

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1986 - 91

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, January 30, 1990

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.20 p.m. on Tuesday, January 30, 1990.

PRESENT

His Honour L. A. WEEKES, G.C.M., J.P., (Speaker)

His Honour J. J. PAYNE, (Deputy Speaker)

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., (Econ.), J.P.,
(Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Q.C., M.A., LL.B.

Hon. B. M. TAITT, B.A.(Hons.), M.P.A., LL.B.(Hons.), (Minister of Health)

Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Q.C., B.A., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of International Transport, Telecommunications and Immigration and Leader of the House)

Hon. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M., (Minister of Trade, Industry and Commerce)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES, M.B., Ch.B., F.R.C.P.(Edin.),
(Leader of the Opposition)

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, B.A., M.A., (Minister of Transport and Works)

Hon. M. A. KING, Q.C., LL.B., (Attorney General, Minister of Legal Affairs and Minister of Foreign Affairs)

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, A.I.C., M.I.A.S., J.P.,
(Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries)

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS, (Minister of Employment, Labour Relations and Community Development)

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN, B.Sc.(Econ.), (Minister of Housing and Lands)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Q.C., LL.M.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR, M.Sc.(Econ.)

Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH, (Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Education and Culture)

Hon. C. V. WALKER, (Minister of Education and Culture)

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees) - Mr. E. BOURNE

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS, M.D.

Hon. W. W. HALL, G.C.M., H.B.M., (Minister of Tourism and Sport)

Mr. C. A. NEBLETT, B.A., (Parliamentary Secretary, Prime Minister's Office)

. Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN, M.A.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS, B.A., Cert Ed

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER

Mr. R. P. BYER, LL.B.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON, LL.B.

Prayers were led by Rev. Father Ivan Harewood.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in session. Before I ask that the Minutes be considered, I want to draw to Honourable Members' attention that the fact of your speakers not functioning is probably because the regular officers are not on their job today and so the House may have to proceed, at the wish of the Leader of the House, under these conditions, if the Leader so desires to proceed....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is obvious that the reporter did not hear what Your Honour said and I am not in any way suggesting that Your Honour might have done other than you did because I heard. But I am not sure that Honourable Members will be able to proceed without the equipment. This is a matter which will probably need some consultation.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, there is apparently a problem that the reporters are experiencing at this time as they are unable to hear the proceedings because the positions usually manned by the Government Electrical Department are not so manned today.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Speaker just said that.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Oh, I see. I was not in the Chamber. I am, therefore, moving that the sitting be suspended. Sir, until 2.00 p.m.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I second that, Sir.

The question that the sitting be suspended until 2.00 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 12.25 p. m.

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. Minutes of January 23, 1990.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Minutes of the meeting of the House which took place on January 23, 1990 be taken as read and confirmed, Sir.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I second that, Sir.

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I am to announce that I am in receipt of the Statement and Accounts for the month of November 1989 as prepared by the Accountant General, also the Auditor General's Report of the Accounts for the year ending March 31, 1989, and the Report of the Accountant General for the financial year 1988/1989.

PAPERS

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Report on the Registration Office and Supreme Court Registry for 1988.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I give notice of a Resolution to approve the vesting in the National Housing Corporation of a parcel of land at the Crane, St. Philip.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Michael North East re allocation of house spots in Long Gap, Spooners Hill, St. Michael.

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, to ask the Minister of Housing and Lands:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the urgent needs of the constituents of St. Michael North East for house spots to buy or rent?
- (2) Will the Minister state what difficulties, if any, are being experienced in the allocation or nineteen of twenty-two house spots at Long Gap, Spooners Hill, St. Michael for which sites and services facilities have been provided by the National Housing Corporation for a period in excess of one year?
- (3) Will the Minister investigate the possibility of allocating some of the house spots above-mentioned to the applicants from St. Michael North East?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that Standing Orders 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting, Sir.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I second that, Sir.

The question that those Standing Orders be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

Order No. 5 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the borrowing of the sum of US\$20 million from Citibank (Channel Islands) Ltd. for the purpose of assisting in the financing of Government's capital works programme and retiring part of the foreign debt.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, under Section 2 of the Special Loans Act, Cap. 105 of the Laws of Barbados, Government is empowered to borrow money not exceeding \$500 million on terms agreed between the Government and the lender. Today, through this Resolution, approval of the House is being sought in order to borrow the sum of U.S.\$20 million under the Special Loans Act. The Addendum states that the purpose of this loan is to assist in the implementation of the capital works programme as well as assist in retiring part of the debt. 2.10p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not given the Honourable Member for the City permission to speak, neither is he authorised to interrupt a Member when he has been given that permission to speak.

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think it is very well known that the Government would not need to C-rely on foreign loans if we were able to meet all of our current expenditures out of current revenues; if in addition to that we were able to meet our Capital expenditures out of the excesses of Current revenue over Current expenditure; if out of our own resources through the utilisation of the factors of production and the use of local resources we were able to carry out the Capital improvements required or determined as necessary in the country; or if over the years the accumulated deficits from year to year which we call.....

*~ *Asides.*

Rt Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad if you would ask the Opposition to behave, Sir.

Laughter.

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Or if the country had not accumulated a national debt, which is basically the accumulation of the annual deficits that are recorded from year to year over a given period of time.

Unfortunately, Sir, that is not the situation, that would be a kind of Utopia. We are not in that particular situation, we do not operate in conditions of what I believe is called autarchy, the economy of Barbados is not isolated from the economies of the Test of the world. We are a very open economy and we depend therefore on trading on international markets both in goods and services for the ^ maintenance and improvement of national welfare and , national well-being.

It is a fact, Sir, that over the past calendar year, as far as our foreign reserves are concerned, we have been having some problems in that particular area and we have lost some of our reserves. We have had problems because our productive sectors have not been producing at a level that is commensurate with our demands for the import of goods and services. That is part of the basic problem.

It is very noteworthy that the provisional estimates for the year 1989 indicate that there has been a reasonable growth rate in the economy during that particular year. Those statistics indicate that inflation has remained at moderate levels. Those statistics indicate that there has been some fall, although not as appreciable as we would wish to see, in the levels of unemployment, and the statistics indicate that the productive sectors, particularly in the area "" of tourism and in the area of manufacturing, have been ^producing positive results and that those indicators are pointing in the right direction, although we would wish to

see a steeper incline in terms of upward movement as far as those indicators are concerned.

I have said, Sir, that I will seek not to put any mystification in the discussion of the public finances, and indeed generally in the discussion of public affairs, but I will seek as clearly as possible to explain exactly what is the nature of the successes that we have been registering, and also to indicate either directly up front or in response to any questions courteously put as usual by Members to give whatever information may be requisite in the circumstances. That is what this Government has tried to do and that is what I, as the Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs, have tried to do.

We must have before us at all times that however we couch our language, however we seek to discuss these matters, the foremost consideration must be the growth and development of our country and we must seek at all times ,to ensure that we do nothing, none of us, in our public lives to harm or impede that growth and development. 2.20 p.m.

I have indicated, Sir, some of the positive facets of the development of our economy, and I am saying, Sir, that the fact that we have been consuming a higher level of imports of goods and services than we are producing exports of goods and services is basically at the root of our problem. It is a demand for foreign exchange in excess of our capacity as a country to earn foreign exchange. Foreign exchange, Sir, is earned largely through the productive sectors of the economy, those that I have indicated, tourism, manufacturing, agriculture; and other sub-sectors make a contribution as well.

Tourism, Sir, grew by some 10.5 per cent in 1988 and by a further approximately 10 per cent or thereabouts, provisional in 1989. When we compare this, Sir, with the performance of tourism in the earlier years of the decade, we would see that the sector has been making a significant contribution towards real GDP in this country. When we look, Sir, at the manufacturing sector, the provisional figures indicate that there was a growth of 6.7 per cent in 1988 and provisionally 5.4 per cent in 1989, again a good effort when compared with the negative growth during certain years of the decade.

Agriculture, Sir, has registered a decline in 1989 so that particular sector has not been able, particularly the sugar agriculture, to make.....

Asides.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: The Minister of Agriculture does not plant any canes to the best of my knowledge. He is not a fanner in that sense. I am talking about the sector, Sir. It has not been able to make for whatever reason the contribution to real GDP that we would

expect. Sir, we are committed. The funds that we require are to satisfy our demand for imports. Those who build houses import from abroad; they import a whole range of materials particularly finishes and so on. Sir, the watches that Honourable Members wear are imported. The pens that we write with, a substantial part of the food that we eat, the whole area of food, clothing, shelter, manufacturing, transport, whatever sector we are talking about, because we are an open economy, we import, and as our tastes change, and as the demands grow, we import more and more. Even, Sir, in our efforts to develop, we import, and there is no magic in this particular area.

The funds to pay for those or to finance those imports can only come from a limited range of sources, from the productive sectors as I have indicated. They can only come, Sir, if we are not producing them ourselves, from funds coming in as aid or grants, but we know that Barbados is not grant-aided and there are no grants or other forms of aid in any substantial quantities that we are recipients of that would make any significant dent in our requirements, it can only come, Sir, from borrowing. If we do not produce it ourselves and we wish to maintain that standard of living or we wish to maintain those levels of imports, then we have to borrow or may borrow other countries' funds for that purpose. That has happened down through the years. It has been a policy of succeeding Governments as at times indicated to raise loans in the international capital markets or from institutions abroad, but, Sir, from the international institutions we are gradually being squeezed out from access to funds at concessional rates. We have been threatened with graduation from the World Bank; we are protesting that particular prospect of graduation, but that is a cloud that hangs over us. The graduation is as a result of our advance among the nations of the world as a country that is doing reasonably well, whose per capita income puts it firmly among the middle income developing countries, and indeed, Sir, near the middle range of countries of the world, and our whole profile of major indicators rank us more or nearer to the profile of the industrialised countries than the countries at the bottom of the table, and that is one of the arguments being used for our graduation from those institutions. 2.30p.m.

The point I am making here, Sir, is that given our need for foreign currency and given the fact that most of our productive sectors while making a determined effort to bring in increased flows are not able on their own to sustain that level of imports, we have to resort to the capital markets but you can only go to the capital markets if your economy is adjudged to be of such a sound state that those who are in the business of lending money have the confidence that you would be able to meet your commitments.

They just do not lend money simply because you go up and say we wish to borrow some money. Like a bank,

Sir, they examine your status, they carry out their assessment and evaluation and then they come to their determination.

It is, I think, to the credit of this country that we have been able to present a sound status whenever we approach those markets and we have been able through our actions, - to run the public finances that that status to which I refer - has been in a sound condition so that you would be able to raise the loans on the markets. In this particular instance, Sir, we will be seeking to raise U.S. \$20 million on the international capital markets on the following terms and conditions.

The loan will be for a period of seven years but there will be an option on the part of the lender to request repayment in full or in part on the fifth anniversary of the loan.

As far as the amortisation is concerned, Sir, the loan is to be repaid in five equal semi-annual payments starting on the fifth anniversary of the loan, that is, if the 5-year period option is not exercised. The interest rate will be 6-month LIBOR plus 1 percent per annum payable semi-annually on a 360 day year and 1 percent of the amount disbursed will be payable as commission.

Sir, we have taken all steps necessary to try to ensure that our economy remains sound and it is not merely a case "• of saying that the productive sectors are not producing at the level to sustain the level of imports that we are faced with.

We have with foresight and with prudence, because prudent management does not wait until a problem comes upon you then to diagnose or try to find out what the problem is and what to do about it. In all of those productive areas of which I made mention, there are detailed studies either on-going or recently completed in, association with international institutions or internationally recognized expert groups to study those areas.

In agriculture a study has recently been concluded and it is a very far-reaching study and discussion is currently in train among the various interested bodies to try to formulate some consensus on how we can move ahead as far as decisions relating to agriculture, sugar and non-sugar may be concerned. -*

We have that particular sector under scrutiny and under examination. A number of recommendations have been formulated and the leadership of the Minister of Agriculture in these particular areas has been perceptive.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, I am hearing a question, "which one?" For your enlightenment, we have a Minister of Agriculture. Let us take Britain in which you were educated. They have a Minister of Agriculture. They have a Minister of State. They have other ministers as weU called Parliamentary Secretaries whom they call Junior Ministers. So you have a Minister, you have a Minister of State and then you have other Ministers. I believe they call one Minister for the Countryside.

Aside.

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: He has a Minister for Bathsheba? I would not expect that kind of question coming from the more matured Leader of the Opposition out there or those members. Only someone who is not familiar with structures of Government would think that this is a problem to come up with. -

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Forgive them, Sir. They know not what they do and they have no knowledge of these matters but they talk about them constantly and perennially.

My biggest disappointment is the Member for St. George South. He is knowledgeable about these matters and would not put his leader right.

Mr. R. P. B YER: On a point of order.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am praising you.

Mr. R. P. BYER: I feel very happy being on this side of the House. I have no problems dealing with matters we say from here. That is the Prime Minister's problem, not mine.

Rt Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I did not say your problem on that side. I was saying you would not exercise the knowledge that you have in putting your leader right but I understand the nature of that problem.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: So we have a study ongoing in agriculture, Sir. 2.40 p.m.

As far as tourism is concerned there is a study I believe nearing completion or just completed in tourism. Decisions on that study are not being formulated so that we should be in a position to put that particular sector on an even steeper upward path, Sir. That is as far as tourism is concerned.

There is a study ongoing in the area of export -,competitiveness and marketing. That study is underway and should become available later this year I believe. Then in

addition to that there is an export development project which is under consideration. The Central Bank is involved in this, Sir, and, I think, the World Bank. It is aimed at promotion of export development and at increasing productivity and efficiency particularly in manufacturing and in service activities in Barbados.

There are three components here. The first is policy reforms to improve incentives for exporters to raise productivity, the second aim is for the financing for foreign exchange earning sectors and the third area is a comprehensive supporting technical assistance base.

So the point I am making, Sir, is that no country can rely on other people's money for its development as the thrust of its policy. If we wish export led growth in this country, we have to ensure that those sectors which have a capability of earning foreign exchange are given the kind of environment within which they can produce. That is exactly why we have these areas under study.

I think that I have given the background to this particular matter. It is not the first time that this Government has raised loans abroad. It is not the first time that other governments have raised loans abroad. This is just part of the ongoing mechanism for managing the public finances of this country. It is well known of course. Sir, that in February, next month, the 28th of February, we have to pay back a bullet loan. I should like to make it clear that a substantial part of the outflows of foreign exchange goes into the repayment of either principal or interest on the loans that have been borrowed. I am not, at this stage, questioning the need for the raising of those loans. I am simply saying that our requirements for foreign exchange relate, in substantial part, to our having to repay loans that were raised some time ago. I am not talking about the loans that were raised during the course of 1989 or 1988 or 1987 or even 1986. I have not got around to those yet. But most of these outflows relate to loans previously borrowed. Sir, I believe I have access to the full profile of those loans. So that when I say we have to repay a bullet on the 28th of February, we have to look for the funds to do that

Now it is true that prudently I took the steps to ensure that the yen is available to us for repaying that loan. But if, Sir, we simply took that up and paid off that loan, we would not be defaulting on any loan, we would meet our commitments. These are sovereign commitments entered into in very good faith. So I am not querying any of that. But prudently I had to make provision for meeting that loan in February and, as a country, we will meet it. But if we take it up and pay it off that leaves a hole in our reserves. We have to keep them at a given level.

So I will seek to finance, will seek to ensure that our reserves are at a given level and, until our productive sectors are able to produce at the level that is more comfortable for us, we will have to rely on the foreign

markets, Sir. But you must be in a position to be able to go to them because not everybody can go. Countries in our hemisphere in let me say, Latin America find it difficult to go to the international capital markets in order to raise those loans. So we have to be in a position to do so. One of the first questions they ask is, what is your deficit? How are you managing? Because they know if you show a big deficit not only on current account but overall they find that that is not a plus, as far as going to the international capital markets is concerned.

I think, Sir, I have given the background. We must understand that this economy went into recession during the 1980s. That is a fact. The productive sectors were down and this country had to borrow heavily in order to sustain its way of life, its standard of living. Recovery set in and we are in that period of seeking to recover. I think this country has made very valiant efforts along that road. Let us work in order to sustain it on that particular path. This particular loan, Sir, is in the interest of this country.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I beg to second that, Sir, and reserve my right to speak. 2.50 p.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I have perhaps on one previous occasion seen a Minister of Finance rise in this Chamber invited to support a Resolution to raise a loan on the foreign capital markets and to do so with extreme nervousness and being extremely defensive in what he has had to say. As a matter of fact, Sir, one could not help but recognise that the Honourable Member must have been having many, many sleepless nights over the problems which he has created in the economy particularly in the foreign exchange sector.

Now he starts off, Sir, by inviting us to note that the purpose of this Resolution is to assist in the financing of Government's capital works programme and in retiring part of the foreign debt. Now Sir, I have no quarrel with the cosmetics of these Resolutions. It has been part and parcel of the format of Resolutions for this House for over a decade. Therefore, I do not propose to quarrel about the wording of the Resolution. What does concern me, Sir, is that after going all around and around and around the Minister of Finance in his winding up came to the point that he expects there is going to be a hole in the reserves, as he said it, on February 28th. I think that was a little early, but anyhow a \$80 million hole in the reserves, and that he wants to fill it half way up with \$40 million. So we really came to the crux of the matter in the last sentence which he used when he was winding up. In other words, you are borrowing the \$40 million to prop up the reserves of the country which are expected to fall by at least \$80 million in

February unless the tourist sector performs much better in February than it has been performing in January. That is the harsh reality.

Now as a responsible Member of this Honourable House, Sir, I can assure the Honourable Member that we will not vote against this Resolution because we will *not* participate in a posturing which will see the collapse of tins' country and if it is necessary to lend our support in order to get the \$40 million we will do so.

Sir, what was of interest was that the Honourable Member indicated that part of his problem was that he had to meet a bullet loan payment. I wonder, Sir, if the Honourable Member realizes that this is in fact a bullet loan. The very Resolution here is a bullet loan because it says repayable in seven years with the option by the lender to call for repayment in full or in part on the fifth-anniversary of the loan. This is a bullet loan.

Let us get to the root of this point. There is nothing wrong or right about a bullet loan or any other kind of loan.

Aside

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not defending anything. Next year. There is nothing wrong or right about a bullet loan. The point is that you should get a loan on the best terms that you can get. That is the first thing, Sir. The second point I want to make is that whether you have a bullet loan, a loan that is repayable in full or in substantial amount after roughly a 3, 4, 5 year moratorium, depends entirely on what the repayment profile of the country is over the next 5 or 7 years. In other words, if looking at the maturity of Barbados' debt and if 1995 was the year in which there was low capital and interest repayment of foreign debt, there is nothing wrong with dropping or slotting a bullet repayment in that particular year. There is nothing wrong with that.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I do not know which one. That is what it was in 1986. I do not know what you have got it like now. All I know is that 1991 would have been a year in which you could easily have slotted in a bullet payment. So that the type of loan is not that crucial. It depends entirely on what your debt profile is like and how you will fit in the repayment there. Now all the rest, Sir, of the Honourable Member's speech boiled down to just one point and the point was this. You have to earn enough foreign exchange to sustain life in Barbados at a given level. That was the single point that was made. There is no need to apologise for that because it is not an original point. It was a point that -

was being made for the past one hundred years or the past two hundred years or three hundred years of Barbados' existence.

Sir, I do not know what the Honourable Members are being very defensive about. If you have to borrow money, you have to borrow money. But that is not my concern, Sir.

That is not my primary concern at all. My primary concern, -> Sir, is why we have to borrow the money.

Now quite clearly, Sir, there is a lot of confusion in this country at the moment as to what is happening in terms of the foreign reserves of Barbados. I think, Sir, that the Governor of the Central Bank in his most recent statements has clarified the position for all Barbadians because he has made it clear that the situation is so serious that in his view he considers the management of the foreign exchange of Barbados to be more important than jobs and shelter for „ Barbados. I think that all of us will accept that the capacity to earn a living and provide shelter is such a primary and basic need that anything which is accorded a higher priority than this must be of a very serious nature. In the general run of things, Sir, if we were faced with a situation where we had to go to war to defend our sovereignty or presumably as the Governor sees it in this case get the economy on such a drastic footing to defend the foreign exchange, it is only in those circumstances of a foreign exchange crisis that you ^_ would accord any other form of economic activity a higher priority than jobs and shelter. 3.00p.m.

I think the seriousness of it now has been driven home to one and all. I believe from what I have seen that had appropriate steps been taken last June at the time when the first recommendations were submitted to the Minister of Finance to take some steps to curb the loss of foreign exchange, then we would not have been faced with the . haemorrhage of foreign exchange that has been taking "" place. It is important to recognise that the foreign exchange ~* situation today is worse than it has ever been in the history of this country and that relates to the fact that the foreign debt has never been of a similar size, so we are faced with a situation where as the Minister says we have an escalating foreign debt to service, we have declining output in the productive sectors, and at the same time we are faced with a significant fall off in our foreign exchange earnings.

What is worse, Sir, is that the measures which have -s been put in place to curb the foreign exchange slide will dry ' up the non-foreign exchange earning sectors of the economy and the foreign exchange earning sectors of the economy and almost certainly trigger a significant recessionary trend in the economy of Barbados.

I have often said that the external economy of — Barbados, the foreign exchange earning economy of - Barbados, does not exist in isolation from the rest of the •economy. By placing curbs on credit, making money more

expensive with interest rates, making cash unavailable to people, in that way you are not going to reduce demand, given the nature of our productive sectors, it is going to affect both and that has been our experience when we have responded to foreign exchange difficulties with the kind of policies which have been put in place. That could be the result.

Now, Sir, sometimes one is faced in public life with a very serious dilemma. The dilemma which presented me in the middle of last year was whether to come to the public of Barbados and let them know what was going on in terms of our foreign exchange or remain silent and let them be caught unawares. Even if you are in Opposition you have certain duties to perform, and therefore we all at times may be caught in this kind of dilemma, but when one saw the foreign exchange of this country drop by over \$75 million in a matter of a few weeks, when you saw the position of the Central Bank going deeper and deeper in the red, despite massive borrowings on a short term basis by the Central Bank, when it was quite clear to you that serious and definitive action needed to be taken and nothing was being done, one had a duty to come to the public and let them know what was going on in this land of theirs. It was absolutely essential.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It is not a matter of coming in first or second, the matter was adverted to inside here on the night when the \$50 million loan was being discussed late in the evening. All I required was available to me, but nevertheless the point was that it was my view for some time that if appropriate steps were taken, and it is my understanding that recommendations were made to the Minister of Finance as early as June/July last year to take certain steps.....

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Honourable Member wants to know how I got the understanding. You told me.

If I may move on, Sir, apparently it was not being dealt with any sense of urgency, and then a major problem faced Barbados. That problem was so serious that even after borrowing \$50 million and bringing it into the system last October, the situation with the foreign exchange of the Central Bank remained in the red up until the end of last year, and it is still in the red. It will have to be.

The Honourable Member somehow or other seems to believe that somebody in Government or somebody in a particular office has to come and give you information. That is not so. The very document which he referred to just now, which he has in his possession, a document forecasting the debt payments and the liabilities of the Government of Barbados over the next five years, ten years,

just by looking at that you can virtually tell what the foreign exchange position is in Barbados at any given point in time. You can tell from that Nobody has to come and tell you anything, nobody has to bring you documents from the Central Bank or from the Ministry of Finance, all you need is one reference point apart from the monthly statistics put out by the Central Bank of Barbados and you have all the information you need. You do not have to be privy to anything, the only reason you may need a little assistance with a document from time to time is that if when you make the statement someone is going to come and say you are not telling "the truth, instead of waiting two to three months to prove that you were true, then some information up front might help to prove that you are true right there and then, but in terms of analysing trends you do not need that

Despite the inflow of \$50 million, nevertheless we ended the year in that position. I do not believe that that situation would have changed significantly between the end of the year and now, and there is no point fooling ourselves, because we know that there is at least \$30 million now reflected in the foreign assets of the Central Bank of Barbados which in point of fact will have to leave them by the end of June.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: We know as well that the Central Bank of course has I believe not less than \$20 million in short term lines to repay during the month of January and early February, and therefore unless they are successful in rolling over those lines, that is, not paying off one and drawing down another, because when they are all drawn up to the hilt you have to request a roll over. This is what is happening now at the Central Bank of Barbados, never in its history before, so there are serious problems. What the Minister really needs - and there is no question about this, let us face the reality, I live here, we all live here, I want to make sure that this country continues to develop in an orderly and peaceful manner - is to borrow a lot more than \$20 million. 3.10p.m.

You need to borrow a lot more than \$20 million, and I sincerely hope that the steps are being taken to ensure that the Government has adequate access to medium and long term foreign financing not only for its capital programme, but also to assist in the repayment of its debt. Let's call a spade a spade. There is no point hiding from it; we have reached this stage, because if you do not have access to that kind of money, then you will be asking for serious problems in the country. I have no intentions of saying otherwise. You don't need \$40 million, you need a lot more than \$40 million. Let me give you an idea of what you need.

The lines of the Central Bank must now be about \$110 million to \$112 million; they need to come down from that

amount to at least \$25 to \$30 million, so you need about \$90 million on that alone. You need another \$40 million - I am just talking about getting the situation out of crisis, that is all - to assist in the refinancing of the Japanese debt that you have to repay next month. That is \$130 million that purely relates to foreign debt management, and has nothing to do with the consequences of any short-fall in export earnings. Those two things must be done. Sir, when that is done, all that has happened is that the Central Bank---situation and the reserves situation would be roughly back to what it was probably around 1983-1984. Now in addition, to be quite comfortable, you will need to be comfortable to borrow additional money as well. Now, Sir, that is the kind of problem that we are faced with.

Now I recall some time ago the Minister seems, not seems, because the only policy position that he has enunciated since he became Minister of Finance is that once you spend as you like and tax as you like, once you have &""-surplus on the current account, that is on Government " revenue expenditure current account, then all else would be taken care of. There can be no greater fallacy because you are having a situation now where you are recording the largest current account surpluses on Government's current account and the largest deficits in the current account of your balance of payments, with a consequential fall in your foreign reserves, so that with the kind of housewife thinking that led the Minister of Finance to believe that once you*=- balance your budget on current account and generate a surplus that all will be well, he does not realise that whilst he is being a housewife in that regard, he was also being the midwife of a foreign exchange crisis in Barbados. That is so because another series of things begin to flow. Once you lift the level of Government expenditure, lift that level of taxation, then you start to create a situation where the Central Bank accommodation of Government, the very money that the Government is now putting into the economy on a very large scale, almost \$300 million more in^ 1989 than in 1986, is now an under current there that is^ eroding your foreign exchange position. When you look at^ the figures for imports, unless you have figures for 1989 that are not available to us, we don't see this high level of skyrocketing of imports by the private sector of Barbados.

Now, Sir, I believe that the Honourable Minister of Finance, the Rt. Honourable Prime Minister should begin to look more fundamentally at his policy position. I would not like to be in his situation today where you have over-taxed, the people, you have over spent, your Governor is not \ telling you that your policies are wrong, he is telling you that you have to abandon your own public sector policies in relation to employment. What is going on in Barbados, and in the middle of an election year? I know what is going to happen to the Governor; I have no doubt about that.

Now, Sir, I am not going to deal any further with thuiA question of reserves. I believe I have done my best^ indicate that whatever the circumstances and whatever the

causes of those circumstances, I think that when we are faced with this kind of Resolution that we have to give it our support, but we have to criticise as well when we see that things have gone wrong and try to point the Minister in the right direction.

Now, Sir, the Minister is very happy with his growth rate. The Governor of the Central Bank is very unhappy "with it, Sir. You know, Sir, if someone is suffering from acromegaly, you can grow and grow very fast and get weaker and weaker as you grow.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not saying what acromegaly is. I am saying what the consequences of acromegaly are. Acromegaly is a condition, and I think I am a trained endocrinologist, associated with rapid growth and ^ corresponding weakness as time goes on. That is one kind of growth. Now if you look around Barbados, Sir, you will see a lot of bow-legged people among the older people. They are bow-legged because in those days their problem was that because of poverty and lack of access to vitamins and so on they grew, but bow-legged. That is the kind of growth that the Honourable Member is boasting about, and that is what the Governor is trying to say to the Honourable Member. What he is trying to tell him in diplomatic terms is to stop printing money, stop destroying the foreign exchange and stop trying to develop artificial non-productive jobs, because in the long run all you are doing is ruining the foreign exchange and ruining the capacity of the country to produce jobs on a long term basis. That is precisely what the Governor is saying. The Governor is not telling you not to try to create jobs in tourism, not to try to create jobs in agriculture, not to try to create jobs in any of the export areas of the economy, he is telling you to stop spending Government money to create non-productive jobs, — and stop financing those jobs by printing money and ruining the foreign exchange of the country. The Governor is afraid to say it; I can say it for him. 3.20 p.m.

Now, I do not think any Governor of the Central Bank would have at the same time, be talking about an expansion in the export earning sectors of the economy, agriculture, which is significantly labour intensive, tourism, which is — directly labour intensive and even indirectly because of the • jobs it sustains in the economy even more labour intensive, or in manufacturing, the very basis for its existence in Barbados in its promotion being its capacity to generate jobs so you could not be saying put jobs on hold in those areas and, at the same time, stimulate them because the statement would not make any sense.

~^ If I am to interpret what he is saying, what he is saying is that you are going down the wrong path. Stop calling on me as Government to finance your deficit with

money that you do not have. Stop calling on me as Governor to finance your deficit because you have transferred so much from the private and productive sector of the economy through taxation. That is what he is telling you. What he is calling on the Minister of Finance to do is to examine fundamentally the policy direction which he is pui cuing. Am I not right?

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am absolutely sure of what he is saying. It is the only construction that I can put on what the Governor has been saying.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is what the Governor is saying. Stop printing money, stop calling on me to finance Government expenditure. Did you read the whole statement? Read the whole statement on what he is saying.

If I may continue, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Which I think you should.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you very much, Sir, and thanks for your intervention to protect me, Sir.

The one thing that the Honourable Member for St. Michael South is boasting about in the morning, in the midday, in the evening, whether he was in St. John on January 22, or whether he was in Oistins last Sunday night talking to 50 people...

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not allow the Honourable Member to be interrupted as such.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It is the same story. But, Sir, it must be a terrible thing to happen to a Minister of Finance that while he is boasting of his growth, his Governor is telling the public at large that it is the growth that has caused the problem in the country. It is a serious embarrassment and I wonder how the Minister of Finance is going to deal with the particular matter.

Now, Sir, if I may continue.

I think that one of the problems that the Minister is having is this. I think that a decision taken in 1988 by the so-called experts to revise upwardly tourism earnings in Barbados has led to a significant misrepresentation of the level of foreign exchange that we are earning because if their estimates were correct for 1988 and 1989, we would not have a foreign exchange problem and I think you are being let down there.

If you are very careful you would see that a most remarkable thing happened in Barbados between 1987 and 1988 where you got a smaller increase in the number of tourists, in the number of, the arrivals percentage wise, but a whopping increase in tourist expenditure in Barbados and Restaurant Sales Tax remained stagnant I think that somebody has misled you.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. If the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would explain as I seem to remember this argument previously put by this side. Is he saying that those figures went in a pressure cooker and got cooked up, Sir? I want to hear clearly.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what kind of cooker they went into. What I am saying is that it is remarkable that in 1988 and in 1989 that you are getting this very substantial increase in the estimates of tourist expenditure.

Now, Sir, we all know that unlike, say your import bill and other areas of statistics of physical trade, that your invisible earnings and your tourism earnings are at the best They are guesstimates but when a decision is taken to suddenly increase them in one year, then you have a problem because it interferes fundamentally with your planning and your assessment of the amount of foreign exchange that is truly available to the country.

It also does something else too, Sir. It distorts your growth figures and very significantly. If manufacturing which constitutes probably about 8% or 9% of the Barbados economy, if the out-put there increases by 100% in one year it has very little impact on GDP because it is at 8% or 9%. If, however, tourism, which is a major slice of the economy, increases about 5%, that can have a major influence on the economy of Barbados and also alter very significantly your estimates of GDP growth.

I am saying that if you have 10% increase in tourism expenditure in Barbados, you should not have a problem with your foreign exchange, even with increased imports last year there is something wrong.

I know some people do not believe in numbers but the fact is, look at those figures. If they are telling you that tourism has increased by 10%, then ask them if it has increased by 10%, how could I have this foreign exchange problem? It does not add up. Now, the same people - I would just say the same people.

I recall when INTEL and Playtex closed down, these wizards came to me and told me that Barbados lost \$74 million in foreign exchange a year and I said to them are you telling me that INTEL and Playtex are worth more to Barbados than the sugar industry? Eventually they revised

their figures down and down until they came to \$8 million, from \$74 million to \$8 million.

I am suggesting the wizards.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Some of the same -wizards you have too. 3.30p.m.

All I am saying now is have a look at those tourism figures because you might be better off getting figures that relate to the 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988 and 1989 period and base a whole lot of things on a lower expenditure level of tourism.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No, no. The 1986 related to 1985, 1987. But in 1988 they changed the basis of estimation.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: All I am saying is the way the foreign exchange is performing, it suggests to me that it is being over estimated.

Now, Sir, let me confess that I am one of those people who felt, for some time, that our earnings from tourism were somewhat underestimated. But I never told anybody to go the other side, correct that and then add on 20% or 30%. That is something completely different.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I think so.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir, the Honourable Member is a responsible Member of the House; If he is saying that the Central Bank's estimate of revenue have been interfered with to the tune of a 20%, over estimation deliberately, he has to submit the basis for that, otherwise it is a very serious charge.

The Honourable Member cannot make that statement to this House, I submit, Sir, without misleading the House because the Central Bank is a responsible institution. The Honourable Member knows that it is a responsible institution.

"

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Honourable Member who is sitting next to the Honourable Member who spoke recently brought to this Honourable House a situation where the Honourable Attorney-General claimed that the amount of expenditure which his Ministry was alleged to have undertaken the year before was incorrectly reported in the balance of payments statistics of the Central Bank.

Now, Sir, I never mentioned the word Central Bank. He mentioned the word Central Bank. Not me. I never mentioned the word Central Bank. Let us get this clear. It is the Honourable Member for St. Michael West who mentioned the word Central Bank, not me.

The point I am making, Sir, ...

J~ Mr. SPEAKER: I am not going to allow interruptions of that sort.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The point I am making is that there was a general feeling in Barbados which I shared that, for some time, the estimates of tourism expenditure were somewhat under estimated.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of - order. I have already made a document of the House a " Paper prepared by a person in the Central Bank who compiles national accounts on the tourism estimates who has said that in his assessment the estimates of tourism expenditure being used by Barbados is over estimated. If that would help the debate, Sir. Even the Central Bank believes it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think you would better have made , that in your speech, rather than on a point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you very much. But the point I am making is that one has gone from one extreme to another extreme. When you go to the other extreme then you get a false idea of the amount of growth in the economy.

I am sure that if you got anywhere between a 8% to 10% growth in tourism that that would have sustained balanced growth in Barbados. But the point is that you are — not getting that kind of tourist expenditure in the economy. — You are misleading yourself. That is what is happening.

I think that that whole area of tourist expenditure needs to be looked at again, Sir. Whilst I am on it, I cannot understand why the whole system cannot be upgraded. In the City of New York there are systems that not only can tell you how many tourists have been in New York on a given day, they can tell you whether the tourists came from , outside of the United States or if they came from within the United States. They can tell you which category of hotel they stayed in; within 24 or 48 hours. They can tell you the amount of money being spent per day by tourists. They can go further, Sir, and tell you the indirect spending by tourists. They can go further and tell you the amount of local production taking place in New York City , consequential on the stimulus of the tourist dollar, almost "on a daily basis. We cannot even get to know how many people pass through the airport, on a daily basis, as tourists. , We cannot even get that. We cannot even get the basic

information. The statistics are usually about 3 months out of date.

That is too long!

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Never mind, Sir. That may be a problem. It may always have been so. But a Minister of Finance should have some idea by the middle of March of the number of tourists that came into this country in January and February, because it makes a complete difference, and the amount of tourist expenditure.

I would hope that one would have some kind of objective approach to this question of housing. The belief that every time you build a house that you are eroding the foreign exchange of the country is something that has to be critically looked at. I hear this kind of thing coming out as a kind of blanket statement from the Central Bank of Barbados. The only authoritative study that I know about as to the foreign exchange demands of housing was one done in the Central Bank itself which showed that the maximum demand for foreign exchange was 10%. That was before we had a cement plant.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I said the only study that I know about. I know of no other studies. I know if you build a house for \$100 000 in Barbados today, about \$40 000 or thereabouts will go in labour. I know about \$20 000 or thereabouts will go in taxes in one form or another. Now that is 60%. So you are left with 40%.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is \$60 000 of \$100 000. That is 60%. So you are left with 40%. Surely some of the materials are locally produced and have some local content I honestly believe that the figure is more....

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Pardon?

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The stones, the sand and this kind of thing. If you think about it carefully and check it out, you might find that you are indeed trying to kill a sector of the economy that does not demand that much foreign exchange in relation to the social function that it serves and the productive function that it serves.

In other words, if you are building apartments, for the tourism sector, are you going to dry that up and say you are

not going to build for them? Are you not going to invest today for tomorrow? The whole point, Sir, is that even when foreign exchange is tight you have to allow building of infrastructure in the hope of getting over your problems whilst you borrow an earning down the road.

Many houses in Barbados are tourist related. Many people buy properties and rent them out to people who pay for their rentals in foreign exchange. Are we going to stop that kind of building activity which generates foreign exchange earnings in the country? So there are, a whole lot of problems that you have. This is why it is so dangerous in principle to talk about one sector of the economy doing this, another sector doing that. Because when you apply all the brakes, the monetary brakes, fiscal brakes, you are applying them across the board affecting both sides of the economy.

I certainly cannot conceive of any situation where things can get so hard in Barbados and so difficult that you should be telling people that you are going to put on the back burner the question of their getting a job of their being able to provide shelter for themselves. 3.40p.m.

Because, Sir, let us be really serious about it. It is with a job that you can buy food. It is with a job that you can get shelter and if someone is telling you that you have to postpone your hopes of a job or shelter in Barbados, then they are really telling you to leave the country. What is the point of economic activity in Barbados at all if it is not going to relate to providing for the basic needs of the people of Barbados? What is the point of it? We might as well all go home.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am going to ask the Honourable Member for St Michael West whether he will sit in a Cabinet and approve any kind of proposal putting employment and housing on the back burner for two years.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. That is not a question that is worthy of any Honourable Member. Nobody would sit in a Cabinet and agree on that except possibly the Honourable Member, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wonder why the Honourable Member has to answer that question. The Honourable Member has no authority to ask you to answer a question. Therefore, I may very well rule that that question is not relevant.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I was seeking your authority to respond nonetheless, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Probably when you speak.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, I am very glad. He was clearly in breach of the rules, Sir.

At this point certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central were asked to be expunged from the record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, I did not quite hear you.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am saying that when I made my ^A ruling I did not allow the Honourable Member to make that comment as part of the records of the House. Therefore, anything in response to that will no longer be part of the House records.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you very much, Sir. To make that point, I do not have to respond to the Honourable Member for St. Michael West. I can say, Sir, that as reported the Honourable Attorney General has stated publicly that he is not supporting any policy to put unemployment on the back burner and it is not Government's policy. It was so reported on the front page of the Press. He said it, Sir, at Oistins on Sunday night. He disagreed with the Central Bank, Sir. If I know the Attorney General, he would not cross over in another portfolio unless there was general consensus that that was the position of the Government.

If I may continue, Sir. I do not propose to deal in further detail with the Central Bank

Mr. SPEAKER: ... and Asides as well too. I would hope that you would desist from replying to Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I agree with you, Sir. Perhaps I recognise the Honourable Member has a problem with the World Bank. Not so long ago the World Bank's position was that they had a given amount of money for Barbados and if Barbados was faced with graduation then they would have no difficulty in giving us all the residual money earmarked for Barbados at one time to allow us to help deal with the refinancing of our foreign debt. I wonder whether that is still on the card.

The next point I would like to ask the Honourable Member is this. What is the status with the IDB and whether or not Barbados will be a beneficiary this year of any sectoral lending by the IDB, and whether or not it will be in the context of some element of approved structural adjustment approved by either the lender or other international institutions which are headquartered in the same city in North America?

If I may continue, Sir. In fact, one final point I would like to make is this.

At this point certain remarks made by Dr. R. C. HAYNES were asked to be expunged from the record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: My apologies, Mr. Speaker. If I may continue, now that I am fully seized of the situation we will have opportunities to pursue other matters in this Honourable House in the future.

Now Sir, if I may continue. I found it fascinating that this country is now faced with a foreign exchange earning crisis which clearly relates to the very low level of investments in the foreign exchange sectors of the economy over the past year or two. It clearly relates to that. All the Minister of Finance can say is that he is going to solve the problem that requires a solution this year and evidence that he is addressing the problem is that he has 1,2, or 3 studies which are now being studied.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Precisely. There have been studies in agriculture, tourism, export and marketing and studies in relation to export development in Barbados before. So you have studies and studies and that is the current response of the Government to the present demand to earn more foreign exchange through your exports. That is what the Honourable Member said. He did not say we have a crash programme relating to bringing investment to Barbados.

Now I do know, Sir, or so I have heard that there is a trip planned to Hong Kong. Is it Hong Kong? There is one to Hong Kong and one somewhere in Northern Europe. AH I would urge is that one should make sure that the heavy expenditures involved are worthwhile. 3.50 p.m.

At least, Sir, if there was some demonstration that the Government was stepping up its marketing efforts as a matter of urgency, put resources behind the Minister of Tourism so that he can go out there and try to arrest the slide in tourism this year. Put resources behind the Minister of Industry and Trade so they can try to get more industry and get more exports in Barbados. Put resources behind those responsible for the offshore services development so that you can get more resources, more effective foreign exchange earnings out of them this year.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, I shall continue and say put more resources behind the Minister of Agriculture, but I really do not think that would be a wise suggestion on my part at the moment to do that.

What I am saying is this. In the past where we have had shortfalls on our export earning sectors, we have had measures introduced in Barbados to control whatever it was perceived was being controlled. There was also an associated package to deal with the export earning sectors of the economy. There is no package presented. I believe

the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central must be as disappointed as I was, because I was waiting for the Minister of Finance to say we have to borrow this money on a short term basis, but these are the measures I am putting in place to make sure that these export sectors are performing. All we have heard is that we have had four studies. We want to get more export earnings in agriculture this year. We want to get more money out of the offshore banking sector and other sectors this year. We want more tourists into Barbados this year, not studying the problem.

The problem is twofold, in two key areas, investment and marketing. The Minister of Finance said absolutely nothing. The Minister of Finance does not realise that the fiscal policies which he has introduced have so fractured confidence in Barbados, plus other social events taking place in Barbados, that the atmosphere is hostile to any form of investment, and that this is part of the problem in respect of our foreign exchange.

Barbados has always depended on supplementary capital inflows to supplement its earnings from its fiscal exports, and with no investment taking place, no foreign private capital flows coming into Barbados - and the designation "foreign" does not necessarily mean that it is non-Barbadian money, it is money from outside the Barbados jurisdiction - with a drastic reduction of foreign capital flows for investment in Barbados, I think this is also at the root of the foreign exchange shortage in Barbados. That relates to a series of matters. I do not want to get into the social environment in Barbados right now, but something needs to be done with the area of crime and other areas. Apart from the social environment, the fact is that you have created an atmosphere that is not friendly, not conducive to investment. So long as you have that, you are going to have a problem. That is as important as the actual money you earn from your exports.

As a matter of fact, Sir, the private capital flows Barbados used to get were probably three or four times the net gain from manufacturing at its maximum. Remittances from abroad, Barbadians sending back money to build homes, people investing in various aspects of the hotel plant and various aspects of Barbados, a lot of that is coming to an end and we are creating an environment in Barbados to make sure that that is accelerated. That is what we are doing.

The net effect of all this, Sir, is that we will come for this U.S. \$20 million now, the Central Bank does not have to come to Parliament to borrow money, they will continue borrowing and later this year the Minister will be back here again to borrow more money. All I am hoping is that, whereas I said from the very beginning that it will be pointless for us to get up and not support the Resolution, that would nevertheless in no way restrict us in making casual comments as we go along, because at this time of the year I am quite sure that in another two to three months we

will have an extended opportunity to review the performance of the Minister of Finance.

I made the same speech in here from 1978 to 1986. Do you remember that?

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: If I may wind up, Sir, I would suggest that a task force of Parliament be established to see what we can do to increase the foreign exchange earning capacity of Barbados. I know that the Honourable Minister of Finance has always felt very strongly that when we have difficulties of this nature it was right and appropriate that Parliament should examine the matter dispassionately through a task force. I seem to recall, Sir, without reflecting on any previous Parliament or anything like that, that there was a Resolution before this Honourable House not so long ago, in a previous Session, dealing with a task force. I cannot quite remember in whose name it was, but I believe that Resolution was in the name of the Honourable Member. I rather suspect that, but I speak under correction. The problem he was addressing at the time was nothing as severe and as significant as this one in relation to the Barbadian economy, so I would urge him now to think whether or not it is worthwhile to establish a parliamentary task force to look at this particular acute problem facing Barbados.

Thank you very much.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, it is very rare in the history of a country that one has the opportunity to say that the long run has arrived. There are those very decisive turning points sometimes in the history of a country when it ought to be abundantly clear that matters cannot any longer be deferred, that decisive decisions have to be taken with a sense of urgency to change the direction of things, because the tendency of the past to defer and defer things in the hope that matters will sort themselves out in the long run will have proven to be a self-defeating policy.

In a sense, Sir, the economic long run for Barbados has arrived. In many respects one of the key issues that this debate raises is the question pertaining to the manner in which in a very small open economy you have to rely on an international financial market for resources for its development at an extraordinarily early stage in the process of that development 4.00 p.m.

One of the key issues that we have to deal with, Sir, and which we cannot defer dealing with, Barbados has not had a long history in capital development, we have not had the benefit of a slave trade to help us build capital, we have not had the benefit of dependence for a long period of time on aid and we have been thrown in a sense, Sir, out at the deep end in having to rely on the international capital

market for resources for the development of this country at an extraordinary stage in the history of this society, and this debate, Sir, raises considerations pertaining to how are we going to operate within that environment

The debate also has to do with the question as to the relevance of our growth strategy, because we are being told by the Minister of Finance that we are indeed at the end of ~ the seventh year of economic growth in this society, but yet, - Sir, despite the growth the problems of the society would from all appearance, have multiplied to such a stage

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, the Members of the Cabinet, Sir, are more out of touch with what is happening in Barbados than one would have thought was the case. The end of the seventh year of economic growth.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would advise the Honourable - Member to continue his speech.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: The Barbados economy, Sir, has been growing since 1983. Each year since 1983 real economic growth has been realised in the Barbados economy. The Minister of Finance himself in his last Budget debate spoke about the fact that he would be speaking about the- sixth year of successive economic ^ growth. I don't know what this issue now is about. The v" point I am making, Sir, is that the relevance of the so-called strategy that Barbados is obviously following is brought into serious question if at the end of seven or six years of economic growth we are now in a position where a Governor of the Central Bank can tell us that there is a problem in this country that is so severe that the matter of job creation is a matter that has to be relegated to a matter of less importance in this society. That, Mr. Speaker, is the extent of the crisis this country faces, that despite what ^ Government says about growth, the question arises, growth ,, towards what end.

Mr. Speaker, one would normally expect that in the course of its growth, one of the beneficial effects that would be experienced by an economy would be an expansion in its job creation capabilities, and the question that the unemployed in Barbados must be asking today, Sir, is by how much must this economy grow and for how long in order for the Government of the country to be in a position ^ to say that the level of unemployment can be brought down.v" I found it very sad that in many respects the Minister of Finance treated the House to a number of homilies which were generally conveyed with all of the emotions of original discovery. I do not think that in his presentation he sought to define the nature of the economic problems that are facing this country in a manner that would allow this House to understand the context within which the House is! ^ being called upon to support Government in the financing-?, decisions that it is being called upon to do. I share the

stricture levelled by the Leader of the Opposition that it is entirely inadequate for the Government to tell us that they are studying the problem. We have had the task force report on employment which was a study, and the question that has to be asked is, what has become of that study. We have just had, Sir, the benefit of a Five Year Development Plan.

Are we to believe, Mr. Speaker, that this country's Development Plan was prepared without benefit and without reference to studies on our export prospects? Are we to believe, Sir, that we could have had a Development Plan prepared for Barbados recently and brought to this House without benefit, Sir, of a study of the tourism prospects of Barbados? What, Sir, is the point of these studies brought now after the Government has set in train a Five Year Development Plan which one supposes is meant to set the boundaries within which Government is to undertake its policies? Are we to believe now, Sir, that the Government is going to reject its Five Year Development Plan and be guided by the policy implications of the studies to which it is now committed?

I rather suspect, Sir, that those studies of which the Minister speaks will suffer the same fate as the World Bank study on sugar and agriculture in general, because that study has been in the possession of the Government for almost a year now and to date no substantive decisions have been taken on any of the recommendations presented in those studies, and I challenge anybody in Government to dispute that. I also want to lend my support to the voice that has been raised by the Leader of the Opposition to the effect that if you are studying the problem now, then those people in Barbados who are expecting some relief from the Government are going to be very seriously disappointed, because it should be clear to Government that if you have just only commissioned studies on export development, tourism development and manufacturing, a time period has to elapse before those studies are finished, then they have to be submitted for evaluation by Government and its bureaucracy before it goes to Cabinet eventually. We therefore have to be disappointed, Mr. Speaker, when given the nature of the economic problems facing this country today all we can hear from the Democratic Labour Party is that we are studying the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to come more directly to the specific financial matter that faces the House, the problem of our borrowing to pay the debt and the nature of the debt problem that faces Barbados at this time. I am of the view, Sir, that the whole question of debt and debt management has to be looked at within the broad context of the way in which this country is handling all of its international obligations, because debt management is but part and parcel of the meeting of international obligations. There is no such thing, Sir, as foreign exchange borrowed just to pay debt, because the foreign exchange that goes into the Central

Bank when it is borrowed does not go in with a tag marked payment of debt. It goes into a general pool and some of it, Sir, can be used to pay for food, some can be used to pay

for motor cars, some could be used for foreign travel, and one of the central issues that Barbados has to grapple with if it is going to deal sensibly with its debt management issues, is to what extent are our international obligations increasing, and what part of them fall within our discretion to deal with so that scarce foreign exchange can be earmarked for some of the major priority things in this society. Can this society truly be comfortable with a situation where our imports of food, for example, were brought down between 1981 and 1985 from \$179 million in 1981 to \$155 million in 1985. It was brought down because there was expanded food production, but has subsequently risen from \$155 million to \$192 million. Don't we see in Barbados, Mr. Speaker, that part and parcel of our management of foreign exchange is for us to redress this quite distressing situation that now confronts us in this country, where we have idle land resources, a proven history in recent times of a society that is able, if it so desires, to bring down its food import bill, but yet, Sir, we are luxuriating in the context of a situation where the food import bill of this society is allowed to rise by as much as \$40 million in the course of three short years, people are unemployed, land is idle and we have a recent history where we could have brought it down. 4.10 p.m.

Sir, I am going to look at the whole matter of our debt management within the context of how are we dealing with our international obligations, how do we define them?

I am also saying, Sir, that the question of debt management is a two-sided financial issue in its own right. You have a debt problem. Debt service has to do with the relationship between debt payments and foreign exchange earnings and it is true that Barbados debt repayments have increased in recent times and that that is part of the problem.

But it is also true, Mr. Speaker, that Barbados' foreign exchange earning capabilities have declined, particularly, our foreign exchange earnings capabilities as regards export of commodities which have declined substantially in recent times and that is part of the problem.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Between 1985 and 1988 and let me tell you what the numbers are, Sir. Throughout the recession of which the Minister of Finance speaks, Barbados' exports of commodities rose from \$297 million in 1981 to \$496 million in 1985. By 1987 this country that was exporting \$496 million a year found itself exporting in goods \$214 million.

Now, the point I am making is, that our export of goods fell by almost 50% in the course of two short years. The point in force, as the Minister of Finance will say, is that a lot of Barbados past debt was negotiated upon the

basis of, as he says, the balance sheet you present to the international bankers, that we went to bankers with an economy whose exports were growing and which had then the capacity to produce at least half a billion dollars in goods per year.

I am saying now, Sir, that you have a drastically changed economic set of circumstances in which rather than producing half a billion dollars of exports of goods per year, Barbados now is limping along at just over \$200 million and it is not just only INTEL because INTEL never used to produce \$200 million worth of goods in itself. Foolishness. Believe that. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am saying that it has taken this Government too long in the face of constructive criticism to begin to deal with the question of export development.

I have been accused in this House, Sir, very often of giving the same speech and the speech that I have been consistently giving is that I did not know of any way by which a small open economy could deal with its problems of growth and development by increasing domestic spending without a corresponding increase in its export capacity and that if we are going to increase domestic spending, that we had an even greater obligation to increase our export capabilities. That, Sir, has been my theme since 1986.

Further, Sir, the two Budgets of 1985 and 1986 had at their core a series of measures, if this House would remember, directly addressing the issue as to how this small economy was going to deal with the problem of export development because even then, and as the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central is in agreement because he understands where I am coming from because we recognized even then that the export development of Barbados had to be put at the centre of our focus before we could think in terms of committing this country to a development process which says let us spend more of our domestic currency.

I very much regret now when I see these numbers that that particular set of measures designed to stimulate earnings from the export of services, the design of measures that allow companies that were earning exports in extra-regional markets to retain 80% of each dollar earned as a rebate, I am sad that that export thrust which was the centre of economic policy of the Barbados Labour Party between 1985 and 1986 was not given a chance to take root in this country before it was overtaken and overturned by a contrary set of economic policies which negated the thrust.

Barbados needed a period within which to build exports and today we can speak in terms of that catastrophic drop in exports from \$496 million to \$220 million largely because export development has not been at the centre of the DLP policies.

I remember in 1987 the subvention to the Export Promotion Corporation was cut as part and parcel of the making of economies in this country. That is a fact I quarrelled about it in this House. I went to the point of saying that the Export Promotion Corporation should be made the most important single financial institution in Barbados. I have said so on the floor of this House, quarrelled about the Government cutting of its subventions[^] to that institution which had the public responsibility of building Barbados' export base.

The Democratic Labour Party, in my view, spent too much time as well trying to resolve our export problems by supposedly finding a solution to trade with Trinidad. Too much of the DLP's export policies, in my humble assessment, was designed immediately after 1986 to prove a political point which could not have been proven because the objective reality was that Trinidad's inability as it has been shown now, to buy from Barbados had nothing to do with a quarrel between Adams and Pitt.

It had to do with the fact that in the process of time Trinidad's reserves were falling from \$6 billion then to \$171 million of today but this Government was committed only to a break-through. You remember the days, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Trade would not speak unless he spoke only in terms of the break-through he was going to bring about in our trade relationships with^{*} Trinidad. <^

The Democratic Labour Party has not had an export development policy. In the context of a situation in which a Government is pursuing a fixed exchange rate policy, what has consistently been done in relation to tourism has to be applied to all of the sectors of the economy.

We seem to understand, Sir, as it pertains to tourism that when the dollar is weak that there has to be a market:- diversification programme where we put the emphasis of our market development in those areas where Barbados can benefit from the weakness of the United States dollar.

That is a policy that has been pursued consistently in relation to the export development of tourism that when the United States dollar is weak, that Barbados looks for increased market penetration in Europe because the weakness of the United States dollar allows Europeans to more afford a Barbadian holiday. ^

Where is the commensurate strategy applied by the Democratic Labour Party since 1986 in the context of a situation where the weakness of the Barbados dollar in Europe allows Barbadian manufacturers the same competitive edge enjoyed by tourism in the context of a situation where our manufacturing trade with Europe was[^] largely organized within the context of a concession[^] trade pack and trade arrangement.

Why has not the same policy that has, to some extent borne fruit in relation to tourism, been at least attempted, given the fact that we are all agreed that we cannot change the exchange rate merely to increase the competitiveness of one sector.

I am saying, therefore, that this Government can truly be charged with not having put export development in the forefront of its considerations and that that particular flaw in its policy is now at the base in some respects, and I am not saying totally, Sir, of the debt service problems that Barbados is going to face.

It is also at the base of a lot of the problems faced in relation to unemployment because when this country loses \$200 million worth of exports, it loses \$200 million worth of business and it loses \$200 million of jobs and Barbados will never be able to overcome the problem about unemployment in this small economy unless the mass of the techniques are able to hold and sustain a market position in markets that are larger than Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the whole history of the Barbados Labour Party even through the recession, if the member would be honest to refer to the numbers, is one in which exports of goods rose and people speak in terms of our experience in the International Monetary Fund but it is also a matter of fact that even under difficult days with the International Monetary Fund, that the Barbados Labour Party was able to bring about an increase in the reserves of this society. That is a matter of fact. 4.20 p.m.

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: By borrowing? The Democratic Labour Party - They say by borrowing, Sir. The difference is that if we increase our reserves by borrowing the Democratic Labour Party is in a position where, since election up to today, it has borrowed \$450 million before this. It is borrowing an additional \$40 million now. Even with all of that borrowing it still has not been able to keep the reserves of this country afloat.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Did you borrow \$490 million from the International Monetary Fund? Is the Minister of Finance in a position today to tell us how much has been Central Government repayment of loans relative to the amount borrowed by the Central Government? Can the Minister of Finance tell us these things, Mr. Speaker?

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Wait until you speak. My colleagues will also have the opportunity in this debate to speak in terms of what we did with the bullet loan.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir,....

Mr. SPEAKER: Just one moment. I do allow asides but not to the extent to interrupt a Member from speaking. If it gets beyond that point then I will have to ask Members to cease making those asides and allow the Honourable Member to make his speech as the rules say, in silence.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want the Honourable Minister of Finance when he comes in his response to say that he is paying back loans incurred by the Barbados Labour Party also to say that he is also paying back loans entered into by the Democratic Labour Party, Sir, before 1976, of which he himself is very well aware. Because he signed one of which the annual repayments today amount to almost \$1 million a year. There is not one Government in Barbados, Mr. Speaker, there is not one sovereign Government....

The Barbados Labour Party Administration between 1976 and 1986 repaid all loans incurred by the Democratic Labour Party without a murmur, including the loan to which he committed his signature and part of which he is himself today, Sir, still repaying.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not be carried away. No Member in here is "he".

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: The Honourable Minister of Finance, Sir, in whom I am greatly disappointed because he came to this House today in that reasonable manner saying that we are one people and how Barbados has, to date, had this fine record. I am agreeing with him, Sir, because the same people who made loans to the Barbados Labour Party Administration were seeing the same balance sheets that they are seeing today.

In many respects, Sir, this Government is in fact borrowing on the strength of a past record. It is borrowing on the strength of the fact that this country has never in its history defaulted on a loan, as compared to many countries in Latin America. It has never had to reschedule a loan and, indeed, its performance in relation to managing its international affairs whether it be in the area of loan repayment dealing with suppliers credit or any other matter, Sir, has entirely been exemplary. But the Government would tell you that, on the one hand, there is no history of any lack of prudence by the Government of Barbados in managing its international external affairs but then, on the other hand, would want to come and kill the Barbados Labour Party for the fact that you are paying back loans now that we incurred to build mis society, at a time when the country is enjoying the benefits of the assets to which

those borrowed funds were put. I am saying that the Government has to be consistent.

I therefore, Sir, have to raise a specific question to the Minister of Finance because the Minister of Finance and the Central Bank raise these kind of contradictory issues from time to time. The international community listens to what they are saying. There has been a time in the past, Sir, when I certainly felt, without being able to prove it, that statements made by the Minister of Finance in the process of approaching the international market and in defiance of our past history as being responsible borrowers compromised Barbados' position in that market I felt so, Sir, without being able to prove it

I am asking the Minister whether the Government has exhausted all the possibilities for refinancing Barbados' external debt this year. The refinancing of a country's debt is nothing that a country should kill itself about. We do it month by month in relation to the Treasury Bills. As the Treasury Bills fall due for repayment, we roll them over. The refinancing of a debt is such an ordinary financial technique so widely practised not only by countries but by companies and by all responsible Governments that it would be only a foolish people that would come now to want to create a controversy about a country refinancing a debt. But that you have to approach the matter with a sense of responsibility.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I am not making a fuss, except to say that we have from the Democratic Labour Party's Administration this position of duplicity, it wants to keep saying that it has inherited a situation that was prudently managed but yet then criticize the people who were prudent for lack of prudence.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am asking the Minister of Finance directly in this debate....

Mr. SPEAKER: In one minute. Mr. O.

S. ARTHUR: In one minute? Mr.

SPEAKER: That is right.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: ... have any arrangements been put in place at all for refinancing Barbados' debt? Is this part and parcel of that particular arrangement?

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of elucidation, Sir. I indicated, in introducing this Resolution, that the purpose of this loan was to assist in the capital development programme and also in the refinancing of part of the external debt. Those, Sir, were the words of the Addendum. And yet the Member is asking me directly if

this is part of the programme for refinancing the debt. That is what the Addendum says. I do not know what all the passion being exerted is about when he says that all governments have to refinance the debt

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a very long point of elucidation.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, let me put the ~ question more directly:

- (a) How much will it take this year to refinance Barbados' external debt?
- (b) Can a loan of \$40 million that has to be split between financing the capital programme and refinancing the debt be adequate in the light of the amount identified?
- (c) How much of this particular loan will go to refinancing, as distinct from capital development?
- (d) If this amount is not adequate and if the amount needed to refinance the debt is larger than part of 40, has the Government yet approached the international capital market?

And what has been the reaction of the international capital market to Government's attempt to refinance the debt?

- (e) Has the international capital market told the Government of Barbados that it is not going to be in a position to assist it in refinancing the debt because it too is concerned, like we on this side are concerned, with the fact that the Government's policy in managing the reserves of/- Barbados, ...

Mr. SPEAKER: And (f) which is not on your agenda. This is the end of your time.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I am in the midst of a sentence, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the end of your time.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir you have to^c allow me to finish the sentence.

Mr. SPEAKER: Complete the sentence. But I had already warned you. I always give a warning period and if Members persist in trying to use time that I have not given, I will cut it. But I will allow you to continue the statement.-'* For any other Member when I have given a time call tha/v will be the end of it.

The Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this Resolution.

I wish to say, Sir, that I was pleasantly surprised by the tone of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition who sounded very much like when he used to be on this side, expressing some balance and some analysis in his approach to economic matters.
4.30p.m.

I believe, Sir, that somebody has impressed on him the wisdom from a position of patriotism and loyalty to Barbados of not favouring every economic statement with rhetoric that is designed to bring this country into bad repute. I hope that whoever is speaking to him will continue to do so.

I am a bit disappointed in the Honourable Member for St. Peter ranting and raving today.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not accept that that is a proper Parliamentary comment

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I apologize, Sir. I am a bit disappointed that he has not spoken in his characteristic manner of calm and scientific detachment in his analysis of economic matters. I believe, Sir, it is because the economic situation that we are discussing in Barbados today is embedded in a number of external and internal factors impacting on the economy. I believe that we can easily take 1981 as a starting point in looking at the morass in which we find ourselves and from which as a country we need to adopt a non-partisan approach in looking at the problems that face us today.

I am going to assert and assert definitely that many of our problems are caused by economic considerations external to Barbados over which we have very little control. At the same time structural problems in our local economy have exacerbated these problems and they have led us to a position where we do not have very many options in the short term to manoeuvre out of the situation in which we find ourselves. Therefore, we have to look at some short term expedience but we have to look down the road too in terms of how we will get out of the particular problems in which we find ourselves.

I heard the Honourable Member for St. Peter talking about economic growth and the fact that although we have been having economic growth we have not been able to weather the problems. All he is suggesting to us is that the economics and the theories of 20 years ago are not necessarily relevant to economic matters today. Economics is a changing science and more and more as the history of various theories are tested we are finding that we have to

think again about the particular brand of economics that we will apply to our own local small open economies. No economist is sacrosanct and no economist must believe that they have the answers to the problems that face us and I am talking here about trained economists. I am not talking about those who call themselves economists.

We are biting the bullet in Barbados. There is no doubt about that. I suggest if you look at the balance of payments situation from 1981 that we started to experience severe problems. The answer of the Barbados Labour Party at that time was borrowing and more borrowing. You had access to the Venezuelan Oil Facility. You had access to the IMF. They continued a policy of borrowing in order to paper over the problems that were facing us. At the same time when you look at the tremendous amount of borrowing that was done in 1985, one remembers the \$55.8 million Japanese Bond Issue and a \$50 million Euro-dollar Loan.

In 1986, you remember that the former Minister of Finance in the Democratic Labour Party had to go to Japan to borrow some money. You remember how you castigated the late great Errol Walton Barrow on the floor for going to Japan to borrow some money and we have continued to borrow. We found ourselves in a position where we had to keep on borrowing money if we were to keep our balance of payments in some sense of equilibrium. When you look at the other side of the picture, the whole question of our exports, the Barbados Labour Party cannot tell us anything about that. The Honourable Member for St. Peter cannot get up here and talk about policies that were set in place to counteract this because I will show you the depth of the problem of our exports as it comes from under the Barbados Labour Party regime. There was a definite problem in terms of our exports especially from about 1984. I am saying this was because of two particular problems and these are structural problems.

We were depending in terms of our exports on two major components. One is electronics from the United States of America and the second was garments to the CARICOM market apart from sugar and sugar has traditionally been a very uncertain export earner. Those were the two pillars that kept our domestic exports going. I would suggest to you that if you look at the figures starting from about 1982 a very graphic picture will be told in terms of electronics and the part that they played in the Barbadian economy.

In 1982 at a time when the electronic industry was very bullish and the whole question of computers and the micro-chips and so on were expanding rapidly and when Barbados was relatively popular as a location for these kinds of enterprises, trade in that particular area expanded. In 1982, electrical exports rose by 112.6%. In 1983, they rose by 49.7%. In 1984 with the coming of Intel, there was a fantastic explosion. The export value of electrical components increased by \$132.8 million which is an

increase of 74.2%. But in 1985 the decline had set in, a decline of \$33 million or almost 10%. In 1986, electronic components declined by \$81.9 million or 27.2%. In 1987, you will recall that Intel pulled out in 1986. Exports of electronic components fell from \$241.7 million to a mere \$51.8 million. That answers the Honourable Member for St. Peter who is trying to suggest that the movement of Intel was insignificant in Barbados. In 1987 where electrical components accounted for \$241.7 million out of total exports of \$420 million, it fell to \$51.8 million and our total exports were a mere \$214 million.

So anybody who understands that history of electronics in our exports would know that it had nothing to do with the Government of Barbados. These were external factors that were impinging on a small open domestic economy that has no control out there in the world of the power sharks and so on. It is unfair quite frankly that when we are dealing with these economic matters for persons who are responsible persons to latch these things on to political parties. We need to let the people know the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. We are in this fight together. The future is for all Barbadians. To try to give the impression that the Democratic Labour Party is responsible for this fall-off in exports and that there is some negligence or mismanagement on our part, it is clearly untruthful. It is untenable. The facts will not support it. So let us be very, very clear. At the same time the electronic component was going down, we all know what happened in Barbados between 1983 and 1987 in terms of manufactured goods exported to CARICOM. I will maintain in here that part of the reason for the decline in the exports to CARICOM was because of the softening of the CARICOM market, but part of it was political. It was the relationship that the Barbados Labour Party had to the Trinidad Government. I will maintain that because the facts will bear it out. You cannot always remove politics from economics and trading matters.

I am saying that there has been a significant increase in manufacturing and our tradable goods since the Democratic Labour Party assumed office. We are only building the base. You do not expect that from the downturn in 1987 that we can in two short years build back the kind of export base that we had before. 4.40 p.m.

I am hearing all kind of talk about what kind of a crash programme you have to bring in investment, what kind of crash programme you have to do marketing. That is a tale told by an idiot full of sound and fury signifying nothing. That kind of suggestion that you can deal with serious structural matters in the economy by crash programmes is really not worthy of our consideration in here. Anybody who would say that the Democratic Labour Party's attitude of setting up studies by experts in order to plan structural change in the economy is the wrong way to go must be termed as short-sighted, very personal kind of

thinking. It is not thinking about people, it is just for political advantage, it is just making statements.

What is even more contradictory is when you do not want studies but you want a task force of Parliament to come up with an ombudsman study, not of experts now, but you are going to refuse having experts giving you plans for the future and you are going to take politicians- to come up with a study on which you are going to base your future* development

We have to analyse these things and let the public know exactly what people are saying to them. It is good developmental policy if you are going to move forward in sugar to get a study, to use that study as the basis of policy decision. The same thing in tourism. If you are going to make any structural changes, because that is what we are talking about, in the future we cannot remain using the same old time strategies and move forward hoping that something good will pick up out there in the world and that will pull us along in the surge, we have to make certain adjustments internally too. We will always have to face those external factors that may impinge on Barbados, but we have to start internally to examine our own position. We have therefore to look within agriculture, and that is why the whole question of cotton is so vitally important. That is why all kinds of attempts are being made to sabotage what is an initiative that has been taken by..... 7
"

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition wants to hear "only". Does he like the term "only"? That is an initiative that has been taken by the only Democratic Labour Party, which has the support of the only Minister of Finance and the Minister of Agriculture. The Barbados Labour Party never developed that cotton strategy and the NDP could not have conceived it. If you want to hear "only" it is only the DLP and you can only do that kind of structural change in the economy if you have a true understanding of the developmental path along which Barbados has to go.

We are not afraid as a Government to start that cotton project, we are not afraid as a Government to start agro processing plants, tying in agriculture with exports. By the end of the year we are going to have a number of those agro processing plants. We are showing the courage in the tight situation in which we find ourselves to come up with creative initiatives to move into the future. That is what it is all about, and not sterile attempts of just borrowing money all the time. When the Leader of the Opposition advises how much money we can borrow, follow the same path that he at one time was against and that has been followed for a long time by the Barbados Labour Party, if we decide that we will borrow in limited ways but try to deal with the situation by other structural transformation, that is the Democratic Labour Party way. We cannot know the out-

turn yet, because only the future will tell, but let us understand we are now coming out of the bottom, the whole trough, of where we have gone in terms of economic decline. That whole history from 1981 right away down has been that kind of history, so we have to be very careful when we are analysing the problems facing our country that we do not lay all *the* fault on the local situation.

XwV

-^ Nobody could blame the Barbados Labour Party totally, nobody could blame the Democratic Labour Party for the fact that the electronics market went soft The Barbados Labour Party did not push out all those electronic firms. I think they played a little hanky panky with Intel and I believe that Intel probably felt that with them out of office they would pull out and see what would happen in Barbados, because that Intel pull out had a very traumatic effect on this country in terms of our export earnings and in terms of jobs. Intel was going to pull out in 1985 and they ^ had to beg them. They could not take an Intel pull out in a ' year before elections, they had to beg them to stay on, but we had to bite that bullet when Intel pulled out.

It probably teaches us a lesson, that we should not in our industrial policy bow down to those big companies that will come into a small open economy and then control us, hold a lot of political weight and clout. They can then get what they want by saying we will pull out, and we have to *1* be very careful in those lessons in development. Those are things we have to look at in terms of learning, not in terms of now chastising a Government for fall off in export earnings as though this Government set out to get a fall off in export earnings. It is dishonest to give that impression. We have to get together now and use the IDC, the Export Promotion Corporation, we have to get studies, we have to increase the skills of our people, we have to find some niches in the external market and we have to build again. That is vitally important.

»
fe

--* It is not easy, because we are now going into the era of the 1990's and people are out there scrambling for capital. That is what we should be talking about now with Eastern Europe, with the Far East, with Latin America and Mexico. Barbados is out there competing for scarce capital. My colleague will tell you that the American economy is now trying to woo Japanese dollars to come in there, because America is a huge place and every part of America is not wealthy. There are parts of America that are going out cap in hand asking people to come and invest in •.* America, but they are trying to make it easy.

=

Therefore, what bothers me is that with a small dependent open economy like ours, which is being threatened with graduation into the capital markets of the world, when we are trying to go for a loan the climate in Barbados is being incensed, that Barbadians are trying to ^ give the impression that this economy is in a state of ... collapse, that Barbadians are giving the impression that ".*' devaluation is around the corner, that Barbadians are giving

the impression that the Minister of Finance does not know anything about what he is doing, that Barbadians are giving the impression that the Governor of the Central Bank ^nd all of our technocrats do not know what they are doing, and trying to give the impression to people in the world that we are putting figures in pressure cookers, questioning everybody's figures but not their own. That is a game they are playing, that Barbadians are doing that. There is no sense of patriotism. Self before country can never be a general principle, and they know what they are doing. We all feel the pressure when people put this global picture.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I hope the Honourable Member is not accusing any Member of the Opposition of that It has become very fashionable nowadays for some people to believe that they are the only patriots this country has, so I really wish he does not make that allegation, because if he does I resent it very strongly.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: To be quite honest, Mr. Speaker, I was not addressing the Honourable Member for Christ Church West. I can say that very plainly. I will address him on other matters and say other things, but I will not accuse him of being unpatriotic. I stop there. He will do things sometimes for political gain, as every politician will, but I will not accuse him of being unpatriotic.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Are you coming up against me? Do not gamble your seat like that. You want to go back to your practice and you are using a smart way to do that, but don't gamble.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, I think it is very important because of the world situation at this time that we conduct our affairs in Barbados with an eye to the fact that we do not Uve in a world by ourselves. Barbadians tend to believe this. The international market out there is very sensitive to how Barbadians perceive themselves, and if the view is that there is imminent collapse in the Barbadian economy, if only because it happened in all the other territories - Jamaica, Trinidad, Guyana, etc. - they might tend to believe that the same thing is happening here. I do not believe it is so, but I believe we have to be very careful that we do not give that impression.

The question of growth. Growth is an important consideration in measuring what is happening in any economy. Not growth in itself, because we all recognise that growth does not give a total picture of what is happening. 4.50 p.m.

You can have bow-legged growth, it is true, but you can have no growth at all too. You can have a foetus that does not develop. Whether a person would prefer a foetus that does not develop or a bow-legged child that is growing

to maturity, that is the person's choice. Then of course you can get a full fledged person, fully developed, six foot and more and everything else, scholarly etcetera, all that is growth too. But there are different types of growth. I am being asked if you have to be six feet to mean growth. I was just using extremes, but anywhere in between there we still recognise growth. I am saying that all growth is not necessarily the same growth. Let us understand that we move from a situation in 1981 when we had negative 1.9 per cent growth; in 1982 negative 4.9 per cent. In 1983, because the Honourable Member for St. Peter was talking about seven years of growth, that is true, it was 0.5 per cent; 1984 it was 0.5 per cent, 1985 it was 5 per cent, in 1986 it was 4.5 per cent, in 1987 it was 4 per cent, in 1988 it was 1 per cent, in 1989 it was 4.3 per cent. These are figures that could be looked at from one source. I will give you another source of figures, and the same pattern would develop. Let me give you the run of figures.

In 1981 there is negative growth of 2.6 per cent, 1982 negative 4.6 per cent, 1983 it was 0.5 per cent, in 1984 it was 3.5 per cent, in 1985 it was 1 per cent, in 1986 it was 5 per cent, in 1987 it was 2.2 per cent, in 1988 it was 3.5 per cent and in 1989, estimated still, we are not in a full position but we are hearing 3.5 per cent to 4.3 per cent. So I agree with the Honourable Member for St. Peter that we are on seven years of growth, but it started as a very minimal growth and it is building up. It has been building I think consistently since 1986 when 5 per cent was achieved then which I heard him claim to be really the result of the budget of the Barbados Labour Party rather than the policies that were implemented in 1986, the new path budget, the Democratic Labour Party's budget of 1986 which achieved 5 per cent growth, and our budget since then has been showing that kind of growth, so we want to suggest that it is totally unfair to give the impression that because we have a balance of payments problem, a problem of foreign exchange which I have outlined came clearly from the withdrawal of electronics from Barbados - I want to be very clear about that, that the genesis of our foreign exchange problem started about 1983 and it could be clearly laid at the fact that the electronics industry declined severely and significantly and that in this electronic industry INTEL by itself was the major cause of that decline. I would say that that fault cannot be attributed really to the Barbados Labour Party administration, it happened during their time. They had no control over it, but we inherited that situation; but for anybody to suggest to us that you could turn around that situation in two years by whatever kind of policies you are talking about is really dealing now not in reality, not in economics, you have to be dealing in wishful thinking. It is going to be a hard road back. Let us understand that. It is going to be a road that calls for all of us in Barbados thinking about the need to earn more foreign exchange through improving the tradeable goods sector. We are working hard.

The Minister of Tourism must be complimented at what is happening in tourism. But tourism again will have certain difficulties, because I want to make it very clear to everybody that there is no Minister of Tourism in Barbados that can control what will happen in the tourism business, and we have to be very clear about that. You can introduce your domestic policies in order to improve the situation, but if tomorrow the Americans, if tomorrow the Canadians, decide that they are going to Eastern Europe, there is going to be very little that we can do to stop them from going there. Let us understand that the fault lays not in our management, it lays in the fact that we are a small, open, dependent economy subject to the whims and fancies of what happens outside of Barbados.

In our manufacturing, let us be very clear it is not going to be easy to get back into the United States of America, not through electronics. We have to go for hi-tech services, and that is why I believe we have to put a lot of emphasis on data processing, we must make the structural changes in our educational system to cater to that, we have to look at the offshore financial sector, we have to do everything possible to encourage that that grows and that we have a very good understanding of what is happening there, but the area in the future has to be services. Everybody in here has said so from time to time. Let us understand that, let us understand the responsibility in making sure that we can play a very important role in the whole area of selling services to the people in the world who wish to purchase those services, and those are the areas that we have to go into. What we know in manufacturing is that we have to fine tune it; we have to go for standards, we have to become better, we have to train our people to the highest levels.

In terms of agriculture we are going through a crisis period but I believe we will come out of this crisis period sharper and better able to face the future. I have no doubt we have to get about 90 000 to 100 000 tons of sugar to be sold. I believe we need to try and get there based not necessarily on taking in more and more land, but in greater productivity. I believe that is very important, but we have to diversify, we have to give that cotton project a chance; we have to do that, we have to do more in terms of fisheries, we have to get in those areas, but these are things that are not done overnight; they call for planning. I am very impressed by the whole concept of pushing the domestic resource cost as a technique looking to see, whatever industry that we push, what kind of foreign exchange it would bring to us, but I have great hope under the leadership of the Democratic Labour Party. We have analysed the problems in our economy and I am sure a full debate will come when the Prime Minister will speak which will certainly come in April, but this was not a full debate. Thank you very much.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister came with a Resolution today to get the approval of Parliament to borrow \$US20 million on the overseas market. Mr. Speaker, we have heard the same speeches by both Honourable Members of the Opposition or similar speeches for the past seven or eight months. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to speculate on the reasons why persons, knowledgeable people, would wish to make the same speeches over that length of period. Anyone's guess is as good as mine. I do not know if they want to tell the outside community that the Barbados economy is collapsing. I do not know if, as some of them are saying, they are alerting the people of Barbados to what is happening; I do not know if it is mainly because of ambition. But I find it strange that every time certain persons get up to speak that the impression is being given that the Barbados economy will collapse next month, which means that for the past eight months, every month people were looking forward to the Barbados economy collapsing.

For the past eight months every person in Barbados was looking for the Prime Minister of Barbados to be going to the IMF or have a devaluation. 5.00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, in March, April or whenever the Prime Minister comes with the Budgetary Proposals, we are going to hear the same speeches again.

Aside.

The Honourable Member for St. Thomas says the Prime Minister will not be coming with a Budget this year. He said already that the elections will be June so I do not know.

Anyhow, the point I am getting at is that we are going to hear the same speeches again. Over and over again we will hear that there will be imminent doom and collapse in the economy and we keep going on and on all the time.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this. The Leader of the Opposition wanted the Prime Minister to speak on every single subject under his Ministry - "The Prime Minister did not speak on this, he did not address this, he did not address that."

Mr. Speaker, when the Prime Minister is presenting his Budgetary Proposals, he can speak for as long as he likes and he can speak on any facet of his Ministry. The Prime Minister did not believe that today was the day to speak on every single facet of his Ministry so to sit and say that the Prime Minister did not address this or he did not address that, you can go on and on saying what he did not address or what he did address.

The question of economic growth, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition tried to tell us what he thought the

Governor of the Central Bank was telling us. Now, the Governor of the Central Bank is an independent and intelligent person. He speaks what he feels. He says it as it is.

He does not want anybody to look behind what he is saying to interpret what he is saying. But that is the way how the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central operates because the Honourable Member needs to be an alarmist and he needs to make the people in Barbados feel that he is an economic wizard and nobody else knows as much economics as he does.

I am alarmed, Mr. Speaker that the same people who have been working in the Ministry of Finance for years, maybe with one or two exceptions, the same people who were working in the Central Bank for years, with one exception and now you are going to hear, all of a sudden, that the figures have been cooked up. They have been put into a pressure cooker.

These are people with integrity who have always worked in the Central Bank, who have always worked in the Ministry of Finance but because the Honourable Member is no longer a member of the Government, the persons no longer have any integrity. They have deliberately over-stated figures by 20%.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order.

I was most careful to say, in referring to the tourist expenditure estimates, that they are hardly ever beyond the level of guesstimates and that they were, in my view, underestimated for many years and that now they are over-estimated.

I think that any rational person would recognize that one is dealing with an area of quite wide discretion, not a reflection on the integrity of anyone, and I am sure the records of the Central Bank and the research in the Central Bank, would address the same kind of issues which I raised. It has nothing to do with integrity.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, if throughout the past two years someone is going to get up in this Honourable House and criticize everything that is being done in the Ministry of Finance, and in the Central Bank, and in any other institution where there have been persons working in there for years, the same persons working for, I believe, the past 15, 20 and 25 years, if that is going to happen...

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Therefore, they were making mistakes all along. Why should they only make mistakes when the Honourable Member is no longer the Minister of Finance? That is the question I want answered.

That attitude, Mr. Speaker, is the same attitude that dictates that a Member can sit around a Cabinet and then the moment he leaves the Cabinet says that no Member of the Cabinet has any sense. That is how the Honourable Member operates. The people in Barbados will deal with him.

Let me just go now, Mr. Speaker, quickly to the Honourable Member for St. Peter. We heard his speech, very intelligent person, but I believe that he allows his politics to get in his way.

Mr. Speaker, I am reading from the Central Bank Economic Report for the last year the Barbados Labour Party held office and I am going to read part of it. It says, speaking about 1985, that was the last full year, page 1:

"Real output expanded hardly at all as the market for electronic components weakened."

That is the point that was being made by the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central that since 1985 the market for the electronic components was weakening.

I go on:

"The tourism sector experienced one of the worst summer seasons in many years while the agricultural sector marked time."

They were speaking about the final year of the Barbados Labour Party's administration.

"There was no improvement in the unemployment situation."

This is under the Barbados Labour Party, the final year. 5.10p.m.

"Substantial foreign borrowing was required to maintain an adequate level of foreign exchange reserves."

This is the Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. Speaker, let me turn to page 21 of that same Report under Foreign Exchange Transactions, this is what the Central Bank said, and it was not written by the present Governor. He did not sign it. It was signed by the previous Governor:

"The Bank's foreign exchange reserves were boosted by the proceeds of a Barbados Government 5 billion yen \$38.6 million and also a US\$25 million loan."

They borrowed \$88.6 million in order to get the foreign reserves at a certain level. You are criticizing us.

The point I am trying to make is that the impression was being given here today that borrowing was wrong. That is the impression you all gave, that the borrowing was wrong, and that you all only borrowed.....

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member is on point of order. ~

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order, the Honourable Member is misleading the House.

The point that I made is that the Barbados Labour Party borrowed money and reserves increased. The Democratic Labour Party has also borrowed money and reserves have fallen. That is the point that I made and the point that the Member should deal with.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am saying and I will repeat it.....

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: That is the point. Do you want us to borrow enough, some more so that it would come up to the level that you all borrowed to get it up to that level? Is that what you want?

Mr. Speaker, I am going on. It is very instructive that you go on. The Members of the Barbados Labour Party would like the people in Barbados to forget the final year they had in office. They would like that to happen. Let me go on. It says here, Mr. Speaker:

"Output in manufacturing fell sharply in 1985."

So manufacturing went down as well. -;

I am going on, Mr. Speaker, it was so bad in 1985, and I am sure the Honourable Leader of the Opposition agrees with this that it was real bad in 1985. >

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: I know. You would never agree with anything I say. It goes on, Mr. Speaker. It says:

"Demand for credit remained weak throughout the 7 year"

Do you know what that is saying, Mr. Speaker? That the people in Barbados did not even want to borrow any money:

.... " and considerable excess liquidity built up in tfcV

banking system."

What that is saying is that the banks had toads of money in 1985 and nobody wanted to borrow it.

It goes on, Mr. Speaker. It goes even further. It says:

"Government's efforts to channel funds to housing met with limited success."

In 1985 the people were so depressed and frustrated - they did not even want the money that the Barbados Labour Party was making available to them for housing. That is what was happening in 1985.

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: It is said here. Do you want me to read it again?

— *Asides.*

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Okay. Let me read it again.

"Government's efforts to channel funds to housing met with limited success."

You all were putting the money there and the people did not want it. That was the problem that we had in 1985.

Mr. Speaker, when the Honourable Member is getting in here and telling us or telling the people of Barbados that things are so bad now, compare 1985 with the position today. Compare this with the position today.

You have heard, Mr. Speaker, where the Governor of the Central Bank....

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: He was the adviser to the Prime Minister. He was the chief economic adviser when all of this was happening. In fact he was a Minister.

Asides.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, let me go on.

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: The Member for St. Peter. "He was the chief economic adviser. You would have heard....

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: He was the problem not the technocrats.

Laughter.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order. I heard you today....

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: apply in keeping with the Rules of the House a very strict interpretation when the Member for St. Michael West rose as he should have properly arisen to question a comment made by the Leader of the Opposition in relation to who was a Minister and who was not a Minister.

I am asking that the same strength and the same judgement that you exercised in that particular matter be exercised in relation to this particular instance so that this House will be guided by one set of Rules.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no difficulty with that whatsoever. Matter sustained.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, he was the chief economic adviser. He was not a Minister.

I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that you would have heard the Governor of the Central Bank last week I think it was stating that there was growth in the economy of about between 3.5% and 4.3%. The Governor of the Central Bank ...

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already ruled that I will not permit interruptions to interrupt a Member from speaking. I would permit asides in a very much more quieter fashion but not to interrupt a Member.

I will ask the Honourable Member now to continue and make his speech while the others are silent

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, you would have heard last week, I think it was the Governor of the Central Bank in giving his review of the economy say that the economy is estimated to grow by between 3.5% and 4.3% this year. The Governor of the Central Bank went on to point out as all of us in here know or should know that you need growth mainly in areas that will generate employment and things like that

The Governor of the Central Bank certainly did not say anything that the Leader of the Opposition said he said. Nothing like that. He never said it. He never said anything that the Leader of the Opposition said he said. That is a fact.

Because the Governor of the Central Bank pointed out, in fact he was at pains to point out that manufacturing grew and he was at pains to point out that we were coming out of a situation where manufacturing had hit rock bottom.

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Of course. Agriculture is part of the economy that is pointing in the other direction. But we will turn it around, just as we turned around manufacturing, as stated by the Governor of the Central Bank. Just as the Governor of the Central Bank pointed out that manufacturing had hit rock bottom and that it has grown. He said construction grew. All the other indicators are pointing in the right direction apart from agriculture. So there is no reason to think that agriculture will not be turned around. There is no reason to think so.

Asides.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: What was being said in here today as though growth.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: is wrong. Growth is not wrong. Would you have preferred negative growth?

I sat in here and I hear you many times attacking the Barbados Labour Party because of the lack of growth....

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Sorry. When you were in the Opposition. They were the Government. I sat and I heard you, on many occasions, attacking the Government of the day because of the fact that they had no growth. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. I am telling you. That is true.

The growth may not be in the areas that one would like. The point is one would prefer the growth to be in certain other areas, along with the areas that are growing. The point I am trying to make is this, that the criticisms that you all are putting on this Government are uncalled for, are wrong, are defeatist and are self serving. That is the point I am trying to make.

Asides.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Precisely. You hear, go to the public, Mr. Speaker. That is how they speak all the time. They speak with the understanding that they can fool the public. That is the way they speak all the time. They speak in here not from a position of educating people or looking at facts as they are, on principle. They speak in here for 2 reasons. They speak in here so that people would get the wrong impression about the performance of this Government. That is one area from which they speak in here. The other area from which they speak in here, and I am going to say this and I am very, very concerned about this....

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: I speak from a position of principle.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not hear the asides. I want to tell the Honourable Member I am not hearing the asides and he should not hear them either. I am gradually coming to the conclusion how to deal with interrupting asides. If you speak and you listen carefully to what you are saying and hear what I have to rule on, I am sure you will make your speech in silence. Speak on.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that one expects as the Government that the party will be attacked from time to time. 5.20 p.m.

~"»S

The situation has reached the stage, Mr. Speaker, where every single thing that is done, every single Resolution that is brought.....

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not going to accept this kind of interruption. The Honourable Member rose on a point of -*• order. I am going to hear him but I will not be permitting "- these fraudulent types of points of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Which kind, Sir? My kind or your kind.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am just saying that I am not permitting these times of fraudulent points of order. So state your point. If it is a fraudulent point of order, I am going to rule it out.

~*

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I do not own any " hotel in Barbados and I have not bought any hotel in Barbados.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, before I go any further, let me say this. I need to say it. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central realizes there is no way that he can get at me.

At this point certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for St. Philip South were asked to be expunged from the record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the Honourable Member to continue his speech.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, let me say- that no one or no person in this Honourable House will stop me from speaking on principle. The former late Prime Minister Tom Adams, a man for which I had the greatest

*'

respect - he was not a favourite of mine, but I had great respect for him - he could not stop me. I operate from a position of principle. I want you to understand that. No matter what the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central say about me you are not stopping me. You have to find some other means to stop me. You cannot upset me by talking things about me because my back is broad and you are not my doctor anymore either.

Laughter.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, let me just end by saying that this Government in my view has been handling the economy of this country well. There have been predictions made from 1987 in every budget debate about the imminent collapse of this economy and I am going to deal with them one by one in the upcoming budget debate. They go on predicting all the time. Despite all the predictions, Mr. Speaker, and despite all the vilification of this Government, you will see that whenever the people are asked who they want to lead them in the 1990's they say this Government. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Thomas.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to you, Sir. I am sorry that my friend, the Honourable Member for St. Philip South, became too emotional, Sir.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I did not say irrational, Sir. I know that he has had a long time in becoming an economist. I regret to say that I did not learn anything from his last contribution that would enhance my own knowledge of economics.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, I agree that in these matters it is a question of personal understanding.

I want to bring the debate, Sir, back to the Resolution before us. Sir, the Resolution today is about the Government's need to borrow \$20 million to do two things - to assist with the implementation of capital projects and to assist in the retirement of debt. Now I think, Sir, the House deserves to hear from the Prime Minister in his reply precisely which capital projects this money or part of this money will be applied and, secondly, how much of it is to be spent on each project. I want the projects identified and perhaps if he could be so kind as to tell us when each capital project will start in relation to this \$20 million. I am sure that he would have given the Channel Islands Bank the list of these projects and all of that information. Otherwise,

he would have misrepresented the position of the Government of Barbados to the lender.

I am very, very serious, Sir. We are asked to vote this money for certain specifics and I am not supporting it. I am voting against it I believe as a Member of this Honourable House that I am entitled even on behalf of the constituents of St. Thomas to get that information which is shrouded in very general terms here, Sir. First point - do not give it and stand condemned.

Now there is no doubt that the Government's economic position is perilous. The Prime Minister has had the decency and courage and I think that he acted with due propriety to admit today that the economic condition of Barbados is not hot, particularly the aspect of the economy dealing with the reserves is creating cause for concern. The Governor of the Central Bank whose speech the Honourable Member for St. Philip South tried to rewrite has assured the country that the growth in the economy last year has been distorted growth, unbalanced if you like. Indeed such growth as there was of 3.5% I believe

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He did not say that, Sir. I am dealing with what the Governor of the Central Bank said when he addressed the Life Underwriters last week Thursday. I am dealing with that. 5.30 p.m.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I do not have it here, but I can get the front page of the Advocate on Saturday where he is quoted precisely and up to now that same Governor of the Central Bank has not contradicted that report in the Saturday Advocate or on page 3 of the Sunday Sun, nor has he contradicted himself on television. He was very explicit on television night before last. I saw him. There is no doubt that what the Governor of the Central Bank was saying was that we have paid a price for that distorted growth that we attained last year and he is warning, as one of the principal financial advisers to the Prime Minister, that this year we had better attend first to money than to human beings and the problem of employment. That is all he is saying, Sir, that the emphasis this year must be on securing the position of the foreign reserves, and in his own words, put the question of people working on a back burner. If they work or not he does not care. If there are consequences of social unrest and disorder, he does not mind. Secure the foreign reserves first. That is the essence of what the Governor of the Central Bank was saying.

The Honourable Member for St. Philip South said that we on this side have distorted what that gentleman has said. I want it to be clearly understood that what the Governor of the Central Bank has said was said before he said it by one

of the founding members of the Democratic Labour Party, one of the Directors of the Central Bank even today.

I have here and I will make it a document of the House from the CANA Business Issue No. 5 that came out about four weeks ago, written by -1 have to call the name of the author to lend it authenticity - one Douglas Lynch...

Certain remarks made by Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS were ordered by Mr. SPEAKER to be expunged from the record.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am saying that Douglas P. Lynch, Chairman of the Barbados Shipping and Trading Group of Companies, a senior member of the Democratic Labour Party and a Director of the Central Bank, headed by the Governor, wrote these words:...

Mr. SPEAKER: Although I allowed you to make the point, you now have to substantiate that he is a Dem with a passport. Have you seen the passport?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: What is a passport?

Mr. SPEAKER: Have you seen the document?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You are asking me, a Bee, about a passport? We do not have passports. Why are you asking me about passports, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, you have no document to show that he is a Dem.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: What passport are you talking about? He is a founder member.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do you have a document to share with us?

Certain remarks made by Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS were ordered by Mr. SPEAKER to be expunged from the record.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: This is what Mr. Lynch said, Sir, and I quote from the CANA Business News:

"In Barbados we mostly tend to think that the most pressing challenge is to decrease the unemployment rate - to find jobs for the unemployed.

In fact, the events of the last few years are such that the most pressing challenge is to maintain a working level of foreign exchange - what the Central Bank refers to as our foreign reserves. If we run out of foreign exchange to pay for our imports, Barbados

will find itself in a sorry mess. If that happened, the probable consequences would be -" and then he lists all the probable consequences of that.

What he has been saying, Sir, is the same thing that the Governor said last weekend. He is saying that we need to decrease the emphasis on jobs and creating work for the unemployed, and try and secure, in his words, a workings, level of foreign exchange. What has been said by the ., Governor and the Director is policy that is known to the Democratic Labour Party, and I submit that the Prime Minister himself subscribes to that policy.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am quite capable of expressing my thoughts and views on national issues or other issues and I do not wish any other Member to make any submission on my behalf. He is attributing, therefore, a position to me which I have not expressed to him and he cannot^-* substantiate anything he has said. I think he should" withdraw that. 5.40 p.m.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: My submission that I believe that the Leader of the Government subscribes to the position adopted by the Governor and the Director? No, Sir, I can't withdraw that. And do you know why I wouldn't withdraw it, Sir, it-is because the Prime Minister is aware'-that the Central Bank has made certain forecasts for this year 1990, and that the forecasts of the Central Bank for 1990 portend a foreign reserve position of minus \$112 million. They envision employment rate of 18.2 per cent, let him deny that; they portend a growth rate of 0.1 of a percent, and that there will be minus seven weeks' imports.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I enquire, you said you were reading from a document.

x*

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I did not say that.

Mr. SPEAKER: What I wanted to ask was when was the end of the quote.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The quote would have been "if that happened the probable consequences would be". I can make it a document of the House. I have it underlined in green. The Central Bank figures that I have given for 1990, the forecast, - no one in here has mentioned them^*-today - have been published to me and I am republishing ^ them to all Honourable Members in here for their valued consideration. I don't have to disclose the source of my information. I have memorised them well.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order, I submit for Your Honour's consideration that since the Central Bank is the sole source of economic information in the " country and since Honourable Members in this House a£> by the rules expected to and always do speak the truth, that ••

the Honourable Member having indicated that the Central Bank has published information, that the Honourable Member if he does not give the source of that information, will allow the community by virtue of the circumstances of the publication to bandy that information into the public domain which may be to the detriment of the country. Therefore I submit that in the absence of authoritative evidence of the publication that the Honourable Member is misleading this House.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, that is almost as fatuous as if I got up before a High Court Judge and said that the rule in *Donahue and Stevenson* is that the manufacturer of goods is liable to the ultimate consumer for negligence, that he would say you can't say that principle of law unless you tell me it is *Donoghue and Stevenson 1932* appeal cases. If I have a power of retention in my mind that enables me to store information from sources albeit perfectly accurately ~ and truthful, I don't have to come in here with any document I can tell you that I have that information and what it is. If I purport to quote from the source, then you can ask to see it and I will put it there on the table.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it is precisely because he preceded what he was going to say by saying the Central Bank has published to me. If he now refutes that the Central Bank published it, he can - believe anything. If he says he heard or he understands or he has knowledge, I cannot question that. My contention is, Sir, that to state that the Central Bank has published, those are the words I refer to.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I did not interrupt them at all, I kept very quiet and never rose on more than one point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would just like to say at this point „• that in circumstances such as these that the House can only go by the records that have been placed before the House and if the Honourable Member is speaking something that has not come to the House, then I have difficulty with it. In other words, if you are speaking about something to come, I am not in a position to determine that. But if it is a record before the House from which you are purporting to say something, then I can accept that.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It is nothing before the House. I am saying that I saw a document coming from the . Central Bank and it makes certain forecasts for 1990. I memorised certain aspects of it and gave the House the benefit of my information.

Now, Sir, the important thing about that Central Bank forecast was that it was done before the current tourist season started to show distinct signs of softening. I think > they call it in the jargon, so that in fact unless there is some substantial turn around in the fortunes of tourism this year,

then we could expect that the forecast will perhaps be even more gloomy later on this year.

Dr. Howard of the University in a similar publication, *CANA Business Issue No. 5*, looking at Barbados into the nineties, I will make this a document of the House as I have done with the other one, at page 6 says, "any prediction on the Barbados economy in 1990 must rely on an interpretation of trends seen in the economy in 1988 and 1989. The most important problems are high levels, of unemployment, 18 per cent, excessive Government expenditure and chronically high fiscal deficits, a foreign exchange reserves problem and weakness in the major productive sectors, particularly agriculture and manufacturing."

I think with all of that we agree.

"Continuing difficulties with the balance of payments will be the main preoccupation of Barbadian policy makers in 1990. The balance of payments problems have roots in the fiscal and credit policies pursued between 1986 and 1989. The year 1986 was characterised by massive tax cuts and excessive Government expenditure. The latter has continued to expand rapidly since then to sustain high levels of domestic demand. The heavy budget deficits of 1987 and 1988 were associated with high levels of foreign borrowing from the commercial banks by Government. In 1989 the Government also resorted to borrowing from the Central Bank as liquidity in the banking system became tight. Borrowing from the Central Bank was a factor reducing the level of foreign reserves by supporting the high level of spending."

He ends off. "Given the present economic difficulty and the foreign exchange problems, one can expect growth in 1990 to be no more than 2 per cent and a figure of 1.5 per cent would not be surprising." That is Dr. Michael Howard, Head of the Department of Economics at Cave Hill.

I would wish to ask the Prime Minister if his Government is so concerned about unemployment why is it that we have not had official statistics on unemployment since October 1988, one year and three months ago. We have some in the first quarter of 1989 by combining the last quarter of 1988 and the first quarter of 1989 at page 87.1 think that Members of this House and the general public are entitled to more consistent and up to date figures on employment which we all can see is a serious social problem than the Government has shown. Do you know what that means, Sir? It means that this Government is saying it is concerned about unemployment, but it is making its plans. They don't plan too much now. 5.50p.m.

Every time you hear "we are looking at this." Check them out on television any night, and you hear "We are looking at this or studying." When they are studying

unemployment and looking at it they cannot properly plan for its relief in the absence of a proper statistical base.

Now, I have to engage the Honourable Member for St. Philip South because he read from the Central Bank Report 1986 reviewing 1985 and he agreed that we continued in office for the first six months virtually of the next year, until May 28.1 just want to put in perspective the state of the economy that we left and compare it with 1985. I am not querying anything in the Report that he quoted from.

What I am saying is that by the time we left office six months after that Report, or the period for that Report ended, this is what the Central Bank said. Now, I have this in my hand, the Economic Review for September, 1986, Page 1. We had gone out of office by then. Listen to what it says:

"The Barbados economy maintained the first quarter momentum into the second quarter, with real output for the first half-year rising about 4.5% above the level for the same period in 1985.

All major economic sectors contributed to the higher economic activity during the first six months of the year 1986."

All, not two, no bow-legged thing, straight up.

"Production, Prices and Employment

The growth in real output in the first half-year reflected mainly improved performances of sugar, manufacturing and activities in the non-traded sector, especially construction. The economy is estimated to have grown by about 4.5% in the six months, following its first quarter performance of about 5%. Tourism improved, although the gains were largely confined to the US market. Helped by the fall in oil prices, the rate of inflation (based on the average for the twelve months ending June) fell to its lowest level since 1968."

Let me deal with sugar, Sir. We are talking about agriculture. ~\

"Agriculture

Sugar output of 111 000 tonnes, 11% above last year's, was the highest since 1980."

They produced only 65 000 last year. You should be ashamed. Eleven percent above last year's was the highest since 1980.

"Manufacturing

The beleaguered manufacturing sector grew by 14%."

The Honourable Member for St. Philip South in his presentation was boasting about a turn around, he called it, in manufacturing where the growth in manufacturing was 6% over the previous year. This is 14%.

Employment, Sir. Hear this.

"Nearly 8 000 more people were employed than at June 1985."

That is page 3, Sir. Now, let us just put some of that in perspective.

Aside.

They have 3 000 at NCC. Unemployment in Barbados today is 22.7%.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I never said that. The Central Bank is forecasting not 18.6% but 18.2%. The figure that I have, and you know that I get my facts, is 22.7%. That is why you cannot see any official statistics come in here for a year.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: That is not Central Bank. That is over yonder, the big place over there across the Bridge. Check in there in the Statistical Department and you will get the figures.

Now, Sir, what I used this Economic Review to do was to try and convince the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central and the Honourable Member for St. Philip South that a country can go through a difficult year[^] because of all kinds of influences and problems but, at the[^] same time, with proper direction, that country could reverse[^] the trend in a short time.

My friend was absolutely right in what he said about 1985 but here it is that by the first half of 1986 that situation had been turned upside down on its side and we were ready to go again.

Where we on this side and I believe I speak for all on this side in this regard, have difficulty with the Government ~ is that we have seen a downward trend and no semblance in any year of an ability to turn that trend the other way.

It has happened with the reserves. There has been a steady decline. It has happened with agriculture period. It will happen to tourism. It will happen to construction[^] because one of the implied consequences of the credit[^] squeeze is that there will be contraction in the construction[^] industry and in tourism because do not forget that the hotels

and the business houses generally cannot get access to credit as hitherto.

There are operations within the tourist sector which have told me that they are finding it tough because they have to take up cash to send and buy things. They have to cut back on somewhere else because, normally, you could write a cheque, get some overdraft facilities and put in your goods or whatever it is you need but now they have to deal in cash and cash is tight.

What I am saying is that regrettably, and I speak as a Barbadian, this year the trend is not going to be good. None of us over here as Barbadians, or on that side, indeed, none of us in this House welcome or relish that situation but we have a duty to say that we have a stubborn Government that has refused to listen to gratuitous advice, well-meant advice from this side from time to time.

Now, I hear talk about a task force, and putting heads together in terms of the economy and sitting down with the Prime Minister. If that could come about I believe the Labour Party would not object 6.00 p.m.

This is different from the drugs thing. On that, poles apart But at the same time we do not feel that it is the function of an Opposition to tell the Government how to run the country. Look all the brains they have over there. Look.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: All the heads at least They know what to do.

Mr. SPEAKER: In light of the many interruptions,....

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:.....I am going to give you 3 minutes.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: - No, Sir - I am very grateful to you, Sir. I have always known and believe you to be a very fair man, Sir, and I have proven it once again. I am obliged to you, Sir.

Let us get back where we began with the debt. I would be grateful if the Prime Minister would confirm the following, Sir:

- (1) That in this year and last year, the Democratic Labour Party, before 1976, contracted a series of debts for which we are even still now paying. A loan of US\$9.7 million with the IADB, 30th April, 1976 signed for by the very Prime

Minister now, then Minister of Health, in respect of the Sewerage Project.

In September last year there was a balance of \$15.5 million on that debt to be paid. I am not dealing with the fact that water rates had to go up.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: US\$9 million I said.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Fifteen million Barbados dollars (BDS\$15m) as at September last year.

- (2) Canadian loan \$2.6 million contracted the 31st August, 1970. The first payment started in 1977. The Barbados Labour Party had to honour that We still owe 2.1 million on that.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Canadian. Do you want it in Barbados? Okay.

CANS3.1 million contracted 31st August, 1975. First payment 30th September, 1982. You all have the debt profile over there. At the moment there is outstanding BDS\$3.4 million on that.

Loan of CANS 1.65 million....

You are talking about massive - Let me just say, Sir, there are 1,2,3,4 more.

January 31, 1973 CAN\$1.65. CAN\$ 10 million 30th September, 1973. We began repaying that on the 30th September, 1980 and there is an amount of BDS\$10 million still to be repayed.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Because it comes in Canadian. You showed me the profile is Canadian.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Am, I a banker?

Mr. SPEAKER: I would wish the Honourable Member to use these last few moments

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: They are interrupting me, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: You would not get any more time for sure.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: In addition to these loans, Sir, and there are two more contracted in 1973 and 1975, this year this Government must repay a loan to Trinidad of TT\$40 million contracted in 1970 when Barrow was the Minister of Finance, the 30th October, 1970.

There is also a loan of US\$40 million contracted by this Government on the 15th September, 1986 due for repayment beginning 30th September this year. Now within.... Alright, Sir, I have got the signal.

Much obliged.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George North.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sir, I did not have any intentions of getting involved in this debate because I am a neophyte when it comes to these matters, economic matters. I do not normally get involved in these matters. But there are one or two things that were said in here this afternoon that have caused me some concern and which I believe that I needed to speak about.

We heard the Member for St. Philip South in his speech starting off by repeating and contradicting the Member for Christ Church East Central. He rambled his way through the Central Bank Report without making any point. And then we heard him revoking his contractual arrangement with the Leader of the Opposition.

When the Governor of the Central Bank spoke recently, one of the things he said was that people in Barbados who were thinking about building homes should put some restraint on that. I would have thought that some part of the speech, as delivered by the Member for St. Philip South would have addressed this remark. Because obviously there seems to be some divergence of opinion between what the Governor of the Central Bank said recently to the Life Underwriters Association of Barbados and what the Government's thinking is on the very matters on which he spoke.

But rather than do that, he chose to - like the proverbial bull in the China shop - rush his way through as he is accustomed doing, without any particular structure to his speech, without any direction in which he was going. At one time, in an aside, he admitted that he was not making any point

Mr. SPEAKER: I must now caution the Honourable Member because no Member is allowed to speak in that fashion, according to the Rules of the House, and then it would be a reflection on the Chair to allow a person to speak irrelevant to the subject.

I think you had better tone your remarks a bit

Mr. R. P. BYER: As I was saying, Sir, I would have thought that the Member for St. Philip South being the Minister of Housing and Lands would have devoted some time to allaying whatever fears might have been caused by the Governor of the Central Bank's speech in relation to housing, that he would have allayed the fears of the Barbadians in that regard. But rather than that, he chose - another route which I do not think was a very commendable one. He should have devoted some time to that. But I would deal with certain aspects of his speech as I go on.

When the Member for Christ Church East Central spoke, he referred to a lack of patriotism of Members on this side of the House, that they were very unbalanced in their criticism against the Government and generally, that the course that the Opposition was taking was not a commendable one since that course is causing people not to have any confidence in the Barbadian economy. Not his words. But I think it is a fair interpretation of what I thought he was saying.

The Member for Christ Church West took him up on the point of the whole idea of the lack of patriotism. I did not intervene on a point of order because I knew there and then that I would have had some opportunity when I spoke to say something about it.

It brings into focus the role of the Opposition in Parliament. Someone once said that the ultimate role of the Opposition was to oppose everything, propose nothing and bring down the Government. That was the traditional role. It is not the role that I believe an Opposition Party should play. 6.10p.m.

But certainly one of the roles of the Opposition is that it got to criticize Government where it thinks that criticism is -* justified. These are naturally subjective matters that we are dealing with. No objective set of criteria can be brought to tell me when I should criticize the Government. If I feel that the Government wants criticizing, I will criticize. If the person who is responsible for the Ministry that I am criticizing feels that my criticism is unfair or unjustified, well get up and attack me on that. But do not tell me that I do not have a right to criticize. I have a right to criticize and I will exercise that right. Now if that offends certain people? and if they want to accuse me of lacking in patriotism, Sir, "that is a matter for them. That is no concern of mine.

The Member for Christ Church East Central said that we on the Opposition were lacking in patriotism in the manner in which we address our criticism to Government. I speak with some feeling on this matter, Sir, because I do not think it is a fair position to take. He started off by saying that this was one of the most balanced times that T[^] has ever heard the Leader of the Opposition approach these -v

matters and then he ventured off into saying that the Members on this side were lacking in patriotism. I think that was a bit unfair and, if I may say so, uncalled for.

Now the Member for St. Philip South also picked up on this theme of lacking in patriotism and proceeded to make another point that the criticisms aimed at the Government were criticisms with a particular purpose in mind. One of the words he used was "ambition" and that people had ambition. The criticisms were aimed in a particular direction because of the ambition of certain people.

Now all of that again, Sir, I dismiss that as just pure talk without any meaning and certainly I am one and I know the other Members on this side are people who are very responsible in the way they approach these matters. The Government has got to recognize that we will criticize and not be thin-skinned about it. There is nothing wrong with criticism. If we believe that the economy of this country is heading in a particular direction and there are certain danger signals and we go out of our way to point out those danger signals and alert the public to them and we find ourselves in a particular situation, well do not accuse us of being lacking in patriotism and being ambitious. There is nothing wrong with ambition as far as I know. All of us should have some ambition. I will say without fear of contradiction, Sir, that the Government itself has done more than anyone to create whatever climate or lack of confidence that there is in the economy of Barbados. The way in which they have proceeded with matters I am certain has led a lot of people along this way of thinking. It is not right for them now to come and say that I am lacking in patriotism because I decide to take certain points and be critical about them in certain regards. If we are not like that as an Opposition, then we will not be fulfilling one of our functions. One of the functions of the Opposition is to criticize but not on everything. We have to propose things. We have to make suggestions and so on.

I believe as an Opposition we have been discharging our responsibility in that regard. I am not one who is going to come in here every week and do not say anything. I have got to get up and talk. I will as far as possible be fair in my criticisms and I will hope that Members on this side as well be fair in theirs. I am not going to make wild and groundless accusations of people. I am not going to do that. That is not my brand of politics. That is not my style of politics. I would hope that people approach these matters in this way.

I am not going to get involved in the whole debate as to whether unemployment is 22% or what. I know that there is high unemployment in Barbados and I would wish that this is not put on the back burner. I would like some reassurance from the Prime Minister that unemployment, will not be put on the back burner. Now it would appear to me, Sir, judging from the Development Plan 1988-1993,

that there was a statement that unemployment at the end of that period would be somewhere in the region of 80 per cent. Now when you look at that coupled with what the Governor of the Central Bank said, one wonders whether in truth and in fact unemployment is not already on Government's back burner or was not on Government's back burner from 1988.

These are things that concern me. Until now the Minister of Employment has not said any word about that. All he is busy doing is running up and down with his pinkish shears from here to there looking after gardens and not being concerned with a major part of his Ministry which has to do with employment. Why does he not make a statement about that? That is something the Governor of the Central Bank has said now for almost a week or four or five days maybe. Nothing has come, no word or assurance, from the Minister of Employment. I would have thought by now something would have been said about that.

Now we hear about studies and studies. I believe the Minister is studying the statement and in due course we will have some comment about it. Similarly, the Minister of Housing will tell us something in response, Sir, to what the Governor said. Now these are things that I am concerned about. I walk around Barbados and I see a lot of people out there who need attention in terms of getting jobs and housing for themselves and things like that.

Now these are things that I am concerned about. I could not care less and do not misunderstand me. I know there is a lot of people unemployed. I am not concerned with the statistics. I want to know that those people who are unemployed are given the assurance that jobs will be coming and unemployment will not be placed somewhere on the last burner of the stove. That is what I want to hear.

Sir, he said things about agriculture. Agriculture has been in the spotlight for sometime now. All we can hear up to this moment is that studies are being done in terms of trying to get the agricultural situation turned around. Before I leave this evening, I want to hear some reassurance in these areas. These are the things that I want to hear about, Sir.

Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think that I would wish to make the point that criticism is not something that one should be afraid of and I do not believe that an Opposition grouping needs necessarily to see itself as being the only source that criticizes. I believe that criticism can come from Opposition forces. I believe that criticism can come from one's own side. The problem very often has to do with exactly what criticism is intended to do and how to set about making critical comments.

I wish to make a few critical comments even though I wish to support the Resolution. I am concerned first of all by the comments raised by the Honourable Member for St.

Thomas not by what he has said but by the reference picked up a moment ago by the Member for St. George South. Both of them are making reference to comments which were made by the Governor of the Central Bank and purporting to echo comments made by other persons sometimes previously.

My concern regarding this matter has to do with the suggestion that labour has to go onto the back burner and that there needs to be a situation of foreign reserves being in competition with or being diametrically opposed to employment opportunities or to the provision of jobs for persons. 6.20p.m.

Though I may understand what the persons who make such comments intend, while I may understand that they are saying that there is the need to focus on having certain initiatives at this time, I take issue with any approach that anyone will have where one is suggesting that because we need to concern ourselves with bolstering our foreign reserves position that it follows, ipso facto, that employment must suffer as a result. Anybody who takes that position in a country like Barbados, or anywhere else for that matter, is a person for whom I will have very grave concern when I examine their own *bona fides* and their own position. What are we concerned about when we look for balance of payment reserves if not to help people? If not for the balance. and the concern and the development of people? When therefore we begin to say that people without jobs must take a secondary position, it suggests to me a sort of indifference that people in Barbados cannot accept from our leadership. Wherever it comes from and whoever it comes from, Sir, I reject it as completely against the best interests of the people of this country.

I have no quarrel about any concerns there might be that would suggest that when we examine the resources at our disposal we are going to have certain difficulties and that employment opportunities might not be as easy as they were before, or as easy as they were at any stated time. I have no difficulty in understanding that as a statement, but I have a difficulty with anyone who makes the harsh presentation that we should take our opportunities for finding employment, and to tell the people in Barbados who are looking for jobs that we have no concern with their efforts to find jobs because we have concerns with other things.

The matters before us, Sir, are not diametrically opposed. The matters before us happen not to be on the one hand one experience versus another experience, and we have to be able to make this point whoever considers it to be a criticism. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if one examines the position of endeavouring to have several of our manufacturing and several of our engines of economic growth going, that we have to concern ourselves with making these engines propel us forward because of the

connections they will have with export, so export orientation is fine and acceptable and I believe that we all have to aim for it. But if we were to believe that when we manufacture that our manufacture will only be for the export market and that we do not have to concern ourselves with a domestic market, then we have a grave way of misguiding ourselves.

If we begin to believe that we can reduce our employment levels and then we can proceed to manufacture, then the question is, who are going to be the people, if employment is not sustained, that are going to be the consumers? We can find ourselves pooling our economic theories, and all the economic theorists will have to tell us how we are going to be able to get into a situation where with decreasing numbers of consumers we are going to be able to propel ourselves forward.

Even if that were not so, Sir, and I should go on to.

„
make the point that because we are seeking to increase employment we are going to lead a larger number of consumers, therefore a larger number of people would be using the resources that are being produced, and the end result hopefully, if managed properly, is that we are doing the best for all of the people of the country. That is the point I want to make.

Those persons who may not concern themselves too much with the unemployed have to recognise that most of us come from working class backgrounds and but for the grace of God most of us might have been unemployed today. Perhaps we have had the benefit of a little better education and some of us perhaps have gone forward and studied at high levels, at universities, and therefore we may have secure jobs, but because of the security of our jobs let us not knock those from among us who do not have the opportunity to find jobs and for whom the finding of a job is a matter of very great concern, because it not only concerns their buying food for their children and for themselves, it has to do as well with their own sense of dignity. A person without a job is a person without dignity, is a person whose own very soul is destroyed, and I do not believe that a nation whose people's souls are destroyed is a nation that can look forward to progressing.

In terms of this matter of loans and borrowing, Sir, I believe that the Honourable Member for St. Peter put it very well when he said this is not the first time that borrowing has come about, this is not the first time that Governments have sought to borrow with part of their project being to borrow to repay previous loans. I think it would be silly of me to believe that the opportunity would have passed today when Opposition Members support the Resolution for them to use the occasion, in what certain people believe is an election year, ...

Aside.

Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN: I say certain people believe to be an election year. Those of us who have been ready from 1986 and who are continuing to keep in touch with their constituents need not bother about when the time will be, the important thing is that the opportunity, we realise, will be taken on these occasions for persons to make as much capital as possible. But I get the distinct impression, Mr. Speaker, that with all of the figures being thrown around one is bound to ask oneself which are the true figures. We therefore have to be able to accept that if we take a situation which after all has to have right somewhere and we endeavour by certain beliefs and certain submissions which have been made, and some of those submissions of beliefs came, for example, from the Honourable Member for St. Thomas, what we may serve to do is to mislead the very public we are trying to educate and whose support we are trying to gain.

I am of the view, Sir, that it is absolutely necessary, especially when we are talking matters of this sort, that we try wherever possible to use the materials that are at our disposal and to endeavour to present that material in such manner that whatever the colour of our political conviction the public is not misguided by any misrepresentations we might make, certainly without any deliberateness on our part.

The comments made by my colleague, the Member for Christ Church East Central, are comments with which I would wish to identify, because they are comments which endeavour to suggest that when we are examining the matter of the current bullet which we have to bite, that we endeavour to examine that not only within our narrow confines as a nation 21 miles long and just a smile wide, but rather that we endeavour to understand that Barbados does not stand alone preserved by God into some special area where we are protected from all of the evils and all of the severities that have been befalling other people and other countries. We need to recognise that even if we ourselves are not enmeshed in some of the difficulties which some of our neighbours may have, because we may not be enmeshed with those difficulties it does not follow that there may not be a fall out that will cause us some degree of problems. 6.30 p.m.

I am taking neighbour in the very widest sense, Mr. Speaker. I am saying for example that we are recognising that there are certain problems facing our neighbours in the wider world, and some of them are ideological problems that are befalling them and revolutions of an ideological sort, Eastern Europe, for example. We are not into that ideological mix and flux at this stage, but that is not to say that as a direct consequence of that we are not going to find " that in the United States of America or that in Great Britain "" or that in Western Europe the money markets turning away --from us, the aid donors turning away from us, and channelling their resources and any kind of aid or trade for

that matter away from the Caribbean and away from Barbados because they believe, some of them do, that by endeavouring to put aid towards Eastern Europe they might be seeing themselves as the great Messiahs, changing the ideological complexion of Eastern Europe and bringing it to what they call democracy or democracy as they would prefer it.

And so, Sir, what we have got to face is a situation where we have got to be on a very speedy learning curve, preparing ourselves as a nation and preparing ourselves as a region for what may very well be very difficult days that are ahead. Now in looking towards that it seems to me, Sir, that there will have to be much more of an integrated approach to many of the problems which face political parties, countries and political complexions in the region, and although there will be the need of course for the thrust and parry of political party politics, there will have to be much more of an understanding of the complexity of the problems which will be facing the Caribbean, and which will be facing Barbados if indeed we are going as country and as a people to maintain our position in face of the external forces that are pressing upon us and that are likely to overcome us if we are not extraordinarily careful.

Asides.

Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN: I was not, Sir, adverting to my own position as the Leader of the Regional Trade Union Movement, but if the Honourable Member for Christ Church West is kind enough to suggest that those comments are coming in that vein, I thank him very much for the comment. One may argue that in that context a task force is necessary. I myself have a difficulty in understanding what exactly would a task force be and what it would seek to achieve, because when one takes an integrated approach, one does not necessarily have to set up another task force, and one has to be careful of those snatches and those expressions because although they may attract political attention and attention in the journals, they don't necessarily address the concerns that we may have. And so I would suggest to anyone, Mr. Speaker, that what we may need is on-going discussion, and we may need to have a position that constantly subordinates our own aspirations to the broader goals and wishes of the country and of the region as a whole. But whether that has to do with the task of any force that the Leader of the Opposition may have, is not within my purview because as I said before, Sir, I don't just like picking out things to refer to them because forces and tasks are not necessarily our concerns here. Force cannot achieve the objective that we have; dialogue can, and I am of the view, Sir, that we have got to be able when we come to grips with the problems that face us to understand that narrow partisanship will not be the answer, but a broader perspective of what lies before Barbados as a nation and what lies before the Caribbean as a region must be what concerns our efforts, our energies, our visions and our dreams. I am obliged to you, Sir.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this measure before this House. As has been pointed out, it is not the first time that a measure of this nature has come before Parliament, and I dare say it will not be the last time, so that the speeches which we have heard before on this matter we will hear again. The fact of the matter, Sir, is that as the Prime Minister has pointed out in introducing this Resolution, this country certainly and I think it is well recognised, has some difficulties which we have to devise ways and means of dealing with. Barbados is not the only country with difficulties. The United States of America has problems, Great Britain has problems, and any country in the world that you can think about or most of them experience problems.

One of the problems which I think we in Barbados have is that we have been led to believe that God is so good to this country that we cannot have any problems, that the problems which we face could disappear by the wave of a wand, particularly if that instrument is being waved or wielded by the Leader of the Opposition. The fact of the matter is, Sir, that some difficult decisions have to be taken from time to time and one of the attributes of the present Prime Minister is that he is prepared to take decisions, a characteristic which cannot be identified with the present Leader of the Opposition. He runs away from making hard decisions.

Now I want, Sir, to join the debate and to reply to some statements which were made particularly by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas and also the Honourable Member for St. Peter. But let me deal with the Honourable Member for St. Thomas first. In part of his closing remarks he made reference to the downward trend which was taking place in a number of areas in Barbados, and he said, and I quote "there was a downward trend and that the Democratic Labour Party was demonstrating an inability to turn that trend around." Of course he read from reports of the Central Bank. We have heard all sorts of reports and articles being referred to to substantiate the points which Honourable Members were making. Now I too would want to read from the Central Bank Report, the Economic Review, Vol. 16 No. 3 of December, 1989, at page 3, which relates to manufacturing. It is against the background of the Honourable Member for St. Thomas making the point about the downward trend which he said was evident in this society and the inability of the Government to turn that downward trend around. The report states relating to manufacturing -

"For the second consecutive year the manufacturing sector recorded encouraging growth. The increase in activity, 5.3 per cent which is about the same as last year for the corresponding period, enabled production in the sector to reach its highest level since 1981. The wooden furniture sub-sector which grew by 29.5 per cent last year performed strongly again growing by almost 40 per cent. The building materials industry

benefited directly from the building boom with cement production increasing by 17.4 per cent to meet a 15.8 per cent rise in local consumption. Following two years of decline, the electronics sub-sector increased production by 20.9 per cent from its relatively small base."

Now the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central when he made what I considered to be a very intelligent intervention, as he always does, indicated very clearly as has been done before that there are a number of areas, particularly the areas where exports in this country have been hurt, and that is in the electronics sub-sector. 6.40 p.m.

He showed that with the pulling out of INTEL the very traumatic impact which this had in terms of this country gaining foreign exchange and, also, in terms of employment. But INTEL was not the only company which pulled out that hurt us from the point of view of earning foreign exchange because we also have to remember that PLAYTEX and one or two other companies which were operating here for some time and which were making a very important contribution towards both our employment activity and, also, the generation of foreign exchange did have the harmful effect on the country and, generally speaking, on the economy. It had really nothing to do with Barbados as such.

The fact of the matter is that those sub-sectors were going through almost a revolution and the changes which were taking place in those areas had consequential effects on Barbados. I would not want to repeat the figures in the detail in which the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central did them.

The fact of the matter is that when one looks at our domestic exports globally, from 1984 one was seeing, certainly, from the figures that I have, and I think he indicated that and went even further back where they were showing a decline.

There was a decline in 1985 on the 1984 figure. In 1984 our domestic exports were about \$98 683 675. In 1985 they were \$70.5 million. I would not go into the exact figures. In 1986 we suffered another decline and that declined down to \$57.6 million. In 1987 it declined to \$53.4 million.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I am sorry. It is CARICOM. Could I just retrace my steps?

Barbados' total trade exports - In 1985 there was a decline from \$583.6 million to \$496. That is, it was \$583.6

million in 1984. In 1985 it was \$496.4 million. In 1986 it declined \$420.6 million. In 1987 and this is where the real INTEL drop came, it declined to \$214.5 million.

I think it is very clear that that had a traumatic impact on our foreign exchange earnings but one is beginning to see and, certainly, the trend is suggesting an improvement because in 1988 our export earnings moved from \$214.5 million to \$248 million which was a 12.4% increase on the 1987 figure.

Admittedly, it is nothing to boast about in terms of the accumulative effect but the fact is that it is showing a turn around and one would hope that this trend will continue. The Government is doing everything possible to ensure that this trend continues.

In 1989 the figures which we have for January to September indicates that our total exports were \$197 million and we project that that figure for the year 1989 could possibly reach \$269 million. We are seeing some improvements and I think this would substantiate the position which was taken by the Central Bank in the Report which I just referred to. That, of course, would give the lie to the statement by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas about the downward trend which has been taking place and nothing has been done to reverse that particular situation.

Now, let me also refer to a comment made by the Honourable Member for St. Peter who stated that the Democratic Labour Party's thrust in exports was only to regain the Trinidad market or that our only concern was in the Trinidad market.

Let me say, Sir, that not only have we been concentrating on the CARICOM market as a whole, but we have been making efforts in the extra-regional areas to ensure that our exports are improved in that area. The figures for CARICOM would again show...

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I will indicate to you but let me just deal with the figures first because I think it is important that we do this.

The figures would indicate that there has been also a turn around in that particular area because exports to CARICOM were falling again from 1985. In 1984 our exports to CARICOM were \$98.6 million. In 1985 they dropped to \$70.5 million. In 1986 there was a drop to \$57.6 million. In 1987 it was at \$53.4 million. In 1988 it rose to \$71.3 million and the January to September 1989 period it is at \$70.3 million with a projection that it should rise for the whole of 1989 in the vicinity of about \$90 million.

In most of the countries in the CARICOM region with whom we trade, we have shown some improvement

whether it is in Belize where there is indication of growth or in Montserrat where there is also an indication of growth. In St. Vincent there is an indication of growth. In St. Kitts there is an indication of growth. In St. Lucia it is anticipated that the growth will not be as much as before. In Grenada there is indication of growth. In Dominica that has not grown as we would have liked. In Antigua that also...

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir.

Will the Minister confirm from those statistics - I missed one that he gave - that in 1988 the exports to CARICOM were \$94.7 million, substantially down from 1983 when it was \$139 million. In 1984 it was \$175 million. In 1985 it was \$164 million and in 1986 it was \$96 million.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I am dealing with domestic exports. You are dealing with total exports. I think domestic exports would be the one we would be interested in.

I was making the point that in Guyana there is also growth there. In Jamaica there is also an improvement and in Trinidad and Tobago there is an improvement so the fact is that on the level of CARICOM the figures speak for themselves. There is an improvement and this is part of the overall strategy where we have tried to revive trade within the CARICOM region. 6.50p.m.

It is a fact that it is estimated that in 1989 that intra CARICOM trade is estimated to grow by about 20%. This is a far way from 1984-85 where there was very, very little growth in intra CARICOM trade. The fact of the matter is that we have to understand very clearly that, in the globalization of trade which obviously is taking place, we in the CARICOM region must recognize that we also have to integrate in terms of our trying to develop our markets as a group and, at the same time, to access markets in other parts of the world in a number of ways, particularly from the point of view of CARICOM.

Trading of individual countries is going to be extremely difficult. We have therefore to make the point that in the international trading community, the Caribbean has a number of arrangements to which the Honourable Member for St. Peter, I believe, referred. We have the LOME Convention, we have the CBI and we have CARIBCAN, if I could mention the 3 major ones which people normally refer to and for which there has been a lot of hope held out. I think that it is generally accepted that the CBI has been a failure. Efforts have been made to try to have it revised, to try to get terms which are easier for us in the Caribbean to access the US market but these efforts have been frustrated in a number of ways. We obviously have to continue to ensure that we get greater access to the United States market.

CARIBCAN also has had a lot of problems. It was an arrangement which more or less was introduced without consultation with the Governments of the Caribbean. Efforts are being made to ensure that that is revised which would be of benefit to us. We have just concluded the LOME 4 Convention which again hopefully will have provisions in it that will make access a little easier. Some of the problems for example which were experienced with the previous LOME Conventions had to do:

- (1) With let us say the value-added criteria where it was argued that the high value-added which was required in order to access the European markets was a deterrent in terms of our manufacturers trying to get in there. Under the LOME 3 Convention the value-added criteria that was required was 60%. We have been able to have it negotiated down to 45%. That is an improvement. It is not what the ACP countries would have liked because the proposal which we were pressing hard for was a 35%. The fact of the matter is that 45% is a considerable improvement on the 60% which was previously there.

We have also tried to reduce the bureaucratic maize which existed in the European bureaucracy when manufacturers are trying to get information and get into the markets. We think that what we have been able to put in place will reduce that bureaucratic base considerably. Rum, of course, which is one of our very important exports which has shown tremendous growth since 1985 - because in 1985 our earnings from rum were in the region of about \$3 million. We anticipate that in 1989 Barbados will earn about \$12 million in Barbados dollars approximately from the entire exports of rum.

Asides.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: The Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central....

Mr. SPEAKER: I have allowed all Honourable Members to make their contribution with few interruptions. I would wish that Members would be fair to others and keep the interruptions at a very low level.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: As I was saying, Sir, the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central indicated that we have to diversify in our investments promotion, in terms of trying to ensure that we get as wide or we canvass as wide an area as possible. He identified data services as one of those areas. I think this is an area on which the Government is placing a lot of emphasis and indeed it should be noted that in the new LOME 4

Convention, for the first time, there is a section which is particularly dedicated to the promotion of trade and services.

There are going to be opportunities existing under that arrangement which hopefully Barbados would be able to take advantage of, and would obviously be well advised to take advantage of. We will be taking advantage of those provisions. We are in step with that particular area. We are working in close collaboration with the Barbados External Telecommunications in trying to develop the facilities that would put Barbados in a position to take greater advantage of what is happening.

But one could not end without referring to the fact that data services is a positive growth area where it is not only creating employment but it is also earning very valuable foreign exchange for Barbados and we will continue to push in that particular vein.

We will be looking, not only at the traditional areas for investment opportunities, but we will be looking farther afield because we believe, as has been pointed out, that we have to diversify, we have to look at whatever we possibly can to attract investment of course which is consistent with our national interest. I think that is going to be very important. We do not necessarily want to stick to the traditional paths that have been beaten and trodden for so many years.

I think that this Resolution is one which ought to gain the support of all of the Members of this Honourable Chamber. One would have to end by saying that any Barbadian who is interested in this country ought to support this Resolution. Certainly the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, as has been pointed out, when he makes the statements that he makes knows exactly what he is doing because he has had to go to the international community to represent Barbados and to raise loans for Barbados. He knows the kinds of questions which are asked. Therefore when he intervenes in the way that he intervenes, when he and his minions get into the newspapers and write what they write, they know what they are doing. It is a clever plan but one which has to be exposed for what it is worth. I

Thank you, Sir.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, we have been here for a very long time and I think it is time for Honourable Members to have some kind of break.

I am going to move, Sir, that this sitting be suspended until 7.45 p.m.

Hon. M. A. KING: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question that the sitting be now suspended until 7.45 p.m. was put and was resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly at 7.00 p.m. 7.00p.m.

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed. The Honourable Member for the City.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, like the Honourable Member for St. George South, I rise really not so much to deal with narrow economic matters. Unlike the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, I try not to deal with things that I am not very conversed with. He knows "Everything and he speaks on everything. He confuses - himself, me, and a lot of other people. I try not to do that.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I rise to make this intervention....

Asides.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: It always seems to pain the Honourable Member for St. John whenever I rise to speak. I am not going to talk about the St. John Development Plan. You can be assured of that. I am not going to talk about the St. John Development Plan in here but elsewhere at another time. Let us rest that for now.

Mr. Speaker, when the Honourable Minister of Finance made his remarks on this Resolution, I found that he filled out his speech with making some remarks about various sectors and I really just wanted to address one or two of those areas. But it would be remiss of me not to deal "With one or two remarks that were made by other - "Honourable Members. I believe that when we are speaking about a matter as serious as what we are debating now. Sir, Honourable Members should not find any comfort in poking fun or trying to use the opportunity to score some political mileage. I almost said something that would have been unparliamentary, Sir. I have to be very careful. I would have thought that no less a person, as I said before, than the Governor of the Central Bank has already said that the matter we are dealing with today is even more serious „than employment or housing. When Honourable Members ""on that side who hold portfolios got up, they could have pulled a leaf from some book of the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central and speak to the whole question in a way that not only would enlighten Honourable Members in here, Sir, but also the public.

As the Honourable Member for St. Philip South tried in tell and then demonstrated otherwise, we should be in Rerc trying to educate people. That Honourable Member did

not get up and address the fact or did not leave us feeling comfortable that his Ministry does not agree that housing should be put on the back burner. Instead Sir, he tried to give the impression as he always does that the Opposition was here making up stories to bamboozle and fool the public. He continued to swipe as he did in his speech recently on the public platform and as he has done really for the last 8 1/2 years. Mr. Speaker, he got so carried away that for the first time in my life I saw somebody who should be in a leadership position aspiring to poverty. He said, in fact, that he was born poor, he is poor, and he will remain poor.

Asides.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Finance said that one of the things we need to do particularly about export manufacturing, and let us deal with that first, was to be more creative. We had to be more creative if we were to take advantage of these export markets and if we were going to assist - "we" being those persons who are involved in the productive sector where exports are involved. Of course, Sir, at the same time one can argue that we do not see the climate whereby that sort of creativity can come out.

As one Honourable Member said, we cannot continue to defer. I think in a lot of regards our grace period has run out. We cannot continue to start off by saying that we are having another study. We cannot continue with these studies because we are now starting to study the studies that I have mentioned before. If you take up a study that was done five or six years ago on export manufacturing and you dusted it off and changed the date, it would apply now as it did then. There are lots of studies. There are several consultants, so called experts, who continue to come to Barbados and give advice in the whole realm of improving export marketing. But Sir, when I saw the Honourable Minister of Trade rise to his feet, I thought that here we were going to be enlightened. Where the Prime Minister did not tell us how we were going to get these additional exports which are going to save Barbados, I thought that when the Minister of Trade rose to speak that I would hear from him how he was going to go about getting this increase in exports. As usual, the Minister of Trade got up and read off a long list of statistics and then the Honourable Member for St. Michael West had to inform him that he was reading the wrong statistics. He then had to read again another set to us. I cannot understand how a Minister of Trade is not even conversive with the trading statistics for the Caribbean.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: The Honourable Member for St. Michael West will agree with me because the Honourable Member knows as a past Minister of Trade that the present Minister of Trade has serious difficulties with

the Ministry. So he must agree with me. This is a very serious matter. I will enjoin the little jokes about certain matters but this matter is too serious to joke about. If I am going to hear fun being made of it from that side, then all it is telling me is that they are not attaching any seriousness to the matter. Maybe the reason they are not attaching any seriousness to the matter is because they do not know how to. We are dealing, Sir, primarily with a case of blatant mismanagement wherever you look.

The Honourable Member got up and he went on and on about CBI, CARIBCAN, LOME 2, LOME 3, LOME 4, and LOME 10. He went on and on with a whole set of talk but at no time did he get to the point. The point was, as stated by the Honourable Prime Minister, that we have to be more creative with our exports. The Honourable Member did not at anytime tell us what mechanisms are being put in place and how they are going to work to bring about this creativity of which the Honourable Member speaks. Somebody said to me the other day that I noticed the Minister of Trade has gone very low profile. I said that he has not gone low profile. He was always low profile. I have never heard the Minister of Trade make any definitive statement on what they are going to do and what is the Government's policy. Again today we are waiting to hear him tell us what is the Government's policy on this export led growth that he keeps on talking about. He always starts off by talking about export led growth and then he does not go ahead and tell us how they are going to do it. 8.00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that when the Honourable Prime Minister spoke of creativity - and I give him credit for understanding exactly what he said - I don't think it is just something he read which somebody wrote, I believe he understands exactly what he is talking about, because we have had talks on linkages before when I was on that side. It might be difficult to talk about linkages with agriculture when my friend tells me that it is dead, but where did we hear from the Minister of Trade about the linkages? Where is this creativity going to come from? Can it not come from those said linkages? One of the ways of exporting without actually physically exporting a product is selling to a tourist for a foreign dollar, you know. Did he tell us about that linkage? Is he clear in his own mind? Is there a policy on export research and development?

Mr. Speaker, time and time again we come in here and ask that same question and the Honourable Minister will take us all over the world scoring some political points here and there, doing like what he is doing now, he is very good in Asides, and then at the end of a speech

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I will get that study now. You take it easy. At the end of his speech you are not clear as to what is Government's policy.

Let me talk about the manufacturing study for a bit, Sir. When I first heard about it I was not too clear on what it was intended to do, but if in fact it showed the Government that there were some companies which had potential but did not have the necessary assistance by way of working capital, or did not have the necessary assistance by way of personnel to do the kind of research that is necessary if you are really going to penetrate a third country ----

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: The Honourable Minister just made a remark *sotto voce* about my company getting a bad report. Mr. Speaker, they sent a man to see me. He spent half an hour, he asked me when the company started, who started it, what we make now and he took a few papers on what our balance sheet was like for the last four or five years. That was it. From that he wrote a report that said how much exporting we do and with whom we deal. He wrote a lot of names I never heard of. I am just telling you this, Sir, to let you see what kind of report you end up with. This is why it is very serious and very dangerous to believe that all these studies are so good. He went on then to claim that he spoke to personnel in the company, who never saw him and do not even know his name.

I never heard- anything more about the study, suddenly about two months ago, after I mentioned it to one of the members on that side, two days after the study appeared on my desk - the owner of the section that deals with my company, not the other nine companies - and the study shows that on the one hand the company has tremendous export potential, but the conclusion was that it should not be given any assistance. The company was in need of assistance, it had the potential, but do not give it any assistance. That is what the report said. Strange enough, one of the other companies mentioned in that report just went into receivership. <<

I will not go any further with that, Sir. The point I am making is that here is a company, like many other small, black manufacturing companies in Barbados, where the Minister of Trade will make fun and these companies for 20 and 25 years have been providing employment.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I do not think that the Honourable Member should say that the Minister of Trade is making fun at companies in Barbados. I merely asked if a report was done on his company, and what did the report say. That is all I said.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: This is what we have become accustomed to. It is like today when I waited in vain for the Honourable Minister of Employment - or Unemployment, I am not too sure what it is - to tell us what is the situation with employment in Barbados. They bandied around all kinds of statistics in here, and every statistic which was

bandied around I could hear him saying *sotto voce* "that is a joke". Every one was a joke, I do not know which was the real one. The point is, as the Honourable Member for St. George South said, whether it is 15%, 20% or 22%, there are a lot of people unemployed and what we wanted to hear was your plan to deal with this high unemployment.

This party said it would provide full employment, and 'that is laughed at by members on that side, but I can understand that, because if you do not understand that full employment can be created in Barbados, then they will either laugh at it out of real ignorance of not understanding • it, Sir, or they will laugh at it in a nervous way as the Honourable Member normally laugh at these things.

Sir, as the Honourable Minister of Finance said, we need to earn more foreign exchange from tourism, another area in which we need growth, if we are going to help the predicament we are in. Again, one wonders what is going on in tourism. The Honourable Minister of Tourism has been extremely silent, thunderously silent, in the face of all kinds of happenings in the area of tourism, happenings that will not help us bring in this foreign exchange and as a result show a decline in figures. But I do not have to repeat what other people have said.

The Honourable Minister of Tourism sits there silently and passes it off by saying "give the fellows a break" or "give them a chance" or something like that, while Heywoods is going into the ground. There has not been a single word on that, not a statement on that Is the Honourable Minister of Labour aware that people are being sent home from Heywoods in the middle of the season? Is that normal? I do not know, I am not a hotelier, but I am told by those who know that that is abnormal. The Honourable Minister of Tourism can check these things out Maybe he is interested.

At Heywoods, beyond just the immediate loss of employment, beyond the fact that you chose the wrong people in the first place to run that hotel, you have a situation where there are other small operators who are suffering as a direct result of the loss of occupancy at that hotel. This should interest the Minister, not only the fact that he is a neighbour, but he should be interested from a point of view of trade. 8.10p.m.

Clearly, Sir, when the figures start to fall, you have a spin off effect, and when you are dealing with a large hotel like that, the spin off effect must be worse. Mr. Speaker, we get people like the Honourable Member for St. John saying that when we come in here we should be so patriotic and so nationalistic that we in the opposition should be suggesting to Government ways of improving the situation and not just v-criticising, and then, Sir, when one tries to attach a note of ^-seriousness that is needed for a situation like we are in now, vyou have all the asides and the snickering and the girlish

giggling and so on. You tend to wonder if Honourable Members sometimes really say what is in their hearts, because if they do then they can't be saying to me in one breath come let us work together and try to solve this situation in the national interest, and then on the other hand trying to belittle any efforts anyone may try to make, making fun of organisations in the private sector in Barbados who are providing employment, albeit small. You make fun of the people that I employ in a plant that I run, but the same people that make fun of that can't provide two jobs for anybody.

Sir, I am sure that you yourselves are very concerned, because only today I heard you talk about the way how Members must conduct themselves in here. You must be very concerned about how we conduct the people's business, never mind how we conduct ourselves in here. Sir, I always hold one position. I get no pleasure in trying to be personal in political activities. I get no pleasure in trying to use this Honourable House as a political platform or public platform, and it is not my intention now or it never will be to get up and make those kinds of speeches. If I have a contribution to make from things that I have observed that could be either a problem to this country or could help, that is the kind of contribution I would make, and I would only use this Honourable Chamber for that purpose. So if the Honourable Minister of Tourism would rather me make twenty speeches like him or one like mine, I prefer my one. I thank you, Sir.

Mr. J. J. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I will be very short. I would just like to make a very brief intervention in this debate on this Resolution. First I should indicate that I rise to give my support to this Resolution. Many Honourable Members have already spoken to this subject, and have no doubt given a variety of different statistics affecting the economy of Barbados. I followed this debate very carefully and there is something that realiy concerned me as I listened to the various speakers as they expounded their different figures. It is my view, Mr. Speaker, that whenever we are debating an issue as important as the economic situation in Barbados, we should sec* to find some foundation and some source for the statistics which we bring before this Chamber. For example, we had an Honourable Member who stated as a fa>-t that the unemployment situation in Barbados today is at the level of some 22 per cent, and he was able to make that svtement immediately after saying that the Government >.i,s not produced any figures since some time in 1988. There Must be some source from which Honourable Members ',£»•. obtain their information. He went on to say, Mr. Speaker, that he had information from the Central Bank. He did not produce that information, but this is information which has not yet been officially made public, and this raises some very serious questions. He is either suggesting on the one hand that public officers in the Central Bank has leaked information to him which would be a breach of the law, or he is suggesting that the Opposition have access to

information which is not available to Members of the Government, which again would be a very strange thing. With that he went on to make a submission that he can tell what a particular Member is thinking on a particular issue.

The point that I am trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that if a Member is going to advance a point of view which is an opinion, he should say so rather than try to give the impression that he is expressing this as a fact, because we have to recognise that the press carries much of the information which is debated in this Chamber, and we cannot blame the press for publishing information if we as Members of this Chamber are not careful about the things which we say and the information which we give as we make our contributions to these various points. What is very important, Mr. Speaker, is that economics is one of the most important subjects that come before this Chamber for debate. It is based on the debates of this Chamber and the economy of this country that investment opportunities for this Island are measured. People have confidence in the economy of this country based on what people say regarding the economy of the country. Foreign lending institutions to some extent make up their minds based on much of the information which they gather concerning debates in this Chamber, and if Members of this Parliament are not conscious of the fact that the things they say in this Chamber can have an adverse effect on the international scene when it comes to debating these kinds of matters, I think it is a matter on which we have to be very careful. So it does not surprise me, Mr. Speaker, that one Member would accuse another of being unpatriotic, and it is for that reason that I am suggesting that all Honourable Members should be very careful how they put out these figures and be particularly sure that they are not speculative in the information which they give to this Chamber. They should give information which is based on fact and from proper sources. The debate should be to inform and not to mislead, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should hold that as one of the hallmarks of the debate.

Perhaps this debate has also brought to focus the need > for Government to supply more readily statistical information concerning its affairs. I think that that is one of the points which perhaps one could draw from this debate, but I must go on to say that this Democratic Labour Party Government has a good record of supplying information as soon as it becomes available, and I have no doubt that we will maintain that record.

Mr. Speaker, the Rt. Honourable Prime Minister in introducing the Resolution gave quite a bit of background information on the economy and on this issue, and I believe that if the Opposition was making out a case that they do not agree with the information which is supplied from this side, I feel they would be right to make that point and they would have a point in doing so, but I do not think it would be in their place to go further and manufacture information or cooked figures in order to extend the debate. I want to

make that point very forcefully, Mr. Speaker. I believe that all Honourable Members of this Chamber and indeed all Barbadians will have to speak to the point that unemployment is one of the issues which faces this Government and indeed which faces Governments around the world. 8.20 p.m.

We in Barbados have had to deal with this problem for a number of years, and I believe that if we check the record of the Democratic Labour Party and we can compare the figures from 1980 and even beyond that to the present time, we would see that the record of the Democratic Labour Party Government in dealing with this problem of unemployment, is one which no-one can criticize with justification.

This Government, in my view, has made every effort to prevent the rise in unemployment which has been escalating in this country since 1980. We have been able to put a curb on that particular problem and I believe that with time we will be able to deal with that problem.

What we have to recognize is that in an economy such as ours there are a variety of competing interests with which the Government has to pay considerable attention. It is my view, Mr. Speaker, that the position which we are taking in dealing with these issues is the correct one.

With these very brief points, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to give my support to this Resolution and I would like to urge Members on the other side that they must give credit where credit is due.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, on August 2, 1989, the Honourable Member for St. Peter who shadows the Ministry of Finance on behalf of the Barbados Labour Party opposition, issued a statement on behalf of the Party to the Press in which he dealt with the deteriorating position in the country's foreign reserves. He was leaving the country then for the United States of America. That statement was published on August 2, 1989.

This House met on the Tuesday, and I believe the Thursday as well in August and both the Honourable Member for St. Thomas and myself spoke on the question of our foreign reserves.

I spoke in measured tones on that occasion, as I am wont to do, the areas in which I formed the view that Barbados' position can be affected adversely if we talk about some matters in terms which can be misunderstood by persons overseas. At that time I said to the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance that the foreign reserves '"" were falling and I warned that Barbados was likely to face ^ balance of payments problem.

The Honourable Member for St. Thomas and myself gave then some provisional figures based on published statistics as far as they were available, and our own forecast, based on information which is readily available, contrary to what the Honourable Member for St. James North may say, in commercial circles. Anyone who follows business trends in this country can easily forecast the development in a macro economic sense in Barbados and "" we did no more than that.

What surprised me then, Sir, was that the Prime Minister expressed his own surprise that there was any balance of payments problems either then facing the country or likely to face the country and merely responded by saying that he was aware of some problem but it would be attended to.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition returned
 *~from overseas where he was and he then entered the fray
 s- and also spoke about the worsening balance of payments and foreign reserves situation that was confronting Barbados. Denial after denial followed and it is symptomatic of the Democratic Labour Party's misunderstanding of the true role of an Opposition that the allegations then made both against the Official Opposition and against the Barbados Labour Party Opposition were that we were prophets of doom, we were trying to
 ;_ destabilize the country, we were telling half-truths and a
 -^ tissue of lies and, worst of all, that we had no patriotism.

Now, I say there is one significant thing about the Democratic Labour Party that they never seem to believe that persons other than themselves have genuine views about affairs in this country which differ from theirs on the basis of principle and it has taken the Government some seven to eight months before it has come to the realisation, rather reluctantly, that the foreign reserves of this country are in crisis and that that crisis has spilled over to the main economy and unless it is corrected, could move into a ^ serious structural economic problem for Barbados.

Several spokesmen, not merely opposition spokesmen, but independent economists, spokesmen in the commercial and business sector, the private sector, lecturers at the University of the West Indies, even employees of the Government who hold responsible, and I believe, should be objective positions, have now confirmed that the
 •• Opposition in this country were speaking the truth and
 ~ spoke properly when it analysed the serious trends in the economy of Barbados.

The Government must not be allowed to get out of this debate by merely appealing to us to take what they say is t^the high ground and put our heads together in a non-partisan sense and come forward with constructive proposals. They must not be allowed to get away with this.

The Government must first be humble enough to recognize and to say to the Opposition, we are sorry for misrepresenting the stand which you all took on these issues. They must first be able to say this before they expect the Opposition to come in here and allow the Government to just walk out and say we can borrow any day. It is any normal borrowing situation. There is no doubt that there is a serious deterioration in the state of our economic affairs. 8.30 p.m.

I would be failing in my duty if I did not say to the Government that the prospects for 1990 are very bleak for Barbados and it calls for very positive action if we are rapidly to retrieve a deteriorating situation.

Tourism has been the main plank of the economy for the last 3 years. Were it not for the growth in tourism that occurred - but particularly the last 3 years - the skewed growth of which the Prime Minister spoke in his opening statement would not have occurred.

You can really talk about a growth in construction, if you like, in the distributive sector and say it shows some growth, but unless that particular growth is backed by foreign reserves it means not one thing to the economy of Barbados in the long run. Tourism has been the only productive sector that has shown any significant impact on this economy.

That is why last week when I spoke in here, Sir, again in my measured tones, I was very surprised at the immediate reaction of the Minister who followed me. I went home and thought again about his reaction and I came to the conclusion that the Government is not on the ball, even in this sector because I do not know how the Government goes about getting its information but any responsible Opposition would want to monitor even at the level of hotel to hotel, tour operator to tour operator what is happening at least on a monthly basis even if not at a weekly basis in the tourist sector. I could have brought into the House - not in any way seeking behind Government to get information, we have a duty in the public domain to seek out that information if our criticisms and if our statements are going to be responsible - for the benefit of Members last week my notes on conversations with all of the major hoteliers in this country when I spoke to them about what were the trends and what was being forecast for the tourist sector. I could have done that for the benefit of the Minister, Sir.

But what was symptomatic of Heywoods is that the trend was bad in the whole industry this winter, other than the 3 of the elegant hotels which were showing reasonably well and have forecast reasonably well up to March. What was significant with Heywoods is that Heywoods was the worst of all of them. That is why I spoke about it. I was not sending any trend to frighten anyone, nor going - as the Government likes to say - behind people's back to get

information. Because, Sir, it is a strange thing, this is the first time for a long time in the history of the tourist sector that, in the height of the winter season, people are being laid off. This has never even happened in the days of recession.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I do not believe that the Honourable Member whose voice *sotto voce* understands what is a winter or a summer. But in the middle of the winter season and particularly the months of January, February and March are the significant months. One would not expect to see what is occurring in the tourist sector, not only at Heywoods but particularly at Heywoods, the lay-offs which are occurring.

In a way, it is affecting - the Honourable Member for St. Michael North wants to know where else other than Heywoods. He should know that people are short time at other hotels in this country. I would suggest that he phones around and finds out what is happening.

The projections that I am getting - I do not know where they get their information from - are not very good for the balance of the winter season. I am more concerned as well that one of the reasons for this is the lack of co-ordination between civil aviation policy and tourism policy. If you again take a sample, take the opportunity to phone the airlines, Eastern is out by the end of this month. American Airlines have reduced its carriage into Barbados. BWIA is having very serious problems, the Minister should know this. Only a few days ago he met with his counterpart, the former Minister of Trade and Industry in Trinidad and Tobago. I could have told him when he was meeting.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: This is coming right through Puerto Rico. The Honourable Member must know that. I am telling the Honourable Member that it is impacting on his trade. That is the point I am making. It is only a year now. The Honourable Member should be surprised that it is a year now that American Airlines has been doing that and the representations from the Government have not been strong enough. That is the point I am making, if the Honourable Member wants to know.

What we are finding is that the Government either does not have the clout or is not putting the clout in its civil aviation policy in order to get the airline seats available. When that is coupled with the lack of adequate promotion, one is not surprised that the tourist trade is in such a serious position.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: It is interesting in the Prime Minister's analysis....

Mr. SPEAKER: I think it is very discourteous to interrupt a Member when he is speaking.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Whenever you see the Prime Minister speaking in a halting fashion in this House with great care, it is because there is something that he does not yet want to say. I have known him for years, Sir, from schooldays. I follow him very carefully. He is not a person who lets go everything. He keeps something up his sleeve. It is the unsaid things that concern me.

But one of the things is that for the first time, perhaps, having given the stamp of approval to his first Minister - [just as you have a First Lord of the Treasury \Pnm&~ Minister of the United Kingdom] - he has a first Minister of Agriculture and a second Minister of Agriculture, having given....

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Unfortunately the first Leader of the Opposition tells me that he was the first choice to take over the Government until Mr. Cameron Tudor displaced him and put the second person in the first place.

Laughter.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member must not cross swords with me at this time.

I want to say, Sir, that in agriculture once again, it really pains me because I came into this House in the last Budget and I spent a substantial part of my time speaking about the problems in agriculture. I dealt with agriculture because I considered it - in the limited time available to me, the half an hour that I had - to be a productive sector that was in serious crisis. This was followed by the Honourable Member for Christ Church East bringing a resolution of no-confidence afterwards. That was a warning to the Government.

It gave offence to the Democratic Labour Party, even at a personal level, as though I had some personal attack to make on people. I was dealing with the aspect of public affairs that was too fundamental to the economic survival of Barbados and unemployment in this country. I dealt with it on that level.

The Prime Minister now admits sugar has not done well but so has non-sugar agriculture as well. The impact has been on the foreign reserves of this country in two ways, Sir, a fall in the foreign exchange earnings when the currency of the account, the ECU, was high and we really

ought to have done quite well, if we had produced more for the price of sugar on the European market

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: In addition - not that we have sugar on the world market - the price of sugar, if you look at the futures, the sale of futures is going up and we should have been prepared for that. But the other position has been the increase in food imports and therefore a drain in foreign exchange. What I was saying is that, over a year ago, the Government should have been taking steps to deal with those problems. The Honourable Member for St. Lucy has lost his voice and probably, Sir, I will forgive the low key fashion in which he spoke about manufacturing. 8.40p.m.

But we really cannot either take any encouragement from what is happening in manufacturing. The Honourable Member came through with his statistics and really at the end of the day all he had said was that he has a bit of increase coming from the CARICOM position of the East Caribbean because the East Caribbean economies have done reasonably well for the last 8 years.

Sir, we cannot feel happy about an economy that is exporting only \$250 million as compared with an economy that was exporting over \$500 million four years ago under the Barbados Labour Party. We spoke about that in here too, Sir. I am saying there is not much prospect for any significant increase at the moment given the policies that the Government is following in the manufacturing sector either.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition spoke about the service sectors and I am not going to hammer this point, Sir, except to say once again that, if Honourable Members would speak to the people who service the financial sector ~ in this country of what is called the off-shore sector and now the Central Bank's Governor is calling it the international business sector, he would find that over a year and a half ago they were complaining about how Government was dealing with the problems of that sector. Therefore, if they get the impression that Government does not have a hands on and a positive way of dealing with these problems, confidence moves and that lack of confidence sends confusing signals into the private sector and finally into the economy. I am not surprised that at the recent Annual Meeting of the Economic Society the private sector spokesman made the point that the biggest problem confronting the economy of Barbados is the problem of confidence and the confusing signals which are being sent. One day you tell the private sector you can have "X" years of losses carried forward and the next moment you change.

- We put in place a package to allow the private sector to exploit successfully selling services overseas or even at home for foreign earning. The administration of that is now

under fire because the private sector believes that the Government is not managing properly. The Government put in place in the Budget Speech certain incentives for agriculture. Instead you see the Press replete with statements after statements between the agriculturalists and the Ministry as to how that regime is to be implemented. Things like that undermine the confidence of the people who have responsibility for executing work in the private sector.

Sir, we say to the Government that the credit squeeze has come at a time when it will now do maximum damage. Had correct steps been taken in time when we were giving the warning, we would not have got to the crisis that we have got tonight in our foreign reserves. I want to say something, Sir. It shows that something is really a little bit radically wrong with us. Despite the heavy borrowing by Government - I think this Government has borrowed some \$450 million in foreign exchange since they came into power - the reserves fell. When we borrowed, they said we 'were using the foreign borrowing because the reserves did not fall. So something must be structurally wrong and fundamentally wrong that despite foreign loans that not only have they fallen, Sir, they have steered the Prime Minister. I know that between the months of April and September it was \$150 million and the overall figure was somewhere about \$105 million at the end of the year. Sir, I am saying now that they are continuing to fall and one has to be very concerned about that position which continues to occur.

Sir, I want to put in this point incidentally before my time runs out. When I look at the statistics from the Central Bank which are put out on a regular and timely basis and one has to take these to bed to study statistics - it usually is useful to take statistics to bed whether they are in book form or pamphlets, one way or the other - I am concerned Sir, that the cash reserves at commercial banks in October 1989 was minus \$8854 million which meant that they were holding \$8.9 million less than required under the Banking and Central Bank Act of Barbados. That safety net has gone. I am saying that this crisis is growing much deeper and cutting much deeper than any of us who loves Barbados would like to see happen. The Prime Minister as Minister in charge must be very concerned about this situation occurring, Sir.

I want to say, Sir, the Central Bank's Governor has spoken. At long last, Sir, he has made some statement of any significance. But let me say this. The Barbados Labour Party does not accept and will never accept that to boost the foreign reserves you must sacrifice jobs and put unemployment or employment on the back burner for all times. There must be policies which have to go hand in hand to cure the foreign reserves situation whilst at the same time not only preserving jobs but leading to job creation. We have spoken in this House on several occasions about that. The Honourable Member for St. Peter,

when shadow Minister of Finance, spoke on many occasions on that and gave concrete ways in which this can be done, Sir. I want to say, therefore, that Government must have policies directed to an even higher production - I want them to repudiate anything of what I am saying, Sir - in all of the productive sectors. We must see policies that are encouraging savings as well in our banking system and in the domestic banking system. The Government must show fiscal discipline, Sir.

The Honourable Prime Minister has replied to us and asked where was there runaway expenditure. I issued a statement in reply to him, Sir. But I want to put it into the records of this House that in 1989 the Democratic Labour Party Government took \$185.2 million more from the people than they did in 1988 and where in the additional growth that occurred in the economy they took 64 cents more from the public of Barbados. Why we say that the overall expenditure has occurred and there is not proper control of expenditure is because the Government had a 20% increase in spending when they can only tell us that the economy was growing at less than 4 per cent. You are not having a correlation between growth rate and expenditure rate.

. *Aside.*

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: That is a fact. Sir. Well, they say quoting the figures do not help. I want the Minister to let us know in this House if the statement of the Governor of the Central Bank about putting jobs on the back burner is part of the Government's policy or not. The country wants a clear statement on that issue, Sir. 8.50p.m.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I believe it is a long standing rule of this House that when Members make statements and seek to attribute words to other persons, they are responsible for the accuracy and veracity of what they are saying. If the Honourable Member for Christ Church West can produce to me the text where the Governor of the Central Bank said the words that he is saying he said, I will be prepared to respond to him. Until he can do that, I cannot see how I can respond to him. I do not have in front of me the text, he should be able to produce it. He is quoting the words, let him produce it and if he cannot produce it, I hope he comes to this House and apologise to the House.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Even now the Honourable Member does not know what the Governor of the Central Bank has said. He does not watch the television. If he knew what he said, he would know what the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central said on Saturday night. I can bring the tape for him. I do not think the Prime Minister would like to hear some of the Asides on the tape from Sunday night.

Sir, it is obvious that all is not well with the economy of Barbados. What has happened is a very serious structural deterioration in the economic life of this country and that the country will go into recession this year. Not only that, we said it from this side, the Honourable Member for St. Thomas has already made a document of this House an analysis by Mr. Michael Howard, a Member of the Board of the Barbados National Bank, appointed I believe by the Honourable Member, so the Government must have had some confidence, in him and the Opposition is not just saying things in the wild, but he did forecast that given current trends we can expect very little growth in the economy this year. We can also expect no debt being paid and, in fact, an increase in the level of unemployment.

The Minister ought to be aware of the fact that in the month of January in the distributive trade in Barbados people have been laid off. I am talking about the distributive trade in the City of Bridgetown. I am not happy when our economy is in this state. I can win the Government without having to deal with that at this level, so there is no happiness in my reciting what can be called a litany of woes. What makes me unhappy is that the Democratic Labour Party believes, and continues to believe, that all is well.

I spoke in extremely moderate tones in this House before taking it outside in the public domain, and then said to the Government, take warning. That warning has not been taken and I forecast that the Honourable Member will come back to the House to borrow more money this year and the foreign debt will continue to rise without showing any real impact on economic development in Barbados.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I think, Mr. Speaker, that all Members who wanted to speak have spoken and I will reply to some of the points that have been made during the debate.

<

Let me, first of all, say that in respect of the statement by the Governor of the Central Bank in relation to the foreign exchange position, or the foreign reserves, and employment, this matter has been raised by Members of the Opposition, the last person to do so being the Member for Christ Church West, and up to this particular point they have not produced the text of what has been said, and in these circumstances, I think it is most untenable for Members to get up and attribute words to distinguished Public Officers claiming that such officers, and in this case the Governor of the Central Bank, made certain statements and cannot produce the statement for Members to judge exactly what has been said. I am challenging the Member for Christ Church West to produce that statement.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir. I listened to the Governor of the Central Bank's speech, the part that was on television. I do not have the text, but if ;-

CBC under the Prime Minister would make available to the

Then, Sir, in 1989, there were incentives for agriculture and for tourism. This is all a matter of record so people when they talk, they talk as though no steps were taken in order to stimulate those sectors.

The Minister of Tourism himself on more than one occasion in this House and outside of the House has referred to the fact that additional funds, I believe it was \$1 million over and above what was requested, were provided for tourism promotional efforts. So to get up and give the impression that no action was taken as far as the productive sectors is concerned, is a total distortion of the picture and to indicate that all we are talking about is studies is also a major distortion.

It is also anti-academic and it is also most unprofessional to give the impression to this House and to others beyond that to study a situation there is something wrong with that particular approach. I believe in a disciplined approach.

If you want to forget your particular training and discipline and to lodge an attack...

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am talking about the Honourable Member for St. Peter and all of those who spoke in that vein, seeking to cast scorn and ridicule and to mock the fact that studies have been initiated in all of the productive sectors of the economy as the basis on which action will be taken, is a great...

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: You can determine then according to the studies and surveys that are done over there. Apparently action was taken on a report. That is what you told us here?

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: They have not taken any action. It is really a lack of discipline, I think, on the part of Members....

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation. To illustrate the difficulties pertaining to studies, a study was commissioned in 1986 regarding a graduated tax for businesses in this country. It has been submitted to Government since 1987 and to this day, although the Democratic Labour Party Government has committed itself to the study and the acceptance of these recommendations, nothing at all has been done in relation to that particular study by this Minister of Finance and it illustrates the point that we are making on this side.

Mr. SPEAKER: YOU are making a statement which cannot be seen as a point of elucidation.

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, I am stating that in all of the productive areas that studies have been initiated for agriculture, for tourism, for manufacturing and competitiveness and export development and that those will form the bases on which action will be taken but you just do -« not get reports and go and implement what is in the report.^v ^ They have to be analysed by those who have an interest in - them.

The point I am making, therefore, is that we have a situation in which we are trying to rescue the economy of this country from the damage done to it by the Barbados Labour Party Government. That is why they lost office in 1986. That is what we are trying to do, to rescue it from them and we have registered a number of successes and we have some problems, as is to be expected, problems left by-T^ the Honourable Member and his Government.

I would not blame the Leader of the Opposition in here because he ran away from them. The Honourable Member for Christ Church West ran away from them.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order.

The Honourable Member must not mislead the House. "^{*} I have never ran away at any stage from anything in this country. It is just like the Honourable Member to accuse the Leader of the Opposition of running away from the Cabinet. ^

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: That is the only thing the two of you have in common, both of you ran away. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, over here we know Government and we know Opposition.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Not minority opposition though. That is twice thrashed.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Again, Sir, the Honourable Member must really not mislead the House. The Labour Party has had a wonderful experience in its 50 years and we can teach him a few lessons in government.

We were a minority Opposition before and came back and rescued the Government and corrected all the faults that were left by the Democratic Labour Party including the Honourable Member when he was Minister of Health.

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: The economy by 1981[^] was wrecked and he was so disappointed by the experience that he left.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I expect the Prime Minister, since he put such a high premium on credibility, to be at least credible.

The Prime Minister will know, Sir, if he does not know let me tell him now, that I never ran away from anything. I served out my five years as a Minister in Government.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: He was in Government after that. He was in Government between 1981 and 1986. But all of us remember that famous day on the floor of the House when the then Prime Minister, Tom Adams, was in full cry and said, "Who wants to resign, resign now."

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Whenever he misleads the House I will tell him, Sir.

The Honourable Member must know that unlike some of his members who may not have the guts, Sir, there are some of us who would stand up and disagree with the Prime Minister and unlike the Prime Minister who does not know how to sack a Minister, if I had to deal with situations even in telling the Prime Minister I do not want to serve under him, I would move, Sir. I would not wait.

In the instant case in which he spoke, Sir, the Honourable Member is quite mistaken that I was asked to leave any Cabinet.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I believe that Honourable Members need to be....

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am speaking. I believe that Honourable Members need to be reminded of Order No. 32 and it refers to Interruptions — "No member may interrupt another member except on a point of order and when he wants to elucidate some matter raised by a member in due course."

I have not seen anything in this particular Standing Order that allows a member to shout from one side of the Chamber to the other. Clearly, that is a breach of this particular Rule 32 and it seems to me that Rule 32 when broken in the way in which it is broken today may require me to ask a few members to obey Rule 28.

I think with the tensions rising, the Chair should very well be cognizant of the fact that the debate must continue as the rules require and one or two members may have to take a small vacation. I say no more. "9.20 p.m.

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, they will get warm as they get a little anxious; their minds are on other matters. The fact is ... "Who want to resign, resign now" and paused and looked around and cast his eyes directly on the Member for Christ Church West who remained seated. I know that he was fortified in his legal position because he had all of the authorities under his arm and a pile of books in front of him. He had a good position.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have allowed this particular aspect of the debate to continue but I shall no longer allow it to be part of the debate before us. I should like Honourable Members now to stick closely to the Resolution before us. I think we have all had an opportunity to speak far and wide. I would wish now that we leave that matter alone and get on with the debate.

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Yes, Sir, we will get on with this particular debate, but you see, in replying to the debate and some of the charges that are made - I know, Sir, that you do not hear the asides and we should not hear them either, I will deal with those in another area - one Member of the Opposition wanted to get a detailed account of which particular capital project would get part of the allocation of the loan that is being raised. This is not a loan for a specific project like the construction of a road. It is for the general capital development programme and it is to assist in the retiring of debt. That is what the Addendum says and that is the form of words that have been used by at least 2 preceding Ministers of Finance.

In 1985 the loan which this Government will have to repay in February, the Resolution relating to that loan stated that it would be applied to the financing of projects approved in the Barbados Development Plan, 1983-88 and other capital expenditure approved by Resolution of Parliament. Nobody asked them for any specific details as to whether it was going into housing projects or coastal conservation or whatever. That was the phrase then and the Addendum indicated that it would be used to assist in financing Government's capital expenditure. Broad statement.

In 1986 when the Member for St. Michael South Central came with a Resolution and the accompanying Addendum again it referred to financing of projects appearing in the Barbados Development Plan, 1983-88 and other capital expenditure approved by Resolution of Parliament. The Addendum to the Resolution was along similar lines that the funds were to be used to assist in financing Government's capital expenditure. I believe that is why the Member for St. Michael South Central indicated that this is the kind of form, the words that are used. In this case - because I have come straight out and not limited it to the capital development programme but - I come openly and tell the House that it will also assist in the retiring of

foreign debt which was not said in the 2 previous Resolutions, even though they were being used for those purposes.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Just on a point of.....

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I have given way.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES:.....elucidation. That money was not used for any debt retirement. It was not necessary.

Laughter.

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Anyhow, Sir, I would not go down that road. The Member has a capacity for getting up and making a statement and then sitting down with a straight face and then laughing afterwards. We know exactly what that means.

But I have come openly and told this Honourable Chamber that part of the reason for this is the retiring of foreign debt. There is no hiding behind any kind of words. That is the position. I do not understand what it is that they really expect of this Government. They had an opportunity to run the country and they ran the country into the ground. We are now trying to deal with that. Some cannot stay the course. It becomes a little tight for them. It needs tough people.

Sir,, quite frankly we have had a lot of talk on this particular matter but I believe all Honourable Members realise or should realize that at this particular juncture and indeed at all junctures of our history we need to stimulate our exports and we need to be able to improve our earnings from those exports so that we can maintain our standards of living. Again I will not hesitate.

This is an offer. It is a new area that we are tapping here. It is a new area of financing that we are tapping here led by CITICORE a number of Japanese investors who are in a kind of non-fiduciary relationship with the authorities in Japan and have indicated a willingness to subscribe to this particular issue. Therefore we will be seeking to raise this sum of money. If or when there is an indication that market conditions are suitable and we need additional funds at that time or future times, I will not hesitate to come, in the interest of this country, because no kind of statement from that side will prevent me from taking the steps that are necessary to protect and promote the health and welfare and well-being of the people of this country.

Thank you.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Resolution do now pass. Those in favour please say aye, those against please say no. I think the ayes have it.

A division has been called for.

The bell was rung.
9.30 p.m.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative with the House dividing as follows:

AYES: RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Hon. B. M. TAITT, Hon. E. E. GREAVES, Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, Hon. N. K. SIMMONS, Hon. W. W. HALL, Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, Hon. C. V. WALKER, Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE, Mr. R. L. MORRIS, Dr. E. A. SIMMONS, Mr. C. A. NEBLETT, Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON, Dr. R. C. HAYNES, Mr. R. P. BYER, Mr. P. J. M. MILLER, and Mr. E. BOURNE. - 18 AYES.

NOES: Hon. H. deB. FORDE and Mr. O. S. ARTHUR.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY"
ACQUISITION OF LAND BY THE CROWN
OF LAND AT BLACK ROCK, ST.
MICHAEL FOR THE PURPOSE
OF THE CONSTRUCTION
OF THE NEW BLACK
ROCKPOLYCLINIC

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on behalf of the Minister, that is a simple Resolution which seeks to acquire a portion of land identified at Washington Avenue, Black Rock. It is a piece of land which is still owned by a Mr. Redman. As the Addendum does not point out but the Schedule does, Sir, it is 13,347 square feet.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Resolution should not occasion any controversy. For some considerable time now I have been indicating that we will be moving the present polyclinic which is in the constituency of St. Michael North West which is attached to the Psychiatric Hospital. You will recall, Sir, that sometime ago under the last regime they determined that they would try to get the polyclinic system going. In those days, it was the multi-purpose clinic and the then Minister determined that she would wish to get the multi-purpose clinics going faster than the planning had indicated. The first opened was the Morris Byer Clinic. The need for a polyclinic in the catchment area of the Black Rock vicinity was pressing and it was determined that the polyclinic would be put in an area of land within the confines of the Psychiatric Hospital which used to serve as a out-patient clinic. That polyclinic has served from then until now. But for sometime it has been apparent that it has outlived its usefulness and for the last two years the search has been on to find an appropriate place to locate the polyclinic.

This land is located approximately 800 yards south of the present polyclinic on the other side of the Black Rock Road opposite the Church By The Side Of The Road from

which conies the religious service by Father Winston J. Massiah. The opportunity will be taken to construct the polyclinic on that spot. The scale model of the proposed polyclinic has been prepared by the architects and will be made available shortly for viewing for the persons who live in the immediate area. Construction is expected to begin during the month of March because the tenders having been put out should be closed within a relatively short time.

I believe that I have outlined to this Honourable House the parameters within which we will be putting the polyclinic at Black Rock and a new polyclinic as well in the Glebe Land, St. John to replace the clinic at Gall Hill which is part of the St. John Development Plan. We will discuss that in due course when the time comes to acquire that land. As I said, Sir, at this late hour, one does not wish to go into any great detail but I shall be happy to answer any questions which any Honourable Member might have.

I beg to move, Sir, that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I second that, Mr. Speaker. Mr.

SPEAKER: The question is that this Resolution...

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of regret that the substantive Minister of Housing is not in his place. There are certain concerns in relation to the operation of the Ministry of Housing which I wanted to raise and this is in respect of land acquisition, Sir, and property acquisition as in this case.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is not a general Resolution. This is a specific Resolution.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am being very specific particularly this late at night. We have to be specific, Sir. I would like to know this, Sir. There are concerns over the state of properties which Government has acquired as a result of the acquisition process. As far as I know, there used to be a house on that property. I am not sure if the house is still there or whether the house has been demolished.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sorry. It was destroyed by fire. What has become very evident is that the Minister of Housing is becoming perhaps the slum landlord in Barbados with the state of dilapidation of so many properties owned by Government in areas where people live and they are not being properly looked after. 9.40p.m.

I believe, Sir, that the time has come when as a matter of policy we have to ensure that when we have acquisition ~ Resolutions before this House that we seek to get some .-further and better information as to how the particular

property will be used and so on. For example, we have been given a rough idea of the location of the property in Black Rock. We have not been told what price or any idea whatsoever of the price the Government will be paying for this property. I think this is very germane. I believe that the Honourable Member for St. John is misleading the Honourable Minister of Health, who obviously would not be in a position to know, because he is not the substantive Minister of Housing.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, that is not a problem. The Honourable Member knows from his experience that that is not a problem. His colleague said earlier that I know all things.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Let us be clear, Sir. This is the end of January. Today is the 30th January, the Government expects to start construction of a polyclinic in March. The Government has come with a Resolution to acquire land and the Minister is trying to suggest that the Government has no idea how much they will pay for the land.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, if the Honourable Member will give way, he can ask any question about how many rock stones there are on the land, anything at all, and I will answer them one by one. There is no problem, ask the questions.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Can the Honourable Member tell me how many rock stones there are on the land?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Yes, 4726 at the last count.

Laughter.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Is the Honourable Member misleading the House?

Laughter.

I am sure that at this stage the Government must have some idea.

Certain remarks made by Dr. R. C. HAYNES were ordered by Mr. SPEAKER to be expunged from the record.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am saying, Sir, that if the Minister spent a little more time looking after Government's property such as this one after it has been acquired, rather than getting involved in facilitating persons who wish subdivision on lands such as lands at Cattlewash....

Mr. SPEAKER: Can you tell me which part of the Resolution refers to Cattlewash?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am talking about the Minister's time, Sir. I am talking about how the Minister spends his time in relation to looking after this land acquisition.

Mr. SPEAKER: But not Cattlewash.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: This is public money being expended and this money has to be properly utilised. One component of the investment is what the Minister of Housing and Lands would do with the property. The second one is what the Minister of Health will do with the property, develop it, but the basic input of Government expenditure relates to raw land in Black Rock and the amount of time that the Minister is going to allocate to it. I am talking about the Minister allocating time.

Now, Sir, I believe it is important, for example, that where Government acquires land that the Ministry which is going to utilise that land should get Town Planning permission in order to erect a structure on it. I am sure the Minister of Health would follow all the codes and so on involved. I am sure that if tomorrow the Minister of Health was told by the Town Planning Department that he could not put a polyclinic on it, he would not go and appoint the brother of a Member of Parliament on a Review Commission in order to assist in overriding the decision of the Town Planner. I am sure the Minister of Health would not do that with this piece of property. He is not that kind of person. He would not do it.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order. I am going to reply to the Honourable Member, but I think the Honourable Member must be aware of the principle which exists in this country, even in the law courts. The Honourable Member knows, for example, that in the Caribbean the brother of a Judge will appear before that Judge because the profession requires it. It is at the bottom of the barrel for anyone to be suggesting that a professional who has been appointed is somehow improperly appointed. He is misleading the House in that he is imputing improper motives to the Minister of Housing. I am saying that the Minister of Health would have appointed a professional, no matter who he was.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I said that the Minister of Health would not do it.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: And I am saying, on a point of order, Sir, that it is a fact that he said that the brother of a Member of the House was on a panel and has been on a panel when the Barbados Labour Party was in Government and is a professional. I am saying that he is imputing improper motives to the Minister of Housing for appointing the brother of a Member of the House. He can say what he likes about anybody else, but in here he cannot impute improper motives to the Minister. He has to withdraw it.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I have not accused the Minister of Housing of appointing anybody. I have said as a matter of propriety the Minister of Health would not do it. That is what I said.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of order. It appears to me, Sir, that the submission that is being made by the Member for St. Michael South Central is a deliberate attempt to circumvent the ruling you have given about the discussion of certain areas other than Black Rock, and is trying to lay the foundation on the basis of a hypothetical question, which also is contrary to the spirit and the law of the Standing Orders as well. This is a deliberate attempt to launch an attack, this is a deliberate attempt to circumvent the ruling of the Speaker and it is quite clear that this is what your intention is.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I believe I have been in here long enough to know a little about the rules of Parliament. I am speaking quite within the rules of this Honourable House and I am going to speak to this Resolution, and only to this Resolution, and I am going to confine myself. 9.50 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I understand what you have said. You are confining yourself to the Resolution, and all comments therefrom refer to the Resolution in the name of the Honourable Minister of Housing, and therefore comments to suggest that if the Honourable Member for St. Michael West was the Minister of Housing that he would not do what has been done...

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Excuse me, Sir, I did not say that it was done.

Mr. SPEAKER: My understanding is that reference was made to Members of this House, and therefore the comment needs to be very carefully considered by myself, which I am doing at this moment and I think in the event the Honourable Member should desist from developing that argument much further. I think it is in the best interest of the House and this debate that that particular line of argument does not continue.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I am sure there are certain events in the public life of Barbados that needs to be addressed. I have particularly asked about the price of this land for a very good reason. I know the owner of this land, I have known him for many, many years. I have known the family for many years. I have known the kind of person that he is; I have known his relationship with the Democratic Labour Party and the former Leader of the Democratic Labour Party for many years. I know he is a man of the highest integrity; so I am not bothered about the land. The only aspect is the price that I would wish to ask about, therefore that aspect that does not apply here; so there would be no circumstances in which I could even think of

any impropriety relating to a transaction between Mr. Louis Redman and any party or any people in Barbados, because he is that kind of person. I would not therefore get involved in any searching questions in that area because it is quite unnecessary.

When dealing with other aspects of events that have taken place in respect of the development of land in Barbados and the prior permissions required for the development of land, there have been happenings that must be a matter of concern to all of us.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is as far as you might be able to go.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not going any further. There are happenings that are of grave concern and that is why I would like to get some further and better information (1) about the cost of this land, (2) to ensure that we are satisfied that the money expended in terms of how it is being utilized in the public interest is a good investment on the part of the Government of Barbados, because, Sir, I would like to know what would be the size of the building that will go on that piece of land. I would want to know whether there would be adequate parking in the area. Those of us who know the kind of chronic problems in that area of Black Rock would know that parking facilities would be very critical to the proper utilisation of this particular property, so we would want to know what is the size of the catchment area currently envisaged for this polyclinic, whether it will be an enlargement of the existing catchment area for the polyclinic which is now sited within the grounds of the Psychiatric Hospital. In other words, if there is going to be < an expanding of the infrastructure in the area, whether or not the Minister envisages that more and more people will be using it.

I would also want to know, Sir, what the Minister intends to do with and to what use he intends to put the building that would be vacated in the grounds of the Psychiatric Hospital so that we can have a proper assessment of the total value of the investment, and, the returns that we can expect of it in terms of the public interest.

Now, Sir, I would also want to know whether the Minister is satisfied that the polyclinics in the area are fully utilised at the moment, and what was his judgment and what has led him to believe that there was a need for this significant expansion, if it is significant, of polyclinics placed in the area. Now my understanding of the Minister's position before he became Minister when he thought more clearly when he was in the Opposition is that he was of the view that having constructed one polyclinic in the St. Michael area that what one should be doing thereafter would be to watch the utilisation factor of that polyclinic and look at the response to demand, do various other associated studies such as transport studies, demand studies,

from what particular area the demand is coming, and that would lead you to a constructive decision as to where the next polyclinic would go so that he would move on. Now I would want to know whether the Minister has available to him and if he has been using this kind of scientific study to determine what would be the best location for a polyclinic in 1990 in the St. Michael area, and if he has done so, whether he has taken into consideration the impact, say, of the east-west highway on the movement of traffic and so on.

Sir, these are very important factors. There are certain people who have just been participating in the exercise of public life and they don't realise that there is hardly anything that comes before this Parliament that has not been debated inside here in one form or another on many occasions in the past, and certainly if there is one thing that has been exhaustively discussed is (1) the need for polyclinics, (2) the use to which they would be put, (3) the location of the initial polyclinics and (4) how we will measure demand in terms of determining the most suitable location for future polyclinics.

If I may continue, Sir, I wonder in view of the difficulty which the Minister is having with mosquitoes at the moment - I understand that we are having problems in terms of dengue fever - whether or not that is an area which leads to the breeding of mosquitoes, and if so, whether or not the Minister would ensure that appropriate steps have been taken to debush the area and do all of those things. 10.00 p.m.

There seems to me to be a suggestion that from the point of view of the staff of the House that we need to break shortly. I would wish to develop some further points in this area.

In particular, I would want to look and check, if possible, between now and when the House meets again to see whether the appropriate planning permissions have been obtained for the proposed development at this site because I would want to address the question of planning permissions in greater detail when I continue my presentation.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I was under the impression that the Honourable Member wanted me to stop. The other point concerns the construction of the Polyclinic at Black Rock. I have had one or two complaints. I think that one has to be very conscious now-a-days in making sure that you build into those clinics the facilities for the disabled. I did see some in the Glebe Polyclinic.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I think in the Glebe Polyclinic there might be, anyhow, I do not know whether you are

going up more than one storey, I do not know but it depends on the type of building you are going to have there. It is important because I know of many persons who would like to make use of certain polyclinic services but because of some disablement, they have a problem and this keeps them away from the polyclinics.

The second thing that I would like to find put is whether there will be adequate space.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am dealing with other general aspects relating to the building, adequate dispensary space for storage of drugs and so on.

Now, I have a good reason for that because I gather there are many people who go to the dispensaries and they have to keep coming back because of shortages of drugs at the polyclinics when they are not shortages in the Island so I presume that this will be a storage problem. I do not know what it is. It could be a money problem but I know the druggists, of course, are not getting paid.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: If I may continue. I would want also to see other features in that polyclinic.

Now you have the Sir Winston Scott Polyclinic. You are building a polyclinic in Black Rock. I hope you are going to look and see where there are any deficiencies in infrastructure at Sir Winston Scott and try and correct those deficiencies at Black Rock, which is one thing.

Secondly, there are certain types of services which may not be offered at Sir Winston Scott, and I wonder whether you will try to introduce particularly infrastructural services, that are complementary to what exist at Sir Winston Scott.

Now, if you see what I mean. Let us say, for example, you do not have extensive facilities at Sir Winston Scott for the care of wounds, for minor stitches and so on, the point I am making is that it may not be necessary because of the proximity of the two polyclinics to have an exact reduplication but to find out where there are deficiencies in one and try and give some accent to overcoming that particular deficiency in the other polyclinic.

By and large I have no major problems here. I have no doubt about the propriety of the transaction. I hope that the Minister would obtain the necessary permissions before he starts the construction and on another occasion by substantive resolution, or otherwise, one may have to deal with any infelicitous conduct which has come to our attention in respect of the abuse of the Town Planning Department by anyone.

Thank you.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, it does not seem as if any other Honourable Member wishes to speak so I will now wind up the debate.

First of all, I wish to state categorically that the Government has not been, since 1986 when it resumed - office as Government, does not now or does not intend to " ^ be a slum landlord.

The Minister of Housing carries out his responsibilities with the same propriety and in the same manner as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition left him carrying it out when he served in the Cabinet next to that particular Minister. There has been no change since he left the Cabinet except possibly for the better, but the Minister is carrying out his duties in exactly the same way. In fact, he has become better at it because he has more - '•-*, experience.

The question of the Minister or any Minister on this side receiving any gratuities, even impliedly, does not arise in this Cabinet and if they know of any they should speak or forever hereafter hold their peace. It is the worst form of innuendo for anyone to be suggesting, even remotely vaguely, that a Minister is on the take.

..

Aside.

^

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Yes, I ask the question because it was asked of me and I will ask it every day because I can ask it anytime of anybody. I have no difficulty with that and the Honourable Minister of Housing has no difficulty with it either so that I get very emotional about it. You can suck off all the teeth you have.

Aside.

-c.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: He does not know any better. He tries to be provocative but he knows who is a slum landlord because he is one of the biggest landlords in Barbados so he would know a slum landlord when he sees one and if the time should come that we have to discuss landholdings we are going to discuss them in full detail.

As for raw land in Black Rock, the raw land in Black Rock is the same land that the Honourable Member knows. -«, It is next door to the house where Louis Redman lives -s. which the Honourable Member has visited from time immemorial. 10.10p.m.

It is the piece of land that is next door that is owned by Louis Redman, The negotiations between the _ Government and Louis Redman have broken down. And '••-' hence since the policy of this Government has not changed, ^ the policy is that we will seek to acquire land by private

treaty wherever possible. It is only when the private treaty appears not to be coming into fruition in time for the Government's purposes that they will invoke the Land Acquisition Act. The Section 3 notice was duly published.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order. Certainly, Sir, if the Government were acquiring land where negotiations have broken down, when the Honourable Member introduced that Resolution, he should have brought that to the knowledge of the House.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: That is no necessity in the acquisition of land, it has never been because the history of this House will show that no Minister introducing a Resolution to acquire land has ever given any detail about the negotiations because the Ministers do not negotiate, at least, not in this Government. So that does not arise and the Honourable Member knows that. It has never been done.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. When I first became a Member of this Honourable House when land acquisitions came up, 2 things used to be done. First of all invariably there was a plan of the land that was made available to Members. And the second thing is wherever possible, the price was quoted. Over the years, for some reason or other, both those practices seem to have been, be at abeyance. I do not know why.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, the plan for this and all other acquisitions is made available to the House. If any Honourable Member wants to see the plan it is always made available. I apologise to the Honourable Member for not being able to say to him, here is the plan. It is here in the House, the Honourable Member can see it.

Secondly, when the Honourable Member was in this House and not a Minister, the argument always used to be because the Barbados Labour Party Government properly said that their policy was to service the Section 3 notice, acquire the land and then negotiate. So the question did not arise. We have always had the difference. I remember the Honourable Member, the then Mr. St. John always used to say, "that is the way we do it". That is the way you do it, because we always argued about acquisition in those terms.

But it is not the practice, Sir, it is not the convention of this House to be discussing the negotiations in detail and that is why, when I was introducing it, I did not so raise the detail. I answered the question because the Honourable Member asked the question, "What is the position with the state of negotiations?" I could not tell him at this point which amount the Government has offered and which amount the owner is proffering because the file is here but it would not be on the file. It is not on the file. It is never on the file. Do not let us mislead ourselves. The negotiation is not done by the Minister of Housing and Lands. The "Minister of Housing and Lands, as the Honourable Member

must know, discusses the negotiation. Negotiation is between the Solicitor-General and the owners of the land.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Yes, but not the file that comes in for acquisition.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Well if you ask a subsequent question, you will be answered. But you cannot mislead me. That is why I tell you I can bring land. I could be Minister of Lands for you because what I know about lands is as much as you wish to know.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: We. Do you hear how you say we? I heard you are a founder member.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The NDP. You had a meeting with him. I did not have any meeting.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Look, do not start with me. I have nothing but time.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, so far as the cost of the land, the chances are that the price of the land will follow the normal standards that have been established. Land has been sold along that area for construction purposes and therefore the cost of the land to the Government is likely to be the negotiated price. I have already indicated it is 13 000 square feet.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The cost would be the negotiated price, whatever that turns out to be.

Sir, I would now turn to the question raised about the polyclinic. The question which the Honourable Member asked as to whether the polyclinic is fully utilized. The polyclinic at Black Rock that now exists has proved to be inadequate for the size of the catchment area. The numbers that go there on a daily basis and the potential numbers, as one looks, using the scientific data which we have at our disposal in the Ministry and which is updated on an ongoing basis, the size of the present polyclinic has proved inadequate for the services which will be provided.

The location study was the result of serious examination recognizing that most of the persons who use that polyclinic are persons who walk to the polyclinic. It is

located within walking distance of a substantial catchment area. As you know most of the persons who live in that area, I cannot give you the figure off the top of my head, but it is about 75 000. But I will come back and give you the exact details. The catchment area is approximately 75000.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: It is the number of persons who are likely to go to it. We have catchment areas that range from 35 000 to 55 000. But we are discovering 85 000 depending on the location of the polyclinic. We do not restrict the users of the polyclinic to those persons who live in the area. It includes those persons who work in or frequent the area. So that persons in St. Philip who work near the Sir Winston Scott Polyclinic may in fact be using the Sir Winston Scott Polyclinic. They are not restricted by geographic locations. They are restricted by use. However there is a fundamental catchment figure, based on the population distribution, based on the studies that have been done and that are updated on an ongoing basis by the Project Unit in the Ministry of Health.

You raised the question of what is going to happen to the old polyclinic. As you know, the old polyclinic was the Outpatients Clinic for the Psychiatric Hospital, to that it shall revert. It shall revert in an advanced form. We will improve the clinic. The plans for that have already been worked out by the Psychiatric Hospital. As the Honourable Member quite rightly said, we have brought the same managerial capability and interest that we had in Opposition to Government. We are approaching the solution of problems in Government using the same techniques that the Honourable Member is identifying. We established, by clearly analyzing the problem, how the solution ought to fit the users and hence the customer. The client is the end result of the planning which we have done.

On the question of the mosquitoes. Frankly the only mosquito this Minister fears is the one who flits around from time to time buzzing here and buzzing there.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: But this particular mosquito who used to be under the arm of somebody over here has flitted over there and is now under the arm of somebody over there.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: No, no, no. It is a female mosquito.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: He knows. He knows who the mosquito that buzzes around is. 10.20p.m.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member wanted to know if we will be taking steps to debush the area.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I fear only one mosquito, just one. The Anopheles mosquito is a dangerous mosquito. The area is in fact a low lying area. It is part of an old alluvium plain and as a result there is a flooding of the waters that come tumbling down from the rolling hills to the east. There is sufficient drainage because under this Government a substantial amount of clearing has been done and continues to be done such that mosquitoes seem to be breeding almost everywhere else.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, all of the planning permissions have been applied for and have been received including the permission from the Ministry of Health. Adequate parking has been built into the polyclinic and it will be a full-service polyclinic that will have an emergency section just like all of the other polyclinics have now been given emergency sections. It will form part of the health system and will therefore have its own X-ray facilities to avoid the press of people who hitherto would have to go to the Hospital to get their X-rays and certain procedures which the Honourable Member would be aware of. So that the polyclinic will be a full-service polyclinic.

You wanted to know if any deficiencies at Lady Meade will be extended to Black Rock. The only deficiencies which exist at the Sir Winston Scott Polyclinic would have to do with the design which causes many of the rooms on the western side to be extremely hot in the afternoon. Steps have been taken to ensure at the Glebe Polyclinic and at this one and all the subsequent polyclinics that the design will have an air flow that will avoid that particular problem.

You wanted to know whether the polyclinic was catering to the disabled. A feature of this polyclinic and the St. John Polyclinic and the others that will follow is that they will, in fact, be built with the disabled in mind. There are ramps leading into and out of the polyclinics and there will be facilities as there are in the other places for the disabled.

I believe that I have answered all the questions which the Honourable Member raised, but I give him the assurance that at an earlier time we will give a fuller explanation and exposition on the new polyclinics and their

relationship with the rest of the health care delivery system. I hope that I have satisfied the Honourable Member in his quest.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, we have not completed the work that we set out to do today. For example, we have not been able to debate the Resolution to approve the Electoral and Boundaries Commission Order 1990 that pertains to the Electoral and Boundaries Commission Report. This has got to be done now on a special day. We are going to have to come back tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock in order to debate that.

Asides.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I move, Sir, that this sitting be now suspended until 12 o'clock Friday, February 2, 1990.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question that the sitting be suspended until 12 o'clock Friday, February 2, 1990 was put and resolved in the affirmative and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 10:25 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection, we shall revert to Item No. (g) under Order of Business.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions:

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$4 446 297 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to Supplement the Estimates 1989-90 Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1989-90 No. 12 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$92 624 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1989-90 Part II Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1989-90 No. 13 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, if time permits, the Resolutions of which I have just given notice and which have been circulated to Honourable Members before this day, - I understand that they were circulated two days ago - we hope to deal with at this sitting.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2.

Order No. 2 was called - to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Electoral and Boundaries Commission (Review of Boundaries) Order, 1990.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I believe that all Honourable Members would have in their possession a copy of the first report of the Electoral and Boundaries Commission. As is known, Sir, that Commission was established by the Barbados Constitution (Amendment) Act, 1981-24 and it came into operation on the 1st April, 1985 through a proclamation dated 28th March, 1985. This, as I have indicated, is the first report of that particular Commission and in accordance with the procedures set out in the legislation, the Commission follows the following steps, and I quote, Sir, from section 4ID of the Constitution of Barbados.

The Commission shall, in accordance with this section, review the number and boundaries of the constituencies into which Barbados is divided and submit to the Minister for presentation to each House in accordance with this section reports either

- (a) showing the constituencies in which it recommends that Barbados should be divided in order to give effect to the rules set out in the Third Schedule; or
- (b) stating that, in the opinion of the Commission, no alteration is required to the existing number or boundaries of constituencies in order to give effect to the rules referred to in paragraph (a).

That was subsection (1) and at subsection (2) it states:

Reports under subsection (1) shall be submitted by the Commission

- (a) in the case of its first report, not less than one or more than five years from the date of appointment of members of the Commission;
- (b) in the case of any subsequent report not less than two or more than five years from the date of the submission of its last report.

It goes on, Sir, to set out the further steps which should be taken after the report has been submitted, and subsection (3) reads:

Not later than two months after the Commission has submitted a report under subsection (1)(a), the Minister shall lay before each House for its approval the draft of an order by the Governor-General for giving effect to the recommendation contained in the report.

- (4) Where the motion for the approval of any draft made under this section is rejected by either House, or is withdrawn by leave of each House, the Minister shall amend the (draft and lay the amended draft before each House not later than two months after the day of its rejection or withdrawal, as the case maybe.

Subsection (5) indicates the procedures in cases where the draft may be approved and subsections (6) and (7) deal with related matters.

Sir, I have followed scrupulously the procedures laid down for dealing with this report. I received the report and within the stipulated time I have taken steps to ensure that it was laid before this Honourable Chamber together with the draft order as stipulated. I have scrupulously followed those procedures and I do not think anyone can reasonably claim or assert that the report has been scandalously treated or any such allegation, because all of the steps indicated in the legislation have been followed. 12.15p.m.

I want to make that absolutely clear at the outset. I do not really believe that any Honourable Member would have made any such statement. I do not believe so.

It says that the Commission must submit its report. The Report must be laid within a certain time. The Commission submitted its report. The Report has been laid within that particular time. It says that a draft Order should be presented. That draft Order has been presented together with the Report. Indeed, Sir, I even took steps to ensure that Honourable Members would have got a copy of the Report in their hands so that they could have as much time as possible to study the contents of the Report because the Report affects each one of us in this particular Chamber as well as it affects our whole arrangements for elections in this country. I really, therefore, am amazed that there could be comments to the effect that the Report has been treated scandalously.

Sir, it is the law of this land that an Electoral and Boundaries Commission should function and the areas in which it should function have been set out in that law. What happened is that for the 1981 General Elections, there were certain changes made to the boundaries of certain

constituencies and then the legislation for the establishment of the Electoral and Boundaries Commission was introduced, as I said, by an amendment to the Barbados Constitution Amendment Act 1981-24. The Commission did not actually come into operation until April 1, 1985. That is the background to this whole matter.

As far as the membership of the Commission is concerned, it consists of a Chairman, a Deputy Chairman, and three other members. The appointment to the Commission are made by the Governor General by Instrument under the Public Seal.

The Chairman and two other members are appointed on the recommendation of the Prime Minister after consultation with the Leader of the Opposition. The Deputy Chairman and one other member are appointed on the recommendation of the Leader of the Opposition after consultation with the Prime Minister.

Those are the arrangements set out in the law of the land. Let me call it the fundamental law of the land as the Honourable Member for St. Michael West is wont to refer to it. You would not believe, Sir, that we have had some arguments in here among those who did not quite understand what the term "fundamental law of the land " meant and the Honourable Member for St. Michael West had to call into play his deep learning of the law on these matters.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 41A(3) of the Constitution, the following persons were appointed as members of the Commission:-

Mr. Kenrick A. Jordan - Chairman
Sir Keith Hunte - Deputy Chairman
Mr. Mertbn K. Hewitt - Member
Mr. C. Asquith Phillips - Member
Mr. Philip Serrao - Member

Those appointments commenced on April 1, 1985 and they served for a five year term.

Aside.

Rt. Hon L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, I said that the appointments are for a period of five years and in due course, under the Constitution, I will carry out the necessary consultations in respect of the appointments to the Commission when the membership comes up for renewal and I intend to follow the law of the land because that is what I am empowered to do. I cannot do otherwise.

Sir, the review of the constituency boundaries is - conducted within the framework of the provisions of the , Third Schedule to the Constitution which are as follows -

and this particular part of the Schedule is very germane to the whole operations of the Electoral and Boundaries Commission. That particular provision (1) reads as follows:

"1. The electorate shall, so far as practicable, be equal in all constituencies:

Provided that the electorate, in any constituency shall, so far as practicable, not exceed 110%." 12:25 p.m.

So within that section, Sir, that particular provision-, the words "so far as practicable" appear twice:

"The electorate shall, so far as practicable, be equal in all constituencies:

Provided that the electorate in any constituency shall, so far as practicable, not exceed 110%,"

It continues, Sir:

"nor be less than 90% of the total electorate divided by the number of constituencies therein."

So, as far as practicable, it should not exceed 110% and, so far as practicable, should not be less than 90% of the total electorate divided by the number of constituencies^{2v} therein.

And 2:

"Natural boundaries such as highways and rivers shall be used wherever possible."

Those are the operative provisions that guide the Commission in terms of its review of the constituency boundaries.

The Commission based its review on the most recent Register of Electors available to them at that time, that is, the Register of Electors published on January 31, 1989. The Register was made up of a total of 175 708 electors in the 27 constituencies as at January 31, 1989. The formula which I just set out was applied to the 27 constituencies. Therefore the size of the constituencies would fall in the following range when the formula is applied. The maximum, that is, those at 110% would be 7 158 electors, - the minimum - that is, for the 90% when you apply the . formula for the 90% - would be 5 858 and the average was struck at 6 508. So when we take the total number of electors, divide them by the number of constituencies and apply the formula so ingeniously contrived to apply to these matters, the maximum would be 7 158 electors, the minimum 5 858 electors and the average 6 508.

I would wish to give, Sir, some position relating to the - prescribed range as it relates to the constituencies, those

below the range, those within the range and those above the range. There were 6 constituencies falling below the range, that is, those which would be below the 5 858 and those were the City of Bridgetown, St. Michael South Central, St. Michael Central, St. Michael West, St. Michael West Central and St. Andrew. Those are the ones below the range when the formula is applied.

Those above the range, Sir. Eight constituencies would be above the range and they are St. Michael North, Christ Church West, Christ Church West Central, Christ Church East Central, Christ Church East, St. Philip South, St. Thomas and St. Peter.

The remaining constituencies would be within the range, as set out, and these numbered 13. Thirteen constituencies fell within the range. Included in that particular list of Constituencies falling within the range is the great and glorious constituency of St. Michael South, St. Michael East, St. Michael South East, St. Michael North East, St. Michael North West, St. Philip North, St. George North, St. George South, St. John, St. Joseph, St. James North, St. James South and St. Lucy.

Now the Commission states that at the commencement of its deliberations on the review of the constituency boundaries that there should be a minimal disruption of existing constituencies; one of the operating principles adopted by the Commission, that there should be minimal disruption to the existing constituencies.

The Commission also considered a number of options with a view to retaining the existing number of constituencies. One option in that particular regard.....

Aside.

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: The Report can be taken as read which is not always the case. What the Commission took into account in this particular regard, Sir, was the option of affecting reallocation of voters within the 2 groups of constituencies above and below the range to give effect to the provisions in the Schedule and this would have resulted in substantial changes in the composition and the boundaries of the 27 constituencies. It also took into account, Sir, the parish of St. Michael which has 11 constituencies including the City of Bridgetown. In the parish of Christ Church there were 4 constituencies and for Christ Church these total 32 105 electors. The number for St. Michael would have been 5 917. 12:35 p.m.

If the formula had been applied according to the thinking of the Commission in any redistribution given the formula as set out, the result would have been a loss of one constituency in St. Michael and a corresponding increase in the number of constituencies in Christ Church.

Asides.

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Any other modifications in respect of those constituencies given the formula might also have led to some rippling effect on the central constituencies and might have resulted in the elimination of a rural constituency if they want to try to carry out some other adjustments.

Sir, the Commission considered other options as well. They came to a conclusion that they would not adopt any of those options since they would have led to major disruptions in the existing constituencies. The Commission, therefore, deliberated on other factors and these included the consideration that the electors in 23 constituencies excluding those in the parish of Christ Church totalled 143,603 and this was an average of 6,243. The electors in the four constituencies in the parish of Christ Church totalled 32,105. Such a number of electors, that is those in the parish of Christ Church, according to the thinking of the Commission would have justified five constituencies in that parish with an excess of 1,325 electors. Based on those considerations and in order to avoid any major disruption in the existing constituencies, the Commission came to the conclusion that the number of constituencies should be increased from 27 to 28 with the additional seat going to the parish of Christ Church.

Let me make it abundantly clear at this stage, Sir, that as far as the increase in the number of seats is concerned that I did not believe in an increase in the number of seats from 24 to 27 and I not now believe that there is really a case in this country taken on its merits for an increase from 27 to 28. I believed then that 24 Members are quite capable of giving representation to the electorate of this country provided they are given the necessary resources to carry out their functions as Members of Parliament. I did not think then and I do not think now that an increase in the number of representatives is justified on the merits of the case. Sir, we are faced with a question of what the law says. The number of constituencies was increased from 24 to 27. Under the formula within the law of the land if that formula is scrupulously applied and followed, Sir, I believe that there is no alternative under the rule of law to an increase in the number of seats. That is what the Constitution says. If it is to be applied, there would have to be an increase. The formula necessitates that. If that is not so and according to my understanding of it, the formula would have to be amended.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Let me rephrase that Unless we wanted.....

Asides.

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: That is your legal opinion, not your economic opinion. Unless we wanted a major disruption among existing constituencies, then that might have been the result.

Sir, I think the major problem rests on the formula. It is at the heart of the problem that we have that formula placing arithmetic constraints on the analysis required for the delineation of constituency boundaries. I think that beyond arithmetic there are all kinds of considerations that should be taken into account and I do not believe that in these matters it is simply enough to set out a formula based on arithmetic in order to be applied stringently in these cases.

I think, Sir, that the issues before us are quite straightforward. We have a report of the Electoral and Boundaries Commission. That report is before us. We have a number of options - to approve the draft Order based on the Report, or the Report can be rejected, or it can be withdrawn. Those are the options, Sir. 12.45 p.m.

If Members agree entirely with the Report, the Report can be approved and its provisions will come into force for the next elections which, Sir, are due some time by May....

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: May, June, July, August. You can talk about August, I am saying May. They are due by May in this country. The last elections were on 28th May and I do not intend to go over that five year....

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: 1991. Sir, I would not like there to be any misunderstanding of what we are doing here. As Minister responsible for this particular subject, I have a responsibility under law to bring the Report here - a duty. Sir - together with the draft Order and I have done that. It is for the Members of this Honourable House to come to a determination on the matters before us.

This is a deliberative body, it is not a rubber stamping body, and there is nothing sacrosanct or nothing to say that any Report that comes here for the determination of the House must either be approved in the form that it comes, or that it must be approved in some other form. It is the House that makes that determination, and Members are free to express their views on the contents of the Report and to indicate what particular decisions they would wish to see brought to bear on the Report, and then the House as a democratic institution will come to a decision on the Report.

The Commission has done, its job. They have submitted their Report. It is now for the House to do its job, which is to examine the Report and to come to a determination on the contents of that Report.

I would like to indicate, Sir, that in this particular matter the Members over here are free to speak their minds on this particular Report. There are no whips applying on anything. They speak their minds, because I believe this particular matter affects each Member peculiarly and we will hear the views expressed in respect of the Report. I have already indicated my views about the total number of constituencies. Those are my views. I have a particular position on this, a constitutional position, to bring the Report and the draft Order before the House, and I have carried out my constitutional responsibility or duty in this particular regard.

We are not telling Members over here how to speak or how to vote on this particular matter. We will hear the views just as we will hear the views coming from over there, so I hope that during the course of the debate Members will, if they so desire, express their views so that the House can come to a determination on this particular matter. It is at that stage that the House will determine what steps will be taken and I will ensure that those steps are carried out.

Sir, I do not think I need to go into the whole question of why you have an Electoral and Boundaries Commission and that kind of talk. I know that that formed the subject of much discourse when the Constitution was amended to make provision for the Electoral and Boundaries Commission. We are a democratic country and we have these processes in place for the consideration of constituencies, the boundaries and so on. That is the law of the land. Those things are not in dispute. What we wish to - ensure is that our system is such that we are not bothered every year or every two years by changes in constituency boundaries, because no one likes to know that the boundaries are being altered very frequently. At the same time I do not believe that they should remain in place so infrequently that the constituencies would get out of line in terms of the numbers.

I said earlier, Sir, that I did not think that we really needed any increase in the number of constituencies, but the constraints of the provisions under which we operate and which - and I will give the credit where it is - the Barbados Labour Party Government put in place, those are the provisions under which we are operating. I have listened to all of the talk about some constituencies being bigger than other constituencies and some smaller than other constituencies. I do not believe that 10 000 persons in a constituency - the largest one is about 9 000 - are too many electors for a representative to be responsible for.

The average constituency in Britain, I believe, is about 60 000. In the United States it is much larger than that

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I have said that that is where the need is, not in the increase in the number of representatives but in terms of the support staff and resources, and we have made a start in that particular area.

Sir, I think we have to put all of this in perspective. This is not the only country that has Boundary Commissions. In Britain there are four Boundary Commissions, as far as I can recall - one for England, one for Scotland, one for Northern Ireland and I believe one for Wales - and it is the Speaker of the House of Commons who presides over each of those Boundary Commissions. Each country has to work out its own arrangements. We have worked out some kind of system here and I am saying that it is my view that in due course we will have to look at those arrangements, the formula as set out, because I am sure if that formula is not modified we will be back here in the not too distant future with another upward revision of the constituencies, considering such a Report making such a recommendation. 12.55 p.m.

I am sure that we will have to give that matter some consideration in due course.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I have set out the main parameters of this particular matter that is before us. I have carried out my constitutional duties and responsibilities, the report is before us and I am moving that the Resolution be approved. Thank you very much.

Hon. C. V. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second this Resolution, and in so doing I am very cognisant of the fact that we have to abide by section 41D of the Constitution of Barbados.

A long time ago we had 24 Members and then we moved to 27, but even before we moved to 27 we moved from double member constituencies to single member constituencies in 1971. Prior to 1981, Sir, we heard talk about 30 seats in Barbados. The concept was from the particular report at that time that we should have 30 seats in Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Labour Party opposed the 30 seats then. Somehow some time later we got 27 seats. The Democratic Labour Party opposed the 27 then and now.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Prime Minister and Minister responsible for the subject has laid a report and a Resolution calling for the establishment of an additional seat or an additional constituency to bring the number to 28.

Mr. Speaker, I believe then, and I believed now, that the Democratic Labour Party is still opposed to 28 seats. Certainly this Honourable Member does not agree with the concept of 28 seats because of the cost factor involved with the 28 seats, and I will explain a little later why I do not believe in the concept of 28, because if you follow the pattern of 28, then 29 and others will follow.

Sir, we have the Electoral and Boundaries Commission which came into being on 1st April, 1985 and again based on Section 41D of the Constitution said that the first commission should report not later than five years, which is the tenure of office for the first commission, and it said that that report must be submitted and under the Constitution that report must be laid in this Honourable House. As a matter of fact it says in both Houses. The report I understand, Mr. Speaker, made reference to constraints. There were also comments within the report about major disruption of constituencies, but however, whatever reasons are given in that report, and I believe all the commissioners, as men within the society, have a right individually as well as collectively to submit their views.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I still believe that 27 seats are enough. I understand the comments which were made about consideration of the options and indeed I would imagine there were several options, and like anything else one will have to consider several options. You may not consider all the options, but you consider several options.

Sir, let us set out a few facts. The first Commission will run and is running for five years, and again according to the Constitution they must report within that five years, thus we have a report within the five years. However, Sir, and this is the point that we have to pay strict attention to, a little later it goes on to say that the next Commission must report in not less than two years or more than five years. In other words, we could very well be back in here with a report, and I will not prejudge any Commission, Sir, in 1992 with another recommendation based on the current formula that we have right now. Thus another one of my concerns about the increase.

Mr. Speaker, I want us to remember that two years and my comments made about 1992 as I proceed. Even if we have to accept the report with the recommendation of 28 seats, with or without changes, I would like to make a few more observations. According to the report, the calculations were made based upon the figure at 1st January 1989 of 175 708 electors on the list. They went on, based upon the current Constitution, to divide that by 27 which gave us the average of 6 508, and again as they point out in their report, using the factor of minus or plus 10 per cent, we find a figure of a high of 7 158 and a low of 5 858. 1.05p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned a little while ago that we could find ourselves back in here in two years, 1992,

dealing with a similar matter, the same structure and if we assume, Mr. Speaker, that the population of Barbados is stable - we have been saying for a while that the population of Barbados has been staying between 250 000 and 254 000 people - if we accept that, Mr. Speaker, then we may also accept that there is a strong possibility that the numbers will remain around the 175 708 in 1992.

Aside.

Hon. C. V. WALKER: I just pointed that out. I will get to that a little later.

Mr. Speaker, if we assume then that we have to deal with the same 175 708 and we assume that we may be back in here dividing it by 28, we will then have an average of 6 275, smaller constituencies, and as I proceed you will see the progression. That means that the 10% then added will only take us up to 6 902 and the bottom figure will take us down to some 5 648.

Mr. Speaker, smaller constituencies, if we follow that formula, will give us a reducing number possibly in the next two years and then in 1994 if we follow the same progression with the same formula we could see the progression whereby we will be back then in four years to the original projection of 30 seats. A master stroke was prepared when this whole thing was thought up. There was a mathematical approach to this with the whole idea, "if I do not catch you now in the first time at first base I will catch you at third base."

Let us look at what we now already have in the recommendation of 28. Sir, if we, as I said, take this figure of 175 708 with the new average then thereabout of 6 275 and a high of 6 902, and if we remember that we are supposed to be operating under the Constitution, I am aware that there are a few words in there which say "as far as practicable" but there are words "as far as practicable."

Mr. Speaker, the maximum then under the 28, if we assume that we are dealing with the same number, as I said, will be 6 902 and we have a recommendation where St. Thomas is recommended for 6 913, above the maximum of 10%, above the norm. We have St. Paul recommended for 6 923 which is above the 110% of that factor of 6 275 plus 10% which would bring us to the 6 902 and creeping right behind there, Sir, St. Philip 6 901, one off. At least a few babies were born some years ago who will qualify in a short time and St. Philip has been growing and growing.

Aside.

Hon. C. V. WALKER: It is St. Philip North under the present recommendation.

But, Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is not the time to discuss the Constitution and the Rt. Honourable Prime Minister

when he was introducing the Resolution made the point that we will have to look at, I think the words he used were, "the formula". Now, Sir, the formula is within the Constitution SO I am going to say that at some time some Honourable Members in here will have to take a serious look at that but that will be when that will be. Today we are dealing with the Resolution that is before us.

Sir, if we got, as I mentioned earlier, another Report in 1992, and possibly one in 1994, we will be looking over and above the three constituencies I just mentioned of St. Thomas, St. Peter and St. Philip North. We will be looking, based upon the figures as presented, at the possible growth where the following constituencies will exceed the number, it may very well happen, according to the pattern, before that period and I am speaking about St. Philip South as well, possibly Christ Church East although it would have just been realigned. We have to pay attention also to St. Michael North and St. James South. We know the demographics. We see what is happening. All of these things I think we should take into consideration because Honourable Members in this House should not have to look back any number of years from now and say we knew what was happening in the society, we should have taken all of these things into consideration when we were discussing the Report. Sir, what I am really saying is that this Honourable House, maybe not this group, will have to address Section 4 ID of the Constitution at some time if we are to maintain some level of stability so that the populace can believe that they will have X number of representatives over a period of time and could very well be happy to believe that the size and description of their particular constituency in the most part will remain stable. People need that confidence.

We hear a little talk about gerrymandering and changing. I think that at some point we will have to take a serious look at the whole description and how the constituencies are prepared because if we do not do that, and we are then stuck with a formula such as this, we will have a snowballing effect. 1.15p.m.

It will be a snowballing effect because we know that the population in Barbados moves around. We know that we have developments going up in certain areas. I think we have the capacity to analyse these things and to put them as part of our overall planning.

I said earlier, Sir, that I believe the Commission did a good job. They mentioned their constraints. We must remember too that the Members of the Commission will be looking at it from one angle but they are not facing the things in the constituency on a day to day basis like the Honourable Members in this House. They did their job. They outlined the constraints, they outlined the restrictions, they outlined their reservations, they outlined what they had to do and what they thought was the best. But as I said, Sir, "we have to think of that level of stability."

Let me repeat, I am not in favour of the 28.1 am not in favour of increasing the cost. The Report, as it is, can yet be amended be it back to 27 like I would prefer or be it to 28 if other Honourable Members feel by majority that we should go that way. But I think it still can stand some amendment, Sir. I know that Honourable Members may have their own personal views. They may be quite different from mine. But as the Prime Minister said, this is a no holds barred Debate. You stand on your own and you express your own views.

As the Report stated, what is proposed may not be major disruptions but to some people they may be major. What is major to some is minor to others. Each individual will have to look at his or her constituency and express his or her views. But that does not change my view.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, before I close, only this morning I saw something else handed to me, Sir, and I want to make a few comments. I just made a quick observation of some documents which were handed to me this morning, Sir, rather interesting. Very, very interesting. Sir, I have before me a list for January 1990 with 184 042 voters. If we were to use the same 28 now, Sir, we will start to have another problem, I would not deal with that now.

I want to point out however that the Voting List on May 28, 1986 was 176 739. We now have it that all 27 constituencies as of yesterday have increased somewhere between 200 and 400 electors. That does not sound right to me, not forgetting what I just said about the movement of people. If people move from here, there, it should go down. I would think so, Sir. And then the total we had, as I said we were dealing with a figure in January 1989 of 175 708 and now we are at, as of yesterday's Report 184 042. An increase from January last year, Sir, of 8 334 people. Where did they come from? The pattern in the figures just do not mesh right with me.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I just made another note and I did my own because I am not privy to the other documents that the other Members had for their constituencies. But I just looked quickly at mine. In St. George North on May 28, 1986, 6 595 electors were on the list. Call it 6 500, if you will. In January 1987, 6 727. You may again call that 6 700, if you will. In January, 1989, the same one that forms the basis for this Report, Sir, 6 484. You may call it 6 400, if you will. And I am saying it so that as I come back to clarify it he will see why I am doing it. And now yesterday, 6 863. Let us look at the pattern. Nineteen eighty-six 6 500, 1987 up by 200 to 6 700, 1989 200 disappear down to 6 400 and 1990 the 200 you lost from there have gone back up to 6 800. In 1986, 6 595. I know personally that out of that 6 595 that at least 200 of those people were either dead or had moved to other constituencies. I know that about mine. So the pace was wrong. The pace then would have been lower than the sixty-five. Where are they now and where are they coming from?

I, Mr. Speaker, Sir, will only state and I will repeat, I understand that we are operating under the Constitution. The Report has to be laid according to the Constitution. It can either be accepted, withdrawn or rejected. But, Sir, I will restate, I am not in favour of 28. And if, Sir, other Honourable Members feel that they are in favour of 28, I am also saying, Sir, that I think we need to look at the little analysis that I have done in general and especially in my area.

Now the question will be what happens?. But again the Constitution is clear, Sir. I think the Prime Minister said if it is withdrawn or rejected, it must be brought back to this Honourable House within 2 months. Now if it is rejected or withdrawn somebody has some work to do. I would hope that it would be good work.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have made my position clear. I think I have given some background as far as I see it to the work done. No problem with the work done. The recommendations of the Commission are their recommendations. They have their right to make their recommendations. We have a duty in here, Sir, to deal with this Resolution. And we as honourable men must be men in the whole sense of men and Members to deal with it in the interest of this country.

Much obliged to you, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is quite evident that the ruling Party is bound by the decisions taken at George Street some 10 nights ago and will not be supporting the recommendations of the Commission.
1.25p.m

So that instead of dodging behind phrases like I will not support 28 and so on, it is better to come to the House and say - look this is a problem that we have. We find ourselves in this position and we will not support it. The Honourable Member finished off by talking about Members being men. That is what men would do and not dippy-doodle and tip toe all over the place as has been happening.

I have indicated, Sir, some three or four weeks ago my concerns over this entire process. We have considered it in the Councils of the National Democratic Party and I have no difficulty whatsoever in saying that the National Democratic Party will not be supporting this Report. It is not a problem. We will not be supporting it.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The National Democratic Party will not be supporting but we will give our reasons. We are not afraid, Sir, to come in here and give our reasons. We have no problems because as I indicated before the National Democratic Party was not involved in the appointment of

any member of the Commission. There was nothing wrong or strange about that because the National Democratic Party did not exist when the Commission was appointed. It is not a problem with us, Sir. I hope that nothing I shall say today shall in any way be construed as reflecting on any Member of the Commission or any member of the Electoral Office or any support staff. Let us get that absolutely clear.

The Commission, Sir, was bounded by certain constitutional requirements and in its best judgment made an attempt I will submit, to ensure minimum disruption of existing arrangements. This is the conclusion to which they came. However, Sir, it is my view that a perpetuation of what exists now, through the application of the present formula in the Constitution, would offend some very fundamental principles which we hold in relation to representation in Barbados. I will deal with those in due course.

Sir, this all goes back to the shift from double Member constituencies to single Member constituencies. From that moment there has been constant argumentation between the major political parties as to how some of those constituencies were divided in terms of giving one political party an advantage over another political party. The National Democratic Party is a modern political party, a forward looking party, and I will not be getting myself involved in that kind of dispute. Having said so, Sir, there is no one in this Honourable House who ought to better understand the problems with boundary changes than myself; and I feel very strongly about this, Sir.

I was elected to Parliament in 1978 with a majority of 1200 votes. By 1981, St. Michael South Central was so chopped up that, if everyone in St. Michael South Central voted in 1981 as they voted in 1976, I would have been beaten by 800 votes. In other words, those boundary changes were so designed as to ensure, based on the 1976 voting, that if everyone voted the same way my majority would have gone from 1200 to minus 800, or over 30 something per cent change in the constituency relationship to my disadvantage, simply by messing around with the constituency boundaries.

Now Sir, I thought that I had a terrible time in 1981 in trying to get back into this Honourable House and with a stroke of luck I managed to convert a structural deficit of 800 votes caused by the cutting up of the boundaries into a majority of 500. I have grown from strength to strength since then. I won by 1500 votes last time. But Sir, I bring this to the attention of the House just to point out what a decisive effect boundary changes can have on the capacity of any Member to hold his seat in this House or to return to Parliament.

Another very serious thing happened at that time in St. Michael. It is often said that one of my valued colleagues, Sir, Dr. Rameses Caddie, lost his seat in this House. Dr. Caddie never lost a seat. As a matter of fact, the seat which Dr. Caddie had to contest in the 1981 was so substantially changed and even renamed that it was hardly recognizable.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No problem. No reflection on your capacity but the point is this. I am not saying, Sir, that anyone stole an election. What I am saying is that the seat that Dr. Caddie ran in was even more substantially changed than the one that I ran in. The question really was whether Dr. Caddie should run in St. Michael South Central or whether I should run again. It had reached that point and he elected to run in that area.

Now Sir, I am just giving you an example of what can happen as a result of boundary changes. So that I ended up, Sir, with a constituency that started at Eastmond Corner in Bank Hall and ended up in Haggatt. With these changes now, Sir....

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It began at Eastmond Corner and ended at Haggatt. Under these arrangements now, Sir, my constituency will start at Eastmond and end up somewhere in Christ Church.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Well wherever, it is part of Christ Church West and it will come inside there, but anyhow way up Fordes Road on the border between St. Michael and Christ Church.

Now Sir, you know this country has a history of communities. It has a history of voting in relation to communities and much that has happened in Barbados has totally disrupted any identification of the electorate with the communities to which they have been historically tied. 1.35p.m.

You take, Sir, the Honourable Member for St. George South. He will find himself now, under these new arrangements, representing part of St. John, part of St. George, part of St. Michael and part of Christ Church. That was not always so. There will be major changes for the Honourable Member for the City. He will now be in part of St. Michael South, part of St. Michael West and part of the City. The Honourable Member for Christ Church East would have had his constituency chopped in half and he will be pushed up into St. Philip South.

The point I am making, Sir, is that these requirements of the Constitution have been put in place after fundamental

changes have been made with the boundary structure in Barbados, and if you continue to apply those changes over time, then the parishes in Barbados would not be recognisable in our constituency arrangements. I think that is fundamentally wrong and I am going to address this as a matter of principle today on the floor of this House.

Now, Sir, I will just give an example of what happened to my constituency. The reason why my constituency was below the average was because of the manner in which it was mutilated in the past. Now the Commission has to address this matter. The logical thing would be to restore to St. Michael South Central what was taken away from St. Michael South Central in 1981. That was not done. In other words, if the integrity of St. Michael South Central was restored, we would have no problems of being below average or anything like that, we would be well within the average.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No, everything would not be all right, because we have overriding principles that would apply in this matter. The point I am making is that here was an opportunity to correct past errors and restore the integrity of St. Michael South Central, but that was not done. Far from that, what is happening now is that St. Michael South Central goes from Eastmond Corner past Highgate somewhere up in the Christ Church area; separate and different communities, sociologically different, not relating to each other and very difficult to build a constituency spirit based on that kind of arrangement. Constituencies cannot be constructed on that basis, and I believe we have to try and get back to a situation which has been seriously undermined over the years.

We in the NDP feel that just as in the United States you have States, in the United Kingdom you have Counties, in Barbados we have parishes. I believe that those parishes have a cultural identity, a historic identity, and what is important, a significant identity in terms of the political culture of this country. I believe that we must ensure that whatever we do we try and maintain the integrity of the parish boundaries in our constituency arrangements.

Now, Sir, I live in Christ Church at the moment, but I am a G man. I am from St. George and everybody knows what a G man is, you do not mess around with him. Even the Honourable Members from the north who affectionately, not offensively, refer to themselves as the Northern Mafia, seem to recognise that there is some identity in the north.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I consider that remark to be offensive and I ask the Honourable Member to withdraw it.

Aside

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: "Mafia" is an offensive term, if you do not understand it. I consider it to be offensive and it has to be withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the Honourable Member will agree that he could have used a much milder phrase than that.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I regret, Sir, I was misled into using that remark because I have heard Honourable Members from the north refer to themselves affectionately in that way.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is repeating the same statement. I consider it to be offensive and I will ask the Honourable Member to desist from that.

Mr. SPEAKER: What I want to say is that he is making reference to Members in the Chamber, and I think that the Honourable Member knows he should not make that kind of statement. Shall we just withdraw that from the record and proceed?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The remark is withdrawn, Sir. The point I want to make, Sir, is that St. Lucy is easily recognised as a political entity with a specific history of representation and I think it helps people, it helps to build communities if people can identify with their representatives on a parish basis.

I think, Sir, our primary unit of representation in Barbados as it was in the past, because of our cultural traditions, particularly the traditions of our political culture, should be the parish; that each parish should have one representative. If or when the population grows in a given parish, then you can increase the number of persons representing that parish. It is the principle I am addressing, and it was the principle which informed the double member constituency arrangements. However, we have allowed considerations of political expediency to be imported and have compromised that basic principle. There is no reason why St. Philip should not retain its integrity as a parish and have two representatives. If at any time the population increases to a level where it requires three, so be it. The same thing with Christ Church. If Christ Church is at a level where it requires X amount of representatives, then so be it, but the basic unit should be the parish. 1.45p.m.

Those of us who have been in this House for long enough know this, and let us face it - I am not pointing my finger in one direction or another - we all know that there has been extensive gerrymandering of the constituency boundaries in the past. We have heard charges of both sides of the House, and as a new modern political party we have to address these things from the stand point of principle and try and get entrenched in the thinking of this Honourable

House some fundamental honourable approach to these matters, and that is what my speech is all about. So I have no difficulty in declaring my hand out front and to set out clearly the parameters which will guide us in these matters, and that is our position.

We have already announced our intention, Sir, to reintroduce local government in Barbados, and it is very important to us, again as part of the traditional political culture of this country that those parish boundaries shall be maintained. Sir, if you meet a Barbadian who has left Barbados a hundred years ago and you ask him where he came from, the first thing he is going to tell you is that he came from one parish or another. That is his point of identification, and people relate not only emotionally, but make no mistake, people relate in a very fundamental and spiritual sense to the parishes of Barbados, and we must not allow at any time that very important content of the Barbadian personality to be disrupted by machinations which might suit us from time to time. Sir, I am well qualified and I understand very well. When I look at what the changes, I do not have to bore the House with a whole lot of numbers, but I understand very well the direction in which things will move and I understand what has happened. There is no doubt in my mind whatsoever.

I would urge the Government, Sir, not to make the mistake of trying to misconstrue anything that I have said on the floor of the House today as giving them the go ahead to chop up these boundaries within two months or whatever the requirements are in the manner that suits themselves, because there is another principle I want to address, and the Honourable Member for St. George North touched on it, and that is, I have said again and again having campaigned in St. George North in 1976, St. Michael South Central in 1978, 1981 and 1986, having spent months and months scrutinising lists in Barbados, that you are going to find a ten per cent error or more on these lists no matter what you do. I do not feel that we have the infrastructure to make any major changes in the electoral process in an election year - with only months to go without causing major disruption in Barbados. It happened in 1981 and hundreds of people were disenfranchised. There were charges of gerrymandering, stealing, all kinds of charges. I am not making any specific charge against the Barbados Labour Party, because what I am saying now I said in a debate inside here in 1981 or 1982 soon after the elections, that I am satisfied that there was no way that the electoral office was geared to make those changes and compile accurate lists in time for an election. So even if there was no intent to do anything that was dishonest, the net result was that people were disenfranchised, and that is a matter that we have to address. The fact is that there were hundreds of people who could not vote in 1981 and I am urging on this House, Sir, and I am urging on the Government to recognise that if they were to attempt to make any major changes in the lists if they were to join in the rejection of this report, then they would not be serving this country well. We all have"

experience of what happens when there are major changes in the electoral lists just before an election.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I did not say so. You have missed the point. I have already stated very clearly what I am saying. I am saying it is too late anyhow. The report in itself is a major change. What I am saying is that it is too late now as you all know to make major changes in the boundaries. I am perfectly clear what I have in mind.

Now, Sir, it is quite clear to me that the Government seems to be afraid to deal with the problem. To effect the changes which I have suggested to this Honourable House or the changed thinking in this matter, it is quite clear that there would have to be a constitutional change. If there is need for a constitutional change, the Constitution was changed to have in it now what is in it and if it has to be changed to improve it, then I have no difficulty in saying that I will support it. We are very serious people in the National Democratic Party. When we address matters of this kind that impinge on the democratic process of Barbados, we are not afraid to get up here and say what we think should be done. That is our position. We have deliberated, we have considered all these matters in depth in the National Democratic Party and as Leader of this party I have been asked to enunciate these matters on the floor of the House, and that is our position. We can do it, Sir, because we do not have to defend ourselves against any past charges of any kind. The National Democratic Party, Sir, is completely clean on all matters relating to the electoral boundaries. We have no charges whatsoever to defend, and therefore, Sir, as I say, we can look at the matter objectively, we can learn from our experiences in the past, but at the same time we can bring fresh thinking. After all, Sir, that is the justification for a new, modern political party, one that would bring fresh, new, pure and untarnished thinking on political matters.

If I may continue, Sir, I will make one final point. As I said before, the numbers criterion is a totally ridiculous criterion to use when you are dealing with small constituencies of the nature that we have in Barbados. I can assure you, Sir, that the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central, if he has 10 000 people, would have far less difficulty in performing his duties as a representative than the honourable Member for the City who may have 5 000 people.

1.55p.m.

Think of the complaints that people come to you with. Ninety per cent of the problems I have in my constituency relate to either unemployment or housing. If you have a constituency where the majority of persons in your Constituency are either unemployed or have housing

problems or rentals etc. quite clearly the pressure on such a representative would be much greater than one that has predominantly a middle-class representation.

I will say this and if the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central disagrees with me in any way, I will bet you that 90% of the problems that you have to address in your constituency come from the small lower income group sectors of the community. That is a fact of life so let us be realistic; you cannot only think of numbers.

Someone who has to look after a parish like St. Andrew where the terrain is so difficult and has got much worst since the Honourable Member for St. Andrew has become representative for that parish, such a member, even if he has 4 000 or 5 000 people, has his work cut out in St. Andrew.

There are a whole lot of factors that have to be considered and I am urging the Government and I am urging members to try to get away from the past in this debate. Let us address the major issues that should confront us now and let us look forward to finding a better formula for the representation of the people of Barbados.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GRIFFITHS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move at this point that this sitting be suspended until 3.00 p.m. this day.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Seg to second that.

The question that the sitting be suspended until 3 p.m. was put to the House and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the House accordingly. 2.00 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed. The Honourable Member for Christ Church West.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, before I start to analyse the Report of the Boundaries Commission, I think I may advert to an omission so far made in the speeches of all of the Honourable Members who have spoken, the Rt. Honourable Prime Minister, the Minister of Education and the Leader of the Opposition and that omission which I consider a very serious omission is really

to thank the goodly gentlemen who constituted the Commission for the work which they have done so excellently.

It is not an easy task to undertake a job such as this one, particularly when you are dealing with 27 nervous people who have at some stage to face an electorate and, particularly, when you are dealing with a situation where partisan political considerations sometimes masquerade under the style of principle. Therefore, when five of our citizens undertook this task, I believe they recognized that they themselves had a difficult job ahead of them.

I want to say, as I have said in this House before a couple of weeks ago when this matter came up under another Bill, that I believe that the Chairman of the Commission, the Deputy Chairman and the other Members have done as good a job as they could in circumstances such as this and in their Report have adverted to the main criteria which should inspire and influence the redistribution of boundaries.

I think one has to set this out carefully because there seems to be a good deal of confusion in the arguments which have so far been advanced on both sides of the House, from the Government side and from the side of the Official Opposition. It is a fundamental principle and it is a radical principle that proper delineation of the territories or areas to be represented in Parliament is an important factor in maintaining the fair working of the electoral system.

Unless the electoral system is made to work fairly, then we can never have a proper system of democratic Government and one of the fundamentals which is stressed to ensure that it works fairly is that the areas of representation are as fairly balanced as possible.

Now, Sir, we have come a long way from the rotten boroughs in the United Kingdom and we must remember that our system has been influenced to a large extent by what happened in the United Kingdom and it was not until, 1843 that the concept of an independent Boundaries Commission to deal with the delineation of boundaries got any support in the United Kingdom and, perhaps, it received its greatest support in what is referred to as the Vivian Committee. As a result, the United Kingdom came to accept that an independent boundaries commission was the surest way of making certain that there was a fair working of the electoral system. 3.05 p.m.

And for that system to work fairly it must confer what is called an equal representative status. That I think is a *sine qua non*. It is really a fallacious argument to say in this House or elsewhere that if you have great inequalities either upwards or downwards in your unit of representation that the system remains fair.

One of the Honourable Members who has spoken, I think the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central in trying to illustrate a point said that he could not see any difficulty where the City of Bridgetown may represent 5 000 and the Member for Christ Church West Central represented 10 000. I say that if that system obtained at all in Barbados, it is contrary to the fundamental principle of fair representation. Because it would mean that the vote of one elector just by moving across the border, across the street, would count more in the return of a Member to this House and in their say than the vote of two electors. I cannot see any principle of logic, common sense or fairness on which such a principle could be based.

The submission that has come out of the debate is that Members in this House, those who have spoken - the Prime Minister was careful to be almost neutral, I will deal with his argument - fail to understand that the electoral process *C* has moved from representing a few to representing everyone that is eligible and trying to give their vote an equal unit of account. This is so in the United Kingdom, it is so in western democracies, in the United States to which the Honourable Member has referred, it is so in Canada and it is so elsewhere. In fact, Sir, this principle now is so much hallowed in the jurisprudence of democratic countries that the courts in Great Britain, in Canada and elsewhere have allowed judicial review in the manner in which Boundaries Commission and Ministers exercise their right to demarcate and delimit constituency boundaries. The principle is so hallowed.

In fact if Members were following recently, an election in one of the provinces of Canada was set aside because of the disparity between the vote of one person and the vote of another. So that Members must bear that in mind. I think what you have seen here is an attempt by the N. Commission to pay regard to the principle of fair ' representation.

When the Boundaries Commission was established the Democratic Labour Party took the view that it was no big thing. The Democratic Labour Party has been opposed in 1966 to an Electoral and Boundaries Commission. The argument at that time was that the House maintain the power to deal with this. The Honourable Member for St. Michael North, Deputy Prime Minister and myself are the ^ only 2 Members in this House besides the Honourable Member for St. Thomas who was part of the media, who attended the London Conference. The Right Honourable Prime Minister is one who would be conversant with the argument then, at that time as well. I understand, Mr. Speaker, from talking to you that you followed the debates very interestingly at that exciting time in the history of our country, in the middle sixties. But the Parties disagreed on ^* the need for an independent Electoral and Boundaries^ Commission.

But I think it has come to be accepted now that such a Commission is necessary and it has been enshrined in the Constitution. I am not going to waste the limited time I have reciting the various arguments for or against, except to say that in 1981 prior to the 1981 election, certain members of the DLP were pressing the BLP Government to implement the provisions of the Electoral and Boundaries Commission legislation in order to give the power to an "independent body. The reason why we have an independent body, Sir, is because it is felt that that body more so than the other 2 types of body - and I would say what the other 2 types of body are - has the greatest chance of being fair to a particular electorate in a particular area.

There are 2 other ways of approaching this. We can allow the government, the Party in power whether it be BLP, DLP or whoever else to have the sole power within their hands and that is when you get all sorts of allegations of gerrymandering, some of them well founded, some of them not so well founded. This is not only in Barbados, it is all over the world that you have seen that happen. That is called the partisan approach.

There could be a bi-partisan approach where the political parties, as has happened in this House, agree on a Committee usually with the preponderance of Government Members and at the end of the day, they come up with a form that satisfies the sitting Members but does not necessarily satisfy the other principles that should be followed. This has been reviewed and anybody who has studied the literature on electoral process and representation would be cognisant of the things I am saying, Sir. And the third and the preferred one by people who have studied the electoral process in relation to democracy is that there is a non-partisan agency operating under predetermined rules. The difficulty about that or the limitation about that is who chooses them and how they are chosen.

** A genuine attempt was made in the Electoral and Boundaries Commission to address that problem. I am not saying that it might have been addressed to the satisfaction of all. Certainly none of us at the time forecast the position where a party would split itself into 2, so far, and find itself with a position that part of the Government returned, at the time of the election, as the Government now becomes the official Opposition. Nobody envisaged that that would have happened and therefore the constitutional change did not make any provision for that. But basically, it can be argued that if you take into account these changes, you still will not come back to the non-partisan outside body to deal with these matters. So, Sir, that is why I began by saying, let me give some thanks to the 5 gentlemen. Their names are mentioned in the Report so there is no harm in looking at the Report and mentioning who they are. It is at the top of the Report. Mr. Kenrick Jordan the Chairman, Sir Keith Hunte the Deputy Chairman, Mr. Merlon Hewitt, Mr. Asquith Phillips and Mr. Philip Serrao. Let me say on behalf of the Barbados Labour Party Opposition that I

believe they have had a difficult task in the first 5 years in setting the parameter under which any such Commission can operate. I believe that they have done their task most honestly and to the best of their ability. Therefore on behalf of the Barbados Labour Party Opposition I am thankful to them for giving civic service of such a high standard to this country. I believe that whatever criticism one may wish to levy at the Report that one has to recognize that the Report has been a good effort to achieve a result acceptable to us all.

The other point I wish to make is this, Sir, that they have been assisted by the Chief Electoral Officer and his staff. The Chief Electoral Officer probably has the longest experience among any serving officers from his Local Government days about dealing with this. I recall a Report which he gave in 1981 talking about the need for 28 seats. So the 28 seats are not new. The 28 seats was what officials felt that they should have been since 1981. Furthermore, in 1955 I think it was or 1951, the then Senior Member for St. George who subsequently became the Rt. Hon. Member for St. John introduced a Resolution in the House asking that constituencies should be delineated as single member constituencies on the basis of 1 for every 3 000. That would have meant then a House of about 30 to 33. The Resolution can be seen in there, Sir. 3.15p.m.

So that is the first, Sir. In addition, Sir, a former Speaker, your distinguished predecessor, at one time recommended when the Democratic Labour Party had the difficulty in St. Lucy as to whether Sir James Tudor or Sir Theodore Branker should run a House of over I think 70. So that you would have had the position within the bosom of the Democratic Labour Party from time to time looking at an increased House. Now what is the argument I hear today in this House against the 28 by the Honourable Member for St. George North? The argument is cost, Sir. The cost of an additional Member of the House is less than the cost of an additional Minister of Government. It is within the bosom however of a Prime Minister to increase his Cabinet by one and to have two Ministers in one Ministry and give the taxpayers a triple cost, but you cannot get the position where you can increase the House by one and give people more representation in those circumstances. That is to illustrate my point.

Asides.

Hon. H. dcB. FORDE: No, Sir. I am arguing the point.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has risen on a point of order.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I hope that the Member for Christ Church West is not misleading the House. I seem

to have heard about an increase in the Cabinet by one. I would like to make it clear. Let there be no doubt about it. There has been no increase in the Cabinet by one.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Prime Minister is a little bit nervous at the moment. I know he would want to be nervous of 27 but he has an extra nervousness, Sir. The Prime Minister was known as a .good debater before, Sir, when he used to be in the Action Club and elsewhere. He knows that I am making the point that any Prime Minister, not only this one, is in a position to increase his Cabinet and increase the cost to the taxpayers and not necessarily get better Government from it. It is going to be argued by the Honourable Members that the increase in representation by one in which the cost is probably \$40,000 to \$50,000 is going to be a tremendous burden. When that argument was addressed in this House in 1981, the then Rt. Honourable Member for St. Thomas said that the Customs duty from one Datsun or Mercedes was enough to pay for the representation and that he never heard the argument that by increasing by one it meant that therefore you are burdening the taxpayers with cost. He did not believe that was the true argument. I agree with his argument. I am not saying, Sir, that you must have an open system that you can move down to units that do not make sense. But in the context of Barbados one has to bear a few points in mind. We have abolished the Local Government system. In the 16th century and 17th century and certainly by the time that Samuel Jackman Prescod entered this House, the electorate at that time was no more than about 60,000 to 65,000 and the number of representatives was 24. At the same time they had a vestry system. That was the situation.

In fact, the whole of St. Joseph was added to the parishes. We had something like 22 representatives. Obviously, if you begin to look at Barbados development and you are not going to be hide-bound by feelings and emotionalism in this issue and try to get the proper system of representation, you have to acknowledge that the changes that have occurred would of necessity lead to changes in the increase in the amount of representation as we have now and sometimes the shifting of boundaries.

Barbados is no longer a completely rural society as Barbados was back in the 18th century. There is a significant shift of suburban Barbados going out into rural Barbados so that the communities themselves have changed, and the Government itself recently brought before this House a Parish Boundaries Act that has itself at times cut through the very communities that we talk about.

I am not buying the community argument either as has been advanced by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition impliedly. In 1981 when he argued.....

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am going to 1981. I am going to deal with his argument first; when he argued about giving him back his community. What happened then was that the Ivy had been divided before, Mr. Speaker, and the effect of the 1981 change, certainly in his constituency, was to bring the Ivy back into one form of representation.

Now in 1971 under the Democratic Labour Party ^ communities were divided. Jackson was divided if you look ^ at the boundaries. In fact, within the very St. Michael area and within our own constituencies there are demarcation lines that divide up communities. I do not buy the argument that a parochial boundary makes a community. That is not really so; in fact, neither does an electoral boundary. Wherever possible the Electoral and Boundaries Commission has tried in this instance to follow the parish boundaries and indeed as amended by us, they pay great regard to the parish boundary and in several respects they have tried as well to keep communities together. I have not ^ always been happy about all the electoral changes that were made. I can talk about my own constituency but I am not going to bother about that, Sir. The 27 of us, if given the task to sit down and divide up the thing, will never agree, Sir. We each would have our own particular interests out there. Speaking for myself, I have always contended that I am happier and this has been my position since 1965, with an independent body that had various guidelines that it could follow so that everybody will feel that they have a ^ fair chance. Now Sir, our guidelines should be even stricter j⁵ than they are.

In the United Kingdom, of course, there is an oral hearing that the electors themselves can make representation before the bodies. We have not got that provision although we should have made the rules and then the electors might have something to say to us who are their representatives. I believe that oral hearing and any future development that takes place certainly becomes a necessity. ^-. The Commission itself could have instituted its own oral _ hearing if the Commission itself wanted to have its own oral hearing. I believe, Sir, as we develop we will get to that situation.

Now Sir, I listened for the reasons why the Prime Minister has said that he is allowing a free vote on the matter. He has ^ stated his own reservation. His own reservation is based on the position that he was never in favour of a change from 24 to 27 and he is not now in ^ favour of a change from 27 to 28. He did not spell out why ^ ^ except impliedly that he thinks that 24 is enough given the size of the constituencies.

Now the Commission addressed that argument and the Prime Minister himself outlined it. It said that if it stuck to the 27 it could mean substantial changes within the existing position. It could have meant the abolition, Sir, of St. ^- Michael North East because Christ Church has 32,000 x- representatives and the City or St. Michael South Central,

the three smallest. That would have been politically controversial. If they went and abolished the St. Michael North East, the Honourable Member for the North East, Sir, would be upset but I think that within the party bosom he would be taken care of. Can you see, Sir, the trouble that would have occurred politically if the result had been to dispose either St. Michael South Central or the City of Bridgetown? You can imagine the political upheaval. You - ^can imagine that we would have been fighting the election on nothing else but that issue, Sir.

Now the Commission obviously had on their political cap. The Commission recognized that it did not want to ruffle the feathers of the Government or indeed of the official Opposition. So the Commission decided that it was not going to disrupt the position and it had to fall back on the other principle of realising that it must not be unfair to the electors, not to the four of us who represent Christ - Church, by continuing to say that if you live in Christ Church your vote will count for less than if you live over the border in St. Michael which is an eminently fair principle that they bore in mind. 3.25 p.m.

It is for that reason and that reason only, as the Prime Minister rightly knows, that they came up with 28. The Honourable Member for St. George North has said that as we continue to increase in the number of electors or the " population decreases, we can get either an increase in the number of representatives or a decrease in the number of representatives. That is not strange either. Anybody who docs Political Science seriously would realise that that is one of the demographic implications of territorial representation and that therefore you could get a whole constituency wiped out in the United Kingdom or in the United States or Canada or elsewhere and a completely new constituency formed, and you can get roughly an increase _ and decrease in the level of seats.

I do not think there has been any fundamental objection here to the Report that has come in, and I have heard nothing so far from members who have spoken to convince me that this side of the House, certainly the Barbados Labour Party Opposition, should vote against the Resolution as it stands. Mark you, Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that if you ask me if I wanted to keep the people from my constituency that are going over to the Member for South Central or going back to the Prime Minister - some \Of them were formerly his and they now come back to me - they got good representation whichever way they were, from King's Village, I would say that, and up the other side I would hope so. I want to keep them, but I must be true to the principle that I hold as a democrat, which is that you must have some fair form of representation if people are to have a fair chance of going on. I do not know what is the ^alternative. If either House of Parliament rejects this ^Resolution, then it means that the matter is back in the seat %f the Prime Minister, and already you have heard the

warning given from one of the political parties here. I am telling the Prime Minister, I am not committing the Labour Party to any support for an alteration in the formula set out in the Constitution. That formula did not come from Tom Adams, as people have said, or from the Labour Party, it came straight out of the Cox Commission Report.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: It is not the same thing, Sir. You can believe what you want to. That was after a hearing up and down the length of Barbados where people had the opportunity to come and give their views on the findings of that recommendation. Dame Elsie Payne, Professor Carnegie....

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: That is the point, Sir. The Honourable Members will feel unhappy with Sir Mencea Cox, Mr. Ezra Alleyne, Sir Carlisle Burton, the Honourable Jack Dear, Sir Alexander Hoyos and Dame Elsie Payne.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order! May I have some order, please?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: However, Sir, I never felt unhappy with the unanimous Report in which such a distinguished person as Sir Keith Hunte - shout B or D - or Mr. Asquith Phillips participated. The point is that this was unanimous. That is the whole point. One of the reasons why I have always felt very strongly about having an Electoral and Boundaries Commission rather than a Minister is to move out of the electoral battle the issue of constituencies once and for all.

I began in politics as an Under 40. This has always been my principle. The Honourable Member said he is not hide-bound by anything in the NDP. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has disowned 35 years of BLP history by the stroke of his hand. I am not going to disown the history. Our history, like the history of anybody, has things that you approve totally of and some you disapprove totally of, but I take the responsibility because I am part and parcel of it. There are limes we may have gone wrong, just as there are often times the other side would have gone wrong on electoral questions, so I am not going to disown it, but I know as a matter of my principle when I first came into politics, and all the Political Science I have studied from the time I was at school and the history I have read tell me that if you want really to have a democratic system, you must try where possible and minimise in areas like this the opportunities for partisan action.

That is why I regret very much that I have not heard a stronger case being put up by way of counter balance. I am sorry as well, Sir, that our legislation has not developed rules for the Commission to operate under which the Minister would have been permitted to come down not only with the Order which he must bring, and he has brought the Order as a matter of law in accordance with the Constitution, but even at the same time if the Government and the Minister felt he could not support the position, to give his reasons, written reasons, and alternative proposals for that.

I believe that when we advert to these matters in the future we are going to have to be a little bit tighter in the rules we operate, but I do not believe at this stage that there is over representation of the electors in the House. I do not think there is, Sir. In fact, I do not think that an increase in one is that significant. If it could have been accommodated within the 27, as the Commission said, without very serious disruption, then I would have been happy with that likewise, but the reality is that the Commission has adverted to that, it has adverted to the point of representation for communities in parishes too.

I said it has followed the new parish boundaries which made substantial changes in what is a parish, where the parish line was formerly drawn, and in any event, Sir, I contend that if I use the yardstick of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in saying a parish must have one representative, every parish in Barbados is so represented. Then if you take that further, as he said, that if there are more you give more, that is exactly what the Commission's Report has done.

There is no parish that has not got at least one representative, and you will find that all of the parishes have got that sort of representation here, Sir, so I honestly find it difficult, having listened to the Right Honourable Member for St. Michael South, the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central and the Honourable Member for St. George North to understand the reasons why this House, even on a free vote, is being asked not to accept the Report as it stands, admitting that each one of us will be affected. After all, I am losing between 1 000 and 1 500 votes. Admitting that each one of us, if we were sitting in the seat would have done it differently, we have to ask ourselves have the Commission tried, within the fundamental criteria and principles we would like to see operating in the electoral system of a truly democratic Barbados, to come up with an answer.

In my view they have tried to make sure that there is fair representation for each voter. Secondly, they have maintained communities to a large extent. I can show you one or two areas where this has not been possible, even in

my own area, Clapham. They have not maintained it in every instance, but by and large within the parameters given to them they have tried to maintain communities together. 3.35 p.m.

In my view they have paid regard to some of the political considerations, the consideration wherever possible not to cause the maximum political disruption and . in my view to pervert the political system. We are arguing^ really on issues that may not, after the election is past, be very pertinent to the future Government of our country. Fourthly, Sir, I think they have paid regard to the historical position of Barbados as much as they could, taking into account the changes which have been made to the Parish Boundaries Act. I do not know what more they could have done. Because of that, Sir, we will support the order. I have not got another speech to reply to some of the things that will come afterwards, but the argument as advanced up to now does not convince this side that there is any reason for other than giving the stamp of approval to the order which has been kid to give effect to the recommendations of the Commission report, and I wish again, - I think my time has run out, Mr. Speaker - to place on record as this Commission's term expires shortly, our congratulations and thanks to these five gentlemen for this selfless difficult task performed well and to the staff who have supported them up to date, Sir.

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a very brief contribution to this debate which, however brief, seeks to speak of my very grave concern over a situation where you can, given the information that is given to us, anticipate from the numbers that are coming up annually in the various constituencies which now constitute the total electoral register of this country, the kind of changes which we are now considering probably on a two or three year basis.

The Honourable Member for Christ Church West made a contribution just ahead of the one I am making now, Sir, and I thought that he began it on a false premise, and that false premise in my view was that he was contending that we were not appreciative of the persons who had spoken before

Mr. SPEAKER: May I just interrupt. Are you saying the Honourable Member was misleading the House? By using the term "false premise", are you saying that the House was misled?

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: If I need to rephrase it, all I am saying is that the premise taken by the Honourable Member for Christ Church West, if I understand him correctly, was that no sense of appreciation was taken for the work that was done so far by the Electoral Boundaries Commission. I don't think that any speaker had spoken before him had given that kind of intimation.

I am of the view, Sir, and I will go on record as saying, that the Commission did as good a job as they could have been expected to do given the kind of parameters which the law, as it stands, permitted them to function under. I believe that the Honourable Member for St. George North made the point when he said that the criteria that is given to the Electoral and Boundaries Commission to arrive at these decisions have been the stroke of a genius. He said it was a master stroke, but I think it was the stroke of a genius, because what it did in my view was to set the parameters for all time in which you could use numbers and figures and come up with mathematical conclusions as to what you want and how you want to do it.

I am also confirmed in the view that the population of this country given the last ten or fifteen years has not grown significantly. In that context of course we must accept that there have been population shifts, and therefore you will recognise that there are going to be areas that are growing while others are reducing in terms of numbers. What do you think, Sir, is the reason why people move from Area "A" to Area "B"? I recognise in several instances and in several cases that people move for various reasons, and in this context I do not believe that the consideration of the vote of a person is the argument here, because there is no Honourable Member who will convince me that if he had 5 000 constituents and if another had 10 000 constituents that they can claim to have been treating every one of those constituents on the same basis like visiting them and by getting to them in all areas. I am saying, Sir, that what I consider a new thinking on what representation should be has to inform us that it will never be on the basis of seeing each constituent on a weekly, daily, monthly or even yearly basis, but that one has to accept that attention to the problems which exist in constituencies should to some extent alleviate the problems which the constituents face, and in a real sense that is what we are here as representatives of the people to do.

The formula, as I said, Sir, which has been devised to determine what the size of a constituency should be, in my view does not take cognisance of the fact that in a constituency like St. Andrew, a constituency like St. Joseph, probably a constituency like St. James North - these are areas the terrain over which a representative will have considerable difficulty to get to those people if you want to deal with it on the basis of individual visits. If you want to deal with it on the basis of individual visits, you cannot tell me that you would require the same physical effort to see those people in those areas as you would require to see people in an area, say, like St. Michael or some areas of Christ Church or some areas of St. Philip. So I am against the concept of the numbers game. Yes, you will arrive at a numerical equation primarily because the total population is a numeral, but I believe, Sir, that the total concept of representation has to take on a completely different meaning from what it meant in the late 1970s and 1980s. It cannot be a situation, Sir, where you can at the

beginning determine what you want to do at an election given the financial resources and the like.

The Honourable Member for Christ Church West did not surprise me that he took a position of defending the Barbados Labour Party in the whole concept of the criteria with which the Electoral and Boundaries Commission had to work. I know my position on that, and I am not surprised...

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of explanation, the vote on the change to the Constitution for the Electoral and Boundaries Commission cannot be reflected on because it is long time past, but from my memory, Sir, and I have not checked, I am reasonably certain that there was no division on that change to the Constitution, and that it met with approval from both sides of the House, both the Democratic Labour Party and ourselves.

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, mention was made of the Democratic Labour Party's position on the increase of constituencies from 24 to 27. I take the point that the Honourable Member is making that there may have been no division in so far as the constitutional provisions for the Electoral and Boundaries Commission was concerned. I am saying though that while I support and I know that my Party supports the existence of the Electoral and Boundaries Commission, I certainly do not accept, and I am speaking for myself on this particular issue, a system where the formula can be used for your own advantage at point "a" or point "b". 3.45 p.m.

Hon. H.deB. FORDE: On a point of explanation because there are two issues. The Electoral and Boundaries Commission formula was 10% one way or the other. From my memory of the debate that was not an issue that divided the parties.

It was in 1981 when the bi-partisan body recommended by a majority to the House that there should be an increase in 27 that that issue was a divisive issue. By the time it came to be voted on, the DLP had walked out of the House because of some interruption, I think, of the then Right Honourable Member for St. John. That was the area of disagreement; the numbers, not on the formula, not on the criteria. The contention was that you could within the same formula have distributed them among 24. That is the distinction.

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish this particular point to be the burden of my contention because, as I said on a previous occasion, I am considered a new member in Parliament but I am not a new political person when it comes to recognizing what has been happening in Parliament.

I am not going to go down that road any further except to say that it is still my contention that if we were not given the kind of criteria which the Electoral and Boundaries Commission had to work on, then we would probably have come up with a completely different solution to the problem presently.

Mr. Speaker, in 1981 the constituency of St. Michael North East was divided. I suppose it may be said that if the constituencies were not divided at that point we may not have had 27 constituencies and since I have come to Parliament since there were 27 constituencies one might argue that I would not have had the opportunity to fill a slot beyond that point but I always treat my political life on the basis of principle and I believe that you would not have had to increase the number of constituencies by any amount in order to provide better representation for the people of this country.

I accept that the only criteria for offering better representation to the people of this country are the representatives themselves and I feel that on that premise and on that premise alone I will have to be consistent in my approach in so far as the increase in the constituencies are concerned.

I want also to say that if one had to look at the possibility, and this, again, is my own view, for an increase in the number of seats in the Christ Church area, or in the country as a whole, my own assessment seems to tell me that that would not necessarily be a coastal position, but that is my assessment.

I want to say, though, that when you look at certain constituencies and I will think in terms of the Christ Church West area, the Christ Church West Central area, the Christ Church East Central, possibly St. Michael South East and St. George South, you may very well understand that if the criteria allowed it to be managed differently, then you might have come up with a more, in my view, feasible situation.

I believe that having made an assessment of the electoral boundaries and what is given to us as the reason why we would have to consider a 28th constituency, I have come up with a few that given the shifting in the population from Area A to Area B and/or C, that you may have to look at the possibility of zoning certain constituencies in the country, recognizing what developments there are in Area A as against Area B and/or C, and determine very seriously - Somebody made the point if you are asked to represent 10 000 persons in a given constituency as against 6 000 persons in another constituency, the terrain over which a representative may have to travel to reach his constituents makes a difference. He may very well understand that some of the boundaries in the Christ Church constituencies would take on a different meaning if you have to adjust them accordingly.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition made the point that his constituency is going into areas of Christ Church. He said that that Honourable Member for St. George South is also going into about four different parishes in his constituency and I believe that those are the areas that need to be addressed if we are going to come up with a formula that would not have us going over this system every two or three years.

I really do not see why for a population the size of ours we must be aiming at 30 representatives, maybe 36. If you look at it as it progresses and goes down the road, you may find yourself having, by this criteria, to satisfy the demand for more and more constituencies. I do not believe this country needs this. I do not believe this country can afford it and if I have to give my support to this kind of constitutional amendment that would give us a formula, I do not care how we reach - when I say I do not care how we reach, we reach that position, I think that we can, as intelligent Members of Parliament, devise a programme which can give us an equitable position on arriving at what is a normal state of development in so far as our constituencies are concerned.

I want to say, Sir, and to reiterate that I have no quarrel. I do not in any way grudge the Members of the Electoral and Boundaries Commission of the job that they had to do. I think they did a very good job in terms of the criteria which they had but I believe, Sir, that we as legislators have the responsibility and the duty to this country to tidy up the legislation relating to the development of constituencies in this country in such a way that the people in the country are not disadvantaged in the long run.

There is one other matter which I would like to make mention of and it is that it is about two years ago, Sir, I asked a question and the promise was made that we would have the differences that come up in constituencies by way of removals, by way of new persons coming on to the register and by way of transfers from constituency to constituency and that we would have that on either a monthly or quarterly, and I believe quarterly is the most feasible position.

The reason why I am very concerned that this is not done is that because those of us who try to keep an up-to-date register on what is happening in the constituency would have a very much better position where we can cross-check on the information that we are using and the information that reaches the Electoral Office. We would be able to cross-check and, therefore, be better able to make these adjustments from quarter to quarter. 3.55 p.m.

I believe that is essential if we are able to monitor the developments within the various constituencies.

In this situation in which I see this matter, Sir, I know that I am not in a position to support this Report, while recognizing the amount of work and the quality of the work that is done by the Commission. I cannot support it because I am not myself happy with the method with which the officers of the Electoral and Boundaries Commission were able to reach their conclusions because it is unsatisfactory - tome.

Take for instance, Sir - because this is what is happening, I am not complaining very much about this work - there have been boundary changes in the constituency of St. Michael North East which take off a sizeable natural chunk of the St. Michael North East constituency and puts it on to St. Thomas. There is also a situation where I am now asked to skip over a constituency boundary line and take up a small section in another.

- I am also asked to go even closer to the St. George North boundary to take up the area between Hothersal Turning and Bourne's Village. The number of houses in that area, in my view, could very easily be covered by the St. George North area and certainly, given the fact that there is some development going and there must be some anticipated development insofar as the opening of that new Highway is concerned, there was got to be some anticipated development, Sir. I recognize that we would have, probably ^A- within the next year or two, to look at further changes ~. insofar as that boundary is concerned. But I am not complaining because I recognize that if you are a parliamentary representative and given the point that I have been making, you will have to expect the boundary changes from point to point. But I do not think that those boundary changes should always find themselves related to the increase in the number of constituencies and therefore the number of seats in Parliament. Therefore, Sir, I cannot give my support on that.

But I made the point that I thought if we had a zoning of the country that we could come up with possibly the similar average to what we now have in the 27 constituencies across the country. As I said, given the understanding of certain problems that representatives may face in certain constituencies and zone some of the northern constituencies, zone the St. Michael constituencies and zone some of the southern constituencies that you could possibly come up with a solution.

I have done an exercise in which I would propose the zoning of the St. Thomas, St. Andrew, St. James North, St. Peter, St. Lucy and St. Joseph constituencies. If I take the 1989 figures on the voting population in these constituencies, I would come up on an average of 6 560 persons. And again given the 110% or 90% you can have, -wur equation there. If we zone the St. Michael constituencies and tack on to that the City of Bridgetown,

and given the nature of the St. James South constituency, you would come up with a situation where you could get an average of about 6018 persons.

Asides.

Mr. L. L. BRATHWATTE: If you did, Sir,....

Mr. SPEAKER: May I have some order, please. Order, please.

Mr. L. L. BRATHWATTE:..... what I consider zone 3 and you came up with the constituencies of Christ Church West, Christ Church East, Christ Church West Central, Christ Church East Central and St. Philip South given again the only population that is on the Register you could come up with an average of about 7 860.

Now I said before that I do not accept that a person in a constituency like either one of the Christ Church constituencies should be equated, numerically speaking, with a representative in St. Andrew or St. Joseph. I am making the point therefore that if you look at the situation where the future development in terms of residential areas are concerned, you will possibly find a situation where it is growing in one, that is what it has been, and reducing in another.

I think, Sir, that my responsibility in this matter is to state my personal position as I see it. I always believe, any time you do not agree with something then you should always in my view have a counter proposal to make. I have done my little bit and I hope that Honourable Members could look at the proposal, however simple it may be to them, and they may very well be able to find some measure of wisdom in it.

As I said, Sir, I am not in a position to support this matter. I am grateful to you, Sir.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have listened to the contributions of Honourable Members on this matter and I think that the House should be aware - certainly Members of the House who are aware of the proceedings of the Select Committee that discussed the whole concept of the Boundaries Commission in relation to another matter would be aware of my views in relation to this particular method of setting up the procedure for establishing elections or carrying out elections in Barbados.

Now, Sir, the legislation is quite clear in that the Constitution gives the Electoral and Boundaries Commission the right to determine how constituencies should be allocated in Barbados subject only to 2 very simple factors. The first is that they must take the total number of electors and divide it, take the total number of the electorate and get an average and then ensure that each constituency falls within 10% either way of that average.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: As far as practicable. And the second basis is that the boundaries should conform essentially to natural water courses, roads, et cetera. Now, Sir, I submit that this legislation is defective. It was defective from the very beginning. I believe that in fact when you look at the task of the Boundaries Commission in relation to how it can carry out this task, it is probably one of the only institutions in this country:

- (a) that has wide jurisdiction to consider any number of factors both relevant, irrelevant, immaterial and material to the question of dividing constituency boundaries;

and: (b) that the power of the Boundaries Commission to carry out any of these activities cannot be questioned in a court of law.

So it would be perfectly legitimate for a Boundaries Commission to come to the Parliament of this country at any point and for example in a Report say, we have divided the boundaries in this country to ensure that a particular political party will win the next General Election. And there would be no basis other than the consideration of Parliament itself for overturning that particular approach. 4.05 p.m.

What I am really saying, Sir, is that the legislation does not set out the factors that the Boundaries Commission should take into consideration in determining how the constituency boundaries in this country should be aligned and the basis on which these constituencies should be established. So that the present report is other than the average. That is all. In other words, it can take into consideration any other factor and it can be the most partisan Boundaries Commission saying that it wants a political party to win and, "this is why I have done so", not that that would happen. I am just showing you that on that basis, other than the decision of the Houses of Parliament at the end of the day, which is really the final appeal in this matter, there is no other way which the decision of the Electoral and Boundaries Commission can be questioned.

Now Sir, this particular report sets out only one ground on which the recommendation were made. I heard the Honourable Member for Christ Church West list a whole number of factors that he believes the Commission took into consideration. Well, none of those factors is set out in this report. This report is very clear and it sets out one primary factor and that is: minimal disruption of existing constituencies. I refer, Sir, to Page 6 of the report at Paragraph 15. At Paragraph 16 it sets out: "The Commission has considered several options with a view to retaining the existing number of constituencies."

So really it is only looking at the question from a position of the status quo; and its attempts really are to maintain, as far as possible and practicable, the status quo in relation to the delineation of constituency boundaries.

Sir, on Page 8 Paragraph 17 it states:

"On the basis of the decision taken at Paragraph 15, the Commission found it inappropriate to consider any ^.. of the options identified above since either of them " would have resulted in a major disruption of existing constituencies."

So the Boundaries Commission, as I understand it, made its decision on the basis that it did not wish to disrupt the existing constituencies. Therefore, I can find no fault with the report on that basis. In other words, if you are saying that is the reason why you are going to come to the conclusions you are coming to, well it seems to me that the Commission was perfectly right in coming to those"" conclusions on that basis. I am submitting now to the House that there are other factors which are very relevant to the consideration of how constituency boundaries should be aligned and those factors as far as I am concerned should be clearly set out in the legislation. In other words, the Boundaries Commission should be told what the basis should be for its decision whether it is topography, communication, or whatever number of factors should be listed. The Boundaries Commission should be required to -*.' give the reasons why it considered any one of those reasons - and the matter should at the end of the day be justiciable. That is just my view. Now I am not going to be supporting the report on the basis that I do not think that the nature....

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Pardon. You want to hear some of the factors. But you know what the factors are. You are a Member of Parliament who everyday knows that-^ people like you and I represent rural constituencies have -N greater distances to travel than other people. Is that a factor? You and I know that rural constituencies have a certain income pre-disposition in relation to the constituents. Is that a factor that should be considered? In other words, I represent almost an entirely working class constituency. Is that a relevant matter that should be considered? There is a whole number of other factors that, as far as I am concerned, should come into play. One of the most important matters which has been raised here has been ^ the question of the topography and the ability of the -'/. Member of Parliament to move around.

Now I know that people take this position of equality as being important and I think that it might be important. But 5,000 people living in a constituency like St. John represented by one Member of Parliament do not necessarily have the same measure of representation on th&~ face of it as 5,000 people living in a smaller area with better communication. This is a well known fact and it really ,

takes considerably more in terms of time, effort, and mobility for a person representing those larger areas whereas it does not the persons representing the smaller areas. There are some MP's who can go into one part of their constituency, as we always say, and at the end of the day they can say they were, "in the constituency". In St. John it would take me four weeks to cover the entire ^ constituency meaningfully. That is a factor to me that seems to be relevant. I do not know that the legislation as it stands

- has addressed any of those factors or will impel the Boundaries Commission to address them. On the basis of what they have before them - of this formula - and on the basis of the reason they gave, I could not see them coming to any other conclusion than the one they came to. But I am saying that that, to me, is not the basis on which the Boundaries Commission should function and the legislation might need amending or that the persons who comprise it should see their role as being more activist. I do not mean J partisan. I mean activist.

This Boundaries Commission to the best of my knowledge has not had public hearings on the alignment of boundaries and that might also be an important aspect of consideration of constituency realignment. The persons who are affected by the decision should be consulted. Now it does not forbid it. The legislation does not forbid it and, therefore, perhaps it never entered the minds of the ^ Boundaries Commission. The fact that it does not forbid it

- should have entered their mind but they did not carry out any public assessment as to how these boundary changes would impact on communities. I am saying that I believe this is one of the things that should be done.

Now the question, therefore, has to be: on what basis do you make decisions to allocate constituencies or on what basis do you make decisions as to the increase or decrease in seats. This is something the legislation should clearly set ~- out so that any questions that arise should be on the basis of . " what the confine of the role of the Electoral and Boundaries Commission is.

Now the other thing that concerns me, Sir, is that the Honourable Member for Christ Church West made very heavy weather about this formula of establishing an Electoral and Boundaries Commission which would remove all the partisanship and the possibility of gerrymandering and so on. Now nothing can be further from the truth and ^ the present scenario which might emerge may, perhaps v more than anything else, demonstrate to us the fallacy of the argument that he has presented. If this House rejects the Boundaries Report as it presently is and if in whatever way, it determines how it carries out certain adjustments or amendments, I am certain that at the end of the day the* Members of the Opposition will be back to the position of accusing us of gerrymandering, partisanship, and so on.

- ff So that the legislation itself sets up this Commission which is to make a report and which the House may very

well say that we do not want anything to do with and then it comes back to where it was before to the politicians. On that basis I have strong reservations about the present legislation and perhaps it is only now that we are seeing this defect because this is the first time we have had this report coming before the House of Assembly. It is the first time that we are having the opportunity to see it actually operating. When the legislation was originally being considered perhaps these factors did not immediately come to the minds of the persons who were debating it. I read very carefully the speech of the Honourable Member for Christ Church West and he talked all about democracy and we have to do this to ensure that democracy is built up in Barbados and so on. At the end of the day this legislation as it is presently set out does not achieve that As I said, I can assure you, Sir, that in two months time or whenever -1 do not want to anticipate any decision - the adjustments that might be proposed are made the Government and the political party in office is going to feel the full brunt of criticism of Members of the Opposition or other persons who might be disaffected by the decision which the House finally comes to. 4.15 p.m.

It does not avoid the claim of gerrymandering, it does not avoid the matter of partisanship, and if the Barbados Labour Party were in office the same scenario would exist. I think that we therefore need to look at the legislation again, and perhaps some of those who suggested an amendment to the Constitution would be better serving their constituents if they themselves propose it. All this talk about amending the Constitution and so on, there are mechanisms I believe by which in the course of our parliamentary procedure, if you think that a particular piece of legislation needs amending or adjusting or changing, you can move the relevant Resolution. If Honourable Members feel that way they can move the relevant Resolution.

Now, Sir, as to the Report itself, I want to say that there is a particular aspect of it in relation to my constituency that concerns me. As a result of the recommendations of the Report, the constituency of St. John basically retains its character as a parish. In other words, all of the areas that were previously slotted out, some into St. Joseph, some into St. George North, some into St. George South, as I understand it, will return to the constituency of St. John and St. John will be essentially pure, except for one particular area^ and that is the area of Kendal.

I am really surprised, Sir, at the decision of the Boundaries Commission in relation to Kendal. I cannot think of any reason that would impel them to take 250 votes away from the JD1 box and split them up between St. Philip North and St. George South. I have looked at the effect that it has on the statistical balance in St. John and if the 250 votes were left there the constituency of St. John would still be within the parameters of the formula at 6 776 persons.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am not arguing here for votes, I am interested in people and the character of the St. John constituency. I am not carrying it at that level. I am not getting into that. It only adds 125 to St. Philip North and as it stands St. Philip North is fairly high up and very near to the top end of the formula, and it adds 125 to St. George South, whereas if those 125 were taken off the two of them, and if Kendal were left as a district in itself as it has always been, and left on to the constituency of St. John, it would not affect it. I do not even know on what basis - I cannot visualise other than on the map - but I cannot think what boundaries were used to carve out Kendal. I can remember how the Labour Party carved out Brereton. That was a masterful piece of gerrymandering where it went straight down a road off St. John, down a road and then opened up, took in Brereton, Ebenezer and those other areas, and then closed back the circle, and Brereton was divided into two. Brereton, Ebenezer and so on are like another constituency to me. It is as though I represent two places. There is St. John, which is St. John as a parish, and then there is the St. Philip part of St. John.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: No, not at all. In fact, I represent them in a different kind of way, because I am presently a resident of St. Philip North and therefore they see me not only as a representative but as a neighbour and as a person who is a friend and who is interested in their welfare.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: My neighbour? I have many neighbours. Oh, the Honourable Member for Christ Church East's good friend is my neighbour, the potential candidate for St. Philip North. I have asked him to take a careful look at the roads, at least as far as his house is concerned, because I do not ask for any road to my house, I do not mind driving on a cart track and I told my M.P. not to send any road down there for me, or at least not on my account.

The point is, however, that I cannot imagine why they would just hive off 250 votes from Kendal and put them on to the constituency of St. Philip North and St. George South. It simply does not make sense. It does not make sense in relation to what the Boundaries Commission has indicated is the basis of its decision, and it does not make general sense to me. I therefore will resist any attempt to move any part of St. John. I think it is a wise decision to retain the character of the parish as a constituency and that in that sense I support the recommendations of the Report. The idea of bringing the constituency to bear as closely as possible to the parishes, as has been done for the Honourable Member for St. Peter, who can now say he

truly represents St. Peter and not just St Peter and a piece of somewhere else, and so on, I am saying that is a wise decision.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am not saying the Commission did not say so, I am saying that is not the only basis on which the Commission should make a Report. That is the wise part of the decision, but then as wise as that part of the decision is, on taking Kendal off I see no wisdom at all. I am therefore suggesting that it be restored to the constituency of St. John. Therefore, Sir, my recommendations now in relation to the Electoral and Boundaries Commission and how it is set up are very clear. There is just one other thing I want to make comment on, and I hope you will permit me and give me the latitude, although I am probably asking for a lot.

The Electoral and Boundaries Commission has power under this Constitution to deal with questions of political broadcasting. This is my hobby horse. The Honourable Member for St. Michael West knows my strong views about it. The Report does not deal with that kind of thing, but I would think that the Electoral and Boundaries Commission in delivering this particular report should deal with many of the aspects of electoral and boundaries matters that are important, including the question of broadcasting.

My position is that the Electoral and Boundaries Commission does not have any business at all regulating any broadcast in this country, and in my view nobody has any right to regulate any political broadcast in Barbados.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Well, I do not know who else it is the view of, but I am saying to you that regulations have been passed, that I have read carefully, that in my view take away some of the fundamental rights and freedoms of Barbadians. The regulations define a political party I think as a party that fields more than ten candidates. That could cause problems for my Honourable friends over there at some time in the future. Getting more than ten candidates is not as easy as it appears, but the point is that any political entity that cannot field more than ten candidates does not have the right to political broadcasts as set out in the regulations.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: That is the only reason why they are fielding more than ten, that is true, but will have difficulty in future conforming with regulations.

The point is, Sir, that this is as far as I am concerned a free country. The Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation belongs to the people of Barbados and the Government, and we have a right to determine the policy of that Corporation in relation to political broadcasts, but we do not have the right to regulate political broadcasts on any private broadcast station, and in fact I believe that if that particular section of the powers of the Boundaries Commission were removed that the people of Barbados would more clearly understand the political alignments of some of the media houses in Barbados. 425p.m.

Now as it stands, they are required to bring you on television, so they are required to give the Democratic Labour Party a voice, and in doing that people might think they are being fair, but while they are giving you a voice - with a political broadcast, they come back and they are -' whipping you in the news and in all kinds of other things.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. a THOMPSON: Not CBC; I am talking about the private media houses. I therefore feel that there should be no regulation at all of political broadcasts; Government has the right to determine what appears on CBC television and radio and that is where the policy should be. But the Boundaries Commission should have no right to allocate any broadcast time, especially, Sir, as this legislation is so carefully worded as to exclude the right of any citizen or anybody else in this country questioning any decision of the Boundaries Commission. So not only can they allocate the broadcast time or restrict time, but you are not able to question their decisions in relation to that restriction, so they can take away your rights and at the same time be devoid of any responsibility for taking away those rights. Now that to me, Sir, is a very serious blemish in relation to the Barbados Constitution. It is almost as bad as the concept of non-textual amendment to the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act NOW these things were perpetrated by the Barbados Labour Party and I have an intellectual difficulty with them right down the road. I believe we have to look very seriously at it; that you give a Commission power to take away people's rights, and then deny people the, right to question their decision in relation to taking away those rights,

-> Sk, CBC, is a Government station and Government has the right to determine the policy of the station.

Asides. ;

Mr, D. J. H. THOMPSON: Sp what are you going to do, call a public meeting and ask people what to do about it. ^Government is the -voice of the people; you must " understand that. There are some Governments that were not »The voice of the people,;but this Government is the voice of the people and that is well known.

Now, Sir, my suggestions in relation to the entire concept of the Boundaries Commission which you have so graciously permitted me to speak about, are as follows. The first thing is that I believe that the formula should be removed from the legislation, and that in place of the formula the Constitution should stipulate the factors that the Boundaries Commission should take into account in arriving at a decision as to how constituencies should be aligned. It does not have to be a mathematical formula; it should be a formula that is based on sound social policy, on human considerations and on policy decisions that are taken by the persons who at the end of the day are accountable to the public. We have to set out those criteria for the Commission and ask it to stick to those criteria in making its decision, if not as I say, you could have a report with one very flimsy reason for establishing 50 constituencies in Barbados. You would have no power whatsoever to question the report odier than in here, and if it were questioned, at the end of the day it would come back into the hands of the politicians who in making a decision on it would be accused of gerrymandering or frustrating the aims of the Commission, because that is what we are being accused of by the Barbados Labour Party. We are being accused of knocking down their sand castle. They built this sand castle called the Electoral and Boundaries Commission; they did not put in the necessary safeguards so that the Commission's report itself either would not have the scrutiny of Parliament even though I do not agree with that, or alternatively that there would be some other mechanism if the report were rejected. There is no other mechanism. What other mechanisms? You send it back to the Boundaries Commission? There is no other mechanism. If the Minister lays his order, you will attack it and accuse him of gerrymandering. That is the whole point that I am making; that it does not remove that question of partisanship that you are up here touting in all of the speeches in relation to the Electoral and Boundaries Commission. It does not remove that, because if at the end of the day it resides within the power of the Minister to make the amendments, you will accuse him of gerrymandering, and that is what is in your mind, although I do not want to anticipate the position of the Barbados Labour Party because they are unpredictable on issues like this.

I believe that the formula should be removed and that the criteria should be set out. I secondly believe, Sir, that the criteria on which the Boundaries Commission should come to a decision should be set out in the legislation - topography, the other social factors, whatever factors we deem are relevant should be set out in the legislation, and the Commission should be required to address each of these factors. Thirdly, the provisions relating to the regulation of broadcasting should be obliterated from the legislation. Fourthly, the Boundaries Commission should be required to hold public hearings in which the persons who are affected by the decisions of the Commission may come and appear and say why they are dissatisfied, because the only way the

people of Kendal, St. John can have their voices heard on the manner in which they have been excluded from the constituency of St. John is through me, and if I were not diligent enough to raise this matter, their voice would never be heard. We have to bring the public into administrative decisions more in this country, and the Boundaries Commission should be required to hear from the public what their views are on the proposed amendments, not by sticking a list up in a school room and telling people well it is there, go and look at it. There should be public hearings which are advertised and go hand in hand with public education programmes on the functions of the Commission so that they can come and comment on the proposed changes.

I also believe, Sir, finally that the procedure after the rejection of the report, whether it is withdrawn or rejected, should be adjusted, and my own personal opinion is that it does not make sense for it to be thrown back in the hands of a Minister who as I say at the end of the day will receive the full weight of public criticism if he decides to align the constituencies in a manner that other persons feel would disenfranchise them or obliterate them from the political scene in this country. Therefore to avoid that, we should find some other mechanism to determine how the report should be amended or adjusted if it fails to get the approval of Parliament. I can suggest many; I could suggest an all-party Committee of Parliament. I am not the repository of all wisdom. I could suggest a Joint Committee of the Boundaries Commission and Members of Parliament. There must be some other, what one would call, an appeal mechanism rather than just put it back in the hands of the Minister, because what I understood the Barbados Labour Party to be saying when it moved this Resolution, and I have read the debate from top to bottom, was that they wanted to remove the partisanship and the possibility of gerrymandering. There is no greater exponent of the ideals of political democracy than the Honourable Member for Christ Church West when he is in his sanctimonious moods at times. He is the greatest proponent of it and yet the very legislation that he brings puts the Government in an unfortunate position where it has to move a report, possibly reject it and then the decision rests within the hands of a Minister who at the end of the day can make whatever adjustments are necessary.

I have read the legislation carefully. I was at the Committee meetings with you, so you can't laud it over me. You know what the weaknesses are of the legislation and that is why you should get up and say what they are. Instead of saying what you think the Boundaries Commission concerned themselves with, you should read the report and you would discover that it only concerned itself with one single fact, and that is minimal disruption of the present boundary alignments. That is what they said. There is no other reason given, and if the Boundaries Commission were open to review in the Courts, I believe that it would be possible for somebody to say that they did not take into

consideration factors that are necessary or relevant in relation to the alignment of boundaries.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, the Honourable Member must address the point. For the benefit of the Honourable Member, Sir, I began by saying and he knows that the Boundaries Commission's performance of its work will be open to judicial review. The trend has been, _* if you look at the cases, that they review how they do their work.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, this debate has already been gone through and the Honourable Member for Christ Church West knows that there is an ouster clause that is very clear. I cannot imagine how he could take the position that it can be questioned. Sir, section 4 IE is written very clearly. There is no court that could come to a contrary decision and still have any respectability when it comes to law. The legislation is clear

"The question whether

- (a) the Commission has validly performed any function vested in it by or under this Constitution; or
- (b) any Member of the Commission or any other person

It also protects functionaries, not just the members of the Commission; I believe it protects members of staff. It says:

"any member of the Commission or any other person or authority has validly performed any other function in relation to the work of the Commission, shall not be inquired into in any court."

I can read the English language. We have had this debate already, and he is telling me now the Court can enquire into it 4.35 p.m.

You could not bring any authority to me that could contradict what the Constitution said that the Courts cannot enquire into it. We have had this debate already. There is no basis that I can imagine in law on which a court could enquire into the decision of the Boundaries Commission after a clause like this.

The only exception to that is subsection 2:

"Nothing in this section shall be construed as preventing the election of a member of the House of Assembly from being called in question on the ground that the conduct of that election was inconsistent with the law provided for election of members of the House of Assembly."

That is the kind of thing that we are hearing now so what I am trying to say is that I believe that the Barbados Labour Party does not understand what it wrought when it made this legislation relating to the Electoral and Boundaries Commission, because every single reason advanced by the Honourable Member for Christ Church West has been defeated.

It has not only been defeated in relation to our argument, but it has been defeated in relation to what has transpired in here today and what will transpire in relation to this the very first Report of the Boundaries Commission and it is clear.

He can say that he agrees with the Report and I say that if that was the only reason in which I was considering -' boundary changes I would agree with the Report too. I cannot fault the Report on the basis of the reason it gave. It gave one reason, minimal disruption, and if the aim is to maintain the status quo but increase the number of seats within the status quo that, to me, is not a valid reason for any adjustment in relation to the constituency boundaries and that is my position.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I do not want to get into that argument, Sir. I will advance those positions outside of here.

Sir, those are the major concerns. I have addressed my concerns and I have sought as much as possible to give the alternatives and I want that to be known, Sir, that I have put on record the alternatives because too often you will hear that people have been critical and have not either put T forward alternatives or have been unjustly critical. I have put forward the alternatives that I think are relevant and I hope that we will have a full opportunity to make whatever adjustments are necessary in relation to this legislation and in relation to this Report in due course.

Thank you, Sir.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that further consideration of this matter be postponed.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that.

The question that further consideration of the Resolution be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and further consideration of the Resolution was postponed by Mr. SPEAKER.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of ^that was to facilitate a statement which the Prime Minister proposes to make and I would like the Order to be called.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand the Leader of the House is seeking permission to revert to the Order of Business - Statements By Ministers. If there is no objection then that is granted.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDDFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Government of Barbados welcomes the announcement that Mr. Nelson Mandela will soon be released from prison after some 27 years of incarceration and that other political prisoners will also be released. We also welcome the news that the ban on certain anti-apartheid organisations will be lifted and that some of the restrictions on the media will be removed.

These are steps and indications in the right direction. However, the pity of it is that these moves should have been taken long ago.

The anti-apartheid movement in South Africa and its supporters around the world can take satisfaction from the fact that their relentless struggle over the years seems now not to have been in vain.

The struggle must now move to the next stage: That is for the negotiation of a South Africa based on peace, freedom, democracy and the inalienable right of human beings for all of the people of South Africa - a country in which majority rule prevails and the rights of the minority are protected and respected.

Barbados will not be satisfied until the final goal of the destruction of apartheid has been achieved, and we witness the establishment of a free and democratic South Africa.

The pending release of Nelson Mandela is significant. As I said in 1988 on the anniversary marking his 70th birthday "his long incarceration is a human tragedy which underlines the harshness and inhumanity of the Pretoria regime but it is not an empty tragedy.

Mandela has by his selflessness and dignified suffering transformed his tragic event into an abiding dilemma for the South African Government, by becoming a universal symbol of freedom. Mandela now lives not for himself but for others. His imprisonment is the imprisonment of the South African people both black and white. His unconditional release from prison would sound the death knell for apartheid."

Once again we welcome the news of Mr. Mandela's imminent release from imprisonment and commend his strength and courage with the hope that he will soon resume his rightful position in the vanguard of the anti-apartheid movement. Barbados pledges its fullest support of and assistance to that struggle.

Applause. RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT

BUSINESS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I move that Government Business be now resumed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2.

ORDER NO. 2 RESUMED: RESOLUTION RE
ELECTORAL AND BOUNDARIES COMMISSION
(REVIEW OF BOUNDARIES) ORDER,
1990

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. James North,

Mr. J. J. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add a few remarks to the debate on this Resolution because it is my view that as we continue to develop as a nation, we have to recognize that Barbados is still young in its experience in electoral matters.

Most of our laws come from the British code and it can probably be said that the British code of electoral laws is still probably far from perfect and those countries which adopt an electoral system based on the British law will find that it will be necessary from time to time to make adjustments to those laws and regulations to suit the local situation.

I believe that one of the steps which we here in Barbados have made in recent time which must be complimented is the establishment of an Electoral and Boundaries Commission. It is my view that when we moved in that direction in setting up an independent body, the Electoral and Boundaries Commission to look after electoral matters of this country, that we were making a forward step. 4.45 p.m.

I believe it is a step that most progressive and developing countries seek to follow as they advance their electoral laws and seek to improve on their electoral system and to develop their various countries.

The General Election of 1986 was the first election which was held since the setting up of this independent body, this Electoral and Boundaries Commission. Today we are looking at the first Report of that Commission which was appointed on April 1, 1985. When we look at the Report of the Commission, Mr. Speaker, we must come to the conclusion that the Commission was faced with a difficult task. It had to consider many factors. There was a variety of interests which had to be considered and I believe that on the whole no one can say that the Commission has done less than a good job in putting out the Report that they have placed before us today.

We may not agree with some aspects of the Report, but I believe that this is because of the present system of electoral laws which we have. The Commission in my view was restricted by the state of the law on electoral matters. I believe that this brings us to a point where we will have to continue to look at areas of improvement of our legal system, make adjustments where necessary to ensure that we have an electoral system which suits the purposes of the A. people of Barbados and which even though it may not be -' perfect reaches the standard which can make our people in this country happy.

If I take a brief look at some of the aspects of the Report, the first matter which I would seek to deal with is the recommendations which are set out on page 11 of the Report. On page 11 there is a recommendation that the number of constituencies be increased. In fact if I read paragraph 23 it says that:

...CN,

"Pursuant to the provisions section 41 (D) 1 (a) of the Constitution, the Commission recommends that the Island should be divided into 28 constituencies specified in paragraph 24 hereunder. The boundaries of those constituencies are shown in Appendix C."

This is one aspect of the Report I believe that the Members who have already spoken have indicated some difficulty in supporting. I have some difficulty in C" supporting this proposition of an increase in the number of „, seats. It is because, Mr. Speaker, when we look at Barbados as a whole we recognize that the total population of the Island has not undergone any substantial increases over the last 15,20 years.

There have been some shifts from one area of the island to another. But the population has remained constant. I believe that when we consider that factor we may see some difficulty in increasing the number of representatives— since the number of the population has not increased. In~/\ fact I believe that generally speaking, it can be said that the " number of the voting population also has not undergone any substantial increases.

Now there is a principle that each constituency should be represented by an equal number of electors. I believe it is this factor which the Electoral and Boundaries Commission took very seriously in mind. It seems to me that its recommendation was a necessary alternative to seeking to^ comply with the constitutional provision that constituencies * should, as far as possible, be equal in number. Previous speakers have already quoted that part of the Constitution which provides for 10% above the national average. I believe that it was in seeking to comply with that provision of the Constitution that the Electoral and Boundaries Commission made this recommendation.

←←

One alternative to an increase, it seems to me, woul{< have been to make some substantial changes to the

constituency boundaries. This would have created chaos. This would in my view have been a situation which most of us would not have liked to see particularly at this stage. Though there may be arguments for and arguments against an increase, I believe that it is one which we have to take in proper stride. The situation really is, as far as I am concerned, that when we are making a decision as important as this particular decision to increase the number of seats, it is a matter on which the electorate should have some say.

I believe that there should have been some consultation with the electorate on this particular point because these are the people who have to be represented and I believe that we should know how they feel on this particular point. As a matter of fact I would go as far as to say that it is my personal view that if consulted there is quite a number of persons who may be of the view that the present number of 27 is adequate for present purposes.

For that reason, I believe that we must therefore seek to look at the formula again as set out in the Constitution. I would be prepared to support a change in that formula as set out in the Constitution to ensure that the electoral boundaries are not changed on a periodical basis because this, in my view, is one of the areas that can affect the confidence of the voting public. I believe that those people who vote in this country must have confidence in the system.

And if people are called upon to vote in one constituency at one election period and in the next election period, they are called upon to vote in a different constituency, they begin to have some doubt in the confidence of the system. Therefore, I believe, that for the purpose of some uniformity, we should seek to have a system where people who live in these various constituencies have some certainty that there would be continuity as far as their particular polling districts are concerned.

But what is also very important, Mr. Speaker, is that, as was outlined by one of the previous speakers, the interest to be represented in varying constituencies differ. This is another factor that has to be taken very seriously. There are some constituencies where the voting strengths are very great, for example, in Christ Church. But that does not necessarily mean that the responsibilities of a particular Member of Parliament will be greater than those of a Member who has a lesser number to represent in the House of Assembly. The point I want to make most forcibly in this regard is that we therefore have to seek to improve our laws to ensure that they reflect the feelings of the people of the country. They must be laws that when applied, when the Electoral and Boundaries Commission have applied them, they can do so without creating any discomfort among people in the country.

But I want also to make the point that no matter what system of laws we have, I think the satisfaction of the system will depend ultimately on the men and women who have to operate that system. In the past we have been able to show confidence in those persons who have operated our electoral system. I believe that no one will disagree with the fact that over the past years, those persons who are responsible for conducting elections in this country have shown a serious application to their job and can only be described as persons with integrity and fairness.

I believe that this is something which we have to ensure remains among us as we develop our electoral system. I believe that the people who are involved in the process are perhaps just as important as the laws which they have to administer. If we do not follow that particular principle then we may have some difficulty as we go down the road on these particular matters. 4.55 p.m.

So those are the points basically which I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, in relation to the report. I believe that this particular recommendation of the increase of seats from 27 to 28 is the only aspect of the report which has been of great concern. The Electoral and Boundaries Commission has made recommendations in other areas. For example, they have changed some of the constituency boundaries. But I believe that Honourable Members will not be able to agree among themselves to any particular demarcation of boundaries. I believe that matter is best left to some extent in the hands of the Commission. We have not seen any substantial changes to the extent where districts are being transposed where for example voting communities have been dislodged. I believe this is an aspect of the report which should create some comfort in our minds.

If we look back on our experiences in elections, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to comment very briefly on another aspect of the matter which is covered by the report. Our experiences have taught us that in an election the actual process of polling is just as important as what takes place prior to the polling process and I come to the point of registration. I believe that a perfect electoral register is very important if we are to have free, fair, and just elections. I believe that this whole question of compiling of the electoral register is a matter which we have to scrutinize even more carefully as we move ahead.

We have a situation in Barbados where communities undergo various shifts. People have been moving into different districts of the island and a very serious effort must be made to ensure that those people are removed from the list in those old districts and placed on the list in the new areas. There are situations where people are deceased. We have to ensure that their names are removed from the list. We have situations where people leave the island and for various other reasons move from one part of the island to another and this can have a very serious impact on the

compilation of an electoral register. Without a proper electoral register, the problem of personation can become prevalent I believe this is a matter which the Electoral and Boundaries Commission may have to focus some of its attention over the next few months.

One of the final points I want to make though, Mr. Speaker, in relation to the report has to do now with the polling districts. We will see that under the present system it is very difficult within the constituencies themselves to have polling districts of equal numerical numbers. We find that in some polling districts the electors are numbered as many as 1400.1 recognized that in Christ Church. In some polling districts the numbers were as many as 2000 and in other districts the polling numbers were as little as 100 and perhaps less. Now this is also a matter which is of concern to many people on election day. There are some people who are of the view that even though transportation is provided for persons who have to vote that the considerable distance which many people have to travel, especially in country polling areas, is a matter which should attract the attention of the Commission. I believe that it should be attended to very early because a problem always arises when we have to move people from one polling district to another. People who have voted traditionally at one polling station and they have to vote at a different polling station always find some difficulty in understanding why they have to move from one polling station to another. This is a matter which I believe should be communicated to people very early. I feel this whole point of informing people four or five days before an election about their eligibility to vote and their name being on the register is a matter which must be reviewed. People must be informed much earlier than the week of election that they are on the list and the station at which they will be eligible to vote. This is a matter no doubt which will attract the attention of the Commission and, as we proceed, I have no doubt that they will deal with this particular matter.

Mr. Speaker, in making my contribution to this particular Resolution, I just want to make the point again most forcefully that we have to continue to update the laws. I think it may become necessary for us to change the formula as set out in the Constitution to ensure that the electoral laws effecting our elections are updated from time to time. I believe if we continue to do that and we ensure that we have the kind of people in place who will ensure that the laws are recognised I believe we will be on the road to having the kind of system which Barbados deserves. Those are my views, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to begin by congratulating the Member for Christ Church West on a very cogently argued case. Indeed, Sir, in my parliamentary experience I have seldom heard a case put with greater logic and more to the point than was put during the course of this debate which on the face of it could be a controversial debate.

I serve notice, Sir, that I intend to support the Resolution. There are aspects of the changes that are proposed in St Peter with which I am not absolutely happy, however. Indeed, Sir, as a politician no one likes to lose any part of the constituency that has traditionally been an area that has given one's party strong support. In a sense, Sir, I begin by making that observation because a lot of the controversy surrounding the changes in electoral boundaries ^ have to do with the fact that some of what we dress up as - principle has simply to do with the fact that people look at ' the proposed changes and evaluate the changes in relation to past voting trends. We find all kinds of arguments to rationalize a change which might be based on good logic but which given past voting trends might have an adverse impact on one's particular political fortunes. In a sense, Sir, a lot of this debate is about that History has proven that attempts at gerrymandering very often, Sir, do not have the kind of impact that the gerrymandered would want them to have. Indeed, Sir, the Member for St. Michael South - *• Central defeated his own argument as far as I am concerned. His argument served merely to establish that despite what he regarded as attempts at gerrymandering it was the will of the people which prevailed. In a sense, Mr. Speaker, one of the contributions that I want to make to this debate is that I will run in St. Peter no matter how the boundaries in St. Peter are cut. I would prefer the boundaries to be cut in a particular way. But I am serving notice that I will- run in St. Peter no matter how the ^ boundaries are cut because I have confidence in the will and ~* judgment of the people, Sir. I have confidence, Sir, that the people of Barbados can recognize the wickedness of gerrymandering in circumstances where gerrymandering is used to try to promote the interest of one party in an unreasonable way over the interest of another party. Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is also a sense in which Barbados is becoming one constituency. People in all districts in Barbados, Sir, are becoming subject to the same kind of shaping influences. Lots of issues we are creating about^ where a community ends and where a community begins ... ^ As a matter of fact, what should be of importance is how boundaries are breaking down as this society becomes more cohesive. 5.05 p.m.

Indeed, Sir, there are very few pockets remaining in Barbados where historical voting patterns of long ago continue to hold. If you were to check the Caribbean you will find that there is a tendency in the Caribbean to very lopsided electoral results. It has been so in Jamaica since 1976, it has been the same thing in Guyana for different reasons, the same thing in Trinidad and now it is the same thing in Barbados. There has been a tendency in the past to be able to earmark that certain districts are supposed to be this person's stronghold and that person's stronghold and all those things are breaking down as people become" ^ subject to the same kind of socialisation, and that is basic point I am trying to make up front.

We still have those pockets in Barbados, Mr. Speaker, where you have communities that are isolated communities where people are neither coming in nor going out, but those are the exceptions today in Barbados. What we have now is a very dynamic situation where some communities are expanding, some are contracting, some parishes are expanding, others are contracting and therefore anybody who wants to pick up past electoral returns and forecast 'future elections, and believe that you can gerrymander on the basis of past elections, is indulging in an exercise that is more futile than economic forecasting in itself.

Having said that, Sir, a number of considerations have been raised in this debate regarding the possible use of additional factors that ought to be taken into account in determining boundary changes. I have heard, for example, the very distressing case put that income distribution should be a consideration that should be brought in the matter. It is distressing, Sir, because the Member for St. John and the Member for St. Michael South Central made the case that in constituencies where there is a preponderance of low income voters, the task of representation is more onerous than those where there is not that preponderance. I believe that people who have that view start with a warped concept as to what representation is about and they may even have a paternalistic concept that the role of the modern Barbadian Member of Parliament is merely to indulge in a kind of welfare function in relation to poor black people, where the Member of Parliament is the provider of jobs and the provider of street lights and so on.

The role of the representative in Barbados, Sir, goes beyond that paternalistic function. I feel I am representing the people of St. Peter not only by providing jobs and street lights, but by making my voice heard in this Parliament on issues. There are also parts of my constituency where there are now clusters of middle income people and the task of - representing them may be different from that of representing a low income person, but it is no less onerous. I therefore feel that once we begin to introduce concepts such as income distribution as a concept that can be used in determining if one constituency should be twice as big as the other, we are going backward, first of all, and we are also using a concept as to what a parliamentary representative should be doing that I think is backward, unrealistic and bears no reality to what we ourselves know that we have to do. Indeed, Sir, I really must put the case that in my constituency for sure I have to spend sometimes more time relating to the middle class sections, although

- they are small in St. Peter, than I have with the low income people, because they have themselves through struggle worked out in many respects ways of helping to represent themselves.

I do not accept any suggestion that the electoral boundaries of Barbados should be shaped with reference to

- matters such as income distribution. In fact, Sir, the value
- * of the average is that in a sense it is so neutral that it takes

us out of having to adjudicate on the determination of what other factors should be called into operation, given that those other factors may be subjective.

Indeed, if I were to make a contribution to this debate, Sir, the only other types of factors I think the Electoral and Boundaries Commission could feasibly take into account in an objective way are factors which would bear not on the size of the electorate in a constituency at a given time, but factors which could influence the size of that constituency at some future date of a predictable nature. Things such as what is contained in the Physical Development Plan. If an area is demarcated as an agricultural area for the purposes of the Physical Development Plan, then one would recognise that for the purposes of electoral and boundaries management the population growth in that type of area earmarked as an agricultural area is less likely to expand than if the area was one earmarked for residential development. It is quite obvious that if you are going to talk about factors that free us from controversy, that only factors such as what are contained in the Physical Development Plan and what Town Planning has approved, for example, by way of permissions for residential development in specific constituencies, the measurement of the likely impact, the future impact, of those types of objective factors on the demographic patterns in a constituency are the types of factors which feasibly and possibly can be brought into consideration. I categorically reject the notion of using the subjective criterion such as income distribution.

I am not hard and fast on the next point I might want to make, but it would seem to me that it might be useful from a practical point of view for us to limit how often we might want to change boundaries in Barbados. I am just throwing it out, Sir, but the pragmatic situation that confronts us with a very constant boundary change - and I speak to these facts selflessly now as a politician - is that you can very often find yourself entering Parliament representing a particular constituency, and because of a frequent process of boundary changes you might well have to face an electorate having to put a new case to a new set of people.

I wonder, Sir, if it might not be more pragmatic for us to set up a system whereby we tell the people of Barbados that perhaps we will review boundaries every 10 or 15 years and have a system by which we have a full fledged hearing - obviously we are too close to elections now to have it in this particular case - but in the future let us agree that we have a review of this system every ten years, or whatever, if constituencies tend to grow. Some will contract in the interim. I do not mind representing St. Peter now, although St. Peter is 2 500 votes bigger than the City. I think I am doing a better job than the Member for the City, nonetheless. All I am really saying is that we could set that system, tell the people of Barbados that every ten years or so we will look at the system, see if constituencies have grown or contracted such as would require amendments to

the boundaries, invite the public to contribute to the process of evaluating whether boundaries should be adjusted or not.

Let us look at the hiatus that will arise if we follow the existing system too strictly. What it can mean now is that if every time a constituency goes over the 10% or the 5% or the 15%, however you choose it, then we are going back into that hiatus where the boundaries will have to be cut. I do not feel it is fair to ourselves to put us through that treadmill of representing a constituency and doing it well, certainly in the case of the three members in the Barbados Labour Party, and then have to be subjected to mis random change in the boundaries, in the context of a situation, Sir, where all constituencies in Barbados, as far as I am concerned, are small. 5.15p.m.

That, Sir, is the point to which I want to come; that in a sense all constituencies in Barbados are small. There are people who have no more ability than ourselves who represent constituencies of millions. There are people in the Caribbean who I know who have no more ability than people in this House who represent constituencies of tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands and more, and all we would have to do is to make sure that Members of this House present and Members in the future are given the type of facilities, the type of support that would allow the fullness of representation to be felt.

So, Mr. Speaker, as regards the proposed change in St. Peter, I am going to lose part of a district that in the context of 1986 politics gave me over 80 per cent of the votes, in fact, 89 per cent of the votes. There are very few Members on that side who can speak in terms of districts in which they get 89 per cent of the votes.

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: That is going to be cut in half. Of course, the Lord gave and the Lord took away. The redrafting of the boundaries to reflect the St. Peter parish, boundaries has also made it possible, Sir, for a part of Boscobelle which I have always been anxious to represent to be brought back into St. Peter. The redrafting of the boundaries, Sir, also means that there is a very small portion of St. Peter which will not vote in St. Peter, no more than 40 people. There is a part of Six Mens that will not vote in St. Lucy because of the way in which the boundaries will be cut, and the only part of the boundary changes really that cannot be now said to represent the parish boundaries of St. Peter was the removal of Road View from St. Peter, and I think that what prompted the Electoral and Boundaries Commission in that particular case is that, because St. Peter is bigger than the average, they had to find some part of St. Peter to send somewhere else.

Of course, Sir, my heart grieves that the people of Road View who have never voted for me in their majority

but with whom I have been developing a closer relationship will not now be in the position to continue to enjoy the quality representation to which they have become accustomed. But in general, Sir, I do feel, and I confess that I do not know every Constituency in Barbados as well as I know mine, that the Electoral and Boundaries Commission tried within the context of the situation in which their task was meant to be executed to do as objective - a job as the ^ circumstances would allow. --

We are hearing Members confess, Sir, that in their particular case the parish boundaries seem to have been the deciding factor. The Honourable Member for St. John said so, but yet he would vote against this because of 250 votes in relation to Kendal, although in his case it was abundantly clear that the people constituting the Electoral and Boundaries Commission were trying to make sure that in future and in 1990 when people vote that the people in St. John would be voting as a parish. ***

Now I am sure that the Member for St. John was being a bit mischievous, in fact not mischievous, he was not speaking with the kind of openness that he should be speaking with, because he failed to recognise that in his case there was an objective consideration that guided the Electoral and Boundaries Commission in determining....

Asides. -

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: He castigated the Electoral and Boundaries Commission on being guided purely, he said, by one factor, the average, when in his case what was absolutely operative

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I did not castigate the Boundaries Commission. I castigated the Barbados Labour Party for passing legislation like that. That is the point. ^

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, he castigated the Barbados Labour Party for passing legislation like that, but the flexibility of the legislation, I was saying, permitted an Electoral and Boundaries Commission to redraft boundaries for St. John reflecting the principles which he himself will agree with, that the people of St. John should vote in St. John and that all that he will quarrel about today, Sir, is the difference of 250 votes.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of ^ order, I also went on to say that the basis of their decision ~ was not, according to the report, to place constituencies within the context of boundaries as determined by the Parish Boundaries Act. That was never stated at any point in this report and I read it sentence for sentence. They gave one reason: minimum disruption of existing constituencies.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable ^ Member is very young, very inexperienced and very naive."

He must know, Sir, that this is an official report and that everyone knows that every little element of discretion exercised will not be reflected in an official report. I do not think the Honourable Member could in all judgment expect in an official report for there to be a clause saying that whereas the average may have been used as the basic bench mark in determining all constituencies, that in relation to St. John or in relation to St. Lucy where it applies, or in ^- relation to St. Peter, we took account of parish boundaries. This is the nature of officialese. If the Honourable Member expects that there was not a lot of earnest discussion, a lot of flexibility of mind exercised, a lot of discretion taken • into account in trying to come up with a workable set of constituency boundaries, then I think the Honourable Member has a very sad view of how institutions function.

It was a bit unfair, Sir. Even if that is what they said, the Honourable Member must know that the relationship ~ between men who are on speaking terms is such that even if they say they only took one factor into account, in the process of discussion a lot of other things would have been taken into account as well. I found he was tiresome in being unreasonably critical of the report. I thought he was also ridiculous, Sir, in some of the factors which he thought could take the place of the sounder judgments that resided in the minds of the members of the Electoral and Boundaries Commission.

~ Mr. Speaker, this report will not make everybody in this House happy. It does not make me entirely happy where parts of my constituency are concerned, Sir. But I believe that this report is worthy of the House. I can see in it no attempt at malice, first of all; I can see no attempt in this report of a Commission anxious to favour one party in relation to another party; it is not evident to me. I believe we will all go into an election having to depend upon the will of the people. Those who feel that past trends will .. provide them with a future seat in this House will be " perhaps as disappointed as persons who in the past were - guided by that kind of consideration, and in that spirit, Sir, I commend this report to the House and trust that a majority of Members will find it in their hearts to support it
5.25 p.m.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I wish just to make a short contribution...

Mr. SPEAKER: You know we have been going v reasonably well today. Let us keep it like that.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS:...on this debate. The Honourable Member for St. Peter and I have discussed this matter at length and I do not want to rehash any of the arguments which he has made.

I wish to begin, however, by complimenting the ^ Commission on their Report. I do not believe that there has x" ever been any report of an inquisitorial nature which in its

final recommendations has always pleased everybody and this is the first attempt that this new body, 1981 creation, has had to let the public see the fruits of its labour. I think we must remember that both...

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I had better say that the two great political parties in this country.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: They go on trying to be great but they are only a year old. They have a long way to go.

Mr. R. P. BYER: On a point of order. It is one year and one day.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: One year and one day.

In the composition of the Commission the two great parties of State were represented and my people whose integrity has never been questioned in this House or outside and, particularly so in relation to the particular job they were doing of trying to refashion the boundaries if it were necessary to do so.

In reality, I am satisfied that the political parties would have had the opportunity over time to have their views represented to their appointees on the Commission and I am being very practical. No one could tell me that the persons who were nominated by the Democratic Labour Party from time to time did not consult with the leadership of the Democratic Labour Party as to what was being proposed and how to do certain things so I believe...

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: And as they say, vice versa. I believe that the parties...

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Am I correct in understanding the Honourable Member for St. Thomas to say that the three Members of the Commission, that is, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Hewitt and Mr. Serrao were in consultation with the Barbados Labour Party on this Report?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: And with the Democratic Labour Party because they all sat together in a consultative assembly on a weekly basis^ the three and the two.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

What I am endeavouring to find out from the Honourable Member, based on what he has said, is if the three members who were nominated by the Barbados Labour Party were in consultation with the Leader of the Barbados Labour Party and Honourable Members in here on the contents of the Report and on the position which they took on this Report.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I can answer him categorically "No" on that. Sir.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: On a point of order. In which case then, Mr. Speaker, I think it can be said categorically that the members who were appointed by the Democratic Labour Party were similarly not in consultation with the Members of the Commission.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, we must not get into stances of pretence because long time ago, it must be 18 months, I heard how they were going to cut this constituency and the next constituency in here and I will confess...

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I heard that they were going to cut and I asked if it were so and I was told "No." All kinds of proposals come up and you look at things and you rely on the Chief Electoral Office to guide you and I never got back into it

In fact, about two or three weeks ago I had to say in this House that I did not have a copy of this Report before the Prime Minister sent it, one of the few documents of consequence that I do not get before they are officially handed, and the reason is that I had made no great effort to involve myself in what was going to come out because I was satisfied that the Commission had been batting around this thing for so many years that ultimately, what would come out would be something that was reasonable, not necessarily perfect

I think that the two political parties have had the opportunity through their representatives to have various considerations taken into account and representations made over the years. I do not know what is the position now that there is a third party but...

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: That is a matter for them. They are now the official Opposition and when the Commission changes they will get their representation for the few months remaining before the elections.

Sir, what concerns me is that the Resolution before the House today is for the approval of this Report and at the

moment I am at a loss to know what is Government's position in regard to the Report.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: We are having a free vote, apparently a vote as to conscience. I did not know that was said, Sir.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: If this Report is not accepted, the procedure, as I understand it, is that it goes back to the Prime Minister as Minister responsible who will then have to bring his own realignment of boundaries within two months. The law provides for it at the moment and we cannot quarrel with the law but that is where Mr. King is going to have...

Mr. SPEAKER: I can hardly hear the Honourable Member when the others are speaking.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I said a Mr. King. I did not say who.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was just asking members to keep quiet.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: What I am saying, Sir, is that if this is rejected...

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I hear "when". When it is rejected, although I hope that all Honourable Members are noting carefully that they have not, thus far, been any strident criticisms of this Report such as would merit its rejection, so that I am left to believe that those who vote against it without expressing their reasons are doing so for ulterior motives. I did not say "dishonourable", I said "ulterior" and that there may be a large area of arbitrariness in the decisions of certain members to vote. That is where I have a fear. 5.35 p.m.

Some that will be in here today will not speak but will vote no because of the constitution of the two sides of the House. It will go back to the Prime Minister and there is a committee headed by King.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: King. One King, not queen-- which is working now to so prepare alternative proposals of a gerrymandered kind.....

Hon. E.E. GREAVES: Now, Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS:.... that will come up in here in two months and receive the approbation of that side.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Honourable Member knows that he cannot make that.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: To say that there is a committee.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: We are discussing this matter now and he is making the accusation that already there is a committee which is established to gerrymander. In short, he is accusing the Government of bad faith. I do not think that this is permissible.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: They have had a committee advising them for so long that the King committee is now fine tuning. As I say, Sir, I am very distressed that....

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Can the Honourable Member inform me who is this Mr. King? Inform this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: No. He would run counter to my rulings.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Therefore, Mr. Speaker, he should not be mentioning a Mr. King in here.

Mr. SPEAKER: He could mention anything.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I do not know his Christian name, Sir. There are several Kings, Sir. There was King James, there is James Cliviston King, there is J. C. King....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. Mr.

D. A. C. SIMMONS:.... all kinds of Kings.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member now says that he cannot remember the gentleman's first name that he is referring. You recall, Sir, that not so long ago when the Honourable Member for St Michael North had a lapse of memory that that Honourable Member behaved in the most unusual fashion. Now today, Sir, he has a complete block, amnesia has infused his mind. Sir.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, let us get that in the Record clearly. Sir. When I accused the Deputy Prime Minister of amnesia a few weeks ago, it was that he did not remember...

Mr. SPEAKER: If you press me and ask to have it withdrawn I might.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, no. I am not reflecting on any vote, Sir. The Honourable Deputy Prime Minister could not remember all of the names of the members of this very Electoral and Boundaries Commission, as he then claimed, Sir.

I certainly have not called a Christian name. I do not want to call the wrong King, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already given my ruling on the matter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Any one of those Kings, Sir. It may be one of them. I am very serious about this, Sir.

I think that if members are going to vote against this Report which has been done by, as I say, nominees of the two Parties and with the assistance of the Chief Electoral Officer over a number of years then the House at least should be accorded the courtesy of knowing what are the specific criticisms that Honourable Members have of it

The Honourable Member for St. John has made a point that a district within his own constituency is cut three ways. Some of the people would have to vote, according to this, in St John, some in St. George North and some in St Philip or St. George South. Clearly that is an anomalous situation and if he desires a change in the boundary, a similar situation I believe, similar not the same, is affecting the Honourable Member for St. George South. If we know what those are, fair enough.

But I commend those Honourable Members who say what are the difficulties that they have with the particular recommendations which will disentitle them from voting in favour of the Resolution. But for those who keep silent, do not let us know what are their problems and then 2 months later come in here with something prepared by the Minister, I wish to say that at that stage - even though I can see that the Commission cannot be taken to court, unless it were possible to show some *vires* in the sense of a wrong assumption in jurisdiction or fail to see jurisdiction or something like that, only in those kinds of circumstances. But even that, as I say, may be *juris*. So I am arguing the legal point.

As distinct from the Commission, I want it clearly understood the Ministerial Order that comes in here in another 2 months

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS:.... or less can be questioned and challenged in a court of law under the Administrative Justice Act. So when you are coming, come good. So I just let Honourable Members know. And the grounds upon which the Ministerial Order can be attacked under the Administrative Justice Act are wide, as the Minister of

Housing ought to be aware in relation to the Cattlewash thing, I am not dealing with that. I only issue a word of warning.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Those can be attacked. In fact that Act in Section 13 says you must give reasons if you are asked, and those reasons can be attacked.

Now, Sir, I think that the coming of this Report to the House has shown up certain weaknesses procedurally. But we know that that is the problem with new legislation and the operation of new legislation. From time to time you see lacunae and weaknesses and you have to tidy them up.

For the sake of argument, let us assume that this Report was acceptable to every Member of this House, except the Honourable Member for St. John because of the specific problems he identified, the present procedure is so cumbersome that the whole thing would have to be rejected, go back and then the Minister come with an Order making an adjustment to those boundaries. I say it is cumbersome.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I do not know about that I am following the Constitution, Section 41 whatever, (e) or (d) or something. That is the problem I find; And therefore I am only throwing it out to Honourable Members that perhaps some time in the future - the Honourable Member for St. John wants ideas and wants to know what we should do, he cannot hear anybody say what should be done. 5.45p.m.

I do not know. I am throwing out an idea that in the future a Government might consider an amendment which would allow the Commission to produce this report as an interim report subject to public comment Let it be in the public domain and the political parties involve themselves and have representations. You expand the democracy of the thing. After two or three months or whatever then they present a final report. They would have had the opportunity in a kind of public inquiry to sample the views of a set of people and then come back up to the House.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The Honourable Member for Christ Church West is saying that might have been a procedure that was available to them now. It is nowhere written into the law and, therefore, they might not feel that they were entitled to do it. They know how bureaucracy operates in Barbados. For them to do that, they would want to send it up to the Attorney General's Office for an opinion and all kinds of things. But I am saying that perhaps we put it in the law or the Minister does it by Order in the future, or the Commission itself asks for powers to do that. I think

perhaps before the final report comes it should be subjected to public scrutiny and comment so that it can really be approved as the Act says. The Act uses the language approved.

The Honourable Member for St. John castigated the Barbados Labour Party for passing legislation and I quote, Sir: "Like the Electoral and Boundaries Act-which was--incorporated in the Constitution". I found it hard for him to have done that and to have come in here this afternoon and repeat, in fact, clarify that what he was doing was not castigating the Commission but castigating the Barbados Labour Party's passing the legislation. That same Honourable Member for St. John some months ago sat on a Select Committee with us in which we looked at the Boundaries Commission's powers *vis-a-vis* the Governor General in relation to the Representation of the People Act and he never made one suggestion for improving the Constitution. " ^

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. Just to refresh the Honourable Member's mind. The point which the Honourable Member for St. John made today about broadcasting is the main point he made on that Committee and he has been consistent

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I know about that Yes.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I do not think that it is fair to say--that he did not make one comment because it is perceived by him that is an improvement.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Okay. All right. Let us have it in the record because I do not want to be unfair to any Honourable Member. The Honourable Member for St John did, in fact, make some useful contributions in respect to the powers in relation to broadcasting. What I am criticizing is his criticism of the Labour Party for introducing the legislation as we have it I am saying that he had an opportunity to express his criticisms, not that they could" necessarily have been reflected by way of legislative amendment, but he could have expressed his criticism there and he did not. I am not going to pursue it, Sir, because I think that it is unfair to the Barbados Labour Party to be criticized for introducing legislation whose aim would be to take the changes in the demarcation of the electoral boundaries out of political partisanship and try and put it into a more independent body as is done in so many Commonwealth countries. I think that the notion and the principle was laudable and really I do not think the Members of the House generally can be excessively critical of what has come out, Sir.

Now there have been all kinds of submissions made today about representation and increase of seats and so on. Sir, this was \i

Aside. A.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Did you speak on it? I do not know if you did. I was handed this report today on the Registration Office and Supreme Court for 1988. One of the things that we have to bear in mind appears on Page IS of this report. I have underlined from 1985 to 1988. You will see, Sir, that the population of Barbados has not changed a great deal. The figures are as follows:

1985 - 253,055

1986 - 253,491

1987 - 253,881

1988 - 253,848

What this is suggesting, Sir, when you look at the next two columns of Births and Deaths, is that in 1985 4,281, were born and 2,127 died, in 1986 another 4,000 were born and 2,160 died, in 1987 3,828 were born and 2,191 died, in 1988 3,745 were born and 2,233 died. The number of deaths per year was about 2200 and the number of persons born was about 4,000 average for the four years. The natural increase is therefore, Sir, about 1800 a year. At Table 14 on Page 24 the majority of persons as I think is to be expected died between ages 65 to 69. In 1988, for example, there were 108. They ranged from 1970 to 1974 - 167, 1975 to 1979 - 180, 1980 to 1984 - 176. Sorry, those are males that I am calling. In 1985 and over there were 145. The females tend to be a little higher when they reach 85 and over. More of them die than males because they live longer.

There are all kinds of information and conclusions that can be drawn from this statistical evidence. Clearly it shows that our population is not burgeoning, mushrooming, and spreading at any great pace. There is a steady increase in the population of about 1800 a year perhaps spread nationally throughout the country. That bit of information has not been worked out but I suppose that can easily be done. I mean 1800 in a population of 253,000 which has remained virtually constant is nothing to worry about. For electoral purposes their concern could not be with any increase in population because it just is not there. They could not tell me that they would readjust boundaries because there is an increase in population. Nonsense. There is a shift in residence. You have some areas of Barbados which are more attractive for residential purposes.

*V

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, I do not want to be sidetracked by any asides. I am only using the figures here. What I am concerned about, Sir, is the shift in geographical location for residency. We know from our experience that there are certain areas of Barbados which are developing at a faster rate for housing purposes than other areas. ^55 p.m.

The whole of West Terrace, Oxnards and so on has made tremendous strides. In 1976 one side of that had been substantially developed, but in the intervening years what is now West Terrace Gardens, Oxnards and all of that have really taken off. I do not know how many people live down there, it must be thousands. Union and Ruby Park, St. Philip mushroomed with houses. That is where the development is taking place, but there is not a commensurate level of development, say, in St. John. St. Philip North - I am not sure if that is even North - Coles, the seaside, Castle Heights and from Castle Heights right back up through Well House on the seaside, all the old sour grass land of Cyril Payne in Well House, all that is now developing. That is where the population has shifted, not that more people are being born to affect electoral patterns.

Clearly, over a period of time, be it a decade or what, the Electoral Department and the Boundaries Commission will have to give consideration to these areas which have developed out of proportion to others. St. Joseph and St. Andrew are contracting populations, and the longer the Government takes to repair the neglect in St. Andrew the more people are going to want to leave St. Andrew and come out of the hills and build in one of these other areas I have talked about.

I do not share the view of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that you can restrict everything to parish boundaries. I do not believe that that is possible, or that indeed it would be fair and equitable. Could you really see one representative or two representatives for the little area of St. James South which has developed so fast? I understand the point about the geographical empathy that people feel with a particular geographical area, but I think the larger view ought to be that Barbados really is a pretty small place when we look at it and having regard to how the development is being planned, adherence to geographical districts in the sense of parish boundaries will perhaps be artificial for the purposes of elections.

I do not think the integrity of a parish is fatally damaged because for the purposes of voting five or six hundred persons who live in the parish of X have to vote in the parish of B. It is purely for voting purposes, but nothing would have changed within the geographical parish of St. Thomas, St. Andrew or wherever.

I understand the problems the Electoral and Boundaries Commission would have had in coming to a Report that was unbiased and that sought to do fairness, equality and justice as between 27 Members, and I think that they have done an outstanding job in the circumstances. I have a little problem. I have lost a part of Bloomsbury and Sturges which have been favourable to me. I am not going to quarrel and dismiss the Report out of hand because of that, Sir.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I got Bibby's Lane, I do not know what it is like. I do not know if I will keep it. I would like to go canvassing up there on Sunday, but I do not know, because when the king gets to work with his knights I do not know what will happen to Bibby's Lane, so I do not want to go and waste any time now, I will go back inside where I know they cannot cut. I know they cannot cut Shop Hill, they cannot cut Porey Spring good enough, so I will be all down in there. On the extremities where they are going to use their knife on me, have a ball.

Sir, I would like to make one final point by way of really expressing solidarity with the point the Honourable Member for Christ Church West made in relation to an increase in seats. If the Commission deems that it is necessary to increase the number of seats by one, I really cannot accede to the argument that that is a financial burden on the people of Barbados. A back bencher probably gets something like \$30 to \$40 thousand a year. I am not even aware of what the gross is, I know what the net is, \$3 166 65 and that multiplied by 12 is about \$40 000 a year. Do you really want to tell me, Sir, that the public of Barbados would quarrel about the expenditure of say even \$40 000 for someone to represent another six or seven thousand people, when a Prime Minister can himself without coming in here appoint a Minister, put him in the Senate and pay him \$70 or \$80 thousand a year?

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: They have had technical adjustments, Sir. Whatever it is, the point I am making is that an ordinary Member costs less than a Minister appointed by the Prime Minister in the Senate. You do that willy nilly. He can decide that he wants to bring in somebody else in the Ministry of Finance and call him Minister of State and the country pays for that. I really think it is a specious argument when it comes down to the question of whether the country can afford it. The country can afford to go and build a monstrosity above Ilaro Court, called Sherbourne, that will end up at \$50 million, bring in, a bunch of coaches that cost millions of dollars and you do not want to pay \$40 000 a year for another Member. That does not make sense in a Government that has this kind of money, this largesse, to throw away.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Nobody, nobody at all. I am not quarrelling, I am speaking with some vehemence and vehemence must not be confused with being quarrelsome. 6.05 p.m.

We have a lot to quarrel about later on. My time has gone.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a few comments on this Resolution and to say that this is the time

of the evening when Members are not particularly jocular, but they do some strange things under your guidance. For instance, at our last sitting I was very impressed, Sir, when my lawyer, the Honourable Member for St. Thomas showed us of his great powers of retention, as he quoted from a document that he read, a Central Bank report, and did not produce it, but he repeated every word of it with such clarity that I could not help but be impressed. I believe I am going to fire him now, Sir, because he is now suffering j-from encephalitis.. I do not believe that he cannot remember " a name, and this is at the point of the evening when people do not remember things.

Sir, as far as this Resolution is concerned, everyone of us in this Chamber can make out a case. This is not a nebulous issue; this is something that all of us, all Barbadians, will wish to get involved in, but even though I know that all of us on all sides would be anxious to say something about this Resolution as it affects us, I think I.* would just make a few points as they affect me. *

Sir, in the constituency of St. Michael West Central I must say, because there has been a lot of talk about cutting and what the surgeon will do and things like that, in the constituency of St. Michael West Central, nothing has happened. It is the only constituency of the 27 that not one fellow has changed. I had better remind him that it sticks out like a sore thumb, even so like a shark in a tank of „«. minnows, and therefore I hope he does justice to it, because -if he doesn't, I will find some case to talk about it in the future. I just wish to say, Sir that when the Leader of the House explains it...

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, I would be grateful if the Honourable Member would please identify to us the book that he was reading last night in which he found that metaphor, a shark in a tank of minnows.

Hon. W. W. HALL: I will ignore him. I do not have to tell him what a shark in a tank of minnows looks like; he ^ knows that. Like him, Sir, I have great powers of retention. I wish to say that with all the intelligent Members in this Honourable House, I cannot believe that we do not know what to do with this Resolution. I would like to say that it is simple. We either have to modify it, or we have to change the Constitution or both. If it is rejected or whatever and it goes back to the Prime Minister, it would seem to me that some modification can be made or we can decide to come back here and change the Constitution if we so desire. I do not know what would happen in the Senate, but I can only ^ think that in this Honourable Chamber we could probably deal with it as we saw fit.

Mr. Speaker, there are problems with this Resolution. There is no getting away from it. If it remains as is, if the status quo remains, it would seem to me that a constituency like Christ Church West Central would have nearly 10 000;*" voters. It would seem to me that the Boundaries

Commission having looked at that would seek to do justice to the Constitution, and that is that you should try and get the numbers as equitable as possible. But, Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not believe that numbers is the only basis for representation, despite what Members may say. It is true that in Barbados you have a situation where one has national constituencies. There are people who perceive a particular Minister as the man that they should go to if they

• have a problem. It might not even be his own Ministry. If for instance you want to go to somebody about pepper sauce, you would know that you would not find it over this side; you have to go in the City. I am only saying, Sir, that when it comes to representation, we have to look at it not only on the basis of numbers. If we looked at it from the basis of numbers, as I have heard it alluded to today, what would be the number? Would it be 12 000, would it be 10 000 per constituency, would it be 8 000 or would it be 6000?

Sir, for argument sake, if you had 196 000 voters in Barbados, should it be then 36 seats at 5 400 per constituency? Should it be 30 seats at 6 500 per constituency? Or should it be 28 seats at 7 000 voters per constituency? Or maybe can we go back to 1983 and those times when there were 24 seats at 8 200? The point I am trying to make, Sir, is that if you look at representation mainly by numbers, you will find that we will have a recurring decimal and in another two or three years you will find that you will come back to the same position.

I wish to say, Sir, that there has been a lot of talk about gerrymandering by the Democratic Labour Party. Sir, that is a grievous fault. I do not think that people having said that believe it, because when I was a big boy at school, in vacation time we used to go to Orange Hill and the people in Orange Hill were very proud to be residents in St. James.

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: The Prime Minister has never seen me in Orange Hill; I do not believe that, Sir.

Sir, the point I am making is that those wonderful people in Orange Hill were constituents in the parish of St. James, but suddenly they found themselves in St. Andrew. You can say the same thing for St. Philip. Again when I was at school and playing cricket at Congo Road, many
 * Saturday afternoons we used to come down by the corner in
 \ Brereton right by the Honourable Member for St. Philip North's home, and that was in St. Philip. Sir, lately the residents of Brereton have found themselves in St. John and now according to this report, the residents of Kendal are now apparently finding themselves in St. George. I will tell you, Sir, that a great man like H.M.S. Pollard will be
 *. turning in his grave. So it seems to me that however you look at it, you are going to get a problem because if you are
 "" going to change the Constitution, it means that you do not

wish to have 28 or more seats. If you are going to modify it will be a question, as your grandmother would have taught you when you were a boy, if you cannot ride a horse you have to ride a cow and, therefore, even though we might not like the 28 seats, even though we feel that we did not like 24,25,26 and 27, we will find that you would have to do a modifying job. 6.15 p.m.

With all of the talk we have heard this afternoon, old talk most of it, Sir, I believe that we have to conscientiously address the problem and look at it in a systematic way where the Government of the day has to deal with this problem.

I wish to say that if we modify this Report and come back here, you would get all manner of outrageous mouthings about gerrymandering and fixing it up so that people could get seats. Quite frankly, and I really mean this, I can run anywhere.

Some people say so. I heard it today in the Opposition benches and I do not believe it but I feel that you should be prepared to go wherever your party wants you to go and that is the reason why I say so.

I feel that we in the Democratic Labour Party have a problem as far as this Report is concerned. The Barbados Labour Party has a problem and the NDP also has a problem. It affects everyone. It affects everyone except me but I am upset about that. Why should it be?

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: I am upset about that because I heard the Prime Minister say today that the maximum amount of voters should be 7 158 and that the minimum should be 5 558 and the average should be 6 501. Why should it be then, Sir, that St. Michael West Central only has 5 577?

I am saying that they have to do the right thing and I am not telling them how to do it. It does not matter how they go. They can go north, east, south, west or central. It does not bother me. Wherever they get the extra 200,300 or 400 to equalize the situation, wherever they get those extra constituents from I suggest that the Report do just that. I am not going to suggest it for fear that people may think that I want a particular section of any particular constituency. Indeed, I do not. I just need us to have a look at it.

Mr. Speaker, if the Report is to give a minimum disruption as far as we are concerned to the constituencies, I would recommend that we look at it very seriously either modifying it or changing the Constitution.

I will end, Sir, by saying that I personally do not agree with increasing the constituencies. I really do not agree with

it and I feel that we would have to have a very long look at it and come back to this House in another two months or so. That is my feeling. I cannot really say how we will vote because I read in the papers that the Honourable Member for Christ Church West definitely will be voting against it...

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: You want me to get the paper? The paper I read. I do not have to read the papers every day. I read in the papers this week that...

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: The one I read the Honourable Member for Christ Church West and the Leader of the minority Opposition said that he will be voting against it. Today he said he is voting for it so he has changed his mind, which he is entitled to do.

All I am saying is that I am not changing my mind. My mind is fixed on what I think is the situation and therefore, with those few remarks I would just implore them to have a look at my constituency - I am not selfish - but I feel that they should because I hear the Prime Minister say this morning something to the effect of the great and glorious constituency of St. Michael South.

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: St. Michael North? I must not say that because they might give me some of St. Michael North, I do not know.

The point is the Prime Minister did say "the great and glorious constituency of St. Michael South" and I wish to say in that same vein that when he was talking about that I know that deep in his heart that he knows that that constituency which he has the honour to represent comes second only to St. Michael West Central and, therefore, I think he would be very cognisant of that when this Report goes before him.

Thank you very much, Sir.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Mr. Speaker, the last member who sat explored the reasons why he would want his constituency to be enlarged. I will present a case as to why the numbers in my constituency ought to be increased even given the state of the boundaries as they are and given the criteria as laid down in the Constitution and then I would want to look at the Report that is before this Honourable House.

Now, so far the conclusion that I can see emerging from this debate is that there are no set criteria for determining the extent and the limits of constituency boundaries in Barbados. Some Members of this House have

said that we should place great store in numbers. Another argument was that we should look at socio-economic factors in determining how boundaries ought to be determined and there was one argument advanced by the Leader of the Opposition that constituency boundaries should bear more relation to the present parish boundaries.

Now, Sir, we had also a number of proposals for the way these Reports ought to be considered. One was ~ presented by the Honourable Member for St. Peter, the Honourable Member for St. Thomas and then the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East also put forward a modified form of gerrymandering which I would call "Brathwaite-mandering."

Now, Sir, I want to just spend a little time looking at the present boundaries for St. George South. Those boundaries encompass two parishes at the moment, the parish of St. John and the parish of St. George. The section -< of SL John that is added is the section that covers Bowmanston, Cherry Grove, the Glen and Henley - That is in the GB3 box which is .355 votes. According to the Register of Electors that was presented to us today, St. George South now has 6 530 electors. Up to January 31, 1990 the parish of St. John contained 6 187. We are within the range. St. George North, St. George South and St. John are also within the range and according to the criteria as set out in the Constitution. ~
6.25 p.m. ~

If you were to add the numbers in the parish of St. George, I would say that in the parish of St. George, as distinct from sections of other parishes that might form the constituency of St. George, the wider constituency of SL George, that is, North and South would have about 12 600 electors, thereabouts, 12 500 to 12 600 electors. That would be enough. If the boundaries were to be drawn within those 2 parishes and along the parish lines, the numbers per - constituency would still be within the range. -

If we go a little further, Sir, and we look at the present re arrangement or the arrangement as proposed in this Report we would see that St. George South would cover not only St. George but it would cover St. Michael, St. John, St. Philip and Christ Church. The St. George South constituency boundaries would now encompass 5 parishes which, to my mind, Sir, is a bit ridiculous to those who know how the parish boundaries run.

For the time that I have been conscious about politics in Barbados, I have noticed the St. George South constituency undergoing many, many changes. At one time Boarded Hall used to be part of the constituency. There was a time when Hannays Valley used to be part of the ^ constituency because Hannays Valley is like an extension to ^ Windsor and Windsor is part of St. George. ^

Under this present arrangement, what would happen is that Frere Pilgrim and Boarded Hall become part of St. George South. You would have Haynes Hill which is now part of the St. Michael South East constituency becoming part of St. George South and then you will have a larger section of Monroe Road and a section which is now part of my constituency being part of the St. Michael South East constituency.

Then we go over to Kendal, St. John. The St. George South constituency will traverse the gully and will go into Kendal, St. John - 127 votes in Kendal, St. John. Sir, the last time I remember going through Kendal Gully was when I was a kid to play cricket. It seems as though I will have to do the same thing all over again, Sir. It might be the shortest route to get in there.

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Not to play cricket this time, to canvass votes.

When we look at the fact that Haynes Hill which is part of the St. Michael South East constituency, according to this Report, will now be affixed to St George, it further entrenches my claim that the Report in relation to St. George South is a bit ridiculous. Why must you remove part of Monroe Road which is now naturally part of St. George and, as it were, affix it to the St. Michael South East constituency, remove a portion of the St. Michael South East constituency and affix it to St. George South. It is about the same amount of votes. It does not make sense to me. It seems all so strange. It does not have any foundation in common sense. Anybody who knows the way that the present boundaries run would know that that is a bit ridiculous.

If the boundaries are to be extended and so enlarge the constituencies to allow for a larger representation, it would appear to me that....I have no problem with the section Frere Pilgrim, Boarded Hall because they seem more to form naturally part of St. George and according to the Parish Boundaries Act, a part of them would be in St. George; so with the changes that I have just outlined in terms of the changes with the St. Michael North East and Monroe Road sections. I have no difficulty with that because Frere Pilgrim and Boarded Hall are more naturally part of St. George than they are part of Christ Church.

Now when you go over to the Kendal section, before we get to Kendal we have to go through Edgumbe which is part of St. Philip naturally. Edgumbe Plantation is now part of St. George South. I have not explored the boundaries fully but I do not know what section

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: The Plantation House. Yes..... is part of the St. George South constituency. Not a large section of St. Philip but nevertheless, it is an area that one would have to go to.

But then you go into Kendal. The Kendal section would now be represented as we have heard by 3 representatives, the representatives for St. George South, St. Philip North and St. John. I do not see how that could make any sense at all for a number of reasons. One of those reasons is the reason that I advanced earlier in relation to the boundary changes in the St. Michael South East/St. George boundary changes. Kendal itself is part of St. John. Why disrupt that community in terms of its representation? Why must the community be disrupted? It has always been part of St. John. It should always remain part of the St. John constituency so that the area could be adequately represented.

I am certain that if this Report were to be accepted by this House, and all indications are that it will not be, the people in that district will have confusion in terms of who is their representative. For that reason I do not think that the Report ought to be accepted, insofar as it relates to that section.

So for a number of reasons, Sir, I cannot support the Report. I will not support it. I believe that other Members on this side, this side of this side, will similarly reject the Report because it impacts on them in a not too favourable way. I suppose the reasons that we give for objecting to the Report will be reasons that are subjective in content in a lot of the cases since we do not have any set criteria for determining how we ought to go about determining the extent of constituency boundaries.

But, Sir, I would still want to make some response to some of the criticisms that have been laid down here this afternoon about the position of the NDP on this matter. I firmly believe that given our present population and the present electors in Barbados that it is not difficult for constituencies to bear more relationship to the new Parish Boundaries Act. That is my view. That is the view of the NDP. The new Parish Boundaries Act has sought to draw and delimit the areas of parishes and relate them to gullies, water courses, to unclassified roads and so on, so that we will get away from the old habit of parish boundaries cutting through people's houses and so on and through districts as far as that was the case.

I do not see much of a difficulty, for example, in relation to St. George having the same demarcation, St. George North and South but that the amount of electors be determined by the amount of electors in St. George at the moment. As I said before, it would be in the region of 6 200,6 300, thereabouts.

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: It would be very, very little. I believe that you would have to come on my side. According to this Report, St. George North is 6 484. Up to January 31st of this year, the Register of Electors that we were given today has St. George North with 6,530. In terms of St. George, it will be a little drift north or south, Sir, as the case may be. 6.35 p.m.

Now the other point made was that numbers should not be the only criteria. Apart from the reasons given by the Leader of the Opposition, Sir, one might also add that a political party in the present system that we operate under can find itself being the Government of the day and capturing as little as 40% or 45% of the vote. In other words, it can be a minority party but yet be the Government of the day. That is quite possible today in relation to the amount of votes cast. My question, Sir, is why then must we place so much emphasis on numbers? Why must numbers be the dominant criterion in determining the amount of persons that form the electorate in any one constituency? I cannot see the sense of that. Of course, we cannot run from numbers. We have to place some emphasis on numbers but it is not the only criterion. There are many others and some of them were advanced today.

When we look at other countries, there is one thing that we have got to understand. For example, in England, America, some of the larger democracies, in Europe, and Canada, what happens is that you have very large constituencies. But there are lots of things that operate in those constituencies that do not operate in ours. In the first place, as the Prime Minister said earlier on today, you have a lot of support staff and, as he also said, the emphasis ought to be placed in that direction. But there is also another point to that and it is this. You have different levels of representation. Not only is there Central Government representation but you have Local Government representation. You may even have a kind of Local Government representation at the municipal level. Certain towns in America, for example, have a mayoral form of Government.

So that when we talk of numbers in Barbados and try to relate numbers in Barbados to numbers in other countries we have got to look at those two points advanced by the Prime Minister in terms of the support staff and also the point which I am trying to advance now which has to do with the different levels of representation available to people in that wider constituency of Local Government representation, municipal representation, and so on. That has got to be borne in mind. So that when we come to this whole principle of fair representation, as I am saying, it ought not to be based purely on numbers. Fair representation has got to be based on many other things.

So that the argument that was advanced today by the Leader of the Opposition when he cited the cases of Christ

Church West Central and the City and if we were to examine that argument a little further, we will see that there is some merit to it. I am certain that from the kinds of conversations and discussions that I have with the Member for the City about the representation that he has got to produce in the City I do not have the problems that he has in his constituency. There are more far reaching problems. The problems are different and so on. So I would not quarrel with the 5,500 people that he has to represent. We are dealing with a different kind of mentality altogether. So that I am not going to quarrel about numbers, Sir. Whether it is a difference of between 5,000 in one constituency and 7,000 in another, I am not quarreling about that because I know the difficulties that one has got to undergo when you are dealing with one constituency as against other constituencies. A person with a constituency that might be dominantly middle class would have less problems in terms of representation than a person with a constituency that contains electors of the lower socio-economic groups. These are things that we have got to keep in mind when we are examining this whole concept of representation.

Now if we were to follow, Sir, the Leader of the Opposition in his debate, one of the things that will happen is that the constituency boundaries will always be changing. I do not think that whatever criteria we come up with that we will all be satisfied because the exercise, as I said, is in a lot of respects a very, subjective exercise and we all have as Members of Parliament our own interests to look after. We are all interested on being re-elected. Whenever we approach a debate of this nature, the point that will be before us is that we want to get back into this Parliament. When we are considering a matter of this kind, we are informed by our desire to recapture our seats. So that anything we say in here today I hope ought not to be interpreted by the Electoral and Boundaries Commission as a criticism of their work in the sense that it is disparaging in any way. But they have got to accept that foremost in our minds is the desire to recapture our seats and even though they are an independent body we will still find some areas to dispute their findings and the report that they have presented to us.

You see, Sir, I think we must accept this view and in some respects it was borne out by what the Leader of the Opposition said today that one must think seriously about whether or not a redemarcation of constituency boundaries, gerrymandering, or whatever it is, Sir, cuts across public opinion. If you carve up a district, that district forms part of different constituencies like for example Kendal as it is now. Kendal, according to this report, consists of three different constituencies. It will mean whether there will be a cutting across of public opinion in that constituency. It may not be a cutting across of the opinion in that constituency as to whether or not one party ought to be the ruling party. This does not contradict in any way the argument that I advanced before. For reasons of certainty we ought to have a district being represented in Parliament by

representative and not by three different ones. In terms of the opinion of a political opinion in that district, I am not so certain that if it is carved up in that way that the opinion in the district will be any different than what it would be if it was represented by one representative. 6.45 p.m.

There are a lot of different things we have to take into consideration when we are examining this Report. As we said before, our position on this side is that we cannot support it, for reasons advanced by the Leader of the Opposition and by myself, but at the same time if the Government is going to appoint, or has appointed, a body to consider the present boundaries and present a ministerial Report to this House we reserve the right to examine that Report in as critical a detail as we have examined this one today. We would hope that the Government would pay particular attention to the present parochial boundaries and not present a Report that is glaringly favourable to their position beyond what it is at the moment and would in any way enhance their position in getting back as the Government of the day in this House.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Mr. Speaker, just a short intervention. I have heard several Members address this Chamber on this Report, but I would like to reflect on the first boundaries Report which was around 1965-66. That was done with the idea to conduct the elections on a single member basis in order to get rid of the old double member constituencies. At that time the country was cut up into 24 seats and they were all cut up in parishes. Suddenly one parish became part of another parish because somebody wanted to change things around to suit their purpose.

I feel we should scrap this Report and go back to parishes. I could not care less whether there were ten people in St. Andrew or 50 people in St. Lucy. I have never complained about the number I have to represent. I have never heard any of the Christ Church Members of Parliament complain about their numbers and I would like to know who came up with the great idea that we should have these numbers of seats in Christ Church. The numbers are too big. All I am saying is that if they want to add another seat in Christ Church there is no need to rearrange all the others.

Christ Church has between 34 and 36 thousand people and they feel it should carry five, so cut Christ Church into five and leave the rest as parishes. Do not cut Below Rock in half and go right down the coast and call that Christ Church South. Put a constituency between the four from north to south and then I might be in a position to accept that.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Below Rock is on the map. If you the Registry you will see that there is no such place

as Silver Sands really, it is Below Rock. Silver Sands is a house built at Little Bay, there is no such thing as Silver Sands, it is Below Rock and it starts from Keizer Hill until it gets to Chancery Lane. It is the valley below Wilcox Ridge and that is why it is called Below Rock. Some people might frown at the name, but I love the name. I like to let people know that I am from Below Rock.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: No. The Silver Sands bus does not go to a house, Silver Sands bus passes through the entire Below Rock and then back to Bridgetown. You see, Sir, all this talk about moving Brereton from St. Philip is bare nonsense. Can you imagine places like Brereton and Ebenezer being taken out and put in St. John? That is nonsense! I would like, Sir, and I am very serious about it, to see us go back to the parish boundaries. If there are 4 000 people in St. Philip, they have St. Philip North and St. Philip South. If there are 4 000 people in Christ Church and I have 10 000, it is all right with me. Then when you look at a place like St. Andrew with all hills and valleys, how could a person represent a place like St. Andrew with 10 000 people the same way I would represent a place like Christ Church East with 10 000 people? It is impossible.

Then you get Members who will compare Barbados with places like Canada and Britain. The Prime Minister and the Honourable Member for St. George South talked about support staff, but I would not even bother to talk about support staff. I lived in Canada for 17 years and I have never seen a representative in Canada going to a house fire. These are the things we must do in Barbados. The office staff does not go either. Whenever there is a house fire the Member of Parliament must beat the fire truck to the fire. If there is a flood, we must be there with a boat or bateau or something. It is nonsense. You cannot compare us with these places, our representation is different.

For example, about two years ago a woman in my constituency had a break-in and she called me to tell me about the break-in and expected me to go up there to see what had happened. This is the type of representation we have to give people, so I could never accept a Report like this. It is true that I commend the work these gentlemen have put into the Report, but certainly it does not suit our purpose. I travel all around the country almost every day - St. Lucy, your constituency, Sir, St. John - so whenever something is done in one constituency it is done for everybody. Nobody has any hold on any particular part of this country. I cannot support this Report.

With those few words, Sir, I will take my seat.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Sir, I move at this point that the sitting be suspended until 7.45 p.m.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 6.55 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION Mr.

SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, given the parameters of the brief that has been given to the Commissioners as set out in the Constitution, I believe, Sir, that they did a reasonable job, and I think that has got to be said, and I am very happy to say this. This is not the first report on the constituencies demarcation. Back in the 1960s as observed by the Honourable Member for Christ Church East, there was another report and that report formed the basis for the single member constituencies as we know them today, and I cannot refrain from saying today that I take some pride in the pivotal part I played in the Representation of the People Act and the reforming of the system from double member constituencies to single member constituencies.

In the course of carrying out my duties, I have not escaped the criticisms from the other side, and the Honourable Members for Christ Church West and St. Thomas have hurled accusations at me from time to time in relation to the 1971 general elections because the leader of their party lost his seat and they were not able to sit down and work out why in fact he lost his seat, and the easy way out was to blame it on the new system for that day.

Let me say here now, Sir, that even to this day the same boundaries that were worked out between Christ Church East Central and Christ Church East persist, and even in the recommendation and the report that is before us, we still have the boundary running all the way up through Woodbourne, through St. Patricks. It was the subject of criticism when they were in Opposition, they became the Government, they criticised it but they never sought to change it. They changed my own constituency boundary, they changed several constituency boundaries, but they did not change that. Is the Honourable Member for Christ Church West saying that in fact I was ahead of my time to have set out the parish boundaries as now form the dividing line between Christ Church East Central and Christ Church East? They never sought to change it, and the same too applies to the St. Andrew constituency.

I must say, Sir, that we in the Democratic Labour Party cannot escape perhaps some criticism for having first crossed the parish boundary lines and that was the recommendation of the Boundaries Commission in 1965. I regret that we had to do this or we thought we had to do this, but I would like to say that I am firmly of the belief

that the parish boundaries should form the first line for constituencies in Barbados. That is my belief. I note, Sir, that in fact in Jamaica that is the position. We have gone ahead in our wisdom and we have worked out some kind of an equation and the equation is that the constituencies shall be as far as practicable even in number and if they are not even in number there must not be more than a differential of 10 per cent higher than the mean or 10 per cent lower ^ than the mean.

I have said here before and I will say it again that I do not believe that that is the proper way in which we should set our boundaries for the constituency boundaries here in Barbados. I think there should be other considerations, and I have said before that I believe one consideration must take into account the topography of an area. A demographic survey cannot be the only consideration because what you are representing is people, and I believe that it is much ^ easier for 10 000 people in one of the St. Michael ^ constituencies to get representation than it is for perhaps '6 000 in St. Andrew. It is more difficult in St. Andrew and that should be taken into account. I said just now that parish boundaries, I believe, should also be a consideration, and in fact that is the position with Jamaica; but in Jamaica it states quite clearly that the boundary of the constituency shall not cross the boundary of a parish as delimited by the Counties and Parishes Law or by any law amending or replacing the law. Now that is the position in Jamaica. I ^ believe, Sir, that should be the position in Barbados, ^ otherwise parish boundaries do not make any sense anymore. People talk in terms of coming from St. Lucy, St. Peter, St. James and so on. If in fact you are not going to use them as a parish, we no longer have the vestry system, the vestry system gave way to some other system years ago and that succeeding system has been abolished, and if the parish boundaries are to make any sense, then, Sir, I believe that we should revert or give some consideration to the parishes. ^

I also believe, Sir, that unless we look again at factors for determining the various constituencies, we will be forever chopping and changing the constituencies. I said that here before and I am repeating it, and we will be forever coming into this Chamber and seeking to amend the constituencies in a way that the original constituency will be unrecognisable from what it was in its earlier state. These are things that we have got to bear in mind, and we can only make a change in this direction if we look at the ^ constitutional provision that requires and provides for the x, setting up of the boundaries as in fact they are provided for now. I think the time has come for us to do this. This is one of the provisions that is entrenched in the Constitution. It is not easy to amend it, but I believe it needs to be amended. In Jamaica in fact, theirs is different, and they say that the electorate of a constituency may be greater or less than the electorate quota in order to take account of the varying physical features and transportation facilities withi^t Jamaica, and the difference between urban and rural areas .

in respect of density of population, provided that the electorate of a constituency shall not exceed the electorate quota by more than 50 per cent or be less than 65 2/3 per centum of the electorate quota. That is Jamaica. We are a mere 10 per cent Jamaica is 50 per cent one way above or 65 per cent below. I am not suggesting that we should adopt the kind of numbers that we see here, but I believe, Sir, that if we were even to amend the 10 per cent that is in the v Constitution to 15 or 20 per cent, we would find that it would hardly be necessary for us to amend the constituency boundaries as we would have to do it under the present equation.

I would like now, Sir, to refer specifically to a part of the report that, although it is not giving me difficulty, I think it would be tidier, and I believe it needs some kind of an amendment. It affects my constituency. The polling district VB 2 comprises Grazettes Court, Grazettes Terrace, Pillersdorf Development, Jemmotts Development and some "" such places. 7.55 p.m.

It is proposed in this Report that this should be removed from St. Michael North. Now I, like the Honourable Member for St. Peter, might have beliefs, not for the reasons he gave, but for the reason that in fact I have always got some excellent support from that part of my constituency. To that extent, Sir, it would be weakening my own position.

But I understand that we have to accept the requirements of the law and, therefore, yield in certain respects and this is one area which will have to be given up. But in removing that part from the constituency of St. Michael North, I honestly believe the Commissioner erred in not putting it on to St. Michael West Central.

They are recommending that it should go on to St. — Michael North East and it makes a lot of sense putting it on to St. Michael West Central. Now, if that were done, then St. Michael North East would be a bit small and St. Michael North East could take a small portion from St. Michael North, that is the area I represent, somewhere in the area of White Hall, Codrington, Green Hill, Free Hill triangle.

I say this because, in fact, even if that little triangle were taken from St. Michael North, that consists of 260 , voters. St. Michael North would still be the largest constituency in St. Michael even if that additional part were taken away from St. Michael North.

There is also another reason why I am suggesting that. St. Michael North is a growing constituency. There are a number of houses in St. Michael North particularly in the Clermont area, what they call Clearview Heights, Warrens v Terrace North, Lodge Crescent. There are several houses in —/ these areas which were not enumerated at the time the

enumeration was done and they did not form part of the consideration of the Commission when they were looking at that constituency.

In other words, what I am saying is that the figures here as shown in the Report for St Michael North will not be the correct figures and there is a fair amount of open space in St, Michael North. The Honourable Member for St. Philip South, the Minister for Housing, has plans for house spots in St. Michael North as well and all of these in St. Michael North will swell and grow. It is my belief that not long, if we continue to maintain the formula as set out here, before long we would have to come back again and take some more territory from St. Michael North.

Now, St. Michael West Central is a very small constituency about 5 700 voters. It is very compact. There is no room there for development and it is logical both in terms of numbers and geography that DB2 should, in fact, should go to St. Michael West Central.

There are 254 voters and the area suggested that should then go on to St. Michael North East to compensate for the amount of voters to be taken away from St. Michael North, are 260 so it is 260 balanced against 254.1 believe, that, in fact, the Order should be amended in that way.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: If the Honourable Member for Christ Church West wants to put it that way, let us put it that way, the matter of changing Green Hill. It is a matter of doing what is logical and what makes sense.

One thing is sure, Sir, one cannot amend the Report. One cannot amend the Order unless you either reject the Report or the Report is withdrawn by both Houses, that is by this House and the Other Place. Not a single amendment can be made to the Order in setting out the boundaries unless it is first rejected.

I believe that it is for this reason that this particular Order should go back to the Minister for the Minister to amend the Order and make a new Order that would then be an amended Order in terms of which I spoke here and of which I have now been speaking.

Perhaps, Sir, we could also look at some of the suggestions made by the Honourable Member for St. George South and see if there is any way in which that can be modified. I know that one of the constraints of the Commission, and again that was set out in the Constitution, is that natural boundaries such as highways and rivers should be used and then it goes "wherever possible" and I believe that the Commission in order not to offend this provision, it became necessary for them probably to intrude upon or cross over those boundary lines as shown by the Honourable Member for St. George South but if there is

any way in which that particular point made by the Honourable Member for St. George South can be accommodated, I believe that we should look at that point there as well.

I can also state that I do not believe that we should have any big wholesale amendments to the Order. I do not believe that that would be proper but I believe that the Order can be improved upon.

There is no report on boundaries, I believe in my time and probably at any time in the future, that would come to this Chamber that would meet with 100% approval by members on either side and there will always be criticisms of that Report and there will always be charges made. When the Report is finished there will be charges made and it is easy to make charges of gerrymandering. That is a very simple and easy thing to do.

I can only speak for myself. When I was the Minister responsible for Elections and electoral matters back in the early 1970's that was never a consideration by the Democratic Labour Party at that time and, certainly, not by me. There were minor amendments at that time made to the Report as set out by that Report and those Reports were carried out. I would like, before I take my seat, just to respond particularly, Sir, to comments made by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas who spoke about a committee headed by one King to advise and cut up the constituencies. His contention was that the Report, if rejected or when rejected, will now go to a committee headed by one King and that King will bring out his knife, according to him, and cut up the constituencies, "fine tune" the words he used, the constituencies. 8.05 p.m.

Let me state, Sir, that there is no committee set up to deal with matters arising out of this Report or arising out of the rejection of this Report.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Is the gentleman King ah adviser, sole adviser to the Minister?

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am not talking about the Attorney-General. He is the Honourable Attorney-General. I am not talking about him at all. I may be close.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: The Honourable Member for St. Thomas is a master at innuendo. His mind can be disabused right now, Sir. There is no committee. There is no head of the committee. There is no committee of 3,4, 5, or committee of 1.

I believe that the Prime Minister in his wisdom in listening to the comments of the Members on that side and on this side will go back and discuss these particular

matters with probably his own advisers being the Electoral Office in this matter before he makes a decision and return the amended Order to this Chamber. I believe that the amended Order will in fact make it a better document I have good reason for saying this.

I see the Honourable Member for Christ Church West has said that it is clear the Commission has 'done the best --job possible in all the circumstances. I believe they have ' -done an excellent job. I do not necessarily believe they have done the best job possible. What is more I can say now, Sir, that I do not think the Commissioners believe that they have done the best job possible either.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: But I will tell you how I know that. I met one of the Commissioners one Saturday morning at the Hilton Hotel, it was a Commissioner whose name I ^ could not remember when we spoke earlier in this Chamber. And incidentally when that Commissioner and I spoke only last month again for the second time, he himself could not remember the name of one of his colleagues who was appointed on the recommendation of the Barbados Labour Party. At that time, he could not remember the person's name. I am not saying he did not know his name. When we spoke, he could not remember his name. And honestly when we were speaking together, I could not remember his name either. I could not call his name, he -* could not call his name. We could only say the man was a former Postmaster-General. But we knew to whom we were referring.

But that Commissioner came to me and he spoke to me in terms of the changes that I mentioned not so long ago, Sir, about putting DB2 in St. Michael West Central. And as a matter of fact he added that they should have done it but it was then too late for them to do it because they had ^ already signed the Report and they could not then do it. So * that Commissioner himself felt that in that way the Report could have been improved.

I am recommending to this Honourable House that at least in that one particular that the Order should be amended and in order for that Order to be amended, we would either have to reject the Report, or the Prime Minister, with the leave of the House, will have to withdraw the Resolution. For these reasons I cannot support the y. Report as set out and as laid in this Chamber, Sir. -,

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it seems that the Honourable Member for St. Michael North has not finished yet, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that I am required to join in this ^ debate if for no other reason than that the Record would show that I did not sit as one of the silent ones, as identifiers by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas. I am very >>

grateful that the Prime Minister and the Leader of the House have indicated that the whip would be removed on this discussion so that we can have our particular view and do not necessarily have to tailor the view to fit into the form that has been put on the anvil for the political party.

Fortunately my view does not derogate so far from the view of the political party articulated that I would have any particular difficulty of conscience.

Mr. Speaker, on the occasion when there was an examination of the boundaries by the politicians, the Honourable Member for St. Lucy and I formed the minority on a Parliamentary Committee that examined the constituencies. We were there and the position which we took then was that 24 seats were enough. I have related before in this House and it will always be a matter of regret to me that a certain amount of undemocratic methodology by the Chairman of that Committee allowed for us not to have our views fully ventilated in that Committee but we were able to file a minority report, after some insistence. And so the views of the party *per se* have been captured in the record and are available for anyone to examine who wishes to examine them.

But I should like to suggest that the basic difficulty confronting us today is the lateness of the Report of the Commission. One of the reasons why we are unable, given - the parliamentary life of this Parliament, the remainder of its life, it is 5 years from the day of first sitting and it has a relatively short time to go and this is the first Report that is coming

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: If your arithmetic is bad, I cannot help that. But 5 years from a sitting in June 1986 would give us September 1991 constitutionally. September 1991 is - the constitutional date required for an election. I think you should examine that. The limit. The absolute limit. We heard the Prime Minister say that he does not intend to go to the absolute limit. He has three months from September moving in the opposite direction. 8.15p.m.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: But that is not for me. I do not call elections. I only win them. I am not interested in when - they are called. He could call it tomorrow. He could call it tomorrow. He could call it six years from now or whatever. Like some other Honourable Members I will be there and I will win.

Asides.

^ Hon. B. M. TAITT: Yes, if they got me made up, I -> must be a thief. But I know that at the end of the day when

the votes are counted we will then know who had who made up. Quite seriously, Sir.....

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: He does not even know how to call the man's name.

Mr. Speaker, the lateness of this report is part of the difficulty of the legislation which had come because the legislation ought to have required a report from the Commission much earlier than it did. Due to a subtlety of the legislation, the Commission was able to put in its first report within five years so that it has acted properly. I am not suggesting that it has acted improperly. But the lateness of the report puts the whole issue in some difficulty and this major disruption which would occur is a disruption which all Honourable Members can understand because those Honourable Members service constituencies. If you are servicing a particular constituency and you have serviced it for four years or three and a half years then to suddenly find that your new constituency is going to be one-third of what you were servicing, this presents an undemocratic portrait for the people in the system. We would all be starting from scratch except for the ones who represent parish constituencies.

The fact is that the formula, as I have said before and will continue to say, is not faulty. The formula *per se* does not present so grave a difficulty that it cannot work if we are doing it in a timely fashion and we recognize that you can have this formula and only ten seats. There is nothing inconsistent with this formula and 24 seats.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Did the Honourable Minister state whether it was the representatives of the DLP on the Commission who for one reason or another were unable consistently to attend the meetings of the Commission and if by reason of that the report was delayed?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: If he is talking about the Boundaries Commission, well I would not know about that. I know absolutely nothing about the Boundaries Commission. I am not privy, like he obviously is privy, to what goes on in the Boundaries Commission.

I say it is late in coming to the House. That is a fact. I do not know why and I do not care why. I am not discussing why. I am not blaming the Commission. Mr. Speaker, I did not lay any blame before the Commission. I am pointing out why we have the difficulty where disruption becomes an issue. I am not concerned with why it is late. I am saying that if the Commission's report had come early enough we could have had disruption and we could then have argued that we do not need the 28th seat. But if we argue that now, and this is the premise that I laid at the beginning, the reason why one might, contrary to

one's own conscience, accept 28 seats is because it is as a matter of public policy you will accept 28 seats. To insist on 27 seats would be contrary to the rights of the people in the country. That is the argument one is putting forward. I am not suggesting that the Commission is late because of recalcitrance or because of absence or because of anything. I know nothing about the Commission except that they had a woman who did the work in my constituency. I wrote the Commission about the unacceptable behaviour on the part of the person who was doing that work and the Commission ignored my letter. They responded to me and told me that they were satisfied that they did not have to change anything. I believe the Commission only did that because it is able, legally to do whatever it does without challenge in the court I have no quarrel with the Commission *per se* but I have a quarrel with a system which allows for entrenchment of the ouster of the courts from any law that is passed. In 1981 when this law was being passed, I fought on the floor of this House with the Attorney General and Government and begged them literally on my knees not to entrench this clause of what I consider heinous and contrary to democratic principles which allows for the ouster of the courts. Once you entrench it in the Constitution, as I said then and I will repeat, it is difficult to have it changed without a two-thirds majority. Therefore, it is going to haunt us that anything the Commission does is well done. But the politics of Barbados do not allow for any constitutional changes to occur no matter how brilliantly conceived they may be. If they come at the wrong time and in the wrong circumstances, it will be perceived that you are trying to interfere with somebody's rights. So no Government is going to risk to change any Constitution interfering with the electoral laws especially when they have an Opposition that is hungry for an issue and all Oppositions will grab issues as they come and deal with them in a particular way. So I am not going to rely on any hope of any constitutional amendment to deal with the issue. I am making a statement of fact that when we dealt with this issue on the floor of the House I asked them then not to entrench it into the Constitution and the Attorney General of the day even though he agreed with me - well let us say by the nature of things as they then existed - to let the law proceed as the Government had brought it down.

I believe that representation in a democracy should be in the context of the principle expounded, I think, in the case of *Dennis*, as the landmark case in the United States, in which the United States Supreme Court articulated and adumbrated the principle that there should be one man one vote. When we are discussing South Africa and the Southern United States and when we are discussing oppression in all other countries we cannot argue and articulate that there should be one man one vote and then when we come to discuss our peculiar situation in Barbados find some variation or some distinguishing feature of that argument to justify our position. The last time that situation was acceptable was when the United States was trying to

fashion its Constitution and they had to settle for a Senate in which all states would get equality by virtue of two representatives, but they dealt with the House of Representatives by ensuring and insisting that the one man one vote principle be the overriding principle. For a very long time the United States Supreme Court allowed the concept that one black man was equal to three-fifths of a white man. That is the principle that applied in the United States right up to the 1950's. It was only after 1954 and the continuing legislation following that even though it had been articulated in cases before then. It was only in 1965 with the Voters' Rights Legislation in the United States that black people started to get one man one vote as a real possibility because it is not a completion as yet 8.25 p.m.

In Barbados we therefore have to be extremely careful that as we argue from a position of personal aggrandisement - and I say that not pejoratively - that we do not trample on a principle which we lay claim to being 'champions of'. If we accept that there should be one man one vote, then in an entity of 260 000 people, a voters' list of 185 000, it is impossible to have any kind of weighting arrangement that will not do violence to the principle of one man one vote. Therefore, the arithmetic must be, it seems to me, overriding; the arithmetic is the basic concept that has to apply if we are talking about one man one vote.

When the arithmetic is applied - I am going to vary a little bit from my friend on my left who talks about the parish boundaries - you have to recognise that the parish boundaries in Barbados were set by some men over 100 years ago, who just decided arbitrarily that this line is going to be St. John, this line is going to be St. Philip and this line is going to be whatever. We decided as a political party that it was in the interest of the country administratively to do away with the Vestry system. This political party decided that the Vestry system was cumbersome and that the country would be better administered if we eliminated the Vestry system. I have seen no evidence presented by anybody to suggest that that decision is not correct even today.

Two hundred and fifty thousand people add up to a mere hamlet in most of the large countries in terms of numbers, and therefore the way we administer that 250 000 people is a question of what system of administration we use. The parish system and the Vestry system are tied by an umbilical cord. There is a sociological and political umbilical relationship between the Vestry system and the parish boundaries, so the parish is not sacrosanct except in the context of the homogeneity of the persons concerned. In that context, what we should be discussing is neighbourhoods. We should try to avoid the breaking up of traditional neighbourhoods.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAUT: I am not talking about any foolish mutualism. We are discussing serious politics and you want to interrupt me by bringing up the NDP. We are discussing serious matters. Do not bring in the NDP. The NDP is a fledgling political party that is seeking to find somewhere to put down some roots, and when they get rid of their philosophical adviser they will begin to become a little more practically involved in the politics of the day; but you do not talk about mutualism, the only body in the world who understands mutualism is the guru who talks about it.

I am sorry. Let me continue. The concept of parish and lines in Barbados should be recognised, and I think that is basically what the Honourable Member is saying, because the people of St. Lucy feel a homogeneity, the people of St. Peter, the people of St. Joseph, St. Thomas, but the people of St. Thomas as they merge in the ridge as they start to come into St. Michael by Arthur Seat, Jackson and Bagatelle, these are new neighbourhoods and they do not feel the same affinity. Nobody who has moved from New Orleans to Bagatelle has this strong feeling of St. Thomas affinity. Similarly, people from St. Philip have that kind of homogeneity. Also, if you came originally from some of the villages around what are now the urban areas of St. Michael, you will find that there are genuine old neighbourhoods - Thomas Gap, Richmond Gap, Chapman Lane, Black Rock, Fairfield, Waterhall Land - these are areas that are homogeneous.

Mr. Speaker, I am steadfastly not calling any of the areas like Deacons Road, Brandons and other areas of Black Rock, Strakers Tenantry and Free Hill. These are genuine neighbourhoods, so I think when we are looking at how we are going to rearrange the constituencies we have to be careful not to break those up. I do not think that the parish *per se* is something that we need to worry about.

I say all of these things just to put my position very clear. That is why I am always amazed when you use foolish words like "scandalously" because I know that when such words are used they cannot be coming from the soul.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am ashamed now that you use "scandalously". You thought you had me firmly?

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAPTT: In one corner. They had a larger crowd up there inside the election meeting than you had during elections.

Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, it is important when we are looking at this principle, therefore ...

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: You can imagine the NDP people, who cannot bring themselves to hold a single political meeting, dare to talk about cold pone? You have to stop interfering with this party. You cannot bring yourself to hold a single political meeting. If you have a political meeting, one Vernon Smith is going to want to be a speaker. I withdraw that, Sir, but you have a member of your party who will create confusion if he is not on the platform as the first name after the Chief, so do not start to interfere with us about political parties. He is creating more confusion in the short time he has come back than you had in all the time before he came back.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have promised that I will not interfere with the NDP when the Leader is away, because really the other Members are all right. The Leader is the only one I need to deal with and it is no point attacking the NDP, because he does not read the record, so he will not see it anyhow. I like to attack the NDP when he is here. He never looks at the record, he always has to get somebody to -do the research for him. When it comes to record and rules that is not his style. You know that, but anyhow,...

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: You are discovering that Mr. Speaker, let me get on. I really believe that the trap we have been put into by the Labour Party in the legislation, the constitutional arrangement, puts the Prime Minister in a very invidious position. You have to be very careful. You will hear them talking now about the Resolution, but the fact is that there are not a lot of options. There are no options open.

On the question of how we vote, if the Member for St John finds that Kendal has been moved and he thinks it should be changed, that is one. If you look at it, there is a phallic symbol in the map which has to be taken out in some part. I think the Honourable Members over there agree that one of the DB's should be shifted. I am sure there are some other Honourable Members, but this does not mean that we disagree fundamentally with the main work which the Commission did, and I do not think the word should go abroad that we on this side got in here and rejected the work of the Commission.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir Is the Honourable Member saying that he and for whom he speaks...

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am speaking for myself.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Oh, he is speaking for himself. 8.35 p.m.

He does not reject the whole report, but he acknowledges that there are one or two anomalies, and

because of the procedure prescribed in the Constitution, unfortunately it has to go back. We cannot modify or amend it in here.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I am glad that I am able to act as a catalyst to allow the Honourable Member finally to be clear in his mind.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, I am very clear. This is very important I just want to make sure that at the macro level of the debate we are *ad idem*.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Sir. That is exactly why I joined, the debate, because I wanted to make, if nothing more, that point, and I am glad the Honourable Member understands where I am. I believe that's where we all are. We are saying that the independent Commission has done a job. It is not often that they all agree so easily, so I don't want to miss this moment. But seriously the point I am making and the reason why I speak is to establish clearly that we are not throwing out the baby and the bath water and everything. What we are saying is that because of the structure, as the Honourable Member so well articulated it, the only way we can make some slight adjustments as may be necessary, given what we have said about the 28 seats, - we disagree with the 28th seat but we recognise why we must have it on this occasion - any small adjustments which must be made can only be made if we reject the Report.

Now there are some people in the Other Place who do not understand these things as clearly as we might think, who when they write or have their friends write, because I see the person who taught me a lot of the things I know now writes in the newspaper, have written some garbage - he has been writing garbage for a fairly long time - but I feel that he has written some garbage today about the state of the country which puts me in a very difficult position understanding what the country is coming to. We have persons in the Other Place who advise persons who write and who themselves pretend to write, who don't understand these things, and the next thing you know you will be hearing that the Democratic Labour Party assaulted the Commission's Report, and I want to make it very clear that the Commission is not on trial here. The law requires that if we do not accept it *in toto* we have to reject it. It is like you cannot be partly pregnant; you are either pregnant or you are not pregnant.

Aside: How do you know that?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Because I am the Minister of Health.

Mr. Speaker, if you have an ectopic pregnancy which is in the fallopian tube, it is still a pregnancy. He does not even know what are the fallopian tubes, Sir.

Anyhow, Sir, I think that the gravamen of my statement is that the Commission having submitted its report, we have found some little anomalies which we believe, if they are corrected, would make the arrangement a better one than what has been recommended. We are following the disruption principle and therefore we do not see, at least I do not see, any need for any great disruption at this stage, because there will be no beneficiaries of a _ disruption, and therefore we will make some changes as necessary. As I understood the Prime Minister, he was ⁿ saying that the Democratic Labour Party and those of us who are in it still believe that the country can be run with 24 seats.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: It would mean that three persons would have to retire, and I am going on to make the point that I believe that Parliament should make decisions for*_ Parliament in so far as the arrangements in the House are concerned. I believe that we could make decisions that there shall be 24 seats beginning with the Parliament after the next or some such thing if we had a mind to and we had the majority. I am not now recommending that that be done, but I am saying that instead of making decisions for ourselves, because if you are peculiarly involved, it is very difficult to be objective. I cannot discuss St. Michael West and its destruction objectively. I have an affinity with the people in *- St. Michael West which has been born of a long ^~> relationship even before I became their representative. I like to believe that I am the best representative - as I am sure the other 26 Honourable Members feel about their constituencies - they have ever had and will ever have. They are the persons who eventually must decide when I have outlived my usefulness, if I so do, but until then I wish them to have the highest possible calibre of representation they can ever have. I feel that they are entitled to it. They have had some distinguished persons representing them<^ From the time we went to single member constituencies, it was then St. Michael South West, the late George 3 Fergusson provided them with the kind of sterling, grass roots qualities which he had and they have always had next door St. Michael West as it then was, Sir Frank Walcott, the President of the Senate, representing them, and they had some good representation until on the western side there was a slight aberration.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, I wonder^ why the Honourable Member is criticising the Minister of _ Tourism?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: As Your Honour knows, there is a tripartite relationship which exists in the general area of Black Rock. The three constituencies and the three representatives that converge on Black Rock are among the best that we are able to provide in all the circumstances^ The people in St. Michael North West, if Your Honour w\$ permit me a little leeway, as the people in St. Michael West

Central and the people in St. Michael West are a homogeneous group of people who are most pleased with the quality of representation they are getting at the moment; so there is no need to criticise the Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central.

Mr. Speaker, I end as I began, pointing out that when - we therefore decide as a whole to vote against this Resolution, we are not voting against the Commission; we are not thereby sending any messages of negative responses to the commission, we are fulfilling our responsibilities at the highest level as Parliamentarians, and we are refining, if you will, what has been put before us as a rough diamond, and we will now apply to it the techniques which will cut it and fashion it and bring it into what can only be described as the best jewel.

Mr. Speaker, I am much obliged to you.

Rt Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to reply to this very long debate which we have had, and I do not intend to be very long in my reply, but I would just like to underline one point made by the Honourable Member who has just spoken, the learned Member for St. Michael West, and it is that this is a most important subject and a most important debate. 8.45 p.m.

It is not only the first Report of the Electoral and Boundaries Commission, but it also relates to our entire electoral process and our reputation as a stable democratic society that has a system of Government based on fair and free elections and one that is administered to the highest standards.

Indeed, Sir, we get invitations from many countries to participate as observers of their electoral process and only this morning I approved a request for our Chief Electoral Officer to go to Nicaragua as an observer of their elections which are due shortly. The Chief Electoral Officer is a very distinguished public servant and he was also in Namibia to observe their elections. He did not need the guns and so on as protection up there.

The point I am really making is that when we examine our electoral procedures and the steps that we have to take to consolidate and to underline the integrity of our system that must go down as a most important debate.

Now, I would like to make it absolutely clear again what my position is here. In accordance with the procedures laid down in the law which I referred to as the fundamental law of the land, I am required to bring the Report and the draft Order together with a Resolution for the approval of the Order.

I have done that, Sir, but I am in a very strange position that having brought the Order for approval, I now

have, after listening to this debate, to vote against the very Resolution that I have brought. These particular procedures do put one in a very difficult position.

I want to make it clear also that the changes that we are talking about are not really fundamental changes in terms of the Report I wish to say it now that within the framework and the parameters laid down in the Constitution, that the Members of the Electoral and Boundaries Commission, in my view, did a very good job. They have recommended 28 seats.

The Honourable Member for St. Peter seems to be very jittery. He always talks about spin.

Aside.

Rt Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: We will be *ad idem* if I say 28? I wish to make it clear we have no intentions of coming with an amendment to have the seats less than 28. In other words, the 28 seats that are recommended in the Report we will be endorsing those 28 seats. The plan will come before this House for those 28 seats. That is the position.

Aside.

Rt Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: What I said at the beginning was to indicate my own position as far as the increase in the number of seats over time was concerned but I was not indicating nor was I sending any signal that we were contemplating keeping the numbers at 27. So why should I keep them at 27? I would like Mr. Bree St. John to be running. I will give him to the Leader of the minority opposition. Why should I not want the 28 seats? I do not have any objections to that. You are welcome.

Aside.

Rt Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I would like to give the members of the Minority that particular assurance. I have listened very carefully to the points made during the debate and the kinds of modifications to the Report that some members have indicated. I have a responsibility now if the House rejects this on the vote to come back within two months from today with an amended Order for consideration by this House and that is what I intend to do.

I do not think I need to spin it out any longer and I hope that we can get unanimity on this particular matter.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order.

The NDP only got 4% of the poll.

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, if we can get that kind of unanimity on this matter I do not think it is a matter that we should be divided. It is the integrity of our system and I have given the members the assurance that I will not come with a plan that would reduce or change the 28 seats as recommended by the Commission even though I have set out what my position is and some members have spoken on that particular point but we will not go that way. 8.55 p.m.

So, Sir, having said that, the Resolution is before us....

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Now -

Mr. SPEAKER: I just want to know what...

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. After all this time, I figured now that if what the Prime Minister just said had been said a lot earlier, this Debate would have been finished 4, 5 hours ago. He is saying that he accepts 28 seats and he is not going to be making any fundamental changes that are different from the broad parameters prescribed by the Report.

I just want to enquire, Sir, whether, since there are obviously 1, or 2, or 3, or 4 perhaps constituencies which appear to me • to have legitimate concerns, whether the Prime Minister would accept submissions before he makes his final Order. You know, if the Member for St. John could write in or the Member for St. George South could write and say, this is what has been done to Monroe Road or wherever it is, could we have a look at that?

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, we have open Government, that is your word, we have consensus Government.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You were always a B.

Rt Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I can give the Member for St. Thomas and this House the assurance that I would welcome timely indication from members of any minor modifications that they may indicate and I will have them very closely examined and seek to take them into account,

if at all possible, in these adjustments. But that would have to be done very, very urgently and very promptly, if I am to keep the deadline.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Resolution do now pass. Honourable Members in favour please say "aye", those against please say "no". I think the noes have it. A division has been called for.

The bell was rung.

The question was put and was resolved in the negative, the House dividing itself as follows:

Noes: Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Hon. B. M. TAITT; Hon. M. A. KING; Hon. E. E. GREAVES; Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN; Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN; Hon. W. W. HALL; Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN; Hon. C. V. WALKER; Mr. L. L. BRATHWATTE; His Honour J. J. PAYNE; Mr. R. L. MORRIS; Dr. E. A. SIMMONS; Mr. C. A. NEBLETT; Mrs. BARKER-WELCH and Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON - 17 NOES

Abstentions: Mr. R. P. BYER; Mr. P. J. M. MILLER and Mr. E. BOURNE - 3 ABSTENTIONS

Ayes: Hon. 'H. deB. FORDE; Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS and Mr. O. S. ARTHUR - 3 AYES .

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, we have been here a long time. It is the end of the week, Sir, and I do not think we should be here at this hour.

I beg to move, Sir, that this House do now adjourn[^] until Tuesday, February 6, 1990 at 12.00 o'clock noon, Sir.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question that this sitting do now adjourn until Tuesday, February 6, 1990 at 12.00 o'clock noon was put and was resolved in the affirmative and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the sitting accordingly. 9.02 p.m.

CONTENTS
MINUTES

Confirmation of Minutes of the Meeting Tuesday, 23rd January, 1990.....	.4759
Hon. P. M. Greaves, 4759	

- ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER.....	.4758
---	-------

Mr. Speaker, 4758, 4759; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 4758; Hon. P. M. Greaves, 4758

Receipt of the Statement and Accounts for the month of November, 1989 as prepared by the Accountant General.

The Auditor General's Report of the accounts for the year ended March 31, 1989.

The Report of the Accountant General for the financial year 1988/1989

PAPERS

Hon. M. A. KING	4759
The Report on the Registration Office and Supreme Court Registry for 1988.	

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES	4759, 4814
Resolution to approve the vesting in the National Housing Corporation of a parcel of land at the Crane, St. Philip	
Resolution to grant the sum of \$4 446 297 from the Consolidated Fund to supplement the Estimates 1989 - 90 Part I Current - Supplementary No. 12	
Resolution to grant the sum of \$92 624 from the Consolidated Fund to supplement the Estimates 1989 - 90 Part II Capital - Supplementary Estimates No. 13.	

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE	4759
Question re the allocation of house spots in Long Gap, Spooners Hill, St. Michael to the Constituents of St. Michael North East.	

ORDERS OF THE DAY SUSPENSION

OF STANDING ORDERS. Hon. P. M. Greaves,	.4759
4759	

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE BORROWING OF THE SUM OF US\$20 MILLION FROM CITIBANK (CHANNEL ISLANDS) LTD. FOR THE PURPOSE OF ASSISTING IN THE FINANCING OF GOVERNMENT'S CAPITAL WORK PROGRAMME AND RE TIRING PART OF THE FOREIGN DEBT..... 4759

RL Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 4759, 4803, 4805; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 4763; Mr. O. S. Arthur, 4771, 4805; Mr. R. L. Morris, 4776; Hon. H. A. Blackman, 4780; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 4784; Mr. R. P. Byer, 4789; Mr. C. LeR. Trotman, 4790; Hon. E. E. Greaves, 4793; Mr. P. J. M. Miller, 4796; His Hon. J. J. Payne, 4798; Hon. H. deB. Forde, 4799.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND BY THE CROWN AT BLACK ROCK, ST. MICHAEL FOR THE PURPOSE OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE NEW BLACK ROCK POLYCLINIC..... 4807

Hon. B. M. Taitt, 4807, 4811; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 4808.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE ELECTORAL AND BOUNDARIES COMMISSION (RE VIEW OF BOUNDARIES) ORDER, 1990 4814

Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 4814, 4862; Hon. C. V. Walker, 4818; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 4821; Hon. H. deB. Forde, 4824, 4830; Mr. L. L. Brathwaite, 4829, 4830; Mr. D. J. H. Thompson, 4832; Mr. J. J. Payne, 4839; Mr. O. S. Arthur, 4841; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 4844; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 4857; Hon. W. W. Hall, 4849; Mr. R. P. Byer, 4851; Mr. E. Bourne, 4854; Hon. P. M. Greaves, 4855.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD	4838
Statement re the announcement to release Mr. Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners from prison.	

SUSPENSIONS 4759, 4795, 4814, 4824, 4854

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 4759, 4795, 4814.

ADJOURNMENT.....	4863
Hon. P. M. Greaves, 4863.	

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, Mr. O. S. (St. Peter) BLACKMAN, Hon. H. A. (St. Philip South) BOURNE, Mr. E. (Christ Church East) BRATHWAITE, Mr. L. L. (St. Michael North East) BYER, Mr. R. P. (St. George South) FORDE, Hon. H. deB. (Christ Church West) GREAVES, Hon. E. E. (St. Lucy) GREAVES, Hon. P. M. (St. Michael North) HALL, Hon. W. W. (St. Michael West Central) HAYNES, Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central) MILLER, P. J. M. (City of Bridgetown) MORRIS, Mr. R. L. (Christ Church East Central) PAYNE, His Hon. J. J. (St. James North) SANDIFORD, Rt Hon. L. E. (St. Michael South) SIMMONS, Mr. D. A. C. (St. Thomas) TAITT, Hon. B. M. (St. Michael West) THOMPSON, Mr. D. J. H. (St. John) TROTMAN, Mr. R. L. (St. Michael Central) WALKER, Hon. C. V. (St. George North)