was $5 per square foot for that land.

I am very happy that Government recognised that these people ought to be able to own this land at the tenantry rate of 10¢ per square foot because it means that this gentleman could now have, as part of his own money $17 005, a saving he would actually realise by having this lot at the tenantry rate as opposed to the commercial rate, $17 005, monies which could now be used to further develop that home in which he and his family now reside or to get into some other area. I am very pleased that the residents at Lower Estate are going to have some relief.

There are some roads in that area but there is one road which needs to be done urgently. You have to swim to get through there when it rains. It is really very bad. It is just off the Sheffield Pasture. I hope that we would get around to fixing that road as soon as possible. The houses there are very smartly constructed. The people have no road. I actually witnessed someone spraining their ankle and getting a very bad fall there within the last two months so I hope we will correct that as soon as possible.

I believe the acquisition of this land to be more than the purchasing of a piece of land. I see it as the empowerment of our people. Here we have individuals with small lots but at least what they are doing, they will be having access to the title of property. We know that every Barbadian likes to have what we call "a title deed" in hand. What the title deed does is it gives one access to the commercial sector. You can go to the commercial bank and get some finance. When you produce your title deeds your land can be used as collateral. I believe this Resolution ought to be lauded in that it is empowering ordinary people.

I therefore, Sir, support this matter on behalf of the residents of Lower Estate in St. George.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Murray.

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: Mr. President, I wish the Honourable Senator had declared an interest in this matter. I believe she has both a political interest seeing that this area is part of the constituency which she sought to woo quite unsuccessfully last time and also I think that she has an historical interest relationship with it through having grown up in that area as she admitted.

But for her to gloss over it and unfortunately trivialise it, as she has sought to do by seeking to win undeserved praise for her party, I think would be to ignore the historical antecedents of this issue.

If she would cast her mind back, she would recognise that I think it was some time last year or 1992 at least, when her successful opponent along with the then Leader of the Opposition successfully mounted a campaign which involved actual visits to the site in order to correct a mess which this Party, through the Tenantries Freehold Purchase Act had sought to, as she said, empower Barbadians by defining a tenantry as having 2 house spots and upwards and they in their non wisdom came and changed it to 5 house spots and upwards. That complicated matters and to a large extent helped to create this problem and to throw the whole tenantry of Lower Estate into a mess. That had also been exacerbated by the approach of the former owner of the land. In essence, what we have had to do has been to regularise the situation and to make it clean so as to give people clean and clear title to the land as the lawyers like to say, in a way that was not possible and had been attempted by the previous Administration.

I was also amazed that the Honourable Senator would be asking for things like playing fields and sporting facilities for the area when her Party had 8 years in which to do it and did nothing at all about it. I think it is a little uncharitable therefore to make these kinds of demands, especially if she had only turned to Page 29 of the document, Choice for a Change which her Party had made a document of the Lower House. It says on page 29, among other things, speaking of rural development that we the Government will:

> "provide multipurpose sporting and cultural complexes in major rural communities to provide outlets for the talents of the youth in these communities."

It is a stated Manifesto commitment and she really is not telling us anything that she did not know.

I would have thought therefore that through her longstanding association with the area and particularly as a result of her canvassing of this part of the constituency in the recent election, that when it comes to talking about churches that that strip of land is probably over represented by churches.

As a matter of fact, there are some 4 churches between Sheffield and the corner by the gas station. I happen also to live in the area, if I might declare that interest also and as a matter of fact it is one of the few instances where churches out-number rum shops in Barbados because there are 4 churches and only 2 rum shops. I can only take it that she is not as familiar with the area as she has sought to make out. I wish therefore that she would get into the spirit of the measure and give it her unqualified support, especially since it seems to redress some of the discrepancies which her side had deliberately established.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Laurie.

SENATOR C. K. LAURIE: Mr. President, I support the acquisition of this land but I have some concerns about the whole Lower Estate area. Lower Estate, traditionally, was a fairly high producing area. It is relatively flat and level land that is recognizable and the future of agriculture has to go in that area. This particular piece of land is to the east of the quarry and gully, is separated from the rest and I see no problem. It is already lost to agriculture because houses are on it, although there are farmers living in there. People there are farming at the present time. There are people there with pigs and sheep and so on. When we get this full development that will probably all have to go.
12.00 noon

What worries me is the rest of Lower Estate. Some parts of it, I will estimate, I think Roberts Manufacturing bought 30 acres and then another strip was bought by other people on the main road. All that is left now is the part that is run partly as a dairy and partly in bush and grass. It worries me that this land is going to all go into housing and so on when it is really agricultural land. So I would hope that this is not a piece meal cutting of Lower Estate which is what apparently the present owners are attempting to do anyhow. They have managed to get permission over time.

That leads me on to this other question of Government's land use policy and I would again call on Government to have a transparent land use policy. One that respects the fact that when the Town and Country Planning and all the various steps that are taken it cannot be over-set by a Minister of Lands without further consultation with the technocrats.

My recommendation is that if the Minister disagrees and he wants to over-set it then there should be a public enquiry on any such change of use of land. I think that a transparent land use policy will go a long way to eradicating these problems so people know very clearly whether there is any chance of changing land use when there is a published land use policy. The Town and Country Planning have a land use policy. They have classified certain estates. There is one called Cottage in St. George which is in the A classification – no land use change will be permitted – and yet this has been allowed to be cut up in bits and pieces. So I would hope that a proper land use policy would come out in the very near future.

The whole question of course is I am not too sure I understood what is the price that the Government is going to pay for this land. Are they paying agricultural land prices? I understood the Honourable Senator said they were going to sell it to the tenants at 10 cents a square foot. But even 10 cents a square foot is way above agricultural prices but way below the $5.00 that we were told the owners wanted before. Is Government going to buy it at $5.00 or are they going to buy it at 10 cents? I was not too sure.

SENATOR MISS J. C. ODLE: Mr. President, I rise in support of this Bill. I think it is an excellent thing particularly as I think it is indeed the desire of every Barbadian to own a piece of this rock and I think it was a masterful stroke through the Tenantries Freehold Act to make this a reality for many, many Barbadians.

But I have a couple of concerns that I would like to share as have come out, not because of the Tenantries Freehold Act but because of the tardiness of a previous administration to follow through on some of the plans and I would like to speak specifically to an area that abuts and bounds the Lower Estate Area and this is the Hothersal Turning Area.

At one time they were all abutting and bounding until we had highways and so on cutting through which is very advantageous but because of that, and I would like to bring to the attention of this Honourable House, the situation there. Because of the mismanagement of that administration you had a situation where a piece of land on which a Barbadian lived and resided and had the right to purchase at 10 cents they were resited because of the road project.

What happened subsequently was, that that land was not used for road development and that portion of the tenantry remained in tact. However the individual who had been resited, did not have the option to buy now as was advised by that administration at 10 cents. I think this is a crying shame because that land still remains unused and he has been told that he can no longer purchase at 10 cents, no reason being given. I am sure it will be dealt with in the appropriate manner by this administration who is certainly not tardy as history will show.

I would also like to raise one other point and again this is to deal with the sites and services as it applies to the Tenantries Freehold. Again dealing with an area that abuts and bounds with Lower Estate and I am sure this will again not happen in the Lower Estate area because this administration will most certainly make sure that the infrastructure is there so that these able-bodied Barbadians who deserve to own this land at 10 cents and will be getting it at that price will not be undergoing some of the concerns that exist currently in the Belle area where the land was approved under the Tenantries Freehold Act but was not carried through. I am referring to the Sites and Service Plan. It was partially completed and was left dormant then and until this day still remains dormant where you now have individuals who have approval for their land and have purchased their land and no road was put in in one aspect and I am referring to the Belle area between the Odessa McClean Avenues/My Lords Hill as it abuts and goes up that way and in the middle you have to swim as Senator Thompson was saying there are certain areas where people have to swim to get in.

I am sure this administration will take care of that fairly soon but the concern that I have is because a lot of the houses have now gone up very ad hoc and there will be some problem to reducing, removing, resiting and re-aligning in order for a road to go through and I would like to think that this would be addressed and I have every belief that it will be addressed in this Administration. I thank you.

SENATOR J. A. WORKMAN: Mr. President in the second meeting of this Upper Chamber, it was the last occasion on which I spoke but it was also the first and it reminds me of an old Sunday School song: "First and last and always this our song shall be". That also reminds me, Mr. President, of words of the Apostle Paul to the Church at Phillipi when he says, and it is in the Living Bible Translation "I never get tired of telling you this and it is good for you to hear it again and again".

In that first speech Mr. President, I talked about our goal and our object should be the restoration of morality and dignity and integrity to the people of this country. I think those words of Paul are again appropriate as we speak on this land acquisition. Mr. President I want us to look beyond the physical development of a tenantry and to look to the development of the human personality which will be residing in these tenantries.

The Apostle Paul as he wrote to the Church at Philippi in that Chapter 3 was exhorting the community of believers to rejoice. There were many things they had to rejoice over and certainly in our country there are many things for us to rejoice over, and, particularly for the poorer people of our community, the Tenantries Freehold Purchase Act is something for them to rejoice over.

It is the result of the vision of this administration in former times under the astute leadership of Prime Minister Tom Adams who had the vision to pass this piece of legislation which permits the poorer people of our country to own a stake in the country. So they need to rejoice over this. But Paul was also warning the community of believers to be watchful over those persons who were philosophically introducing evil into the community, and we still have this in our community today and we need to have a watchful eye for such persons lest by some misfortune the now 'moral minority' be robbed of their peace and joy in this country.
12.10 p.m.

The land of Philippi was fertile land such as this land at Lower Estate. But apart from the fertility of the land, there was the fertility of the people. There was a cosmopolitan people at Philippi and I believe, Mr. President, that from time to time, as tenantries are established in Barbados and as the Rural Development Programme comes into being, there will be a cosmopolitan people for these developments will naturally draw people from various parts of our island, various backgrounds and various understandings. So, like the church at Philippi which had Lydia who was a seller of purple and the slave-girl who had the spirit of divination and who was exploited by her masters and the Philippian jailer who was prone to suicide, we have these types as part and parcel of our society today. We need to ensure, Mr. President, that we go beyond the boundaries of the physical development to the human development.

It was these cosmopolitan people at Philippi who formed the nucleus for the development of a strong community of believers in God and believers in the dignity of human personality. The community of believers at Philippi became a pilot scheme or a catalyst for the spread of the community of believers throughout Europe. I believe, Mr. President, that our tenantry development can and must become a pilot scheme and a catalyst for the development of our people in this country. We have become accustomed now to heights, terraces and gardens and some of us would want to forget the villages. But that village life is strong community life. It is that village life we need to bring back into the heights, terraces and the gardens like where you and I reside, Mr. President, where, in a situation I had been unable some years ago to see my closest neighbour for four months until he and I were at a funeral together at St. Silas Church which is on the boundary of St. Peter/St. Lucy. That community spirit has been lost and it is within the tenantry that we can restore true community spirit and meaningful life to our people, particularly those people who are less fortunate.

Mr. President, the church at Philippi, this community of believers, was as a result of the visionary call of the Apostle Paul who received that great call in his vision "come over to Macedonia and help us" and he responded to that call. Today, we have people in our community in our tenantry situations who are crying out to us and we have refused to hear the Macedonian call and to have a vision for them. Who really cares? Do politicians really care? Does the business community really care? Do professionals really care? Does the church really care? Does society on a whole truly care for the poorer people of our society?

I say all of that, Mr. President, to say this. In this Tenantries Freehold Purchase Act, we have a power-house of legislation for transforming people but it must be properly handled. The Tenantries Freehold legislation has brought our poorer people to what I call from "tenancy to tenantry". They are no longer tenants but they own the tenantry collectively and I call that a "tenable situation". But the time has come when this legislation must go beyond the tenable situation to look at the individuals who live there and bring them from tenantry and from that tenable situation to a sustainable situation where individuals can know their worth, know that there is dignity within themselves and where they can make a living for themselves and have encouragement.

Mr. President, in this year 1994 and onwards, tenantry development and rural development must go beyond the focus of physical development and must be seen as people development. The resources of our country are bound up in our people; all of our people, not just those who have the professions and have good jobs, but also those who have no jobs, those who seem to have no hope in life, and those who seem to be drifting without a vision. We need to come to the development of the human tenantry as opposed to the development of the physical tenantry. Anything

short of this, Mr. President, in the context of 1994, is only a perpetuation of quiet brave endurance on the part of the poorer people of our society. That quiet, brave endurance no longer seems to be very quiet or so brave and it breeds a haven for anger and deceit, crime, and all of the ills which come to our society. I am not suggesting, Mr. President, that the only ills of our society come from people of the poorer class. I am not suggesting that for one moment. But it is a fact that the devil finds work for idle hands to do and we need to see to it that these people have an opportunity to do something.

Therefore, Mr. President, the acquisition of this parcel of land and the acquisition of other lands for tenantry and rural development must have a social function. They must be aimed not just at giving roads to those who formerly had mud tracks and not giving electricity and water to those who did not have. But they must be aimed at giving them upliftment in their standard of living and a standard of living is not bettered merely because "I have a barbergreen road in front of my house today when yesterday I only had a mud track". The standard of living is changed when my inner being is transformed, when I am propelled outside the physical development of what God has placed within me as my gift not only to myself but to my brothers and sisters, and when that gift is transformed into active human endeavour. We need in our tenantry and rural development to have a holistic approach where we will transform those who reside there into a truly integrated society to become persons who are whole and healthy human personalities, economically, spiritually, culturally and morally.

Sir, we have in our society an unfortunate situation where for too long the poorer people in our society have been called the masses. It is an unfortunate term, Mr. President. I have taken a little time to try and understand what the masses mean and I went to the Oxford and Webster's Dictionaries. Both of those dictionaries say that the "masses" mean the lower classes in the social order or the common people. When that word is used in the singular "a mass", it is defined as a dense aggregation of objects. The constant use of this term "the masses" by politicians and quasi-politicians has caused many of the poorer people of our society to be mentally enslaved. I know this in my capacity as a counsellor. Only this morning as I was coming down to this meeting, I stopped to give a ride to a youngster who lives in the Clapham Park Development. As Members of this Senate would know, Clapham Park persons are those who were resited from Emmerton in Bridgetown to make way for the sewerage project. He was one of my little protogés when I did some social work in that area. He said to me: "You are going down to Parliament now. I know you are going to talk about the tenantry. You know, they always call us masses," as if he were reading what I had planned to say. He says "It is unfortunate that they call us that, because we do not feel that we are anybody." 12.20 p.m.

It is this stigma which we need to rid our people of and this cannot be done just purely by giving them physical development. Many of them have begun to understand themselves in the definition of a mass in a singular sense; that they are nothing more than a dense aggregation of objects, and we are to a great degree responsible for that. This has had a ripple effect throughout our society where we have a situation now with these mentally enslaved people feeling inferior, feeling insecure and are unable to enjoy the fullness of life which is theirs to claim in our community.

This whole question of classes is really a man made structure. It was not a God given structure and that is why when Jesus came on the scene and he started to uplift the poorer people of the community, we are told....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Workman, as usual I am a little reluctant to interrupt you, but I think you are straying from the Resolution.

SENATOR J. A. WORKMAN: I am obliged to you, Mr. President, for what you are saying, but I am trying to develop the point that the poor people of our society need to be uplifted beyond the physical and that there is need for certain safeguards which are necessary to ensure that this is so. Some of us may do it by referring to law books, I was just doing it by referring to the biblical book, so I am obliged to you for your guidance.

As I was saying, Mr. President, whatever important schemes are being planned for the Lower Estate Tenantry, or for any other tenantry or for rural development projects, they must include programmes and projects which are made to uplift the individual, to give them release and relief, to allow them to understand new and creative ways of thinking, to allow them to discover themselves. All of that is encompassed in the Tenantries Development Act.

If we refer to the Tenantries Development Act, Cap. 239A, Section 12(4), it says:

> "The improvements referred to in paragraph (b) of subsection (2) may include provision for any of the following:

(d) facilities for the creation of new avenues of employment in or within easy reach of the designated tenantry."

That is one of the points I want to make concerning the whole question of tenantry development. Tenantry development must be comprehensive and it must include opportunities for the people who live there to express themselves in small business; they must be able to have self esteem, self discipline, self determination and self development. It is when these take place that growth truly comes within the tenantry development.

I believe, Mr. President, that such is not only the responsibility of the Government, the political Government, it is the responsibility of the whole community and it is towards achieving this end that I believe that Government can give consideration in the establishment of these tenantries to the establishment of approved programmes and projects which are specially designed for self improvement and in particular for small business. That will fall right within the provisions of the Tenantries Development Act. This, Mr. President, is the way forward for developing tenantry in its fullest sense; not through any gambling but through personal development, because personal development gives that assurance which allows an individual to discover his or her worth, and to open his or her eyes to opportunities provided through the infrastructure.

On this tenantries development, Mr. President, I would like to see a number of safeguards put in place. We need to have the assurance that when these lands are acquired they will remain under the provisions of the Tenantry Freehold Purchase Act so that the blessings and the benefits will accrue to all who reside there and who will come in the future. I believe, Mr. President, that we will have a situation where, if a development is put in place, we would have to resite persons from other parts of the community.

Senator Odle made reference to the situation at the Belle. There may be a time when some of those persons at the Belle may have to be resited. What I am saying is that if an individual in a particular existing tenantry has to be resited to a new tenantry, provision should be made to ensure that that individual continues to have the benefit by way of accrual of whatever rights he would have had in the former tenantry, so that an individual who had already accrued two years towards becoming a qualified tenant in a former tenantry does not have to come into the new tenantry and spend five years before he or she can benefit, when in truth and in fact the period should only be three years.

The other thing is that we have to ensure that when these tenantries are established the persons who are to be resited in the tenantries must be the poor people of our society. I say that because there are many land sharks in our country who can easily establish themselves in a tenantry, but who are well able to buy lands in the terraces and the heights and they will defeat the purpose of the legislation. And so there is need for that safeguard to ensure, by way of some kind of definition, that persons within a specified category only are entitled to be tenants in a Government tenantry. Otherwise, Mr. President, we will have people who will go in there and buy up that land and then make a profit out of it.

Mr. President, I support the acquisition of this land. I support the development of tenantries in general and rural development. With those words of caution, challenge and encouragement, I have great pleasure in giving my utmost support to the passing of the Resolution. I will just say that as we have opportunity let us do good to all people, especially those who are of the household of Barbadians.

HIS HONOUR SENATOR C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. President, this Resolution brings to mind the full history of the Tenantries Freehold Purchase Act when it was introduced in the Other Place in 1980, but it was the Barbados Labour Party in office which saw the problems of tenants on plantation tenantries – and that is what the Act was about – who had given their lifeblood for plantation owners and who were still deprived of ownership and were being removed again.
12.30 p.m.

When you look at the history of the plantations they were removed and put on the hills because they were termed rab hills and not good for planting. Then they were removed and put in the back because the hillocks became the precious areas, and then they were put on the gully sides and in areas where there were no roads. The Barbados Labour Party brought a Bill in Parliament to pay back some of what they had given to the plantation owners and the then Democratic Labour Party said we were taking away people's land and that they were not going to support it.

The Government of the day had to bring people from around the world in order to pass the Bill and they went to Colonel Drax and the late Errol Barrow said he would give .... So when the last Senator who spoke says

thanks to the last Administration for this Bill, if they knew what they were doing, all they had to do was to list it on the Schedule and the land would have been sold at 10 cents a square foot. All that was needed was to list it under the Schedule of the Act; but they played ball. That's what they did. Played ball with every piece of land. Ball and bobol. The Senator probably has not been told what is going on.

After 8 years, I know Lower Estate backwards. I was an overseer for donkey years before I left to study law and everyone would have fallen under the Act if they had only been listed in the Schedule and you could not get around it.

Mr. President, we have a situation in Barbados where certain people do not comply with the Law. I heard Senator Laurie ask about a land use policy and say that the Town Planning Department had one. They have none. Ask where files go when you want to find something from up there because certain people in this country can do what they feel like and get away with it. Town Planning does not look. It looks the other side.

It is strange when the so-called people who are in high places, in the pockets of the Dems, can do what they feel like, when they feel like and how they feel like and the Town Planning does not look; but let a little poor man.... I am not straying from this Act. Look at this good, because we in the Lower House then had to put certain provisions in this Act because the very Town Planning Department wanted it to come under the Act telling you that it must be 6 weeks from this, you must make a plan for this, you must do that. They did not understand the social position of Barbados at the time and whom this Act was designed to assist.That is what you must look at.

Our Administration went into all the tenantries and put down roads without regard to the ownership of the land at the time and we had situations where roads were put down and then landowners then charged $5, $6 and $7 a square foot. So this Act is a special Act. This acquisition now is only because the last Administration failed to follow the Law for reasons best known to themselves.

The Government could have avoided this. It means the Government has to find money to acquire this land only because the whole thing was jeopardised by the manipulations of the last Administration. That is what it is today.

You talk about agricultural land being taken out of agriculture. Senator Laurie, you know as well as I know that you only have to go certain places up there and you know it moves and you don't know. They do not follow the Law. Until this Government does something we will be going through these manoeuvres from time to time and everybody will be talking about a land use policy and what is right and what is just but you have, as Senator Workman just said, to bring back integrity into Barbados as a whole. That is what is needed. Bring back integrity. Let people act according to Law, and everybody should act according to Law. Not some and not others.

Senator Odle spoke about Odessa McClean Road. Here again is another situation where under that Administration a Minister, for political purposes or otherwise, sought to remove squatters, people who deliberately squatted in the Belle area, the zone 1 land of Barbados where the majority of our water is underground and pumped for human consumption, and after a report that our water was in danger of being contaminated, the Government then went and acquired part of the land in Cutting Road to move people who had unlawfully squatted on that land. And tell you that is how Law works in this country? You break the Law and then cry out and say you must help me? I keep worrying because something is wrong and very wrong.

Whenever the DLP comes to office this is what they do. They have no regard whatsoever for Law and Order as long as they get satisfaction for themselves. Odessa McClean Road runs on zone 1 and MTW was sent in to put roads and they had to stop at a point because the Water Authority and the very Town Planning complained that you were breaking the laws of Barbados and endangering the health of every Barbadian because the Belle is the Number 1 pumping station in Barbados.
12.40 p.m.

We get our water from underground rivers and underground streams. If you go from the Belle, if you go to Golden Ridge you go down in a boat and you can sail from there all the way down into St. Thomas – underground rivers in this country. That is where our water source comes from. When you allow people to settle in areas like the Belle which is Zone 1, and then you say "well these are my voters so I must look after them", anybody can put up a house anywhere. As long as you belong to the Dems – I am saying it now – when they are in power they break all the laws in the world. Put it up anywhere and then come and complain. They will tell

you that they are justified in doing it. Go in Cutting Road, just above where I live, they put part of them up there and ask anyone of them.

I go further. Ask how many of them are Barbadians. You just go up in My Lord's Hill and go down the road and ask how many are Barbadians. They put up any kind of a shack, and then say you have to resite them. Where else in the world would you find something like that happening? This administration has always demonstrated its ability to cure the wrongs and it has always shown that it is a thinking administration.

Senator Thompson asked for playing fields. Now, we are an unfortunate lot on this side. In the 1980s when we talked about developing towns in this country and we earmarked St. George for a development, we were laughed out of court by the Democratic Labour Party, a Tale of Two Cities. But we went into St. George. We negotiated with the Church and we redeveloped the whole of the Walkers area. We resited people. We gave them roads. We gave them playing fields. We gave them pavilions. We gave them schools, everything in St. George and the Dems laughed at us. We struggled and went forward and now the Senator is asking, after 8 years that they have been in office and did absolutely nothing, they are now asking that we must go down in Lower Estate and do what they should have done and which they did not do. Like the other fellow from the Other Place, after 8 years Minister of Finance, I read in the newspaper he says you must give priority to St. John, as if we were born this size, big and foolish.

Do not come in here and try to make people believe that this Government does not know what it is doing. We have a programme, a programme which was carefully developed and which will be carefully executed but will not be driven by the talk of those persons who had an opportunity to do and did not do, and would like to make believe that we do not know what we are doing. We are on track and we should follow a course because at the end of 5 years we will again come with Promises and Performances.

Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR THE HON. R. FARLEY: Mr. President, I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put to the Senate and agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

SENATOR THE HON. R. FARLEY: I beg to move, Sir, that the sitting be suspended until 1.45 p.m.

The question that the sitting be suspended until 1.45 p.m. was put to the Senate and agreed to and Mr. PRESIDENT suspended the sitting accordingly.

12.48 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Farley.

SENATOR THE HON. R. R. FARLEY: Mr. President, the matter before us, the Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill, 1994 seeks to amend the Act Cap. 228 allowing the Minister to sell land and to provide for the laying of annual statements before both Houses. Sometimes the Crown is forced to acquire private lands. The Act also provides, at Section 28 of the Land Acquisition Act, for the disposal of land:

> "It shall be lawful for the Minister at any time to sell and dispose of all superfluous lands acquired under this Act which are not required for the purpose for which the same were so acquired."

The Amendment is seeking to provide for Government to make optimum use of superfluous land. An interest has been expressed in the leasing of the land as opposed to the absolute sale. This is not possible.

The Bill therefore seeks to delete Section 28 and substitute a clause to grant licence for the use of the lands. It would also have Section 29 which would provide for a Minister to lay statements in both Houses of Parliament. We have the Financial Year in which to give account of all dealings in the disposal and lease of superfluous land.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Bolden.

HIS HONOUR SENATOR C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. President, I do not want to hold up the proceedings of the Chamber in this matter because it is a very straightforward matter. But I should like to draw to the attention of the Government that one particular building owned by Government should be utilized as quickly as possible. I speak about the old Empire Cinema. That building is owned by the Government of Barbados.

When we were about to celebrate the 350th Anniversary year of Parliament, I made a suggestion that that building should have been re-acquired and developed to be used for the arts, for large delegations, opening of conferences, et cetera like we have for the CPA. It is to my knowledge that the lessees of the building had family problems about 3 or 4 years ago.

I think the Government should move swiftly and have that building refurbished. I would like to see the Government develop buildings as they have in California. They have a policy of taking over derelict buildings and providing them for entrepreneurs and providing loans to put them back into active use. We have reached a time where our city needs to be refurbished. If you travel along Roebuck Street there are dangers of a rat infested country.

I think that this Bill would provide the Government with the ample opportunity to look at an urban renewal programme whereby the Government would not be forced to find all the money for the refurbishing of these buildings and they could then lease them out – I am not talking about any 5 year lease, I am talking of a 99 year lease – and bring them back to use.

I was talking to a gentleman a couple of weeks ago and I am sure he would not be annoyed if I call his name today. He puts on the Teen Talent Contest. He is Richard Stoute. Richard Stoute said to me I want you to bring a case against some people. I being a hungry lawyer asked, who will be the defendant. He said the Democratic Labour Party. He said for all the years that I have put on the Teen Talent Contest I had to pay. I would not call a sum because I would not want to embarrass the Senator at the end of the table. If he wants to use the Gymnasium it would cost $30 000 for an evening. We cannot look at a young man providing an input and saddle him with costs of this nature, and what grieves me is to see our promoters and our artists going from door to door begging for subscriptions to put on a show or something like that and we have a place like the Empire cinema lying there that could be refurbished by Government and rented to these promoters at nominal rates for such activities.
2.00 p.m.

I am not talking about enterprises like Spectacular promotions who are in it primarily for the profits. I am talking about So and So Dance Company and the Social Group from Black Rock and the one from the Pine. All those community groups that want to have a presentation in order to raise funds for the development of the group would not have to be forced to go to the Gymnasium which was established by the former regime but would have a nice place at a reasonable rate where persons could go and sit down in a nice and orderly fashion and enjoy the show.

I attend quite a lot of productions at the Daphne Joseph Hackett theatre in Queens Park but that is a small place and sometimes you hear that all the seats are sold out and they have to come to an end because the actors can give no more of their time for week-end shows. But if you had somewhere large enough like the Empire Cinema you might not have to stretch it out for such a long time but would be able to cater to the same audience in a given period with the same response from the general public and more people would be able to go there.

I go back to planning and vision. When this administration conceived the idea of a Central Bank one of the things that that Cabinet and primarily the late Tom Adams insisted on was that we should have an auditorium in the structure of the Central Bank. And we were criticised when we spent $90 million to put up a building like that when we could have built more houses for the National Housing Corporation. We finished it and little do people in Barbados know, and forgive me for talking if I am giving away any secrets. A Central Bank is the only institution that makes money and does very little work for it.

The Central Bank paid for the building itself without any stress or strain. When you get 100-dollar bills I am told it cost just 3 or 4 dollars and the Central Bank sells them for 100 dollars and that is profit. It cost you more to make a silver dollar and a 5 cents piece than it costs to make 100-dollar bills.

The auditorium in that building is now effectively used but I think we need something alternative because Sherbourne in Two Mile Hill was to be used as an examination centre. It was to be used as a Conference Room. It was everything in the world but I know what it is, it is an unfinished symphony. I do not know which orchestra will go and try to finish it. When you come down St. Barnabas and you look in the back of that building, you look into a sea of iron rusted from top to bottom. I know many people do not know this but I did $4^1/_2$ years of architecture.

I know that Barbados is a very small island and salt air surrounds us. There is nowhere in Barbados that you do not get salt air and I know that steel work that is left exposed up there is going leech into the concrete and it is going to burst and when concrete starts to burst there is nothing that you can do to it to stop it. So the unfinished structure up there will cost any administration a lot of money in the next couple of years because you cannot put steel to stand up and think you can cure rust when rust sets in.

I remember there was a car from out of Italy which used to be sold in the United States but the body used to rust. It is the Fiat car and the United States banned the Fiat car from coming into the United States.

I am speaking about the acquisition and what Government can do with property which it has and how to use it. This Bill is to deal with Government not selling outright certain property but leasing it and I am looking at Sherbourne which already was put up for lease to the United Nations. I also read where the United Nations said it had no discussion about that. Government must come up

with an idea of how to deal with Sherbourne before it causes any more expenditure.

Mr. President, I hope that the Government will take a look at the old Empire theatre and something will be done to put it to good use for small community groups who might want to use it but do not have the finance to use the Gymnasium and those other buildings. Thank you.

SENATOR P. BERNSTEIN: Mr. President, while on the subject of land and the selling of Government land, there are two pieces of land at the back of Marine House which the Barbados Shotokan Karate Club acquired on a licence basis. I am a member of that club. That licence was given to us by the Barbados Labour Party administration when Mr. Aaron Truss was responsible and the then Minister of Housing and Lands was Mr. Delisle Bradshaw. 2.10 p.m.

Unfortunately, we got a 25 year lease. This club has approximately 150 members and it deals with the teaching of karate. It is a non-profit club I might add. The building that we constructed cost $400 000 and I am happy to say that after 12 years we have paid it off through fund raising events and from receiving $20 per student 18 years and under and $25.00 per student over 18 years.

Sir, we had approached the last Government and they had asked us to produce a letter regarding our financial position. The reason we want to buy the land is because we used to pay $2000 per year, but it is now costing us in the vicinity of $5000. We would like, if at all possible, to see if we can buy the land the building is on in the back of the Marine House. There is a tennis court and a squash court already and that area could be developed into a sporting complex just in the back of St. Matthias School. I am going to be brief and say that I would like the appropriate Committee to consider our purchasing a piece of land in the back of Marine House.

Thank you.

SENATOR THE HON. R. R. FARLEY: Mr. President, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

The question that the Bill be now read a second time was put to the Senate and agreed to.

On the motion of SENATOR The HON. R. R. FARLEY, Mr. PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate went into Committee on the Bill, HIS HONOUR SENATOR C. L. BOLDEN in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Senate is in Committee.

Clauses 1 through 3 were called and passed.

On the motion of SENATOR The HON. R. R. FARLEY, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. PRESIDENT resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of SENATOR The HON. R. R. FARLEY, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ORDER NO. 4 – TO MOVE THE PASSING OF A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF THREE PARCELS OF LAND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF PUMPING STATIONS FOR THE SOUTH COAST SEWERAGE PROJECT

SENATOR THE HON. R. R. FARLEY: Mr. President, the matter before us is a Resolution seeking this Chamber's approval for the compulsory acquisition of parcels of land for the purpose of construction of pumping stations for the South Coast Sewerage Project. Sir, the South Coast Sewerage Project is one of the major initiatives which this Government will have to implement. I almost said sadly because, as you know, having worked on the South Coast Sewerage Project one knows that it was in the pipeline by this administration. It is extremely important that to date we would have to return to complete that job.

Sir, that project is extremely important because of the environmental impact which it will have on the entire South Coast. Over the years there have been substantial environmental problems caused by sewerage and other waste water into the sea just off the South Coast. Some of this has been delivered, Sir, and others have been caused by the leakage of various sewerage systems and other treatment plants which were in close proximity to the coast.

The project, Sir, will involve the extension of the Bridgetown Sewerage Project from its terminal point to the south of Bridgetown and it will stretch as far eastward as Oistins. We anticipate, Sir, that some 3,500 properties along the coast will be affected and we expect to have those properties connected as part and parcel of the project.

Sir, this project will consist of several pumping stations, a complete system of pipe work and a treatment plant to be located at Graeme Hall. The Resolution today relates to the acquisition of three parcels of land for use for the location of pumping stations.
2.20 p.m.

Sir, the environment is extremely important to members on this side and we will move with the utmost dispatch in having this long overdue matter completed. Unfortunately, Sir, even as we speak now there are still some connections to the Bridgetown Sewerage

System that have not been completed.This has caused the system to function in a suboptimal fashion.We are told by the experts that these various systems are designed to carry a particular level of load and when that load is not reached they function in a manner which is less than desirable.We intend to ensure that we do not have the problems related to connections by making them part and parcel of the project.

The other major change with this project will be the use of no-dig systems along several aspects of the project, that is, the pipe will be laid by a method which will not cause the breaking of the road surface along the full length of the system.

With that basic information, I would ask that this Honourable Chamber support this Resolution for the acquisition of the three parcels of land laid out in the Schedule for the construction of pumping stations for the South Coast Sewerage Project.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Mr. President, I just want to make an intervention in support of this Resolution. All of us are aware that our environment is fragile. I agree with the presenter of the Resolution that it is unfortunate that at this late stage, after so many years, that we are now at the stage where I think in March or April next year we are going to start construction of this important physical facility, but there is one matter I would like to raise in connection with this sewerage system. I raised it on many occasions when I was gracing the Chamber from the other side. It relates to the use of the waste water after it has been treated.

Sir, I do not think that given our present situation and given the projections into the future that we can afford to send the water back into the sea as we do with the Bridgetown plant. Technology is well advanced in the world today and there are many countries in the world today where that water is recycled and used again for human consumption. We have a situation where every year between the months of January/February to May/June we have virtual drought conditions. I think the time is right where we use that water from all three sewerage systems – the Bridgetown, the South Coast and when the West Coast is put in place – for agricultural purposes after all the toxic chemicals have been taken out.

If people want to build golf courses, they should be made to put down the pumps to use that water for the golf courses and not, as happened in Westmoreland, and this is a fact, where the DLP Government at that time overrode the recommendation of the Water Authority and allowed the developer of that golf course to pump more water from our existing ground water supply than the Water Authority thought was reasonable and fit. That happened under the last administration, where the Cabinet, with their knowledge of geology and all that, decided to override the proposals put to them by the authorities who are competent and trained to deal with such matters, so the matter of utilising this water is very important. Only this year we saw what could happen if we have a prolonged period of drought, so I urge Government to look again at these sewerage systems.

The sea, Sir, has enough water, but we in Barbados at times suffer for water and I am told that within about 25 years or so we may have to put down a very expensive desalination plant, so it is something I think we need to look at again, that is, using the water from these sewerage systems for agricultural purposes.

Sir, I also want to raise another point, which has been mentioned many times before, that is, when we compulsorily acquire people's property we should with urgency compensate the people for the use of their land. That is something I feel strongly about. I appreciate the fact that Government must have the right to acquire property. It is something we are working on and I want the people to know we are working on it, but it is something the last Government was very tardy in implementing.They were quick to acquire people's property, but when it came to compensation they left us a mountain of debt, but the people of Barbados can rest assured that we are going to tackle it, because we honour our commitments. In spite of the fact that a lot of it was not really our doing, we are the Government of Barbados and it is our intention to tackle this mountain of debt systematically so that within a few years' time we will be back on track once again. It happens every time that we have to clean up the mess which has been made by the DLP, but if that is our lot we accept it gracefully and pray that God will give us the necessary strength and the wisdom to carry it out.

With those two points, I want to support this Resolution.

SENATOR C. K. LAURIE: I would like to add to what Senator Barker has said. In Barbados the rain falls mainly in the higher parts and then percolates down and we collect it at lower parts of the island.When we start pumping water out to sea, this water that comes down actually pushes back and holds back the sea water incursion into our water table, and there is concern. I know from speaking to people who did the south coast study that some of the consultants had concerns about this question of upsetting the balance by pumping water out into the sea we may then allow incursion of sea water into the aquifer. For instance, studies have shown that wells at Government House and at the Geriatric Hospital that for ever were flowing fresh water are now showing signs of sea water incursion. It is a worrying thing and, as Senator Barker says, the reuse of that water for agriculture would have been a good thing.

The technology of biogas fermentation of waste to produce energy to pump that water up there is already there. It requires a little more capital expenditure, but we could return treated water back to the highlands where we have the large cap of coral to filter it before it re-enters the aquifer. In the meantime, we could use it for agriculture. So I would like to support what he said, that the Government should pay some attention to that.
2.30 p.m.

SENATOR THE HON. G. MURRAY: Mr. President, I would like to see whether I can add another dimension to this debate, in supporting this Resolution. Sir, waste, both solid and liquid, is a fact of everyday human existence, especially in today's world when there is a high degree of commercialism and consumerism and disposal of things that people eat and...

Aside.

SENATOR THE HON. G. MURRAY: The point is that this is likely to continue as we become more "developed", and as we proceed to consume more and more items of materialism. That being so, it seems to me that we have to recognise that dealing with this waste, whether it be solid or liquid, therefore presents a tremendous challenge to our human ingenuity.

Other Senators have mentioned the abundance of technology that is available to put some of this material to productive use thereafter. For example, both Senator Barker and Senator Laurie talked about some imaginative use that could be put to water from the sewerage treatment plant; but I think we should need to go further and look to see some of the economic spin-offs that can come from the further treatment of human waste.

I know for sure that the Prime Minister has made it clear that the Government stands ready and is willing and able to offer incentives and concessions to business activities which are willing to get involved in disposing of human waste so that, for example, instead of having to take the fish offal and dump it at Mt. Stinkeroo, which I am happy to say I heard yesterday will no longer be in existence or at least will be closed shortly hereafter, that productive use could be put to this offal which could be converted into fertiliser which would save foreign exchange and which would create jobs and create opportunities. Now that is the kind of thinking that the Prime Minister wants businessmen, especially small businessmen, to get involved in to meet the challenge of disposing of these offshoots of human existence.

Therefore, it seems to me that all that really is holding us back is our imagination. We should stop thinking along traditional lines and stop thinking that human waste is a national bother. Of course, it is a kind of personal nuisance. I think it is one of those things that we cannot do without and therefore we have to learn to deal with it. Therefore, rather than seeking to make utilisation or disposal of this material into political footballs, into social eyesores, into social bothers, what we need to do is to take it out of the realm of nuisance and see it as a challenge and proceed wherever possible to devise productive means, even if it means importing the technology or going abroad and studying other activities in this area, that we should follow suit.

There is a rudimentary form of this kind of activity at the moment as exists in a company called DICABED that, for example, processes old newspapers. There is now another company on Roebuck Street in the old Coca Cola BBC building that is using paper and plastics. Although I must admit, when I think back, the productive use and the collection and disposal of solid materials is not really a recent phenomena although it might be quite popular now coming out of the industrial world, but as a youngster, I remember there was a man called M.L. Seale on Tudor Street who used to collect what we called "old iron" and ship it abroad and make money and that was in a very "primitive state". Now that the world is more concerned about the environment and there is greater recognition of the need to protect the human and social or whatever environment, we can rise to the challenge and seize existing opportunities to seek out new opportunities to put these human materials to productive and money-spinning and job creative use. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR P. WELCH: Mr. President, I want to continue from where Senator Murray left off. I know on the South Coast one of the problems that has arisen over the last couple years is that the Oistins Fishing Complex was built with a sewerage system in mind and we had anticipated that as long ago as 1985 that the South Coast Sewerage Project would have been executed. There are some problems in Oistins relating to drainage which are the direct result of there not being a sewerage system there.

As I said, there is tremendous potential for the utilisation of fish offal and the other offal, say from the BMC, and the poultry processing plants in the manufacture of fertilisers, particularly for the zone 1 areas where it is not to our advantage to use normal, chemical fertilisers. There is also potential for the establishment of a rendering plant and I hope that the incentives would be provided and that Government and the private sector will take the opportunity of the tremendous amount of waste material that we have right now in this country.

We have a situation where we have two processing plants for chicken. We have the BMC. We have the fish markets and basically what is happening particularly in the poultry industry is that we are importing corn and soya

meal at exorbitant prices and then dumping at Mt. Stinkeroo, as Senator Murray said, about 25% of the body weight which we spend exorbitant amounts of money to produce.There is technology available in CARICOM, in Jamaica, the Jamaica Broilers Association which has had a tremendous impact on the industry there where they have been able to convert this offal into fertiliser and into animal food, particularly for the feeding of pigs.

Also on this particular aspect of the sewerage project I know there is going to be a lot of inconvenience to people who live in that area and I want to ask that perhaps the best way of going about this is to have a programme of education. I remember during the Bridgetown Sewerage Project you could look at GIS perhaps once or twice a week and see a programme actually informing people of the need to have a sewerage project so as to build a relationship between the people and the execution of the project, because you are going to inconvenience people and you need to have them on your side. I hope that we will put in place the PR aspect of this project that will sell the idea to the people because it is not enough to tell people that it will benefit them. You have to sell it to them.

While I am talking about inconvenience, I know that traditionally with pumping stations there is a lot of noise associated and the whole area on Highway 7 is a built-up area, a mix of residential and tourist and commercial type activity and I am hoping that use will be made of acoustic materials which will have the effect of noise reduction because you don't want to take one step forward and two steps backwards. We need to have a situation where we are going to advance by providing an improvement to our environment and we also do not in achieving that neglect the important aspect of the environment which is noise pollution. I know that perhaps some of you will say to me that the level of noise on the roads from the traffic and the modified cars is probably a nuisance also but I think this is something that must be addressed at a different time.

Perhaps the major problems facing this country in terms of environmental health is solid waste disposal and excreta disposal, as Senator Murray said, and to some extent, disposal of liquid, domestic and industrial waste. We have a situation here where plants can just allow the run off from their manufacturing to enter into the gutters or wherever else. It is unfortunate that some of these liquid wastes have in things such as phosphate which is not really good for the environment and which can seep into our water supply and create problems for us. Because of the topography of the island also we have a situation where the pesticides and the fertilisers used in the agricultural belt can run off and enter into the sea. We always notice that the area where you first see the degradation of the environment in island states is always along the coast line because the eco system there is very fragile. If you want to see the extent to which the environment is degrading look along the coastal area. We have lost 8 years in correcting the problems that ought to have been corrected in the south of the island.
2.40 p.m.

I support this Resolution because I know that as Barbadians we have the will and the technology. I see it as a matter of looking at recycling the waste, separating the plastics from the paper, shipping the paper away to be used wherever it can be, as is being done at the present moment, utilising the fish offal and other offal in an economical way that can benefit us and at the same time providing things like the Sewerage Project that can treat the waste that come off from this part of the island.

It is significant that in CARICOM itself only 10% of the waste produced in the entire CARICOM is treated before it goes into the sea. We are beginning to feel the impact of this on our coast-line. When we take into consideration that along the South Coast we depend heavily on tourism we need to ensure that the attraction of the tourists that we have on the South Coast are kept intact and are not really destroyed by the same hotels and other industries that grow up along there, if the effluent they produce is allowed to go on to be deposited in the sea. It is on this basis that I support this Resolution, Mr. President.

SENATOR P. BERNSTEIN: Mr. President I rise to support the Resolution and I will be brief. The First Schedule reads "property of R.M.L. Charles situate at Palm Beach, Hastings". My concern is what effect will a pumping station have on the Asta Hotel and the Golden Beach Apartments which are located in the same Palm Beach, Hastings. I have just been told that there is noise pollution. On the one hand we are looking at encouraging tourism and on the other hand you are putting a pumping station, I believe – I am not 100% sure – at the entrance of the Asta Hotel and the Golden Beach Apartments which is in the same Palm Beach at Hastings. I am a little concerned about the problem with the pumping station right next to the hotels.

The other thing I am concerned about, while I support it, and I have been told now that they are not digging up the roads that there is a new method, I certainly believe that there is going to be obviously some disruption in the traffic. While we realize that thousands of people use Highway 7 to go to work and they have to be at work on time, and I know you will institute a simple measure of diverting traffic, perhaps if you are not digging the road and you are only using the side of the road and you only have half of the road for traffic to use, I would like to recommend that from midnight to 12 noon all the traffic going towards the west towards Bridgetown could use the Hastings Road so we would have a free flow of traffic

and in the afternoon, coming out from Bridgetown from 12 noon to midnight we are using the opposite direction coming out of Bridgetown going east. In that way you would not disrupt the Hastings Highway 7 at all but diversions will only be on the opposite side of the rush hour. That is basically what I wanted to say.

Thank you.

SENATOR D. GILL: Mr. President, I would like to follow in a similar vein as Senators Murray and Welch. Before I do that, I would like to inform Senator Bernstein when we did the Bridgetown Sewerage Project there was little or no real disruption of traffic. If we follow in a similar style there would be some hope...

Aside.

SENATOR D. GILL: I well remember there was one day where traffic really went out of hand and the whole of the City was crazy. What has me a bit concerned is whether the 2.25 million capacity of the treatment plant will be one large enough to handle the South Coast because, as far as I can see it, it is not only going to be the hotels which will be making use of it but the residents as well, just as in the City not only the business houses but the people from within the City. I would like to think that during very difficult periods, one in which numbers have soared like Crop-Over and Christmas, that we would not be approaching the maximum capacity because today when one makes projections one is looking down at 20/20, and I would not like to see us tackling it a second time within 25 years.

The other factor which is of some concern is that of stench. A couple of years ago, I do not think it exists right now, we had a problem at the more westerly side of the City where you could actually pick up the stench, that is, in the Kensington area and beyond, for quite some distance from the Treatment Plant. I hope that we use some of the most up-to-date deodorizing chemicals which would help to eliminate or reduce to as great an extent as possible the stench because we are not only looking to please the visitors but we are looking to please first and foremost the residents. I do not think we should always be pinpointing what would interfere with the visitors as opposed to what would interfere with those who are here 365 days.

What I would have also liked to see is that we are bringing not only a Resolution to secure lands for the pumping of the sewage, but I would have loved to see at the same time that we consider the whole area as one and we look at the Graeme Hall Swamp, that we look at a desalination plant, even if we do not act on it right now, and we look at another plant further south, in the Spencers area where, at the moment, the effluent from the City sewer is taken into the south. I would have loved to see another plant there which would treat that further and use it for irrigation in the south-eastern part of the country.

From time to time we have heard stories some for, and some against the water being used at the Garrison to keep it lush. We have been reading of the hardships which have been experienced over the past year with water. We are fully aware the extent to which the world bodies are looking at the conservation of water.

Earlier on in another Resolution Senator Bolden spoke of the underground lakes and rivers and this was backed up on this one by Senator Laurie. We should try to maximise wherever possible every drop of water so if we use desalination for one purpose, be it the golf courses or whatever, and then you back up the irrigation with the sewage which has been treated and then on a third you can use the treated sewage, some smaller hotels - I know a few years ago the Hilton had its own treatment plant - and you can use it to maintain the lawn and gardens which take a heavy toll on our underwater supply.

The sludge which Senator Welch referred to as being used in agriculture again we can improve on that and use it once again in agriculture, not this time to irrigate but to fertilize. Anything which impacts on our plant or animal life should be taken with a great degree of concern because, as I said, not only are we looking at our tourist arrivals but that is a serious and important aspect, but we are also looking at maintaining this small island in a habitable state over the next century. I think most of us will be around at the turn of the Century and I do not think we will be that stingy not to be laying the correct groundwork for those who are coming at the turn of the other Century.
2.50 p.m.

I spoke earlier about bringing it in a holistic way of treatment. If we were to look at the swamp at Graeme Hall, if I understand correctly, the actual treatment plant will be at the north eastern side of the Graeme Hall Swamp. It would not interfere with the Swamp life. It would not interfere with the river and I am fairly pleased to see that that has been taken into account.

Today when we are looking at marine life, we are looking at fish farming, we are looking at fish farming not only in saline conditions but semi saline and in absolutely fresh water conditions, again we must take our hats off to the planning of the South Coast Sewerage Project. I think anyone who sits on this side should be more than pleased to see that we have tackled, as I put it, Plant No. 1, we are about to tackle Plant No. 2 and this document makes reference of Plant No. 3. Of course we would have to look at a West Coast Sewerage Project. Whereas in another

document, Sir, we see that there were lots of studies carried out to be executed, to be looked at and have been looked at and are to be looked at again. But this shows you that we are in keeping with the vision is vision. We are looking ahead of the times. We are 30, 40 years ahead. If we stick to this timetable then Barbados would be a much more comfortable place to live notwithstanding the leaps which we are making in the world of science and technology, effluent and chemicals, et cetera being potentially hazardous.

Anything, any monies which would be spent in the acquisitions in order to make the environment a more comfortable and habitable place for all Barbadians and visitors alike I have absolutely no difficulty in associating myself with it. I am much obliged, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Thompson.

SENATOR Mrs. A. P. THOMPSON: Thank you, Mr. President. In speaking on this Resolution, I hear the other members applauding themselves on the Sewerage Project. I think I should draw to the attention of my friend, Senator Gill, that in the National Development Plan 1993-2000, I believe it is already a document of this House, on the West Coast Sewerage Project, the construction of the West Coast Sewerage System will commence following the completion of the South Coast Sewerage System. This project will benefit from technical assistance provided – not to be provided by – the Inter-American Development Bank. It is as much a part of another document as it is a part of yours.

I think we would all agree that with the increase in tourism in Barbados and the emphasis being placed on the development of tourism that it is very important that we try to secure our shores. We all recognize that the disposal of human and other waste into the sea creates serious problems for our marine life and our ecosystems.

I must say I am a little concerned as a Barbadian, I do not mind how we play our party politics but I do not think that any proud Barbadian should feel proud referring to anything in Barbados as Mount Stinkeroo. I think that if we were to be in the United States of America and hear somebody refer to any place in Barbados as Mount Stinkeroo, it would hurt. When Barbadians refer to Barbados in that way it says a lot about us and how much we really love our country and the extent to which we would go. I really hope that we would desist despite our political feelings from time to time from referring to the landfill, when we do not call it a dump we call it Mount Stinkeroo. It does not say anything about our national pride.

It is known that waste is being used in many areas. It is a big business now all over the world. I have seen furniture which has been produced from the plastic bottles which we dispose of at our homes. I know of a young man in Barbados who has approached the Government about a project which he has and he is going to get some international funding on it to dispose of a number of these things which were discussed earlier, like the waste from animals and things like this. He has a number of useful ideas on how we can go about this. I hope that Government would keep its ears opened to individuals. We say we want to develop small people in business, I hope that we would listen to these small people who have these ideas and that we do not think we have to bring experts in at all times to do these things when there are Barbadians among us who are equipped to do so.

The components in the South Coast Sewerage Project are a sewerage treatment plant – I understand, according to Senator Farley that some adjustments are being made. I do not know if we are going down this road still – a marine outfall and the property connections, the over 3 000 properties to be connected. This project is due to be completed in 1997. Are we still on target to complete the sewerage project in 1997?

Asides.

SENATOR Mrs. A. P. THOMPSON: Fortunately for me, I know a Barbadian is not a B, a D or a N. It is rather unfortunate that others have not learnt that. As a Barbadian...

Asides.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Order, please. Order, please.

SENATOR Mrs. A. P. THOMPSON: ...I feel extremely pleased to see that in the island in which I was born and my children were born that we are going to have erected here a sewerage project in the south coast and that at some time we will have one on the west coast also because we have a Barbados that we can all be proud of in the future.

As a Barbadian in a developing country which is the envy of many others, I hope the Government will continue to pursue these projects which would help to enhance our environment and cause us to be considered and continue to be ranked number one in the developing world and number 20 in the developed world. I believe that things like the improvement of our environment contribute significantly to these ratings.

As a member of the Democratic Labour Party I would have no objections whatsoever in supporting this Resolution since the campaign is over.

Aside.

SENATOR Mrs. A. P. THOMPSON: You still seem to have campaign fever. We are here to do the business of the people.

Mr. President, I therefore support this Resolution. Thank you very much, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Bolden.

HIS HONOUR SENATOR C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. President, I am happy to see that the Honourable Senator has taken that great leap across the great divide and has now come into the land of the living and those who have vision. But although she read from a document prepared by those whom she formerly supported she has missed a very cardinal point which I believe will go to the success of any further sewage treatment plant that is developed in Barbados.
3.00 p.m.

I well remember the history of the first plant that was developed, when one early morning somebody dressed in a dark suit with a jacket over his head went to the house of Mr. Lionel Craig and knocked on the window and pushed up a document and said, take this, take this, and disappeared. When Lionel opened the document it was the agreement signed by a Minister of Health who then became a Prime Minister and which had so many unacceptable terms therein, including raising the water rates of the entire population of Barbados to support a sewerage plant in the St. Michael area. That plan was on sandy ground and had to be revitalised and put on a firm footing.

Since that agreement had certain commitments the then Barbados Labour Party Government was unable to extricate itself from these difficulties and I would like to say to the Minister introducing this particular Resolution that when he noted that there is still not 100% connections to the Bridgetown Sewerage Project that that project raised several legal problems in terms of connections. And I would hope that the Government would look at this project now and amend it in such a way and at the same time come back to the House with a Resolution to provide sufficient funding that all properties on the West Coast would be immediately connected to the system from the time it is completed and that the cost of those connections can be pro-rated on to your Waterworks bill over a given period because that is the basic reason why you have not got 100% connections to the Bridgetown project.

I well remember being asked a question by somebody from the Water Authority if they could go to court to make people in Bridgetown connect to the system. I told them that properties in Bridgetown had an inherent right which you cannot override by putting down a system and telling them they have to connect to it and that the best thing to do would be to offer financial assistance to all the properties in Bridgetown or Government should make the connections and agree with the property holders to defray the cost over a given period suitable to the pockets of the property holders.

I would like to see the South Coast Sewerage system adopt such a policy and before you even start, you go around to every householder, get his or her agreement on the approximate cost of the connection and spread it over the 1 year or 2 year period and attach it to the Waterworks bill. We would then get 100% connections.

I know in the last 8 years, the last administration never thought about the pockets of people in Barbados. We had the same problem with the extension of the natural gas line. You come in an area and say, we are putting in natural gas. Apply now if not when we cover up you cannot get natural gas for another 3 or 4 years because we are not digging up the road. Then there was the complaint that people were not connecting to the gas mains.

Now if you are going to do excavations on the road, if you are improving your whole country, I think you have to bear in mind that there is not every householder out there who can afford that lump sum of money at a particular time.

Human waste and any waste connected with human existence is a necessary evil and while we talk about the reuse of the water, I would like to remind this Chamber that when the Bridgetown Sewerage Plant was being discussed that is one of the proposals that was mentioned that we should reuse the water from the plant rather than pump it into the sea. We suggested that that water be used to irrigate the lands around the BMC and IDC buildings and the surrounding areas in Broad Street so that we could landscape the whole of that area.

If you look at what is called the Carlisle Bay Development Plan you will note that a series of trees were proposed to go down what is the back of the wharf, the old Marshall Hall Building etc. There was to be a nice walk down there. But there was an outcry in Barbados of reusing sewerage water. We in Barbados have been accused over the years to using pure water pumped and used once and washed out. That is why it was changed to pump it out to sea. We have to do a good public relations work and educate the people as to the reuse of sewerage water.

I hear in this Chamber, people talk about the reuse of the water for irrigation. Barbados has one water system, not like other countries that have a system for irrigation water and a system for drinking water. If you are talking about reusing this water for irrigational purposes you must look at a separate system because you cannot pocket into the water lines and I think the South Coast sewerage system

can have a beneficial effect on the properties on the South Coast because I think we need to bring back more greenery to our landscape.

We have over the years allowed too many houses to be constructed in such a way that you have no green forecourts or anything. I think we need to look at that. Even take Accra Beach, you have trees but you have no grass and all along that coast one would have to look at a system whereby you are going to use that water for irrigating those areas to have grass growing along there to give us little more greenery, etc. in the area.

I think it is going to be a great engineering feat as to how you are going to reuse the water without putting it into the present system. At one time there was a suggestion that we pump the sewerage up to two great ponds in St. George and that is the time we were developing the church area and people in St. George had an outcry of pumping sewerage up to St. George so you are up against a belief by Barbadians that from the time they hear the word sewage it is bad. It is unwanted. But where are you going to put it? It is a necessary evil that I do not believe any administration has had the strength to deal with the matter. We have a pulverization plant in St. George. When I went into office in 1976, it was already in existence. I suggested that we make two additions to that plant and that we grade the stuff that came out of that plant and we further refine it for agricultural purposes. But nobody took note of that. Everybody is thinking now of growing crops organically and I think that this would be a perfect time to use the waste that comes out of the pulverization plant to spread it back onto our agricultural lands to enhance the components of the land. We probably have to look at a special team to look at solid waste disposal and, in doing that, you have a good body to do your public relations and then you can market the sale of this stuff to the best for all.
3.10 p.m.

Sir, I support the Resolution 100 per cent but, as I said, I would hope that the Minister would convey to the Ministry of Finance that they should provide that money to the system that connections are made at the time when the lines are being laid and not wait later to go back and cut tracks to make the connection or wait for people to make the connections. Otherwise, you will end up like the Bridgetown Sewerage System and you will not get 100 per cent connections.

Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR THE HON. R. R. FARLEY: Sir, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

ORDER NO. 5 - TO MOVE THE PASSING OF A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF A PARCEL OF LAND AT ALLEN VIEW, WELCHMAN HALL, ST. THOMAS FOR THE LAYING OF UNDERGROUND ELECTRICAL CABLE AT HARRISON'S CAVE

SENATOR THE HON. R. R. FARLEY: Mr. President, the Honourable Senate is being asked to support this Resolution for the compulsory acquisition of 1 068.5 square metres of land at Allen View, Welchman Hall, St. Thomas for the purpose of laying underground electrical cables at Harrison's Cave.

Sir, the Harrison Cave, as you are aware, is one of Barbados' major tourist attractions particularly cruise ship visitors who are spending just one day here. That is one of the "must see" places on their schedule. The Cave as we think of it, Sir, is usually considered an underground attraction. However, Sir, there are a number of overground activities which will cause us from time to time to have to take action such as we are taking today. That is the acquisition of land on top of the Cave as it were, Sir, for various purposes.

This matter relates to the electrical upgrading of the Cave and the parcel of land which we are seeking to acquire would allow for the laying and, of course, once we are laying the underground cables we need to have the right to the property and furthermore the continual control over what happens on that property to ensure that all goes well. This property is one which will allow for the most direct route for the laying of underground cables from the electrical main to the Cave.

Now we have discovered that the Cave has been beset by a number of difficulties. As I said, Sir, it is a major tourism attraction and everything must be done to ensure that it remains as such. I am sure you are aware, Sir, that the malfunctioning of some of the trams, which we call the trains in the Cave but they are really trams, have caused delays in terms of being able to satisfy bookings. As we understand it, Sir, matters have reached such a stage over the last 12 months or so that some cruise-lines were threatening to withdraw the Cave from their list of attractions. Because as you know, Sir, with a one day tour precision of the movements around the island is extremely important and also because of the emphasis of the lines on quality of service they take a very deem view of their clients not being satisfied or being able to enjoy some of the sites and so on that were recommended by the trip.

We are in the process of effecting repairs to a number of the trams that had become unserviceable. This has proven to be somewhat of a difficult task in terms of

acquisition of the replacement parts, the engineering capability as required and so on. We are also concerned, Sir, that the management of this national treasure be considered as a major component of Barbados' major tourism future. We are concerned that there are reports of some level of degradation of the stalactites and stalagmites. We are concerned about the level of customer service. We are concerned about the apparent failure to maximize the fact that being a major attraction many visitors will be attracted on a daily basis and we need to ensure that not only we focus on the Cave itself but provide other opportunities for us to take some money off those visitors who spend some time at the Cave.

In this regard, Sir, we are currently reviewing the entire operations of the Cave. Because we consider the Cave to be an area not just an underground attraction where we need an entrance and that is it. We obviously have to maximize the tourism potential of the area as well as ensuring to the extent that is necessary for the control and preservation of that national treasure. We also control the lands which are around the area, Sir.

I am sure you would have heard already, Sir, that there is a problem, for example, coming from the use of bits of lands over the Cave and that matter will be the subject of attention of this Chamber in due course. But you are aware that things like the trams and the disposal of the waste from pig farms is being disposed in the traditional route that has been used over time and has caused some of this matter to find its way into the Cave. There have been reports of discomforting odours and some measure of discolouration in the actual Cave.

Sir, the point that I am making is the management of this national treasure is a matter which we take very seriously and we do not view the Cave to be limited to the underground component of it; that is the attraction side. This is what people go to see. But we will certainly be paying very close attention to all matters that impact on the Cave to ensure that that treasure which took thousands of years to develop would not be devastated by a few years of human interaction.

Sir, this Bill is as much a tourism matter as it is a land acquisition matter. I want to make the point that in developing our economic resources such as our tourism potential that we have to approach it, and we will approach it in a holistic manner. We will not allow the failure to take care of what are apparent minor details to have a major negative impact on our national treasure. From time to time, Sir, matters relating to the areas around the Cave will be brought to this Chamber. Investigations will be carried out to determine what those matters are. In other words, we have to ensure that as part of the ongoing management of the Cave, not only do we ensure that people can go to see it, but the continual environmental impact assessment of it so that we can be kept abreast of how the Cave is shaping up both regarding human interaction in terms of visitors to the Cave and in terms of activities above the ground and seek to take proactive steps to ensure that the treasure is preserved.

3:20 p.m.

I would ask that this Honourable Senate support this measure which, as I said, is one which is aimed at providing for the upgrading of the electrical facilities at the Cave and the acquisition of the land is required to provide for a more direct routing of such cable and for the subsequent control of the area where the cable is laid.

I beg that this Resolution do now pass.

SENATOR Mrs. V. DAVIS: Mr. President, I rise to support the Resolution on the Land Acquisition Act, Cap. 228 and the land to be acquired for the laying of underground cable at Harrison Cave. I am particularly interested in a Resolution like this because, as the Senator said, this is one of our great treasures and we are here as good husbandmen. We have to see that our natural treasures are preserved.

I would also like to think that not only do we acquire the land and see that this Cave is efficiently run, but I would also like to think that not only our tourists - and I am one of those people who encourage people and I think it is a wonderful natural resource - but that we also try to make it convenient and accessible for the public. I am thinking especially about our young people and school children. I remember that there used to be some transportation going directly to the Cave from the bus stands. I am not sure; but I think this is one of the things I would like to see in the overall, total development of the Cave that we not only make sure that it is run efficiently and that we make sure we take the care of the environment but that we make sure it is easily available to the inhabitants to come and go so that everyone can know that there is a bus that goes every hour, especially during vacation time.

I also want to say that having been at the Cave several times I am also wondering what plans are there for an overall development in terms of shops and restaurants and things in a way that we probably might need more land. We probably might need to use a lot more land to do the sort of things I am thinking about. I have heard people say that it is really one of the rare wonders that we have here at Harrison's Cave. In just making that brief intervention, I would like definitely to support this Bill.

SENATOR THE HON. G. MURRAY: Mr. President, in rising to support this Resolution I am happy to advise that during the luncheon break I had a chat with the

Chairman of the National Conservation Commission and, as a result of that information, I am therefore able to allay some of the fears and anxieties that members might have vis-a-vis the availability of the Cave to cater to the traditional influx of large numbers of visitors and users of the Cave for the winter tourist season. He has advised me that the two trams that have been ordered for the Cave are now expected to be installed and functioning for the December 15 opening of the winter season. That should take a great deal of strain off the ability of the Cave to service the demand from visitors and locals alike.

The prior arrangements for the acquisition of these two new trams ran into a number of difficulties because of the quality of the companies chosen to provide them, but that is now behind us. These two new trams will come on stream by December 15 and there will be a programme of phasing out. I think there are four older trams which will be phased out over a period of time by replacements every few months so that in due course there will be a brand new stock of trams to service the population who would like to visit the cave which, I have been told, amounts to something like 9 000 a month. So that is something like 108 000 a year which is a fairly sizeable sum of money that could be garnered therefrom.

I have heard members refer to the cave as a natural wonder and local treasure, but I have read about caves in other parts of the world and talked to people because, when I was at the Board of Tourism, I was involved in some part of the development of the Cave and therefore I know some of its background and some of its early days. They tell me that it is what speleologists regard as one of the 8th natural wonders of the world. It is really a magnificent gift of nature and we, therefore, have the responsibility to make sure that we make maximum use of it.

I would also answer some of the queries from Senator Davis. She was wondering about a more comprehensive development of the Cave and I was told that, for example, plans are now actually in the hands of the architects and technicians to provide a restaurant on top of the Cave which would not only serve food and drink but provide visitors with a very appealing and magnificent view of the South Coast of the Island. Apparently, it is very striking from that area and in addition there are plans to erect various duty free shops, souvenir shops.

It has always bothered me why you are able to go to New York and come back with a miniature of the Statue of Liberty or the Empire State Building or you go to France and you get the Eiffel Tower and you go to the Cave and there is no miniaturization. We have pottery here and people can easily produce miniature replicas of the Cave so that when you leave you have something which is a souvenir of lasting value and which acts in itself as a promotion device.

In addition, there are no tee shirts. There are no mugs and these are the kinds of areas where I understand the new management of the Cave will be going into. So that in addition to seeing the actual cave you will be part of what they would like to call the Harrison's Cave's experience and, in that regard, they are going to provide entertainment during the day or at night at the Cave to make a whole host of activities. They are going to upgrade the treatment that people get when they visit the Cave so that you don't have people who sell you a ticket and guide you but you will have hostesses who will greet you and who will be trained to interact with the public in a much more hospitable manner and make them feel that they are really welcome in order to enhance the value and the whole experience that one gets from visiting Harrison's Cave.

In that regard, Sir, I beg to support this Resolution.

The question was put and agreed to.

3.30 p.m.

ORDER NO. 6 – THE MARRIAGE (AMENDMENT) (No. 2) BILL, 1994

SENATOR THE HON. R. FARLEY: Mr. President, the matter before us, the Marriage (Amendment) (No. 2) Bill, 1994, this amendment seeks to remove the requirement for the 3 day waiting period before couples who are desirous of entering the holy estate of marriage may proceed to do so. This matter involves the repeal of section 29 of Cap. 219A.

This matter is important, Sir, primarily in the light of the success Barbados has had in promoting itself as a location for honeymoons within the tourism market. That package has been quite successful. In fact, it is one of the leading lights within the assignment of the tourism industry. We have found that this particular matter of the 3 day wait has resulted in some obstacles towards benefitting even more from this package. For example, because of the 3 day wait obviously cruise ship passengers cannot take advantage of tying the nuptial knot in Barbados.

It is interesting to note, Sir, that of the marriages annually in Barbados which average around 2 000, approximately 50% of those are marriages of non nationals. This would indicate that matters relating to the Marriage Act are not just applicable to Barbadians but equally to visitors to our shores.

The other consideration in this matter, Sir, is that with respect to tourism our competitors in Jamaica have already moved ahead some time ago to make it possible for

couples who fall in love either with, or in Jamaica, or both, that they should be able to do what you and I agree, Sir, would be the right thing and that is, to get married as quickly as possible.

What we are seeking to do then, Sir, is to ensure that we maintain and attain some measure of competitiveness with other destinations in this matter. Of significant note is the fact that Sandals Resort which, as you know, portends to be a couples only resort, has given commitment that it will commence its renovations and the subsequent opening of its hotel in Barbados. We can expect that the marketing edge with respect to our honeymoon business will be enhanced by a couples only resort such as Sandals. To maintain this 3 day waiting period would only frustrate the efforts of persons who have been shot with Cupid's arrow with the kind of assistance and facilitation of the salubrious climate in Barbados.

Aside.

SENATOR THE HON. F. FARLEY: If I am waxing poetically, it is because the concept and the idea of marriage I am so happy in that holy estate that it moves me to speak in glowing terms.

But, Sir, like I said before, it is important we understand that the amendment we are making is justified with respect to making adjustment for non nationals because, as I quoted earlier, half of the marriages in Barbados are by non nationals. As we know the question will be asked, why would we seek to amend the Marriage Act which some skeptics would wish to suggest would add a frivolous air to the serious act of marriage by removing that mandatory wait. The concept in having that wait was that people who were contemplating such a serious step should have all opportunity to reflect, and possibly reject the idea. But I am advised that there might be other considerations. What we are doing with this amendment is we are making it possible for those non nationals who currently visit the island as tourists to be able to get married in Barbados as soon as they can basically.

Sir, in introducing the amendment to the Marriage Act the Minister took the opportunity to make the appropriate amendments to the Marriage Forms and Fees Regulations which would be in line with the new provisions of the Marriage Act.

Sir, you will want to take note as well that amendments were made to the Marriage Act and gazetted March 31, 1994. Those other amendments you are already familiar with which were necessary. The necessary steps of repealing section 29 were not taken at that point in time. We are seeking to do that today to enhance our tourism product by allowing couples to become married in Barbados within a one day period.

I would urge members of this Honourable Chamber to support the amendment to the Marriage Act which represents the repeal of section 29.

I beg to move, Sir, that this Bill be now read a second time.

SENATOR Mrs. A. P. THOMPSON: Mr. President, I cannot help but observe that we seem to be doing quite a bit in the name of tourism. I think home drums beat first. We have a few things in the Marriage Act which we need to address. I am particularly concerned about that area of the Act which does not permit the foreign husbands of Barbadian women to the same entitlement of citizenship that the foreign wives....

SENATOR THE HON. R. FARLEY: On a point of order, Mr. President. That matter really relates to the Constitution, not the Marriage Act.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Farley is quite right.

SENATOR Mrs. A. P. THOMPSON: Thank you, Senator Farley. I think it is an area that deals with marriage so I believe I can deal with it. I am not talking about fiats or mercedes. I hope that matter will be addressed expeditiously. The Attorney General has given us the assurance that it is on his table. I hope that it does not remain there for a very long time and that in the shortest period of time the women of Barbados would have this same benefit granted to their foreign husbands. I believe the men thought that by giving us this that we would bring all of these foreign husbands in. But we note how many foreign wives there are in Barbados at this time.
3.40 p.m.

On behalf of the women's organizations and the many women in Barbados I call on the Government to deal with this matter urgently.

Aside.

SENATOR Mrs. A. P. THOMPSON: I have no problems dealing with marriage. I kept my end of the bargain, 'til death do us part. I believe the others here who have done otherwise have their problem to deal with.

I therefore, Sir, have no difficulty in supporting this Bill since it aims to assist this country in earning some foreign exchange and to keep up our competitiveness in the tourism market.

Thank you.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Bolden.

HIS HONOUR SENATOR C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. President, the Honourable Senator is doing her best in making a contribution on this Bill. But for the benefit of the lady, what she is speaking about cannot fall under the Marriage Act of Barbados because you are looking at women who marry foreign husbands sometimes outside of Barbados and they are governed by the Marriage Act of the particular State in which they are married. Therefore any amendment to the Marriage Act in Barbados would not achieve what the Honourable Senator would like to see.

What the Senator is talking about is a little bit more difficult than it sounds. It is rooted in international law and international law says that a woman takes the nationality of her husband on marriage. We have had cases here and my friend would tell you we have Barbadian women who marry men from Lebanon, et cetera, and that is where their nationality comes all of a sudden. I had a case here where a Barbadian woman, married to a Jamaican man in England had some children, the man abandoned her, she sent the children to Barbados and I had to fight for years before could get the Immigration authority to allow those children to remain in Barbados because in international law they are Jamaicans. They are not Barbadians any more.

We have, under the Constitution of Barbados, where a child born of a Barbadian father outside of Barbados is still a Barbadian. That is not so. You have to look at our Constitution and our Constitution must make special provision for those circumstances because it might not still work in places like the United States. It is a Constitutional amendment which has got to be made and as you know full well, as soon as you talk about touching the Constitution in Barbados everybody is up in arms. It has to be carefully dealt with when you are going that way.

But getting back to the Marriage Bill I can understand the Government's desire to amend this 3 day wait. This 3 day wait crept into this Bill because there were a lot of persons from foreign countries who came to Barbados and they got married in a method which is not common to the Barbadian situation, or they would come on vacation and then you suddenly hear they are getting married and, as I said, because the women were marrying to Barbadian men immediately, under the Constitution, they had the domicile of their husband and you could not put them out. It pertained particularly to the Indians.

The Immigration Department concocted the system that most Indians coming to Barbados are only given a visa or permission for 3 days stamped at the airport for 3 days and then they have to go back to the Immigration Department and get an extension. The next point that came up was what they call arranged marriages and that is why it crept in. We have to be more magnanimous than that in these days because people do it here and Bajans do it out there too. There are no maybes about that. Bajans go to the United States, find a man, marry to him, find a woman, marry to her and then apply for citizenship of the United States. We have to be just as magnanimous.

What I would like to have seen, along with this Bill would be an amendment to the Family Law Act, Section 21 which deals with the jurisdiction in matrimonial and divorce cases and I think that would be more lucrative to the Barbados Government. If you amend Section 21 or 22 which allowed a decree, Section 22 says:

> "Proceedings for a decree of dissolution of marriage may be instituted under this Act by a party to the marriage if at the date on which the application for the decree is filed in the court either party to the marriage is a citizen of Barbados, is domiciled in Barbados, is a permanent resident of Barbados within the meaning of the Immigration Act or is an immigrant of Barbados within the meaning of the Immigration Act and has resided in Barbados continuously for 1 year immediately proceeding that date."

I would have liked to have seen that amended because many of us in the legal profession who practice at the Bar – and the Senator over there is not one who practices at the Bar. He is too well off, he sits in Chambers and he does the lucrative conveyancing. He does not have to go down – but those of us who go down to the Bar would know that we get letters from people in the United States, we get letters from people in the United Kingdom, et cetera, where sometimes the wife is in Barbados and we have situations here where a lot of women come to Barbados, fall in love with the sun and the sea, et cetera, or vice versa the men come here and decide they are staying here and then the other party comes down and would like a divorce. Normally, the other spouse does not care whether they get a divorce or not. But because of the restrictions in the Family Law Act you cannot help. You have to go back in England. You have to send the petition to the person and the person has to sign it and all this thing before it goes through.

In Barbados, under the present Family Law Act, if the parties have lived what they call separate and apart for 1 year – and separate and apart does not mean you have to live outside the same house. You live in the same house but you have no conjugal arrangements between the two of you. The law says so. The law says she could cook for you, serve you at the dinner table, everything and you could still go and get a divorce. Many people come here and would like to have a divorce in 4,5 weeks and get it off. It is valuable foreign exchange earning which can accrue like in Mexico.

I would entreat the Honourable Minister to speak to those responsible and see if they can couple this arrangement because having given them the right to marry when they come, when they come back next year and they do not like it any more they want a new spouse you should be in a position to accommodate them as well.

I personally do not see any problems because the fear which people may speak about is where there are children involved. I think our law has that situation that you will obtain Part I of the divorce but you cannot receive the final part unless the welfare of the children have been taken care of to the satisfaction of a judge. Even if they did Part I here it would be lucrative for this country if the property matters are dealt with here because they can be dealt with quickly and since we have the Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgement Act in Barbados, a judgement obtained in Barbados can be registered with the particular Embassy here and be effective in the other country. There is no problem as far as that is concerned. A little more imagination and we could make a round package which would be satisfactory to most people in the same way as you are going to take one limb of it now and you could do it together. That is my contribution. I support the amendment to the Act, Sir.
3.50 p.m.

SENATOR Miss O. P. SYMMONDS: Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment to the Marriage Act. Yesterday I was very pleased indeed, stemming from this Bill to hear the Attorney General in the other place assure people that the problem of foreign husbands would be addressed.

I was privileged to be the Deputy Chairman of the National Commission on the Status of Women which looked at this problem and which heard views through public hearings. And, Mr. President, this is an anomaly which hinders considerably the man's ability to make his contribution to the family.

At present only Barbadian men can confer citizenship on their wives through marriage. This right does not extend to the Barbadian woman. Husbands have to apply for immigrant or resident status just like any one who is residing or living here.

On page 98, Section 184 and of course this was laid in Parliament in September 1978 – The Report of the National Commission on the Status of Women – it precisely stated that under section 6 of the Constitution a woman who marries a citizen of Barbados or who marries a husband who later becomes a citizen of Barbados is entitled herself to register as a citizen of Barbados, but not a man who marries a woman in similar circumstances.

It went on to say, "The Commission accordingly recommends that any discriminatory provisions which prevent the husband of a Barbadian woman from registering as a Barbadian citizen, a right now enjoyed by the wife of a Barbadian man, be altered."

So, again I repeat that I am very pleased that this Government with its usual vision and its action and decisive difference for change will be doing something about this very soon. Again I am very pleased to support this Bill.

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: Mr. President, I support this measure particularly because of the significant role it plays in our tourism product.

Sir, a visit to Barbados and indeed a visit to the tropics is not just a question of the sea and the sand, but it is all a fantasy of visiting the Caribbean. And just as there is a song which talks about, "I am dreaming of a white Christmas", many people in Europe and North America often dream and fantasize about having a tropical wedding, a wedding in "Paradise" with all the flowers and music and rum punch, coconut trees and the sea next door. Therefore this measure really is one step towards having to realise this dream, this fantasy or this goal as somebody might deem to call it.

Up to March this year Barbados was, believe it or not, the only island in the Caribbean catering heavily to tourists that had this waiting period and as a result it caused us to lose our competitiveness where attracting people to Barbados to get married is concerned. Therefore this step puts us in line with the other destinations that conduct a very lucrative business in what really is slowly becoming a major sub-sector in the overall tourism product.

It is a specialist market which the Barbados Tourism Authority, I am happy to say, takes very seriously to the extent that it advertises every year very heavily in Brides magazine which is a very prestigious magazine that, as its name implies, caters exclusively to brides and bridal parties and all the activities surrounding getting married.

It is a magazine which for example boasts of having exposure to something like 4 256 000 bridal consumers so when Barbados advertises in it, it has a tremendous reach and it therefore has a significant impact on what we do in tourism.

Now this marriage by non-residents is a growing phenomena. For example I have some statistics that indicate that in 1992, 956 non resident marriages took place in Barbados. In 1993 this rose to 1 256 and between January and August this year there have already been 1 149.

It is also of interest to note that for the January to August period this year only 654 resident Barbadians got married here. Some skeptics would say that while the marriage rate for non-resident Barbadians is going up, the divorce rate for Barbadians is also going up but that is something that I think would require deeper study and deeper analysis to establish the true reasons for that.

On the other hand, Sir, the bridal market does not cater to what might be deemed to be the cheaper tourist. It is regarded as a middle/upper income bracket type of tourist whereby most of these weddings take place on the West Coast where the up-market segment of the tourism plant and product heavily reside.

Therefore, we stand to gain very significantly from this activity, where for example, the fee payable for non-residents and non-citizens is $100 cash and then $25 stamp duty. That in itself is also a money earning activity. When one multiplies this and adds this to the money earned by the Marriage Officers, I understand there is one man who makes $18 000 a year who virtually specialises in these activities. A marriage officer is either a Magistrate or a Minister of religion. If you can make $18 000 a year I think that is something. Seeing that our "number one job is jobs", I think we may be able to create more jobs by pushing this activity even further.

Mr. President, I therefore thought I would add those kinds of factors to let people see that it is not a whimsical activity or an activity that can be taken very slightly or this is just a trivial measure on the part of the Government. It is something that has significant impact on our tourism product.

I thank you.

4.00 p.m.

SENATOR THE HON. R. R. FARLEY: Mr. President, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

On the motion of SENATOR THE HON. R. R. FARLEY, Mr. PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate went into Committee on the Bill, HIS HONOUR SENATOR C. L. BOLDEN in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Senate is in Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On the motion of SENATOR THE HON. R. R. FARLEY, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. PRESIDENT resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of SENATOR THE HON. R. R. FARLEY, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. R. R. FARLEY: Mr. President, I would like to move that this House do now adjourn sine die. I would also want to inform the Senators that the earliest possible date for our next meeting will be December 7th given that the House of Assembly has been adjourned until December 6th and we have taken care of all outstanding matters which have come up from the House of Assembly. So the earliest date will be December 7th and we most likely will meet next on December 14th.

The question that the Senate do now adjourn was put to the Senate and agreed to, and Mr. PRESIDENT adjourned the sitting accordingly.

4.05 p.m.

CONTENTS

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

SENATOR THE HON. R. R. FARLEY 83

1. Guarantees granted under the Exempt Insurance Act, Cap. 308A to the following:

   (a) Atlantic International Reinsurance Company Ltd.

   (b) Atlantic Offshore Insurance Ltd.

   (c) European Atlantic Reassurance Company Ltd.

   (d) European International Holding Company Ltd.

   (e) European International Reinsurance Company Ltd.

   (f) Glenmaple Reinsurance Co. Ltd.

   (g) HSM Insurance Ltd.

   (h) I. F. A. Insurance Company Limited

   (i) Monticello Insurance Limited

   (j) Phencorp Reinsurance Company Inc.

   (k) Standard Reinsurance of North America Ltd.

   (l) Union Excess Reinsurance Company Ltd.

2. The Immigration (Forms and Fees) (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations, 1994.

3. Annual Report of the National Housing Corporation for the Financial Year 1992-93.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER

SENATOR THE HON. R. R. FARLEY 84

Suspension of Standing Order 45(2) for the remainder of the sitting.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SENATOR THE HON. R. R. FARLEY 84

Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill, 1994.

The Marriage (Amendment) (No. 2) Bill, 1994.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

SENATOR THE HON. R. R. FARLEY 84

Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill, 1994.

Marriage (Amendment) (No. 2) Bill, 1994.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 1 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT MAXWELL, CHRIST CHURCH .. 84

Senator the Hon. R. R. Farley, 84; Senator Mrs. A. P. Thompson, 84; His Honour Senator C. L. Bolden, 84, 86; Senator J. A. Workman, 86; Senator Miss O. P. Symmonds, 85; Senator P. S. Bernstein, 85, 86.

ORDER NO. 2 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT LOWER ESTATE TENANTRY, ST. GEORGE 86

Senator the Hon. R. R. Farley, 86; Senator Mrs. A. P. Thompson, 87; His Honour Senator C. L. Bolden, 93; Senator the Hon. G. S. H. Murray, 89; Senator C. K. Laurie, 89; Senator Miss J. C. Odle, 90; Senator J. A. Workman, 90, 92.

RESUMPTION

ORDER NO. 3 – LAND ACQUISITION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1994 95

Senator the Hon. R. R. Farley, 95; His Honour Senator C. L. Bolden, 95; Senator P. S. Bernstein, 97.

ORDER NO. 4 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF THREE PARCELS OF LAND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF PUMPING STATIONS 97

Senator the Hon. R. R. Farley, 97; Senator the Hon. G. S. H. Murray, 99; Senator T. E. Barker, 98; Senator C. K. Laurie, 98; Senator N. P. Welch, 99; Senator P. S. Bernstein, 100; Senator D. T. Gill, 101; Senator Mrs. A. P. Thompson, 102; His Honour Senator C. L. Bolden, 103.

ORDER NO. 5 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPUSLORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT ALLEN VIEW, WELCHMAN HALL, ST. THOMAS 104

Senator the Hon. R. R. Farley, 104; Senator Mrs. V. J. Davis, 105; Senator the Hon. G. S. H. Murray, 105.

ORDER NO. 6 – MARRIAGE (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) BILL, 1994 106

Senator the Hon. R. R. Farley, 106, 107; Senator Mrs. A. P. Thompson, 107; His Honour Senator C. L. Bolden, 108; Senator Miss O. P. Symmonds, 109; Senator the Hon. G. S. H. Murray, 109.

SUSPENSION 95

Senator the Hon. R. R. Farley, 95.

ADJOURNMENT 110

Senator the Honourable R. R. Farley, 110.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

BARKER, Senator T. E.
BERNSTEIN, Senator P. S.
DAVIS, Senator Mrs. V. J.
FARLEY, Senator the Hon. R. R.
GILL, Senator D. T.
LAURIE, Senator C. K.
MURRAY, Senator the Hon. G. S. H.
ODLE, Senator Miss J. C.
SYMMONDS, Senator Miss O. P.
THOMPSON, Senator Mrs. A. P.
WELCH, Senator N. P.
WORKMAN, Senator J. A.