

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1986 - 91

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, March 6, 1990.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 p.m. o'clock on Tuesday, March 6, 1990.

PRESENT

His Honour L. A. WEEKES, G.C.M., J.P., (Speaker)
Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.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. 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)

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

Mr. E. BOURNE

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

Mr. C. A. NEBLETT, B.A., (Parliamentary Secretary,
Ministry of the Civil Service)

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

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

Prayers were led by Rev. Father Ivan Harewood.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in session.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting of
Tuesday, 27th February, 1990.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, before I move
confirmation of the Minutes, I must say, Sir, that we are
fortunate today in that I am not distracted by the sound of
feet elsewhere in this Chamber. I think it would be a good
thing if, in future, such noises as we hear could be made
before you enter this Chamber so that I would not be
distracted by, for instance, some doors that I see usually
open somewhere to the West of myself.

I move, Sir, that the Minutes of the proceedings of this
Honourable House that took place on the 27th of February,
1990 be taken as read and confirmed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no observations, let these
Minutes stand confirmed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I am to announce that I am in receipt
of the Ombudsman Report for the year 1989.

PAPERS

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am
commanded to lay:

The Electoral and Boundaries Commission Review of Boundaries Draft Order, 1990.

I am also commanded to lay:

The Report by the three man investigating team appointed to look into the misuse of the Diplomatic Bag from the Barbados Embassy, Caracas on 24th November, 1988.

I am also commanded, Mr. Speaker, to lay:
The Estimates 1990-91.

Hon. C. A. NEBLETT: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay:

The Annual Reports and the Financial Statements of the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation for the years 1983, 1984, 1985 and 1986.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and to appropriate it for the service of Barbados for the year ending the 31st of March, 1991 be read a first time, Sir.

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

The question that the Resolution be read a first time was put and was resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is the instant Order of the day.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I am moving, Sir, before we begin Government Business that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42 (5), 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of this sitting.

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

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 4.

ORDER NO. 4 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE ELECTORAL AND BOUNDARIES COMMISSION (REVIEW OF BOUNDARIES) (AMENDED) DRAFT ORDER, 1990

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, when this matter last came before this Honourable Chamber, the House rejected the Order that was before it for consideration.

In accordance with the provisions of the Constitution, as the Minister responsible for electoral matters, I am required to lay an amended Draft Order in this Honourable Chamber before the expiration of a period of 2 months.

Today, Sir, I am bringing that matter before the Chamber. This revised Draft Order makes provision for some amendments to the Draft Order and these Amendments relate to the constituencies of St. Michael North East, St. Michael North, St. Michael West Central, St. Philip North, St. George South and St. John. The Amendments proposed in respect of the constituencies, that is, St. Michael North, St. Michael West Central, St. Michael North East would now include part of that particular polling district known as DAS which contains some 260 electors from the constituency of St. Michael North. 12.25 p.m.

The polling district known as KB2 with 254 electors would be excluded and that would give the St. Michael North East constituency - these responses I am making are in respect of the St. Michael North East constituency - a revised total number of electors of some 5,699.

As far as the constituency of St. Michael North is concerned, the report of the Boundaries Commission had assigned some 6,764 electors to that constituency and that figure was some 138 below the maximum range. Some adjustment is thought to be necessary and therefore with the transfer of 260 electors from the Polling District DAS to KB1 in St. Michael North East, the revised number of electors in the St. Michael North constituency would now be 6,504 which puts it somewhat lower in relation to the maximum range as indicated by the formula in the Constitution.

As far as the St. Michael West Central constituency is concerned, the electorate in that constituency is 5,777 and that is just 129 above the minimum. What is proposed, Sir, is that the Polling District KB2 with 252 electors from St. Michael North East would be added to this constituency and that would give it a revised total of electors of 6,031.

There are some changes also proposed in respect of the three constituencies of St. Philip North, St. George South, and St. John. The revised descriptions of the boundaries of these constituencies coincide with the parish boundaries of St. Philip, St. George, and St. John at that

particular point, that is at Bye Mill, Halton, Kendal and the Edgumbe areas. The district of Kendal was divided between St. John, St. Philip North, and St. George South and this proposal will now retain that district of Kendal entirely within the constituency of St. John. It is a district within the constituency of St. John and that is where we believe it should be for electoral purposes. The revised numbers of electors for the above constituencies would be as follows:

St. Philip North	6,776 electors
St. George South	6,355 electors
St. John	- 6,471 electors

These are the adjustments, Sir, which I am proposing to the Order that was presented. These are the proposals in this amended Draft Order. They do not constitute a substantial departure from the proposals put forward in the recommendation of the Boundaries Commission. They are more in the nature of adjustments. As I indicated during the previous debate when this matter was considered, I did not intend in any way to alter the recommendation of the Boundaries Commission for an additional seat in the Christ Church area one designated as Christ Church South. But I would wish to reiterate, Sir, that the Constitution provides certain powers to this Honourable Chamber and those powers include the power to examine the report and any Draft Order which comes before it in respect of electoral boundaries. Those powers include the right of this House of Assembly to make changes to the Draft Order which may be presented and if those amendments are approved by the House then they become the law of the land when all of the entire parliamentary process would have been completed, that is, like any other matter, the House of Assembly, Senate and the necessary approval thereafter.

These are the procedures, Sir. They are set out in the legislation and just as the Constitution gives certain rights, privileges and responsibilities to the Electoral and Boundaries Commission, it also provides certain responsibilities and duties upon this Honourable Chamber. We have carried out those responsibilities and let no one seek even to impute that the House has gone beyond the powers which it has been allocated. Such an imputation would be entirely inaccurate. Anyone can look at the powers allocated and cannot but come to the conclusion that we have acted within the framework of the law.

Sir, I have carried out my responsibilities. The Draft Order came. We have looked at that Order. There are certain adjustments which we are proposing. I have outlined what those proposals are. They affect a number of constituencies. They are minor adjustments to those constituencies. I am, therefore, happy to recommend these ""to this Honourable Chamber and I, Sir, move that the Resolution do now pass.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I second that motion and reserve my right to speak. 12.35 p.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, many have struggled hard for a long time to get their positions established in the final draft of this matter and the final adjustments are currently being made.

I have stated the position of the National Democratic Party when this matter was debated in this Honourable House not so long ago, and that is this, that the present situation and all the present difficulties, whether it is resulting in unacceptable escalation in the number of seats, or unnecessary escalation in the number of seats, or in the elimination of the parishes as the basic unit of representation in this Parliament, that it all stems from many years of political gerrymandering in relation to the boundaries of the constituencies in Barbados.

However, Sir, we hold fast to the principle that one can cut up the boundaries as one likes, but that does not mean that public opinion would follow in the same way as one may term it. The chopping up of boundaries may influence decisively a particular constituency but it cannot influence overall public opinion in Barbados, since that opinion flows far beyond the geographical boundaries of a constituency.

I think that there are very few people who deep down inside do not recognise that they are faced with a situation to which they can only attach the one principle, that as the Constitution now stands adjustments of one kind or another have to be made.

But there are more fundamental principles, Sir, that would need to be addressed in respect of representation in this House of Assembly. I am quite sure that as matters now stand, in order to conform with the existing formula two things will happen. One, that you will get an ever increasing number of seats in Barbados, and two, you will get a progressive erosion of the principle of parish representation forming the unit of representation in Barbados. That is almost inevitable, and what is happening now is a reflection of that, and as time goes on it is going to get worse and worse. Sooner or later this Honourable House is going to have to decide whether or not it is going to take drastic decisions in order to reverse those built-in trends in the present boundary arrangements in Barbados and the changes in the Constitution. It is going to have to be done.

We find ourselves, Sir, on the right side of this argument both from the point of view of offering the best possible formula for the representation of the people of Barbados, and also on the right side of the moral underpinnings that should go with any argumentation on these matters. In fact, Sir, what the Government is saying is that we are faced with a situation where the Constitution

says X, Y and Z and we are not happy about it. I believe the Right Honourable Prime Minister when he introduced the motion last time said that he is not really happy with an increase in the number of seats and he would prefer to see resources going to ensure that there is a better infrastructure for representation in the constituencies.

Whatever fine tuning, whatever fine Italian hand went into this final determination, I know not, Sir, and I really am not concerned about it, because we are thinking of these matters at a higher and more fundamental, level. We believe, and the policy of the NDP is, that we will try to retain the traditional City of Bridgetown as a unit of representation, because we feel when we look, d^n,, the road in the future our vision of a City of Bridgetown.'\$; such that we feel that that should be adequately r, epre^nigd,, as one unit.

We also wish, Sir, to see the parish boundaries in Barbados fully restored in such a way that the parishes will form the basic unit of representation. It is also our policy, which we have already proclaimed to Barbadians, that we are interested in the restoration of Local Government in Barbados based on the parishes. We believe, Sir, and I think in a sense this is consistent with the kind of thinking I heard expressed on the other side, where when one talks about expanding and upgrading the infrastructure available to parliamentarians, that that in itself is a recognition that some additional infrastructure is needed in the constituencies.

We go further and we will say that you need an elected representative body at the parish level in order to offer the kind of individualised services required by the various areas in Barbados. I think it is very necessary, because as I see it, Sir, although we are a small country the issues facing Barbados today and the issues that will face Barbados in the future, the kind of issues that will come before this Parliament, are no less complex, no less demanding in time than the issues that would face a legislature in the United States or elsewhere. In addition, legislators will not have the kind of infrastructure available to them at research and at other levels, so that in point of fact they have to put in a lot more time if they are going to function effectively as legislators at a national level.

I think the time has come when we have to recognise that it is desirable to ensure that there is a return of Local Government in Barbados that would strengthen and improve the levels of representation of people and ensure that their needs in a wide variety of areas are addressed. I do not think we can continue to fool ourselves. We can talk on the one hand about expanding the infrastructure in constituencies, but that is only responding to a perceived need of greater resources being made available to provide better representation. What I am saying is that that representation would be more expressive of the will of the people in the parishes, it would deepen the democratic

process in Barbados and also provide for a wider involvement and less alienation of the people in respect of the democratic process in Barbados.

That is my own feeling. That is the position with this party and that is a matter that will be an election issue. We will be taking it to the electorate as part of our package for better government in Barbados. • ^
12.45 p.m.

We have nothing to conceal in this regard because we feel it is the kind of thing that should be fully ventilated over a long period of time so that people can form judgements.

Now, Sir, you see then why we are so anxious and feel so strongly that those parish boundaries should remain as the unit of representation because I can see a situation^ where you have your Local Government and you have your ~ central Government with representatives being elected to Parliament within the geographical unit of a parish.

Now, that is our position and as we did in the last vote on this matter in the house, we abstained and we will abstain again today because we do not see the point in getting into the argument as to who cut up the boundaries which weigh in whose interest. All of us who have been in >^A politics in Barbados-know exactly what happened before. ~

We do not wish to get into the argument as to whether 200 people should be here or 200 people should be there. We recognize that as matters stand now, they are unacceptable and any changes on a percentile basis will always result in a worsening of the present situation so that a fundamental change needs to be introduced in these matters.

Before I wind up, Sir, one final point I wish to" ~s
reiterate and that is this, that in Barbados today such is our political culture and so deep rooted is it in influencing the behaviour of people I believe that if we restore our parishes as a unit of representation, if we seek to have local government in respect of those parishes, that we would be building a kind of community spirit which existed before and which is being fractured by the utilisation of the parishes as basic units of representation in Barbados.

Unfortunately, there does not seem to be any will on " the part of the Government to address these matters, the - matters of recognizing what is basically wrong with the distribution of seats as you find it now and all the Government is prepared to do...

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I indicated quite clearly on the^ - floor of this House before that whatever support was needed in order to enshrine in the principle of "

representation a restoration of those parishes as the basic units of representation of Barbados then the NDP would have supported it.

I say this further, Sir, that I think a great opportunity is being missed in dealing with these matters. I believe when I spoke last time I indicated that whereas the parish - boundaries would remain as the basic unit of representation the number of representatives in a parish would, of course, increase with the population of the particular parish.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That would be a matter for you to work out. You are the arithmetic genius, not me.

Anyhow, Sir, I think I have made my point and I think the Parliament of this country, the House of Assembly, has missed a great opportunity to restore certain levels of respectability to the boundary divisions between constituencies in Barbados and to re-enshrine in that process the integrity of the parishes of Barbados.

I think a great opportunity has been missed and I believe that, certainly, all those persons who were members of this Honourable House over the past 10 years would know exactly what I am talking about and I am not saying it in any detail because I do not wish to be drawn into any controversy in the matter, any controversy that might cloud the higher vision which we have tried to put across to the House today.

As I finish, Sir, I would say of the NDP that, as I said last time, our hands are clean in this matter and we wish them to remain clean and, therefore, we will abstain.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is only a couple of weeks ago that I spoke in this House on a similar measure which came before the House and laid out quite clearly the principles which should guide the delimitation of boundaries and constituencies for the purpose of representation.

I stated then, and I repeat, that the most fundamental principle is to ensure that the vote of one person has as equal a weight as possible as the vote of another person.

As I understand it, those of us who believe in Parliamentary democracy, have always looked to and adverted to that principle as the guiding light and the fundamental principle for the delimitation of boundaries as the basis of representation. All the classic textbooks that one reads on this subject agree with that principle.

*>' Students of Political History and Current Affairs would tell you that it is a principle that down through the

ages has become sacrosanct. I have always strongly believed in it and the Labour Party strongly believed in it and that is why when the Constitution of Barbados was being negotiated in 1966, we argued very strongly to set up an Electoral and Boundaries Commission which would advert to this fundamental principle and as much as is humanly possible will remove from the hands of the politicians who were in the day to day struggle for office the fixing of boundaries.

I said a couple of weeks ago without reflecting, certainly, on that debate, that I believed that the Electoral and Boundaries Commission had done, in all of the circumstances, a reasonable job. Nothing that has been said in here today by the Rt. Honourable Prime Minister or, indeed, by the Leader of the Opposition will make me resile from that judgement.

I think that these five men did a very good job on a very difficult subject, a subject in which we are at times, because we are vying for office, apt to put our own particular interest foremost without at times looking at the overall interest. 12.55 p.m.

It is significant that the only 2 criticisms that have been made now by the Minister with responsibility for bringing an Order if he disagrees with the Order made by the Commission, it is significant that those adjustments are being said to be minor adjustments and not substantial changes.

Logically, I can conclude that even the Government is now satisfied that the Electoral and Boundaries Commission did a substantially excellent job and that there are only minor changes to be made to their Report. That is the point.

I do not believe that there has been any principle that has inspired the changes being made today. I thought at one stage the suggestion of bringing Kendal back fully into St. John was with the intention of keeping one community fully together. If I accept that as the premise for Kendal then I find it difficult to understand why, in the case of the changes being made in the 3 St. Michael Boundaries, we are finding that the Whitehall community is now being further separated among itself, Whitehall Tenantry 1, Whitehall Tenantry 2.

The road is now coming right through and going through Whitehall Tenantry right across to the Edgehill Memorial School, down the hill to go towards Brechin Road and coming back up along Spooners Gap, Long Gap on to Spooners Road and then to Accommodation Road. That is really the only change being made on that area. The result really in my view is that the Whitehall district now seems to me to be sandwiching between areas. So the

argument in one case does not seem to apply in the other case, Sir.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member for St. Lucy says *sotto voce* you will never find a perfect - he said sitting in his seat without standing, he does not want that, Sir - he says that you will never find a perfect solution. I could not agree with him more. That is exactly why we said and why I said in the debate on the first Order that came down that you will never find a perfect solution in the demarcation of boundaries and what you had to be guided by principally, not the only criterion, but principally was the question of ensuring that votes are equally weighed. I say and I repeat that nothing, nothing that has been said in the debate so far satisfies me that it was necessary for us to go through this exercise in the manner in which we are going through the exercise today, in the way that we are doing now.

Sir, I want, however, to advert to a mistake in the arguments of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I think he repeated it on the last time he spoke and he repeats it again today. I think it is based on a misconception. I say that there is nothing in the Constitution of Barbados which will prevent the Electoral and Boundaries Commission from reducing the numbers in this House to less than 27. Nothing.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The average is not fixed. Therefore if 20 seats is what we want, you take the number of electors and you divide them by 20. You get an average and you have 10% one way or another. So there is not a thing wrong with the formula. If you wish 30 seats you do it likewise. If you want 27 you do it likewise. And if you want 28 you do it likewise.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If you want 48 you do it likewise.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If you want to go to 24 you do it likewise. That is as I understand it.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation. It is quite obvious in any arithmetic matter of this nature that one would have to fix one variable. You have to fix at least one variable. The variable that would be fixed in determining the number...

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: In other words, Sir, the point I am making is that my argument is predicated on an assumption which has always been the case that there is a given ceiling to the number of persons one would wish to form the unit of a constituency.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Any objective analysis of the argument that I have just advanced would find that I am - absolutely correct.

I am satisfied I am correct, Sir. I am not saying this merely because I am a politician in here. As a student of political theory and as a person with some knowledge of these matters.

The position is that if the Commission had determined that they wanted 20 seats and were going to recommend to this House 20 seats the Commission could have gone through the number of electors and drawn the boundaries to reflect 20 seats. The only reason why the Commission at this stage recommended an increase by one seat, as I understand it, is to come within an average without disrupting existing sitting Members too much.

You will recall, Sir, a suggestion from the Honourable Member for St. Peter, and I think it was the Honourable Minister for St. Michael West, that perhaps in future we should look at not changing boundaries for a longer period, 10 years or so because, and this has been recognized in some countries, it gives a reasonable time for that boundary to be known and to be settled. Some countries do not change boundaries for outgoing Parliaments. They change it at such a time that the boundary change sinks into the community and it disrupts as little as possible the process of holding elections.

I would have wished that the Commission possibly have reported sooner. That point was made too. I am satisfied, having heard everything, and I again repeat that I am satisfied that the Commission did a very good job and I see no reason therefore to give them any vote of censure. Our position remains as it was by the way we act, in approving, as we voted positively for their recommendation showing our commendation of what they have done.

Now, Sir, the Honourable Member made some points about the parish boundaries. Once again let me say when we discussed the Parish Boundaries Bill in here - and I am not going to reflect - I stated then the Labour Party's position. We hope that parish boundaries were not going to be used impliedly to change the constituency boundaries at that time. An undertaking was given by the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister and I am satisfied that everything is now done, that once the Government goes through with the new elections under these Orders, nothing would have been done to have affected the electoral process.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Under this Order, Sir. I am not putting any position. I want to put my position clear. Because I know when I have to make political points in the hustings what political points I would wish to make.

What I am saying is that now that the Government has brought this particular Order, in my view, the elections must be held under this Order with a new 28 constituencies. If we revert to it, we pass this, if we try to hold it under the former Order with the Parish Boundaries Act in operation, if we proclaimed it, the undertaking given to me would not be honoured. I am very careful how I put that, if we proclaim it. I do not want us to have any misunderstanding. The Act, as I understand, is not yet proclaimed. Fair enough. Therefore the existing boundaries stand. 1.05p.m.

This Order, if it is approved by this House and the Senate and signed by Her Excellency the Governor-General, becomes the current Order from the time it comes in. But if it does not go through that process and the Parish Boundaries Act is proclaimed without any consequential change in the existing boundaries, we will be back to a fine situation. I wish, therefore, to outline that I am following the events with great care. I have seen the undertaking given to me honoured so far and I hope that it will be honoured in its entirety.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am not going to cite Standing Orders to the other Members. I am not going to be provoked between now and the time when I win the elections whenever they are called, Sir. So the Honourable Members could talk to their heart's delight. I am calm, collected, and cool. I am just following the ball as you bowl it, Sir.

Now, Sir, I want to talk about the parishes because again we are under some misconception. We articulated quite clearly, that is the Labour Party, in our last Manifesto that we see the need in Barbados for greater participation of the public in Governmental structures. I am not going to rehash the reasons why parochial representation at the parish level was changed and I am certainly not at this stage going to go through the report of the Moyne Commission or indeed the report of the Jackson Commission and the reasons for the changes. Some of those reasons are valid. Time has proved some of them not having worked as effectively as possible to the overall benefit of good Government and active community participation in Barbados. The Labour Party is already on record. Its Manifesto speaks to it and it is still relevant and it will be repeated, updated, and expanded in saying that it is >- "necessary to give people more day to day participation other than every five years in governmental management.

There are several ways of achieving it. I do not believe that it is necessary to achieve it only within a geographical area called the parish. As a matter of fact, in many respects the demographic changes along the landscape of Barbados have altered considerably the relevance of the geographical entity called the parish. What we must achieve, however, is to ensure that there is not merely a central authority laying down the law and nothing but the law for the people on a daily basis. More and more people are becoming over-dependent on political patronage and political will and less and less able to show their own initiative as active citizens. This is part of the Labour Party's policy we enunciated in 1986. Unfortunately, our Manifesto was not discussed as much as we ought to have discussed it because we were answering charges against ourselves on the positive aspects. But part of our policy in our Manifesto will continue in the next election to be to get wider participation by every man, woman and child in being part of the community Barbados. It is important if we are to be a caring and sharing Barbados.

The Honourable Member for St. Peter has spoken in this House, and I have enunciated it before, the fact that in Barbados today we are in danger of having two Barbados, a suburban Barbados along our southern and western coast and a division from the St. George Valley going back in where some of the necessities of life for people in rural Barbados have not kept up with what is required. We must, wherever possible, whether it is on such lines or whether it is on lines of class or colour, have a bounded duty to make sure that Barbados is not divided into two societies. The Labour Party's philosophy, as democratic socialists, obligates us and it obligates me now as I carry on that legacy to ensure that those divisions will not take place in this society. I give the House and the country our firm understanding and undertaking that, when the time comes, we will enunciate in details the specific measures that we will take to ensure that this does not happen. The country can look forward to a greater participation by the community at large and by every citizen in Barbados in the day to day administration of this Government. Ministers will no longer believe that their fiat and that their word is the ultimate and final word of what happens. When I had the responsibility, Mr. Speaker, Sir....

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I know the Honourable Members will now shout. They must listen, Sir, to a good discourse and let it sink in, Sir. When I had the responsibility in this House for being Minister in charge of Legal Affairs and (he Attorney General, I started a series of measures by way of the Administrative Justice Act and what not to make those changes. But we will make the changes in other ways and particularly, Sir, in dealing with the changes which are necessary to prevent the two Barbados and make sure that there is greater participation.

You will notice outlined, too, in our then Manifesto that we suggested for instance, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that at the level of the polyclinic we had to bring more participation....

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE:... seeing how those were being administered. You will notice, Sir, that we were most anxious, even before that, to show that there was decentralization and we talked in one of our Manifestos before about it and set about trying to create it in trying to bring, about sub-towns. I remember very well the Democratic Labour Party talking about the tale of three cities.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Well, they talked of the tale of two cities. But I heard the then Right Honourable Member for St. John speak of a tale of three cities in decrying and making fun at our Manifesto. We tried then to ensure that type of development, Sir. I do not believe that we can revert to a system of Local Government in the classic sense based on parochial boundaries. I do not think in modern Barbados and the way Barbados has gone that that policy is either in terms of cost or in terms of the development that has taken place, a proper system. The vestry system could never be returned to Barbados and make any sense in the context of Barbados, Sir. The reasons for the vestry system were so different. Barbados has developed in a different way. Therefore, when we speak in our Manifesto about looking at the developments, we are looking in another sense about decentralization of central services and the participation of people, whether it is at the level of the Parents/Teachers Association or whatever you like in the actual management of their affairs.

When I was a kid growing up, Sir, it was easy for all of us in our street, Water Street where I was born, to go out as children with our parents and grandparents and weed the side of the street in front of us and brighten up our households. Today in the terraces very few people want to go and weed anything in front of their door in order to keep the environment clean. We want in Barbados, in this society, to create that feeling in the minds of people that they are real participants in the system of Government and that once they are getting the privileges they have corresponding duties to the society and the community as a whole.

Therefore, when we speak of Local Government along these terms, we are speaking in that deep sense of community and not in the sense of being bound by a geographical entity called the parish* I know the then Right Honourable Member for St. John was most anxious when the session of this Parliament began in June 1986 to bring

back the parish boundaries. It was something that his mind was very much set on.
1.15p.m.

I think on reflection we all will concede that they serve very little purpose, and even if one looks at them in relation to jurisdiction of the Magistrate's Court today they make little sense. What we have to find are what are proper entities to be able to deliver our services to the people so that the people do not feel that they are being ruled only by bureaucrats and politicians, but that they themselves are part of the Government of Barbados.

Barbados is such a small territory in many senses that we must not, in our anxiety to seem new, duplicate services and duplicate thoughts. The system of Government we must run must be one that ensures maximum day-to-day participation by people in governing themselves at minimum cost available, and cuts out a lot of the bureaucratic humbug which occurs from having too much government too heavy at the centre, Sir.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that on another occasion, perhaps in the next few days during the Estimates when we are able to dilate on these matters, we will talk more and more about the matters which I have adumbrated very quickly in this debate. I am grateful to you for allowing me to try to tie in a wider matter with the issue of representation, but I tie it in under the rubric of representation, Sir, and therefore I will say that the Labour Party's position on this is as it was on the last Draft Order. We believe that the Commission has made a proper report, we have not seen much here that would persuade us otherwise and unless during the debate some more substantial justification comes, we will have to vote as we did last time.

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

Ayes: Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Hon. B. M. TAITT, Hon. E. E. GREAVES, Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN, Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, Mr. C. A. NEBLETT, Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH, Mr. L. X L. BRATHWAITE, Mr. R. L. MORRIS, Dr. E. A. SIMMONS and Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON - 12

Abstentions: Dr. R. C. HAYNES and Mr. E. BOURNE-2

Noes: Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS and Mr. O. S. ARTHUR - 3.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY
ACQUISITION OF LAND AT WILCOX, CHRIST
CHURCH FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF THE
AIRPORT APPROACH LIGHTING SYSTEM AND
FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks parliamentary approval for the compulsory acquisition of this 30 000 square metres of land at Wilcox, Christ Church.

The Government entered upon this gentleman's land way back in the seventies and installed landing lights at the airport to help aircraft to land. It separated most of the gentleman's land and it was of no further economic use to him, because where the land is houses cannot be built because it is in the flight path of aircraft.

This Resolution seeks approval to compulsorily acquire the land from the owner. The purpose is for an airport approach lighting system and for agricultural purposes.

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

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that, Sir, and reserve my right to speak.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I have just one query to ask of the Minister of Housing. Am I to understand that all of the land in the approach path, which would be available for airport expansion of the runway and otherwise, would be kept solely for that purpose? I think this land is to the West, if I am right, but it is to the East of the airport as well that it is necessary to ensure...

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I know that, but I am coming to the point. The Honourable Members must know that when I speak in this House I do not speak lightly, I try to get my facts straight.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Just wait. I know when Spencers was acquired and from whom it was acquired and for how much.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: No, it was acquired during the ^Democratic Labour Party's time, so the Honourable Members would know. I do research, you know.

I am not on a controversial trend, although the Government seems jumpy today for some reason. What I want to ask the Minister, Sir, is whether or not there are any proposals for using the land to the East, which already is Crown land, for constructing any factories or other buildings. I think it is necessary to ensure that in planning, for instance, the expansion which is being contemplated by the ADC and associated companies, that expansion does not take place in what will be required in the future for necessary development of the airport

That is really the only reason why I have intervened. Other than that, Sir, the Resolution certainly has the support of this side of the House.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. B.M. TAITT, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee of Supply. 1.25p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1989-90 No. 18
HEAD 10-GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, the sum of \$14 540 was approved as the provision for Object No. 6 - Travel, under Subhead 1, Governor-General as part of Head 10 Governor-General.

This Supplementary Resolution is seeking an additional \$3 100 for the purpose of travel and this has been occasioned, as indeed has been the case with a number of other Object Nos. in a variety of ministries, by the fact that there has been an increase in the travel allowances and that agreement on the level of increases took place after the current Estimates had been prepared and the Agreement dated back to 1988 so this supplement of \$3 100 is necessary to meet the additional expenditure.

I beg to move that Head 10 stand part.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that.

The question that Head 10 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 36 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, most of these have to do with increase in public utilities.

I beg to move that Head 36 stand part. Hon.

P.M. GREAVES: I beg to second that.

The question that Head 36 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 40 - MINISTRY OF TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 40 stand part.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that.

The question that Head 40 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1989-90
No. 19 HEAD 84 - MINISTRY OF
TRANSPORT AND WORKS

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 84 stand part.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I beg to second that.

The question that Head 84 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES No. 20
ANNEXED ESTIMATES - HEAD 50 -
POST OFFICE

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 50 stand part.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that.

The question that Head 50 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to His Honour the SPEAKER the passing of three Money Resolutions in Committee of Supply and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. P. M. GREAVES seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for today. There are some matters standing under Private Members Business and the names of Members on the Order Paper. I do not know if Members are in a position to start with them today. I understand from the Other Side the answer is "No".

I move, Sir, that Question Time be now taken. "

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Thomas, Question No. 109.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would be obliged if the answer could be laid. This was last week's. This was before the House and ought to have been replied to then. The House adjourned without the matter coming up—^ so I do not mind if it is laid.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 109, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question 115 by the same Honourable Member for St. Thomas. The Honourable Minister for Tourism and Sport. He has just asked to lay them on the table. *

Hon. C. A. NEBLETT: I beg to lay the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 115. Thank you.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, in respect of Parliamentary Question No. 115, I did not ask that that be laid. I anticipated that 109 would be pretty lengthy because of the nature of the information sought and I was accommodating members by asking that it be laid so I could have a look at it but this is a short one. I would be grateful if I could have this reply. "--

Hon. C. A. NEBLETT: I have no difficulty in accommodating him.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Minister then rise and give the reply to Question No. 115.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Question No. 115. To ask the Minister of Tourism and Sports: ^

1. Is the Minister aware that there is need for a pavilion or changing facility at the playing fields in Bridgefield, St. Thomas and Proute Hill, St. Thomas. If the answer is in the affirmative will the Minister please state what are Government's plans for construction of the said pavilions/ changing facility? C*

Hon. C. A. NEBLETT: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the question is "Yes, Sir," and the second part -

"There is need for an additional pavilion and changing facilities in St Thomas and in other areas of Barbados as well. Such facilities will be provided from time to time as resources permit."

Thank you.
"js.35p.m.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Supplementary, Sir. Sir, I wonder if the Honourable Minister could tell us what are the specific forecasts in respect of the construction of pavilions and playing fields at Proute and Bridgefield -1 do not want to hear about the rest of Barbados - Proute and Bridgefield in Barbados?

Hon. C. A. NEBLETT: Mr. Speaker, I have not got that information currently but no doubt it will be provided in the very near future.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Number 2, Sir. Will the Minister please state whether it is proposed in the Estimates for the Financial Year 1990-91...

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, no. Government's policy, Sir. What is Government's policy...?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is introducing matter that is irrelevant to the question. You are introducing now matter that is irrelevant to the question.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: With respect, Mr. Speaker, he did say in his substantive reply that it was Government's intention when resources are available in the future. I am asking if the future includes the period 1990-91.

Asides.

Mr. D. A.C. SIMMONS: They asked me to deal with it next week, Sir. He is only acting.

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Alright, Sir, I will accept the plea in mitigation. We will wait until next week, ^esumably the substantive Minister will be here.

Mr. SPEAKER: The same Honourable Member 118.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: In respect of Question 118, Sir, this can be laid because I think some action has started. The answer is now *ex post facto*. They can lay it.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, as Your Honour is aware....

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am on a point of order related to the Standing Orders.

Mr. SPEAKER: Which Standing Order are you referring to?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: To the Standing Order referring to Questions.

Mr. SPEAKER: Which one is that?

Laughter.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFQRD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 118.

Mr. SPEAKER: End of Question Time.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move, Sir, that this House do now adjourn.... Let me stale, Sir, before I move the adjournment, for Honourable Members' benefit, that next week we shall be dealing with the Estimates of Expenditure and Revenue beginning from Monday right through until Friday.

That being the case I am moving the adjournment of the House until Monday, the 12th of March 1990 at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Monday the 12th March, 1990 at 10 o'clock in the morning was put and was resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the sitting accordingly at 1.41 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Confirmation of Minutes of Meeting of

Tuesday, 27th February, 1990 4971

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 4971

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR THE
SPEAKER..... 4971

PAPERS

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD 4971

1. Electoral and Boundaries Commission
(Review of Boundaries) (Amended) Draft
Order, 1990.
2. Report by the Three-Man Investigating
Team on Misuse of the Diplomatic Bag
from the Barbados Embassy, Caracas on
24th December, 1988.
3. The Estimates 1990-^91.

Hon. C. A. NEBLETT..... 4972

4. Annual Estimates and Financial
Statements of the Barbados Tourism
Investment Corporation, for the years
1983,1984,1985 and 1986.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

The Appropriation Bill, 1990.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS 4972

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE ELECTORAL
AND BOUNDARIES COMMISSION (RE
VIEW OF BOUNDARIES) (AMENDED)
DRAFT ORDER, 1990 4972

Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 4972; Dr. R. C.
Haynes, 4973; Hon. H. deB. Forde, 4975.

RESOLUTION FOR COMPULSORY ACQUI
SITION OF LAND AT WILCOX, CHRIST
CHURCH, FOR AIRPORT APPROACH
LIGHTING SYSTEM AND FOR AGRI
CULTURAL PURPOSES 4979

Hon. H. A. Blackman, 4979; Hon. H. deB.
Forde, 4979.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1989-90, PART

I - CURRENT- NO. 18 FOR \$454 468.....4979

HEAD 10 - GOVERNOR-GENERAL.....4979

RL Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 4979

HEAD 36 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH..... 4980 -

Hon. B. M. Taitt, 4980

HEAD 40 - MINISTRY OF TRADE,
INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE..... 4980

Hon. E. E. Greaves, 4980.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1989-90, PART

II - CAPITAL - NO. 19 FOR \$250 000..... 4980

HEAD 84 - MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT
AND WORKS.....4980

Hon. Dr. D. G. Blackman, 4980.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1989-90 -
ANNEXED ESTIMATES - NO. 20 FOR
\$56309.....4980

HEAD 50 - POST OFFICE 4980

Hon. Dr. D. G. Blackman, 4980.

QUESTION TIME

NO. 109 BY Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS 4980

Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 4980.

NO. 115 BY Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS 4980

Hon. C. A. Neblett, 4980.

NO. 118 BY Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS 4981

RL Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 4981.

ADJOURNMENT.....4981

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 4981.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

BLACKMAN, Hon. Dr. D. G. (St. Michael East)

BLACKMAN, Hon. H. A. (St. Philip South)

FORDE, Hon. H. deB. (Christ Church West)

GREAVES, Hon. E. E. (St. Lucy)

GREAVES, Hon. P. M. (St. Michael North)

HAYNES, Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South-Central)

NEBLETT, Hon. C. A. (St. Andrew)

SANDIFORD, Rt. Hon. L. E. (St. Michael South)

SIMMONS, D. A. C. (St. Thomas)

TAITT, Hon. B. M. (St. Michael West)

-
^