
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(UNOFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 2013 – 2018

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, July 16, 2013

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 10.00 a.m. on Tuesday, July 16, 2013.

PRESENT

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

His Honour M. A. CARRINGTON (Speaker)
Her Honour Mrs. M-J. M. THOMPSON (Deputy Speaker)
Mr. G. A. CLARKE, J.P.
Hon. D. St.E. KELLMAN (Minister of Housing, Lands and Rural Development)
Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition)
Hon. R. D. JONES, J.P. (Minister of Education, Science, Technology and Innovation)
Hon. R. L. SEALY (Minister of Tourism)
Hon. F. J. STUART (Prime Minister, Minister of National Security, the Public Service and Urban Development)
Hon. J. D. E. BOYCE (Minister of Health)
Hon. S. D. BLACKETT (Minister of Social Care, Constituency Empowerment and Community Development)
Dr. the Hon. D. S. LOWE (Minister of Drainage and the Environment)
Hon. S. A. LASHLEY (Minister of Culture, Sports and Youth)
Hon. C. P. SINCKLER (Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs)
Mr. T. A. PRESCOD
Mr. K. D. SYMMONDS
Mr. E. G. HINKSON
Dr. M. M. AGARD, J.P.

Miss S. J. O. BRADSHAW

Mr. SPEAKER: Good morning, Honourable Members, this House is now in session. Members, as you are aware, there was no meeting last week as a result of the *weather (to be confirmed)* system which threatened. We are happy that we were spared the wrath of that system, and I wish to thank all those who would have co-operated in letting us put things in order so that we could get the notice in place, so that we met today instead of last week. I have with me the minutes of our meeting held on Tuesday, June 25, 2013.

MINUTES

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes. Members, let me take the opportunity to acknowledge in our midst this morning Carol, Lady Haynes, and the family of the late Sir Richard Haynes, a former esteemed Member of this Chamber, whose memory we will honour this morning in tribute. We extend our condolences to you, and wish you God's blessing at this very difficult time. Yes, Mr. Clerk.

PAPERS

Hon. J. D. E. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, sir, I am commanded to lay the Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (*Barbados (to be confirmed)* Incorporated) Order, 2013; the Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (*Yvette Edghill (to be confirmed)*) Order, 2013; and the Barbados Economic and Social Report 2012.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes. Thank you, Honourable Member.

SPECIAL REPORT OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, Honourable Member for St. Michael North East.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. This morning we lay the Special Report of the Public Accounts Committee, which requests of this Honourable Chamber direction in respect of Standing Order 61, which states that no evidence shall be published in any format. There is potentially a conflict between this and the Public Accounts Committee Act, which says that the evidence of the Public Accounts Committee shall be heard in public. But for the avoidance of doubt, and rather than going the lengthy and expensive route of seeking legal opinion, we have determined that we will seek the guidance of the Honourable House of Assembly to determine whether this Standing Order can be waived, as has been done in the United Kingdom and other Parliaments.

If that is the will of the House, then the Public Accounts Committee evidence can be published. If it is not the will of the House, then the Public Accounts Committee evidence shall not be published until such time as a report is laid in the Honourable House of Assembly. But the consensus of the PAC is that it will be bound by the will of the House of Assembly, so that at the appropriate time the House will have to take the necessary vote. I do not imagine that it will be this morning, but either later today or next week or whenever the House meets again; and we will be bound by this. I believe this will be circulated to all Honourable Members who are not members of the Public Accounts Committee. I am obliged to you, sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am obliged.

OBITUARY - THE LATE SIR RICHARD CHRISTOPHER HAYNES, K.A.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, Honourable Prime Minister.

Hon. F. J. STUART: Mr. Speaker, Richard Christopher Haynes, a late Honourable Member of this Chamber, died in Barbados on the 23rd day of June and was buried on the second day of July. In accordance with the hallowed traditions of this Chamber, I rise to sponsor the usual condolence resolution which usually follows the passing of Members who have sat in this Honourable Chamber.

The history of Richard Christopher Haynes, Mr. Speaker, is very well known: a product of the parish of St. George; former student at the Workman's Primary School and the St. George Boys' School; former student of Combermere; former student of Harrison College; Barbados Scholar in the ancient classics, Latin, Greek and

ancient history; student of Edinburgh University, where he qualified as a medical doctor; distinguished medical practitioner in Barbados; distinguished public health official; ultimately a Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians; and, of course, a Member of this House.

It is appropriate, Mr. Speaker, that one examines the life of Richard Haynes, because there are so many lessons to be learnt from so distinguished and so action-packed a life. As a doctor, of course, working at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, to him is attributed much of the development which that hospital has seen and the diversification of its activities: the creation of the intensive care unit, its overall development as a modern tertiary care institution and, of course, a modern teaching hospital. So nobody will deny that Richard Haynes made a massive, substantial and wise contribution to the development of public health in Barbados. He was so renowned and so highly esteemed a doctor that his skills attracted even the attention of royalty, and it is not unknown that on occasion members of the Royal Family have had his medical attention and care bestowed on them.

But the respect in which Richard Haynes is best remembered in Barbados, and which I think needs to be the focus of this House today, is that of a Member of Parliament, a contributor to the public life of Barbados between 1976 and 1999, when off and on he sat in this Chamber. Now, I have been around politics for a little while in Barbados. I followed it from the time I was in single digits, and I do not know of many politicians who came to public life, who came to electoral politics, essentially summoned there, invited there, by the masses of the people of Barbados. Ordinarily, people enter politics and they distinguish themselves, but Richie Haynes was expected to enter politics, was basically invited into politics and, of course, for as long as he was in politics, attracted the attention of the people of this country.

The only other person in my lifetime that enjoyed that kind of renown was my predecessor in office, the late Honourable Member for St. John, who from his teenage days sent signals out that he was destined for a parliamentary career; and people could not wait to see him realise that ambition and to see him come to sit in this House. So too was Richie Haynes. In fact, of Richie Haynes it can truly be said, as the French 19th century novelist Gustave Flaubert said of the Carthaginian general Hannibal, that he always seemed to be clothed in that indefinable splendour that marked him out as a man destined for great enterprises.

So that even when he was a doctor at the hospital, he was being christened the second most powerful man in Barbados; not only because of the deep impression he made on that institution, but he so carried himself and so comported himself and so deported himself that the average

citizen of this country knew that you were dealing with a man destined for some kind of greatness, greatness more than he had already attained as a distinguished medical practitioner in Barbados. And needless to say, since it was well known where his political sympathies lay, he attracted the attention of political adversaries even before he declared himself for electoral politics.

But that time would come in 1976, when he took the plunge into electoral politics, contesting the seat in the St. George North constituency, the area in which he was born. Now, Mr. Speaker, I followed that campaign quite closely and spent some time myself in the constituency of St. George North because, because it was Richie Haynes, St. George North was the focus of the 1976 general election. I shall never forget attending a meeting at Charles River Bridge, where the then Leader of the Barbados Labour Party admonished the people of St. George North that even if he, the leader of the Labour Party, lost his seat, and even if Mr. St. John lost his seat, and even if Mr. *Forde (to be confirmed)* lost his seat, they would all be happy as long as the people of St. George North allowed Mr. *Jack Dear (to be confirmed)*, Richie Haynes' opponent, to be the Leader of the Opposition.

That was the kind of attention that Richard Haynes attracted. And even while he was attracting this kind of attention, he never lost his *cool (to be confirmed)*. He never sacrificed any of his personal dignity and, of course, he gave as well as he got. He did not get elected in 1976. Not only did he not get elected, but the Government lost. But even though he was not elected, he was still the focus of the attention of his adversaries, because the country still yearned for his contribution, and it was thought, not unreasonably, that a place would have to be found for him to get access to this Parliament.

That place was found in 1978 when the then holder of the seat in St. Michael South Central, the Honourable Frederick Smith, now Sir Frederick Smith, resigned from Parliament and the Democratic Labour Party chose Richie Haynes as its candidate in St. Michael South Central. The St. Michael South Central by-election was one of the most hotly contested by-elections in Barbados' post-Independence history; hotly contested, again, because Richie Haynes was the candidate, and it was thought that every effort should be made to ensure that he did not secure election to this House. After a hard-fought campaign, he was resoundingly returned to this House by the constituents of St. Michael South Central.

I well recall the day he took up his seat in this House. Parliament yard was blocked. It teemed with people, cheering admirers of Richie Haynes. At last he was going to take up a seat which they thought was his by way of entitlement, so much had he promised as a young political prospect. And from the time he got into this

House, in fact on the first day he was in the House, I well recall that the then Prime Minister got up to congratulate him on his election, only to draw the ire of Mr. Barrow, who was then Opposition Leader, who in most unparliamentary language accused the then Prime Minister of hypocrisy: after trying so hard to keep him out, why was he congratulating him now? And that set the tone for what would happen in the Parliament of Barbados from 1978 on.

One would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that as a medical doctor the focus of Richie Haynes in this House would have been matters related to health and social welfare and that kind of thing. Not so. His agility of mind, the flexibility of his intellect, resisted any of that. He focused on the matters that touched and concerned the Prime Minister of the day, matters related to finance and planning. Week after week, Richard Haynes confronted the Prime Minister of the day on the economic direction of Barbados. Citizens marvelled at the fact that a man trained in the classics, a man trained as a doctor, could so easily make the transition to matters related to finance and economics and matters of planning. But Richard Haynes was able to do that, and do it with consummate ease.

In the meanwhile, of course, people had begun to suggest that, given the quality of his performance and given his political stature, he was destined to be a Prime Minister of Barbados. Now that is interesting, because at the time in the Democratic Labour Party there were two other young men, the late Branford Taitt and Mr. Erskine Sandiford, and that triumvirate attracted national attention, and it was thought that any of the three could become Prime Minister of Barbados.

Now there is nothing too novel about that. In the 1960s, for example, in the United Kingdom, in the British Labour Party, there was another famous triumvirate of Denis Healey, Roy Jenkins and Tony Crosland, all three of whom went to Oxford University, all three of whom got first-class honours, all three of whom ended up in the British Labour Party, and all three of whom were thought to be future Prime Ministers of Britain. As it turned out, none became Prime Minister. In fact, Denis Healey is still to this day described as the best Prime Minister Britain never had. Tony Crosland, of course, died very early, and Roy Jenkins broke off and formed a party called the Social Democratic Party. So those triumvirates are known.

More recently, there was the triumvirate of Tony Blair, Gordon Brown and Robin Cook. It was thought confidently that Brown would be the Prime Minister of Britain, but then fortune smiled on Blair and he emerged, went ahead of Brown, and dominated British politics for a while before Brown eventually became Prime Minister. And very much like Tony Crosland, Robin Cook died. In Barbados we had this triumvirate in the Democratic Labour Party. Of course, there was a triumvirate in the Barbados

Labour Party too, the triumvirate of *Forde (to be confirmed)*, St. John and Adams, all three of whom could have been leaders of Barbados at any time. But as history unfolded, even though St. John had had the head start, Adams is the person who dominated his era, St. John becoming Prime Minister for a year and *Forde (to be confirmed)* not becoming Prime Minister at all, but just leaving the Labour Party at a certain stage.

These triumvirates and how their fortunes unfold are not unknown. So in the case of Richie Haynes, Mr. Speaker, there were Erskine Sandiford, Richie Haynes and Branford Taitt, and any of the three of them could have become Prime Minister of Barbados. As it would turn out, Erskine Sandiford became Prime Minister of Barbados. Taitt never did, nor did Richie Haynes. But the history of that period cannot be written, and cannot be written with any degree of completeness, without reference to the outstanding contributions of all three to the development of Barbados during their time.

So between 1978 and 1981, Richie Haynes emerged as, in many people's minds, the answer to Tom Adams. In fact, it was Richie Haynes who alerted Barbadians around 1980 that this country was going to end up in the hands of the IMF because of the policies being pursued by the then Adams Administration. And it was he who eventually, even before the Government did, informed the country that Barbados had in fact gone to the IMF after the 1981 general election, because he had access to information that sometimes baffled political observers and, of course, always kept his political adversaries in a state of imbalance.

We did not win the 1981 general election, and Richard Haynes' efforts continued between 1981 and 1985. His contests with Adams, the titanic debating struggles on matters related to economics and finance, continued between Haynes and Adams until Adams suddenly died. And, of course, the focus then shifted to Adams' successor, Mr. St. John, who became Prime Minister and who had taken over Adams' portfolios. The Opposition party prevailed in 1986 and, not surprisingly, because of his stewardship between 1978 and 1986, the then Prime Minister, Mr. Barrow, appointed Richie Haynes Minister of Finance, Barrow retaining the Ministry of Economic Affairs for himself.

The politics of the Democratic Labour Party, the politics of Barbados, became very interesting around that time, because we were not doing spectacularly economically at the time, and Richie thought that we needed an experiment, a new political experiment. The economy of Barbados had been managed in those days, prior to Haynes' incumbency, on the basis of general Keynesian principles, demand management. But Haynes thought that the economy needed a spurt and that we should move from the demand side to the supply side. And

the supply side was fairly popular at that time, because Ronald Reagan was the President of the United States of America and he was doing it there and it seemed to be working; Margaret Thatcher was Prime Minister of Britain at the time, she was doing it there and it seemed to be working. And it was thought that supply-side actions by the Government to provide incentives to businesses and individuals would give a stimulus to economic activity in the country.

That did not in fact find favour with the then Prime Minister, who was always, as he described himself, an unrepentant product of the Keynesian revolution in economic thought. He was always Keynesian, and therefore could not accommodate himself to supply-side policies. And there was some ambivalence in the Government as to whether this experiment would succeed. For a while it seemed as though it was succeeding, as was the case in the United States, as was the case in the United Kingdom. But then the stage was reached where it was thought that it had spent itself and that the policies needed to be reversed.

It was at the point of the reversal of those policies that Richie Haynes thought that he could not be true to himself, and he was a man of robust personal convictions. He could not be true to himself if he just meekly accepted that deviation. And there came then the break between him and the Democratic Labour Party. But the break notwithstanding, Richard Haynes continued to contribute mightily and massively to the thinking, the economic thinking, and the debates in this Honourable Chamber. The 1991 election came and, obviously, the stand-off between Haynes and the Democratic Labour Party was the feature of that election as well. He lost his seat in St. Michael South Central in 1991, but, nothing daunted, returned in 1994 and recaptured that seat, which he kept until 1999.

It was my special pleasure, Mr. Speaker, because I too got elected in 1994, to sit on that side of the House accompanied by Richie Haynes, the Honourable Member for St. Lucy and myself, and we had some very good times discussing public policy with Haynes and, of course, participating in the debates of this Chamber with him. He gave up electoral politics in 1999, after the general election had been called, and gave himself over to business. He continued his medical practice but also shifted his focus to business, and in that sphere of human endeavour he was also something of a past master. Everybody acknowledged, and everybody still acknowledges, his genius in that area.

And of course he is remembered with respect for his achievements along the South Coast. Small wonder, then, that this Government thought that a certain area of the South Coast should bear his name, and therefore the boardwalk on the South Coast has been christened the Richie Haynes Boardwalk. That recognition brought him

immense satisfaction. It was my special pleasure to deliver the feature address on that occasion and to spend some time with him that evening, and I can attest personally to the pleasure he felt that his efforts in that area had been recognised. Of course, long before that his contribution to the country had been recognised, because he had been elevated to the status of Knight of St. Andrew in recognition of the rich and enduring contribution which he had made to the public life of Barbados, whether in the medical profession or in the sphere of politics.

The time comes, Mr. Speaker, when human beings are required by nature to lay the burden down. With the passage of time, failing health made incursions on the body of Richard Christopher Haynes, and for the last few years he has had to battle what I would call a treacherous illness. But he bore with fortitude and with determination all the challenges and complications that treacherous illness begat. And of course, always at his side, and a source of dutiful sustenance to him, was his wife of well upwards of 40 years, Carol, Lady Haynes, in whom he believed and who believed in him and who, in his darkest hours, whether in his declining years or in politics or in medicine, was always there as a source of inspiration and a source of comfort to him.

Richie Haynes was also a good family man. As he said to me on the evening the boardwalk was opened, he reminded me that when I was through all that I was doing, and when I was finished exerting myself in matters political and in matters prime ministerial, to remember that after all of this, all you have left is family. And I will never forget those words, because he himself had lived them. He himself had savoured that experience and he knew what he was talking about. He was not the only person of high political renown from whom I had heard those words, so it must be that that is one of the axioms of modern public life; well, not modern public life, public life on the whole.

But he was a devout family man and, of course, as we heard in the eulogy, the eloquent eulogy delivered eloquently by his son *Kashka (to be confirmed)* at the funeral, he paid very close attention to his family and, of course, to a narrow and loyal circle of friends. Put differently, that was the kind of man Richie Haynes was. On the 23rd of June he surrendered to his illness and, predictably, the country went into mourning, because all Barbadians recognise, all Barbadians realise, that we had lost not just another Barbadian but a Barbadian of very high distinction.

But the life of Richard Haynes would be wasted if we do not distil from that life the lessons which he so determinedly taught all of us. For Richard Haynes, politics was not a spectator sport. He took politics very, very seriously. Whether it be politics at the national level or politics at the constituency level, he took his politics very,

very seriously. He never asked any quarter and he never gave any quarter. For Richard Haynes, politics was a matter of conviction, and there were things which he thought he could not sincerely espouse. He made decisions based on conscience and also, of course, on respect for his personal manhood. You may not agree with him all the time, and I certainly did not agree with him all the time, but you had to respect him, because he followed where his convictions led.

He was that kind of politician, Mr. Speaker, and there are many of this kind who excited either intense affection or intense opposition. But the one thing you had to be sure about: you could not ignore Richie Haynes. You had to acknowledge he was there; you either liked him or you decided to oppose him. So I think that he has left his own unique legacy in the politics of Barbados. And as Leader of the Democratic Labour Party, I want to publicly thank him for the contribution he made to the Democratic Labour Party. That is the party with which he spent most of his life, and he contributed to its discourses with conviction and with sincerity for as long as he was associated with our great organisation.

Now lies he dead. His life enriched us for as long as it lasted. His death now leaves desolate that portion of our landscape which he so proudly, so uniquely and so gracefully occupied. To his wife, Carol, Lady Haynes, and to his sons, Richard and Kashka, and to their families, and to all of his sorrowing relatives, to all of those persons gladdened by his life but now saddened by his death, I, on behalf of myself and, of course, my own family, extend heartfelt condolences. Barbados was the better for having known Richie Haynes. It was the better for having produced Richie Haynes. It was the better for having benefited from the insights and from the contribution of Richard Christopher Haynes. May he rest in peace. I am obliged to you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. "We have no interest in the politics of hate. We see no one as an enemy, and our philosophy inclines us to co-operate with all persons who do good for Barbados. Those who perceive their survival as dependent on sowing the seeds of enmity in the society, the seeds of hate, the seeds of destruction, usually reap what they sow. We shall continue to ignore the personal attacks, for personal abuse is the refuge of the intellectually bankrupt." Those were the words of the late Sir Richard Christopher Haynes in April 1989 in the Budget Debate. I quote them because those were the words that I strongly remember upon entering public life, for it was less than three months later that I formally entered the process of representational politics by being nominated in St. Michael North East.

I start here, Mr. Speaker, as I rise to second the motion that the Honourable Prime Minister has moved to celebrate the life of a great Barbadian and former Member of this Honourable House of Assembly. I start here because those words reflect, for me, the essence of what Richard Haynes' legacy ultimately will be about. It is significant that he left public life in Barbados as leader of a party that is not represented in this Honourable House today. But it is equally significant that the sentiments that will flow today will record that he was one of the greatest Barbadians since Independence to have served in this Honourable Chamber.

Indeed, the Prime Minister spoke of the triumvirate in England and used the description, in respect of a British politician, that has often been used in respect of Richie Haynes: that he was the best Prime Minister Barbados never had. Such was the respect that all parties, and indeed those not in parties, across Barbados had for Richie Haynes. I can only speak from first-hand knowledge of my time in Parliament from 1994 to 1999, when I first entered this Honourable Chamber, and I can say clearly that there were two people who made it their business to guide young parliamentarians, and certainly myself. One was the late Sir Harold St. John and the other was Richard Christopher Haynes.

Indeed, sir, within months of joining this Honourable Chamber, I faced a no-confidence motion, what subsequently became the *Colloquium (to be confirmed)* debate. And the one person who guided me and held my hand, who was not of the Labour Party, was Richie Haynes, who assured me that this was literally the politics of politics playing itself out and that the best form of defence was always attack. But, sir, I want to speak to the man and his ideas, because that for me is what will loom large.

It is interesting that on the morning after his passing an interview was played on the radio for over an hour, and some even thought it was of recent vintage. But in fact it was an interview done in 1999, and it spoke to some large ideas and spoke also to the coincidence of interest in those ideas that literally came about and that saw many of those things that he believed strongly in and fought valiantly for be put in place. I speak specifically of things in relation to the fight against poverty. It is interesting that the language of those who believed that they could wrestle poverty to the ground, in the manner in which and in the phrases in which they spoke, the fight against poverty, the fight to mitigate and alleviate poverty, is really something that became part of the vernacular of politicians in Barbados in the post-1990 period.

I know that it gratified Richie Haynes greatly that this was a policy which the National Democratic Party strongly advocated and which found coincident support, having been equally identified and ventilated by the

Barbados Labour Party. Similarly, in relation to matters relating to health care reform, while we have not, in my view, reached where we need to reach as yet, the work which he did as Chairman of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Commission stands still today as relevant as it did when the report was filed. There have been recommendations which have been implemented; indeed, the very presence of the board was one of the things which was strongly recommended and advocated by him in that report.

But there are other recommendations which still stand to be reviewed, and I hope that this Minister of Health and others will continue to recognise the urgency of the reform of that institution, which is now in serious need of continuous reform if it is to be relevant to the needs of Barbadians. But in addition, perhaps the most important contribution was the voice of Richie Haynes on the fiscal affairs of this country and on the importance of fiscal stability and the role of public expenditure.

You know, life is funny, sir. That this debate is taking place against a background in relation to a topic on which Richie's greatest contribution will come to be judged is perhaps a little more than ironic: his articulation of a philosophy, from 1988 right through to 1999 when he left this Honourable Chamber, and some may say afterwards, as to the importance of fiscal rectitude; as to the importance of being able to afford government; as to the importance of being able to run a government in such a way that, if you understood your duty to the masses of the people of this country, you would not do things that would literally leave them exposed because of an inability of government to protect them when it really mattered, because it would not have the money to do so.

And you know, sir, in 1991, which, as I said, was the first election in which I ran, the voices of Richie Haynes and Owen Arthur, the Honourable Member for St. Peter, were loud and large in respect of warning the Government then as to the dangers of what they were doing in respect of the levels of public expenditure and the low levels of reserves. And in a very real sense, a lesson stands to be learned, because the country did not hear the warnings. The country did not heed the warnings until the day of the dismissals and the day of the cuts. It is only after the dismissals took place, and it is only after the cut in salary took place, that people realised that what Richie Haynes had been saying all along was in fact not only true, but the reality of what the country would come to face.

Now I say this, sir, because great leaders, even if they do not hold the office of leadership, very often see ahead of the rest of the crowd, and Richie Haynes saw ahead of the rest of the crowd all the time. I spoke just now of public expenditure, but I could easily be speaking about the role of Parliament. One of the great ideas which he espoused, and which found favour certainly with myself

and other younger Members, is that this Parliament will only become effective when the Cabinet is not the largest single block in Parliament. In a funny sense, this last election has made it slightly different, because the numbers of the Opposition with the backbench can in fact exceed the Cabinet; this is the first Parliament in Barbados where the Cabinet is not the largest single block.

The import of what he was trying to suggest is that you cannot have true separation of powers if the Executive is able to get its will in Parliament simply by reason of the numbers of Members within the Cabinet. Because if the Prime Minister gets his will in Cabinet and the Cabinet gets its will in Parliament, then are we not disrespecting the true intent and purpose of the Constitution, which speaks to a clear separation of powers between the Executive and Parliament?

And what were his views and suggestions on it? That ultimately Barbados should move, and a number of us would have discussed this, including Sir Roy Marshall, who is still with us, thankfully, to a situation where we not only elect Members of Parliament as constituency representatives, but where we elect national Members of Parliament whose primary motivation would be the state of affairs and condition of Barbados; and that by so doing, and by increasing the numbers, the Executive would have to work, as most other Executives have to work in other Parliaments of larger size, to justify their initiatives, their legislation and their requests for funding, such that the democracy that we have would be all the stronger for it.

Indeed, sir, this topic is one that has now occupied the attention of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association and others, who recognise that one of the vagaries of a small state is in fact the small size of its Parliament. But Richie Haynes saw that as long as 15 or 20 years ago, and had been advocating it as the next wave of parliamentary reform that this country must face.

He also saw, sir, the danger of investments from outside that would ultimately change the fabric of this country in relation to the change in the source of control of companies; and perhaps in his comments before Sagicor, formerly the Mutual, became Sagicor as we know it, with a different and diversified share ownership, Richie saw the implications of that and ultimately the implications for Barbados. One of the things that he pointed out clearly was that while in 1991 the Parliament of Barbados and the Government of Barbados were able to call on Barbados Shipping and Trading and other Barbadian-controlled companies to bring back their resources to this country to help aid this country at a difficult time, the presence of companies whose source of control was no longer Barbadian would mean that it would be that much more difficult for us to *pre-empt (to be confirmed)* the assistance of those companies which are large in the commercial

landscape of Barbados, but whose control was not Barbadian and was not necessarily of the same view as the Government or the people of the country.

These were the large strategic things that he saw. And we are witness today to many of these things playing out, recognising that Richie Haynes was a man whose vision and whose capacity for strategic thinking really went beyond the ordinary. Indeed, sir, it is of great regret that this country will no longer be able to avail itself of his experience and of his incisive thoughts as we go through these difficult times in which we find ourselves today.

I also want, sir, to speak to Richie Haynes the man. As I said on an earlier occasion, he was a gentleman and, equally, he was a gentle man. Yes, for those in here, it is true that he asked for no quarter and gave none. But outside of the ambit of this Chamber, I say to you he was a gentleman and a gentle man. And that says a lot to me, sir, because civility must count for much in this society today. I tell people all of the time, sir, that if we did one thing and one thing only in Barbados, that is, to treat other people as we would want to be treated, the Golden Rule, then we would be so much better off as a people and as a country. And the manner in which Richie treated people and dealt with people from all backgrounds reflected that gentlemanly nature of which I spoke.

Family meant all to him, and the Honourable Prime Minister has already referred to the wonderful and eloquent words of Kashka in his eulogy and tribute on the afternoon of the funeral. But I want to spend a few seconds on the issue of family because, sir, I believe that family is the most important unit in our society. Many people believe that it is a case of doing as I say and not as I do. But Richie Haynes walked the walk and did not just talk the talk. I believe that that rootedness within his family was responsible for him being able, with courage and with conviction, to do the other things that people might otherwise retreat from because of the absence of that support system that comes naturally from a family which cares for and loves and nurtures you.

To stand up for principle is an inconvenient thing to do. To stand up for principle is a thing that causes many great hesitation and anxiety, and that is why it is so rare a thing, particularly in our modern society, to see people stand up for principle. That he should do so, and squander what others may have considered to be the possibility of a brilliant political career and the possibility of high office, says all that we need to know about the measure of the man. And you know, when people are no longer with us, we do not talk about how much money they had at the funeral. We do not necessarily dwell upon the offices that they held. We talk about the quality of the person and the quality of their interaction with other people. And Richie understood that.

I say that I believe that that rootedness of family allowed him the freedom to treat with the decision of standing up for principle and conscience in a way that those who do not feel that nurturing and that buttressing of a family may otherwise be reluctant so to do. Not that it is the only prerequisite, but it is a key one in respect of those who enter public life and who have to walk the road of public life.

The other key point that I would want to make, sir, is that in a very real sense those who come to write the history of this country will also want to write the history of its political parties, and will also want to speak with greater frankness than those of us who may be at the centre of it today, as to whether political parties have truly evolved in order to accommodate those of strong opinion and varied opinion, and whether they have been as faithful to the process of democracy within the party institution as they have been to the country. These are some of the difficult discussions and topics that will have to be addressed as we move forward as a country, and indeed the loss of persons from the *fold (to be confirmed)*.

Because were it as simple as just an issue of the rejection of supply-side economics, then the issue would be no problem. But the lasting memory I have, upon returning from the United Kingdom, was the speech that Richard Haynes gave in this Honourable Chamber on an evening at about 6:30. I cannot remember the date, but it is etched in my memory, and I refer to it as the “boy on the burning deck” speech. It was riveting. It held one’s attention. The drama was there. But it also spoke of a man who was pained by having to make those remarks in this Honourable Chamber, and you could feel the pain in his voice as he delivered that speech, recognising that he had clearly committed himself to a party with all his body and all his spirit, and that there was clearly going to be a break.

That can never be an easy thing. And that he could continue without the rancour, without the vitriol and without the need for vengeance is to me the greatest hallmark of Richie. That is why I started my tribute today with the quotation that he delivered in his speech in this Honourable Chamber in 1989. We will always face difficult times. We will always face fierce battles. But it is how we treat with them and how we comport ourselves thereafter that will determine the measure of who we are as individuals. And Richie Haynes stood, for me, large as a man because of the manner in which he comported himself and the philosophies which he espoused, recognising that while difficulties may come with other human beings, his focus would remain on the larger cause and the larger fight and the improvement of the people.

I say that, for me, that has made the greatest impression, even as I myself have gone through, and not always walked the straight and narrow course, in the course

of my own public life. This is perhaps the most difficult speech that I have given in this Honourable Chamber, because Richie Haynes was like a second father to me, and I feel a sense of great loss. As the evening went on at his funeral, the one thing that I felt was that one of the few people in this world who had my back at all times was no longer here.

It is not an easy thing, therefore, for the family. And I would want to say to them at this stage that when you have someone who looms as large, and who occupies as great a space, and who was as domineering, but not in a negative sense, to have that space now empty physically cannot be an easy thing. But to Carol, to Kashka, to Richard, to his grandchildren, to his daughters-in-law, to his family, his sisters, I say simply that life has to end, but love does not. Life has to end, but love does not. And it is the love with which we carry people in our hearts and in our memories that will make the difference; not just what is written in the books, as that will come, or what is written and said in Hansard, as that will come, or what is said by his constituents, as that will come.

It is the love and the example which he set, and the carrying of that in your hearts and memories, that will make the ultimate difference. I can only say to you, may God cast His blessings on you at this difficult time. May He hold you firm in the knowledge that while you no longer have the presence of your husband, your father, your grandfather, your brother, you have the memory and the love of one who was acknowledged, not only by you but by all, including those who opposed him, to be great, a giant of a man, but still a gentleman and a gentle man. I am obliged to you, sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am obliged. Yes, Honourable Member for St. Lucy.

Hon. D. St.E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, I too rise to pay my tribute to the late Sir Richard Christopher Haynes, and to make the point that, as with the two Members previous to me, I entered this Parliament in 1994. But prior to entering this Parliament in 1994, I would have had many conversations with the late Sir Richard. I remember well, in the lead-up to the 1986 elections, when he brought his economic proposals and many people criticised him, I was bold enough to put pen to paper, and I wrote many articles supporting the view. But I also remember well that I think it was in that famous year of 1958 (*to be confirmed*) that he associated himself with the Democratic Labour Party, and that was not by accident.

I remember the honourable Member for St. Michael North East just now making reference to what he said in 1991 and so on, but I was also around long enough to remember what he said prior to 1991, and the warnings, as was said by the Prime Minister, of what he said as early as

1980 and even before that. I also want to make the point that he started his political career in 1976 in the parish of St. George, in St. George North, a constituency in which everyone thought that he would easily have won that seat. It was one of the fiercest elections that was ever fought in Barbados. It is rather interesting: the next election my mind reminds me of is the by-election in St. Michael North West in 1996 (*to be confirmed*).

But you know what was also interesting? He did not win that election. The Barbados Labour Party said many things about him. They threw everything at him, including *the Freundel-Jones and the COVID (to be confirmed)*, and he lost that election. But by 1978, because Sir Frederick Smith, as we know him now, had won that seat by only 20 votes, Sir Frederick used the opportunity to make the point that if, with all the time he had spent in politics and what he had done in politics, he could only win a seat by *a pack of greats (to be confirmed)*, he could only but leave and give way. And give way to whom? Sir Richard. You bet he did. All of us know the history of that election. Remember what went on in the *Britton's Hill (to be confirmed)* area, the type of activities that were created by the other side and things like that. But I want to say that that was a very fierce battle. It was well fought and it was won handsomely.

I also remember well that because of that by-election a Prime Minister once referred to one of his Ministers as being worse than a storm to the Ministry of Tourism. You know, we in this country have short memories, and we forget many things. But a Prime Minister said of how the tourism industry was being treated at that time that it was struck by management worse than a storm. So when I hear all the talk, it is rather interesting that my own *honourable friend (to be confirmed)*, who people will not know is working very hard and who now represents the same constituency, St. Michael South Central, would have inherited that statement and would have been able to keep himself away from that.

I want to say also that he was a good physician, and that Princess Margaret used to fly to Barbados *for her liver (to be confirmed)* to be treated by Dr. Haynes. So, you know, we in small developing countries sometimes pull down and we tear down, but we do not realise the type of foundation that has been built in this country and built by the people of this country. Sometimes we need to focus more on the positive things that our people would have done, like what Dr. Haynes would have done for the Ministry of Health and what he had done for the economic growth of Barbados, and so on.

I remember Dr. Haynes well, on the floor of the House and outside of the House, advocating that the biggest error we were making was when we went to the Japanese market to borrow those bullet loans. I remember that well; so much so that I followed it on a daily basis.

Every day I used to call the bank to find out what was the rate of the Japanese yen, and I used to do it because I recognised the point that he was making. The point that he was making at the time was that a small developing country could not afford to go and borrow yen when the yen was at its lowest, especially in a Japanese economy that was about to grow.

And what we saw, and I remember the figures well, was that the Japanese yen at the time when we borrowed it was 0.008 to the US dollar, and it grew and it grew until it actually doubled, to 0.016 and even over that, which meant that by the time that Barbados came to repay the money that it borrowed from the Japanese market, we were actually paying double the capital. Dr. Haynes spoke about those things. Unfortunately for Dr. Haynes, I must tell you, when he took over as Minister of Finance he found that Dr. Courtney Blackman had committed him to a Japanese loan, and he could not pull out of it. He could not pull out of it because he felt that had he pulled out of the bad loan that was left to him, it would have embarrassed the country, Barbados, where Barbados had gone and committed itself to this loan; so he could not, and he went along.

This also created another problem, because it created a problem for him and his best friend. People talk about politics, and I keep telling people that politics is *rich (to be confirmed)*; but one thing about politics, you have to remember the politics. So when I hear people speak, I sometimes laugh, because they behave as if we are now here for the first time. History has a way of repeating itself, and I can tell you that Dr. Haynes was a great player in demonstrating these things.

The honourable Member for St. Michael North East spoke about the falling out between the two Members. There is no doubt that Dr. Haynes was a thinker, and he recognised that you could not continue to run the economy on the same principles on which you had been running the economy for over 300-and-something years. He brought something new, something that I followed and something which I admired. But I must admit I had to differ with him, because the truth is, if you are going to give up *a war hand (to be confirmed)*, you have to find a way to balance it.

Because of the bookkeeping knowledge, which *the honourable Member who used to represent St. Michael North (to be confirmed)* used to say was all that I am able to account for, I knew that assets equal liabilities. So if you are going to give up some of your assets here, and you are also increasing liabilities, you also have to find assets to match those liabilities. And the truth is what occurred, and I think sometimes the Opposition could create a relationship that should not have been created. They made it look as if Dr. Haynes was being reversed. The truth is that Dr. Haynes was not being reversed. What was happening, what *Sandiford (to be confirmed)* did at that

time, was that he was trying to balance the revenue that was given up. He recognised that he had to.

So the truth is that both of them were on the same path, but what was needed was a bond to bring the two together so that they could see that they were not necessarily going against each other. And the Opposition, as any good Opposition would do, put some wood under the fire to make it look as if somebody was trying to dilute the other. But in 2005 (*to be confirmed*) it was not a dilution of anyone; both were looking at country Barbados and the bigger view. But the dilution occurred, and the parting of the ways of two good friends, as the Opposition wanted. They were able to create a wedge between two good friends, and that is why you got the NDP and the DLP; and, as Gabby said, “NDP, DLP, all the same”.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that one of the things I also admired about him, and the Prime Minister alluded to it too, was his ability to attract people to him. He did not necessarily allow himself to be tied down by the theoretical underpinnings of the public sector. He was able to use the knowledge of the private sector to advise them, and he was able to become the barometer and be the catalyst to ensure that he balanced both views. That was very important, because he was then able to articulate those things that he wanted to articulate.

But it was rather interesting that as far back as 1980 to 1981 it was Dr. Haynes and, a lot of people have forgotten, the late *Harry Blackman* (*to be confirmed*) who were able to tell the Government of the day, “I do not know what you are talking about with economic problems, but you should not have economic problems. In 1980 you were bragging about how much money you received from sugar.” I remember this debate well, as if it was yesterday, and this is now 33 years ago. They made the point that if you had your best year in 1980, when everything was well for you, how could it be that because of one bad year in 1981 you could find yourself before the IMF? I remember that debate well. I can even remember *Harold Blackman's* (*to be confirmed*) speech on that matter.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that Dr. Richard Christopher Haynes made a change to how people projected the economic life of Barbados. And there is no doubt that Dr. Haynes was feared by Tom Adams. Whereas the rest of us feared Tom Adams, Tom Adams feared Dr. Richard Christopher Haynes. I also want to tell you that I was a beneficiary of his knowledge, not only because we sat together on the other side, but at the table where I sit now, Dr. Haynes and I used to sit together.

I remember one Tuesday somebody said something to me about having a lot of money, and I said, “Me? A poor boy?” As soon as I finished that, he leaned over and he said to me, “Let me tell you something, young man. If you want

to continue in politics, never, ever let me hear you tell anybody again that you are poor. People do not vote for poor people.” He said that. So that is why now, if anybody calls me a millionaire, I tell them, “That is all you could think of me? Why can you not call me a billionaire?” But you know that got me in trouble last election, because somebody made a statement and I said, “You could only call me a millionaire? Call me a billionaire,” and that was used to say that I was saying that I am a billionaire and do not need politics. But, as Dr. Haynes would have said, impressions count. You remember that?

So we have to understand the many things that he said. It is true he was one of the most creative businessmen I have ever met. He is the only businessman I know who could get people to give him a building on a future plan without going to the bank. Yes, right. He was the only businessman I knew who could get a person to give him a building without going to the bank, because he could put a proper plan in place to show that he could finance it. And that is something that we need to recognise and we need to deal with.

The QEH: I have heard people making the point that Dr. Haynes is responsible for the QEH having a board. I would say that he suggested it, but I am not going to hold his hand for what was left with the QEH as it was formed as a board, because I understand statements like those. What Dr. Haynes wanted was *a curious board* (*to be confirmed*) that would not have to beg the Government for money, so that the allocations would have been there. And I can say that, while in Opposition, the first thing that happened to the QEH Board when it was formed was that it had to go and seek a loan. That was not what Dr. Haynes was advocating.

I keep telling people, we hear people in the media and so on speak, and when you hear these things you sometimes tend to believe that these things are occurring for the first time. I am saying that what you need to do is go and read what was said by Dr. Haynes, and you will see that these things that we are seeing now are not new. These are things that occurred previously, and the same way they were solved previously, he has left us with the knowledge of how to solve them. So fear not. He has laid the foundation, he has given us the knowledge, and we as a Parliament will stand up and we will ensure that we use the knowledge and the foundation laid by him to take this country where it has to go.

He had a big heart, there is no doubt, because when you can leave a ruling party to form an opposition party when the party is in government, that is a big heart. Normally it is always better to do it *basically prove later* (*to be confirmed*). Remember, when he left the Democratic Labour Party and formed the NDP, he was not in charge of the Opposition, but he was then able to manoeuvre his

position to out-manoeuvre the Opposition, not the Government, because he became the Leader of the Opposition not by diluting the Government but by doing it to the Opposition. Even though they would have been praising his action, they turned out to be the losers by his action, even though they advocated that he should have done that to the Government of the day.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this debate, even though it is an obituary one, is one of knowledge and one that is very refreshing. It is very biblical, because it says that when a man dies we shall praise him. I think that we sometimes move away from the biblical underpinnings, and I think that this House has a great opportunity; and it is regrettable that sometimes we do not do these things when the person is alive. I was very grateful for the foresight to rename the boardwalk on the South Coast after him, because I felt it was a fitting tribute to him, considering the amount of economic activity he would have created in that area; because most of the time people do not associate persons like Dr. Haynes with being people who create the economic activity on the South Coast or the West Coast.

So again, he was a leader. He was a leader in his political profession. He was a leader in his medical profession, and he was also a leader in the business profession. And he was also the adviser to some of the best politicians in the House. So, Mr. Speaker, I must say to his family that I am very grateful to have met him. I am very grateful that he was so good as to *direct excellent at Walterboro (to be confirmed)*, something I will never forget him for and will always be very grateful to him for. I also appreciate, sir, the contribution that he would have made to the Democratic Labour Party.

We had only one falling out politically. I remember well, during the election, at Market Hill, I made a comment when he switched from the Democratic Labour Party to the Barbados Labour Party, and because I made that comment Dr. Keller (*to be confirmed*) ran against me in St. Lucy; but it did not change the tide. So, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the family: stay strong. You have had a good foundation laid for you, and I know that you too will build on that foundation. May his soul rest in peace.

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

Hon. R. L. SEALY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to make my contribution to this obituary for the life of Richard Christopher Haynes. Mr. Speaker, if I have ever made a speech on behalf of my constituents, it would have to be this one. I have the honour, of course, of representing the St. Michael South Central seat, the seat that Dr. Haynes would have held for his entire parliamentary life. Therefore, I certainly speak on behalf of the residents when I say that there is a deep feeling of loss, and we would want

to extend condolences to the entire family. The depth of feeling that is held by persons in St. Michael South Central is really hard to describe.

It is true that perhaps it was just fortune that saw that relationship initiated in 1978. The Prime Minister spoke of the determination that someone of the ilk and scholarship of Dr. Haynes should be in the Lower House, and the vacancy that occurred from the retirement of Frederick Smith saw that he came down to St. Michael South Central and, of course, successfully carried that seat. But having said that, it is a relationship that has been deep, and it is my certain knowledge that even after he retired from active politics after 1999, he still remained very close to the constituency. In fact, up to weeks before his passing he was still in touch, it is my certain knowledge, with residents of St. Michael South Central and persons who would have literally spilled blood on his behalf.

So I know I can say that there is a view that he did contribute deeply, and that he represented the interests of St. Michael South Central in a very impressive manner. The point has been made here a few times, and that is that however you may have felt about what he was advocating, you had to respect Dr. Haynes. I think that is in fact a very pointed statement, because he committed himself to carrying or going about his business in a manner that you had to respect. So even if you did not agree, you had to respect what Dr. Haynes said. I am positive, actually, and I think that that is a lesson that many of us in here could learn well from.

But beyond that, I think it was actually founded on the fact that he came to politics with certain principles and he left politics with those principles; and in fact he has gone to the other place with those principles. Principles is also a word that I have heard featured in all of the speeches so far, and that is something that I think we could also learn a lot from. The same way that when a mason is going to a work site he has his square, his trowel, his plumb line, you have your tools. Dr. Haynes, when he came to politics, brought certain principles, certain beliefs that he never swayed from, whatever the circumstance, in terms of which side of the House he may have been sitting on or, for that matter, whichever political party he may have been associated with, because parties themselves have to be founded on something. And I think Dr. Haynes understood that.

So he had certain basic principles that he brought to politics. He brought them to the issue of representing the interests of St. Michael South Central and, of course, to his advocacy on behalf of all Barbadians. There are quite a few of them that we could focus on. I know, for example, one that is near and dear to me is his position on taxation. He believed that taxation is something that we have too much of in Barbados, and that we should constantly focus on

trying to see how we can minimise it. Yes, tax is necessary, but at the same time we should dedicate our lives to seeing how best we can minimise the necessity for taxation.

So, for example, the famous reply to the Budget in 1986, the *back-raise (to be confirmed)* speech, as they say: it was not so much, in my view, about back-raising Bree St. John to win an election. It was in essence the shadow Minister of Finance speaking from his heart, with again one of the tools that he brought to work, in that he felt very strongly that we needed to lower taxes in Barbados in order to spawn more economic activity. It was something he felt very strongly about, and he always held that view. So the famous *back-raise (to be confirmed)* speech was not simply about electioneering. It was an expression of those principles, and again he carried that with him constantly.

We have politicians who, from one parliamentary committee meeting to another parliamentary committee meeting, change their principles overnight. They are like chameleons. But it is good, and we can learn from a politician who, in a career that lasted 40 years in and out of the House, for he was a politician before he got here and afterwards, still remained faithful to those principles on issues of governance and so on. Many people criticised the NDP manifestos. There were two: there was one in 1991 and one in 1994. People thought that they were a little too excessive in terms of what they were promising. But these were statements that expressed a vision of someone who saw Barbados being someplace else. And I think that that type of vision, again founded on principle, is something that we could learn a lot from.

And so I think that Dr. Haynes was a visionary. I think he was ahead of his time in many respects. I do not like this term “the best Prime Minister we never had”. I know that Denis Healey, of course, is constantly referred to in those terms. I think Abba Eban as well, from Israel, who was Ambassador to the UN and was Minister of Foreign Affairs; he was everything except Prime Minister, and he is also described in those terms. But what I would say, and I think this is fairly germane to somewhat counteracting the whole idea that he is the best Prime Minister we never had, is that, as brief as his tenure was at the Ministry of Finance, he did make a difference. And we do not talk about it much. You probably would not hear anybody paying tribute today refer to the tenure of Dr. Haynes as Minister of Finance, but he made a difference there.

During that period, a private company by the name of the Tourism Development Corporation was established. And indeed it was as Minister of Finance that he took the view that persons who contribute to the TDC, as it is now called, which just celebrated its 25th anniversary last year, should get 150 per cent of their contributions back as a tax break. That has seen the TDC grow into an entity which has made a significant contribution to a number of tourism-

related projects in Barbados. In sports tourism, for example, we could talk about the Banks Hockey Festival; we could speak, in entertainment tourism, of the early initiatives at the Jazz Festival, et cetera; all benefited from the TDC. More recently, of course, there is Tennis on the Rock and a myriad of other initiatives.

We would love to see the TDC grow and more private sector persons participate. But the idea and the vision to establish an entity like that saw government and the private sector working together in closer collaboration, and in essence, if allowed to come to complete fruition, it could ease your fiscal situation such that it would make it possible, again, to lower taxes. So everything all fits in. Even though he only had a brief period at the Ministry of Finance, he was able to put that in place, and it has made a significant contribution to the tourism industry.

I know that the Member of Parliament for St. Michael North East spoke about his willingness to offer advice, and he never lost an opportunity when we encountered each other to give of that advice. But what I will vividly recall is, on assuming responsibility for the tourism portfolio, visiting him at his home in Golf Club Road, and he highlighted a fundamental point that is not often said. That is, in his exact words, “the exquisite relationship between exchange rates and how people move between markets”. And so, in assessing your tourism sector and the tourism markets you should target, you should look for where the currencies are strongest.

It would explain, for example, why, when the US dollar is strong, in the summer the European cities are full of Americans; but, of course, when the dollar is weak you see a lot of Europeans over in the US. It would explain why, a few years ago in the early 1990s, when the yen was strong, the Japanese practically flooded London. You had Japanese all over London. And, of course, more recently, with the renminbi being strong, the Chinese have been doing a lot of travel. The exquisite relationship between the exchange rates of currencies, and what that means for understanding tourism on the global scale, and by extension for understanding what is happening here in Barbados: we are tied to the US dollar.

I always remember that advice, and it has certainly been fundamental in how I have operated with respect to looking for new source markets and understanding the realities of what is happening in tourism, sometimes in the face of some unfortunate criticism. But again, I need look no further than the person from whom I got the advice. All sorts of criticism: I do not think any politician has had more terrible things said about him than Richard Christopher Haynes. And in the face of it he remained committed to his principles and his values, and I think that is about the best tribute that anyone can pay to him.

I also think that, as an individual, and we heard this as well in the very eloquent tribute that his son Kashka paid to him at the funeral service, he was very much into himself. You could say he was an introvert. He was not one for all the excessive socialising, and you would not necessarily see him propping up a bar in anybody's shop on any regular basis. That is just not the man; that was not his style. But in this very noisy world, in this very extroverted world, introverts can sometimes be misunderstood. And I speak here having had to deal with my own introversion in terms of my public life, so I understand how he could be misunderstood.

Yes, yes, yes, my own introversion: even in that *calypso tent (to be confirmed)*, Mr. Speaker, I struggle to deal with that, with my introverted personality. Having said that, I think that he is still a model that we can all learn from. My own experience, Mr. Speaker, is that panic and being panic-stricken are the enemies of competent leadership. Whether you are leading a movement, a party, a family, an organisation, whether you are leading a view, a school of thought, if you are trying to lead opinion as an intellectual leader, you cannot do it from a position of panic, or being panic-stricken.

The fact is that Dr. Haynes was always very measured and deliberate, and that in my view demonstrated an understanding of exactly what was important. Yes, he never actually held the office of Prime Minister, but office-holding and leadership are not always synonyms. You could be the captain of the cricket team, but somebody else is the leader of the team. So he was a leader in Barbados, and I think he understood that. He set a fine example for many of us, and I think certainly for my generation of politicians he stands out, maybe with one or two others, as being the best example for us, and one that we try as much as possible to emulate.

In terms of the South Central by-election in 1978, the Member for St. Lucy alluded to it. I was quite young at the time, ten years old, but I vividly recall that by-election. I do not think this country has had, certainly not since then, a by-election quite like that one, and probably not one prior to that. The truth is that with all the other by-elections, and the two in St. John and St. Thomas, you kind of knew what the result was before the by-election took place. But that 1978 by-election was really interesting. The late Tom Adams was at his peak in terms of his party. He had just won the 1976 general election. He had his tongue sharp on both sides, and other parts of his anatomy were probably sharp as well. And you had Dr. Haynes, who was the future of the DLP. It was the clash of the titans.

The whole country was enraptured by what took place in St. Michael South Central in 1978. And of course what followed only served to vindicate what everyone had initially thought, because the battle continued straight from

the by-election into this Parliament. We all know about those classic battles between the late Tom Adams and Dr. Haynes, and the pride that he brought not only to the constituents of St. Michael South Central but to all Barbadians. So he has been a fine example for all of us to look to, and I think that that is the note on which I would want to conclude my tribute.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is that this is my tenth year in this place. There are about 11 or so who either would have come in here with me or whom I came and found, so the other 19 or so seats would have changed hands a couple of times. So there are probably about 50-odd either colleagues or former colleagues that I have. One unfortunately has passed to the great beyond already, the late Prime Minister, but everyone else is going to have to have a debate like this held for them. One will be held for me; one will be held for everyone in here and all of my former colleagues. More than likely it will be in this place, but it need not be. More than likely we will all gather around that Mace, wherever it is.

And my question to all of you, and to those who would have served in here, is: what will they say about you? Have you stayed true to your principles? Did you bring your tools to work and leave with those same tools, or were they compromised and morphed along the way? I think we could look to the life and the career of Richard Christopher Haynes as a fine example of what we would like friend or foe, Government or Opposition, those for you or those against you, to say about us when they are paying tribute. That is, however you may have felt about his policies and what he advocated, the point is you had to respect what he represented and what he said, and the fact that he remained true to those principles.

So, Mr. Speaker, I again want to extend heartfelt and genuine condolences to all of those who are grieving, and in particular to his family: Carol, Lady Haynes; his sons, Kashka and Richard; of course the grandchildren; and all of the siblings. I extend condolences to them, and again I speak also on behalf of the many, many souls in St. Michael South Central who were touched by his life. And we say that he has certainly earned his rest, and we pray for light perpetual to shine upon him. I am obliged to you.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am obliged. Yes, the Honourable Member for St. George North.

Mr. G. A. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to lend my support to this resolution and also to pay condolences on the passing of the late Richard Christopher Haynes. I rise, Mr. Speaker, to speak on behalf of my constituency, and in particular I speak on behalf of the people from my village of Newbury, St. George, the very village in which the late Richard Christopher Haynes was born. I do so because I believe, and have said on many occasions, that he was one

of the greatest sons of the St. George soil, the greatest son ever produced out of the village of Newbury. In truth and in fact, I believe, as all other Members have said, he came at a time when the political affairs of this country were being reshaped in this society, and I believe that his contribution is significant.

It is significant from the point of view of coming out of a village that knew poverty, a village that embraced new concepts and a village, Mr. Speaker, that saw intense political rivalry. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that one can say from this vantage point that it was in this village of Newbury that Dr. Haynes would not only have read great political thinkers, but would have been immersed in the thinking of the day. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe that all persons of that era, the era of the 1950s, would have seen in Dr. Haynes the emergence of a person who would one day become a leader in this country.

I have done a lot of research over the years on Dr. Haynes and some of the persons of the St. George era who would have made a contribution to our society. In 2003 it was the St. George North group that honoured Dr. Haynes as one of the pioneers of modern thinking, one of the persons who have contributed significantly to St. George and indeed to Barbados, and Dr. Haynes received that award. But I want to say up front that I believe in what it meant growing up in a village like Newbury, to very humble parents. Of course, as a young boy I could not help but notice the family. His mother, Muriel, or Maggie, Haynes, was a shopkeeper. His father was a local entrepreneur, planting crops, and also a person who had a truck in those days, and he was the one who transported many of the small peasant farmers' canes to the factory. So he made a significant contribution to the landscape of Newbury and indeed to St. George as a whole.

His family played a significant role, and when you grew up in a village like Newbury you had to respect people like the Hayneses. You had to respect people like the *Realees (to be confirmed)*, the *Elcocks (to be confirmed)*; a man, Mr. *Elcock (to be confirmed)*, who is now 104 years old and still very vibrant in mind, who remembers Dr. Haynes as a young boy growing up in St. George, well respected, travelling on the bus to town, to school, like any ordinary person. And of course one has to ask Mr. Clarence *Elcock (to be confirmed)*, who is still sound, and who I know is still listening to this broadcast today, what was it like in the early 1950s to see young boys like Dr. Haynes running through the village?

Now his sons did not know that Dr. Haynes actually played cricket. It was not known, but Dr. Haynes played cricket like ordinary fellows in the village. In fact, one old policeman said to me this morning that Dr. Haynes was a tall fast bowler, starting a young club in the Newbury/Salisbury area called the Gloucestershire Cricket

Club. In those days persons in Barbados would name a cricket club after an English county, and Gloucestershire was out of the Newbury/Salisbury area. So he played cricket, but of course that was in his early years, as a teenager.

But he was also a very serious person, a very serious scholar. Now when he did his scholarship exam, it was said that his parents thought that he would fail the exam. But little did they know that Dr. Haynes used to go to the *barracks (to be confirmed)* at Gun Hill and prepare himself, and he was able to refocus and play back everything he knew, so that he got, I understand, 100 per cent in the Virgil, and he won the Barbados Scholarship ahead of all those persons who sat it that year, in 1956. He was a bright star. Dr. Haynes went on to study medicine and so on, and people felt in the area that he could have done anything. He could have studied economics, he could have studied mathematics, but he was gifted in Latin and Greek in those days. He went on to study medicine and he was worshipped in the St. George area.

Can you imagine, in 1956, your hero going off having won a Barbados Scholarship? The people celebrated. I was told that an old man called Archie Holder, who is dead, had a function at the *Wagon Wheel (to be confirmed)* for their hero, and they sent him off in great colour to England. He was a hero. He returned, and I made the point before, whenever he returned to Barbados he would go by his family. He was a family man. He was a family man, and he returned to Newbury and he spoke to the people in the village. He spoke to a number of persons, and of course the Gorings; *Outer Workman (to be confirmed)* was his first cousin. He was always there, and he played a vital part in the life of the St. George people.

But of course, one aspect, and I think this is what happened when he returned in the 1960s as a medical doctor: you had to distance yourself from the local rum shops. You could not associate yourself with the local fellows, as you would have been expected to. Having gone off in 1956 to university, you now saw a new concept in your mind: "I am a doctor. I have to perform at a hospital level." You could not, and therefore many persons at the village level could not understand this.

And I made a point too, because there are many misunderstandings about what happened in the 1976 election, when he came back seeking the nomination for St. George. He was being prepared, and I use this phrase very importantly, Mr. Speaker: I do not think that he lost St. George. I think it was a preparation. It was a preparation for him for great things to come. The St. George election was a preparation for Dr. Haynes, because it was after that that he understood what politics was all about. The Prime Minister made the point that the 1976 election was a *clan and tribal (to be confirmed)* election. It was an election in

which *clans (to be confirmed)* were brought together, an election in which families were pulled together, where people said you have to vote according to family ties. It was an election in which Dr. Haynes was prepared for the next election, which came in 1978. But he was destined to be, he was born to be, a leader of this country, and he was.

Now when you look at his political life, I want to refer to the Democratic Labour Party's Manifesto of 1986. The 1986 election, Mr. Speaker, was the Democratic Labour Party's election to win. When you look at page nine of that manifesto, it says: "The quality of life of a nation is determined by the performance of the economy and by the mores of social and political behaviour. The new fiscal arrangement, the new energy policy, the new policy on public enterprises are part of a comprehensive policy agenda designed to strengthen the economy and improve the quality of social and political life and behaviour of Barbadians."

Look at what the Democratic Labour Party said. It says also on page nine: "The Democratic Labour Party will be charting a new path in all areas of economic policy." This was *Dr. Haynes' (to be confirmed)* idea. This was the Democratic Labour Party's idea in 1986. And I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that Dr. Haynes brought new ideas in 1986. When I look at manifestos over the past 100 years, two manifestos in particular stood out: the 1951 Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party, which *fought about (to be confirmed)* free secondary education. The 1951 Manifesto spoke about a new life for Barbadians, and it was a revolutionary piece.

I know there are many people in this House who do not read, so they do not understand the 1951 Manifesto. But the 1951 Manifesto, which was written in part by *Errol Barrow, in the Barbados Labour Party (to be confirmed)*, and the 1986 election Manifesto, which was written in part by Dr. Haynes, charted a new path for Barbadians, with the economy as the focal point. And I am saying that it was the Democratic Labour Party that ran away from the policies of Dr. Haynes and *Errol Barrow (to be confirmed)*. They have moved away, and since then the Democratic Labour Party has been in the mode of practising social engineering rather than economic engineering as a priority.

And I am saying, Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed the last speaker. I enjoyed the last speaker because the last speaker, remember, who inherited that constituency, said that if there is one thing that you could admire in Dr. Haynes, it is that he stood for what is right. He charted a new policy. You cannot blame him for that. He was a man of *my (to be confirmed)*. Why? Where did he get that from? I have always said in here, even on my side, that that is the one thing that the people of St. George have always said: "We do not want any handout. Give us education. Give us something that we can work with, but we do not want

welfarism. We want to be independent." And coming out of the bowels of Newbury, I am proud to say that we have always stood on that principle.

We must be true to what we believe. We must be true to what we believe. We believe that the people come first. We believe in independence of thought. There are many times over here I have to speak my mind. I have told my colleagues in no uncertain terms, "This is what I believe and this is what I will do," and that is what I will do. And I am saying to you that Dr. Haynes, over the past 20 years, believed in a philosophy that the people must come first. He believed also in enfranchising the people. Dr. Haynes saw poverty all around. He saw poverty in the St. George area. He saw poverty in the St. Michael area.

And therefore this Manifesto, which was the highlight of his career: when it was broken, he was very sad. That is why Dr. Haynes would have formed the NDP. That is why he supported the policies that led to poverty *enfranchisement (to be confirmed)*. He wanted to see people move out of poverty. This is what he wanted to see. He wanted to see, Mr. Speaker, regardless of the political party, that things had been done to the benefit of the people. And this manifesto that we talk about, historians must refer to it. It has a lot of information that I think the Democratic Labour Party should look at.

The supply side of economics: how do you look at a society, rather than cutting wages? Dr. Haynes never believed in cutting to the disadvantage of people. He felt, as a Minister of Finance, that you should give tax relief in order to promote the economy. That is what he believed in. This is the supply side of economics. Even if it came from a conservative view like that of the US President Reagan, he believed that cuts, austerity measures, will lead to the disadvantage of people. And I want to say today that the Government, rather than introducing cut measures at this time, has to look at the 1986 Manifesto and introduce measures that will produce further employment in this country, that will produce enterprises in this country, and at the same time will lead to prosperity in this country. Whether it is through government or private enterprise, you have to do it.

I am saying to you, Mr. Speaker, that Dr. Haynes did not follow persons who acted for political aggrandisement, for political opportunity only. When the Central Bank was opened, and I heard the Member for St. Lucy talk about it, in 1986–87, *Dr. Haynes (to be confirmed)*, I think, was one of the few persons who attended the function. It was by invitation of the then Prime Minister. But he felt that the Central Bank and the Central Bank's development area, which was a Barbados Labour Party programme, had to be continued after the general election. It was he who believed that the bullet loan that was arranged on the Japanese market should have continued. It was he who believed in

these policies, and therefore by 1988, when the Democratic Labour Party was not true to themselves, was not true to the manifesto, which they had broken, and to the Barbadian people, he left.

He held that view throughout his life. He supported policies, and I am saying, Mr. Speaker, I believe that he would have loved to see, he would love to see, a Barbados that was free from political *rank (to be confirmed)* only. And to his memory, to his memory, we have to be true. He was a fierce debater, as I said, a disciplined politician, a man of conviction, a man of conviction. And of course we say he was a gentleman. And I say to you, even though I was from this side, I am from this side, that Dr. Haynes supported most of the contributions that I would have made for development, not only in the St. George area but also in Barbados.

A man who spoke his mind. I am of the view, Mr. Speaker, that we have to do more than pay lip service to a man who kept his word. He was a man who kept his word as Minister, as businessman, as family man. He kept his word, and we need more persons of that nature. Mr. Speaker, I believe too that Barbadians have really lost a great statesman in Dr. Haynes. We have heard it, we have heard it from all the contributors, both in public and in private life. We have heard the contributions, and from persons outside of Barbados who recognised that this was truly a great man. We have lost him, but of course we have his memory. We have to look at the records that he has left in terms of his private life, in terms of his professional life and in terms of whatever he has contributed.

We believe, Mr. Speaker, that we will mourn his passing. And of course we believe also that life must go on, but we can do the favour of giving the memory of Dr. Haynes not only to Barbadians but to the people of the Caribbean, that we need to see persons of his calibre come to public life. We need to see people who are strong in the conviction that people matter. We need to see those persons come into public life, honouring the life of Dr. Haynes and persons of that nature.

To his family: his wife Carol, Lady Carol Haynes; his sons, Richard Jr. and Kashka; his sisters who are still alive, the three of them; and to all of the Gorings, the Hayneses and the *Byers (to be confirmed)* family, to all the families who are mourning his loss; and of course to the friends, the great number of friends who are still mourning his loss. We believe that he has gone to be with his Maker, God. The Bible says, "The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord." And we have to consider and recognise this.

And as the Member for St. Michael South Central asked, what will be our tribute when our times come? What tribute will you pay to us? We have to be men of steel and

stand up for what we believe. But I believe, Mr. Speaker, finally, that the words of an American poet are still relevant to us, the words of the US poet Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. In "A Psalm of Life" he states: "Lives of great men all remind us / We can make our lives sublime, / And, departing, leave behind us / Footprints on the sands of time." Mr. Speaker, I am obliged to you.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am obliged. Yes, Honourable Member for *Christ Church South (to be confirmed)*.

SUSPENSION

Hon. J. D. E. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended for lunch until two o'clock this afternoon.

AN HON. MEMBER: I beg to second that, sir.

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

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: Good afternoon, Honourable Members. The sitting is resumed. We were on the obituary and with that we shall continue. Yes, the Honourable Member for St. John. Thank you.

Mrs. M-J. M. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late Sir Richard Haynes. My friendship or acquaintance with the late Member of Parliament can be described as by association, as it is through my late husband that I knew Sir Richard. Sir Richard was always described as a person - and this is professionally I mean - who gave his all to reach the peak of his career. His political career can best be described as a man consumed with passion. I genuinely believe that Sir Richard had a passion for politics and people. No matter how we seek to colour the journey he travelled, there can be no divide on the fact that the late Sir Richard was a man driven by passion.

His passion was so deep that history may misrepresent his contribution as the man who broke away from the DLP and in the eyes of some caused or contributed to an implosion that has actually made the party stronger than ever. I always believe that there is never a bad happening, Mr. Speaker, and that there are questions that can be asked arising out of his contribution to public life. Why was Sir Richard not a quitter? And what ingredients contributed to the passion that drove the late Sir Richard? I will not stand here and judge Sir Richard for his departure from this great party that I now have the honour of representing in the constituency of St. John. But no one

can take away from the late Sir Richard the fact that the people of St. Michael South Central kept faith in his capacity to represent them as their Member of Parliament, no matter his persuasion.

The success of Sir Richard and the passion with which the job was carried out speaks to a relationship that was constructed with the voter and the Barbadian public. This relationship, I submit, embodies a characteristic of the Barbadian voter that we sometimes take for granted. The voter in Barbados must like you, no matter what party you belong to. One can advance the argument that some constituents have embedded in their constituencies the DNA of a particular party. But I believe more and more that we are seeing a movement by the voting public which says that there is a need for politicians to have closer relationships with constituents and to demonstrate passion for the job. I believe the days are fast approaching that elected officials can do as they like and no matter what happens, the vote is assured. The Barbadian voter is asking for and has said to both sides that we need to walk the talk and I am sure that the message was heard.

That is why I started by saying earlier that there are lessons to be learnt from his contribution and it is worth an examination. We cannot, as a core of elected people, believe that we are entitled to a seat in Parliament or that our political future was willed to us by a foreparent or a party leader. The task before us at the level of the individual is to determine what our role is as political representatives and elected public officials. There is no doubt that Richie was clear in his mind what his role was and what was involved in having it executed. Sir Richard's model may not be one that is promoted, but his attributes of passion to serve and steadfastness to the job can be extracted and examined. That is the model that is worth discussing. I know that there is something here for me to reflect upon as a Member of Parliament for St. John.

As I wrap up, Sir, I want to bring home the theme of my presentation. Today we witness a political class emerging where the motivation is driven by comfort. Sir Richard was not comfortable where he was nurtured as a young politician, but it never stopped him from taking his eyes off of the goal post. Nor did it cause a decline in trust, as he was able to convince the people of St. Michael South Central that he was worthy of being their parliamentary representative, despite having a different political persuasion back to back in elections. Let me lend a word to the wise. Be cognizant of why we exist as politicians and parliamentary representatives and bear in mind that when we depart this land all we leave behind is our name.

Mr. Speaker, I recall the correspondence so kindly sent to me by Lady Carol at the time of the passing of my dear husband David and I wish through you to thank her for the comforting and encouraging words which did

exactly that for me - comforted and encouraged. And so I wish now to extend my sincere condolences and that of my daughters to Lady Carole and to Richard and Kashka and their respective families and indeed to all of the Haynes family. I am obliged.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Christ Church South.

Hon. J. D. E. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, sir, I rise to join the tributes being paid in memory of another great Barbadian scholar, a great Barbadian doctor, a great Barbadian politician, and indeed, sir, the tributes paid so far this morning and already in this afternoon session speak to the excellence of performance, the excellence of the contribution of Dr. Richard Haynes. As has been indicated, one could separate his career into two parts, one as a medical doctor and the other as a politician, but in both cases, he bestowed the landscape of Barbados with absolute aplomb.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour at this time, at the pledge of the Prime Minister, of course, to lead the policy direction for the Ministry of Health. And as such, sir, we at the Ministry of Health were especially touched at the loss of such a great contributor. Sir, commentators throughout the length and breadth of Barbados spoke to his phenomenal intellect. The fact that once specialised as a classical scholar, having won the Barbados Scholarship, he switched immediately to the discipline of medicine and was so successful that he returned to Barbados and more or less has never turned back since.

His contribution to the hospital is especially noted for the work he and others at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital did in establishing our Intensive Care Unit, which of course has grown from strength to strength because of the continued contribution of others after he left the direct work at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Many of the persons who paid tribute so far spoke to the question of his discipline, and I think that this is certainly one of the characteristics which will long be remembered, especially by his colleagues at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

As a matter of fact, sir, a lot of the last couple of weeks have been spent reflecting on the work of the late Sir Richard Haynes at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and indeed in private practice in Barbados. And there is no question that at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital while he was there, there was a certain respect which was automatically rendered, so to speak, sir, to not only Sir Richard Haynes, but almost every practitioner of medicine at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. And indeed, during our reflections, one of the things that constantly comes to mind is the fact that today, regrettably, discipline is one of the areas in which we battle almost daily. Discipline in our family structures, discipline in our wider communities, discipline at our

various workplaces, and not surprisingly, sir, discipline at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, because all of us in the provision of such an important service - our doctors, our managers, our nurses and our support staff - must be mindful, sir, of the need for that discipline. And as I said, there was no question of the command and the discipline which was immediately enforceable in that era.

Some say it is an era that we have passed through and it is an era, sir, which we have to fight very hard to retain, because in our quest to achieve some levels of efficiency or any serious levels of efficiency, discipline must be at the forefront.

Sir, again in his contribution to medicine, passing reference was made to the important work of what has become familiarly known as the Haynes Commission, but more correctly the Advisory Commission of Inquiry into the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. This document, sir, which I shall quote from time to time during the next couple of minutes of my presentation, is the final report of this Commission. And indeed, although Sir Richard Haynes was chairman, I think it is worthy at this time to note some of the names of the other members of this Commission, all great Barbadian men and women. As I said, Dr. Haynes was the chairman of the Commission. Sir Carlyle Burton, Sir Keith Hunt was a member, Professor the Honourable Errol Walrond - or now Sir Errol Walrond of course - and still contributing to the good work at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the practice of medicine in Barbados in total. Dr. Albert Graham, the late Albert Graham, Professor Trevor Hassel, now head of the National Non-Communicable Disease Commission in Barbados, Branson Cullimore, the late Wendell McLean, Senator - now Sir Leroy Trotman - and Senator Peggy Rickerson at the time. So this was the calibre of person led by Sir Richard Haynes, of course, who did this report and who looked at the forward path for the delivery of health care in Barbados.

It is wonderful to note that as you peruse this report and as you delve into the body of the report, a lot of the aspects of which the Commission spoke then in 1999 are still areas of challenge, areas of improvement with which we grapple today. The Commission, for instance, speaks to the question - the whole question - of the changing demographic of the Barbadian population in respect to delivery of health care services. It speaks to the fact that we are now what is described as a largely ageing population, so that a lot of our energies, a lot of our monies in health care are spent in the care of the elderly. It speaks, sir, to the kind of diseases which we now have to tackle. Years ago, of course, we dealt very assiduously with what is termed the communicable diseases. But today, the health challenge in Barbados is certainly the non-communicable diseases - diabetes, heart disease, stroke - and these kinds of illnesses, which in large measure have been, it is claimed, derived

from the lifestyle practices that we have inherited, largely from the countries on which we so often model our lifestyles and our whole changing eating habits from those of yesteryear.

So, sir, we are in a battle for the minds of Barbadians, so to speak, in terms of what we eat and how we eat and how healthy we therefore remain. We are asking Barbadians to reduce their intake of sugar, for instance. This is something which is not going to come easy. We are asking Barbadians to reduce the use of salt. Again, this is something to which we are accustomed, but it is something which - thankfully - is a message which is beginning to take root in the Barbadian psyche. And we at the Ministry are satisfied that we are seeing a major turnaround in this regard as Barbadians continue to respond.

So the report spoke to the physical plant of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and contemplated what a new hospital for Barbados may want to include. And again, it is instructive that the proposals, the suggestions which came from this report - the work of Dr. Haynes and the team I mentioned - have been largely embraced, and especially over the last six years or so, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital has taken on an improvement in the physical plant which has brought tremendous levels of comfort to those Barbadians who from time to time seek treatment in that facility. We recognise, and the report recognised, and we continue to fight with those areas which still need our attention and which will continue to engage thinkers and medical practitioners in Barbados as they seek to improve the level of service. We think immediately of areas like the accident and emergency department of the hospital, which continues to be a severe challenge. There have been tremendous improvements, but as far as I am concerned, as far as the Ministry of Health is concerned, this one bad situation is enough to trigger the acute need that there is for even greater improvements.

The report spoke to the question of improving the finances of the hospital and looking at ways in which more financial support, more revenue can be made at the hospital for the services rendered. And it spoke to things like accessing insurance, where insurance policies exist, where persons come to the hospital who have private or public insurance policies, in making sure that these policies are accessed so as to pay for the services that are provided. Healthcare is expensive business. Healthcare in Barbados is extremely expensive, and indeed the healthcare industry worldwide is one of the growing opportunities for providers in the world and for business people. More and more business people - and not only doctors - are getting into the business of provision of health care. After all, it is a fact that once it is about the preservation of life, then the human being will be prepared to spend any amount really

to be able to look forward to some level of comfort and cure.

So sir, especially as we look to dealing with the kind of economic adjustment which will have to take place in Barbados over the next couple of months or short to medium term, it will be required to reflect on these recommendations in the Haynes Report - in the report of the Advisory Commission at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital - and to look at the implementation of many more of the suggestions, and indeed the implementation of suggestions that have been made since this report. Because no one at the hospital or the Ministry of Health has sat down and said, well, this report is the final document on which we will act. But we have taken on board the suggestions of this Haynes Report and we are moving towards incorporating new ideas as we try to roll out a more efficient and a more effective medical service in Barbados.

So I felt that emphasis on this part of Dr. Haynes' career in Barbados is important. I know that the medical fraternity has lost a great leader in Dr. Haynes. I know that they are emboldened by his contribution and that there are many who have come after him who continue to be guided by his principles and his excellence and continue to offer to Barbados a level of medical care which remains the envy of the rest of our neighbours in the Caribbean, and are committed to the mantra that long shall it remain that way.

Sir, on behalf of the Ministry of Health, therefore, and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in particular, I want to convey to the family of Dr. Haynes - his wife, Carol Lady Haynes, his two sons, Christopher and Kashka, and to the extended family of Sir Richard Haynes - our deepest condolences. Personally, and on behalf of my brother, who is a member of the medical fraternity and a colleague of Carol Lady Haynes and the late Richie Haynes, I want to extend his personal sympathies to you. And so I want to wish them strength at this time, be assured of our continued support, and to thank them.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Christ Church West. Thank you.

Dr. M. M. AGARD: Madam Deputy Speaker. As I rise to add my voice in tribute to the life of Sir Richard Haynes, I am struck by the frequency with which we have met in this House to pay tribute to our fallen leaders and our loved ones. And this frequency certainly forces me to reflect on the transience of life. I have always heard that death is a debt that we all must pay. But as we prepare, albeit reluctantly, life offers each of us an opportunity to live it and to live it to the fullest. I believe Sir Richard Haynes lived his life to the full.

A tribute paid to him by his son Kashka gave me an insight into the personal life of a man who had a love for

people and whose passion knew no boundaries. A man who preoccupied himself with serving his country and his community and striving to bring an improved quality of care to the lives of others, be they his patients or his constituents.

I first came to know of Sir Richard Haynes - or Richie Haynes as he was affectionately known - in the early 1970s when I lived in the constituency of Christ Church South Central. I lived with my adopted grandmother. She lived on St. Hill Road, Carrington Village. She was a staunch member of the Democratic Labour Party. And she loved Richie Haynes. As she would say, Richie Haynes could do no wrong. And Madam Deputy Speaker, in her humble way, and that of her community of Carrington Village, she was proud that her district was represented by such a distinguished personality. His presence gave that humble working-class community respectability and credibility. And I believe that they are forever in his debt as a result.

In fact, it was her love of her representative and her general interest in politics that triggered a curiosity in me that eventually led me to take a similar path. I did not know Richie Haynes personally. All that I know of him I experienced through her eyes. And today I offer this tribute in her name and in her memory as much as in my own name.

Richie Haynes enjoyed an illustrious political career that no doubt was the envy of many. He was an elected representative of the House, a Minister of Finance, though unfortunately not a Prime Minister - and that is the most privileged and trusted position in any democracy - an Opposition Leader and the political head of a party which he formed after separating from the party in power, after crafting for that party an overwhelming mandate from the electorate just a few months earlier. Such is the making of an icon, for it was certain that he would rise to political greatness, complete political greatness, and achieve that which every politician desires - to lead a nation. And whilst he did not achieve that mandate, there is no one in this country who did not recognise Richie Haynes as one of the greatest leaders Barbados has ever known. Charmed, respected and revered by his constituents, trusted by his political colleagues and feared by his opponents. He was a man of passion and principle, of conviction, bold, fearless, visionary, a risk-taker, a transformer. He was the consummate statesman.

I have come to appreciate many lessons from Richie Haynes, which I now share as I pay tribute to him.

As a statesman, one must have an enduring love for constituents, a burning desire to work toward the improved standard of living, and a quality that is defined by action, action. To have a vision for transformation and not only at

the community level, but the national level. A transformation that can be achieved politically or professionally. Indeed, the medical profession, the medical fraternity to which I belong will forever be in debt to the changes he brought to the profession. Many have been documented here today, none more so than the Intensive Care Unit which has become a symbol of dedicated service to the medically compromised. One must be passionate and fearless about one's convictions. Enjoy the dance of being shrewd, wily and witty with a devilish sense of humour. I am certain that when Richie Haynes could no longer exist in harmony with his parliamentary colleagues, it was his conviction of conscience that led him to walk away from the party, though he, more so than any other, may have been credited with the resounding victory the DLP had enjoyed, as I said previously. But it must have been his wit and his will that led to his colluding with three of his colleagues not only to form a new political party, but to displace the then BLP opposition into third place and assume for his newly formed party the position of Her Majesty's loyal opposition. I have no doubt that he must have shared a hearty laugh with himself in many of his private moments.

To this day, he is respected by many for choosing not the cowardly route of party hopping, but of challenging the status quo by forming a new party. To this day, there are many who believe and wish that the NDP had survived to offer Barbados a true, credible third option. Another one of his teachable moments for me was to recognise that here was an individual who was respected across the political divide. Indeed, it was under the BLP administration that Richie Haynes was honoured as the Knight of St. Andrew for his outstanding work to national building. He too was gracious and respectful of the contributions of all political talent, regardless of their political leaning. He observantly and prophetically coined a fitting term when he referred to the economic team of the Right Honourable Owen Arthur, Honourable Mia Mottley and Mr. Clyde Mascoll as a formidable triumvirate as he applauded their achievements of managing a sound economy and affording Barbados a prosperity yet to be reproduced in recent times.

And finally, Madam Deputy Speaker, my most interesting and teachable experience came when I personally met Sir Richard Haynes at the dedication ceremony of the Richard Haynes Boardwalk in Hastings on January 29th of last year. The Boardwalk had been renamed in his honour for his outstanding contribution not only to politics and health care, but also to the immense commercial development in Rockley and no doubt in Christ Church West, where he resided with his family on Golf Club Road. After surveying him for some time, in deep conversation with Prime Minister Freundel Stuart, I decided that I would approach him, offer him my salutation, and then make a quick exit. After extending my greeting and formal congratulatory remarks, I turned to

leave, only to realise that Sir Richard Haynes had started to strike up a hearty conversation, Prime Minister included, about his valiant efforts to secure a victory for the Democratic Labour Party in Christ Church West. He regaled me with stories of his planning public meetings, the difficulty of finding speakers for the platform, and his having at one time to speak at length for his colleague John Daniel, when all other speakers had failed to show. He seemed particularly amused that even Daniel himself had failed to show. After which he closed the meeting and made his exit.

At that point, I appreciated that it was the delight of every politician to reminisce of days of yore, but even more significantly, that there was Sir Richard. There was Sir Richard, the man of the moment, honoured yet taking the time to share a piece of his political history and enjoying the moment. He was a busy man, but he took the time. I was charmed and I understood why people loved Sir Richard. I stand in awe of Sir Richard Haynes - statesman, physician, politician, knight, gentleman, an illustrious and irreplaceable son of Barbados stock has gone to the great beyond. Sir Richard, you inspired and excited a nation. Galvanise others to see your goals of transformation achieved for the good of others. As we on this side mourn your loss, no doubt others on the other side hasten to greet you and to make their reacquaintance. To Carol, Lady Haynes, to your sons and family, I extend on behalf of the residents of Christ Church West and in particular of Golf Club Road, and indeed on my own behalf, heartfelt condolences. May Sir Richard Haynes rest in peace and rise in glory.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Honourable Member for St. Michael Central.

Hon. S. D. BLACKETT: Thank you very much, Madam Deputy Speaker. I too would like to add my tributes to Sir Richard, as my colleagues did. It is as if the Lord is assembling a host of the most brilliant political minds and able-bodied politicians ever to have occupied the four walls of this honourable House or graced the hallowed halls of this Parliament. The passing parade, Madam Deputy Speaker, especially over the last three years, has seen some of our most treasured and revered sons called to higher service. Sir Richard Christopher Haynes can be counted amongst them. From all that was said before his death, Madam Deputy Speaker, and subsequently, it clearly conveys he was no regular citizen of Barbados, but one whose name will be etched for all time in the annals of this country's history as a distinguished patriot, and gentleman of the highest order.

He was described by his son in the eulogy as a wonderful husband, a loyal friend, amazing grandfather, and an outstanding father-in-law. But the one common thread, Madam Deputy Speaker, that strung those

characteristics together is without doubt his passion to be a strong, unwavering and devoted family man. Despite his illustrious career, Madam Deputy Speaker, in medicine and his stellar and fierce contribution to politics, it is this characteristic of strong and unshakable family devotion that emboldened Sir Richard to me, as a man of stature, certainly a man of respect, conviction, and familial devotion. For today, in this fast-paced world of technological advancements and where interaction with social media, Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, or even the myriad computer games, these now take precedence over what was the traditional gathering of the family. In the sitting room, or as most of us were raised - in the old shed roof and front house - we were gathered there for what I consider to be the most important social interface and discourse that once existed in any household, whether it be in town or whether it be in country. Now, this over-possession of this sharing of conversation and gathering of the family unit can safely be grouped with all of the other contemporary factors that really militate against the strengthening of the family as we once knew it. And it is this unravelling or diminishing of the family structure that highlights or promotes a man like Sir Richard, who despite his professional and political endeavours still found time for his siblings and his relatives, his wife and his family. Now that was an unmistakable and wonderful characteristic of this fine gentleman.

As a young man who always had a passion for politics, Madam Deputy Speaker, and whose interest was always piqued when I got an opportunity to hear the debates from the House of Assembly - when I heard the political titans like Sir Branford Taitt and the Right Honourable Errol Walton Barrow and Sir Bernard St. John and Tom Adams and of course the young David Thompson - Sir Richard was always one of my favourite debaters here in this House of Assembly. He brought an intellectual and certainly a sagacious slant to his contributions to the debates and at all times I detected they were always tempered by a deep and abiding affection for the dispossessed and the indigent who found themselves crushed in the arms of unyielding poverty through no fault of theirs. Sir Richard also brought a certain flair to the stage of politics that could not even be emulated even if most of us tried. For this flair and swagger was not contrived, Madam Deputy Speaker, but flowed naturally from this gentleman who wore these attributes with comfort and ease, as if they were his and his alone.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the young Sir Richard, as I was told, grew up in the rustic Newbury in St. George and showed his brilliance as an academic from his early school days. He was the toast of his village, I was told, and also his parish, and this speaks to the time when sons and daughters of the soil were celebrated royally when their achievements brought glory and honour to their local villages and to their local districts. But Madam Deputy

Speaker, the kind of celebration of our local achievers is not so recognised at the community level anymore. Because some of our communities, we now know them not as close-knit as they once were, not as welcoming, because of the emergence of a vibrant middle class society in this country. So disconnected are we who live in the modern developments across Barbados that our neighbours are only now known by car registration numbers and the occupants of a particular house are referred to by their house number or by the colour of their house. In my own neighbourhood, Madam Deputy Speaker, the family who lives right next door to me and have been living there for the last two and a half years - I have not spoken to them or they to me. Not because I don't like my neighbours, but simply because there is no social interaction. If ever I saw them walking on Broad Street, I could not recognise them. This is the kind of Barbados that we now have. I have never seen them, I have never introduced myself to them, never even exchanged a word of pleasantries or a greeting. Certainly that was not the kind of environment that existed in the close-knit community of Newbury in which Sir Richard grew up. The residents were familiar with and proud of him. And he was equally as proud of them, paying regular visits to his parents' home and to those of his relatives and his friends.

We have truly lost, Madam Deputy Speaker, one of our brightest and one of our best. Sir Richard could have remained in the cloistered security of his medical practice and remained untouched by society, and society remained untouched by him, with the only contact through his practice. But he was motivated, Madam Deputy Speaker, enough by his humanitarian and altruistic persona to immerse himself not in the peripheral but in the mainstream electoral politics of this country, using it as a vehicle to achieve an objective to better the lives and better the conditions of the people of St. George, St. Michael South Central and indeed Barbados. For he didn't enter politics to advance his own personal wealth. God knows he didn't have to. I believe it was a love of people and a love of country. We younger politicians who are following will do well to emulate this giant of a man, separating our personal ambitions from that of being of service to our fellow man and exhibiting that milk of human kindness which Sir Richard Haynes so often displayed.

I say to his wife, Carol, Lady Haynes, and to his sons and family and other relatives, I extend my deepest and heartfelt condolences. I say to Sir Richard, well done, my good and faithful servant. Rest in peace and rise in glory and may light perpetual shine on you. I am obliged to you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

MADAM DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Michael East.

Mr. T. A. PRESCOD: Madam Chair. I want to participate in this tribute to the work of one of the most outstanding Barbadians, Sir Richie Haynes. Haynes, as I struggle to locate him, is significant not because of his intellectual achievements. I've heard many people speak about his intellectual achievements and that is known to almost every Barbadian who is conscious of the contributions, the verbal contributions which he has made. But I would more like to locate him as an important historical figure who used that wisdom as a local guru to chart a path for the less fortunate people in society. You know, Haynes won his seat on three occasions in South Central. It was not simply because he was a great doctor or that he was a great orator, but there was an innate being in Haynes, and apart from all his intellectual achievements, he had that grounding, that passion to see that he used his knowledge to uplift the quality of life of the less fortunate people. And that is why, if you know the demographics and the sociology of Carrington Village and Brittons Hill and the Valley and so on, that is why you will see ordinary people responding to Richard Haynes favourably on many occasions.

Now, I want to place him there because I also know that there was no rigidity in the ideology that guided him. My view is that he had a strong commitment to the unity of theories, and that is mirrored in his relationship, especially in the formation of the early NDP, with, in my view, a right-wing grouping. But three years after, you see a unity with a different grouping, a social and political grouping. By the time Haynes came to the 1994 election, in that group was a distinguished historian and radical by the name of Leroy Yeardon, who was a strong Pan-Africanist. David Commissar - I claim legitimacy to being present at this specific time, although we had little reservations saying that because I didn't want to be classified as a party hopper in the circumstances. But the reality is - I heard some member, and I really hope that - I think that we were consistent, unswerving in a principle for the preservation of justice and democracy - that the institution which is multicultural with many different interests did not make any difference at this specific time. And Haynes wanted to create this new political configuration so that he could remain in the forefront of the preservation of the democratic principles of Barbados. He was not happy with what he had to endure in the last party that he was in, and therefore the formation of the NDP. But Richie Haynes has to be looked at in a very wide context. He was not just a politician; he was a tactician too. Never underestimate him.

Now I will tell you this, and I know that there is even an administrator within the precincts of this room who was also part of that pioneer status in creating this new formation - along with probably I am the only lasting feature of a candidate in the NDP on that occasion. But Richard Haynes went to Quakers Road, his first meeting for the return to victory for the NDP, the first time the NDP

was well placed to land a successful candidate in the election in this House of Assembly, which he decided consciously so that the first meeting must be held at Quakers Road in close proximity to the Christian lands and sacred sites of the Creoles who were in the revolutionary boat at the end of the 17th century. And I say revolutionary because of fundamental changes. And sometimes we talk about reform and we talk about revolution and some people retreat from revolution because of its stigmatisation. But the reality is that what the Creoles stood for, that would have inspired him, was radical - because the Creoles were talking about the abolition of the slave trade. The Creoles were also talking - and that is in 1807 - the Creoles were also talking about the abolition of child labour. And they were also talking about major fundamental changes in the political structures of the land, asking their own people at home to recognise us, not as second-class people, but as human beings, and asking them to reduce the cruelty that was being inflicted on our people at the time.

Now, if you examine Haynes' role, you could see the trajectory, the influences that were responsible for making him what he was, and why he decided at that time that Quakers Road must be the sacred spot for that election campaign. I was the first speaker on that platform in 1994. I led the charge, and there were over 6 000 to 7 000 people on that spot. It is not because he was bright. It was probably because he was wise and he had a compassion for people. So you had people from Carrington Village, Brittons Hill, and the entire area swarmed down on that area. The NDP delivered over 6 000 manifestos on that night. It is not just all over Barbados because he won. A lot of people see large meetings and don't win. He won, and what was significant - he was not travelling on the winds of a political party with a long historic track record; he was the man responsible for a new vision, a new vision at a particular time.

If you look back at the tenets of the 1994 Manifesto, for the first time in the history of Barbados, the whole concept of the eradication of poverty - we were talking about it all the time. But Haynes placed the concept of the eradication of poverty as one of the major tenets of the NDP in 1994. Now this is a man - and I'm not saying this in any prejudiced way - this is a man who would have been seen by some people as part of a new educated elite in Barbados, because that is how we classify and frame people in Barbados. But the heart of him, the heart, focused profoundly on the concerns of the poor people in the society. And that is why he came to them once and they gave him their support. He went the second time and they gave him their support. There was a misfortune, but then he went back to the people and got the support of the people, and the NDP landed, for the first time, a leader - he was the leader of the political party - and that was significant. All the others could only walk away with the credit of looking good. But the reality is that he won. And he won that seat

at a time when my cousin was the parliamentary representative of South Central. I had to do things in that campaign that my conscience afterwards worried me for a little while. But I thought that Haynes was really deserving, obviously, at this specific time. One day I will redeem myself to him - and I'm talking about my cousin. I redeemed myself to him.

Richmond Hill also at the parochial level, because Carrington Village returned him. But what did he do for Carrington Village? Through his medical practice, the services were always available to those people. Anything that was wrong with anybody from Carrington Village and Brittons Hill and the area too - they would go to Richard Haynes and he would give his services free to them, and they were always satisfied, even if it was a form of psychological satisfaction, as long as Haynes touched them or talked to them.

They felt as though they were experiencing some form of atonement. Yes. He was that important to them. He did not create himself. He didn't. He never called himself a messiah. But that was the way how the people held Richie Haynes in their confidence. They trusted him as an individual. Richie Haynes - I remember in the early stages, Richie Haynes was one of the persons who was calling for the reconstruction of the Carrington Village School. And it was supposed to be constructed at the time - I think it was Dr. Shortland in Three-Side Road. But he had a vision and he knew what he was doing. He did a lot of work. In the area of sports, I know that there is a view that he probably might not be a sports practitioner, but the reality is that he did everything that he could to make sure that the sports clubs in Quakers Road and all around there - Bayshore Road, around all of those environs, those are the ones I can speak about - they were looked after, and he helped with the actual regrading and the preparation of the Gully Hill pasture in that particular community.

But when you look to see, as I examined his journey, not just in the NDP, but I was in the trenches with him in the dark holes fighting for justice - not the party for justice and democracy. And I was there with him in 1986 when Richard Haynes brought to the platform and represented with clarity the importance of having a tax allowance for all those persons who were receiving \$15 000 a year or less. And I remember how he sold it to the people and how the people responded at the particular time. It resonated. The Barbados Labour Party at that time was offering, I think, about \$12 000 to the public. Haynes, being a good tactician, understood that if you raise the bar and it is to the benefit of the poor, they will respond favourably. And what is wrong with a man understanding how to manoeuvre in the circumstances? And that is precisely what he did at that particular time.

Now, the whole idea of what I describe as a theory of ideologies - I said that because even in his economic policies and so on, he had different views prior to 1986. In fact, during the 1986 period, he had different views. And I heard the Honourable Prime Minister give clarity and enunciation to that particular point. But he had strong views on things. But he was not the kind of man who, if you could provide a logical counter to what he was saying, was indifferent to listening and reconsidering. I know that unfortunately - or fortunately - at the time, he could not reach the compromise in the Democratic Party that he was willing to reach, and it was rightly said that was a painful departure at the time when he made that departure. But his commitment to ideas allowed him also to establish a kind of an amalgam with the Barbados Labour Party. And you see it in the policies - when the Barbados Labour Party came to power, those same policies that you saw in the NDP Manifesto are some of the policies that you will see being executed by the Barbados Labour Party. So I don't think he went about to claim any credit for them, and that is the nature of the man. But he continued in his political career to make positive contributions to this country.

I strongly believe that it has to be acknowledged - not just an intellectual that we are extremely proud of, but what is more important to me is that when you achieve all the credits and certifications in academia, that you never forget the humble origins. Return and make sacrifices as a form of redemption and repayment to the people who are responsible for you being here. And I am going to say it in the House of Assembly just as much as St. James scripted in the King James version. I'm going to be saying it all the time. Try to make a sacrifice. Don't know how hard the struggle is. Never, never, ever retreat from your mission. The only reason that we will remember him at the end of the day is because of his contribution to the general development of this society and to the general civilisation of this country we call Barbados, and more in particular, the way in which he related to ordinary people.

I know sometimes he was a little unorthodox because I know that. I have travelled with him and we have had challenges because he doesn't like hostility unnecessarily. We are going to the minibus, and we try to meet, and if somebody behaved in a manner which we did not consider to be too wholesome, he would be uncomfortable with that. But that can be understood. Some of us might pretend that we are courageous and that we can endure all of these things. But the reality is that some of us manifest the truth in many different ways. And he manifested the truth in different ways. He would always say let me get out of here because he didn't feel that he deserved it. And I never felt he deserved it either. But I really believe that in his heart, whatever misrepresentations and false perceptions some might have of him, I think that he deserves to be etched deeply into the history of Barbados and for his contribution to this House of

Assembly and to national development in general. Madam Chair, long live the spirit of my brother and friend, Dr. Richard Haynes, and may his soul rest in peace.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central.

Hon. R. D. JONES: Thank you very much, Madam Deputy Speaker. I am not going to be like so many who claim personal affinity with the gentleman whom we speak of today. I remember, ma'am, his journey into politics. I was still relatively young, even though now, as you look at me, 1976, onto this time, I would have rather harshly as a result of my own surging into politics, but as even then a loyal and supportive follower of the Democratic Labor Party, screaming loudly at each and every success going way back to 1966 and therefore following politics with a certain passion, the emergence of Dr. Richie Haynes on the political scene added to what I call the powerhouse of the Democratic Labour Party. Dr. Haynes had an interesting style I would now reflect upon. It was not a loud and aggressive voice, but there was a tonal quality that captured your ears and fixed you to what was coming from his mind through his mouth. And therefore, as a youngster, you paid attention to that. In fact, it has already been stated by several first persons of, especially when he got into the house in 1978 of the combats between great minds of that time, great minds of that era. Many centuries who, regardless of their station in life, were hewn from the bowels of Barbados. But more particularly, and I was quite pleased to listen to what I consider to be one of the better presentations of the oral member for St. George North. And that is because he was a participant in some part of the life of Dr. Haynes, Sir Richard Haynes. And I am therefore persuaded to reflect a bit on what he said, but particularly my understanding of Barbadian culture and Barbadian history. And he having reflected on the origins in Newbury, St. George, which by its very nature, and I believe someone referred to it as part of the rustic part of Barbados, meaning the rural, where life vibrated with a passion, a verb for life, an energy and a strength. And that is where he had his origins. That is where love and appreciation for human beings was called.

Within that district, and there were so many, we call them villages. District, yes, but villages of Barbados dotted across the space. Essentially, the majority of the people worked on plantations - that is where they had their living, that is where they had their life and occasionally when hunger penetrated their beings, they got a tot. A tot with cracked liquor and poured some water and stirred it quickly and drank it to stave off hunger. That is how it was. In Barbados, that was the period of the existence. And yes, early education at Workman's, a school which has gone through some changes in shape and form, but there was something about early elementary, as it was called then, education in Barbados. Sometimes as Minister of

Education, I wish for some of that. Not all. Not all. Because there were contradictions even then. The bright, the gifted, the brilliant were held up and they were channelled by educators of that period. Many of the real poor were not. This is the history of Barbadians. And therefore Richard Haynes, as he was obviously called in, brought into elementary education a brain which had already formed by his family conditions, by the interaction of speech within his family. So his language was being developed in a particular way. So the ability to express was already embedded quite early within a domestic environment and fully then supported by a village.

And the colleagues are right, if you understand the sociocultural history of Barbados, you would understand, and I still believe it happens now, different forms, that the bright youngster was held up in church and chapel and in school and in the community. It still happens now. Yes, it takes a village to raise a child and children were raised by our villages and there was certain homage. Regardless of however the community or the village is structured, there was a particular homage paid to certain names within that community because they stood for something that people admired. Like the Joneses, the Morrisons, the Stewarts, the Bosticks from up in the north, the Bristows - used to call them nowadays the Bristows, the Bristows, but they were really Bristows from St. Philip. There were so many - the Mosleys, the Mortleys - these are names wrapped around Barbados and there were people who paid specific respect to those persons and it came out of a long history of paying respect, in the early stage of respect being enforced but gradually as our people came into their own. They recognised that as Christian beings, you had to pay respect to people regardless of their station in life. And it is out of that milieu that Sir Richard Haynes emerged. And he has done well. He did well. And we have to celebrate persons who have done well regardless of their circumstances. Regardless, he who is born to higher state, he who is born to lower state - and he, I mean she as well - regardless of wherever, when persons demonstrate those qualities of focus, determination, commitment, resilience against the odds, they should be shown due respect.

Now, listening to just a small part of the story of Sir Richard Haynes, one would want to, almost I would call it, sell that story to young people of Barbados. Sell it, tell that story to the young people of Barbados. To those who are now sailing on boats without stern or rudder. Those who are on boats without oars, do not know where they are going, do not know how they are going to connect. But there are such excellent examples for them to follow in this small rock of 166 square miles. So Richard Haynes is but one of those examples. And the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central alluded to several who have now become part of the passing parade. They have become part of the passing parade who have come to this House, many who have never come to this House, but have made a

significant impact in their country, in their villages, and in this country of Barbados. And if we can but get some - we cannot get all of our youth, of our young people - to say, you know something, listening to that life story, maybe I can, maybe I should, maybe I must. That would really be a testimony. No, no, no big murals painted in the sky or on some billboard somewhere. But reflections of examples of life truly lived. That is really what you want. Young people sitting and reflecting on their own paths, their own journeys, and the paths and journeys of others, and see what they can do to fashion a life view, a world view, a life cycle that would make them truly worthy citizens of the world. I am, as Minister of Education, would be so pleased. I can lay down my books rather than seeking to use them to trample those who do not care about this country. I can lay those books down and relax in the comfort of my home, knowing that the youth can carry on the strength and vigour and the focus, contented in what they do and what they have achieved. So the life of Sir Richard Haynes gives that small impetus, that small momentum for change in the lives of our people.

These are stories dotted across Barbados - Sir Grantley Adams and what he did then and in that period of time, the Right Excellent Earl Walter Barrow, the Right Excellent Sir Grantley Adams as well. I would not want to be accused of forgetting that as one of our national heroes. I can see how the media would twist it and turn it. And men would plot to bring me to my knees. But I am aware. So I leave that alone. The Right Excellent Earl Walton Barrow. You name them over time in this country. Let us name them. Let us recognise them. Let us exalt them, so that as we look through time, they can still steer us as a nation and as a people. That is what is important. So the young boy from a unique, rustic village became a great man in a great country, and one wonders if the great man made the great country or the great country made the great man. It is an interesting dichotomy. As far as I am concerned, the two must work together. The great man must continue to make a great country because it is out of the great country, out of the bowels of the great country, the great man, the great woman, the great men, the great women, emerge. And so the symbiotic relationship that exists between the two, between you and I as country and citizen, truly makes a great nation, truly makes a great people. And so Richard Haynes became a great man.

I am not going to say that there was a point in time in my own life, looking at the political history of Barbados as a participant, as an observer participant, that I was pleased with everything Sir Richard did, because I supported it in my own way and therefore I had prejudicial notions as to what Sir Richard could and should have done. But that is my right. But that is his right also - what he did. Because I remembered the formation of the National Democratic Party. I remembered when you took out of the heart of the 1986 Democratic Labor Party several members

of that party to form a new party, that would have been a challenge for the Democratic Labor Party. And therefore, he slid somewhat in my esteem. I am being frank. He slid somewhat in my esteem. But yet, I have never in my life held rancour against his soul. And you cannot as a Christian carry hatred in your heart for fellow men or women. He did what he had to do based on his own understanding of political reality for him and those who followed him. I heard the Honourable Member for St. Michael East say he did some things in the shadows of the night, even against his family. That was his confession. He has in the darkness, even of the night now, prayed to his Lord for forgiveness, prayed to the Lord for his own salvation. Because we cannot give him that salvation. We cannot even give him shelter over here. Because, like the other member for Christ Church, she referred to many of her people as cowards. She said there were cowards, those who hopped and scotched and bent and picked up things that do not belong to them. So I understand when you love someone, there are sometimes things you do to demonstrate that love. So you too are forgiven - not by me, but by those who want to forgive you. Only the Lord can truly forgive, not man. Only the good Lord, for those who are Christians. So I understand that journey that he made.

I also understand the battle he enjoyed in St. Michael South Central, a constituency which he previously represented under the ambit of the Democratic Labour Party. And he joined the Democratic Labour Party because he understood the philosophy and just like the Democratic Labor Party emerged out of the Barbados Labor Party at the time it did, there are historical junctures when certain things happen. The Honourable Member for St. George North referred to the Manifesto of 1951 of the Barbados Labor Party and the immense contribution of the Right Excellent Earl Barrow - as he was called then - to that Manifesto of 1951 and the notion of free secondary education. It was part of these policies that forced the emergence of persons like the Right Excellent Earl Walton Barrow out of the Barbados Labor Party because they looked at the slate and realised the slate was not being written on as quickly as possible. That is what happened. The slate was not being written on as quickly as possible. And in the desire to bring about change, out came Roy Exton, Earl Walton Barrow, and several others, founding members of the Democratic Labor Party. And therefore, with the same vision captured by Sir Richard Haynes, Richard Haynes as he was then called, the frustration of making a difference - because he had captured in his mind at that time that the DLP was not moving fast enough to address the poverty which he saw as a youngster growing up within the sociological context of a rustic village where cane and ground surrounded every person. Left and right. Yes, there were some small farming land holdings. You grew some cassava, you grew some eddoes, corn, yam, there were coconut trees and sugar apples, et cetera. But that was not enough on the small lots to give the family the

kind of living that was necessary. So he wanted to change the pace of movement towards the liberation of the poor and the defenceless and the vulnerable, the impressionable. So I understand now on reflection why that movement.

There are different times, as I said, in the movement and change takes place. I now recognise, though, that change is not necessarily in the formation of a new institution, but change is in the transformation of the people within the institution. That is what I now understand and I now recognise. That you do not stand from outside and throw stones. You go inside and engage your mind and you have the contestation of ideas and views and vantage points to make a difference. He has now gone - for those who believe in Christianity - to be with his Lord and the maker of all humankind. Even though the Lord is a jealous God, just like we are jealous sometimes in what we do, we know that he is also an understanding God because we have constructed him or her in our image. Those of us who are forgiving, who are understanding, we create the God out of our imagination and we deify that God. And therefore, Sir Richard Haynes, with all that he has done on this earth, has equipped himself well. Rejected first by his own people - a man they say is never king in his own country, never king in his own country. So in 1976, St. George North said, you are a good son, we love you, we care for you, but we are not going to elect you. And I do not accept that it was preparing him on a ramp for St. George North for greater service. You know, there are some little jealousies embedded in every society, in every community, in every village. I remember in that election - 1976, 1978, 1981 - Sir Richard Haynes was referred to as Richie the Rich. That is what he was referred to. Come on, these are history. The Honourable Member for St. Michael East would be aware - as Richie the Rich. And when I was a youngster, especially in the early stages, just out of school, starting to hear these phrases, I started to put it within a sociological context. There are little jealousies emerging. But you know that difficult period did not stop a man of such stellar qualities from emerging - did not stop, because part of the bedrock of the village is to strengthen people, make you stronger. And therefore when he emerged in the by-election in 1978 in St. Michael South Central, you can well understand that

he was stronger, yes. He was better equipped to deal with the tumultuous nature of cannibalistic politics. And the Honourable Prime Minister spoke about the blows that was heaped upon him and also reflected on the comment that the Right Excellent El Baradei made to Tom Adams at the time. My, that is hypocritical. But that's the nature that we've made it of politics. In 1978, in that by-election, Sir Richard Haynes scored 2 604 votes, as opposed to Mr. Hinds of the BLP 1 367. There were 6 086 registered voters in that constituency then. It hasn't changed all that fundamentally because the movement of people in this sector in the urban area out into the villages now in St. Philip, St. George even, Christ Church, St. Thomas, St.

George. So there'd be movement of people from St. Michael out into the other areas that are developing. And 4 022 valid votes were in fact cast. And he was successful and he represented that constituency.

Long may his family continue to admire him because he's yours even though he belonged to us. He's yours. You embraced him with love. You embraced him with understanding at his strong moments and at his weak moments, because that is what we have always to do within a family. At our strong moments we must be loved and at our weak moments we must be loved even more, because you know those frailties of human beings come out from time to time. And therefore, long may you continue to show that love and understanding of your husband, of your brother, of your father, of your grandfather, of your in-law, of your relatives. And long may we as a Parliament, long may we as the Democratic Labour Party, who provided shelter for him and who benefited from his counsel and his words. Remember him. Long may he continue to rest in peace.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Honourable Member for St. Michael South East. Thank you.

Miss S. J. O. BRADSHAW: Madam Deputy Speaker, I too wish to rise at this point.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, Honourable Member, please continue.

Miss S. J. O. BRADSHAW: I wish to rise at this point to also express my deep sympathy to the family of the late Sir Richard Haynes and to share the similar sentiments that have been expressed here both this morning and this afternoon with respect to the outstanding contribution that this son of our soil has made to the development of Barbados. The year in which Sir Richard Haynes would have entered in active politics was actually the year that I was born. And yes, I'm a baby to politics for sure. And it is significant as well because it was also the year that my father would have also entered in active politics. But I think what is interesting is that despite my youth at the time while Sir Richard would have been in politics, I am certainly well aware of the contribution that he would have made in this chamber and also in respect of his medical profession as well.

And I too wish to echo the sentiments of others that I believe that we have lost an outstanding citizen of this country, someone whom I believe that more could have been done and I think can still be done to ensure that his memory certainly lives on. And I say that because too often we come to these chambers and we pay respects to those who have passed before us, but I think we do owe it to ourselves and to those who have gone before us to ensure

that the generations to come understand not only the sacrifice that is made by persons entering political life, but also the contributions that these persons make to the development of this country. And when I speak of the sacrifice, I speak not only of the political sacrifice, but also the personal sacrifice that each and every member makes when they take the position to enter public life.

It is a sacrifice that I know all too well, being the child of a politician, and one which I certainly understand and appreciate the sentiments that were expressed by Sir Richard's son, Kashka, at the funeral. And I wish to say through you, Mr. Speaker, that I too understand and sympathize with the family, because there are times as a child of a politician where you do not often get to spend time with the father or the mother, as the case may be, because they obviously have given themselves to the public and to their constituencies to serve and to transform Barbados as we know it. And I think that takes a certain type of person to contribute, to also still contribute to the family life and to the family environment, but it also takes a special person in the form of the wife or the partner to be able to stand by that individual, to be able to raise the children, to be able to look after the household, to still be able to balance one's career and family life and to support one's husband or wife.

And that being said, I would certainly like to applaud Lady Haynes for the contribution which she too has made and the support which she would have given to her husband in his best days and in his finest days of giving to this country, but also to applaud her and the family for being able to stand by him when he was ill. Because as politicians, often when you're at your peak, people are always there. But there are times when you are ailing and when you are sick that you suddenly realize who your friends and your close supporters are. And I think that as we salute Sir Richard Haynes, we must also salute his family and those who would have given him to us or have loaned him to us in order to make a contribution to Barbados.

I have had the privilege of knowing very closely one of his sons, Richard. And it was only while I was sitting here and recalling that Sir Richard would have represented the constituency of St. Michael South Central, that I certainly realized that Richard's company, his entertainment company, South Central Entertainment, no doubt is named after the constituency for which his father represented. So it kind of hit me very hard just now as to perhaps Richard may at some point enter elective politics given that he seems to have politics so close to his heart. And I jokingly say that, but I really do believe that men like Sir Richard Haynes - and we've spoken in this chamber about Sir Branford and others - have made a contribution to Barbados for which we must all be proud. But they've also raised children whom I believe have been

able to give back to society and who have made an outstanding contribution, whether in business, whether in the social environment, in whatever aspect they've chosen. And I think that is something which we must applaud and which we must continue to encourage.

Because the one thing about that generation that is certainly common across all of those persons who I've come across in that generation for sure, is that they've been able to balance not only, in a sense, being able to walk with kings and queens, but also being able to walk with the common man and to have the common touch. And I think a lot of them, from my interaction with their children, have also been able to exhibit those qualities. And I think they are certainly greater and more enriched as a result of it, because the parents pass on to them the ability to not only stand up for what you believe in, but also to defend and to uphold what you believe in, no matter what anyone may want to say. And I think those are the lessons that we can take from Sir Richard's life.

I know it will be a tremendous loss to his family and to those who would have been supporters in the constituency that he would have represented, and no doubt to both political parties, because what is interesting is we stand here today and we salute his contribution - both members on either side can certainly salute the contribution of Sir Richard Haynes and do so in a very, for the most part, a very non-partisan way. And I think that while we do so, we must certainly acknowledge that we have a responsibility to ensure that his legacy is not lost, that the legacy of all those who we stand here in this chamber and we salute, is not lost.

As the Government of Barbados, we have the outlet of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation at our disposal, and I would hope that we would find ways from time to time to be able to capture in some way the lives of these individuals who have contributed to this country, but also to encourage our journalists, to encourage our historians, various writers to capture the essence of who these people were and the contribution that they would have made. Because a lot of our people don't read, a lot of our young people don't read, and if we are expecting them to pick up, to go to Hansard, to be able to find out the contribution of a Sir Richard Haynes and others, then that is certainly not going to happen. So I think we have to be innovative in the way that we allow the legacy of these individuals to continue and not simply come here and just talk about it, but certainly to start to do things that show the members of the other generations to come, that we not only can talk about it here, but that we accept and we acknowledge that better can be done.

I wish through you, Mr. Speaker, to express my condolences to the family on behalf of my own family as well. And I must tell you that I do feel your loss, the

tremendous loss that you must feel as a result of losing Sir Richard. I cannot begin to imagine what it would be like to lose any of my parents, and certainly to have to sit in this chamber and listen to the tributes of others talking about any member of my family. But I know that day will come, and I think that what you hold on to are the memories that you have with your family and the person who has made a contribution to this country. Because no matter whether people like you or they didn't like you, you are still the father or the mother of the children that you have left behind and the wife or the husband of the person you have left behind. And with those words, Mr. Speaker, I offer my sincere condolences to the family of the late Sir Richard.

Dr. the Hon. D. S. LOWE: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to ensure that before this exercise was concluded that I had an opportunity to place my testimony of a man who lived a life to be remembered not only amongst us, but remembered by those who would follow us. I was struck by the words of one of the speakers this morning. When they talked about sowing seeds and seeds sown, that yield a harvest of kind. And I hope those words are remembered for a long, long time in this chamber, because all of us are sowers of seeds, and some of us will reap harvests that are reflective of the type of sowing we've done. And there will come a time when members of this chamber will have to reflect on the lives lived by those who have passed, who have had a role to play in this chamber, and I would hope that we will be able to reflect on not only that period of sowing, but on the harvest time that will naturally follow.

Sir Richard Haynes - I have only had one opportunity to have a face-to-face conversation with him. I have had three opportunities to have a conversation with this man. Now, I have followed politics for some time. I lived away from Barbados for some years, but it is impossible for anyone who is a son or daughter of this soil to not be gripped by the life lived by this great man. I say great man because all men and women will have lived some great lives, some ordinary lives. This is one of the lives that can be paraded as a great life. Now, people describe people differently and people see people differently. Sir Richard was a man loved and revered by many, and there were those who would have chosen to find distracting symbols to describe him. For me, I reflect on the life of this great man only in the context of the life of this great nation. And this nation's democracy as we understand it today, Mr. Speaker, could not be defined or could not be described as it is had it not been for his contribution. That is the contribution of Sir Richard Haynes.

A man's vision, a man's cause cannot be contained in any political party. So the fact that Sir Richard would have started a political party to me is non-significant from the standpoint that he never veered off course relative to his political cause. And there are a lot of us, Mr. Speaker, who

- some of us in here now, some of us who would have been here before, some who will be here after us - are not necessarily here because they are driven by a cause. Different types of vehicles bring us to this station point. I would rather want to be considered as being remembered, not necessarily because I was a member of the Democratic Labour Party, or could have been a member of the Barbados Labour Party, or perhaps could have been a member of the NDP, but I am here because there is a greater purpose for which we must give ourselves wholeheartedly and that our voices must always reflect the voices of that which we believe. Because the great book, Mr. Speaker, gives us examples of pilgrims who lived and died for different reasons, as well as pilgrims who lived and died because of their cause. Sir Richard Haynes cannot be, for me, reflected upon except in the context of his pursuit of a cause.

From all testimonies, a man of humble beginnings. From all testimonies, a man of honour. From all testimonies, a man of humility. A man who chose a path in life, not simply because he was in search for himself, but he chose a path in life because he was simply searching for the greater good of humankind. And I am gripped by those who would have graced the annals of history and those who would have walked these halls, men and women who can only be described as men and women who were so driven by a sense of purpose that they were willing to give up any comfort, even if it were the comfort of a political party, to ensure that they fully lived out the virtues of what they believe.

And when I sat in that service, that funeral service, the internment of this great man, and I heard the testimony of the life he lived - a man who did not confine himself to be defined as a physician, a man who did not confine himself to be defined as a politician, a man who did not confine himself to be defined as a great businessman, but a man whose definition moved beyond the concrete nature of those variables and landed him in the bosom of a man who defined himself as an altruistic human being in search of a greater purpose for the greater good of mankind. Mr. Speaker, I am touched by that. And it was best reflected in my view on that evening of the internment by his son who spoke. And I told myself there and then that with all that I may try to do and all that I may achieve in life, if one of my own could stand on that day of my final flight away from this earth and speak of me in the tender, honest, transparent terms of a son that he did, then I believe that I would have been able to do my part and be so recognised for that.

I really believe that at the end of the day, when we have all taken this stroll through this avenue of life, and when we would have had the privilege of being chosen by people - our peers, people from our communities - to serve them in this place, at the end of the day, I want to be remembered as I choose to remember this great man, as a

man who has given my all for the service of people. A champion of the poor? Yes. And somebody asked me, how do you reconcile the fact that Sir Richard was not one who frequented places that some of us feel in order to be successful politicians we must frequent, like rum shops? I spent some time there from time to time. I spent some time on the dance floor with the Honourable Members of St. George North from time to time. I am not dancing with them, but I have, and I have enjoyed that side of my personality. But every personality is not captured in the same context. And therefore, my effectiveness as a servant of the people cannot be restricted by defining me because I am here or there.

I want to be remembered for my thought, my thinking. That is the transformational virtue that God has blessed us with. And if we define ourselves in terms of limitation, because we attach symbols and places to who we are, then we will never be able to make the impact of a Sir Richard Haynes and the impact he made on this country. So I listened that afternoon. I watched how his family departed themselves. The calm - I watched the serenity over their countenances. And I said to myself, here are people who are surrendered to the fact that they have been part of a great life, a great life that made a great contribution to this country, a great life that shall be remembered forever by those who were gripped and those who are gripped by the substance of his contribution to Barbados.

There are those of us who, as we observe the passing of loved ones and colleagues - I go back to the late Prime Minister and his passing - and we reflect on our own mortality and we reflect on the morbidity of death. And we ask ourselves if indeed we have fought a good fight or if we will be fighting a good fight. And for those who have come to the end of that journey, those of us who remain are the testimonies of their contribution to humankind. And that is why we remember people like the late, excellent Errol Barrow, the late, Right Excellent Sir Grantley Adams. That is why we remember people like Sir Harold St. John, not just because of political labels or symbols, but when we dig deeper, we search for that which is not perishable, which holds a society together, which preserves the DNA of our nationhood. We search for those elements and we ask ourselves if what we are doing will vanish with time or there will be living testimonies, living oracles of what we have done.

I am in awe of this man, Sir Richard Haynes. I met him in person in January last year. And I could not believe a man who was fighting a valiant fight of life and had shifted his focus from his political activities and his business activities and the like, and shifted his focus on the very eminence of suffering. But you could not believe, Mr. Speaker, the grace and the love of life and the absolute delight, the clarity of thought as you engaged. It was on the

occasion when, as our Honourable Prime Minister noted earlier, the Hastings Boardwalk was named and officially opened in his honour. And truth to tell, the memories of a great man are not simply contained in earthly symbols. The pages of history tell their own story of the life we have lived. The way people have been touched. And sometimes God blesses you with such great attributes that they become the points and target points for those who would be overtaken by jealousy.

I believe a man of his physical stature, a man of his brilliance - he was a brilliant man - a man demonstrating love for family, a man who was as lucid in his thinking as you will find in any other man, a man who had risen to his heights in politics in Barbados - there were people out there who just did not like him because he was Sir Richard Haynes. And all of us will be befallen by that from time to time. But I always say, who cares? If you do not like me, talk to the person who made me - God. Have a conversation with God. That may be enlightening for you if you do. But that never stopped him. That never slowed him down. And even on that moment in time there on the Hastings Boardwalk - now the Sir Richard Haynes Boardwalk - I listened to a man who knew who he was, a man who knew his purpose in life, a man who was absolutely consumed by his cause, a cause that I believe he took to his grave with him. A man who loved country and loved people.

You know, all great men do not from humble beginnings spring forth. But I know of great men who from very humble beginnings have lived their lives in such a manner that they have transformed and illuminated the path that they travel to get where they are. And I think this is a wonderful example of what Barbados can produce. It is a clear demonstration of the philosophical position of the Democratic Labour Party, which outlines

and declares that it does not matter what station in life you may find yourself, that as long as you take the full advantage of every opportunity accorded to you, you can become as great as you wish to be in this society. And Sir Richard Haynes is a living testimony of that philosophy, a philosophy that he took, embraced, and expanded into the National Democratic Party. So today I join with my colleagues in a moment of celebration of a great life, a life lived by a great man, a man whose memory shall live on forever. And as I look towards his family and see the absolute rest in their faces - the rest that a great man has left, but his work continues - the greatness of this man is best lived on not in a portrait, but in the lives that you choose to live.

And I pray that God will allow His eternal grace and strength to be yours at this time. For there is a song that says His strength is made perfect in your most arduous moment of weakness. You do not need to be strong on your

own, but you should rely on the eternal arms of God that will see you through not just today or tomorrow, but for the rest of your lives. May God rest his soul in eternal bliss. I am sure that while we have sent him off from here, he has been welcomed with open arms by a God whose love is eternal and a God whose love is extended to all of us. Mr. Speaker, I am obliged.

Mr. E. G. HINKSON: I rise to add my voice to the tributes today given to a man who, in my opinion, was one of the most outstanding Barbadians of his generation, not having been, of course, a member of either the Democratic Labour Party or the National Democratic Party, I would only have met him on one occasion. I remember that occasion very well. It would have been around 1974. I would then have just become a teenager. It was at the house of the late Joy Edwards. My father would have taken me there - an all-day party - and introduced me to this tall, physically striking individual. In fact, I think the late Branford Tait was in the group talking as well. And my dad would have introduced me to Richie Haynes and described him as the second most powerful man in Barbados. And this individual made a striking impact on me. I mean, he was physically - he had tremendous physical presence, his intellect, his moustache, and his whole bearing of confidence and his whole aura showed that he was a man of importance and significance.

This was an individual who, of course, used his undoubted intellect, his brilliance - a Barbados scholar, of course. And in those days, no disrespect to the Barbados scholars these days, a Barbados scholarship meant something because in those days there were only five given; these days there are about 20 that are given. A man who used his intellect and brilliance for the benefit of his country. The Honourable Member for St. George North, who knew him better than I think certainly most of us on this side, spoke about his upbringing in the village of Newbury, and clearly that village helped mould him and help make him, and I myself being born in the country understood what the Honourable Member for St. George North was talking about in terms of the sociology of Barbados. And clearly Sir Richard's success - when he won the scholarship - would have been taken by the village to be part of the village's success.

But Richie was clearly an outstanding intellect. I mean, an individual who would have won a Barbados scholarship in the classics - Latin and Greek, I believe, and ancient history might have been the combination - but yet went on to be an excellent medical student and a medical doctor without parallel in Barbados, certainly not surpassed in terms of his medical skills. And then going on to be a politician with vision and with passion and with principles and philosophies, and mastering economics in terms of his knowledge and his debating skills with the late Tom Adams and the rest of the Barbados Labour Party team in

the late 1970s up to the time of the death of the late Tom Adams. I mean, this was a period of parliamentary debate that really and truly was riveting and was extremely special to me as a young adult in the early 1980s, forming my own views of society and of politics, and at that time myself gearing for the opportunity which I have today.

But Richie Haynes was clearly an individual who learned from his first defeat in electoral politics in St. George North. The Member for Christ Church East Central described it probably best when he said, sometimes you are not king in your own country. His own birthplace rejected him. I mean, there were issues then, of course - outriders and white suit, I remember. And of course that was a period of time in 1976 when the people of Barbados decided that it was time to rid themselves of the Democratic Labour Party and to bring in the great combination of the Barbados Labour Party in any event. But he recovered quickly and in two years, having been given the opportunity, elected to this Parliament with an overwhelming majority - two to one, I seem to recall that it was. And there he entered head-to-head debates with, as I said, the late Tom Adams at the height of his political and intellectual powers. And he carried the fight to the Barbados Labour Party on the economic issues especially.

In 1986, as was said, he was one of the main reasons why the Democratic Labour Party won by an overwhelming majority. The 15 000 concept that he brought in terms of tax-free allowances caught the imagination of the people of Barbados. And here I think really and truly we in Barbados have to pay the greatest respect to Sir Richard Haynes because, having been made Minister of Finance and then after the death of the Right Excellent Errol Barrow seeing the concepts undermined and the manifesto promises made by the Democratic Labour Party in 1986 being breached, he on principle decided that he had to part political company with the Democratic Labour Party. And that is a man who you have to pay tremendous respect and honour to, because he was an individual who, as I understand it, gave his heart and all to the Democratic Labour Party previously. He made tremendous financial contributions to the party, but he regarded a manifesto as a social contract between the party and the people. The manifesto had in fact been signed by the Right Excellent Errol Barrow as leader of the party. And therefore he felt that this was not something that should be breached.

And therefore when the 15 000 tax allowance disappeared after the Right Excellent Errol Barrow's death, and when other aspects of the manifesto promises were breached, he said that he could not be part of this anymore. And you know, Mr. Speaker, we now are in almost the same position in our country where this Democratic Labour Party government, having made many promises to the people of Barbados a few months ago, and having won an

election based on those promises, now find themselves in some difficulty. And one wonders where is this Sir Richard Haynes on that side who will stand up for Barbados and realise that your first honour is to Barbados, the country, and not to party. We will wait and see. We will wait and see. Those on this side, Mr. Speaker, we will find someone who will put country first and who will put the philosophies and principles for the benefit of the people as opposed to the party. And that is what I admired him most about.

Mr. Speaker, he decided - one can say that he erred in political judgment - that he could have stayed in the Democratic Labour Party, and maybe he might have become Prime Minister eventually. One never knows; one will never know. I personally believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Democratic Labour Party made its greatest mistake in not making him Prime Minister of Barbados in 1987. I believe he was - and with greatest respect to Sir Lloyd Sandiford who did become Prime Minister and who in fact is my constituent - but I believe that he was the best person to become Prime Minister, and maybe the course of Barbados may have been different. Maybe the history of Barbados in the early 1990s may have been different. Maybe we would not have had to go through all the trials and tribulations and austerity measures that we went through in the early 1990s. But we will never know, Mr. Speaker.

But this was clearly an individual who stood up for his principles. Maybe he had the financial independence that allowed him to do so. Clearly he had the backing of a strong family, and one has to really and sincerely, Mr. Speaker, pay credit to his wife, Carol, Lady Haynes, herself an outstanding individual who, even though Barbados is not the country of her birth, has made a fantastic contribution to this country in terms of health care, and who would have been with her husband through all his trials and tribulations, his ups and downs in politics. In fact, I remember seeing them once along Collymore Rock, Upper Collymore Rock, canvassing - I cannot remember which election it may have been. And you know, Mr. Speaker, they say in many cases behind every great man is a great woman, and you really have to pay tribute to her in terms of Caribbean unity. The reality, Mr. Speaker, if I may make the observation, is that quite a few of the individuals in Barbados who have achieved Knighthood are married to Jamaican women, both dead and alive. And it must be something in it that speaks towards Caribbean unity and Caribbean formation in this respect.

But Mr. Speaker, here was a man who took the political sacrifice, formed his own party, which was a no-winner in this great two-party system, but he still did very well. In 1991, if I recall, the NDP received 17 000 votes, taking away votes from both parties. And in 1994, he was able to win back his seat in St. Michael South Central. And that was a fantastic achievement, breaching the two-party

principles in Barbados and winning the seat as a third-party individual. And I remember Richie, on many occasions, joining with the Barbados Labour Party - I remember a budget speech, it might have been his 1995 budget speech - saying, but I cannot oppose this policy initiative by the Barbados Labour Party because it is an NDP initiative. The two parties coincided in many cases in terms of the policies and philosophies between 1994 and 1999.

In terms of the economic policies, when the Barbados Labour Party passed legislation to make it unconstitutional for any future Democratic Labour Party government, for instance, to come and cut public sector salaries again, Richie would have supported that concept. When the Barbados Labour Party would have increased the tax allowances for individuals again, Richie supported that concept. When we brought measures to alleviate poverty in Barbados, Richie would have supported it. When we formed the Rural Development Commission and the Urban Development Commission, again Richie supported us. All of these would have been issues which the Democratic Labour Party would have opposed between 1994 and 1999. And he clearly would have influenced as well some of the Barbados Labour Party policies during that period.

Some of the policies that he enunciated have not yet come into effect in terms of all governance, because Richie, of course, was someone who rated highly governance and transparency and accountability in politics in Barbados. He would have certainly been one proposing integrity legislation. And even though that has been passed in both Houses, it has not yet come into force in this country. I recall Richie as well speaking about freedom of information. And again, that is a concept that was in the Democratic Labour Party Manifesto of 2008, but still has not yet reached the floor of this Parliament. He would have, of course, promoted the concept of a Contractor General - a public official overseeing contracts given by government departments to individuals, seeing that they are transparent, et cetera. A piece of legislation that, for example, is in Jamaica but yet has not yet reached the floor of this Parliament. His concepts of governance and transparency and accountability were visionary, Mr. Speaker, and we have to give honour to such an individual.

Sir Richard was an individual, of course, knighted by the Barbados Labour Party government in 2003 - very deservedly so - who could have remained within his private life as one of the leading doctors in Barbados and, of course, serving people in that capacity, the most vulnerable and the financially disadvantaged, but who chose to make the sacrifice and to enter politics. And again, one has to, of course, commend his family for allowing him to be of service to Barbadians. You know, he would have entered politics when his children clearly were young, and that itself must be a great difficulty. I myself, Mr. Speaker, would have taken the decision to allow my children to

become older before I entered politics. So I could start to understand the difficulty - as the Member of Parliament for St. Michael South East spoke of - of getting into politics when your children are young, and you know, it is a great sacrifice, I am sure, for your children.

But you know, he clearly was someone who believed in family and had a strong family background, and I know his wider family as well because his sisters - I believe I am correct in saying both - would have had professional associations with him. So, Mr. Speaker, this is an outstanding individual, someone who would have been part of the Democratic Labour Party at its highest in 1986, someone integral to that, someone who would have been a strong part of their tremendous electoral success in that year. An individual who made his contribution not only in terms of the politics of this country, but in terms of the medical profession - establishing, being one of those who established the intensive care unit of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, who would have chaired the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Commission - and an individual who clearly made an impact on the business and commercial aspect of Barbados. An outstanding individual who all praise must be given to.

And Mr. Speaker, you know, as the Member of Parliament for Christ Church West said, this is, I think, the third tribute that we have paid since the formation of this particular Parliament. And it is something that I suppose we reflect on in terms of what would be said of us when that time comes. But for now, I wish to give deep sympathy on behalf of the constituents of St. James North, on behalf of myself and my family, to Sir Richard's family, and may his soul rest in peace. I am obliged to you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am glad you remembered, sir. Honourable Member for St. Michael North West. Thank you.

Hon. C. P. SINCKLER: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, sir, and I myself rise to make a brief contribution to the tributes which we would have heard today, today in recognition of the lifetimes and service of the late Sir Richard Christopher Haynes. And in doing so, permit me to say from my own conceptualization of this great man and great Barbadian, was that, or is that he is, was the quintessential nationalist and patriot of Barbados. In many ways, when you listen to the tributes both outside of this House and inside of this House, the common denominator that runs through 99.9 per cent of them is that he did what he did for love of country and for the development of Barbados and Barbadians, having a deep sense of commitment to the transformation of Barbados into an even higher state of existence among the family of nations of this great world in which we live.

Indeed, I think I can say without fear of contradiction that when one considers his contributions across the various endeavours of human activity, whether it is medicine, whether it is in politics, in government and governance, in business and other ways, that Sir Richard's conceptualization of Barbados was not as a developing country at all. Indeed it was that Barbados could become a developed country in the shortest possible time based on a strong application of sound and fundamental principles relating to high moral standards, strong families and communities, a vibrant, diversified and expansive economy, and a model of governance, a model of governance that placed a very heavy emphasis on the development of the human condition. If one follows his career from medicine into politics and business, one would see a consistent trend of putting an emphasis on the development of the human character and capacity, and that certainly must represent the bedrock of his contribution to the development of Barbados. And in that respect he was a nationalist.

Now there are many people, for example, in many countries including Barbados who qualify in professions and they do so and they make their contribution sometimes more towards their own personal aggrandizement, towards their own personal achievement than to the development of a wider expanse of human beings. Dr. Haynes could not be accused of any such thing. In fact, his contribution to medicine in particular was not so much to advance his clearly identifiable superior skills as an intellect and as a doctor, but as we have been told repeatedly, both when he was alive and unfortunately because of his passing since then, his contribution to the development of the national healthcare system in Barbados. So he wasn't consumed - he could have easily stayed in private practice, stayed away from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, become the greatest physician that Barbados ever produced. He had that talent. But he took what talents he had, what time he had, what energy and intellect he possessed, and put it at the disposal of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to make it an even better institution, to bring it into modern practice in Barbados.

Now, who other than a strong nationalist could think of that type of thing, could make the sacrifice, the own personal sacrifice of gain in terms of recognition and economic wealth and whatever the case may be, to have done that in relation to their own country. If you look at his contribution to politics, you will see that again. He could have come into politics - and I think the Honourable Member for Christ Church East has said he could have come into politics not with a philosophical view of anything but to advance his own personal cause. The fact that he did not do that and that he resisted what so many other politicians before him, now and clearly after him, will do is a testimony to his nationalism, his patriotism, his love of country in terms of the role which he would have played. And he would have suffered in politics as many people

suffered. We remember the great battles with the late Member for St. Thomas, J.M. Adams. We remember - and I, as a youngster growing up in my teenage years with the Honourable Member for St. James Central, we used to role-play. So he used to pretend to be Richard Haynes. We used to have some fun doing it, but one of the things that we used to do, in addition to coming here and listening to the debates, is that we used to actually read the debates, and we know of the battles between Sir Richard Haynes or Richard Haynes as he was then and Tom Adams. We used to fascinate at the back and forth. In fact, I remember reading in one debate Tom Adams, who, after a very scathing attack on him by Sir

Richard in relation to the offshore sector and the fact that they had to put appropriate regulations and checks and balances in place with people coming off of planes with suitcases of money and running around in the country and saying that they're international business operatives. He was concerned not about the fact that we should have the sector, that it should be properly regulated. And he said, you know, in this day and age, the mafia is looking for places other than the industrial countries to put their money, and we have to be very wary about that. And Tom Adams, in response, being very annoyed about the clearly scaling attack on the lack of serious application at the time of regulation, made the point in the debate that the then honourable member for St. Michael South Central was so fascinated by the Mafia, that every time he got up he spoke about the Mafia and that if Good Friday fell on Easter Sunday, that he would blame the Mafia for that too.

I remember in that debate it was really fascinating to see how they went at each other and the clash of intellects in here. And many people speak limitedly, I think, about Dr. Haynes' interactions and confrontations with Tom Adams. But if one were to expand your thoughts about that era, one must remember that it was not only Tom Adams that you had to deal with - it was a lot of other people. There was Sir Henry Ford, there was Bree St. John, there was the ebullient Lionel Craig, who was one of the more vicious platform speakers that you had, and also parliamentarians in the House. And in the Democratic Labour Party, as the Prime Minister quite correctly said, there were other people here. There was Brandfort Tate and Erskine Sandiford and Ramseis Cattle and so forth and so on. So you're bringing a person who was not naturally into politics, who's coming from medicine into the political arena, and almost in lockstep being able to contain and in many instances outshine many of the persons, the towering intellects, and in some instances, great politicians.

Think about it. Sir Richard would not have only contended with Tom Adams, but could you imagine the discourses that would have taken place between Richard Haynes and Errol Barrow on matters of policy? At a dinner table or in a cabinet meeting or in the portals of the

Democratic Labour Party in the auditorium. I mean, it's fascinating when you really think about the fact that he would have - and had - won the confidence so greatly of the late Right Excellent Errol Barrow to have been appointed as his spokesman on finance and then subsequently the Minister of Finance and being a chief spokesman on behalf of the Democratic Labour Party. When you really think about the individual that we are speaking about, you can see just how great an individual he was.

I heard the Honourable Member for St. James North - not a whole lot of his speech that I really particularly enjoyed - but I heard him speak about the \$15 000 tax-free. Are you aware that to this day there is a whole catchment of persons in Barbados who owed their tax status to Richard Haynes? Those policies were not reversed. In fact they were expanded upon - I think the \$15 000 to \$17 000 or something like that - by the Barbados Labour Party. Precisely, the threshold was moved again. But it is Sir Richard who, when he introduced that concept, there were people who were shaking in their boots and saying that Barbados would come to an end and that it would collapse and that the entire tax base would be eroded. So he was 10, 15, 20 years beyond his time. So much so that today we look towards the concept that one day Barbadians may enjoy the status of not paying income tax at all in the system as we seek to reform the tax system. That may not happen in my lifetime. But it is not a concept that we should frown on because in Antigua, for example, and other parts of the world, it has happened. So it is not something to frown on in the context.

And Dr. Haynes would have been doing that when there was no value added tax. So you have to see that he could see. And I think we should also pause - because a lot of people have not said it - but I think we should also pause to speak about the great relationship that he would have had, of course, with the late Vandel McLean and that team that would have worked to, I believe, shift the whole debate on economics in Barbados. That a non-economist and an economist - in terms of non-economist by training - could have gelled so beautifully with one of Barbados' foremost economic minds to produce programmes for the advancement of Barbados.

And we have to be honest in these debates. Both political parties, the major ones - the DLP and the Barbados Labour Party - if you dissect their manifestos over the last five or six elections, the majority of the policies you would have seen in there would have been influenced in some way by Dr. Haynes and the National Democratic Party's manifesto, particularly the first one that they would have produced. You know, my friends in St. Michael South Central - the successors to that seat - it troubles me that I used to go to NDP meetings. It's true. I went to hear what Dr. Haynes had to say because I liked

Dr. Haynes. I was fascinated by him. And we used to go and listen to Dr. Haynes because you always felt that at the end of the day when you left, you would have left with some bit of knowledge, because he would have applied himself to some particular topic.

Look, it is a fact that Dr. Haynes spoke of - if nobody ever told his children, rest assured - that when Dr. Haynes was speaking about 100 per cent mortgages in Barbados there was nobody talking about them. That is a fact. He used to repeatedly in Parliament - in fact, he and the former member who occupied the seat which I now hold for St. Michael North West - they used to have battles when Dr. Haynes was leader of the opposition for the NDP over the question of 100 per cent mortgages. Go and read the parliamentary debates right here. And Dr. Haynes repeatedly said that Barbados had to move to that stage, and the banks came trailing years after he made that intervention both in here and outside of the House of Assembly. So when you think about it, he was doing it thinking about raising the human condition, giving people the opportunity to own a piece of the rock and feel good about themselves, expanding home ownership and land ownership, expanding the concept of economic enfranchisement - this is the measure of the man that you are speaking about.

And then you think about his nationalistic approach to the discourse of political and economic and social matters. Because one of the things that you must also credit Dr. Haynes with is that he didn't limit himself to economics. He spoke on every possible subject, particularly on some social subjects of great importance - and we know health, of course. But he spoke about education, he spoke about social welfare, he spoke about the environment. So he was not just this unit walking around with numbers in his head speaking about economic models and seeing everything from the prism of economics. He spoke also from a deep conviction and understanding of development, and of course his medical training would have contributed to and conditioned that type of thought about how the social dynamics of Barbados could be so transformed as to allow people - every boy and girl in this society - to have an opportunity to succeed, knowing how he would have succeeded coming through a system which clearly in his day, the 1950s and so forth and so on, may not have been the most pleasant environment in which to grow up and succeed.

And the fact that he was able to do it - he brought that understanding of the human condition and dynamics in a closed society, even able by his own personal standards to transform his then current class status and to move among ordinary people to seek their support and confidence and to gain it, but not only in the geographical confines of a constituency, as is the case with St. Michael South Central, but for the whole of Barbados. Now, very

few people come into politics and do that. Very few people come into politics, Mr. Speaker, sir, and challenge the status quo as he did politically, but not just for the political gain of office - even though he was saddled with this view that he was power hungry, something that was cleverly crafted by the late Tom Adams. Because you know what the saying used to go around: that Sir Richard had a lot of money, so he could not be in politics for money. He had to be there for something else. And what that something else was - power.

But when you really think about it, you know that for many years people said that it was impossible in modern-day political practice in Barbados for a third party to emerge and win a seat in the House of Assembly, or to be successful enough to attract national attention such that a sizable portion of the national vote could have gone to that party - significant enough to disrupt the comfort of the two traditional parties. Dr. Haynes achieved that. And then moving the bar a little further. And even in the titling of the party - the National Democratic Party - that it was towards the development of the nation. It shows his quintessential nationalist approach. And most of the policies of the NDP were broad nationalist policies. In fact, I think I can say again without fair contradiction that Richie Haynes was a big ideas person.

You know, in politics today, the Prime Minister likes to make the point that we are into the retail aspect of politics - everything must be some minutia, must be done instantaneously like a barbecue pigtail. And the Prime Minister often makes the point that politics is not about that. It is about the big ideas, about transformation, about moving the quality of life of individuals and systems to the extent where we can see generational benefit down the road. That is what, from what I have been able to observe and read, Dr. Haynes contributed to. I think that perhaps is his greatest contribution because he changed - or sought to change - the retail aspect of politics, because he was about big ideas: the same \$15 000 threshold, the 100 per cent mortgages, the contractor general, parliamentary reform. Those are big ideas. These are not the everyday stuff that you argue in some rum shop over a drink. These are serious things that you're talking about. And that is what we need to get back to and continue if his legacy and great contribution is not only to be remembered, but to be acted upon positively for the development of Barbadian society.

I remember, of course, Mr. Speaker, sir, only days before my first budget speech here in Parliament - of course with the expected nerves that I would have had - I went, at the invitation of Dr. Haynes, with the Reverend Guy Hewitt, my very good friend Guy Hewitt, who was part of our group that we used to model ourselves off the politicians. I went to visit Dr. Haynes and I'm very grateful to his wife, Lady Haynes, for hosting us there at their beautiful home. We sat on the patio and had a conversation

with Dr. Haynes. It was absolutely fascinating to hear him speak about the economy of Barbados - mind ever sharp, memory just absolutely pristine. You hear him tell the story about the emergence of the Transport Board, how it came to be and why it is in the condition it is in. And I certainly got a far better understanding as to why it is the way it is and how perhaps we can approach reforming those concepts - speaking about the environment in particular and about energy and the need for Barbados to reform its energy platform going forward. He was speaking about that even then.

So when you really think about it - I mean, he didn't need to host me there, he didn't need to impart that knowledge, but he did it graciously, wished me all the best, told me about his time as Minister of Finance, and I really enjoyed that Saturday morning immensely in relation to what he was able to help me to understand about economy and finance and management.

I remember the day of his funeral - actually quite coincidentally or strangely enough - a file came to me in the ministry. And one of the things I like to do is read through files from almost when the file was started, so you could go back to when Errol Barrow was Minister of Finance and signed files back in 1967 and so forth. But they brought a file to me to sign for the renewal of a licence for a company franchise. And while pulling the current licence off what they call the cover on the file, as I lifted the thing, I saw that Sir Richard had signed for the same company when he was Minister of Finance. And I called the staff, the secretaries, to show them - they looked quite coincidentally at whose name was beneath there and his comments on the file and so forth and so on. And that is part of the fascination of the process. It's quite coincidental that the file just landed on that morning of the funeral.

But I also want to say on a slightly lighter note that Dr. Haynes brought style to politics too. He didn't just bring a great intellect - he brought style. He transformed the way in which politicians were perceived because he really did have - I mean, of course he was tall and elegant, he drove a nice car too - but he had a way about him, a kind of aura, that when you met him as young boys, maybe we would have met him in the Democratic Labour Party, you looked at him in awe because of course he was very tall in stature, you had to look up to him, but he had that way of engaging you immediately, almost without words.

He dressed immaculately and he brought a certain presence to politics that, you know, I think many people have tried but have not been able to replicate in their times. And that is good, yeah? And yeah, man, and yeah, that trademark wave, just the light rays of the hand. I mean, we used to have it down pat. As boys, we used to really have it down pat with Dr. Higgs, and copying his mannerisms and so forth and so on, even to the point of pushing up the

glasses where we didn't wear any. But, you know, that was hardly like to say of understanding and, you know, being part of the process and really invigorating us because politics is not an easy business. I can imagine and I pay homage to his family, for having made the sacrifice - particularly his wife and children - for making the sacrifice to have him available to Barbados and making Barbados a better place because of your sacrifice. And I think on behalf of the people in the Ministry of Finance, the ministry I have the privilege to represent and lead at this stage, I want to say thank you, and for all those who, you know, would have been touched by him. To have him available to Barbados is not easy. I know my own wife complains a lot about the amount of time you have to spend in the ministry, the amount of files you have to do, you have to bring home and the... Huh? Is that the work I do all I have to do? It is not easy because, of course, being Minister of Finance is a hot seat. Even being the shadow minister of finance is a hot seat because the spotlight is on you 24 hours and you constantly have to be explaining yourself and saying these things and so forth. So it is not an easy task. I want to say that.

I also want, before closing, Mr. Speaker, to also recognise - since I know he does not have a voice for himself in this debate - to recognise and express the profound gratitude and thanks for the association, for the Deputy Clerk of Parliament, Mr. Bayer, for his association with Dr. Haynes and the NDP. And they are all former members of the Democratic Labour Party. You know, many times when you do these things, you feel a sense of loss, but you don't grieve over what you've lost. You celebrate what you had. And the Democratic Labour Party is a better party for having had Richie Haynes, for having had him in our bosom. And the other guys who would have been with him, because they made their contribution long before they left, whether it was, you know, a bit controversial as it was on philosophical principles or whatever the case may be, they would have made their contribution and Dr. Haynes would have made his contribution. And I think that must be said for the record, that we don't spurn his breakage from the Democratic Labour Party - the heat of the moment, of course, you say things because these are the exigencies of politics. But as time goes on and you are able to reflect on the contribution which Dr. Haynes would have made at a time when, as you know, as you heard, when Tom Adams was at his peak and many people were afraid to stand up on their two feet and stare down and debate down and challenge one of the greatest debaters in the House of Assembly and one of the toughest politicians that you could find anywhere in Barbados, Dr. Haynes did it. And he did it not only for his party, he did it for his country.

And therefore I think that, you know, we celebrate the contribution he would have made to making the Democratic Labour Party the great institution that it was,

having joined back in the 1950s as a member of the party. I think the people of St. George's loss was the people of St. Michael South Central's gain. And I am also happy not only that the current Minister of Tourism has been able to carry on that legacy in St. Michael South Central, but that his son, through his business activities, has also carried on that concept of South Central. And of course, I admire his son too, the older one, for his contribution to business. He must have gotten that acumen from his father. He's one of the few people that I know that can consistently put so many beautiful people in the same space every year - for my viewing pleasure. And so I congratulate him for being a successful businessman and carrying on the great legacy of his father as a businessman in Barbados, something which perhaps is not as well known to many Barbadians as it ought to be.

So in closing, Mr. Speaker, sir, again, as I said, on behalf of the officers of the Ministry of Finance, on behalf of my constituents of St. Michael North West, where Richie - Richard Haynes - Sir Richard - would have on many occasions traversed all over Black Rock and made his contribution, on behalf of my own family, my wife and children and extended family - my in-laws and others, my nieces and nephews and aunts and so forth and so on - I want to express our own condolences to his family on his passing and to say to you that to continue to reach for the face of God and He will extend His countenance towards you and give you comfort in this time of bereavement. But be assured in the knowledge that the name Richard Christopher Haynes will always be regaled in Barbadian politics, in Barbadian economy, in Barbadian social settings and life and indeed culture, because here was a man that came, saw and conquered and dwelt on behalf of the people of Barbados. May God bless his soul and may he rise in glory with the Saints.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central. Thank you very much.

Hon. S. A. LASHLEY: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join in this tribute to the memory of Sir Richard Haynes, whom you would have heard would have served in this House as Minister of Finance, Leader of the Opposition, and certainly a very revered member of the Democratic Labour Party. I, Mr. Speaker, would have had the opportunity as a young reporter in this House, being able to observe firsthand the contributions of so many great stalwarts who would have graced the presence of this chamber. And one of those persons, Mr. Speaker, would have been the late Sir Richard Haynes. And of course, I would have observed him not only as a parliamentarian, but certainly as someone who would have grown in stature in this House. The very heated exchanges which some members would have referred to in relation to Sir Richard Haynes and the late Tom Adams - I happen to have been present in this House as a young reporter and was able to

view and to hear firsthand those very robust exchanges. And as a young person, make of course my own observations about political debate and the way in which, of course, politicians of the day would have conducted themselves in the House in the pursuit of their various philosophical and political agendas.

And I can say, Mr. Speaker, that certainly my encounter with Sir Richard Haynes both in the House and outside of the House would have been ones in which I have had great admiration for his ability and came to revere him, particularly in many of the public stances he took, both in relation to his defence of the Democratic Labour Party's philosophies in the face, at that time, Mr. Speaker, of a Barbados Labour Party that was very much poised and positioned in a manner that he himself considered to be contrary to the working class and the success of the working class in Barbados. And that is perhaps why, Mr. Speaker, even although there came a time when Sir Richard would have moved away from the Democratic Labour Party in forming the National Democratic Party, that is perhaps why he never probably considered joining the Barbados Labour Party, because he would have been philosophically and diametrically opposed to many of the political and certainly philosophical moorings of the Barbados Labour Party. So certainly that particular stance in particular would have shown where Sir Richard Haynes stood in relation to the three political parties that emerged at that time.

But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that interestingly enough, in October of 2010, when Sir Richard would have paid tribute to the memory of the late David Thompson, he made a number of very telling observations about the character and the philosophical moorings of David Thompson. And he, in a nutshell, captured what he saw was David Thompson's preoccupation with ensuring that particularly young Barbadians felt that they could develop themselves in a Barbados that they felt remained their own, and that David Thompson was committed to putting in place economic policies that reinforced that position for the benefit of all citizens of Barbados. And by some coincidence, one could say, I believe that tribute that was paid to David Thompson by the late Sir Richard Haynes could very much be used in paying tribute to his memory today, because those were the same characteristics that informed his own view of Barbadian society. And he would have very skilfully, as you would have heard in this debate so far, the late Richard Haynes would have very skilfully used his ability to understand the nuances of economics and financial management, and to turn that

into policies and programs that were designed to benefit the overall well-being of Barbadians, not from a position of pure, raw execution of power, but from a position of translating one's knowledge of the broad meaning of economics into how practical it could become

for the benefit of Barbadians. So I believe, Mr. Speaker, that at the end of the day, when we finalize our own positions on the contributions of Sir Richard Haynes, we would have to come to the conclusion that he utilized his talents and his skills in the interest of uplifting the well-being of Barbadians generally. But I want to also reflect, Mr. Speaker, on Sir Richard Haynes. He's still with us from a perspective of the example that he can be seen within the context of a young Barbadian who is looking on. And Sir Richard Haynes would have been a student at, I believe, the Workman's Junior School. He had his early education at the Workman's Junior School, then the St. George Boys' School. And then of course he would have gone on to university where, based on my research, he would have been involved in student politics. So his interest in development and political issues obviously were instilled at a very young age. And therefore, as he would have gone into other areas of endeavour, such as medicine, which of course he would have made his lifelong career and ultimately making himself available for public life. That demonstrates to me, Mr. Speaker, the kind of individual based on the humble beginnings and the way in which he would have been brought up as a young man.

His ultimate introduction as a student to politics and then ultimately his decision to become involved not only in medicine and the development of the various aspects of medical care at the QEH, as you heard from the Honourable Minister of Health, but then translating that into a wider philosophy of commanding a knowledge in terms of economic and financial management. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there's a lesson here for us because within the context of someone such as Sir Richard Haynes and his ability to not only move through the ranks, but to be able to leave some solid roots of engagement should be an indication to young Barbadians that there is a role for them to play, not only when you rise to a high public office, but within the context of your childhood as a student, and that role has to be and can be one of consistency.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that one of the things that struck me in particular in relation to Sir Richard Haynes and the various positions that he would have taken was that he always came across to me, certainly in listening to him and his various contributions. He came across to me, Mr. Speaker, as someone who was not only fearless in relation to his conviction, but he came across to me as someone who was pretty much caught up with the importance of the issues of the day and his public positions that he took. In relation to defending not only the broad economic policies of the Democratic Labour Party and the policies which were then incorporated into the philosophy of the National Democratic Party, he struck me as someone who was prepared to stand for a principle and to canvas that principle even in the face of persons who may have been close to him at the time who would have taken a different

position to him. And that, to my mind, Mr. Speaker, translates to us and to me that taking different philosophical positions, different political positions, need not divide us if in fact those positions are for the betterment of one's country.

And I believe that at this stage, as we look back at the contribution of Sir Richard Haynes and his various differences of opinion that he may have had, his movement away from the Democratic Labour Party, and we analyse the reasons that he would have cited for those kind of positions, I believe one can conclude that those positions were taken by someone who felt convinced that they were taken and had to be taken in the interest of the development of Barbados. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that one of the things that Sir Richard would have stood for was for decency in office and the ability to be able to convince even one's opponents of the sincerity of argument. He was indeed a very strong debater and I believe in reflecting on the Tom Adams and Richie Haynes battles in this House, that perhaps the single most check on the power base of Tom Adams was perhaps that of Sir Richard Haynes, because he would have entered that point of his political career at a time, of course, when Tom Adams would have been large and in charge. And to a large extent that was a dividing point within the context of political history in Barbados. And I think that the debates and those very fervent and fierce political battles fought out in this House was a good check on the expansion of the power base of Tom Adams and in a sense policies of the Barbados Labour Party which otherwise may have been implemented had to be put up to scrutiny and several of them would have failed on the floor of this House because of the intervention of persons such as Sir Richard Haynes.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that Barbados needs more men of stature and principle like Sir Richard Haynes. And his memory ought to be one of not only political engagement, not only involvement as a politician in pursuit of political office, but his memory should be one in which those of us who remain at the helm of political engagement should see that we must etch out for ourselves some wider and greater political purpose. So that when we are examined, there's some philosophical position, some point of departure which we would have been known for like Sir Richard Haynes. I want to also take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to say that the contribution of Sir Richard Haynes to the development of Barbados has to be remembered within the context of the time that he lived and the politics of the day. And to a large extent, many of the challenges which he would have confronted, both social and political, are not very different from those challenges that we face today. And the continued development of Barbados will have to be gauged within the context of the brilliance of those contributions. And when you combine, Mr. Speaker, that contribution with the contributions of the likes of the late Errol Walton Barrow, we have a formidable body of

political philosophy and economic policy which I believe can serve us even today as we reflect on particularly challenging economic times. And the focus of our nation must again come back to the contributions that we ourselves must make in the further advancement of the broader development of Barbados.

I believe that persons such as Sir Richard Haynes who would have contributed to the political life of Barbados, would have done so out of love of country and would have done so with the support of his family, both of which, Mr. Speaker, are critically important for the success of anyone who enters politics. And I feel that particularly young Barbadians who may want to enter political life, that one of the persons who I would certainly point them to as a living example of a politician that they should emulate, that person would be Sir Richard Haynes.

I also feel, Mr. Speaker, that within the context of political involvement we will from time to time make our own judgments about which politician was better than who and who would have inspired confidence, who by their personal attributes and their way of life would have been persons who we would hold up as a role model. I believe that in my examination of Sir Richard Haynes, I saw in him many of the things that I believe politicians should emulate. And I never heard him on a political platform using any indecent language. I always found that he sought to reduce the arguments of his opponents by research, analysis and incisive debate rather than invective. And I think that is something that should be emulated. I felt that in the conduct of himself as a member of parliament, as a minister of the Crown, that he sought to use his intellect and his ability to persuade to convince Barbadians as to the correctness of a policy initiative rather than use personal attacks on anyone. And I was always impressed by that because I happen to believe that political debate and involvement in politics does not have to be one in which you have to be abusive or that you have to be personal about persons. And I would dare say that if you analyse any of the political debates, any of the political contributions of persons like Sir Richard Haynes, that you would hardly find that kind of political attacks and political invective.

So, Mr. Speaker, in paying tribute to Sir Richard Haynes, I believe that those fine qualities, those qualities that we often overlook, must be commended and certainly used as good examples, not only for us, but for others who may want to aspire to high political office. I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, certainly on my own behalf, on behalf of my family and my constituents of Christ Church West Central, to record in this House our profound sadness and condolences and to say to the family, Lady Haynes and the sons and other relatives of Sir Richard Haynes, that we have been the beneficiaries of a significant contribution by Sir Richard Haynes, and that our country and indeed the region is the richer for it. And if his loss can

be seen within the context of etching out for us a lasting memory of his contribution, then I believe we would have been able to say, well done, Sir Richard Haynes, but also well done to you, his family, for extending him to us and for supporting him so that he could give the kind of contribution that he would have given to this country.

I believe that his contribution will be one that will be held in very high esteem within the context of political history in Barbados. I feel proud to be able to identify myself with many of the compliments which were paid to him. And I feel very comfortable in attributing to Sir Richard Haynes a very high accolade of contribution to public life in a manner that was honourable and in a manner that could not be held up to any kind of negative scrutiny. I again would like to extend my condolences and to say to this House that Sir Richard Haynes would have fought a battle not only one in which he would have held high stakes, but one in which the country would have benefited from in every possible way. I'm obliged to you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Very well, honourable members, let me thank those members who would have spoken in memory of Sir Richard. I, of course, would wish to associate myself with most of the comments coming from both sides of the House. And we recognise that in spite of the political differences that he may have had, he has still left an indelible mark on this institution and on Barbados. We all agree that he has made a sterling contribution and for that we will be forever in his debt. Now let us stand and observe a minute's silence in honour of his memory.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Hon. J. D. E. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, sir, I beg to move the first reading of the Defence Amendment Bill 2013.

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

Hon. C. P. SINCKLER: Mr. Speaker, sir, I beg to move the first reading of the Final Appropriation (2012–2013) Bill, 2013.

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. D. E. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44 for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. CLERK: Order number two, sir, in the name of the Honourable Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs to move the second reading of the National Insurance and Social Security Amendment Bill 2013.

ORDER NO. 2 – NATIONAL INSURANCE AND SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENT BILL, 2013

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, the honourable member for St. Michael North West.

Hon. C. P. SINCKLER: This matter before the House, the Bill before the House, is a bit of tidying up on an initiative which the Government would have launched in consecutive series starting, of course, on April 1, 2009, as part of the process of helping businesses in Barbados to be able to manage their circumstances in the very difficult economic times that we were facing. Of course, at that time the process was unfolding in 2009, which was a particularly difficult year for many businesses in the early part of the financial and economic crisis. As it turned out, there are many companies who over the years, because of various difficulties, had built up pretty sizable arrears to the National Insurance Department. And one of the things which we felt as a Government would be critical to contributing, to assisting them to be able to manage through those difficult times, was to introduce what we call at the time a WIP programme - a waiver of the interest and penalties on arrears owed to various Government departments, of which the National Insurance was one of those featured departments.

Of course, we have as well the value-added tax, the land tax department, and of course, inland revenue. And this was all in an attempt to hold the hand of businesses who were having particular difficulties with their cash flow - not to give them a free pass in the system, as they say in Trinidad and Tobago, but to assist them genuinely. Those who wanted to make the effort to come in and sit with the National Insurance Department and make an arrangement that could allow them to address the issue of paying down and eventually paying off their principal arrears, by lessening the impact of having to pay the interest and penalty on those arrears. And in many instances, sir, as you would imagine, those penalties and interests would have built up to be even more than the original amount owed.

We felt in the circumstances that that had been done, and that programme was first rolled out by the late Minister of Finance and Prime Minister in 2009. That first iteration was terminated on December 31, 2009. And then a second amnesty was introduced on December 1, 2010 and ran to May 30, 2012. And by way of information for the House, the results of the two-fold programmes are as follows. 195 agreements were signed by employers and self-employed

persons for a total raise of \$14 089 144.08, comprising contributions of \$9 024 707.73 and interest of \$5 064 436.35. 69 employers submitted arrears payments totalling \$1 345 399.00, comprising contributions of \$689 517.22 and interest of \$655 881.78, with the amount of interest waived being \$655 881.00. 107 of these agreements were not honoured by the employers themselves consistently, and 19 employees submitted monthly payments in accordance with the signed agreement.

The third amnesty - or second amnesty - was a 100 per cent interest waiver programme, which ran from August 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011. And under this amnesty, 59 employers submitted plans or agreed to plans totalling \$2 155 253.06, while interest of \$2 179 346.19 was waived. Nine of these employers are liquidating the remaining 20 per cent of their contributions from the total arrears of \$94 538.27.

Now the rate of success of this programme has not been spectacular. I think we can say that in the least. When we consider the fact that the National Insurance Department is owed in excess of \$200 million - but many of these go back way back to the seventies, some to the eighties, and more latterly into the nineties. And we don't want to have a situation where we encourage people not to pay their National Insurance contributions, contributions which would have been taken out from workers' salaries or which would have been the employer's part contribution to that payment. But in the circumstances, as we go through the process with National Insurance to look to see how we can recover these, we continue - not on a generalised basis, but on an individual basis - to have a programme like this in place.

And we felt that it was necessary to give us the scope legally to be able to do that, and that is why we have made this amendment to put this in the Act, because we anticipate, given the difficult times that we are facing, that you are going to have these circumstances. But if people can genuinely make arrangements - and I have had a few to deal with in recent months, for example, where people go to a financial institution or they get a piece of land that they own and they sell it and they say, 'Look, I can pay off the entire principal, but the interest and penalty might be a little difficult for me. Are you prepared to allow me to use your discretion to allow me to be able to do that?' - I think in the circumstances, the thing is really to get the principal payments. The penalties are in fact stringent. They are hard, but they are supposed to be hard because we want people to make those contributions.

I would also say that in respect of Government departments - because in the financial situation that we have, there are some statutory bodies, as opposed to Government departments, because most, if not all, of central Government departments meet their commitments

on time - but there are one or two statutory boards that may have challenges from time to time, and we work with them to ensure that where there may be a delay in transfer of monies from central Government to them, we ensure that we clean that up and ensure that those contributions are paid in to the National Insurance and that there are no lapses in relation to that. Because of course Government cannot be insisting that people make their contributions when Government itself is falling behind in doing this. I mean, we always at the end of the day pay, but the timeliness of it of course helps the National Insurance to be able to do other things in the economy of Barbados, including investing in areas that are important for the success, not only of

the Fund, but clearly of the economy of Barbados. So one of the things that as Minister of Finance I keep a very eagle eye on is to ensure that all of these statutory entities are kept up to date. And I think that we have reasonably been able to do so in most cases, if not all, and where any is highlighted, we would often intervene as swiftly as possible, as we need to ensure that there is no falling back in that particular regard.

So without going into a deep discussion on the National Insurance - which of course members of the House are free to do, and I would respond accordingly, since we have had numerous debates in here on this matter and will continue to do so - I want to commend this particular amendment to the House as a useful thing for the Government to have done, and to encourage those persons who are contributors to the scheme to continue to meet their commitments so that we would not have to exercise too often this particular clause of the Act, but that we can continue to guarantee our workers that when the time comes due, they will be able to be guaranteed their benefits, both in retirement, but also if illness or other calamity might befall them should that circumstance arise. So with those few words, Mr. Speaker, sir, I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, in principle, the amendments that are before us are not objectionable. But there are some concerns that we have, and perhaps it is in the context of the Minister providing the information for us, because we are labouring really under the circumstances of a deficit of information. The last annual report for the National Insurance Fund was laid in this Honourable House for the year 2007. We are now in the year 2013. And that clearly has put us under a severe strain in being able to independently assess the operations of the National Insurance Scheme and the National Insurance Board.

In addition to that, perhaps of even greater concern, Mr. Speaker, is the absence of the actual review. The last actual review was done in 2008, and that actual review was valid as of the end of December 31, 2008. But what we should have central in our minds is that under section 34 of the National Insurance and Social Security Act, Chapter 47, that actual review is to be done by law every three years. And I therefore would want the Honourable Minister to indicate to us when it is expected that the 14th actual review will be available, or more correctly, laid in this House if it is available, because it is on the basis of the actuarial reviews that fundamental decisions have been taken on the health of the fund.

Indeed, Sir, the major reform of the national insurance scheme was taken as a result of the earlier actuarial reviews pointing out that on the then current trajectory, in the absence of changes of contribution rates and retirement ages, the National Insurance Fund could have gone bankrupt in this country by the year 2030. When we were the government, decisions were then taken to fundamentally face the situation and fix it, and it led to an increase in the contribution rate, as well as an agreement across the social partnership and then reflected in legislation to move the retirement age over a period of time from 65 to 67, but doing it in six-month increments over a period of time. So that the actual review is in fact therefore critical for all those who would want to have an idea as to the state of the fund and particularly the investment income of the National Insurance Scheme.

And I say all of this because even in the absence of formal reports, what has been clear - in fact only in today's newspaper - the Director of the National Insurance Scheme was reported as having lamented the fact that Barbados continues to face an inverse population pyramid. In other words, that there are less and less younger people supporting the pensions of older persons in our midst. And that while at the time of the commencement of the scheme in 1967 there were effectively 18 persons to each retired person drawing from the scheme, in recent times that ratio has now fallen to 3.7 persons for each retired person. And that is a combination of declining birth rates. It is also, however, a combination of declining numbers in the workforce.

And indeed, Sir, Minister, it is our information - and the Minister can verify it if it is wrong - that for the first five to six months of this year, the income of the National Insurance Scheme has in fact declined by almost 25 per cent on last year. Now that is a significant reduction in income if that is in fact the case. And that also will speak to the fact of two things: a combination of less people working and equally serious cash flow difficulties that this very measure that is before this Honourable Chamber today recognises as a distinct possibility for many of the enterprises who are facing difficulties in Barbados in

keeping their businesses afloat and who may choose to meet other expenses rather than paying fully the statutory obligations which they have.

Now, this is a serious matter and ought to be addressed, and it ought not to be the subject of us trying to find out, because if we acknowledge - as has been acknowledged in recent weeks - that we are facing some difficult and perilous times, then it is important that we share the information and seek to be able to work together as a parliament in order to be able to stabilise the institution that goes beyond all of us in here, because not only is it providing the pensions for those current pensioners, but must do so for Barbadians in the future. And therefore we have a duty to make sure that any changes which we have made to the stability of the fund by the reforms that were undertaken will not be - even if not intentionally - negatively affected by reason of the economic decline which the country is facing at this stage.

I also say so cognisant that I am also told - and any Minister can confirm or deny - that the Unemployment Benefit Fund is now paying out at the rate of twice what it is collecting. Indeed, I am told that the Unemployment Benefit Fund collects about two and a half million dollars a month in unemployment benefit contributions, but it is now paying out at the rate of \$5 million a month, which clearly is unsustainable and would lead to a situation where the Unemployment Benefit Fund may become insolvent if there is no correction made to the operations of the fund on the current trajectory.

Now, this is a matter equally of serious concern. No one can deny the important cushion of unemployment benefits. Indeed, the late Prime Minister Tom Adams would have introduced unemployment benefits as a feature of our national insurance scheme back in the early 1980s. And Barbados is one of the few countries in the region that in fact pays out unemployment benefit. Others will pay out the more traditional pension benefits and injury benefits, et cetera. But Barbados took through this Parliament a conscious decision that we needed a cushion for persons to be able to either find alternative employment or to go into some form of retraining, and hence the importance of the Unemployment Benefit Fund.

Now if the current economic climate has so led to the fund being unsustainable because of the rate of pay being at twice the level of the rate of contribution, then we need to hear from the government what will be done to sustain the situation in circumstances where it can reasonably be expected that we are unlikely to see light at the end of the tunnel within the next few months, and hence people may need to have recourse to that unemployment benefit fund - maybe at an even higher level than they have been in the past. And I am not talking about government

workers because they do not draw from that. I am talking about private sector workers.

I am also concerned that the absence of reporting has meant that we are really none the wiser as to the extent of the percentage of funds now invested by the National Insurance Scheme overall in the Government of Barbados and its paper as a percentage of its overall investments. And if I may quote from page six of the 2008 13th actual review, it would have indicated then that the analysis confirms several areas of concentration with 90 per cent of investments domiciled in Barbados, 73 per cent of investments invested in Barbados public sector securities - either government directly or statutory bodies - and over 40 per cent of the portfolio having maturity dates of less than 10 years.

Now, Sir, this situation may have obtained - maybe not in as extreme a case - but I acknowledge that there has always been a heavier reliance on the Government of Barbados paper than the actual reviews have been happier with. But it seems as though in recent years, in the absence of the 14th which is not now available, and with the 15th being due by next year, one has to go to other data to get an idea of what is the kind of strain that the national insurance may be under, or the fragility of the national insurance investments given the current economic climate in Barbados and given the principle that ought to obtain with Social Security funds - that of diversification of investments and assets.

And if one were to look at the Governor of the Central Bank's latest press release delivered last week for the first six months of the year, on page 11, table five, it makes it clear that the debt held by the National Insurance Scheme in the Government of Barbados paper has moved from \$1.404 billion in 2007 to \$2.791 billion in June 2013. That is virtually, Mr. Speaker, a doubling of the debt held by the National Insurance Scheme in Government of Barbados paper. The government paper has moved from \$1.4 billion to \$2.79 billion between 2007 and June of 2013. Indeed, Sir, in the last year alone, between June last year and June this year, it increased by almost \$300 million of that \$1.4 billion.

And given the difficulties that the government now currently faces in financing a deficit which we suspect - even before the Governor of the Central Bank has spoken - is likely to be more than the \$1.2 billion that was indicated and approved by this Honourable House in March, the question as to the level of holdings and exposure of the National Insurance Scheme in Government paper becomes a relevant consideration for the Parliament of Barbados and for the people of Barbados. You know, the old-time people, Sir, would tell you: do not put all your eggs in one basket. And there was wisdom in that, because if something happens there, then you lose everything.

And one of the reasons why the National Insurance Scheme has investment guidelines that speak to it investing from government paper to fixed deposits, to equities - in other words, shareholdings in other companies - to loans, real estate, they own the buildings. I believe they have been made to invest in two buildings in Warrens, the details of which I think we need to hear about, particularly since I think one is now completely overdue in terms of delivery time, the one that is above Kentucky. And then there are foreign investments. So that investment guidelines set out a range of investments, recognising that by having that diversified portfolio, the National Insurance Scheme can ensure that when people are ready to retire, the money which they have paid in has been able to achieve a level of return that will allow their pensions and other benefits to be paid comfortably.

And indeed, Sir, it therefore is critical that we look at the investment policy of government. And you know, Sir, in that context, I could not help but recognise that it is important for us to see beyond the information which the Central Bank has provided us with - that there has been a doubling of the holding of government paper by the NIS. What are the other investments? Or is this now a situation where the government paper and public sector securities of the NIS is now more than the 73 per cent that it was indicated to be at the end of 2008? Because unless there was a corresponding rapid increase in private sector investment, it means that it would be reasonable to contemplate that the level of exposure of the NIS in its investment portfolio to public sector securities may now be in excess of 80 per cent, which would be a dangerous development for us as a country. And this has nothing to do with any government now. This has to do with the stability of the fund for the future of Barbadians.

I also want, Sir, not only to therefore find out what is the state of the investment portfolio, but for the Minister to also indicate whether there has been a reprieve given to the National Insurance Scheme to allow it to invest any of its money outside of Barbados since 2008. Since 2008, all of its investments have been domestic. And one of the things that a good portfolio mix of a Social Security fund has is that it allows it to invest in regional and international equities in order to ensure once again that you do not concentrate all your eggs in one basket. And indeed, Sir, it is our understanding that since 2008 there has been no foreign investment whatsoever, and that this is despite the fact that if required - because of the secondary tier reserves that the Central Bank accommodated some years ago - there would be a clear understanding that the NIS would return to Barbados any funds that are necessary in the event of an emergency. And hence what we are doing is depriving them of the opportunity to be able to have that diversification of portfolio if there are no regional or international investments being made by the fund.

So there are a number of things that I think the Minister perhaps may need to bring the country up to date on. My speech this evening is purely to solicit information and to be able to understand where we stand in the absence of the annual report since 2009 and in the absence of an actual report since 2008. And why is this becoming more and more important? Barbados is now one of the 10 most indebted countries in the world, I believe. But yet, through an agreement with the IMF and others, the Central Bank now reports our debt, for the most part, net of NIS, as if the National Insurance Scheme was a part of the central government or an affiliated body like a statutory board is.

The difficulty with that, Sir, is that under Chapter 47 of the National Insurance Act, National Insurance Directors have a fiduciary duty to the integrity of the fund. And as much as there is a link between the health of the investments of the National Insurance Scheme and the health of the economy - as was stated very clearly on page one of the same actual review, and I quote: 'National insurance financial performance is closely linked to the economic performance and labour market changes of the country' - we acknowledge that. But it is a separate and distinct legal entity where the directors operate under separate fiduciary responsibilities, and therefore to net it out of government's overall debt lends the suggestion that government can in fact not record it as having to be paid. But the truth is, Sir, that is not the case, and we now know that at the end of 2012, 37 cents in every dollar of revenue earned by the Government of Barbados in fact goes into debt service. Sir, when we were at 10 cents in every dollar, there were those who write in the paper on a Sunday now who would criticise us and say it was too high, because the more you are spending from your revenue in debt service, the less options you have to provide development opportunities for your country and for your citizens.

And when your debt service gets that high, as has happened in Jamaica and other countries, it means that you have a restricted set of options in terms of how to plan out the affairs of government and how to deal with the development of the country's citizens and economic and social opportunities for the country. In these circumstances, sir, it must be therefore of great concern to us to look at the overall portfolio given the extent to which government's current account deficit has so ballooned and fiscal deficit overall has so ballooned that there may be legitimate considerations as to how much more the National Insurance can carry in respect of the holding of government paper. But we cannot pass a judgment one way or the other on that in the absence of the appropriate information.

There used to be a time when we would get the monthly statistics of claims from the Unemployment Benefit Fund and the Severance Payments Benefit Fund. Now that information is not readily available, and therefore other than the macro intimations that you get, like the funds

revenue being down for the first six months of the year, we can't sensibly comment or track it. And I believe, therefore, that in the absence of these reports, the minister would do well to update Parliament on this data. We note that the Economic and Social Report has been laid for 2012 today, but that does not contain a lot of the data that we are asking for. And we therefore believe that in the context of the entire country, being asked at some point in the future, I am sure, to comment on a programme that will be outlined by this government against the strictures of the Governor of the Central Bank that we can only appropriately comment with all of the available information being put in our hands.

You know, sir, a diagnosis and certainly a second opinion whenever given cannot be done purely on the basis of reading an x-ray result if there are lab results and blood test results that are available in order to be able to determine how best and what best to do. And if we want, as a country, to move forward as one, then the information that is available to the government in this ought equally to be made available to us.

We need also to hear from the Minister, sir, what is the state of the tertiary education fund that he announced in the budget to be coming out of the National Insurance Fund once again? We felt that it was a solution that did not make sense at the time because it is not sustainable and that in the circumstances to simply say that you use a percentage of the surplus, and those who are involved in Social Security will tell you that the notion of a surplus is a misnomer. Because really and truly what you try to target is a ratio of eight to one. And under the previous actuarial report, Barbados had projected a reserve expenditure ratio of 7.4 and we got 7.1 up to the end of 2008. Where are we now with our reserve expenditure ratio given the fact that the government is committing out of these so-called surpluses to fund both a tertiary education fund out of the reserves and similarly a hotel refurbishment, energy efficiency and food production fund, which equally is supposed to come out of the NIS funds. And I think that this House would do well to hear on the progress being made, what are the implications in particular from the tertiary fund on the reserve expenditure ratio, and how are we going forward in that respect.

And finally, sir, what is the position in relation to the catastrophe fund? Because we have no data on that other than to know that it was the intention to use some of these funds in relation to Tomas. But there are still stories and reports from many of the constituencies being held and represented on this side of persons whose houses are yet to be repaired, but equally and of concern, reports of houses that have been financed out of the catastrophe fund that were not damaged by Tomas. And while this is not the debate for that, it is simply to put on the table at this stage that we need to know the state of affairs of the catastrophe fund and what is going to be the situation if, God forbid,

something were to happen again. We were lucky last Tuesday. Indeed, this Honourable House could not meet because of the country being on tropical storm warning, I believe. And we thank God that we were spared any damage whatsoever. But we are equally cognizant that this is early in the hurricane season and that we need to know, particularly given government's straitened fiscal circumstances, government's limited cash flow, what is the state of the catastrophe fund such that in the event of the worst happening, are we in a position to appropriately meet the needs of our citizens given the fact that Government, on the advice of the Governor of the Central Bank, has to make the level of cuts that is being requested of them to make.

And then, sir, as I said, the last issue would be against the background of all of this and in the absence of such information, is it advisable for the Cabinet of Barbados now to be asking the National Insurance Scheme to be funding a bridging loan for the purchase of Amman in the circumstances. I understand for the sum of \$35.5 million US dollars to be provided by way of bridging loan by the National Insurance Scheme. And if that is in fact the case, the government needs to tell the country and this Honourable House what are the arrangements for the ultimate investment. We are hearing talk about the Chinese, but what are the terms and conditions of that arrangement? Are they sustainable? Will they provide a level of return? And I speak from the position that I am not anti-investment. I really am not. But I do know that in circumstances where the revenue of the NIS fund, if it is that it is down by 25 per cent this year for the first six months, and if it is true that the Unemployment Benefit Fund is being drawn on -

to the extent of paying out twice the level of contributions, then it may well be that the NIS and if the NIS is being called upon to continue to take up government paper at the level and rate at which it has done to the point where over the last six years its holding of government paper has gone from 1.4 billion to 2.8 billion virtually. Then can we afford to be making these decisions about the NIS and its funds at this particular time in circumstances where the information is not before us. It may well be, sir. It may well be that the interest rate is equally an attractive one. But what we can't have is us flying in the dark. And there are concerns, legitimate concerns, across the community given the performance of the NAS, given the absence of reporting, given the absence of the actual view, given the extent to which government is now relying on the NIS to finance its cash flow on a daily and monthly basis, we need a full debate on the National Insurance Scheme, and we need it perhaps even before the budget debate, so as to allow the full information to be before us such that the decisions which will be taken to stabilize the country can be made and informed by all of us.

Sir, all of us want the best for this country. We really do. And we want to make sure that therefore any decisions and any statements that we make are informed by what is sustainable and what can be done in a way that does not put anybody or any institution in an adverse position. The National Insurance Scheme the National Insurance Fund is one that has to write us out. And I appreciate, sir, that therefore the tone that I am setting in this is really one to ask for the information, respectfully so, to ask for it in the interest of being able to make decisions for the country. But I really, there's nobody on this side who can make decisions based on a 2009 1999 Annual Report or a 2008 actual review. And I therefore would be grateful if the Minister would provide us with that level of information and clarity so that we can continue. There may be some things we will agree with and there may be other things we will disagree with completely. But we do know that the situation is untenable if the revenue is dropping as it is and if the Employment Benefit Fund is under the kind of strain that it is.

I'm told that the Severance Fund is still reasonably healthy, but that the Employment Benefit Fund has serious challenges. And we all know, of course, that you can't divert money from one fund to the next because it would be in breach of the law. It would be in breach of the law, so to do.

Sir, I am hearing some noises that would suggest to me that I may well be misguided in my reasonableness, here. But if that were the case, I'm prepared to be misguided, not because I am frightened for the comments of one who comments much from St. Lucy, but because I believe, sir, that ultimately what is before us is too serious and too complex a situation for us to treat it other than in the most serious and noble of ways. We need the information. We have said in here over and over that we believe that this country is at a perilous state. The governor of the Central Bank is clearly saying so. I must confess that we are concerned that on the one hand the governor is saying one thing and on the other hand the chairman of the Economic Advisors of the Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs appears to be diametrically opposed, and appears to be taking a completely opposite position in public. Now those are the things that will take away from the confidence of the country in terms of us going forward. And I would hope that therefore those kinds of signals will not continue to come because you can't have on the one hand one economist saying that it would be complete madness for anybody to make that kind of adjustment in the same year. And on the other hand, the governor of the central bank has taken clearly his reputation now. Having said that the economy is stable, he's now saying that the level of reserve depletion is such that if this adjustment is not made, there are going to be problems.

Now, what is the difference between this and 1991? In 1991, the House was asked to agree to an adjustment in the public sector. But when that adjustment was being asked of us, it was against the background of enterprises and businesses that were relatively stable and that had not gone through a battering financially. It was against the background of households that had some level of savings and therefore could weather out the circumstances. The difficulties now, in all seriousness, is that you've had four years of companies facing cash flow problems, facing insolvency in some instances, facing difficulties, certainly with profitability, facing difficulties with meeting even statutory payments, hence the legislation that is now before us to approve. If there was no problem in 2009 with companies meeting their statutory obligations, there would be no need for the first amnesty. There would be no need for the second amnesty. If there was not a problem with the number of people being laid off, there would be no need for the unemployment benefits to have been extended from 26 weeks to 40 weeks, 60 per cent for the first 26 weeks, 40 per cent for the last 14.

And indeed, sir, I am told that arrangement is now at an end since December last year. And the minister needs to clarify whether the extended unemployment benefit program that was available up all through last year is no longer available at the very time when people are most likely to need it. Now, if there's a reason why it can't be done, then he needs to level with us on that, too, and we may well be able to understand, but I'm told that program is no longer available in terms of the extended unemployment benefit. So that, Mr. Speaker, the difficulty is that households and companies have been taking a battering for four years and are not fit for purpose to go through any further major adjustment, and that must be therefore of concern to all of us. All of us. And I don't accept that it wouldn't be. But it therefore means that we must use the best that we can and pull the best that we can to put this country back on a stable footing.

Now, there is no doubt that the National Insurance Scheme has been one of those entities that the government has used to finance its deficit. And I want to go back to the year 2010 to 11. The minister came then and indicated that instead of central government providing the Barbados Tourism Authority, the Transport Board and the University of the West Indies with the funds that it needed, that the NIS would provide the funds via instruments. The Social and Economic Report for last year, for 2011, showed that the NIS was to have provided the sum, I believe, of \$128 million in total, which worked out to about one and one-third percent of GDP that would otherwise have had to have been carried on the deficit. Our position then, as it is now, sir, is that was unsustainable, because these are all entities that come back for money every year. And therefore to ask the NIS to carry them for one year would only have had the appearance of creating a plaster for that

year to make the deficit in 2011 look less than it would otherwise have been. And sir, in truth and in fact it happened.

So they're having had a deficit of 8.6 per cent in 2009, which when we warned in here in March, when the government said they were going to run a deficit of five percent, we said it couldn't work because you're not accounting for expenditure that we know you have to pay because you're liable for it. In 2009, you ran eight. In 2010, you ran 8.8 per cent. All of a sudden in 2011, you ran 4.5 per cent deficit. And that was the very year that much of the expenditure either was pushed on the NIS or were allowed to build up. Because the other discussion that we're not having nationally is separate from the deficit - what is the level of arrears money owed by the government of Barbados? And is it a fact that it is almost \$350 million or more that is owed separate from the deficit? And then all of a sudden in 2012, when the NAS is not doing the direct funding, the deficit is back up in excess of 7 per cent again. So that we need to know the facts in relation to the National Insurance Scheme, sir. It has been too integral in helping this government to finance its deficit as well as to finance money that has not been reflected in the deficit. And we suspect that there may be a negative impact on the health of the fund, but we're not in a position to speak about it.

We know that there are no audited accounts for years and there are some structural and systemic problems that relate to that. And that's not what I'm talking about. I'm talking about the simple annual report and the simple actual review. We know about it. And at the end of the day, the presence of the actual review has allowed us to reform the system in the past. It will allow us to meet the needs of the present. The one before this, I don't have it, and then the National Insurance Fund Report 2009. But by law it is done every three years. By every three years. So I would be grateful, sir, if the Honourable Minister can provide that information. As I said, on a future date we may well have the opportunity to agree or not agree but at this stage we are operating from the basis of an informational deficit. And we can't comment other than to know from the Central Bank report that the NIS has increased the holding of government paper from 1.4 billion to 2.79 billion between 2007 and 2013. And that is ominous because it suggests to us that all of our eggs are being put in one basket. And similarly, if that is happening without foreign investment being allowed, then it becomes a matter of grave concern as to the health and stability of the fund. Sir, I will await the comments and responses of the Honourable Minister.

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

Hon. D. St.E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this debate. And to say from the outset, I want to congratulate the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East for locating the problem as far back as 2003, when that actual decision was made. Because out of that actual decision, what you saw, sir, was some draconian measures that inflicted some pain on the private sector, and caused them not to be able to pay. As the Honourable Member pointed out that by 2008–2009 we saw large arrays where the government then had to put a policy in place to cushion that impact. But it did not only affect the private sector and created problems for the private sector, but what you saw that it affected the transfers from government, because, as you know, the statutory boards, because of the increases of the national insurance of which they had to pay, that the main government had to look for more money to pay to the statutory boards increasing the allocation because of the draconian measures introduced by the Barbados Labour Party in 2003. When they instead of looking at the impact on the private sector and the impact of the statutory boards, they took all the money and put it into the National Insurance before looking at the impact of the growth and the impact of the employment generation, dampening the impact of the employment generation so that the National Insurance, when in 2003, one would have expected the National Insurance to be flush with funds and not suffering for funds because at that time, Mr. Speaker, we were told that unemployment was not a problem.

Mr. Speaker, pray tell that if you have your economy operating at its maximum, why would you then have to come and increase national insurance contributions when your total workforce was at its maximum? And you know, Mr. Speaker, if we were to go back to Hansard, you will see that in that same debate, I questioned the government at the time: why is it that you are increasing national insurance rates when you claim that you have the maximum amount of people employed? Because surely, whenever you are increasing the number of people employed in the sector, it means that you are increasing the contributions to the National Insurance Fund. But instead of that, sir, you had an actual study telling you that you had to take drastic measures. And instead of the government of the day looking to see the impact that it was going to have on the private sector and the statutory boards, they ignored that, causing a compromise and a decline in the number of people employed by 2008, which caused the amount of contributions that would be going into the National Social Security to decline.

But you know, sir, there is a story to that. I also said to them, look, based on the statistics that you are bringing before this House, based on the employment levels that you are seeing, there is no need for these harsh measures to be put in place. I said to them at the time, sir, that what you were going to see is that the private sector will suffer because what you are doing, you are draining the few cents

that the private sector should be using to expand the economy and you are putting them into the National Insurance Fund. Mr. Speaker, sir, when you look at the National Insurance Fund today, you can see that whereas the private sector and the statutory boards are suffering, the National Insurance Fund got so much money that they do not even know where to put it. I have heard the Honourable Minister of St. Michael and All Saints in this Parliament today telling us that instead of building our economy, that we should invest the money in Greece and France and the United States and the United Kingdom. Everybody knows that all the economies in the world have a problem, but we should take the hard-earned money of the masses of people in Barbados and instead of holding the people above water, we should take that money and invest it in other countries that have the same economic problems as us. What kind of madness am I hearing in this House?

And you know what is even worse, Mr. Speaker? If we were to invest this money overseas, we would only get 2 per cent return on it - only two per cent we will get - but if we invested in Barbados right now we are getting 7.5 per cent return, and when the money is lent to government, 5.5 per cent more. But what is even more interesting, sir, is that even though we were gaining an additional 5.5 per cent more, we are also getting a significant flow of funds into national insurance because it is keeping jobs. And for every dollar earned in Barbados, the national insurance gets 21.35 per cent. So when you hear all this economics, all this voodoo in this House, about taking the money and investing it overseas, and how you have not done it since 2009, and it seems to be a crime - the people who are educated should go back to school - because what they are saying is that we should stop getting 5.5 per cent more for National Insurance, because whenever you lend it to government they are actually paying 5.5 per cent more and putting it into the fund, but on top of that you are keeping jobs and getting a contribution of 21.35 cents on every dollar earned going into the National Insurance.

So when you hear about all this money in National Insurance, the truth is the government is doing the National Insurance a favour. National Insurance is not doing the government a favour. Because if you take that same money that they claim has been lent to government and put it out there on the international market and do an opportunity cost, you will see that instead of us in here talking about the national insurance having a surplus of money, they will have a serious problem with cash flow. So do not come in here with that poor economics and those poor masks trying to give the public the impression that this government is not doing the right thing to prop up the national insurance. We are doing them a favour. In Britain, the money that is paid to National Insurance - you know what it is used for? To run the health scheme. You hear me? The National Insurance contributions are used to run the health scheme. In Singapore, the money is used to invest back in the

economy. But you want to tell me that I must go and work every week, and even though I am putting in money and my house is going to be sold, I must continue to put the money in the fund and not pay to ensure the house is kept. What kind of madness am I hearing? What kind of madness am I hearing? All these voodoo economists walking around this country - I challenge any of them to do the opportunity cost of what they are proposing and do the opportunity cost of what we are doing, and tell me any honest economist, any honest financial person, if the National Insurance Fund is not better off now that this government is in control and doing the right things.

I challenge the Honourable Minister of St. Michael and All Saints to tell us what was the impact of the decision taken in 2003, when that actual review was taken to crush small businesses and even large ones too. Check and see what was the impact of that. I raised that question, and you know what the result is? That decision embarrasses us today. You have many small businesses struggling and in arrears. What kind of economic madness are we talking about? The whole aim and object is for us to live like a family, not a few getting everything. And what they were able to do is to make the few an asset to view and the masses to crumble and beg for the crumbs. And the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East comes in here after putting those measures in place and now behaving as if she has clean hands. There are no clean hands in this matter. You do not go and burn down the house and then go and get water to put out the fire after you are done burning the house. And that is exactly what is happening here. They have destroyed the economy because of the 2003 actuarial review that was given for bad advice.

And Mr. Speaker, I can tell you exactly what they did. You hear them talking about government borrowing money and they are behaving as if it was the Democratic Labour Party that started borrowing the money. It was not the Democratic Labour Party that started borrowing the money from the National Social Security Fund. It was the Barbados Labour Party - when the Honourable Member, the Deputy Prime Minister - they borrowed the National Social Security money to buy a building up in New York. And they did it so badly that they even bought it wrong, because they have us paying some expenditure that we should not be paying because the wrong person is holding the asset. All of those things that they did not know. And now coming here behaving as if they were the best financial managers that ever existed in this world.

I have already said that the truth is that the money that the government is taking from the National Insurance Fund - if you were to go back to the base of 2003 - one will recognise that some of the money that is claimed to be owed by government is not really money that is owed by government. It is money that was overcharged by the actual fund to the actuary who did a bad calculation. And I

challenged them to come and admit that they should have done a review and said that the money owed by the government is not that high. The \$2.9 billion that the other members claim is owed by government to the National Insurance Fund - if you were to do a proper review, you will see it is not that high. That 2003 actuarial study was done badly, and they saddled the government with a large amount of money owed to the National Social Security Fund and they put nearly every small business in trouble in this country.

So when you see what the Honourable Member is in here doing - creating the cushion for the empire - all the Honourable Member's finances are doing is cushioning what was done by the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East and her administration at the time, creating pressure, and all we are doing is trying to ease the pressure and cushion the impact. But I ask all fair minds, all people who study statistics and finance at a higher level, to go back and do the opportunity cost of the action of 2003, and all of those social scientists, political scientists and so on - I want them to go back and see where this problem started, the root of the problem. The root of the problem would have been as far back as 2003. That is when they came to this Parliament and said that the National Insurance Fund had a problem. Remember those famous words? The National Insurance Fund had a problem in 2003 when employment was at its highest in Barbados - could you imagine that? You have your highest number of people employed, but yet still the National Insurance Fund had a problem.

The National Insurance Fund should have a problem now, not in 2003. This is when they should be here asking for increased rates for the National Insurance Fund. But we are not asking for increased rates for the National Insurance Fund during the crisis, when they claim unemployment benefits increased by 100 per cent. What we are seeing is that we are cushioning the impact that occurred in 2003. And you know, this is a perfect case study. Why is it that in a crisis the government is not before Parliament asking for an increase in the contribution for the National Insurance Fund, but the government is reporting surpluses? But in 2003, when the workforce was at a maximum, the government had to come to Parliament and ask for an increase in the contribution for the employer and the employee. And that is the question I leave before this House, sir. I thank you.

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

Mr. K. D. SYMMONDS: Mr. Speaker, sir, I want to make a very brief intervention in this debate, sir, and to restore a sense of purpose and hopefully some sense of balance and perspective to the deliberations which are before this chamber. I am appalled, Mr. Speaker, that after

the very reasoned and rational and reasonable intervention made by the Leader of the Opposition on matters, sir, which I think are really clearly in the national interest - at a time when the nation's concern, almost to the very last one of our citizens, turns on the way in which we are managing public finances - I am appalled, sir, to think that the Member for St. Lucy, the Honourable Member for St. Lucy, could respond in the almost senseless way that he responded.

Now, Mr. Speaker, sir, he says that the government is doing the NAS a favour. One would have imagined that the Member for St. Lucy, being a member of the Cabinet of Barbados, speaking in the immediate aftermath, Mr. Speaker, sir, of a question put to this chamber by a constitutional office holder in Barbados as to whether or not there is merit in the claim that some 35 million United States dollars by way of a bridging loan has been asked upon the National Insurance Scheme of Barbados for the purpose of purchasing Almanzar - that a member of the Cabinet speaking immediately after that matter has been raised would be intervening, sir, to allay the fears of Barbadians, or alternatively to confirm to the country that this critical issue [Inaudible.]

Hon. D. St.E. KELLMAN: Yes, I remember. Do you remember the figures were so high for the Honourable Members that he did not even realise that I answered? The Honourable Member is misleading the House, but he gave the impression that I did not deal with the money. Because I did not say Almanzar, it does not mean that I did not deal with the money. And that is why I made the point, sir, that when you make an investment like borrowing the money to go into Almanzar, the National Social Security will get a return on its capital amount and also on the contributions that the workers would pay when they work at Almanzar. So the Honourable Member should be very, very careful when he treads on territory that he is not qualified to condemn me on.

Mr. SPEAKER: Wait, wait, Honourable Member, please continue.

Mr. K. D. SYMMONDS: The Honourable Member will one day meet condemnation, sir, is a matter about which I am almost certain. But, Mr. Speaker, sir, I go on. The question really should be, or the issue should be, whether or not the Member for St. Lucy is now confirming to this chamber that a shocking level of imposition has been urged upon the national insurance scheme. The Member for St. Lucy tells us - and he says these things lightly - that the government is doing a favour to the NAS, Mr. Speaker, sir. And one asks whether in fact it is a favour when you have an employment benefit fund which is now recognising

receipts of \$2.5 million by way of contribution but being asked to pay out \$5 million. Well, Mr. Speaker, sir, what is the favour?

Hon. D. St.E. KELLMAN: Sir, the member is misleading the House again, sir. I explained that, sir. What I am saying, sir, is that if the government was not investing, sir, the contributions for unemployment would have been much higher, sir, and the fund would have been broke, sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I treat that as a point of elucidation. Please continue.

Mr. K. D. SYMMONDS: Mr. Speaker, sir, the question again is raised by the Honourable Member - whether he even understands what he says, how he indicts his own Administration, sir, when he speaks of doing a favour.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not parliamentary. Please withdraw that and let us move on.

Mr. K. D. SYMMONDS: I withdraw the word, sir. But I would say, Mr. Speaker, sir, that the concern I have is: where is the favour of which the Honourable Member speaks? And I want to direct this chamber, sir -

Hon. D. St.E. KELLMAN: Yes, sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. He is saying that I did not explain to this House and the country how the government is doing National Insurance a favour. And I clearly said - Honourable Member, just a minute, please.

Mr. SPEAKER: You got up earlier and you explained. Thank you, Honourable Member. Please continue.

Mr. K. D. SYMMONDS: Mr. Speaker, sir, as I said, I wanted to make a very brief intervention. And I increasingly despair that trying to reason with the Member for St. Lucy is going to get either me, sir, or this chamber anywhere. The Honourable Member for St. Lucy, sir, has a predetermined way of looking at life, and I leave him to himself.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, sir, that it is perhaps best to deal with the Member for St. Lucy through the language of a member of his own political party. I hold in my hand, sir, a document entitled *The Future of Social Security in the English-speaking Caribbean*. It is, sir, a publication of the Antigua and Barbuda Social Security Board. I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, sir, that I do not see a date of publication on it, but I am quite happy to make it a document of the House.

It is written - now, I heard you would not hear, sir. You would not hear because you cannot hear. But immediately, without even having had a chance to lay an eye upon it or lend an ear to its content, the Member for St. Lucy is to tell us that it is garbage. It is written, sir, by Dr. Frank Alleyne, former Chairman of the National Insurance Board of Barbados. And my eye catches the date - June 2009, sir.

Now, Mr. Speaker, sir, Dr. Alleyne says as follows: the practice of governments using social security surpluses to provide a cheap source of public financing must be brought to an end immediately. The experiences of our region show that as schemes approach the point of break-even, investment income becomes a critical factor to viability. To the extent that governments commandeer social security funds at below-market rates, the schemes are denied an important source of investable funds. In addition to ensuring that market rates are available to fund managers, there needs to be a relaxation of the existing restrictive conditions pertaining to options for investing funds. While we must minimise undue risk, there is no need to restrict options to certain local and regional securities. In the interest of asset diversification and earning higher yields, therefore, we should try to avoid undue risk while fashioning an investment strategy which permits fund managers to place investments in selected extra-regional hard currency first-class securities.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat the last line for the benefit specifically of the Honourable Member for St. Lucy, who enjoys basking in a lack of knowledge. Sir, Dr. Alleyne, no less, says that in the interest of asset diversification and earning higher yields and avoiding undue risk, we need to fashion an investment strategy which permits fund managers to place investments in selected extra-regional hard currency first-class securities. Extra-regional hard currency first-class securities, sir.

Hon. D. St.E. KELLMAN: Yes, there is a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House, sir, to get up and just say reasonable and serious security before identifying that these are just words. You do not invest in words, sir. It is just an opinion.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order. Please continue.

Mr. K. D. SYMMONDS: Mr. Speaker, sir, the issue that I understood the concern of the Opposition to be making - and what I described deliberately, sir, as a very reasoned and reasonable approach - was the fact, sir, that any Barbadian, and we are all Barbadians, who has a concern about the NIS must therefore, sir, I would imagine, be equally concerned as to the fact that there is a concentration of the investment. And indeed, sir, I hold in my hand the 13th Actuarial Review, sir, of the NIS, which

indicates that we have 90.5 per cent of the investment of the NIS in Barbados at the end of 2013.

Mr. Speaker, sir, the issue therefore must be that Dr. Alleyne is raising an important point. It is not only the Member for St. Michael North East. It is that the country now must be concerned that there is a need to look at the way we are taking the NIS funds and investing them. Now if we are going to have a sensible debate on this matter, sir, I would imagine that what we would have to be doing is looking at where and how - but not, sir, dismissing the merit of doing it arbitrarily as the Member for St. Lucy is wont to do; to treat it, sir, as though it is another piece of the hodgepodge left over from the mumbo jumbo of the last election; to jump up just to signify sound and fury - a tale told, sir, almost in the Shakespearean term. But Mr. Speaker, sir, that is to do an injustice to the solemnity of the moment, because this is a vitally important issue dealing with the lifeblood of future generations of Barbadians - generations born and yet unborn - going to depend on the NIS fund.

Mr. Speaker, sir, this is why I have intervened. I have intervened, sir, simply to try to direct the Honourable Member for St. Lucy to the view that there is perhaps now one issue about which he could attend to become somewhat serious and slightly sober in trying to bring a measure of determination and judgement on an issue that fundamentally affects not only his constituents, but those of all the other 30 constituencies represented in this House. To the extent that this intervention may have benefited the Honourable Member for St. Lucy in some small way in the manner I suggest, sir, I feel that there may be some benefit to my having gotten to my feet. If I have failed, sir, it is not because Dr. Alleyne has failed. It is not because the Leader of the Opposition has failed. But it is because, sir, we have tried where even the Almighty has failed - and that is to get the Honourable Member for St. Lucy to be a reasoned and rational person. I am obliged, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. C. P. SINCKLER: Allow me to thank the Honourable Members on the other side for contributing to the debate. I equally, of course, congratulate my colleague from St. Lucy for his presentation, which I think really connected with the essence of the issues raised by the Leader of the Opposition in refuting some of what she said and speaking generally about the NIS.

Mr. Speaker, sir, the matter before the House is a fairly - well, I would want to say perfunctory, but it is a simple amendment to allow for some goodness to make way for previous goodness and future goodness to take place in Barbados in these times that we are living in. And you know, Mr. Speaker, I really do believe that I have passed the stage now of trying to get into this back and forth - the retail politics of the Leader of the Opposition, the type that the Leader of the Opposition obviously clearly

likes to revel in. And I am not going to be drawn into this situation where one comes seeking information, as it is said, by the dropping of a lot of unsubstantiated remarks and comments only for the benefit of the members of the media to be published tomorrow, to again give the impression that everything in Barbados is collapsing around us and the last bastion of support in the economy, the NIS, is now falling down and all of that.

I forgive the Leader of the Opposition, sir. The Leader of the Opposition, I believe, over the last week missed her opportunity to be current on the report of the Governor for the first half of the year. I understand the Leader was -

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Point of order. The Honourable Member is grossly misleading this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us hear the point of order, please.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: The Honourable Member is grossly misleading this House by suggesting that in my speech this evening I spoke of everything in the government collapsing. Now if that is the admission that he wants to make to this Honourable Chamber, then feel free to do so. But all I have done this evening - and I am amazed at the response that it has solicited - is to ask for information that has not been provided by way of annual report since 2009, nor information that has been provided by way of actuarial review since 2008. Now, if that is going to lead to the kind of spurious attacks from the Member for St. Lucy and the Member for St. Michael North West, as he is about to do and has done, then let there be no point of order from me.

Hon. C. P. SINCKLER: I currently recognise that I have said I am not going to get into the retail politics of the partisanship that has beleaguered the Opposition. I really think that we in Barbados have reached a stage now, given the issues that confront us, that we need to step back from some of this retail politics. And I am not attacking the Leader of the Opposition. All I was saying is that one could recognise from the speech that drifted, Mr. Speaker, sir, into issues pertaining to the deficit and the public finances and all of these things - a regurgitation and recitation of comments that were made before in this House of Assembly - that the Leader of the Opposition wanted to be here last week, could not be here. I actually missed the Leader of the Opposition's voice because, you know, as quickly as those reports are given by the Governor, either a press conference calling for my resignation or firing or that of the Governor of the Central Bank usually follows in lockstep, and it did not happen.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I have not called for the Minister's resignation as yet. He must not confuse me with his Cabinet colleagues.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order. Please continue.

Hon. C. P. SINCKLER: The Leader of the Opposition does not want me to say in the House what the Member for St. James said to me. And I am not going to say it. I am not going to go there because I am not in that. And she knows - the Leader of the Opposition, sir, knows exactly what he told me. I did not tell her what he told me. She knows. And that is why the Honourable Member for St. James Central went down earlier to give the impression that he was lending support. And I understand you have to give your leader as much support as possible, even if that support is as shallow as a shallow draft.

Mr. Speaker, sir, the reality is, sir, and I say this again - the National Insurance Fund is as sound as it has ever been, even in the most difficult of economic times that we have faced, Mr. Speaker, sir. I keep hearing this thing repeatedly. I did not intend to get into it because I did not think it was necessary. I have always said that he who comes to equity must come with clean hands. Now the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, sir, was Deputy Prime Minister. The Honourable Member was also the Minister responsible for information when the loan from the NIS was given to the CBC. I am not going to go down there. I am not going to go there because I am trying to keep away from that. But how could the Honourable Member - how can the Honourable Member come to the House protesting and lamenting and giving the impression to the general public through the media and those who will be listening to the House of Assembly over the radio or internet, that there is some general degree of lethargy or ineptness by this Administration in relation to reports of the National Insurance Fund and the Board that is put in place to manage that Fund - when the Honourable Member well knows that when this Administration came to office in 2008, financial reports for the National Insurance were outstanding from 2002?

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Point of order, Mr. Speaker, sir. The Honourable Member is really misleading the House. The reports of which I speak are not the audited accounts of the National Insurance Fund, which are still outstanding.

Mr. SPEAKER: He did not say that. He made a point with respect to other reports.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: But he made the point that these reports were outstanding since 2002. I am speaking about the report of the National Insurance Board - the annual report. What is outstanding and remains

outstanding is the audited accounts of the Fund, and they are totally different things.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order. Please continue. And I expect that my directives are followed.

Hon. C. P. SINCKLER: Please continue. Mr. Speaker, sir, I understand the disjointedness. It is jet lag, really. I believe it is the effects of jet lag. You know, an annual report without the accompanying audited financial statements is nothing more than a normative report of words that describes in flowery language what somebody might have conceptualised in recording what the fund might have done. What people - when you have a fund that deals with money - nobody wants to hear all the fancy narrative. They want to go to the report, the audited financial report. In fact, even if they cannot get the audited financial reports, they want to get the financial report.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, sir, the honourable member is yet misleading. Mr. Speaker, this document, Mr. Speaker, was laid on September 25, 2012. And the Chairman who was responsible for this report - the flowery language of which the Minister of Finance is now dismissing - is none other than Mr. Jeptah Ince from January to October and Ms. Sandra Ford, who is now at the Transport Board, from November to December. So you cannot reprobate and not probate. This Government has laid this report, albeit three or four years late, but you cannot now say that this is an irrelevant consideration. Honourable member,

Hon. C. P. SINCKLER: I am not going to raise my blood pressure today over anything like that. The honourable member does not want it to go out. I am saying it. That when we became the Government in 2008, Mr. Speaker, sir, we found an unholy situation in which the audited financial statements of the National Insurance Fund were not done since 2003. Mr. Speaker, sir. Yes.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: The honourable member is yet misleading the House again. The honourable member cannot say that I do not want it to go out that the accounts were not audited since 2003 when I referred to it in my speech. So you cannot accuse me of not wanting it to go out when the first reference to it in this debate came from me.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order from no one. Please continue.

Hon. C. P. SINCKLER: Mr. Speaker, sir, I don't know if, when you were small, if you used to play snakes and ladders, but the honourable member has clearly devoured her own argument from top right down to the bottom. Look, one of the reasons - let me get to the issue. One of the reasons why the actuarial reviews are delayed

is, in addition to the fact that the NIS uses, as is the case with most of the national insurance schemes in the Caribbean, one particular consultant from the Bahamas - and maybe we have to look at diversifying the personnel. But not only that, because the financial reports - financial, not just audited - the financial reports of the NIS were not prepared since 2003 up to 2007. When we became the administration, the board took a decision to have all of these reports done. The two in particular, 2003 and 2004, have given a lot of trouble to the auditors because information, Mr. Speaker, sir, was not readily available. Apparently, I am told, I am advised, because of the changeover in the software programme at the NIS - a software programme, I might add, Mr. Speaker, sir, that the last Government approved to be bought but has not been substantially used, when they were advised not to get it in the first place. I am not going to go there.

The point I am making is that we are far behind because there were so many of them to do that the poor Auditor General had to decide - because these reports have to go to the Auditor General first before they are laid here - he then had to decide to outsource the work, tender it, because you cannot turn up at the Auditor General with reports for five, six, seven, and eight years and say, do them. It is not fair to his staff. He had to outsource it to a firm. Ernst and Young, I believe, is the firm. But the board previously had to engage MG to clean up all of the reports that the Barbados Labour Party Government did not do. Now, I ask you the question. The honourable member got up in here, Mr. Speaker, sir, and said that, oh, how can you be making fundamental financial investment decisions on the NIS when you do not have any reports? Do you know how many investment decisions were made by the last administration when they did not have any audits? When they did not have any reports? Yes, the final border.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just a minute.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: The honourable member is yet again misleading the House. I now better understand why Barbados is in the position that it is. There is a fundamental difference between an actuarial review, which is required by law every three years, and the audited accounts. There is equally a fundamental difference with the report of the board, which is different from an audit of the fund. And if the Minister continues to confuse all three, then he will continue to accuse me of making statements which I have not made.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order, please.

Hon. C. P. SINCKLER: Mr. Speaker, sir, I think I have made my point because I am not going to let the Leader of the Opposition drive me to call for a forensic audit into the accounts of the Labour Party. I am not going there. What I am saying is I would be happy if the

honourable member would not only call for a forensic audit into the accounts of the Labour Party.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I want them to call for an account of Pelican. I want them to call for the \$1.3 million that he still cannot account for in the Democratic Labour Party that may have been received by somebody else.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable member, you just got up. You did not indicate where you were standing and you just put all those comments on the record. Those comments are struck from the record. Please continue.

Hon. C. P. SINCKLER: We have a party too, because what is good for one.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have made my ruling. Sit down. Let us continue.

Hon. C. P. SINCKLER: Continue.

Mr. SPEAKER: On a point of order - what is the point of order being breached now?

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Misleading the House in respect of his comments in relation to - comments are struck out in relation to what I said.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable member. Honourable member. I did not hear the honourable member say anything after I made my ruling. Please sit. Just a minute. I recall the comments which were made both the last two times you spoke - they are struck from the record. The first was struck from the record because you did not have my authority to speak. You just got up and spoke. Subsequently, you rose on a point of order and nothing had transpired between where I made the ruling and now. All right. All right, member, please continue.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Are you calling into question my ruling? Mr. Speaker, I am asking to explain what I am objecting to because you have spoken to a matter to which I have not spoken. You have spoken, Mr. Speaker, in relation to a comment subsequent to your ruling. I am speaking, sir, to a matter and a comment that was made by the member for St. Michael North West prior to my speaking. It was not an aside. It was not a casual remark. And I am asking for a copy of the record, sir, in order to be able to clarify such that it too can be struck from the record.

Mr. SPEAKER: All right, honourable member. No point of order found. And those comments you made are struck from the record.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Which comments, sir? The last couple of minutes you spoke - the last presentation. So what is the position in relation to my request, as a matter of privilege, sir, in relation to the comments made by the member for St. Michael North West? My comments about forensic matters of the Democratic Labour Party and his about the Labour Party, sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable member, you suggested I am being unfair.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am hoping that is not the case. Okay, let me clarify it. You have no right to ask for any record. I made a ruling that was clear and unambiguous that the comments would be struck from the record and that is the ruling. All other members - honourable member for St. Michael North West, please continue.

Hon. C. P. SINCKLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, sir. I am going to move on and try to bring this to a close. But there are a couple of things I need to respond to.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Point of order, sir. And a point to understand whether I have a right to ask for a copy of what was said. I have been in this House - in both Houses - for almost 20 years. This will not be the first time that we have asked for a copy of the record to confirm what a member has said, to ensure that if for whatever reason one of us heard wrong, it can be corrected. If I heard wrong about the member for St. Michael North West,

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable member, please. I have made my ruling. If you wish to question the ruling, there is a formula for doing so under the relevant Standing Order. If you want me to point it out to you, I will point it out to you. I have made my ruling and we are continuing. No point of order. Please take your seat.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I am asking a different point. And you have not allowed me.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have said clearly and I am not going to accommodate you and entertain you in this manner anymore. I have made my ruling clear. It is unambiguous. You are not entitled to call for the record. I am entitled to call for it for my assistance. I do not need it. Please continue.

Hon. C. P. SINCKLER: I am the member for St. Michael North West. You are still interested in continuing? I am the member for St. Michael North West. Yes, sir. Sorry, Mr. Speaker, sir. I got slightly distracted there in the back and forth. Mr. Speaker, sir, the Leader of the Opposition equally made some comments that I think do

not reflect the facts in relation to the NIS. And I think for the record, I need to correct some of those statements that were made. The first, Mr. Speaker, sir,

is ready, right? Where are you going?

Mr. SPEAKER: Sit down. All right, member, please continue. Let us get on with the people's business.

Hon. C. P. SINCKLER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, sir, as I was making the point that when we came to office, there were so many audited financial statements of the NIS fund audited and also the regular financial statements. But the audited one, there were so many of those statements that were missing and not done that we had to actually institute a programme where you brought on an accounting firm to try to get all of them to get them done. And I am saying that you can't come here to tell me that you are criticising the government for making investment decisions because two or three years of statements - reports have not been laid. The reason why those reports have not been laid or have been delayed is because you had a backlog. In other words, the board of the fund could not even get to 2008, 2009, 2010 because they had to contend with getting 2003, four, five, six and seven finished. So it pushed back everything. And those are the reports precisely. Those are the reports under the last administration that were not done. Yet they were making great financial investments and great financial decisions for the National Insurance. It is particularly one of the reasons too why the actual reviews have been pushed back some, because that information is critical to the actuary to be able to do his work, which really is about looking at the state of the fund and making recommendations on the futuristic investment portfolio of the fund and such matters.

Let me make this other point. They want to reprobate and appropriate at the same time. Let me make the point. Mr. Speaker, sir, in relation to what the honourable member quoted - the honourable member quoted that last actuarial review. And I don't know which section the honourable member was quoting from, because the honourable member of the opposition said that Social Security funds require an expenditure reserve ratio of eight. When we know that the standard by the last review, 2008, it is normal that the standard expenditure reserve ratio for funds is normally around five. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the projection of the actuary who did the last review for the NIS was that the NIS should maintain a reserve expenditure ratio of five, but that the current going of the fund was 7.1. So the fund was ahead of its projections and therefore sound enough. So that defeats the misinformation of the honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Third point - in relation to NIS holdings of government paper. By 1999, Mr. Speaker, sir, under the last administration, by the actuarial review, Government of

Barbados securities held by the NIS constituted 69 per cent - that is in 1999. By 2003 it had risen to 73 per cent of the NIS overall holdings. The highest tally has been under this government: 2011 was 64.7 per cent. So in fact, NIS holdings of government paper and investments in government are lower today than they were under anything under the last administration. Things were good. So what is the point? I mean, you don't come here to give a political speech. Mr. Speaker, sir, I am challenging the information that is not true and giving the impression to the media in particular that this government is doing something to raid the NIS. NIS holdings in government are less today as a percentage of their overall investment portfolio than they were under the Barbados Labour Party. And for the entire existence of the fund, nearly, it has always been above 60 per cent. And one of the reasons for this, Mr. Speaker, sir, is that in spite of all the pretty theoretical talk that people put in papers, at the end of the day, there are not a whole lot of investments that Social Security schemes can invest in. They are highly restricted. And when you look around the Caribbean and you look internationally, there are not a whole lot of them. All of this fancy talk about high quality investments - they ain't got many of them around. The highest quality benchmark investment in the financial markets is considered government paper, because it is assumed that is the safest place you can invest. There are very few others. There are hardly any private sector investments that you can think about.

Now, if you have been running a situation where in the United States in particular, interest rates for the large part of the last six, seven years have been yielding investments of 0.1 per cent and 0.2 per cent and all of these very, very small rates of return - if you look at any of the investment reports of the NIS, you will see that they have been hardly getting anything on the investments and in some instances may have lost a little bit on the overseas investments which the NIS currently has. And the Leader of the Opposition is standing up here and recommending to the government that we should take up Barbadian money and go and invest it in securities or invest it in other instruments overseas, get 0.1 per cent to 0.2 per cent on those investments, when they can invest it in the people of Barbados, in the future of Barbados, and get a safer return from it. Now, if that is not voodoo economics wrapped up, Mr. Speaker, sir, I don't know what else is. And I continue to say: if there is a successful diversification plan for NIS investments that can securely give the NIS a reasonable return and it is a good quality grade investment, the NIS is empowered to do it. But we are not going to have you telling me that I should not use the NIS money to finance my deficit to support my people, but I am to give it to the United States government to support theirs - a trillion dollar economy - just because you want to sound pretty, as though you have this new road to Damascus experience, and you now discover the knowledge of investments.

The Barbados Labour Party was investing NIS money all the way in CBC, and they took the money and spent it - and nobody knows what it is that they really have done because CBC is not in better shape today than when we took it up than when they had it. The Leader of the Opposition was the minister responsible for information when that law was approved. And the first thing that the people at CBC did was to invest in putting down big feet in the yard - you remember the concrete feet, put down and painting all kinds of carnival colours. But you don't know whether CBC is not better off for the investment. And in fact, Mr. Speaker, sir, what annoys me about the whole thing is that when we came to office, they had not paid back a cent. And the late Prime Minister, the Honourable St. John, had to instruct that money be paid back immediately. And it was highlighted in the Auditor General's report. Now, if the Leader of the Opposition wanted something constructive to do with the Public Accounts Committee, the Leader should investigate that. But once you have to confront the Leader of the Opposition and her members with the facts, they get up and walk out of the House of Assembly. And that is why I have passed the stage, Mr. Speaker - I am not getting into these things anymore. We have passed that stage in Barbados now; we are going to a completely different level.

This issue, Mr. Speaker, sir, about the unemployment fund - again, a whole set of information, no crediting where this information is coming from. I heard that the unemployment fund is this, I heard that this has happened. You can get up in the House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, and say you heard all kinds of things. Let me tell you what the facts are. The unemployment fund, Mr. Speaker, sir - as you know, the unemployment fund pays benefits when you are unemployed. In 2009 we took a decision to extend unemployment benefits to hold the hands of Barbadians. I have consistently told people: this government is not going to make any excuses and we will fully accept any responsibility for the decisions that we have made to support Barbadians, and we are carrying them as far as we can carry them. Mr. Speaker, sir, nobody is going to make me as Minister of Finance, and any member of this government, feel bad about the fact that we stood up and helped Barbadians.

I hear a lot of people talking in the tourism industry about the lethargy of this government and a whole lot of comments. I have just restrained myself from responding because I know when many people in the tourism sector were on their feet, this government put \$25 million of the people's money in their hands. Not a loan - not a hard, soft or medium loan - a grant to people to help them to stand up on their feet. But nobody remembers these things. Nobody remembers these things. We have held the hands. This matter that we are discussing here today in the NIS was a matter to hold the hands of businesses in Barbados. Mr. Speaker, sir, we allowed businesses in Barbados to defer

NIS payments to help them with their cash flows. And you know everybody gets up and says, oh, we did nothing to help. And if you understand that there is a particular brand of person usually hanging around Roebuck Street who has a degree of spitefulness in them whenever you are doing anything to help the private sector - it does not be a problem, you know. But if you are going to do anything to help workers in Barbados, especially if they need the public service, you know, you have committed the greatest sin in the world. But I know the record will show that this party stood up with the people of Barbados. If circumstances have changed and we have to do some things and change, of course we will do what is in the best interest of the country. But I am not making any apologies for the things that we have done, because the job of any government - the first job of any government - is to protect its citizens as far and as much as it can in the circumstances.

So I am not making any apologies for this unemployment fund. The honourable member said - with no source of information, no document laid before the House - that he heard that the NIS is bringing in \$2 million a month and paying out \$5 million. The last report for the NIS unemployment benefits, in information supplied to me by the NIS, was for April. The fund collected \$11.9 million and paid out \$14.7 million - a deficit of \$2.8 million for that month. And the fund has assets, liquid and fixed, of \$44 million. So the fund, if the situation requires, can tap into its assets to support itself. The fund has assets of \$44 million in investments. It paid out \$14.7 million and took in \$11.9 million - a small deficit of \$2.8 million. But let me tell Mr. Speaker, sir: in a crisis, yes. And let me tell Mr. Speaker, sir, if it comes to it and that fund has to be replenished, the laws provide for how that fund can be replenished by the Government of Barbados. And we will do it to the extent that it has to be done. And this will not be the first time that it has happened. It is not the first time.

So I don't understand. The other member slipped in - I understand that the sovereignty members are in a slightly better way. You all remember: in a much better way and running a large surplus. And on this issue of surpluses, you know, we like to get involved in all this technical babble about terminologies. If you expect to collect \$10 and you have expenses of \$11, and you collect \$13 and you pay your expenses - anything left that you didn't expect to get is a surplus. I mean, you can call it whatever you want. It is a surplus. And the NIS has consistently been collecting surpluses over the last few years because of some of the actuarial changes that have been made, and that is likely to continue into the future.

I am not going to be drawn in to all this issue about [Inaudible.] and who has sent a request. They want to know the information on that - I know. But what I can say is that when the time is right, the public of Barbados will be fully briefed on the matter. But we are investing in the recovery

of the Barbados economy and investing in the stabilisation of that economy and getting people back to work. There is a growth strategy with this government. There is a growth strategy that this government will unveil very shortly, as there will be a stabilisation strategy, and we will be fully conversant with the public. I said in the Estimates in March, I expected and wanted - and this government wanted - to get a full debate on all of the economic issues. We are getting the debate now. That is what we wanted. We are getting it now.

You know, somebody once said that if you put 20 economists in a room and give all of them the same information on one particular problem, you get 50 different answers. So I don't mind. I listen to the economics. Some will say A, others will say B, some will say C. They are looking at the same information; they have been given the same scenario. So you get on the one hand and on the other hand. The job of a government is to lead. The job of ministers is to provide leadership, is to devise policies. And when we are satisfied that the public discourse is wide enough and broad enough and strong enough, and that the internal discourse among the various technocrats at our disposal who advise the government - and then we as the Cabinet of Barbados, having taken on all of those bits of advice from private sector, unions, economists, everybody - our job as the elected government is to make a decision. But those decisions will be made and communicated when we are satisfied that we have explored all the options, that we have heard the benefit of the widest possible consultation and advice, and not before.

And I say to this country: there are those who are invested in the failure of this government - that is all that motivates them every day. All that motivates them. I saw an article somewhere in the media that your Minister of Transport met with somebody and decided to do things - that meeting never took place.

And even though they call you or ask you if it is true and you say, no such thing happened, you know, they still go ahead and publish it. That it actually happened. So they take no word from government, they're taking their lead from elsewhere. And there's a consistent march every day to beat down the psyche of Barbadians, to pull it down, to destroy your confidence. By every day running about in town trying to find this body, the next body to say something bad, to find every bad example that they can find or supposed bad example to try to expose it. If a fellow can't get a coconut shell, is the government fault? Oh gosh, things are so bad. I have never seen it like this. You know, these people don't know what they're doing. All of that in order to pull down this government because they're not invested in the future of the country. They're invested in their own future. They want the opportunity again to reverse what the people of Barbados did on February the 21st because it doesn't suit their purpose. Mr. Speaker, sir,

I am past that. I have told the people who are suffering from post-election stress syndrome, get over it and move on. Let us pull together as a people, work out our challenges, bring a programme that can keep this country on track and bring us to the prosperity where we want to go, Mr. Speaker, sir.

And therefore, that's why I'm not going to be drawn in to the retail debate, the retail politics debate. I am not doing it. I am going to listen very carefully to what everybody has to say. We've started a process. I've started to meet with all the social partners, unions, private sector, technical groups. I've met with all of them. I will continue to do so. But we are going to stay focused on our gaze, which is going to be focused on what we know needs to be done. And we are going to do it. Not going to allow ourselves to be distracted by people who are invested in the failure of Barbados for their own personal gain. Little Rick had a song called Mash Up and Bury Back, but that is exactly what they're invested in. Mash it up so they can get it because they are geniuses. So they feel that if they destroy Barbados, they can build it back in a week. Just give them the opportunity. I'm not going to be side-tracked by all of that. We are going to stay focused.

The message, sir, the NIS is not in any financial difficulties. Sir, the reports are ready. The audits are going to be completed, all of them, right up to 2011 and laid in this Parliament in early 2014. That's the message I have gotten from the leadership of the Fund at the board level, and I have no reason to doubt the sincerity of that advice to me. We will continue to seek ways to strategically invest the savings of the public of Barbados, to build out an economy, to improve our human condition, to improve the economic and social welfare of the country. Mr. Speaker, this measure is a measure to continue to hold the hands of businesses in Barbados and to try to work, as we work with them as partners, to seek ways to grow our economy, to grow jobs and to return us as quickly as possible to a state of normalcy in our economic relations. And with those few words, Mr. Speaker, sir, I beg to move that this bill be read a second time.

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

Hon. C. P. SINCKLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into Committee in consideration of this Bill.

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

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is now in Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. C. P. SINCKLER, the Bill was read a third time, passed and cited as the National Insurance and Social Security Amendment Act, 2013.

Mr. CLERK: In the name of the Honourable Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs, to move the second reading of the Final Appropriation 2012–2013 Bill 2013.

FINAL APPROPRIATION (2012–2013) BILL, 2013

Hon. C. P. SINCKLER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is the Final Appropriation Bill for the financial year ended March 31st, 2013. And I beg to move that this bill be read a second time.

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

Hon. C. P. SINCKLER: I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into Committee in consideration of this Bill, it being a money Bill.

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

COMMITTEE

Clauses 1 - 4, inclusive, were called and passed.

The Schedule became the Schedule to the Bill.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. C. P. SINCKLER, the Bill was read a third time, passed and cited as the Final Appropriation (2012–2013) Act, 2013.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. D. E. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, sir, with that we have come to the end of government business for the day and I beg to move that this House be adjourned until Tuesday, July the 23rd at 10 o'clock.

The question that the House be adjourned until Tuesday, July 23, 2013 at 10.00 a.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

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

PAPERS

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

SPECIAL REPORT OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS
COMMITTEE

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY.....2

OBITUARY - THE LATE SIR RICHARD
CHRISTOPHER HAYNES, K.A.

Hon. F. J. STUART.....2

Hon. Miss M. A. Mottley, 5; Hon. D. St.E. Kellman, 8;
Hon. R. L. Sealy, 11; Mr. G. A. Clarke, 13.

RESUMPTION

Mrs. M-J. M. Thompson, 16; Hon. J. D. E. Boyce, 17; Dr.
M. M. Agard, 19; Hon. S. D. Blackett, 20; Mr. T. A.
Prescod, 22; Hon. R. D. Jones, 24; Miss S. J. O.
Bradshaw, 26; Dr. the Hon. D. S. Lowe, 28; Mr. E. G.
Hinkson, 30; Hon. C. P. Sinckler, 32; Hon. S. A. Lashley,
36.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Hon. J. D. E. BOYCE.....38

Hon. C. P. Sinckler, 38.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. D. E. BOYCE.....38

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 2 – NATIONAL INSURANCE AND
SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENT BILL, 2013.39

Hon. C. P. Sinckler, 39, 49, 50, 51, 52, 55; Hon. Miss M.
A. Mottley, 40, 49, 50, 51, 52; Hon. D. St.E. Kellman, 45,
47, 48; Mr. K. D. Symmonds, 47, 48.

FINAL APPROPRIATION (2012–2013) BILL, 2013

Hon. C. P. SINCKLER.....55

SUSPENSION.....16

ADJOURNMENT.....56

Hon. J. D. E. Boyce, 56.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

AGARD, Dr. M. M. (Christ Church West)
BLACKETT, Hon. S. D. (St. Michael Central)

BOYCE, Hon. J. D. E. (Christ Church South)
BRADSHAW, Miss S. J. O. (St. Michael South East)
CLARKE, Mr. G. A. (St. George North)
HINKSON, Mr. E. G. (St. James North)
JONES, Hon. R. D. (Christ Church East Central)
KELLMAN, Hon. D. St.E. (St. Lucy)
LASHLEY, Hon. S. A. (Christ Church West Central)
LOWE, Dr. the Hon. D. S. (Christ Church East)
MOTTLEY, Hon. Miss M. A. (St. Michael North East)
PRESCOD, Mr. T. A. (St. Michael East)
SEALY, Hon. R. L. (St. Michael South Central)
SINCKLER, Hon. C. P. (St. Michael North West)
STUART, Hon. F. J. (St. Michael South)
SYMMONDS, Mr. K. D. (St. James Central)
THOMPSON, Mrs. M-J. M. (St. John)

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

EDITORIAL NOTES — NOT PART OF THE REPORT

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

EDITORIAL QUERIES

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

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

Q2. Throughout. The bracketed time-checks in the afternoon portion of the source are out of sequence (for example '[12.30 a.m.]' and '[5.30 a.m.]' during the afternoon sitting) and have been omitted.

Q3. Throughout. Passages printed in italics are uncertain readings from the recording and should be checked against it.

Q4. Suspension. The seconder of the motion to suspend the sitting is not identified in the source and is printed as AN HON. MEMBER.

Q5. Obituary, Madam Deputy Speaker before Dr. M. M. Agard. The call 'The Honourable Member for Christ Church West' is headed 'MR. SPEAKER' in the source. Dr. M. M. Agard begins 'Madam Deputy Speaker' and the next calls are from Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER, so the call is printed under Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER. Please confirm when the Deputy Speaker took the Chair.

Q6. Obituary, Dr. the Hon. D. S. Lowe. No call from the Chair is recorded before this speech; the source runs straight on from the close of Miss S. J. O. Bradshaw's speech. Please check against the recording.

Q7. Obituary, Mr. E. G. Hinkson. The opening words 'I rise to add my voice to the' are headed 'MR. SPEAKER' in the source and no call is recorded. The speaker extends sympathy 'on behalf of the constituents of St. James North', the captions name Mr. Edmund G. Hinkson, and Hon. C. P. Sinckler later refers to the Member for St. James North, so the speech is printed under Mr. E. G. HINKSON. Please confirm.

Q8. Obituary, Mr. E. G. Hinkson. The source reads 'as the Member of Parliament for St. Michael South spoke of' the difficulty of entering politics when one's children are young. The reference is to Miss S. J. O. Bradshaw, Member for St. Michael South East, who spoke of the sacrifice as the child of a politician; corrected.

Q9. Obituary, Mr. SPEAKER before Hon. C. P. Sinckler. The call reads 'I remember for St. Michael North West' in the source (captions: 'I remember for, sir Michael Northway'); printed as a call of the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West.

Q10. Obituary, Hon. S. A. Lashley. Headed 'HON. MICHAEL A. LASHLEY, S.C., M.P.' in the source. Mr. SPEAKER's call, given in the source as 'Christ Church West', was to the Member for Christ Church West Central (captions: 'Christ Church, West St.'), and the captions name Hon. Stephen A. Lashley; the call is completed and the speech printed under Hon. S. A. LASHLEY. Please confirm.

Q11. First Readings of Bills. Hon. C. P. Sinckler's motion reads 'Final Appropriation Creation Bill 2012–2013' in the source; the Clerk later reads 'Final Appropriation 2012–2013 Bill 2013' and the Bill was passed as 'the Final Appropriation Act 2012–2013'. Printed throughout as the Final Appropriation (2012–2013) Bill, 2013. Please confirm the short title.

Q12. Suspension of Standing Orders. The source reads 'Standing Orders 6, 16, 18, 20, 42, 43 and 44'; the captions give '42-5-43'. Printed as Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44.

Q13. Final Appropriation (2012–2013) Bill, 2013. The Clerk does not give an Order number for this Bill, which was read a first time at this sitting; no Order number is printed. Please supply if required.

Q14. Order No. 2, Hon. C. P. Sinckler (reply). During the exchanges on points of order the source divides several sentences between speakers at the wrong place (for example 'The Honourable Member is yet / misleading the House again' and 'such that it too can be / struck from the record'); the words have been moved to the speaker to whom they belong. The words 'I am the member for St. Michael North West. You are still interested in continuing?' at the resumption of Hon. C. P. Sinckler's speech may be the Chair's; they are printed as in the source. Please check against the recording.

Q15. Order No. 2, Hon. Miss M. A. Mottley. Mr. SPEAKER ruled that Hon. Miss M. A. Mottley's remarks about 'an account of Pelican' and '\$1.3 million' were struck from the record, and later that further comments were struck. They are printed here as they appear in the source. Please decide whether they should be omitted from the Official Report.

Q16. Committee. Mr. CHAIRMAN is not named in the source; the Chairman of Committees, Mr. J. D. Paul, is presumed. The Committee stages of both Bills are condensed to the Official Report formulae; all clauses were passed without amendment.

DEBATE SUMMARY

(Editorial summary — not part of the record.)

The House of Assembly met at 10.00 a.m. on Tuesday, July 16, 2013, with Mr. SPEAKER presiding; there had been no meeting the previous week because of a threatening weather system. The Minutes of June 25, 2013 were confirmed and Mr. SPEAKER welcomed Carol, Lady Haynes, and the family of the late Sir Richard Haynes. Hon. J. D. E. Boyce laid two Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) Orders, 2013 and the Barbados Economic and Social Report 2012. Hon. Miss M. A. Mottley laid a Special Report of the Public Accounts Committee seeking the direction of the House on Standing Order 61, which prevents the publication of evidence.

The Prime Minister, Hon. F. J. Stuart, moved the condolence resolution on the death of Sir Richard Christopher Haynes, K.A., who died on June 23. He traced Sir Richard's defeat in St. George North in 1976, his election for St. Michael South Central at the 1978 by-election, his service as Minister of Finance and his departure from the Democratic Labour Party. Hon. Miss M. A. Mottley seconded, quoting Sir Richard's words in the 1989 Budget Debate and recalling his ideas on the role of Parliament. Hon. D. St.E. Kellman, Hon. R. L. Sealy and Mr. G. A. Clarke, who spoke of Sir Richard's upbringing in Newbury and his Barbados Scholarship of 1956, also paid tribute before the sitting was suspended until 2.00 p.m.

After the resumption tributes were paid by Mrs. M-J. M. Thompson; Hon. J. D. E. Boyce, who spoke of Sir Richard's work at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the

Advisory Commission of Inquiry which he chaired; Dr. M. M. Agard; Hon. S. D. Blackett; Mr. T. A. Prescod; Hon. R. D. Jones; Miss S. J. O. Bradshaw; Dr. the Hon. D. S. Lowe; Mr. E. G. Hinkson, who recalled the \$15 000 tax-free allowance of 1986; Hon. C. P. Sinckler; and Hon. S. A. Lashley. The House observed a minute's silence.

Hon. J. D. E. Boyce moved the first reading of the Defence Amendment Bill, 2013 and Hon. C. P. Sinckler that of the Final Appropriation (2012–2013) Bill, 2013. Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44 were suspended. Under Order No. 2 Hon. C. P. Sinckler moved the second reading of the National Insurance and Social Security Amendment Bill, 2013, which gives legal scope for waiving interest and penalties on arrears of contributions; he reported on the amnesty programmes begun on April 1, 2009 and said the National Insurance Department was owed in excess of \$200 million. Hon. Miss M. A. Mottley said the last annual report laid was for 2007 and the last actuarial review was valid to 2008, and that the Scheme's holdings of Government paper had risen from 1.4 billion to 2.79 billion between 2007 and 2013.

Hon. D. St.E. Kellman blamed the contribution increases of 2003 and said the Government was doing the National Insurance Fund a favour. Mr. K. D. Symmonds raised the question of a bridging loan of 35 million United States dollars for the purchase of Almanzar and quoted Dr. Frank Alleyne on the use of social security surpluses; Mr. SPEAKER required him to withdraw a word. Replying, Hon. C. P. Sinckler said the Fund was as sound as it had ever been and that the audits up to 2011 would be laid in early 2014. Mr. SPEAKER struck remarks by Hon. Miss M. A. Mottley from the record and ruled that she was not entitled to call for the record. The Bill passed through Committee without amendment and was passed as the National Insurance and Social Security Amendment Act, 2013. The Final Appropriation Bill, for the financial year ended March 31, 2013, was then passed without debate, and the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 23, 2013 at 10.00 a.m.