

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1971-76

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 29th June, 1976.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.00 o'clock noon.

PRESENT

His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P., (Speaker); Hon. C. E. TALMA, C.B.E., (Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. J. B. SPRINGER; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E.; Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport); Hon. P. G. MORGAN, C.B.E., (Minister of Tourism, Information and Public Relations); Hon. P. M. GREAVES, B.A., (Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance); Mr. H. deB. FORDE, M.A., LL.B.; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. A. MORRISON, (Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology); Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A. (Econ.), (Minister of Health and Welfare); Mr. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M. and Miss B. A. MILLER.

Prayers were read.

PAPERS PRESENTED

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning, I am commanded to lay the following:—

The Income Tax (Technical Assistance Officers and Employees) (Designation) (Amendment) Regulations, 1976.

On my own behalf, I am commanded to lay the following:—

The Public Utilities Board Report and Accounts as at 31st December, 1975.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:

The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations, 1976.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister, I beg to give notice of the following:

Resolution to grant the sum of \$4,752 from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1976 – 77, Part I – Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1976 – 77, No. 9, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:

A Bill to provide for the incorporation of the Barbados Boy Scouts Association.

FIRST READING OF BILL

On the motion of Hon. F. G. SMITH, seconded by Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, the Bill to provide for the incorporation of the Barbados Boy Scouts Association, was read a first time.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform you that Oral Reply to

Parliamentary Question No. 83 asked by the hon. member for St. Philip North, is ready.

Also, Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 128 asked by the hon. member for St. Thomas, is ready.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of any definite understanding in relation to the suspension of Standing Orders, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42, 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of today's Sitting on the grounds that we have quite a full Order Paper of Government Business on very pressing matters, and I will give the undertaking that if the Opposition has anything greatly important to deal with before we rise, we will give them the opportunity to do so.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply. Mr. LOWE took the Chair.
12.10 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1976-77 No. 6

A Resolution for the sum of \$10,000 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of this Resolution, Part I (Current) — Judiciary, Item 13, in the sum of \$10,000, the Addendum sets out the position clearly, Sir, but I can still give some more information at this stage.

The Registrar has reported that the existing sum for bringing reports and reprints up to date is insufficient. These reports are extensively used by judges for the purpose of research. At the time when the Current Estimates were being prepared it was not known that the new reprints of the English Reports, reprints for use in the Law Library, Supreme Court could be obtained.

The estimated cost is £2,314 net for 118 volumes. It has been indicated that some of the earlier volumes of the Reports are reportedly of uneven quality, but it is said that they are a very useful source of knowledge for legal research, as hon. members of the Legal Profession would know.

No provision was included in the Current Estimates for the purchase of a new set of the Reports since it was not known at that time that the new Reports were available; so we are now coming for a supplementary vote in order to purchase these new Law Reports which are essential for the administration of justice by way of research by the Judges of the Supreme Court.

I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$10,000 do now pass.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, it has taken the Government some-time to recognise that the English Reports, which are a valuable source of Legal knowledge have been crumbling for a long time, and some of the Reports can hardly be used at all. I was wondering how long it would have taken the Government before we had a vote on this.

I believe that several members of this House have spoken on this Head before, and I would like to throw out a bit of advice to the Government in relation to the Law Library. The Law Library is not properly air conditioned, and as a result the books are suffering great deterioration more rapidly than one would expect and I would suggest that the Government have a serious look not only at this side of the Law Library.

But the other part, is in the interest of the cultivation of the Law Library as a whole. There are some very valuable volumes which need rebinding and proper treatment. If this cannot be done at the Law Library at the Court, then at least we could send them to the UWI so that they can be stored at the university library and properly kept and preserved there, and of course be readily available when wanted in the Law Courts.

Some of these volumes are not indeed in every day or even monthly use in the Law Courts. Books like Cooke or Lyttleton and reports by Sir Herbert Greaves - I doubt that you will find many of these in any part of Barbados today — they are really treasures and contribute to the legal knowledge of the country. So, it is not only in relation to the English Reports that

we must show some concern, but in the other reports in the law library which need much attention.

I trust that the Minister will bear this in mind in the next study of the Estimates.

The question that the Resolution for the sum of \$10,000 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

RESOLUTION TO AMEND HEAD 113 — MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

A Resolution to amend the note to Head 113 — Ministry of Education, Item 5, Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic — Capital Estimates — 1976–77 was called.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, this is really non-controversial. One of the conditions of the Inter-American Development Bank Loan for the construction of the new Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic is that the Planning Division of the Ministry of Education should be strengthened. Steps have already been taken to strengthen the planning section in conjunction with the colossal educational development taking place at the Barbados Community College. Provision for furniture, equipment and other support services for such increased staff cannot be met from the vote already provided, and it is thought best that the note should be amended to properly allow such expenditure for the purchase of materials and the temporary relocation of the Polytechnic at Belmont Road, as well as for the purchase of equipment for the expanded programme of the Polytechnic. I think that the House and the public should know that the Government has had approval of a \$6.6 million loan from the Inter-American Development Bank for the construction of a new polytechnic at Constitution Road. In addition, we have had a loan of over \$6 million for the expansion of the Barbados Community College. Anyone who goes to Howell's Cross Road can see the expansion that is taking place at that institution.

The Polytechnic is geared to train 2,500 students, so that it will be a far bigger polytechnic than the existing one that is located in Belmont Road. In addition to that, opportunity is being taken by the Government in view of its investigations, to expand the courses being taken at the Polytechnic to meet some of

the needs and requirements of the young people; and that is why the last part of the vote mentions the purchase of equipment for additional courses in the expanded programme of the Polytechnic.

I beg to move that the Resolution to amend Head 113, — Ministry of Education — do now pass.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA each seconded by Hon. A. MORRISON, the Resolutions were read a first time and second time, and agreed to.

12.20 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the Government next proposes to revert back to Order No.1 standing in the name of the Prime Minister: To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) Order, 1976.

I beg to move that this be the next Order of the day.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

Order No. 1 was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, Order No. 1 deals with the Civil Establishment (Teachers) Order, 1976, and the introduction which I made to the Civil Establishment Order a few days ago applies with equal force to the matter which we now have before us. I do not intend to repeat the history of the negotiations in

this matter. Suffice it to say that the Order deals with the proposed revised salaries of people in the teaching profession, that the Government has had negotiations with them, and the negotiations did come to a state where there was no possibility, as far as the Government is concerned, of any possible rational agreement.

It appears to me that what the representatives of the public workers, using ingenerate terms to include teachers, casual workers, administrative grades and everybody else, understand by the term "collective bargaining" is that you agree with what they demand. This is what they mean by collective bargaining. As far as I am concerned, being the Head of the Government which was responsible for the introduction of the principle of collective bargaining in deciding the wages, salaries and conditions of all classes of public workers in this island, collective bargaining means an attempt to reach some kind of consensus based by rational discussion around the table, or around several tables until one either arrives at an agreement or alternatively one fails to arrive at an agreement and at that stage there is no possibility of the two sides coming together to arrive at an agreement.

I have to repeat this because we are still hearing a lot of discussion about forsaking and abandoning the principle of collective bargaining, and resorting to legislation. I want to repeat what I had to say before. These Orders were made by me as Minister in charge of Establishments as the law required. The Civil Establishment Act requires in the one part that before you pay any money to members of the established staff you have to get an order and that order is subject to affirmative Resolution of the Legislature. That is in the Civil Establishment Act. I think the Act is dated 1967, I may be wrong; I am speaking now on my feet. Well in so far as that is concerned, when we consider the annual Estimates, when we come for the Appropriation Bill in this House before 31st March in each year and every year as is required by the Constitution and by the Financial Administration and Audit Act of 1964 and 1970 as amended and the Rules made thereunder in 1964 and 1970 as required by law — it used to be by the Letters Patent and Royal Instructions — we do not even discuss the salaries which have been approved under a Civil Establishment Order; those salaries are not in the Appropriation Bill because those salaries would have already been fixed by law.

So when we come to the Appropriation Bill, which is required also by the Constitution that we should come for in the Estimates — we come for

the unvoted part of the Estimates of Expenditure for the ensuing year and not for those which have been fixed by law, which is the Civil Establishment Act. I want to establish this very, very clearly. So whether you reach agreement or whether you do not reach agreement you have to come to the Legislature to vote money for the established staff.

Now let us look at the position with the unestablished staff. Before you can pay any money out of the Treasury of Barbados you have to have the approval of the Legislature and such sums as are voted must be spent in the manner indicated and approved by the Legislature, and not otherwise. So that even today we are coming for amendments to Notes because there is a slight variation and from time to time we come to the House, because financial control in this country is very, very rigid. In little Montserrat a Minister can sign a special warrant for \$240,000 without going to the Legislature; and various other Islands of the Lesser Antilles have this kind of practice. This is not the case in Barbados. We cannot sign any special warrant. No Minister can even sign a warrant for his own salary. That is done by the Clerk of the Legislature, and no Minister even sees the cheque for his salary until it is returned by the Bank at the end of a period. As a matter of fact I think if his cheque is paid by the Clerk of the Legislature it is probably returned to the Clerk of the Legislature when it is drawn.

So this idea that Ministers can sit down and write out cheques is not correct. No Minister can write a cheque for anything in Barbados, neither can they spend a penny of any money which has not been fixed and ordained by the Legislature, neither can the Accountant General pay out any money to any casual worker or anybody else unless the House of Assembly approves.

Now let me cast my mind back — my mind had been there for a long time till 1968 — and let us draw the analogy now of collective bargaining in the private sector where the Government and the Minister of Finance is not involved at all. I want this repeated on the record. In 1968 the workers' organization and the Sugar Producers Federation of Barbados were locked in mortal combat over the wages — I cannot remember whether they were out-of-crop or in-crop wages, but they were wages for sugar workers. I think they were both, but specifically they related to the starting of the crop in 1968, and the usual time came around for the commencement of the crop and no conclusion or agreement had been arrived at between the two parties, the union on the one side substantially

representing the workers in the industry and the Sugar Producers claiming on their side to represent the sugar plantation and factory interests of this Island.

The commencement and successful completion of a sugar crop is vital to the economy of Barbados, and after a delay of two or three weeks in the commencement of the crop — I am not going to say now that somebody came to me; I am not trying to attribute responsibility, I am not going to say that I went to them because I certainly did not go to them, — but I had a meeting with each side, to this dispute in 1968, and they told me there was no possibility of an agreement between them, and after I saw them I got in touch with them — I am not saying that I did not necessarily see them — I said since you have not been able to reach any agreement I wish to inform you that I will have to take appropriate action to see that the economy of Barbados is not ruined by your failure to reach agreement through the normal process of collective bargaining.

12.30 p.m.

There is no law, except the Wages Council Act, dealing with specific areas in the commercial sector chiefly which gives any Government authority to fix wages in any industry in this island. The Legislature of course is paramount and can pass any law at any time which it considers in the national interest, and over the week end — you will remember as a representative of a rural constituency, I am sure you will — I went on the public media, that is, on television and radio, and I had a blackboard and I explained to the general public what wages were being paid in the sugar industry to various categories of workers. I explained that the two bodies responsible for collective bargaining had failed to reach agreement, and I wrote out on the blackboard the wages which I thought should be paid, and I told the general public that I was going to the Legislature on Tuesday and have a Bill enacted not only to fix those as the minimum wages in agriculture but also for the first time in the history of any Caribbean country to give agricultural workers a guaranteed weekly wage, that is, that they would be out of crop entitled to be paid whether work was available or not, provided they turned up in the factory yard or plantation yard and made themselves ready and available for work. I also cited the case of the dock workers under Mr. Ernest Bevin way back in the 1920s, how this guaranteed weekly wage was applied because the dockers during the depression were turning up day after day, week after week at the dock gate and they were being told that there was no work available. If you

want to stabilise a labour force, I explained, it was vital that the people who were there ready and willing to work should be fed while the canes were growing, because the employers made the profit at the end anyhow, and therefore while the canes were growing they should be fed whether the employers wanted to put them to work or not.

What I wish to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, is this. Although there was no legal authority at that time for me or anybody else to fix wages between two private parties, as it were, in the private sector, the Legislature unanimously approved — this Legislature in 1968 — the Minimum Wage and Guaranteed Employment Act of 1968, the Bill as it then was, it was unanimously carried in the Other Place with representatives of the Sugar Producers in the Other Place, and nobody at that time said that the Prime Minister had abandoned the principle of collective bargaining by passing legislation where the law did not require legislation to be passed. That Act is still on the Statute Book and it is still the minimum wage in agriculture, and we have changed the guaranteed week from three days to five days a week which is the same as we have in the public service, a five day week, but only thing in the agricultural sector the five days are guaranteed whether there is work or not. The difference between the agricultural sector and the public service is that they are guaranteed five days year in, year out, month in month out, whether they work or not, not whether the work is there, the work is always available, but it is whether they work or not they are guaranteed, but in agriculture they have to be ready and willing to work and if the work is not there because the rain falls then the employer still has to pay them because the canes are growing when the rain is falling, although the workers are not working, but the crop is being added to due to the fact that the rain is falling. I don't think I could put it any more simply than that.

What I am emphasising is this. Nobody can get any revised salaries unless we come to the Legislature; it is impossible, no matter whether I agree with what they want or whether I don't agree. I just want to stress that. The point is, when do I come? If as Minister of Finance after 18 meetings with various bodies, four plus two with the Barbados Workers' Union and the other 12 scattered all over the rest of them — I really did not come in here with what time the meetings started, when they ended, how many meetings — I had 18 meetings altogether with the various bodies. If at the end of a certain time it is clear that it is not possible for the Government, having the general interest of the

community and the taxpayers at heart, to be so irresponsible as to accede to the minimum requests made by the representatives of the public workers, if at the end of that, is there some magic in numbers that you must hold seven meetings or three more meetings, or 49 more meetings? My understanding of the situation is that I have made up my mind based on the realities confronting this country today, you can call me the employer, but I am only the representative of the other taxpayers in the island, I am the representative of the employers, call me the General Secretary of the taxpayers, and I was confronted by the Presidents and General Secretaries of the public workers, therefore if on their behalf I decide that there is nothing more to be done, I am not sending to England — excuse my using the phrase — for any white gentleman in a top hat to come down here and tell the Minister of Finance of Barbados what we must do in an independent country. That is what they had under the Labour Party.

Let me call the names. G. H. Adams, not the late Prime Minister of the Federation, but a gentleman from England, and the public workers paid him more respect than they have ever paid the former Prime Minister of the West Indies Federation. You should have seen them bowing and scraping and forming fours and saluting, and when you heard them, especially the top ones, — I know because some of them, I regret to say, are related to me, and some of them are friends of mine. Some of my best friends are public officers. I used to be a public officer myself but not in that era, fortunately for me, I had graduated from that unhappy state of affairs by that time — but if you had seen them performing, and when they went around with the book and said Adams said this and Adams said that, they weren't referring to the Premier, you know, oh no, they were referring to Mr. G. H. Adams who was sent down here as Salaries Commissioner, and not one of them challenged what Mr. Adams said. Do you know what Mr. Adams was giving them? Seven cents, 8½ cents and in some cases 11 cents, but if you check carefully through the Salaries Commissions you will find that the Salaries Commissions, being the kind of people that they were, let me name them. Adams, Godsall, Gardner-Brown, Puisinelli, and somebody else's name I really can't call to mind now. These are the ones when I was in the Legislature starting back in the sixties or late fifties. Gardner-Brown, Adams, Puisinelli, Godsall and Jacobs. The only one they didn't have was Joseph, because Jacob must have stolen his coat, but what really used to bother me was the kind of reverence and the sort of obsequious way in which they said "Oh, well, Gardner-Brown said

so-and-so, you know; Mr. Jacobs said so-and-so," and I have never had any demonstration against either the principle of somebody coming down from England like they come from Mount Olympus and dictating to public officers what they should have. No remonstrance, nothing at all, and what used to happen was that the then Government would bring the report in here and ask you to approve the report, invariably without the slightest amendment.

12.40 p.m.

They never used to discuss anything with any unions. The only thing they used to promise to do was to appoint an Anomalies Committee so that the top civil servants, who did not like what you were paying to another top civil servant in another Department or sector of the Public Service, would be able to have his salary readjusted in order to preserve what they called relativities of salaries (*Asides*). I am telling you what are facts.

Now this is what used to happen under them. There was no equal pay for female workers in the Government Service. We introduced that. They said in 1958 that when vacancies occurred on the staff of the Grammar School, the vacancies need not be filled by teachers of the highest qualifications. When Mr. Tommy Miller came in here and exposed a gentleman called Mr. Adey in respect of the discrimination which they were exercising at Queen's College in respect of his daughter, they threatened to expel Mr. Tommy Miller from the Party.

When we asked for the guaranteed employment of the sugar workers, we came in here and asked for it, and they said that a Commission should be set up to find out whether the employers could afford to pay the workers for a 5-day week. In 1958, when we had a strike, they openly sided with the sugar producers, and advised the workers to go back to work. A gentleman called Mr. Cox went up to Government House and asked the then Governor if he could not issue a warrant for the arrest of Mr. Crawford, Mr. Tudor, Mr. Brancker, and Mr. Barrow. That is how they looked after the interest of the workers! (*Asides*.) So that was destabilising! I see. But Sir Robert Arundell had the good sense — I forgot to mention the late revered Mr. T. T. Lewis was also honoured by being amongst those that they wanted to arrest — to ask them to put this request in writing and, probably, the reason we were not arrested for defending the cause of the sugar workers was that

that information was not forthcoming in writing.
(*Asides.*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Your time will come, I hope, to reply.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, let us examine the mentality of the people we are dealing with who profess to be the champions of the underprivileged and the workers in this Island. I have now prepared a list of 156 pieces of labour and social legislation introduced by this Government, which I want to send to the ILO and show them how far in advance we are ahead of them. Let us examine the mentality now of the people who profess to speak on their behalf. I was horrified when we introduced a Resolution in this House condemning the action of the South African Government at Sharpeville — we now hear about Soweto — but those of us who have been involved in this business know that Sharpeville was the first massacre. The representative for the parish of St. James, and not the present representative, a gentleman called Mr. Belfield Searle, his contribution on behalf of the Labour Party to the debate was that they should not have shot the Africans and that flogging would have been enough. Here we are protesting and sending something up to the Secretary of State...

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. The Rules say that you should not criticise persons unless Your Honour has been made aware of the person's name in advance. Has your Honour been made aware of an attack on Mr. Belfield Searle?
(*Asides.*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Everything has been going very nicely, so please be calm.

Mr. ADAMS: That is an exceptionally bad thing to say about a man. I am on a point of order, Sir.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: He castigated Commissioner Reid, so he is an authority on it.

Mr. ADAMS: When I wanted to attack Mr. George Reid, I wrote you and told you that I was going to do it. If the Prime Minister wants to attack Mr. Belfield Searle, he should write and tell you so. I do not believe that Mr. Belfield Searle said that. I challenge the Prime Minister to produce the debate in which it was said.

Mr. SPEAKER: Take your seat! (*Asides.*) I said to be silent. Do you not respect the Chair any more? I will tell him when to read it, and if he does not read it I will send him out. I will

send out anybody who disobeys regardless of who he is today. Let us have some order, and let the Prime Minister continue.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: There are a lot of things the hon. member does not believe, but we are categorising them for him chapter and verse. I was in here and he was not even in the Island. With regard to compensation for workers who were fatally injured — this is how they represented the workers — I tried to change the Workmen's Compensation Act from \$1,800.00 to \$10,000.00 in the case of fatal accidents. They voted against that. In the first instance, they curtailed the debate, and me and the Speaker at that time had a row outside and not in here, because he said that I was finished talking when I was in full force. At about one o'clock in the morning he curtailed the debate. I came back and they voted against it. This is how the workers were represented.

Now, all of this mealy-mouthed hypocrisy that we are hearing about Barbados and about collective bargaining from people who do not know the first thing about trade unionism has to be examined very critically, and we are examining it critically. My Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act to change the compensation from \$1,800.00 to \$10,000.00 was voted against and, when we challenged them on the grounds for which they voted against it, they said it would increase Government's liability as an employer of labour. Now, the most fatal accidents that we ever had in Barbados in one year was seven. In any one year two were Government employees, the maximum. This was vigorously opposed by the Opposition. I remember one of the first Bills that we passed when we came in here in 1961 was not to increase it to \$10,000.00 but to increase it to \$12,000.00; so we got our opportunity. I could go through a whole list, but the reason why I am doing this now is very simple.

12.50 p.m.

I want you to examine who is really representing the workers in this country. I invite the hon. member for St. Michael West to cast his mind back to the battles we had to fight on behalf of the workers. Let us take the same Deep Water Harbour in the south of the Island and then I am going to move up to Harrison's Point in the north of the Island. The Government refused to allow Richard Costain who was building the Harbour to pay wage rates higher than those obtaining in the public service in Barbados during the construction of the Harbour. I say that categorically. And I go further now.

The General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union was a member of the Committee on the Deep Water Harbour. Ask him whether the Barbados Labour Party did not insist during the construction of the Harbour that work on Saturdays and on Sundays should not carry overtime rates, and let him get up and deny that. Let us see who is on the side of the workers.

Let us go now to Harrison's Point in the north. I came into the Other Place week after week arguing the case for my clients on the conveyance to the Admiralty for Harrison's Point before the place was taken over. I know a lot about that and I think I will be in on the negotiations later on when the place reverts to its rightful owners, that is, the people of Barbados; but more of that later. We are dealing now with labour. When the Naval authorities, the negotiations being complete, took occupation and the C. Bs who did the construction work had departed, they objected to the Naval Facility paying the workers down there at the wage levels which were laid down in their specifications for U.S. workers. I want to say this in extension. I am the devil's advocate now; I am going to plead their case. I want to say they are not the only West Indies Government who did this. Nearly in every West Indian Government, including the Antigua Government which was a Labour Government, that had U.S. workers, the Colonial Office told the Governments down here not to allow the U.S. authorities to pay U.S. wages because it would disrupt the economy, although they were ready and willing and strictly speaking by Congressional Act they were supposed to pay those wages. And do you know how they got around it? The hon. member for St. Andrew can tell you how the U.S. authorities legally got around it. They have contracted one man. The hon. member for St. Peter knows about this too. They pay the money to one Barbadian. Right or wrong? (Mr. HINDS: Yes; Mr. Armstrong.) I am not saying anything derogatory. They give the money to Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Armstrong then deploys the money at Barbadian wage levels because if they did not do that they would be breaking the U.S. Congressional law. I am telling you that that Government over there when they were in power forbade the U.S. authorities from paying the proper wage levels to Barbadian workers, and now they are coming in here and talking about a few teachers that get five months holiday a year and saying they are representing them.

I want to ask them a simple question. When did your interest in the working class in Barbados begin? It certainly did not begin when we brought in a Bill for peaceful picketing because they voted against that too. Ask the hon. member who is now their comrade in arms all of a sudden. At least he has a job to perform and we understand his predicament, and I would like to say that this is a democratic society and we have a free vote on this matter. We have a free vote on members' salaries because I do not vote on that at all and there is nobody that could convince me that I should come in here and have anything to do with any legislation to increase salaries for Parliamentarians, myself or any Minister of Government. From 1951 I have never been in here; as soon as they start discussing it I leave because I did not come in here for that. But this is a free vote. Anybody can vote any way they want. I realise the predicament of certain members, but their interest in the working class did not start then. It is of very recent vintage.

Now I would like to say this. I recognise that these different organisations are vying for membership. They have, strange to relate, annual elections and only the position perhaps of the two members, the hon. member for St. Michael West and the hon. member for St. Lucy are assured because they have the confidence of their membership, but the rest of them are birds of passage, and in order to get elected President, General Secretary or whatever of those organisations, they have to try to convince their constituencies which are the public officers that they claim to represent that they are claiming for them more than other people are claiming. They have nothing to do with the economy of Barbados. They have nothing to do with the taxpayers of Barbados or the level of taxation in this country, and they also happen to know that on several occasions I as Minister of Finance, in my own right, as a member of this House and as a taxpayer have said that I consider the level of personal taxation in the economy of Barbados high enough because we as a country and a community are not saving in the private sector, and we are not saving in the public sector, and you cannot expect to get savings out of the private sector if you increase taxation, and therefore making it very difficult for people to save and more difficult for them to meet the increased cost of living.

Now if they know, and they know, that personal taxes and corporate taxes account for, let us say, approximately 25% of our total Government revenue and a considerable portion

comes from the Common External Tariff to which we are committed, the only thing you can go and do is to increase consumption taxes. You can of course within the context of the Community Agreement increase personal tax and corporate tax, but the effective level of corporate tax in Barbados is 52% and our personal income tax goes up to 65%, that is, on assessable incomes of over \$24,000 a year. Where is the money to come from? Who shall I turn to? I think that when these people make these inordinate demands on the Government that they are just playing politics. I am talking now particularly of the people who are the teachers. Don't forget that these same people who represent the teachers, or some of them because I would not like to say every single one of them, when we set up the Community College said that the salaries at the Community College were too high. Do you remember that, Mr. Speaker? They said it was ridiculous to pay these kinds of salaries because they did not want for political reasons the Community College to succeed, because they were Sixth Form addicts and they felt that the Community College meant the immediate liquidation of all Sixth Forms throughout the Island, and that has not taken place up to now; but they bitterly opposed it. I am not going to call names, but some of the same ones who came in to see me came in to see me at the time when we set up the Community College and they argued then that the salaries we were paying to the tutors at the Community College were too high, and now they are saying that the salaries are too low. Now you cannot approbate and reprobate; you cannot approve and disapprove. That is the legal man's way of saying you cannot approve and disapprove. You either have to approve, disapprove or keep quiet, but you cannot approve and disapprove at the same time. But you see, they approve and disapprove because they believe in the classic saying that the people of Barbados have short memories, and therefore at one time if it suits them politically to say one thing, they will say one thing, and at another time if it suits them to say the opposite, they will go and say the opposite.

There is just one thing I should like to add which I think I mentioned before when I was discussing the Civil Establishment Order and it is in respect of the grammar schools. Now at the moment we have in the secondary school system several Boards and so on, Governing Bodies. The old Education Act set up Governing Bodies for what they called the first grade schools and gave the legislature power to introduce schemes for the

establishment and rules for the management of any new schools, and the classic example is Grassfield or St. Michael Girls' School which was established at the insistence of the Vestry of the parish of St. Michael and particularly the late Mr. John Beckles.

1.00 p.m.

The old schools which were First Grade schools all had sixth forms, and because they had sixth forms, the headmaster of those schools have traditionally received higher remuneration than the headmasters and headmistresses of the newer secondary schools and what can be described as the Second Grade schools. What we have done now is to bring the Comprehensive Schools and all the schools on to the same level. In the new classification exercise all of these posts have been upgraded. Nobody has been downgraded except, I think, one post of Deputy Head; but the salary is higher, anyhow, with the salary revision.

As I have said, after consultation and discussion on the reclassification, as long as there are sixth forms in any of these schools, the Heads of those schools will continue to draw higher emoluments; but when they cease to have sixth forms and only have fifth forms they will be only entitled to the same salary as the Heads of the Comprehensive Schools and the schools traditionally described as Second Grade Schools.

I do not see anything wrong in that. This was the big issue raised by representatives of the secondary school teachers when I had meetings with them. As a matter of fact, they misrepresented the position of the Chief Establishment's Officer to the extent that they accuse him of saying that Head Teachers of the First Grade schools would no longer receive a different salary, which was a complete misrepresentation. I fortunately had the Cabinet's decision. I do not often disclose what we say in Cabinet, but I was coming to the House anyhow and I said that I do not care what the Chief Establishments Officer said, or what they thought that he had said — and I know that he is a most careful officer — their fears will have to be allayed because that is the position. That was the big issue at that time.

I have already dealt with the cost of living elements of this exercise, but there are other things. People try to compare what the Government is doing with what is happening in the private sector. It is all right to talk about the Transport Board, but you cannot say what is happening in each and every firm in Bridgetown, because conditions vary from firm to firm and from industry to industry. If you are going to

compare what is happening outside of the Government, the biggest employer of labour in Barbados must be the garment industry; but you never hear public officers representatives say let us compare our wages with those in the garment industry because they know that the wages in the garment industry are not so spectacular.

They tell you about the Transport Board driver getting more than a policeman. Let us examine this. The Police Association did not raise this. They are more sensible. A bus driver is a bus driver. They say that a rose is a rose is a rose. The only thing a rose can change from being a rose is a dead rose. When a man goes to drive a bus, unless he emigrates he stays in this occupation. He is a bus driver, and he remains a bus driver. There is no Permanent Secretary among bus drivers. There is no senior Assistant Secretary bus driver. There is no Assistant Secretary bus driver. There is no Chief Secretary bus driver. When you pay a bus driver \$130 or \$140 a week he cannot have any prospect of graduating upper unless he changes his occupation. So you cannot compare him with a youngster entering the Civil Service at 18 with three or four O' Levels and say how you can pay a bus driver more money than you pay him; because his salary is incremental anyhow, and if he has better qualifications he will get more money.

The same thing applies to policemen. A policeman gets additional increments from the start for every certificate that he has. If he has five certificates, he might get nearly \$500 a month. The same thing applies to a primary school teacher. There is no point in telling me that the Transport Board is saying this or that and that we are less counting clerical officers and policemen, because it is not relevant.

Further, I want to draw to your attention that a youngster entering the Civil Service with O'Levels gets his steady increments. A police constable starting at \$420 a month gets increments up to nearly \$800 or about \$750 or something like that. He goes steadily up, and by the time that he gets up there, his salary is nearly doubled because he might have had two or three salary revisions.

The youngster entering the clerical grade or the police constable has opportunities for going abroad, taking training, going to a university, all provided for by the Government under the Training Scheme Fund. Where does the bus driver go? One bus driver came to me the other morning and said that he went away and that when he came back his job was gone. So I had to get vexed with him. I asked him if he thought

that we could hold a job for him when he went on a spree. He said that he did not go on a spree, he went away to cut canes. I said you cannot walk in and walk out like that, because what of the fellow who was doing your job? I said you know I can talk to the General Secretary too when I get ready. I said the trouble with you is that you went up there to break the people's contract and then picked up a lady to marry her and they hustled you back out of the USA, and you want me to ring up the manager and tell him to find a job for you. It does not work that way. You have to take your chance alongside the other people. There are other people queuing up for these jobs. You cannot just walk in and out.

A person can do that in the Civil Service today. Under my dispensation as Minister in charge of Establishments, we have made it possible for persons to walk out of the Government Service, walk back in, walk out again and run back in, run out and crawl back in and their pension rights are guaranteed all the time. Look at all the things they get. They get leave passages. No private employer normally pays anybody leave passages. No bus driver gets leave passages.

Up to a couple of years ago, when Civil Servants retired they drew non-contributory pensions from the Government plus a gratuity and then National Insurance. As a matter of fact they still do. The casual workers are only entitled to National Insurance benefits, so we will have to increase their level of pensionable emoluments so as to ensure that casual workers are in a no less favourable position than before when they were entitled to casual workers pensions.

In other words, if they got two-thirds of their average earnings provided they had worked for over two years and the salary is now \$100 a week, when they retire they will not get more than \$60; but as a result of this salary revision, casual workers will be getting more than \$100 a week and then we will have increased the minimum of National Insurance benefits.

1.10 p.m.

I do not really know — apart from everybody wanting more, of course — any other arguments about the teachers other than the Headmasters and so on of the senior secondary schools, that I will have to deal with. Anything that I might have said before in the Civil Establishment Order in general applies to the teachers, and anything that I say about the teachers applies *mutatis mutandis* to the general Civil Establishment Order. So the arguments are the same.

As far as the quantum of the increase is concerned, I think they are very lucky here in Barbados, and I hope that we will not run out of our luck, and, I beg to move that this Order do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I will have to make a reply to some of the things that the Prime Minister said because as he said, this is a free country; we helped to make it a free country, but there are some statements he made that I am bound to correct. He spoke about comrade in arms. I have to remind the Honourable Prime Minister, I could never be a comrade in arms with the Leader of the Opposition because I have been fighting the Leader of the Opposition and his party for too many years consecutively and therefore we could not be comrade in arms. We cannot be comrades.

Now the Hon. Prime Minister spoke about 1956, and that was a water-shed year for me. The Prime Minister himself should remember that we were the two arch enemies of the party over on the other side and I do not see how he could speak about comrade in arms. His memory is getting short. I was the Chairman of the Deep Water Harbour, not in 1956. In 1956 the Labour Party was opposing me every inch of the way and were putting forward proposals.

Now I must make my position clear. The Hon. Prime Minister spoke about membership. The Barbados Workers Union was not interested in membership in these proposals. Last year when the Government was asked to give a cost of living bonus to public servants the Barbados Workers Union said we had an agreement with the Government and the agreement was for three years and we were going to send forward our proposals when that agreement expired. So if we were trying to play to the gallery and look for membership we would have done that, but we did not. We do not go poaching anybody membership.

On the 29th December, 1975, we sent forward proposals to the Chief Establishments Officer. He replied acknowledging our letter on the 5th January. On the 4th March the first meeting was held with the Chief Establishments Officer; on the 9th March the Chief Establishments officer sent a letter offering the Union 25% and 10%, and a second meeting was held on the 16th March and we refused that proposal. We said we were not accepting it. We said we did not understand what was meant by 'interim', bottom and top too big, there was not

a precise statement, and we said we had different proposals. On the 24th March the Chief Establishments Officer amended his proposals and sent forward different proposals to the Union. On the 26th March a third meeting was held indicating our position. We amended our position then and we told the Chief Establishments Officer at that meeting on the 26th March that we would be prepared to accept a proposal of 35% in the first year and 60% in the second year for those earning up to \$100 per week. Those were our proposals.

On the 28th March we held a general meeting explaining our position to those workers we represented. On the 2nd April the Chief Establishments Officer increased his offer and he made an offer of 35% in the first year and 50% in the second year and another proposal of 12% and 20%. On the 7th April, we had the fourth meeting with the Chief Establishments Officer and he promised to review the position of the Union.

On the 12th March, we received a letter from the Chief Establishments Officer stating that the Minister does not consider that the Government can meet the cost level of the increases. On the 15th April, the Barbados Workers Union stated that the Executive Council was unable to accept — I am saying all of this in chronological order to let it be known how we worked it. On the 27th April, we received a letter requesting the Barbados Workers Union to meet the Prime Minister. This was the first time I was meeting the Prime Minister in these negotiations. This is what I told him at the meeting and I am going to repeat it. These are notes prepared by the Prime Minister's office and I would take it that he has seen them. The Barbados Workers Union — This is a meeting dated the 5th May, the last time I met the Prime Minister on this matter. The one and only time. We only had two meetings. The second time I was not in the Island. "Mr. Walcott said that his Union represented workers in the key scale and he did not understand how he could be invited to discuss salaries with other unions and associations who represented different categories of workers. He said that his proposals were not based on any desire to compete for membership or on Union propaganda but they were based on the level of the wages being paid in the country."

1.20 p.m.

This is a meeting where no public can hear what we are saying, so when it comes to be revealed now you can't accuse the Union of looking for membership. "He could not in fairness to the workers and to his Union accept an offer of less than 60% in the second year." He expressed the view that if the Government was

stand in Fairchild Street, and we have been standing there for the last 30 years running our own affairs. That is where we stand. On any issue we stand on the side of fair play and justice. We do not have to make any apology on this side. With what I have stated before the Prime Minister, the Prime Minister would not only regard me as a coward, but as a convulsed clown to come before him and tell him this is where the unions stand and when the matter comes down here to vote for it. You would have to be a convulsed clown. You would not have any self-respect. There is such a thing as self-respect or dignity that you do not sell in a drug store like phensic. You can buy a bottle of phensic, but you cannot buy a bottle of self-respect. You cannot buy integrity and you cannot buy courage. If you used to buy courage as you would buy tablets, everybody would have courage. You do not get it that way. You either have it, or you do not have it. If you do not have it, then they cannot inject you with it. Even when they dope the horses the horses go to sleep as soon as the dope runs out.

I want the hon. members on the other side and even the Press to understand that the Opposition would have to vote with me, because we preceded them with our negotiations. They have not sent any proposals to anybody. This is a political area, and the matter has reached here. I agree with the Hon. Prime Minister that you have to come here eventually, but the Hon. Prime Minister knows that this is the area for ratification and not the area for negotiation. Long ago for that reason he has agreed, and we gave the Government credit for agreeing, that we set up methods of negotiations that were superior to the old-fashioned Salaries Commission.

I refused to attend the last Salaries Commission meeting that was held here because I said I did not have any time to waste. We met the Chief Establishment Officer and we negotiated. In here it is a matter of ratification. I said that the Hon. Prime Minister did not reach the stage in the negotiations that could be said that there was no other course. You cannot carry a matter from the Prime Minister to the Chief Labour Officer.

Now, the Prime Minister mentioned what he had done in other areas where he had acted in the capacity of a mediator, but he is not now in the capacity of a mediator. He is in the capacity of one of the main parties in the dispute. We appreciate that when you have finished at that level you have finished, but I could not consider from the meeting that we had on the 5th May that, when the Prime Minister said we would hear

from him, we would not have heard from him for six weeks.

1.40 p.m.

When we heard from the Prime Minister again, we heard that he proposed to come to the House of Assembly with his proposals. If the Prime Minister had at the last meeting been told that we would take back the proposals and when he heard from us again we said our position would be that there would be no work from the next day, he would say this is a very peculiar way of dealing with it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has two more minutes to conclude.

Mr. WALCOTT: I subscribe to the view that collective negotiations and collective bargaining must form the cornerstone of our industrial democracy in this country, because Barbados is a predominantly wage-earning society. We have to have a system where we can sit down and negotiate because it has kept this country from the violence and the industrial warfare that plagued some of our sister territories. Maturity and commonsense has prevailed at the level of industrial negotiations. And this is not the first time we have negotiated with the Government either. You must remember that we met the Government three years ago and we reached an agreement on an agreed basis, so we are not now introducing any new facet.

I have stated that I cannot support these proposals because all of them form part of the same proposals that the Government has rejected, and for that reason I cannot support them.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I believe it is very well agreed that the main issue before us today is the question of the state of the country's economy, because we have been told what it can bear and what it cannot. It must be accepted, however, that the Minister of Finance has so mishandled the financial crisis which faced this country from some time in 1973 up to the present, that we find ourselves in this situation. The Government in our view should have tried to consult with all sectors of the community, let us say, the businessmen, the Trade Union and the workers generally, and this ought to have been done at as early a stage as possible so that we might have been able then to arrive at what we would call a voluntary wage restraint. Had this been done, we believe that the wisdom of bringing into effect a strong or vigorous prices policy would have prevailed.

I want to say here that it is known that the Barbados Workers' Union has been calling for

some time for a national economic commission and urged that it be comprised of the various sectors of the community, and that the purpose of this commission would have been to monitor the state of the economy and maintain a continuing dialogue concerning the economic problems as seen by the various sectors. That, Mr. Speaker, was totally rejected by the Minister of Finance in this country. Instead, what we witnessed or were forced to witness was that the Minister of Finance took advantage of the rise in sugar prices; and what did he do with this; he sought to bring into effect nothing more than short term measures, but you will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that short term measures, while they may have some effect at the particular time, the timing often conflicts because it is when one sees these short term measures appear to bear fruit that the neglect is brought into play where long term planning is concerned. You will find, Mr. Speaker, this sort of sweet-mouthing that you get of having this free give-away Christmas type bonuse and that kind of nonsense.

Having failed to institute successful long term measure the Government in 1976 finds itself in worse financial straits than it found itself throughout the period 1973-1975. I doubt the Minister of Finance would try to deny this.

Now as for the salary negotiations, we are witnessing today that the Government is sacrificing the salary negotiations and merely tailoring them to the election requirements of the Democratic Labour Party. It is know, Mr. Speaker, that the Government would of necessity have what we would call an election time-table and by hook or crook money must be in the hands of the public servants during the month of July; so it must mean that regardless of what is coming, regardless of how the public servants look at it or how you or I look at it — I should not say you, Mr. Speaker, because you have said that you would not be in it — regardless of what any of us may have to say, this election time-table means that negotiations hanging fire for too long have got to be completed at such and such a date, hence we do not have any more time at the bargaining table, and we will come to the Legislature.
1.50 p.m.

You will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that nobody can say that justice appears even to have been done. In the negotiations with the National Union of Public Workers the Government has found itself, as we have heard already in the role of employer, negotiator and then as judge in so vital a matter. This, we say, is the essence of dictatorship, a thing which we would hope to rid

this country of and never see it raise its ugly head.

The views of the Secretary of the Barbados Union of Teachers are well known on this matter because he rightly suggested that the moment that the Government found that it could not reach an agreement with the several negotiators, the matter should have been submitted to an independent arbitrator. (Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is a big joke). We understand that it is a big joke, but the Minister of Finance very well realises his true position in this matter.

The Minister of Finance took us for an excursion this morning; but I believe that the Minister of Finance in this whole matter dealing with teachers and their salaries, whether they get five months vacation or not, he will truly have earned his 30 pieces of silver, Sir. Mr. Speaker, the undemocratic system of forcing legislation on the people — that is what has brought us here today — without the consent and without request is a signal to teachers.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, the debate on the constitutional changes. You will remember, Sir, the Education Act; and now we are legislating for these salary revisions. You know and I know that this way of negotiating salaries is setting a serious precedent, and that if the private sector finds themselves following the pattern set up by the Government where it will lead in this country. You will find, Mr. Speaker, that what the Government is now doing is setting a pattern for blood to flow in the streets of this country. That is what we charge. The Government, by its action today, is seeking to create as much disturbance in the industrial sector of this country as one could ever want to hear about or see.

This cannot be denied. You know, Mr. Speaker, that we have to look at this whole pattern. It is that the Government in truth and in fact is imposing a defactor wages policy on a single sector in this community.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If the hon. member would give way.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member completed his speech?

Mr. HINDS: No, Sir, but I will give way.

Hon. C. E. TALMA; Mr. Speaker, we have reached the time for recess. It is now 2 o'clock. I beg to move that the sitting be now suspended for 45 minutes.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

2 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the Sitting was suspended the hon. member for St. Peter was speaking.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the luncheon break was taken I was making the point that the Government by its present course of action has sought fit to impose a defactor wages policy on one sector of the workers in the public service, that is, the public servants. Now we have got to agree, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the trade union constitutes on the planks of democracy as we have seen it and know it to work in the West Indies. The Government of this country has already eroded many of the planks of freedom which the people of this country have a right to enjoy.

I have before my mind, Sir, the passing of the Public Order Act. I also have before my mind — and this come forcibly to mind, Sir — the Constitutional Amendment and the debate thereon. What is now taking place, Mr. Deputy Speaker, brings us further to the point of Government threatening to erode the rights of workers to negotiate for wages. That is the point at issue; that the Government is seeking to erode further the right of workers via the trade union to negotiate for better wages.

The hon. member for St. Michael West made the point that they are satisfied that they put up proposals that were reasonable. This brings us, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to making a thorough and compassionate study of the industrial operations in this country as we know them. It brings us, Mr. Deputy Speaker, into telling ourselves, seeing for ourselves and realizing not what the Prime Minister sought to make us to believe as a new interpretation to collective bargaining as he sees it, because he sees it that collective bargaining means for some people, that you agree to what they demand, meaning in this case that the Government is expected to agree to what the trade union demands on behalf of the workers.

He went on to enunciate a policy in which he said that you either arrive at an agreement or you fail to reach an agreement. These are fundamental issues, and coming from the mouth of the Minister of Finance, lend or add the

greatest weight thereto. They cannot be cast aside lightly, Sir. So it must mean, if the Government is seen to be successful in its present undertaking, that is by legislating in such an instance, it means henceforth that the power of the trade union is broken and the Government becomes the all-powerful. This, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we would not wish to see or to have in our community.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to be a little more specific about this whole matter. Let us look at what is contained in the proposal. You will come to agree with me that we have got to look at our educational system proper to see what it sets out to achieve, what it has achieved so far, and to see if there is not a very considerable amount of leeway yet to be made up. We must first look at the classification as at 1975 and we come firstly to the point of entry into the service via the recruit. It must be proposed that there ought to be an upgrading of the whole service and you will agree that in the teaching service provision must be made to attract persons of definite academic promise to the teaching service. There can be no doubt about that. If we are to have a service that is meaningful and a service upon which a system can really develop — because throughout there is an area of tremendous responsibility that is placed upon, what we call, the raw teacher and no one in his or her normal sense could suggest that what the raw recruit is expected to do could any longer be considered as routine work.

Now this confederation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is clearly acknowledged in the Establishment draft proposals 239A and B and indeed, Sir, the Establishment's draft proposals, if applied, would place the entire teaching service at a grave disadvantage in this recruitment programme. Nobody would wish to see this. Nobody would ever want to dream of this. After all, you recruit persons to the teaching service to perform, to function, and if you place obstacles in your own way of recruitment, then what can you expect or what do we expect in the long run?

So if we were to look at it in the broadest light we will have to see a revision in an upward direction when the union considers the proposals as contained at 239. Now we come then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the status of the primary group of teachers. You will find, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the necessity arises for the complete equation of primary headteachers with graduate teachers, and there is set out somewhere in the proposals what the maximum should be and what not. You will also discover, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the necessity arises for no longer to

have these number of grades at the headteacher level in the primary schools, and that they could in truth and in fact be reduced to two.

Now we again see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the upgrading of the whole of the qualified teacher structure must be undertaken, and I may say we will have to introduce a salary structure possibly beginning at \$502 with a maximum of \$606.

2.55 p.m.

It has been further suggested that with the maximum after your qualifying bar be \$820 going up to \$916, and that this should be phased in over a three year period if we are really to find ourselves avoiding the overlapping with the graduate teachers on the staff as such.

There can be no justification whatever, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for any disparity between a graduate teacher and what we would call a manager of any school, secondary or primary, and certainly not a disparity which works against the primary Head Teacher. We would say that the reverse is more justifiable, and the existing disparity in all that we now witness is nothing more than a piece, I would say with the nature and more or less the fabric of the old colonial system, and this in itself, you will agree, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for you yourself have been in education for very many years, this will reflect the social stratification and the discrimination that there is in the whole system. You know as well as I do, Sir, that primary education in this country has never really enjoyed any status as such. There is the rhetorical lip service which is still very much in vogue, and we can't get away from this, and it has certainly not enjoyed status as such because it has never sought to provide adequate remuneration for the persons employed therein. When I say adequate remuneration for the persons employed therein, that is, bearing in mind the universal importance to the vast majority of our citizens. That is what primary education really means. It has a vital importance to the vast majority of our citizens.

We very well know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that secondary education was for many, many years the preserve of the sons and daughters of the former ruling classes. We know this, we do not seek to deny this, hence you will come to the wide disparity between the graduate teacher and all those personnel employed in the primary system in our schools. Why is it that our primary school system has failed up to the present to attract graduate teachers all along? This we would be glad if an explanation could be offered, but it

cannot be. It means therefore that the upgrading of our primary system must still be seen as of prime importance in this whole exercise. We have the post of Senior Teacher and we know the salary attached thereto, but there must be the provision of ancillary staff and additional teachers, because there will be the need, and the need has been established for additional teaching.

You also have much clerical work to be undertaken at the primary school level. You also have to make way for the non-teaching periods as such, and you also have the operations of our school meals programme. All of these are involved and involve personnel at the primary school level. These we must take into consideration. You also have primary school Head Teachers, you have Games Masters and Mistresses. You will have to place some of these on a travelling schedule as well, and I believe this would have to be assessed on an *ad hoc* basis in relation to the work load in the special circumstances. Ironically, the fact that primary education is of widespread importance and therefore involves a very large percentage of personnel has been used as a justification for poor remuneration, and this is allied to the poor status of all primary school workers. No doubt, Mr. Deputy Speaker, all factors taken into consideration from there demonstrate in no uncertain terms the ability to depress, and it would tend to represent itself to us that they conspire to depress the entire education area at the primary level.

3.05 p.m.

We believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the time has come for us to set about to redress the balance. We have it before us that the proposal of the union seeks full recognition. It sets out to achieve the following: It seeks full recognition of the responsibility factor in the Primary School Management and the consequent enhancement of Primary School status. It takes into consideration the importance — the career importance — of the qualified teacher who monopolises the primary sector. That is one of the points at issue, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It seeks to encourage graduates into the primary sector, and primary school careerists to pursue further studies of particular relevance to the needs of that.

We are not suggesting, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that teachers be provided with scholarships, and that they go abroad to whatever institutions there may be to pursue studies to gain better qualifications for better pay. What we are concerned with is that the course of study the teacher must pursue must bear some relation to what duties or functions that teacher is going to

perform in the particular sector when he or she returns to the classroom. What obtains at the present, Sir? You will find that many of these teachers get scholarships, and when some of them see that the scholarships are too far flung, they have to take their leave of the primary school teaching and leave. One has to bear in mind that it is the Teaching Service that we are discussing, and we cannot accept that a movement from primary to secondary in itself is promotion. It is not necessarily so in every case.

Now there is in the school a Senior Teacher. It is of the utmost importance that the responsibility of that teacher must be fully acknowledged. Failure to do this is to court disaster not necessarily in one institution, but to court disaster in a system of education in this country. We are urging that full recognition be given to the responsibility of the Senior Teacher in the system. Now, if we were to go to the number of grades at the Primary Head Teacher level and reduce them to two, this should only be brought about not as we are here debating the matter and that the Government is seeking to ram or force legislation down the throats of people without arriving at any consensus, or without reaching an agreement in any area whatsoever. We urge that the grades be reduced to two, but after consultation with the Head Teachers concerned. It must be after consultation and agreement. You do not want to say that you have reached an agreement by passing a letter from Establishment to the Head Teachers and leave it there, some replying and others not replying. They must meet around the table and reach an agreement. If this can be done I believe that we will be laying the foundation for eradicating what we would call "The Culture of Competition" amongst these Head Teachers in our primary schools. We would be seeking, in our view, to stabilise school management in the system.

The present system, it cannot be denied, merely seeks to lay a foundation where a Head Teacher's feet are in one school and his heart is in another school to which he hopes to be transferred at some point in time in his career. This proposal is also based on the proposal of the recognition of the common responsibility and a common workload, or the ratio thereto in the primary school system. I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that if we were to examine this matter we would find ourselves approaching the secondary group. We still have lingering somewhere the Puisinelli Report of 1969.

As for the secondary group, the proposal is for absolute equation of Head Teachers and Deputy Head Teachers in the newer secondary

schools with their counterparts in Sixth Form Grammar Schools. There, again, we have it as our authority the Puisinelli Report of 1969. But we go further, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because the necessity arises wherever a school has a population of 1,200 pupils or more there must be the creation of an addition post of Deputy Head Teacher to cope with the workload arising therefrom.

The National Union of Public Workers, I think I am right in saying, submitted memoranda on Division 1V in 1969 and 1971. I believe that the Ministry of Education showed some concern about this matter in 1974 with respect to having Deputy Head Teachers where the numbers in some of these schools exceeded a population of 1,200.
3.15 p.m.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, continuing this qualifications process we are concerned with the appointment of Heads of Departments and when we consider this for the provision of additional posts of Heads of Departments in individual subject disciplines and immediately the rationalisation of the general studies. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we see in the creation of new posts Secretary, Librarians, and you find the growing need for laboratory assistants. You cannot overlook the recruitment of additional domestic staff, nor can you disregard the requirements for groundsmen where they do not know exist, and this is something that must be urged upon the Government.

There is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the need for absolute equation of graduate teachers in our newer secondary schools with their counterparts in the older grammar schools, and this with all reference to conditions of leave. Now from its inception I understand that the Trade Union made it clear that the general studies area was impossible to comprehend within the framework of a department, and that the present unworkable arrangement was in no way dictated by any professional or academic criteria, but there again financial considerations were brought to bear. It was in no way that the necessity had arisen. The obvious need to improve on a system, to adequately equip a particular subject area, nothing at all like this was considered, mere financial consideration. I want to tell you that on declared Government policy, when one looks at what has been enunciated from time to time one has got to see that what obtains here in this sector, the discrimination here is possible and runs contrary to Government policy.

I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there must be what we call subject areas for education in our system so that we come to special posts in our educational system. The necessity arises for expanding the career scale for qualified teachers with specialist training, and it is being urged that this should be placed at the top of the senior teachers scale. There must in addition be a pensionable incentive. There must be some consideration given to the inconvenience of travelling by some of these officers, and I have before my mind teachers at the Deaf and Dumb Schools and institutions of that sort, because we believe that the consideration for travelling allowance should apply to all personnel below the level of Head Teacher. We would find too, Sir, that new posts would have to be created as well. You will also have to have a number of Deputy Head Teachers, but we urge that the Head Teacher at these institutions be equated to the top primary school grade. That is for consideration.

You will find, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what we call career cul-de-sacs in the teaching profession, because they lead to a dead end; there is no escape, no promotion after one reaches that point, and for the education of the deaf, dumb and blind and those seriously handicapped persons, you require teachers with special aptitudes and temperaments, and for these we feel that there should be fair and adequate consideration where the question of compensation is concerned, because it is not always easy to attract persons to these areas, and once having attracted them it is Government's responsibility to set out and retain them and not allow them to be drifting here and there because of better economic opportunities. Nobody would deny that the need has been established in this community for that type of teacher. Nobody would deny that the teacher functioning at these institutions has got to perform a very considerable amount of what we call welfare duties. His duty is not merely that of the teacher in the ordinary classroom; he has got to perform at the welfare and in particular the family guidance level, and when you think of a situation where the teachers at a single school for the Deaf at the Pine, St. Michael are drawn from nearly every parish in the community, we urge that these teachers ought to be given a special travelling allowance.

3.25 p.m.

We urge that since this is so, if you have your one school established at the time with teachers drawn from almost every parish, that these teachers should be given a special travelling allowance and they ought to be placed on the

same scale as teachers in other schools. Recommendations have been made in respect of this, but how far they have reached is an entirely different matter.

So we come now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to special posts in the system. These special posts cover such areas as domestic science teaching, commonly known as the Housecraft Centre. We have Industrial Art teachers and Fine Art teachers. You know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that these areas are areas of scarcity. This is a point that we must bear in mind, although the scarcity or depression in those areas is not quite as severe as in the case of the educational system for the deaf.

There are before us in addition to these industrial teachers and the like, the necessity for a principal and deputy principal of the Housecraft Centre for Domestic Science studies; and we urge that the same classification as that of the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic should apply. We urge, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there should be consideration for the instructors at the Housecraft centre.

I understand from the hon. member for St. Michael West that it was thought at one stage by the Government at Establishments level or Ministry of Finance level that some people did not understand the meaning of "interim" in the negotiations. However, Sir, the salary of the senior teacher as an interim measure, I understand has been under some sort of consideration.

The second consideration here is the application of the principle of equal pay for equal qualifications. There is no justification for any differential in remuneration amongst equally qualified teachers merely on the basis that they are placed in different institutions. If they are placed in different institutions, they are in different institutions under one educational system which operates in this country. Were it the case where a different responsibility factor applies, yes, Sir. We would have to support a differential in remuneration because responsibility and the work load might not be the same.

Now I think that our Industrial Art teachers, our instructors, should be on a par with those at the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic. At the career scale we urge that they should be at the top of the senior teachers scale barring the question of responsibility and work load. All specialist and non graduate personnel in Technical and Fine Arts or crafts and for your City and Guilds Certificates at the beginners scale should have incremental credit.

Now, on the matter of qualification, there is need for the Government to work out clear classification equivalents and a scheme for the assessment of technical qualifications in Arts and Sciences. We believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that Government has never wanted for a single moment to accord the teaching service their just due in the present circumstances.

It has been established beyond the shadow of a doubt that the proposals made by the Union to the Government were considered reasonable; and it is not merely that the negotiators at trade union level are saying that they are just and reasonable, but the whole public service sector is convinced that its cause is a just one; and the whole public sector is convinced that if this Government had been setting its priorities right there would have been considerable cut backs in our expenditure, and we could have avoided many wastes that have taken place, and that the economic situation would not have to be laid bare and held out on a platter for everyone not to take, but to see and examine that it is all bare bones without the flesh, and erosion in the management of our affairs, so that now mere bones are being offered to the public sector.

We have got to try to come to grips with the situation as it really presents itself. We have to see whether in truth and in fact the Government by its mismanagement of our financial affairs have now to enter before the Civil Servants a guilty plea and then turn and beg for mercy.

3.35 p.m.

The Government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, ought to be the last to find itself in the present predicament, but I believe that the Minister of Finance is prepared to lie down in his bed whether it is hard or soft, because he must content himself with the fact that it is he who has made it what it is. We cannot from this side of the House, Mr. Deputy Speaker, do anymore by way of teaching the Government how best to manage the affairs of this country. This is not the time for that. It is the time for the Government, in our view, to examine those areas of wastage — and they are all too well known to each and every one of us here, and thank God, to the public at large — because if we were to mention the wastage in our foreign service expenditure, it boils itself down in truth and in fact, to an unproductive exercise on behalf of the people of this country; and at what cost? A cost which we can no longer bear when we relate that expenditure to what is really coming into this country.

When you find an investor coming in, what is the investor really doing? For the most part

many investors are coming into this country, they are bringing into this country a lot of second hand machinery, they are charging in on their books at a very high price, and there is nobody in Barbados who has been appointed by Government up to the moment to carry out an appraisal, a true valuation of what these people call machinery, that is their input into the industry in this country, but they come here.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you dealing with the industry of education?

Mr. HINDS: Oh yes, Sir. What we are concerning ourselves with, Sir. We are concerning ourselves with the wasteful expenditure of the Government; the Government now holds out bare bones; no flesh, no blood. Bare bones they are holding out on the table before the teachers.

So what we are saying is this. You set up a foreign service to do nothing but invite bare bone investors to come here; and what are we doing in turn? We are borrowing the money from our banks, from our institutions, and helping them to carry on their establishments, all to their own benefit. Nothing, so to speak, to the benefit of the economy of this country; but as long as we take the taxpayers money — we give them all the incentives that you can give any investor in any part of the world; all the encouragement with the taxpayers' money; we do all sorts of things for them. How then if the money is wasted in these directions can the Government find money? But what does the Prime Minister tell us today? That a school teacher gets five months a year. Now this is to tell us that his reasoning that he has brought to the bargaining table is based on prejudice, to put it mildly, because he comes to the bargaining table with a prejudiced mind; not with an open mind to hear what the other side has to say, but he comes ready armed that whenever you are finished talking you hear it is five months vacation you get. You get five months vacation and you want money too? That is the Prime Minister's argument to the teachers. You get long vacation and you want money too? In other words, that if they are getting the pork they are getting the substance, and he is asking, do you want the pork too? How is it you are getting the substance and want the pork too? That is the Prime Minister's submission.

We believe that had there been a more cautious approach to project our economy as one that is expanding at every beck and call, when in truth and in fact statistics show us how often it has been found to be standing still, if not reversing its trend — we have got, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to survey the whole gamut of things. The areas of expenditure in which the

Government is even now embarking upon, throwing away the taxpayers' money *(Aside)* I am hearing some slurs about the bus fares. We are not, Mr. Deputy Speaker, debating the bus fare issue today. Do you want to know something, Sir? I want the Hon. Minister of Education to get the message, that we on this side of the House have more than half of our battle won. More than half, because it is the populace, the people, the public generally who are putting their own constructions to the every action of the Government. The people themselves. I do not have to assist them. I do not have to try to teach them. When they see a gimmick they tell you it is a gimmick before we know it is a gimmick.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let us hear about the gimmick of the teachers.

Mr. HINDS: Yes, Sir. It is all of these gimmicks. There is nothing related to the teachers that is a gimmick. Nothing.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER *left the Chair and*
Mr. SPEAKER *resumed the Chair.*

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Peter may proceed.

Mr. HINDS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. What we on this side are very, very serious about is, we cannot any longer permit this Government to remain in office and to continue frittering away the hard earned money of the taxpayers in the way we have seen them do in the recent past.
3.45 p.m.

You will observe, Mr. Speaker, that in every Government sponsored project in this country there has been an area of unaccountability, tremendous losses in every Department and nobody to be held to account therefor. You will find that there is hardly anything to which the Government has put its hands that in truth and in fact did not rebound and turn out to be a failure. but what you will find the Minister of Finance has been attempting to do from time to time, that when he sees failure staring him in the face he has set about to redouble his efforts to gloss over the losses, the wastage before the faces of the people by employing the evident communist tactic, that whenever the country is faced with a serious crisis, a serious problem as the Russians would do, employ steel bands and little side attractions to carry away the people's attention from the main issue. That is how this Government has been dog dancing before the public, and it has got to stop. The people have it in their hands now, the public service generally has it in its hands. I heard the Prime Minister

asking people to draw their belts, but I would ask the teachers and the public servants to draw their belts for one month and the Government will be in trouble, but to invite them not to go to the Treasury and draw these few pennies you will be asking some of them to commit suicide, because as you know the economic depression through which they have come during recent years has placed them in such a quandary that they cannot at this stage perhaps decide to draw their belts any further. There is now no more room for any more holes in the belts, this is now a question of bottle head to bottle head, no more leather around the waist, so you will understand then why we have to be as careful about this matter as we really are.

The teachers, the public servants I want to say, have the matter in their hands at this moment. We realise that there is still this foolish silly attitude of our people that they are not fighting the Government, they are not standing up against the Government and all that kind of nonsense, but the Government is prepared to grind them, to trample the living dust out of them. That is what the Government is prepared to do with them, that when it comes to the question of finding money, even if it is water rates, they know you must have water, so they increase the rates by 400% and not gradually, 400% one time. You have to drink water and money has got to be found. What you will find is that following Government's pattern in this particular, the cost of living jumped sky high resulting from a number of actions on the part of Government. We do not want to say anything about the fact that the land tax has been imposed upon our people and if one is not careful you will have bought your own piece of land back from the Government again we don't want to tell people about this, but we want to tell people that the millions that are drawn in is not being accounted for. Who is accounting to the public for it? We have to face the fact that the public servants have been depressed in many areas for a very long time and all of this because they were at one time an army of occupation over which the Minister of Finance ruled, he was the Governor-General over them for 15 years and what did he do about it? He merely saw to it, well you are an army of occupation, no war, all peace and quiet, if you get food you are not obliged to get money too, that is how he looks at it, and they have been depressed. If the teachers were to study their own history - and do you notice something, Sir? Our teachers generally are like some parliamentarians. Some parliamentarians feel there is nothing more for them to learn, and some teachers feel they are the most educated in

the world, but they can hardly carry on a conversation outside the classroom. All of this is true, quite suddenly so, but you will find that the time has come when the public servants generally will have to do what the Prime Minister has told this Hon. House when you want justice keep out of the law courts. That is what he said, and if you want fair play in industrial relations keep from in front of the Minister of Finance. That is what he means, that if you want fair play in industrial relations where the Government is a partner in those negotiations, keep from in front of the Minister of Finance.

In the light of all of this, in the face of all this, the warning — You know, there is a popular song "you better take warning" — and we are urging the Government to take warning, because they will find that the teachers, the public servants, might through economic circumstances be forced into accepting what is now being pushed before them, but remember, we hope that they will have it established in no uncertain terms that this they determine as an interim measure, and we ask them for the sake of the peace and the good of this country, for our good name we ask them not to employ a course of action that would be a retrograde one but we leave it with them that they must be militant.

3.55 p.m.

We leave it with them that they must be militant; we leave it with them that they must express their desires, and that whenever they make a claim or demand upon their employers, who happen to be the Government, they will be satisfied, as the trade unionist has said, that deep within their hearts they are satisfied that their demand was a just one. It is upon that premise, and that premise alone, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we ask them to bargain whenever the opportunity presents itself. We urge upon them to fight for what is their right whenever the opportunity presents itself, but under no circumstances must they allow dictatorship, or a dictator, to rise up in our midst to stifle the hopes and aspirations of any sector of this community. We urge upon the teachers to educate themselves relating to matters of an industrial nature. We ask the teachers to educate themselves so that they can fight their own cause; that they do so nobly; that they do so justifiably, and with the contentment of mind that what they do is just and right in the sight of Almighty God.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, in dealing with this Resolution, I would say that this is an election year, and we have been hearing electioneering in this Honourable House of

Assembly. While I am in sympathy with the various unions, when it comes to collective bargaining, I am saying without any contradiction that the Opposition is holding on to the union's coat tail because it is election year, and because they feel that by coming in here and speaking against this Resolution they will get the teachers' votes. It is as simple as that put in a nutshell.

Sir, you can fool some of the people all the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all the time.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not fool anyone! You are addressing me.

Mr. WEEKES: Not you, Sir. Now, there are three points I would like to speak on, and the points were made by the hon. member for St. Peter. Firstly, he said that the Government has mishandled the affairs of the country; secondly, he said that this Government is forcing legislation on Government employees; and thirdly, he said that this Government will cause blood to flow in this country. Now, let us deal with the first one in which he said that this Government has mishandled the affairs of the country. This is a developing country, and it depends on tourism and sugar cane. Let us take the United Kingdom for example. With all of the resources of the United Kingdom, what is the £ equivalent to? In the United Kingdom there are approximately 1,300,000 people unemployed. When you are thinking about a little rock like Barbados, this Island is fortunate to have the Hon. Minister of Finance to be in control of things at this crucial moment in the history of not only Barbados, but in the world.

In New York you have over 50,000 people laid off; they have gone bankrupt; there is no money to pay their employees, and this poor country has been doing all that it possibly can and has stability. It is the most stable country in the world. You can hear what is happening in our sister countries, and, when you consider how peaceful this country is, some people will go as far as to incite people to riot in this country because of the lust of power. But you do not get power that way. You have to get it by the ballot box; therefore, when you come in here and see people in the Gallery, and because you make speeches to incite them which they will appreciate, and you feel that you can give them heaven, you are making the biggest mistake of your life. The time will come.

Let us assume that, by accident, you got into power. What would you do? What would happen to this country? It would go to

destruction, chaos and confusion, because you have not taken into consideration the resources of this small country. The Prime Minister has told this Honourable House that we have started with a deficit of \$20 million. I am going to repeat that the Union has been doing its job and has been doing it well. I have come from among the working people in this country and, therefore, I am in sympathy with the unions for the representation which they have given and, especially, the Barbados Workers' Union. But let us take a true picture of what has happened on this occasion.

4.05 p.m.

Now the Minister of Finance has from time to time told the various Unions that the Government cannot afford more than \$X. You are holding meeting after meeting to hear that the country cannot afford more than \$X. Would it pay dividends or make sense to continue to tell the Unions that the country cannot afford to pay more than \$X? I repeat the Union has the people at heart. While it may be a bad precedent, it is something for which there was no solution. The Opposition has been getting up and telling us to do this and to do that, but they have not told us where the money would come from. In taxation it is a matter of priorities, and the Opposition cannot for one moment tell the public that if you take off this from here you have not got to find somewhere else to put it. This would be misleading the public.

Now you got the young teachers picketing in the Public Buildings yard. These are the teachers whom the Government has done its utmost for. Without this Government we would never have free secondary education; we would never have education to University level free of cost, but thank God in looking through the crowd I did not see one senior teacher. That proves beyond shadow of doubt that the senior teachers of this country appreciate what the Government has done for this country, and when you as members of the Opposition hold on to the Union's coat tail because this is an election year to say the teachers will vote for you, you are fooling yourselves.

Now with inflation throughout the world and with all the problems in this world, this Island has gone from strength to strength. I heard the hon. member for St. Peter say that you must do this and you must do that, but he has not for one moment told us where the money must come from. Now he deals with the 400% increase on water rates. Let me say this about that. The oldest pensioners are given special concessions

when it comes to water rates. That was never done before. The old age pensioners have not got to pay taxes. That was never done before, and I want to refute a statement made by the hon. member for St. Peter. He is giving the public the impression that when old age pensioners are relieved of their taxes that at their death the Government will own the land. I want to say here that that is making misleading statements and trying to fool the people of this country.

Now when it comes to dealing with all aspects of the revision of salaries, we must take into consideration the resources of this country, and I repeat if you cannot pay more than \$X, where must the money come from?

Now I have some figures here which were published in last Sunday's newspaper. A maid in 1961 when we took over the Government received \$19.20 a week. That maid will receive \$62 in 1976/77 and \$70 in 1977/78. I want to tell you that they will receive this \$70 for nine months not a year, because this is the month of June. A constable at recruitment received \$100 a month. This constable is now going to receive \$420 this year and \$450 nine months from today. A Staff nurse in 1961/62 received \$156 per month and this year she will receive \$527 and next year \$574. A clerical officer with four subjects received \$100 a month in 1961/62, will receive \$355 this year and nine months from today \$390. A qualified nursing sister on recruitment received \$206 when we took up the Government; she will receive \$827 this year and nine months from today \$891. A trained teacher received \$148; he is going to receive \$527 this year and in nine months \$574. A headteacher at a Grade 111 school received in 1961 \$301. Do you know what is going to be his pay now? \$1,012 this year and next year \$1,101. A headteacher Grade 11 received \$325 per month and will receive \$1,127 this year and \$1,306 nine months from today. A magistrate who was receiving \$394 in 1961 is going to receive \$1,524 this year and \$1,625 nine months from today. Are you telling me that this Government has not done its best for the masses of people in this country?

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when we must be realistic; the time has come when we must not try to mislead the people. The time has come when we should let the public know the facts.

4.15 p.m.

Again I repeat that I am in sympathy with the Union in connection with the principle of collective bargaining. I have seen their point; but

Mr. SPEAKER: Sit. It seems as if this debate has generated too much heat, and if you all continue, this side is going out as well as that because - let us hear something about the teachers; who is going to pay them, how they are going to get the money, and when.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, with great respect. There has to be some protection for hon. members. I am making a speech. I have been interrupted over and over and over again while making the speech.

Now if the record is examined, never did I say the Prime Minister was not here. (*ASIDE*) I challenge anybody; do not mind whether it is supported by 18 people, I said the Prime Minister cannot call on the hon. member for Christ Church East for assistance. I never said for a moment; not when I had it opened at the Prime Minister's speech could I say he was not here

Mr. WEEKES: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, he did say that the Prime Minister was not here. (*ASIDES*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, I do not want to expand on this. I really do not want to expand on it, but every defence the Prime Minister has put up is mistaken. He said that. For example, in those days they did not show when people came in and out of the House, but after the vote - read it here - Mr. Tudor, Mr. Brancker, Mr. Straughn left the Chamber. So he is wrong at every level. The hon. member for Christ Church East was not here

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: When did Mr. Searles and the members enter the House after prayers?

Mr. ADAMS: It says so at the beginning, Sir. Everybody who was there and appears

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Well where does it say that a member comes in after prayers? It would say who left but it does not say who comes in.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point taken.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: In any case my point is proved because I could not take part in a division if I was not in the Chamber.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Two members are on their feet.

Mr. ADAMS: But the Prime Minister has got things wrong. His head is so hot for being contradicted with being proved wrong that he cannot hear straight. His head is so hot with confusion that he is getting up and quarelling, and begs me to answer where he is going to get the money from to pay the civil servants.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow

Mr. ADAMS: There cannot be one rule for the Prime Minister and another rule for me. If he is free to malign Mr. Belfield Searles in here I must be free to defend, and I am going to get a letter from Belfield Searles and make it a document of this House, denying this wicked accusation against him

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir. How can he get a letter from Mr. Searles denying the accusation when he has not spoken with Mr. Searles? He could only be suborning perjury to do that.

Mr. SPEAKER: At this stage we do not want to hear about the accusations

Mr. ADAMS: I am commenting on it. Unlike the Prime Minister, Sir, when an error is pointed out I like to amend, because I like to be truthful, unlike the Prime Minister

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to hear the truth about the Resolution for the teachers.

Mr. ADAMS: Yes, Sir. Well, having disposed of the fact, irrelevant though it was, that Belfield Searles did not make any speech in here about flogging natives in South Africa, let us see if we can get on a little bit with the substance. I have examined a number of these statements made by the Prime Minister about 18 meetings. I listened very carefully to the very wise and intelligent speech, if I may say so, made by the hon. member of St. Michael West. I hope he does not mind my commenting favourably on his speech. This is not the only issue on which we have had to appreciate his comments; not by any means the only issue. There are certain things that are above party and I believe that this could very well be one of them. I listened to his speech and I heard him say, I think, that there were two meetings and possibly one at which he was not present, with the Barbados Workers Union in connection with this matter. It is a matter on record that the National Union of Public Workers held three meetings with the Prime Minister but the Prime Minister is putting the question of 18 meetings as if there were 18 sets of negotiations. He is not admitting that there were only three

sets of negotiations with any one body. If there are six bodies and you negotiate three times with each other, that amounts to 18; but it still does not alter the fact that there were only three sets of negotiations, and all of the different bodies have emphasised that from their point of view the negotiations were not sufficiently extensive.

The National Union of Public Workers, for example, put a case for 100% to the Government; the Government offered 30%. Later on the Government reduced its offer and the National Union of Public Workers said this was the first time in history of collective bargaining that one side had made an offer, the employer had made an offer and later reduced it. The National Union of Public Workers then indicated, Mr. Speaker, that they would still go on. It was between the first and the second meeting that the Government wrote to the Union of Public Workers and said that they were not prepared to enter into negotiations for increases in salaries and wages which exceeded 25% at the bottom and 10% at the top. Despite this — this is a second meeting; the Government had already threatened to break off the talks, at the second meeting of what is called collective bargaining. At the third meeting the National Union of Public Workers was then offered a raise from the 25% to 35% at the bottom and 12% at the top, and different figures for the second year. The National Union of Public Workers then said they had come down from 100% to about 60% — whatever it was — and the Government had gone up only from 30% to 35%, and proposed further bargaining, and they were then told that the Government's representatives had said that as far as they were concerned the talks had broken down.

Now all the talk of 18 meetings is being used to mislead the public that every avenue of possible agreement was explored.

4.35 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir, normally it arises out of Standing Orders. Standing Order No. 28 Rule 7. I said on the floor of this House that between me and the negotiating teams there were 18 meetings held. The member for St. Thomas keeps on repeating that I am trying to mislead the House — we are only concerned about the members here — and inferentially, the general public. I never said anything different, and I made it clear here today and on more than one occasion that there were 18 meetings held altogether, not necessarily with them collectively or 18 meetings with one

particular group, but the hon. member must desist from making the allegations he is making, because under Standing Order 28 Rule 7 no member may impute improper motives to any other member. Suppose I said there were 3 meetings altogether and I considered 3 enough and that there was no hope of settlement, I would say there were 3. If there was only one that would be enough for me, I don't have to exaggerate and say there were 18 when there were not 18, there were 18 meetings, and I never said that they were with one group.

Mr. ADAMS: Well, Sir, when the Prime Minister was making a speech he spoke about people who talk about collective bargaining....

Mr. SPEAKER: Just a minute. It has been brought to my attention....

Mr. ADAMS: I haven't said that he was misleading anybody.

Mr. SPEAKER: Reference has been made to Standing Order 28(7) which states: "No member may impute improper motives to another member." (Mr. HINDS: About what?) Are you a prophet? I gather that the Leader of the Opposition is trying to prove — because I am checking with him also — that there were not 18 meetings, but I do not see the point raised by the Prime Minister, that it is an improper motive.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said that he said that in saying there were 18 meetings that I was misleading the House. That is what he said and that is improper. It is not imputing, he said that I had improper motives. He has not said that there were not 18 meetings, he said the 18 meetings were not 18 meetings with each and every group, and I never at any time said that each group had 18 times to meet me as a negotiating team. He said that I was misleading the House, that is what he said. (Mr. HINDS: That is only an opinion).

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the opportunity to prove whether he said so or not by asking the Reporters. No one can deny me that right, the Prime Minister has alleged that and I will have it verified if it takes until tomorrow. If it is so, the hon. member will withdraw the remark.
4.45 p.m.

I think at this time, perhaps, it will be better to suspend the Sitting for 10 minutes in order to get the full Report. This Sitting is suspended for 10 minutes.

On resumption -

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is resumed. Unfortunately, at this stage, I am unable to get from the Reporter the alleged statement. As I have suspended the House for 10 minutes, I have kept my promise. I am wondering if the hon. member, the Leader of the Opposition — as I have heard in a *sotto voce* remark that he would withdraw some remark — would be willing to withdraw the remark. If he is so generous, I would like him to make that remark on his feet.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, the situation is this. What I said, and I will maintain I said, was that this figure of 18 meetings should not be used to mislead the public. I did not say the Prime Minister, and I am going to explain myself. I was trying to say so several times, and neither you nor the Prime Minister would allow me to say it, Sir, if you do not mind my saying so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not stop anyone in making his speech. Anyhow try to make your speech.

Mr. ADAMS: What I will do is withdraw any imputation that the Prime Minister is the person using the figure of 18 meetings to do the misleading, but I cannot withdraw that there are people outside...

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Who else used the figure of 18 in here? Nobody in the debate at all but me!

Mr. SPEAKER: That point is correct.
(Asides.)

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, hon. members are asking if I have been called on to withdraw, and why am I withdrawing. I want the debate to get on and the people's business to be done. You have not called on me to withdraw, and I am explaining things.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I made a mistake when I said that there were 18 meetings. I checked it and there were 21 meetings altogether.

Mr. ADAMS: Did the Prime Minister also check and find out that the hon. member for Christ Church East was in England on long leave at the time when he said he was in the House and heard the remark made by Mr. Searle? Has he apologised to the House? Has he apologised to the House for telling the House that the hon. member for Christ Church East heard the remark and could bear it out when the hon. member was on study leave in England and did not return

until July? If we are going to have a general waterwashing, I withdrawing, he apologising, well let us all put our cards on the table. Let him say also that Mr. Belfield Searle did not make the remark.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want to hear about Belfield Searle nor to see him. I want to hear the speech from the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, it is a terrible thing to say in here something about a man and then say that the Leader of the House, a man that carries respect among the population, was present and could confirm it, when the Leader of the House was 4,000 miles away in England! It is a very terrible thing to do that to a man. I could not care if there were 25 meetings. What I want the Prime Minister to do is to stop other people, since I am sure he will not do it, from using the figures of 18 or 21 to mislead the public outside. I want him to stop people from doing that. He is above that and too honourable to do that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am nothing to do with what people say outside, or what they do. The member said that I had said there were 18 meetings, and that I was attempting to mislead the House. I know that he said that and he knows, and he now wants me to stop other people from saying that. Do I have jurisdiction over the newspapers or anybody else in this Island?

Mr. ADAMS: Is he repeating again what I have said I did not say? I try to make peace in here to get the debate going and...

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is any peace-maker in here it is me!

Mr. ADAMS: I am not accusing the Prime Minister specifically of using the figure to mislead people. Apart from anything else, I could not do it in Parliament, and he is still getting up to quarrel. I cannot even make a speech in these circumstances, Sir. Now, we are asked for the Barbados Labour Party's views on all of this. A series of meetings, 20 or 200, at the first of which both sides put impossible positions. At the second of which the employers reduced their offer, and at the third of which the employers made an offer of 5% above the first offer, cannot be said to be a state of affairs consonant with collective bargaining as it is understood. In this I fully support the case made by the Barbados Workers' Union.

There is nothing shameful in an Opposition saying that their views are coincident with those of the workers' representatives. This is

particularly their case and, therefore, I think that we are free to follow, to lead, or whatever. I do not mind how it is put. I also want to deal in passing with all of these remarks made about the white gentlemen in top hats who come down here. We heard a lot about Mr. G. H. Adams. Mr. G. H. Adams, perhaps, was trusted by the Public Servants because he was himself a Public Servant. Perhaps, I do not know; I was not around then. Mr. G. H. Adams was a Colonial civil servant in the employment in the Government of Grenada, as far as I know. Whether he was white or not, it appears to me likely, even leaving out the climate of that day, that the Public Servants would have more trust in another public servant to deal with a case than they would have in their employer to impose a fair solution. I would not like it to go abroad that it was only the Barbados Labour Party that subjected salary claims to the decision of an outside arbiter. To the best of my knowledge, although the Prime Minister can remember so well what Mr. Searle said and that the hon. member for Christ Church East was here; perhaps, I should not blame him, but to the best of my knowledge in 1969, the Prime Minister was Prime Minister of this country, and Puisinelli appeared in these parts when the present Minister of Finance was also Minister of Finance. If it is a sin, both parties are guilty of the sin.

I, perhaps, could tell the Prime Minister this. If he could get the Public Servants salaries through with so little dissension by using an outside Commissioner, and he does not want to bring another Commissioner from England or some other place, then he had better examine the circumstances and see whether the machinery for negotiations between Government and Public Servants is the best that we have at the present time. If they trusted Puisinelli, they trusted Adams, they trusted Godson, but they do not trust the Prime Minister, if I were the Prime Minister, I would ask myself why.

It is the view of the Barbados Labour Party, and we have put this view already, therefore, I will not spend a lot of time on it, that you cannot have an incomes policy for civil servants alone. The whole burden of carrying the decline in prosperity in Barbados cannot fall on the teachers and the Public Service.

5.05 p.m.

The National Union of Public Workers produced figures to show that persons of the grade of teacher or clerical officer, those persons with five certificates have been getting raises that bring their average salary up to \$412 a month now in private industry. The teachers are offered \$374. Going outside the teachers a little bit but

also making comparisons, where watchmen in private industry are said by the National Union of Public Workers to be getting \$85 to \$90 now, Government watchmen are getting \$71. I would like the Prime Minister, since he cites as an example lorry drivers employed by private enterprise, to give as an example a department under his control, namely, the Chief Marshal's Office, and he will find that in the Chief Marshal's Office watchmen are being hired not at the govern-rate of \$71, but they are being hired at \$105 weekly. I am saying that as a fact and litigants of the court who have to pay for the service of watchmen from the Chief Marshal are paying not the offered rate on the new scale of \$71; they are being called upon to pay \$105 weekly. Indeed you find yourself paying \$210 because the Chief Marshal carries out these things on a lavish scale and when he employs a watchman he employs a watchman night and day and charges \$210 a week. That is a department of Government.

Mr. WEEKES: I think I am in a position to state...

Mr. SPEAKER: On what has the hon. member risen?

Mr. WEEKES: I said on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not hear it.

Mr. WEEKES: I would like to clear the air and let the Leader of the Opposition know that these workers are paid for overtime.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point made.

Mr. ADAMS: I just wrote a cheque for one of the bills and no overtime appeared on it. Do not clear the air with me. I wrote a cheque for one of the bills and it is going to be put in court because we feel it was excessive; so do not clear any air with me. There was no overtime on it. I know what I am talking about. I do not have to be contradicted by the hon. member for St. Philip South.

Mr. WEEKES: On a point of order, a watchman at M.C.W. who is working overtime receives more than the stipulated amount. It is as simple as that. Can't you understand?

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Mr. ADAMS: The hon. member cannot understand I am not talking about M.C.W. Anyhow, Sir, all of us deserve a dose of humility from time to time and my dose of humility has

come today when I am asked by the hon. member for St. Philip South if I do not understand. All of us deserve to be put in our places and I am afraid I have been put in my place accordingly. I will know it in future vis-a-vis the hon. member for St. Philip South. I will know not to bandy words and cross swords with him. Now the Barbados Labour Party's views on teachers' pay, if I can get on without interruptions. Now a gentleman called Mr. Joseph Leroy Bryan made a speech on Friday night at Welchman Hall in St. Thomas and he asked me to tell the people of Barbados about our position on the issue that has just arisen in the House of Assembly, and he said, "Mr. Tom Adams up to now has not made a definitive stand on that" and Mr. Bryan said that in a country like Canada increases have been restricted to 8% in 1976 and 2% in 1977. Well assuming, and it is a very large assumption to make, that Mr. Bryan is truthful on this score, I can only say that if he wishes civil servants in Barbados to get a rise of 8% in 1976 and 2% in 1977, then I cannot agree with him. I cannot take my stand with him on that, and I will repudiate entirely Happy Bryan's suggestion that the civil servants should get a rise of 8% in 1976 and 2% in 1977. More than that, I will go on to say that at the time he spoke we had taken our stand. We have made it clear that we feel you should return to the bargaining table as suggested by the Unions. We have made it clear that we were prepared to find a form of words to postpone further consideration of this Resolution without in fact destroying the Civil Establishment Order so as to allow the negotiations and the bargaining to be resumed. We have made this absolutely and perfectly clear. The Government did not see with us, so we let the Government have its way.

We have been able to defeat the Government when they were in shock and disarray after the city by-election result, but even with the assistance of the hon. member for St. Michael West and the hon. members for St. Lucy, we saw no point once the Government had made the situation and its position clear in pursuing that aspect of it any more and today indeed all we are going to do is vote against the Resolution and not offer any amendments, and that will be a simple and straightforward matter.

I want to emphasise this aspect of our stand and I am going to use words equivalent to those used by the hon. member for St. Philip South in succeeding sentences. He went out of his way to ask where is the money going to come from. Let the Opposition tell us where they are going to get this money, and then in the next sentence he answered himself.

5.15 p.m.

He said that the Opposition is not in power to know how to take some from here and put it there and to know how to adjust these things. The member for St. Philip South asked a question and answered it himself. What we will say is that the money used to subsidise public transport — \$5 million could have been used — I am just saying that this is an amount equivalent to what would give public workers a rise of over 40 per cent.

If the Government could find 40 per cent in May that it was not sure finding on 1st May, but by the end of May they could find it, can you tell me that with negotiations like these going on, they could have found an amount to subsidise the Transport Board and not give a 40 per cent rise?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has two minutes more.

Mr. ADAMS: You see, Sir, as the Prime Minister has cogently pointed out, you do not have to vote sums of money. They automatically become sums expendable by Statute, voted by law once we confirm the Civil Establishment Order.

He does not have to come to this House to balance figures which he alone, as Minister of Finance can do, to tell us exactly how this money is being found, but we cannot believe that the Government could casually take a decision to subsidise transport just like that and not equally be able to find as much as \$5 million for the Civil Servants to give them a 40 per cent rise, or perhaps a 43 or 44 per cent. A smaller figure presumably would give them a 40 per cent rise, and that is why we cannot support the Resolution. There is the principle of unequal sacrifice. The teachers, like other Civil Servants, are being asked to make greater sacrifices than people working for Statutory Corporations, and the persons working in private industry. There is the principle of collective bargaining, and the breach thereof, and thirdly the fact that the injection of money into the economy — a point dealt with last week — would itself generate more revenue, and there would have been no need for increased revenue for the flat rate increases in these salaries.

There are three principles on which our votes are being cast, and we are prepared to stand on the principle that there should be no unequal sacrifice, that there should be no breach of the principle of collective bargaining, and that an increase at a time like this would help to recoup the economy. We stand on these principles. They

have been broken, and that is why we will not support this Civil Establishment Order.

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

Ayes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Hon. C. E. TALMA, His Honour A. DaC. EDWARDS, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Hon. P. G. MORGAN, Mr. J. B. SPRINGER, Mr. W. R. LOWE, Hon. A. MORRISON, and Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES — 12.

Noes: Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. E. E. GREAVES, Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Mr. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. W. C. B. HINDS, Mr. H. deB. FORDE and Miss B. A. MILLER — 8.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL
ESTABLISHMENT (TEACHERS)
(AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1976

Order No. 2 was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the Teachers Order, 1976, seeks to amend the Teachers Order of 1976 in one respect only in connection with the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order by deleting the words "9624" appearing opposite the year 1976–77 therein and substituting therefor the words "9924" in Schedule D thereof.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Order No. 3 was called.

RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE FOR THE CONDITIONS
APPLICABLE TO HEADTEACHERS, DEPUTY
HEADTEACHERS, AND VARIOUS CATE-
GORIES OF TEACHERS IN SECOND-
ARY SCHOOLS AND THEIR EMOLU-
MENTS WITH EFFECT FROM
1ST APRIL, 1976

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, this is another one of the consequential Orders for the revision of salaries for headteachers, deputy headteachers and various categories of teachers in secondary schools as from the 1st April, 1976. I do not think it is necessary to add anything to what I have said in respect of the other Orders.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I was unfortunately absent from the first debate which dealt with the question of Civil Establishment Orders in relation to recent salary negotiations between the Government and the various unions; and without the benefit of Hansard, which is always very tardy in coming to hon. members, I waited with patience to hear the position which the Government would have in bringing these Orders before this Hon. House.

As the Minister of Finance spoke, I listed some 13 reasons which he sought to advance for this sort of resolution which is now before the House. I wish indeed that they were valid reasons, but to each one of them there is a valid reply, some on principle and some on the grounds that the reasons are totally irrelevant to the matter which is being discussed.

If I may take the first reason which he sought to advance here, it is simply that the Civil Establishment Act is such that there must be an Order brought to the House, so that in any event there is need to have a Resolution. I do not think that that is a sufficient argument as regards the principle which has been advanced here by the unions. The unions are not saying, and as I understand it, they never said that the law of the land does not eventually oblige the Government to get Parliamentary approval for Civil Establishment Orders.

5.25 p.m.

If the Government since Puisinelli has accepted the necessity for direct bargaining between itself and those representing public workers including the various teachers in the secondary and other schools, it must recognize that those negotiations should be conducted in the spirit where time is given for the proper exhaustion of what we would call the local remedies of collective bargaining. I believe that the hon. member for St. Michael has made the position clear on the concept of collective bargaining, and the Government must be — and I agree with this wholeheartedly — a model employer. It has an over-riding obligation toward the State and to the public at large to set an example, and it cannot appear hasty in its actions even although it may be working to a tight schedule, and I consider that in this instance if one followed the course of negotiations, that it is absolutely apparent that the Government had made up its mind very early, that it was not

going beyond a figure X and regardless of what the Union said it was not going to move from that figure.

Now the Government is in an untenable position in that in addition to being the employer it is also the Government of a country. That is quite true. It also has, of course, the majority vote in this House and as far as the principle of the free vote is concerned, it might be politically injudicious to say there is a free vote on this issue; but the outcome of that vote, of course, was well known before the debate here today. I believe the Government is in breach of the principle of collective bargaining and it can offer no satisfactory justification in this case for not having the patience to negotiate a case, in my opinion, which has been clearly proven against the Government as a whole.

It is undoubtedly true — and I think the Government has had to admit this in the Notes to the various Resolutions that the unions have made out a strong case for an increase and a substantial increase in the level of wages to which they are entitled in this case.

The hon. member for St. Philip South read into the record on the last Resolution, certain figures, and of course one could use figures for many purposes, and by merely using nominal figures rather than looking at the real wages, it may appear to some people that public servants in this country have done fantastically well in the last ten years. I would like to quote for the purpose of this debate from some figures that would show you what are the problems confronting wage earners in this country, between 1970 and 1974 for instance. I am reading from the Central Bank of Barbados Quarterly Report, Volumn 3, No. 1 for the month of March, 1976, at page 44. This is what it says: "Average income, for instance, in the manufacturing sector rose by 54.7% from \$2,204 per year in 1970 to \$3,410 in 1974. However, real income declined by 20.7% as retail prices rose by 95.5% during the same period. The average annual wage in 1974 measured in 1970 values was \$1,744. An annual income of \$4,308 was required in 1974 to maintain the 1970 purchasing power. Real income declined by 3.1% in 1971 and by less than 1.3% in 1972."

Now I have dealt with these years since he has taken a sample of figures of a wider period; but an analysis of the figures would show that — do not mind the money value, the money term used — there has not been a corresponding significant increase in real income in the public service or other sectors of the economy during

this period of time, and that a person in 1970 who was earning \$2,204, if that person was earning \$3,410 in 1974, that person would still be 20% worse off than the person was in 1970.

It is necessary to remind people about this, because I saw the figures thrown into the Advocate last Sunday, and for the unwary they look brilliant, as though there had been a line of progress in the country, a line of progress that was real progress as distinguished from a line of progress that was only nominal progress in money terms; and part of the case of the civil servants has been that the phenomenal increase in the cost of living at over 88% during the period of time of the last salaries revision and now had eroded the basis of their true wages position; and you cannot redress that balance by merely conceding them 35% at the lower rungs of the ladder and something like 12% at the upper rungs of the ladder. The reason is that although the overall points in relation to the cost of living has been the figure that I stated earlier, at the lower rungs of the ladder the increase in the cost of living in the essentials has been higher, and the lower down you are in the economic scale in this country the worse off as a result you find yourself; and on this rung alone it was with arguing the case on the cost of living that the Government must recognize that it is doing less than justice to the case of the public servants in this respect.

Now what was the second argument which the Minister put up? He said that in 1968 we cannot be accused of not looking or intervening because in 1968 he intervened in an industrial dispute, and that therefore there is precedence for his intervention in the interest of the country as a whole.

The hon. member for St. Michael West has already punctured this argument but I would also like to make the tyre completely flat because the argument against it is cogent. The role of the Prime Minister and of the legislature in 1968 in that dispute was the role of arbiter in the first place. It had to hold the scales between two other parties and it was in no way a party to that dispute. The difference here is that the Government is a party to the dispute and the Government is therefore being its own jury, and the Government is also being its own judge, and wherever it is called upon to act in these various roles by virtue of being the Government it must appear and try to be fairer than any other employer would be in the circumstances.

5.35 p.m.

The only appeal that the union can have in these circumstances would be to resort to strike

action, which most of us would not welcome in the public interest as a whole, but then there would be a direct confrontation with the Government and they would, probably, be accused of being disloyal to the national interest. When negotiations as delicate as these are going on, obviously, political parties who, like ourselves, are responsible, resist the temptation of even interfering with the negotiations.

You will recall, Sir, that very early some time last year, I believe, and earlier this year, we advised the Government to negotiate with an open mind and in a fair manner to avoid any political interference or political problems resulting from civil servants' wages. I think no one can accuse the Opposition, during the process of negotiations, of doing anything at all on either side to prevent the negotiations from proceeding on a smooth course. That is why I am surprised to hear it being said that the Opposition is holding on to somebody's coat tail, and it is being insinuated that the hon. member for St. Michael West is now a comrade of the Opposition. Now those are statements that are, probably, made from political motives.

Mr. WEEKES: On a point of order, Sir. Nobody has said in here that the unions are associating themselves with the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order! That is a point of interruption! Please continue.

Mr. FORDE: We respect the union's undoubted right to make its position clear. Let me say that I would never have expected the leader of the union, for the man I know he is, to have taken one stand in the negotiations and to take another stand in the Legislature, regardless of whether he belonged to a particular political party, at all. Nor, indeed, should the Government expect us to take a different stand from the one we have taken. I would like to remind hon. members because they seem to forget this, and this is going to deal with the third point by the Hon. Minister of Finance. They seem to forget that regardless of the political battles that have occurred mostly because of personality, the history of the union is such that the Barbados Labour Party has had a sound founding part in its beginning, and will be with it until the end of the world to come, Amen. Regardless of whether or not the political personalities in the 50s were such that a division had to come

about, one must recognise that the Barbados Labour Party has always been known to be a party associated with the workers. I do not want to hear the argument that the Opposition is merely holding on to the union's coat tail on an instance such as this. This is far from the truth.

In any event, as we sometimes say in the law courts, without admitting but assuming that the contention is true, if the union has a proper case in this event, the duty of a responsible Opposition is to orchestrate that case. What is wrong with that? That is the whole role of an Opposition to point out to Government where it is right. We do not make any assumption on this side where it is right or where it is wrong. We cannot make the assumption on this side that the Minister of Finance in charge of Establishments is the only person to whom God has given all of the gifts of being right all of the time. That is a fallacy. It is a sort of the approach that has been preached in this country for too long and, therefore, because he said: "I have made up my mind that 35% is enough at this moment", it necessarily means that 35% is enough. Suppose he had made up his mind that 24% is enough, it does not follow that that is all the Public Treasury could afford at the time.

I want to say that the 1968 argument is irrelevant and, likewise, the other argument which he used. He said, "When do I come to Parliament? I had 18 meetings and after a certain time it was clear that it would be irresponsible to accede, I had made up mind and, therefore, there was no point in continuing the meeting." I believe that this statement must be seriously examined. A Government should have an open mind on many questions, and it should, in particular, have an open mind where it is dealing with 15,000 of its own employees. It should not be impatient when dealing with those persons.

Now, I do not believe that in this case it should be a question of the Minister saying that he had made up his mind after he himself had sat down, with three meetings, I believe, with individual unions. He should tell us what avenues he had explored with the unions; what other *quid pro quos* there could have been to do what the hon. member for St. Michael West said: see where the unions could exercise restraint in return for some proper national policy on this issue. Now, I want to remind the hon. member of a few statements he has made, and probably this explains how he approaches negotiations. I remember vividly, after the 1971 elections results, the hon. member saying that

who vote for it are the ones who forced him to do this? Am I to understand that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, for instance, or the hon. member for Christ Church North Central, or the man who has billed himself as the small man's man, or the hon. member for Christ Church South Central, for instance, are those who are defending this and the Minister of Finance does not have his heart in it?

If that is so, let them be men now and exercise a free vote and vote against it. Otherwise it must go down as political window dressing when only two hon. members on that side on the principle of collective bargaining would have stood firm. Let them then say that the country cannot afford it and vote against it. I bet you that you will not see one finger up at all. I accept that for what it is.

Now where the Government and the private sector are concerned, the wages set out for teachers, particularly in these negotiations are always drawn from those in the higher sectors of the industrial area. Let us say that the wages in the manufacturing industry in Barbados are nothing to boast of. I believe that statistics of the Central Bank in the last quarterly have exploded the myth that in this country there is any real terrific increase in wages in the manufacturing industry in this country.

I believe that the Government must set the pace when it comes to maintaining the real wages of workers, regardless of whether it is in the private or public sector. Many private industrialists look to the Government in this field as a means of bargaining for the wages of the workers.

Another of the arguments advanced is that Civil Servants are so ungrateful because they can now move in and out and come back in at the same salary. That sounds a very attractive argument. I remember that one of the justifications for introducing amendments to the Pensions Act was that the Government wanted to have an inter-change of expertise with the private industry; and that the Government service as a whole stood to benefit from this inter-change. It was not conferring any benefit unsolicited on public workers. The Government as an employer also had its own self interest to serve by this legislation; and in any event the argument is irrelevant to the particular case.

One can bring a thousand and one reasons that may sound attractive if one is arguing something but their relevancy to the case does not arise. I think that the last one when he says

— I do not want to pass over this if there is one person or one political party that has benefitted from the change in the Pensions Act it is the Democratic Labour Party because it has enabled them to be able to recruit Civil Servants to run on political platforms without loss of pension rights, and with the prospect that when they lose they can go back into the Service. So let us note that too.

When one is talking about these things, one has to note them. My final reason is that the arguments that the teachers and Civil Servants should count themselves very lucky about the quantum which is too high. But high in relation to what? I would like to develop the theme which the member for St. Michael West raised and left dangling in the air. The duty of the Minister of Finance must be to examine his fiscal measures when he is presented with a case such as this, having regard to the total economy of the country and see if there are not ways in which one could negotiate this type of situation.

There are precedents in other countries that one can use. I think that it is a strong case that you cannot have a wages restriction policy for your public service. The whole question of the cost of living, salaries, fees, earnings and dividends relate to other parts of the economy of the country as a whole. If there is to be a restriction, there has to be a restriction on the country as a whole and not only in relation to one segment of workers; and the restrictions must be such that at the same time you are not either reducing employment conditions or creating an inflationary situation where the economy is not going on and is not producing properly.

What the Minister has to look at is what policy of tax concessions he could have given to workers to cushion the effect of the restrictions that he has put on them percentage wise. Since 1971 there has been no review of the personal income tax allowances in the country. The Minister could have discussed this aspect of the matter with the unions to see if they felt that they would be getting real savings. Although there have been *ad hoc* restrictions on prices, one has found that there has been no real indentation in the retail price index between 1971 and 1976; and one would like to see a proper price policy produced for the country.

There has been none of these things. We cannot have a half baked price restriction or incomes policy, if you like, only in the public sector; and it is unfair in this context to pursue the matter along these lines. These are cogent

reasons why I believe that the suggestion made today by the hon. member for St. Philip holds.

I can recall the union for several years asking for a National Economic Council. I believe the feeling was that this would give the union and employers too much say and insight into economic plans. Let us get one thing straight. No matter what party forms the Government, it is recognised that the labour content of the country is one of the most important, if not the most important elements in the country's progress as a whole.

If there is one thing that we have an abundance of in Barbados it is labour resources, and we have to recognise the importance of that. Any Government which looks very seriously at any suggestion coming from workers representatives, regardless of whether it is the Barbados Workers Union or the National Union of Public Workers.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member would give way. He must be aware that in my emergency Budget Speech of November, 1974 I said that I was appointing a National Economic Council. He is now trying to make it look as if he is putting in a plea on behalf of the workers. I have written various organisations in this country during the course of this month asking them to nominate persons to serve on the National Economic Council. So what is this big speech that he is making? I have informed the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union three or four years ago that no matter how many people we appoint to the Council, I know that it will be the Minister of Finance and two public officers who will do all the work and perhaps apart from the workers representatives, the other 20 or 24 of them will be posing for pictures in the newspapers and having cocktail parties.

Mr. FORDE: In the first place, the hon. member must be aware that I do not have access to his files, so the letter that he has written a month ago would not be within my knowledge.

Rt. Hon. E.W. BARROW: I said that during the course of the month I have been in correspondence with various organisations about nominating persons to the Council and the General Secretary of the Workers Union has been discussing this with me for four or five years.
6.05 p.m.

Mr. FORDE: That is just the point I am making. It has taken four of five years to press against his door for a long time to get him to move. That is the point I am making. You are now closing

the stable when the horse has escaped. That is the whole argument that we are making; that if four or five years ago you had acceded to the requests you would have had a concerted opinion and cooperation of the union and of the employers in this instance, and given some guidance on how the economy should go. This is what we are saying.

I am accepting his statement, but there are many avenues in which production has fallen in the country and hence you must know that this would affect the growth of the economy. There are many avenues in which they have been retrenchment of workers in this country; serious retrenchments; and if you look at the unemployment figures you would see that between 1960 and 1970 there were more people employed in this country in 1960 than there were in 1970. Look at the figures. They are there. This is one of the things that we have constantly to say; that we have followed what is the Puerto Rican model of development, it looks successful in its initial stages, people like the union recognized that it was failing for some years and were trying to get this through to the economic advisers to the Prime Minister, and finally to himself, and it has taken us to 1976 to recognize that this has been happening.

Now I have never professed myself as having gone to the LCC and read economics, although I did do some economics in my short sojourn at another university, but I think I am sufficiently aware of these factors to see what has been happening. I would cite speech after speech that I made during the Prime Minister's absence, and his presence in fact, when he went to Florida, showing the trend which had been developing in the economy and saying that unless we did something about it we were going to find that wages were going up and up because they had to follow the prices that were going up and up, there would be retrenchment and the economy would slow down and that nothing was being done. All that this debate has proved is that the Government has not handled the economy properly.

Now where is the money going to come from? The Government must recognize that its dollar must be properly used. There has been too much wastage in Government and I refuse to bide the argument that it is only because of the public servants that one has found wastage. There is too much wastage in Government departments; and the Minister must be tight in the manner in which he runs the Government departments.

Opposition to help the Government. When you have a country to run you have to run it, and at this stage the Government took the initiative after all the negotiations had broken down. We have to admit that the Minister of Finance would have to know what he can afford and how far he was prepared to go; and the Minister thought that he had reached that stage.

Senator St. John, as he now is, has said already in this Chamber in 1968 when negotiations between the Barbados Workers Union and the Sugar Producers Association broke down, that it was nonsense for the union to negotiate over a period of seven weeks, and he could not understand. He referred to the member for St. Michael West as the "Khaki King" and said that he did not understand why somebody had not acted yet. Suddenly he wanted action. He was the Leader of the party then.

A lot of unnecessary talk was indulged in earlier in the day. There was talk about Mr. Belfield Searles. Anyone who knew Mr. Searles would know that if he did not say it he was capable of saying it. He was inferior to the wealthy whites, and the wealthy whites were superior to the blacks. That was Mr. Searles whole philosophy, and it is regrettable that time was wasted on Mr. Searles.

Before I finish I would like to say that it would be a good thing for this country to learn from this experience. It would perhaps be an ideal situation to have a body of unionists, although I do not see how you will get them under the present system. It is known that there are various unions which you could call poaching unions. The seamen's union is there to carry away some members from the Barbados Workers Union, and the transport workers are doing that.

In 1954 the Barbados Labour Party formed a union for sugar workers and general workers to do the same thing. This has always been a symptom of behaviour in Barbados. As soon as they feel that somebody is too powerful, they say let us cut off something from him, I have no doubt that if the workers had one union to represent all of them, this would have been settled long ago; but they want to satisfy the workers and the public that they can get more for them than the BWU.

Before they used to have a Civil Service Association. The teachers had a Teachers Union; but every year the secretary of the union got drafted into the public service into a higher post and the same thing happened to the secretary of the Teachers Union. It was felt that becoming

one of these secretaries was a stepping stone to a high grade in the Civil Service. This has always been so, and finally, I would say that it is good to see for once since 1954 the Barbados Labour Party and the Barbados Workers Union in agreement.

6.45 p.m.

The Barbados Workers Union and the Government happened to be on opposite sides this time, but you were not in the Barbados Workers Union in 1964 with the windfall; you were not with them in 1968 with the fixed wages in the sugar industry. You were not with them then. You were not with them with the strike; you call for legislation, (*Aside*) What have you got up for? You do not know anything about it. You were in England; don't get into it.....

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I was always here.

Mr. SPRINGER: You were always here. Right, well I will take objection from you; but when the Roebuck Street merchants in 1971 had the union strangling, on which side were you? You were not with the union then. You know why? The Government was with the union then. When the transport workers were asking for more money you were not with them either. The bus drivers are getting too much money; you do not relate.....

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I have never heard any member on this side say that the bus drivers were getting too much money. Could the hon. member tell us which debate, whether it was 1971? We voted with the Government in 1968.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member did not say that.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Speaker, I am not responsible for what the hon. member heard. I know what I heard. He tells me he did not hear. Well he hears it now; and they are drawing these analogies with the bus drivers getting \$120 and a civil servant with five "O" Levels getting \$400 a month, but he has lost sight of one thing. The civil servants are going in at \$400 and the bus drivers are coming out at \$125 a week. But this is the kind of lopsided reasoning that you get, and I would say this. I could sympathise with the Opposition in this matter. If they vote for it they cannot go and tell the people 'we increase your taxes', and this bus fare talk about the \$5 million.

I heard the Leader of the Opposition — well he was in England at this time — he is talking about a free medical scheme. Let the member for

St. Peter remind him. He knows about this; that in 1956 the Labour Party tried to introduce a measure in this House; it passed the Cabinet and — to make people pay 24 cents for bandages and certain treatment at the hospital, and we in the Opposition prevented them from doing it; and now they are talking about a national health scheme? You are smiling. You remember

Mr. FORDE: I was only smiling at the fact that the hon. member does not recognize that within a month of taking over the Government the national health scheme would be initiated; that is all.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order at all.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Speaker, that reminds me very much of a statement the Leader of the Opposition makes ever now and again. He says: 'this is the last budget the Minister of Finance will make and I will hear it in this House.' This is a similar one. When they take over, I have been hearing this all along. I heard it in 1966, 1971, and I hear it now again. They have got so accustomed to losing now that they do not know if they can win.

However, getting back to the seriousness of it. We have got to be realistic. Everybody must accept that after a period of three years people who are employed in a particular field expect some type of increase, and to equate what happens in Government with what happens in private enterprise is just nonsense. In private enterprise, for the most part, people who work in private enterprise work to create a profit. The reverse is true in Government. Very often the people who work in Government work and create additional expenditure whether it is in road building, school construction, regardless of what it is; and to bring the argument about not holding strain in private enterprise and asking the public workers to do it is just plain nonsense.

I would say this; unfortunately for the public workers — and they have only themselves to blame — they have created the type of public image that they do not do anything for the money they get, whether they are working in the road or working in the office. If they could convince the Barbadian public that they really work for their money they are paid, probably production in the country would be so high that they would be able to get what they are asking for because they would probably reduce the kind of wastage that the Opposition is talking about.

I have seen instances — and it is not fair to blame the man in the road alone. There are instances in which you go to offices for a simple thing and you cannot get through with it under half an hour; and there are very few offices that you can telephone after a quarter to four and get anybody to answer at the office. A quarter to four is the hour for leaving and carrying home the children from school, and a quarter to nine is the time for going in after taking them to school.

I honestly believe this, that if we did not have this type of democracy where the Labour Party or, if we are in the Opposition, the alternate party could cater and try to pander to some of these civil servants, we would get more production but the attitude is, if you do not do it I will get the rest to do it, and you have to play along with them; but this year I feel is the year of reckoning, and I think that considering that it is election year it takes some courage to tell the civil servants we can't give you what you are asking for; whether it is the general feeling that the country can afford it or not, it takes some courage to tell them that in an election year.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I should not be very long but I would just like to add my quota to this debate. I think this Resolution clearly indicates the responsibility of this Government, because when you are accused of standardizing bus fares as an election gimmick, if we wanted to be irresponsible, all the Leader of this Government had to do was to give the civil servants what they asked for, call an election in the hope that that would sweeten them, get back the Government and then for the next five years, squeeze them. It is simple. The whole tenor of this debate is a tribute to the Government's courage in an election year in putting forward to the people how responsible they are even in such a year. What I find in Barbados, Mr. Speaker, is that the average worker wants money in his pocket and very often he is inclined to forget the countless other benefits which increase his pay packet. Now I am going to give you some figures briefly, and I could show you if we wanted to, we could find another \$16 million easily. I am going to give it to you. The school textbooks scheme cost \$2 million; put that in wages and make them pay for the textbooks. Now every citizen in this country who has a child at a secondary school is benefiting from this. Is not that an increase in wages? Is not that a saving to him?

6.55 p.m.

negotiations, but I will tell him that cantonniers go now; they were in our delegation, but there is no point in being emotional. What would be the point at this stage in time of leaving a cantonnier by himself to negotiate with the Prime Minister; for him to come back and say that it would not be any competition? It would not be fair to the man, so we do not negotiate like that.

I was very sorry to hear the last Minister speak. I believe it is these extreme positions that have been adopted that have caused us to be debating these matters so long. Undoubtedly the teachers in Barbados have been down-graded for many years. Those of us who have been in public life have been in public life on the basis that teachers have been poorly paid in a general way, and that is a fact. We had carried on a long perennial battle on behalf of teachers in Barbados, and that is known because the history of teaching, that it is this sort of voluntary service, this free service closely associated with the Church means that the wages and salaries have been scandalous in the past. So it has a bad background and it is against that background that we are today struggling.

Now when I hear the Minister and when I hear all these arguments, that is why I say you cannot negotiate in public, and I will say quite frankly that it suits the Prime Minister to have a situation in which the whole public service is up before him like a cook-up, because you cannot make a sensible compromise for a person who is getting 50 cents an hour and a person who is getting \$2,000 a month and you are meeting and dealing with them at one and the same time. I have been telling people for years that you cannot treat simultaneously with this situation at one and the same time. What kind of percentage are you going to put in for all of them that would be operative? It requires patient negotiations so that you can go up to \$2,000. You move from \$1,000 to \$1,500 and from \$1,500 and over. You cannot do it in the House of Assembly in a debate. The Hon. Minister spoke about his salary. We are not talking about a Minister's salary. It is nonsense to compare a political salary with a career salary. A teacher is a teacher; he is not a politician and therefore every Minister receives a salary with a tax allowance that is greater than any teacher's salary. Look at the salaries here. Nobody in these new rates is going to get a salary as great as what a Minister gets as a non-taxable allowance; so there is no point comparing yourself with people. A Minister gets a non-taxable allowance of \$800 and there is no teacher getting \$800. I am not talking about the ones who start. The top of that grade is

\$6,600, so there is no point making these odious comparisons.

The Prime Minister in dealing with this matter has found people who took an extreme position because they are not good negotiators. You cannot start off with an extreme position and do not know how to come in from your extreme position and negotiate. It suits the negotiator when you find yourself in an extreme position and the Ministers today have been taking up an extreme position against an extreme position, because the teachers asked for 100% it does not mean *ipso facto* that that is what you are called upon to pay out; that is nonsense. You are not called upon to pay 100% and you cannot use the vague language against what you can afford to pay because your argument is nullified. The Government does not operate on the ability to pay because the ability to pay is a private enterprise but since that is against the basis of profit, and the Government is not operating against the basis of profit. You do not use the words "ability to pay" because the Government is a service. It is what service you want to provide.

7.15 p.m.

If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition says that he wants a free medical service, it must then be a question of the ability to pay. It must be a question of what services you want provided and what you have to pay for them. There was a time when the Prime Minister was chary about public transport. Now today he is supporting the subsidising of public transport. After 15 years of running a Government he now sees that it is vital to employment and therefore to the economy. It was 15 years ago that I said that transport was vital to the economy of any country. Now the Prime Minister finds it very easy.

It may not be politic for me to say it, but the very point I heard today has absolutely nothing to do with the mechanics of negotiating a contract between the Government and the private sector, because the Government is not the only employer to put money to the treasury to pay the public servants, but that is what you run your services with.

Barbados is not the only country in the world in which the Government is the largest single employer. Call any country in the world where this is not so. The US Government is the biggest single employer. You have the Ford Company as one of the biggest employers in the USA, but the biggest single employer will always be the Government. Therefore, this is nothing

new; but it is a service that you are running. The Government runs a hospital. How many operations are you going to do to determine the cost? But, you have to pay people to run these services.

I feel that the extreme position taken up by negotiators in the beginning was an easy way for the Government to take up an extreme position on the other side and say that they could not get together. My point of view was, Mr. Speaker, that that was not the end of the settling of the matter. The Government had an excellent opportunity of reaching an agreement.

The hon. member for St. Michael South East made a great point. I have been in the trade union movement long enough and no one can accuse me of doing something because I am courting membership. When you look at teachers' salaries, what you have to examine is the question that your services will be diminished if the salaries do not bear a true relationship with what is taking place in the community.

One member said that you cannot compare the Government with the private sector. That Minister does not know what he is talking about. We are not asking the Government to make public servants privileged persons, but people with a total relationship to the whole of the community. So the Government Service must bear a relationship to the total labour force or you will be out of focus with what is going on. If you have your barometer too low, it sets the temperature too low for the whole society. That is the danger.

It is not a question of what the Government can afford. It is a question of what is just. What you can afford is your judgement. It is what you can afford to ask the community to pay. Are wage levels in Barbados such as to give a teacher a starting salary of \$400 a month when everybody else is getting \$500 or whatever the figure is? You do not arrive at what is reasonable by just saying so.

With regard to this argument about a deficit the Prime Minister knows that if you start off with that before you have salary increases, that argument is unsupportable because if you are going to start with a surplus, it is equivalent to the amount that you expect your increases to be, so you will have to make provision for this new rate and you will say that is what you want, and that is what the community must pay for.

To my mind the arguments that were used were not arguments against the method of negotiating, but about why the Prime Minister's decision should be what it is. The Prime Minister cannot say that this extreme position of asking for a 100 per cent increase was the only position that an agreement could be reached on. We did not put forward 100 per cent. The position between the Government and the BWU was marginal. That is why we were not afraid because we knew what we were talking about. We knew that we were not going to pin the Government down because ours was a marginal position.

We did not ask for any 100 per cent because we said that we were going to absorb some of the cost of living because other employees would be expected to do the same thing. I am very pleased to hear the Prime Minister's remarks on the idea of a National Economic Council.
7.25 p.m.

We feel that there is a lot of public wastage. We feel that if you could harness the wastage in the public service tonight you would have the surplus to pay from. If you could harness the wastage — I am not talking about wastage in terms of people just speaking of a man not working, of people having to stand up and wait until the material comes — but the wastage from department to department. Somebody forgetting to order this; repeat the order; a bundle of things. You can multiply them in all the departments and I am sure you will save a lot of money. So we are opposed to public wastage. I am opposed to any kind of wastage. Human beings should not be wasteful. The more you have the more you have to conserve all your energy.

The Prime Minister said that in the Central Bank there was a lot of money and that if the people did not use the money in the bank he was going to make them pay rent. To whom does that money belong? Somebody in Barbados. That is the kind of money that we are going to get the money from. Get some of the money from those places and utilize it.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to these debates over the last few days. Despite the difference in the nomenclature of the Orders, it seems to me, Sir, that there is one thread that runs through all of these deliberations. Now there are two basic issues involved in this. There is the position of the Union and the concept of collective bargaining, and there is the question of whether the Government could afford

Mr. WEEKES: On a point of order. I never complained; I made a statement, Sir. It is the legitimate right of any person or organisation to adopt the policy of peaceful picketing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point made.

Mr. SIMMONS: He has now expressed himself in more fulsome terms. The Prime Minister himself complained about the teachers in the yard, and he drew it to the House's attention that he had introduced and had put in himself section 39 of the Trade Union Act, and that it provided for picketing at or near. I have already said that he omitted to say that it provided for peaceful picketing where the employer happened to be. That is also in the Act. I pointed out, Sir, that he happened to be in the yard then, and the teachers happened to be in the yard then. If there is a conflict in the law between the section which was copied lock, stock and barrel from the English Act of 1906 and our Public Order Act which sets out a list of Scheduled premises, that is a conflict which would have to be rationalised between the Government lawyers, and they should bring down some kind of amending legislation if they think that it is desirable, but the Trade Union Act did give the teachers the right to picket, in my submission, out there.

Where are we now, Sir? We have the union on the one hand dissatisfied with the Government's offer of wage increases, and the Government through the Prime Minister and the Minister of Health trying to assure us that the country is not able to bear the wage demands of these various categories of workers, and the member for St. Michael South East submitting that he has not heard the Opposition say where the money is to come from. The member for St. Philip South also said that he has not heard from the Opposition where the money is to come from. The last time I spoke on, I think it was the General Order, I dealt with public wastage. The member for Christ Church West, and today the member for St. Michael West not so long ago suggested that one of the first things you would have to do is to cut out public wastage. Before we start to deal with restrictions at a personal level, the Prime Minister, if he is serious, must make a national appeal to the country and let the people know the facts of the economy instead of pretending that there is nothing wrong with the economy of this country. I will go further and say that the Prime Minister, from 1973 when he came back here in, I think it was December, had a duty after the Minister of Trade had warned of the possibility of a Black Christmas and had invited us to share a shower and save power, and

had pretended that there was a crisis. The Prime Minister then had a responsibility to the country to tell the people that there was a crisis. It is nothing that requires us to resort to panic stations, but from now on there will have to be belt-tightening. Instead of that, it was only last Tuesday that he invited you, Sir, to be the first to pull in their belt. Save power and share a shower. That is the Minister of Garbage himself. I will withdraw that, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no Minister of Garbage in here.

Mr. SIMMONS: I did not intend to say it through the microphone, Sir, and I withdraw that. The hon. Minister of Volubility of Speech. He does all of the talking. I am returning to a serious point now. What I am trying to say is that it is no good, as a Minister of Finance, knowing since December, 1973, the potential effect of the oil crisis, the potential damage that the oil crisis, international as it was, could have done to Barbados' economy as a substantial importer of oil and all the concomitant results of the oil crisis, pretending that it was nothing to hurt our heads about. The result was that in 1974 this country made little progress, and that was admitted during the Budget debate in that year. As a matter of fact, a second Budget had to be introduced, the Emergency Budget, in late November or December, 1974.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. There is a complete and utter misrepresentation of a situation which existed in 1973. It was being stated at that time that there was a fuel crisis in Barbados. When I returned here I made a careful examination of the existing stocks. No doubt the Minister was misled by the refiners and importers in Barbados that there was some fuel crisis, and there were cars queuing up at Service Stations. People were in a great state of panic and pandemonium about a shortage of fuel. After I made an examination of the existing stocks, I discovered that at that time, probably in anticipation of the OPEC agreement among the Organisation of Petroleum and Exporting Countries, they had stock-piled a considerable amount of fuel. They were creating an atmosphere whereby they could come to the Government and ask the Government for an increase while they had existing stocks.

In other words, the refiners were creating a situation in which they were encouraging people to believe, and probably succeeded in convincing the Minister of Trade, who did not carry out the investigation that I had carried out, that there

was a shortage of fuel in Barbados. I did not say that there was no crisis as a result of an increase in fuel prices at no time. I said that there was no shortage of fuel in Barbados, and it turned out to be ample fuel in Barbados at the time. To build up a whole case on a statement that I never made is completely misleading.

Mr. SPEAKER: That has been a thorough explanation.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would not wish to misrepresent the Prime Minister. If he got the impression that I was misrepresenting him, it is now about three years since the exact words were used. The point I was making is not that the Prime Minister said there was absolutely no crisis, but the impression he gave the public, and I as a section of the general public got the impression that things were not as bad as the Minister of Trade had purported that they were.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I wish to state, categorically, that any remarks I made could leave no room for any doubt in any person's mind that I was referring to fuel stock in this Island. Obviously, all over the world in every country the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and all of the oil importing countries, are still suffering from the effects of the inordinate increase — 400% in fuel prices.

7.55 p.m.

We are now paying over \$66 million and \$70 million per year in imported fuel when we were probably about \$18 million or less than \$20 million before, and I said at that time there was no fuel shortage in Barbados to encourage the people, as the refiners were doing, to panic and queue up at gas stations, and I make no apology for it. If you go and read my speech in 1974 when I went back and traced everything that had happened from 1973 there is absolutely no reference to my saying that there was no economic crisis existing in Barbados or the rest of the oil-importing countries.

Mr. SPEAKER: I suppose that was a point of explanation.

Mr. SIMMONS: There was therefore a serious economic situation in Barbados in 1974 as a result of the fuel crisis in late 1973. In 1974 the Prime Minister did not appeal to Barbadians to tighten their belts. Similarly in 1975. It is only

recently that he has sought to appeal to the people's sensibilities and especially last week. What I am saying is that if the economic situation of this country has been constantly monitored, then corrective action should have been taken. It could not have been a total solution, but it would have lessened the effects of the oil crisis and the consequent burden which the taxpayers of this country felt. For example, the Central Bank Report for 1974 showed a decline. I have termed the Central Bank Report for 1975 which I have here as a report written by somebody about a country in decline. Take agriculture and fisheries — I think that is the general head. Sugar went down in 1975; fresh milk production fell by 2.8%. Estimates for beef and pork indicate a decline in the production of these commodities. In shrimping there was a general decline in that year. In construction no major projects were started. The National Housing Corporation built 195 houses in the whole of 1975. No employment of a meaningful nature was being created. They built 357 houses in 1974 and the number fell in 1975, but this year we are told it will be 779 to create employment. Throughout the report there is the use of the word "decline".

Now, Sir, if the Unions had been constantly made aware of the economic situation in the country, and this goes back to the point where I said that the Unions should be part of the decision-making process, if they had been kept aware, all of them, not only the Barbados Workers' Union, then I believe we would not this year be hearing of any inordinate and unreasonable demands as some of the speakers in this debate and last week have accused the Unions of making.

As far as the teachers are concerned, other members of my party have dealt with them. I would just like to make this one point. It is assumed that civil servants and teachers are not productive because you do not see what they export and get any rake off from that for the Treasury, but the teachers and the civil servants perform a function and produce in a different way from the manufacturing exporter or entrepreneur, and were it not for some of the quality teachers we had in our day who were able to produce people of the calibre of the Prime Minister, all those on the front bench and those behind and those on this side, you would not have had the level of intelligence in Barbados that you have today and the level of restraint and responsibility that is shown by persons in public life today.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very short on this occasion. Over a period of days we have heard the rights and wrongs of this particular pay settlement question. I do not think there is anyone who has sat through these long debates or even read the reporting in the newspapers that have been unusually full and competent in certain aspects of what has been said, who can doubt that what everybody calls the principle of collective bargaining was short-circuited. I also think that whether you have the opinion held by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central and the hon. member for St. Philip South that you cannot compare Government to private industry, or whether you have the opinion that we are all members of one community and therefore it should be one for all and all for one, it cannot be doubted that persons outside Government have received a better deal in the rounds of pay increases that have gone on during late 1975 and 1976 than persons in Government.

I was not able to follow all of the speech of the hon. member for St. Philip South; he became vehement, he became merely partisan, he departed from logic, but I will say that outside he did make one point that I have not particularly heard made in here which is a point that I formed the impression has been canvassed in circles other than Parliament, namely, that private employers can afford to give bigger raises because they can retrench. I have often heard, and I beg the Union's pardon for saying something slightly controversial, that the Union well knows this and is prepared to make these sacrifices in the interest of increased productivity. But the point is this: that the operations of Government are expanding every year, therefore if Government does not expand the public service, it is in effect retrenching because it is doing nothing to bring in new employees, it is seeking to expand the level of service available to the community with the same staff which has the over-all effect of a retrenchment in the economy. So I can't really accept that that is a good argument.

I have emphasised constantly in here that everybody must be asked to make sacrifices. But the Government itself is, I repeat, asking the community to accept a situation in which a sacrifice made by public servants will be greater than the sacrifice made by the community as a whole, and more significantly greater than the sacrifice made by Government. I have not heard any speech into the elementary statistic of how much the Government revenue has risen since the

last pay increase compared to the pay increase now offered. If any hon. member has set this statistic out to the House, I hope that he will correct me, but upon the basis that we should compare current Estimates with Estimates of 1973/1974, it will be found that Government revenue has gone up 48.6% since the last pay increase.

8.05 p.m.

Public Servants are offered between 30 and 35 per cent, possibly nearer to 30 per cent. So the Government plainly is making a profit out of the pay crisis. The Prime Minister has quite plainly taken the opportunity to reduce the proportion of Government expenditure which the public servants will receive. It is a simple matter. If Government expenditure has gone up 48 per cent, has gone from \$140.5 million in 1973-74, in a matter of three years it has gone up to \$208.9 million, an increase of just under 50 per cent.....

Mr. WEEKES: On a point of order. The hon. member should know that the price of commodities and materials has increased from time to time, and consequently it would show an increase.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, I do not think that the hon. member understands the argument. I do not want to be rude or anything like that, but he should keep out of things that he cannot grasp. I really do not want to be rude to him. The fact that the cost of materials has gone up is allowed for by the fact that Government revenue has gone up 48 per cent. That is all there is to it.

What I am trying to explain to the House, and inferentially to the hon. member for St. Philip South, is that the proportion of public service emoluments to Government expenditure will *ipso facto* come down. As a matter of fact it will come down by more because the Estimates for 1976-77 were for \$208.9 million. When you pay out Civil Service emoluments it will reach \$230 million.

The public servants are contesting the figure of \$25 million. They say that it will not be as much as that. The percentage increase from 1973 will be something like 60 per cent. In other words, while the expenditure has gone up 60 per cent, public servants would have only got a 35 per cent raise. The proportion that public servants will take home will be less. I hope that that would be understood. Nobody else seems to have made the point and I suppose that I am partly at fault for not making it earlier. The

point is that the Government has taken the raise in the cost of living as what the Prime Minister would probably call a drain on the treasury attributable to the emoluments of the public servants upon the basis that it will go up to \$230 million which is a very generous basis.

On that basis you will find that Government expenditure will have gone up by 64 or 65 per cent since three years ago, and the services will account for perhaps only half of that. So other operations of Government will account for just as great an increase. I do not mean the proportions but on the question of emoluments there will be this general increase. It is a matter of commonsense that the Estimates are more now than they were in 1973. That is a matter of straightforward commonsense. As a matter of fact, since 1972 Government expenditure has nearly doubled in this country. Government expenditure has gone from \$100 million to \$208 million since 1972, the exact period quoted by the hon. member for Christ Church West.

In other words, at a time when the real income of Barbadians has fallen 20 per cent, Government expenditure has gone up over 95 per cent. At a time when Civil Servants are offered a 35 per cent increase, the Government's ability to pay has risen by about 48 per cent. So, this question that the Government does not have the ability to pay is no argument any more than the argument on the other side that because the cost of living has doubled, emoluments should have doubled.

The argument that the Government does not have the ability to pay does not hold water, because revenue has gone up by a greater percentage than the percentage increase which it is offering to the public servants. I hope that that point has sunk in to the hon. member for St. Philip. The point is that Government does not want to pay because the Government feels that the percentage of emoluments to Government expenditure was so high, perhaps in 1973. Not perhaps. I have heard the Prime Minister say so in here already. He has pointed out that the public servants absorb a fairly large proportion in emoluments of Government expenditure, and I think that a decision was taken to have this proportion reduced.

If I had time, no doubt it would be quantified. The Prime Minister, perhaps, has these figures available. On that analysis, the argument that the Government cannot pay, which is one of the main arguments which has been put before the public, is that you first heard a lot of talk

about doubling income tax to give the people all that they want. This was demolished. Then it was said that you would have to double customs duties. That also was demolished. We were then left with the blank statement that the Government would not be able to pay; but the figures show quite clearly that the Government's ability to pay has not been impaired by the inflationary spiral, and that is a well known fact.

You now can perhaps understand how the Government has managed to accumulate these funds for election year. It is a well known fact that in an inflationary crisis a government is the last one to suffer. A Government benefits from an increase in direct taxation. When prices go up, the Government benefits from percentage increases in indirect taxation. The 5 per cent sales tax must produce more revenue when prices go up. Income tax must produce more revenue when wages go up.

Governments have used inflation to ease the political pressures on them to contain inflation. There are very few revenue pressures to contain inflation. They have used balance of payments pressures to contain inflation. There are very few pressures from revenue earning projects of Government and from taxation.

Inflation has been used as a means in some societies of solving governmental problems, all sorts of problems. The Germans solved the problem of the French occupation of the Rhine by inflation. Other countries have solved the problem of unemployment by inflation; but you always have to balance these factors by the fact that the public do not like to see the cost of living going up, and by the fact that your balance of payments will become distorted if you permit too much inflation. You have to balance these against the benefits to Government revenue.

We think that the Government has reaped some benefits from the inflation. There has been all of this talk about materials costing more. Let the hon. member for St. Philip South be assured beyond the shadow of a doubt that the cost of the Government is negligible compared with the overall revenue, compared with the cost of stationery, building materials, new vehicles and so on; that it is negligible compared with public servants' emoluments and the fixed cost of administration.

8.15 p.m.

Let all hon. members be quite sure that the increased revenues of income tax doubled, despite a reduction in rates since 1971. More than

doubled. Considerably more than doubled the revenue from income tax. The revenues from indirect taxation, from the five percent sales tax, the revenues from consumption taxes which have created more revenue despite the non-increase in straightforward import duties due to CARICOM, all of these things have put the Government, since the unfortunate events of 1973 when in fact the Government revenues had not increased quickly enough to meet its expenditures at the first flush of inflation, all these things have put the Government in a better position to spend money; not Barbados' — there is a difference — has put the Government in a better position to spend money.

The people of Barbados are in a worse position. That is what the Central Bank Report showed; but the Government revenue has been increasing steadily. Very, very few people can say that their income has doubled since 1972. The Government's has gone up from \$107 million to \$208 million since 1972. I do not think any hon. member in this House can say that his income has doubled in those four years; certainly not in Parliamentary income.

So this business about the Government's inability to pay is in danger of becoming one of the great myths of our time. I have seen it flogged over and over and over again in this debate, and if I have a regret about my earlier speeches the regret is based on the fact that I have taken for granted that other people may also understand that the Government's revenue has doubled in four years and therefore that the Government's inability to pay cannot be quite so great as the Government is making out. These are the factors you must bear in mind. Everybody is concentrating on the cost of living and accepting the Government's arguments 'we cannot pay more.' Everybody is thinking that because Barbadians are suffering, that the Government itself is under some crippling limitation. Everybody is thinking that the mismanagement of 1973 has the Government borrowing money to pay interest for a month or two at one time, everybody is thinking about that, is concealing the fact of what I may call a great governmental confidence trick, is concealing the fact that the Government has an expenditure half as much again as it had — is planning for expenditure half as it was three years ago. In fact, Sir, the revenue is indeed more than 50% up. Government's revenue over that period is up from \$120 million to \$182 million which is more than 50%. I was quoting from the expenditure. The revenue is more than 50% up over this period when it said it cannot afford to pay the public servants more

than 35%; and all hon. members will, I hope, draw their conclusions as to the cogency and the validity to be given to the arguments of the Government's negotiators in this particular matter when they think seriously about these figures.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to prolong this debate. This debate has already dragged on. Every single Resolution that we have in respect of the public servants' salaries has produced the repetition of statements, most of them reckless and unfounded statements made by the people on the other side. We had the great federation and winding up by the Leader of the Opposition in which he accuses the Government of a great confidence trick.

Now it is very clear to me that although the Leader of the Opposition prides himself of being a mathematician, that Arithmetic was not one of his strong points. When you listen to him speaking here this evening, no one would have believed that we had discussed the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure in this Chamber before the 31st March, the Revenue and Expenditure of this Government for the Financial Year 1976-77. And I heard a very interesting statement which seems to be — I say it was interesting because it was a very novel statement — he was inter-changing the terms the Government revenue, the Government expenditure, and showing that where the Government's expenditure had risen, therefore since the expenditure had risen you could afford to pay civil servants' salaries

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. I chose the expenditure figure and I said that if I had chosen the revenue figure it would be more in favour of my argument, because the revenue has risen over 50%. But I specifically chose the expenditure figure since we are talking about expenditure.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point made.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: We last had a salaries revision in 1973-74. As a result of that the Bill on Government account for salaries has risen. There was an average of 40% increase at the bottom and 20% at the top, therefore Government expenditure must rise because of the civil servants' salaries. So you cannot use that as an argument to say that the Government can afford to pay because the Government's expenditure has risen from 1973-74. In addition to that there are annual increments granted to public officers and last year for the first time the Christmas loan, approximately just around 4% of the salaries of people up to a certain bracket —

\$800 a month — was a non-reimbursable non-refundable loan which could not be ignored in cushioning the effects of inflation. So that you have the 40% — 40 tapering to twenty at the top in the last salaries revision three years ago, the Christmas bonus of 4% plus a five percent annual increment, plus the cost of living bonus which amounts to just over 10%, plus 14%, and then the normal increments that people who are in the graduated scales would get. All of that to help cushion the effects of inflation.

Now the hon. member gets up there and said it is a great confidence trick to say that the Government cannot afford to pay. I made a statement — I think it was last night — and I said if this Government had the kind of surpluses that the Trinidad and Tobago Government found itself with in this financial year, with a surplus on current account of over \$800 million and a reserve position of over \$2½ billion, that when the public officers' representative came to me and said they wanted 100%, I would tell them come back next week, and when they came back I would say, well I think that the economic situation justifies 150% and not 100%. But I am not going to be dishonest with the people of this country.

The reason why I rose was this. We went through the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure in the month of March, and the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure disclosed that the Government estimates revenue for the period 1976-77 was \$182 million as against estimated revenue or actual revenue in 1972-73 of \$110 million. Now this is an increase of about 60% in revenue but we had introduced certain measures during that time, like the Common External Tariff.

8.25 p.m.

This is an increase of about 60% in revenue, but we had introduced certain measures during that time, like the Common External Tariff or very high increases in duties on liquor and that kind of thing, motor cars, during the period, and during that same period there was no increase in personal taxation or company tax, but last year we introduced the measures whereby professional people and self-employed persons would have to pay their taxes on an on-going basis in the same way as people like us who work for salaries have to pay pay-as-you-earn. We collected corporation tax last year alone, and the tax on professional persons and own-account or self-employed persons was to bring in between \$11 and \$12 million of additional revenue which we cannot

look forward to this year. Before we brought the Estimates to the House for the Financial Year beginning 1st April, 1976 and ending on 31st March, 1977, we drastically reduced all the demands for non-recurrent expenditure to try to keep the expenditure figure down to the bare minimum, and despite all our pruning, as I said at the time of the Estimates, because of our commitment to pay, first the increments to public officers, and secondly the 5% which we agreed to pay them as part of the collective bargaining process that we instituted in 1973-74, we could not reduce the expenditure below, I think it was — just a moment, Sir, I would just look for the figure here....

Mr. ADAMS: While the Prime Minister is looking for his figure, I wonder if he would just allow me.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: What is this now, Mr. Speaker? What point?

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: He has the final right of reply.

Mr. ADAMS: I know, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is he giving way?

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not believe there could be any point of order in my making various statements, of fact. I honestly believe there could be no point of order.

Mr. ADAMS: I don't want to quarrel, Sir, I can sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER: If it is a point of order I will have to hear it.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, he is talking about the 1973-74 salaries. The Prime Minister just said he had to make provision for them, they are not shown. I would point out that the figures from which I am quoting for 1973-74 already show the increase, so all this talk about the 5%, I have quoted from the year in which we voted for the increase, and revenue has gone up 60% and expenditure since the last increase.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a statement.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member is either deliberately deaf or pur-blind,

because the figure which I quoted here was 1972-73 \$110 million. I did not quote 1972-73 in a figure because that was the year before the salary increase. I said we had gone up \$110 million, then to \$182 million, and during that period after that we had a revision. Now he is only getting up to interrupt.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, the Prime Minister is imputing improper motives to me as I see it, by suggesting that I have been reading figures to the House before a revision and saying that they are after. I am saying that I quoted from the 1973-74 figures which already show the revision, and he must not suggest that I am misleading the House.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am dealing with what I am quoting, I am not dealing with what you are quoting, because what you are quoting is not anything that anybody over here can pay any substance to.

In 1972-73, I have it on page 1 of the Estimates in a statement of revenue for the five year period was \$110 million. What I am stating then is that since that time we have had increases both in salaries revision and the 5% increase and so on. The point I am making is that the hon. member was switching from revenue to expenditure and back to revenue in a very glib kind of way to prove that the Government had money and that the Government, since the expenditure had risen during this period, therefore it is only logical to assume that with expenditure rising at that rate that Government could afford. The point I am making is that the expenditure was rising because of salaries amongst other things, and if revenue was rising at the same time it was not because of any increase in taxation but in a particular year there had been the corporation tax as a result of the budget and so on, and also the own-account workers which we cannot expect to get again this year, because that was a once-for-all payment where the companies had to pay their tax in advance as it were.

Now he is using expenditure in isolation. You can't use expenditure without showing what your revenue is going to be, so that the growth of expenditure which was by itself generated by increases in salaries you could afford to pay salaries in 1976-77. What you have to do in this exercise as a matter of simple arithmetic, what is Government's expenditure? What is Government's revenue? Has your budget balanced? Is your rate of growth such in revenue, not in expenditure, that you can reasonably expect that without

borrowing money from somewhere you will be able to pay for any demands which are made on you by the public service or any other sector. We are dealing with current revenue and current expenditure now. You cannot switch from revenue to expenditure because the facts of the matter are simple, that in the financial year in which we now find ourselves that the Government starts off with a deficit of over \$20 million. We have never had an estimated deficit of more than \$10 or \$11 million during the past 15 years.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. The Prime Minister must not make untrue statements. The very Estimates I am reading from 1973-74, have an estimated deficit of \$19.7 million. Look at them here, send for them.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Not after the budget. If the hon. member says it is 1973-74 which is the year we had these sky-rocketing prices, we had an estimated deficit of \$19 million, we had a budget and we still calculated to come out under. We didn't balance the budget, but we were able to get things back on an even keel. Now I am saying that if you take \$20 million, it is really \$25 million, you will find out that with the various things we had planned, that the gap between estimated revenue and estimated expenditure is like \$25 million without an increase in salary. When we vote pensions, both the Government pensions and old age pensions, and the settlement on the public officers, it will be a \$50 million deficit on current account, and there is no way that the natural growth of the economy without excessive taxation on everybody in this country can close that gap between revenue and expenditure, because that is basic to the whole exercise. There is no way that in this year or next year that I can foresee that any amount of reasonable taxation or any growth in the economy, things being what they are now, can take care of that gap, and I have never before had to borrow money to pay salaries or for current expenditure, because we have always managed to come out just carrying over into the next year and then balancing out.

I have been Minister of Finance of this country for the past 16 years, and I think he has condemned himself by getting up and showing that under my administration the economy has grown. I don't think it is an indictment to get up in here and say that from 1972 to 1976 Government revenue has grown from \$110 million — he said it was \$102 million — \$182 million.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, the hon. member is misrepresenting what I said. He said that I have admitted the economy has grown. I drew a distinction between the economy which has declined and Government revenue which has grown. I can see the difference, if he is Minister of Finance for so long he should be able to see it too.

8.35 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: As far as I know, I do not think that anyone, including the Central Bank, has the actual statistics. The gross national product of Barbados, even last year, could not possibly have declined because of high sugar prices. If it has ever declined it might have declined during this particular period by 1% or 1.6%, but I do not have the accurate figures. To say that the economy of Barbados has declined is a joke, because we had a steady growth rate of about 7%, and after the crisis it did not accelerate at such a pace because we were getting increases in tourism. You may be increasing absolutely, but the higher you go your rate must necessarily drop off although you are increasing absolutely.

Now, they are saying that the economy has declined. Why do they not read the whole of the Central Bank's Report, since that is now their Bible, and see what other things are stated in the Central Bank Report? I do not think it is my job, as Minister of Finance, to come here and read a document that has been circularised to members, from cover to cover, to get them to understand what we are trying to say there. What they are saying now is that we are guilty of a great confidence trick because we really do not have any problem. He has not mentioned this, but he must know that there is a deficit on current account of at least \$20 million. I am looking for the expenditure here, Sir.

Expenditure in 1976-77 is estimated at \$208 million, while revenue is only \$182 million. If you do a little quick arithmetic, you will see that it is something like \$26 million. This has nothing to do with the amount we have to find for the subsidised bus fares which is over \$5 million, plus the pensions and the salaries which is \$25 million; so it is \$56 million even without coming for any expenditure that may arise *ex impro viso* that we have not anticipated yet, and these are inevitable sometimes. It is \$56 million on current account.

Now, he is saying that Government expenditure has grown, and the economy of Barbados has declined. I am not aware that the

economy of Barbados has declined. With the high sugar prices we got, the GNP of Barbados has actually risen. Our balance of payments surplus was the highest that we ever had on record. This is in the Central Bank's Report. Why do they not read that and they will find it?

It is almost dishonest for anybody, Minister of Finance myself included, to come here and ask for any kind of money, but there are pressures from the small man down at the bottom to whom we will have to find accommodation. We will have to scratch our heads and tax our brains to find something to cushion something which is not the rise due to inflation and which is not the fault of the small man. They are trying to blame me for inflation. I make no apology for that. I think that Barbados has done remarkably well, because I do not see the kind of squalor and abject poverty that you get in far more highly industrialised societies than ours, and sometimes in the rich oil countries like Venezuela where you have the ranchos tumbling down the hillside without any streets, water, sanitation, as you very well know, Sir. You go to Rio Janeiro or Caracas and you see this kind of thing, but you do not see that in Barbados. The people have devised a way of modifying their expenditure patterns by spending less on luxuries, and we have been surviving and doing reasonably well compared with how other people are suffering in the rest of the Caribbean and elsewhere.

I am saying, categorically, that as a result of these Resolutions the Government is going to be faced with a deficit of over \$57 million on current account, which means that if it is \$57 million this year, it is going to be more next year and we cannot go on borrowing money in order to liquidate a current account deficit. We borrow money for capital expenditure. The capital expenditure was estimated, as far as I can remember, at \$88 million of which we can find, probably, about \$38 million from international sources leaving a deficit on capital account of over \$50 million. But now with these salaries the deficit on capital account is going to be considerably more, probably 20% or 15% more as a result of these salaries, because there will be a wage component in the capital projects which will send up the estimates that we approved here in the month of March skyrocketing to unprecedented heights.

Futhermore, the prices of the materials which we have to import in order to carry out the capital projects will also go up. On current

account and capital account we are going to be faced with finding something like \$120 million. We do not tax people for capital projects, but we cannot borrow money indefinitely year after year to pay wages and salaries. That is the point I am making. For anyone to sit down over there, or to stand up and accuse the Government of some kind of confidence trick by pretending that we do not have the money is nonsense. We do not have the money. I do not know where it is going to come from. If you want us to tax people's incomes I will tax people's incomes, including my own. If you want us to increase corporation tax, I will increase the corporation tax and I will have no compunction. If you want us, as the hon. member for Christ Church has said, to put on a tax on wealth, so that if you own a house for \$50,000, you will have to pay in immediately \$25,000 to the Government as 50% wealth tax. He said that he will pay that willingly, and I will be glad to get it from him.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order. I do not want the hon. member to say that I have suggested to him to put on a wealth tax.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You said that you had no objection.

Mr. FORDE: The hon. member for St. Michael South Central asked whether, in referring to people who were well off, I was referring to people like myself, and I said that if he was bringing me personally into the debate and wanted to put a wealth tax on me, or any person who came into property by way of their parents, I would not exempt myself from such a tax. I have not given him any suggestion, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point made.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You accepted that if it had to be done, you would pay. I would be glad to get the money from you for the Government and not for myself. If this is what we want, let us, before we leave in here tonight, come to some kind of agreement and let the general population know what the Opposition and the Government want to agree to, to raise this money, but do not accuse us of any confidence trick. If you want a wealth tax, they are having it in England. That is, if you have money in the bank, you will have to turn over some to the Government.

Now, one of their members, the hon. member for St. James, and I do not want any interruption because the Leader of the

Opposition knows it is true. We have all the Reports of the meeting. Your General Secretary and the member for St. James went down to Guyana and suggested to the Prime Minister that he should export the Burnham version of socialism to his colleagues in Barbados and elsewhere.

Mr. ADAMS rose —

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Do not worry to get up because you know it is true.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. The Minister knows I am going to get up, and he knows I am going to set the record right.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what have you got up?

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. It is well known that the hon. member for St. James said that Mr. Burnham should send the blueprint to his colleagues in the Caribbean for study. Mr. Burnham's policies have been repudiated by the Barbados Labour Party on numerous occasions. I do not want to make a speech on the next reading of the Resolution. I will ask the Prime Minister to do one thing. In so far as the Government does not have the money, while he is replying could he deal.....

Mr. SPEAKER: What point of order is this?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: He cannot ask me what to deal with.

Mr. ADAMS: It will waste more time if I have to make a speech on the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: You have made your point already.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, he cannot be telling me what to deal with! What is this House coming to now?

Mr. ADAMS: I am asking on a point of elucidation if

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am the Minister of Finance, and he wants to tell me what I should deal with!

Mr. SPEAKER: Somebody seems to be getting tired or something. Sit down!

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Take your seat, please.
8.45 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Somebody seems to be getting tired. Take your seat. You all were going quite well.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I understand what the General Secretary

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, the Prime Minister is in my submission misleading the House because he is saying there is no revenue, but the Central Bank Report says there is a \$22 million surplus on current revenue at the last count, contrary to what he says about there being a deficit.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: But for what year? The most recent report is March because it cannot be issued before I see it. See if it is not the March Report! That was printed before we brought the Estimates in the House, and furthermore the Central Bank Report did not deal with the year 1976-77 which is what I am dealing with here, and furthermore the Central Bank Report is misleading because they do not have the out-turn figures for the financial year 1975-76. There was a surplus but it was nothing like \$22 million then, and it was largely because of the sugar levies when we had a surplus. As a matter of fact I will say that right now we do not even know at this juncture precisely what the out-turn figures are, but I will bring them to the House as soon as possible, probably within the next week or so. That report was printed in March and is not conclusive on the out-turn figures for 1975-76, but it has nothing to do with the Estimates for 1976-77 which he discussed and debated in here. There are the approved Estimates for 1976-77. We are not dealing with last year, yet he says the economy has not grown.

I want to come back to this business about the blue print. He quoted very accurately up to a certain point. He said that the hon. member for St. James asked the Comrade Leader in Guyana to send the blue print for socialism to Barbados for this Government to study. That is a big joke. He said a lot more than that. Let me tell you about the blue print for socialism. Mr. Burnham is a personal friend of mine for over thirty years, but let me tell you what the blue print is. In Guyana today you cannot leave property to your children. If that is what the hon. member for Christ Church West wants, I am not saying that you said that, but if that is what he wants me to do in order to get my hands on some wealth to give the public officers, let me know before I leave here and I will know what to do tomorrow.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order, I will let the hon. member know that I have never believed in complete taking away of people's property.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I know you more than anybody else do not believe in taking away anything.

Mr. FORDE: I would not even take away the Prime Minister's; instead I would give to him.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: It is not mine and I want to say I did not take any from you. I was not mentioned at all; that was David, not me. You might think I had something to do with that, but I had absolutely nothing to do with that. He knows what I am talking about, Sir.

Let me get down to brass tacks about this business about a blue print for socialism from Guyana. They have passed a law down there that you cannot leave any property to your children; you have to leave it to the Government. If you want that and that is what we must do to pay the public officers, just let me know because it does not matter with me. They can have mine, what little I have, if that is what the country wants. If that is the kind of Labour Party socialism they want a blue print for, I am not in favour of it because I do not think the people in Barbados really want that. I think that they are overdoing the thing down there and I made a statement one Sunday afternoon in Trinidad that they were giving people \$15 with which to travel and in Barbados it is \$5,000 to travel, and I said you must tell me how you can turn your country into a concentration camp. I told this to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Frank Hope and he went and reported me to the Comrade Leader. I want to know how you can do this and people do not riot, because we cannot do that kind of thing in Barbados and get away with it. Incidentally I think we should have a look at the travelling allowance because I think it is too generous. I do not mean the travelling for people going on Parliamentary delegations; I mean what we allow private people to spend going outside. I do not think we are right to make it so generous. In Guyana it was \$15 and now it is \$200. We do not want that kind of blue print. Mr. Burnham did law and I did economics. I do not want his blue print, not for socialism, but if that is what they want and their hierarchy wants it, let them put that to their Annual Conference and adopt it. I do not think it would get by, but I want to get back to the main point I was making.

Mr. ADAMS: The Prime Minister must not be so provoking and not get points of order. He

knows it has been put to the Annual Conference, they have rejected it and they have said we are not to be represented again at Burnham's conferences. The Prime Minister knows that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: They must have treated it seriously that they put it to the Annual Conference. I want to make this point because I was getting very confused when the Leader of the Opposition was switching from expenditure to revenue and back. In any one year what you have to take is what is your revenue/expenditure pattern and what are your revenue/expenditure patterns likely to be over the next three, four or five years. I am saying that the situation as from this year for the first time in our history is becoming very critical.

I am watching the clock, but with these interruptions I cannot finish. I am saying that what we have to do is to look down the road a bit. We are very lucky that even when we had deficits they were manageable. I am now saying that the deficits are unmanageable and we cannot borrow money to buy bread. You should not go to a supermarket or shop and trust food unless in an emergency, but you should not year after year, month after month, week after week have to be crediting food. I am making the analogy because if you have to be crediting food, there is something drastically wrong either with your expenditure pattern or with the income which you are getting because somebody is underpaying you or you are spending money recklessly. Consumables such as salaries should not be the subject of borrowing over any extended period. In an emergency yes. This is an emergency which we could not have controlled or contained, but we are not controlling it and we are not containing, and I must share some of the irresponsibility because I am a socialist and I believe that for the man down at the bottom we must devise ways and means to help him, but incidentally we have had to help everybody all the way up to the top to the tune of 12%, and I am saying it is — I do not know an appropriate Parliamentary word to describe the statement made by the hon. member when he accused Government of a confidence trick to say we do not have the money. The fact is we have not got the money, but if they say we should go and tax wealth, that we should increase corporation tax, that we should increase income tax, they are the ones who are talking now of relieving the Treasury of the \$6 million or \$7 million that we are getting from the sales tax on non-essentials, not on things like food. It is

true it is on medicine, but they are even saying we should not have the sales tax at all. They are saying that the water rates are too high. They should be in the Bahamas, where I had to pay \$2.93 for four pints of fresh water, and I can bring the container in here. The hon. member for St. Peter was there and he knows it is true. We pay \$6.00 a quarter for 100,000 gallons, leave on the hose all night, do what you like, and the members who have been to the Bahamas know you pay \$2.93 for four pints of water, and they talk about water rates being too high. They are going to take off the sales tax and all that irresponsible talk, and are now accusing the Government saying that the Government is guilty of a confidence trick because we have the money hidden somewhere.

8.55 p.m.

I just want to say something in conclusion in answer to the member for St. Michael West. The money that was, not is, the money that was in the Central Bank belongs to the commercial banks. They are people's savings, unless they want us to tax the savings now and liquidate the public service and go after the private sector to pay Civil Servants salaries. If they want that, tell me about that too, and I think that I could call and inform all the bank managers tomorrow morning to tell their depositors that people in the Assembly want us to take away the deposits which they have in the Central Bank. This is not the Government's money. These were surplus funds. Some of them had to be paid back to the Sugar Industry as a result of the sugar levy.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. The Prime Minister has misrepresented the motives of hon. members who have spoken. None of us has suggested anything of the sort.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: He was not here. The member for St. Michael West said that the money in the Central Bank belonged to the commercial banks, and that is where we should get the money from.

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

Ayes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. A. MORRISON, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Mr. W. R. LOWE, Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Mr. A. DaC. EDWARDS and Hon. P. G. MORGAN. — 11.

Noes: Mr. E. E. GREAVES, Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Miss B. A. MILLER, Mr. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. W. C. B. HINDS and Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS — 6.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today and I

beg to move that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 6th July at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

9 p.m.