
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1986 – 91

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, December 2, 1986.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Hon. L. A. Weekes, (Speaker)

Hon. L. E. Sandiford, B.A., M.A., (Econ.), J.P.,
(Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Education and
Culture and Leader of the House

Hon. H. deB. Forde, Q.C., M.A., LL.B., (Leader of
the Opposition)

Hon. Dr. R. C. Haynes, M.B., Ch.B., F.R.C.P.
(Edin.), (Minister of Finance)

Hon. N. K. Simmons, (Minister of Health)

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

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

Mrs. M. Barker-Welch, (Parliamentary Secretary,
Ministry of Employment, Labour Relations and Com-
munity Development)

Mr. C. V. Walker, (Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry
of Education and Culture)

Mr. L. L. Brathwaite, J.P.

Mr. E. Bourne

Mr. C. A. Neblett, B.A., A.C.M.A.

Mr. P. J. M. Miller

and

Mr. R. P. Byer, LL.B., L.E.C.

Prayers were led by Rev. Father Ivan Harewood.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in session.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of the
25th November, 1986.

*Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN and Mr. J. J. PAYNE
entered the Chamber and took their seats.*

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Minutes
of the meeting of the House of Assembly on Tuesday, the
25th day of November, 1986 have been circulated, and I
beg to move that these Minutes be approved by this Hon-
ourable Chamber as an accurate record of the proceedings
of this Honourable Chamber on that day.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, I beg to draw atten-
tion to an error in the Minutes. Among those present I do
not think it is accurate to say that last Tuesday the
Honourable B. M. Taitt was present in the House. He was
still in Montreal.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the honourable Mem-
ber is referring, according to the rules of the House, not
by name, but to the honourable Member for St. Michael
West. I take it that honourable Members agree. Will some-
one move the adoption of the Minutes with that
amendment?

Mr. C. A. NEBLETT: I beg to move the adoption
of the Minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no other observations,
let the Minutes as amended stand confirmed.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to
give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of
\$4 418 461 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it
at the disposal of the Government to supplement the
Estimates 1986–87 Part I – Current as shown in the
Supplementary Estimates 1986–87, No. 13, which form
the Schedule to the Resolution.

And also, a Resolution to grant the sum of
\$152 629 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at

the disposal of the Government to supplement the Annexed Estimates 1986-87 No. 14 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Judges Remuneration and Pensions Act.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Christ Church East Central, a Resolution urging the erection of a statue to the memory of the late Charles Duncan O'Neal. The honourable Member is not in his place at this point.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Andrew, work permits for non-nationals.

Mr. C. A. NEBLETT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following question to the Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs:

"1. Is it still the practice of the Immigration Department to issue work permits to non-nationals only after full investigations to establish whether or not the skills which non-nationals possess can be found among Barbadian nationals at home or abroad?

2. Are work permits issued to non-nationals on condition that Barbadian nationals be trained in the particular skills?

3. Will the Minister state whether any and, if so, how many, non-nationals are presently permitted to work as flour millers in Barbados, where any such persons are authorised to work, whether Barbadians are being or have been trained as replacements for those persons, and whether there is a lack of trained nationals justifying new or extended work permits for flour millers?"

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Christ Church East, illegal dynamiting of fish from Bow Bells to Sam Lord's Castle.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question:

"1. Is the Minister aware that, despite legislation prohibiting it, the dynamiting of fish in the sea is done daily from Bow Bells, Christ Church in the south to Sam Lord's Castle, St. Philip in the east?

2. Will the Minister consider having the Coast Guard patrol the above area with powers of search and arrest to deal with offenders?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same honourable Member, pavilions for St. Christopher, Fairy Valley and St. Patrick's.

Mr. E. BOURNE: To the Minister of Community Development:

1. Is the Minister aware that pavilions which were promised by the former Government for

(a) St. Christopher,

(b) Fairy Valley, and

(c) St. Patrick's, Christ Church, have not so far been provided?

2. Is the Minister also aware that last year a mockery was made of the people of Fairy Valley by Government by the dropping of an old wooden school building, without a roof, on the grounds, and that the building has now fallen after a year of disuse?

3. Would the Minister have modern pavilions erected with dressing room and toilet facilities at Fairy Valley, St. Patrick's and St. Christopher?"

12.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The same honourable member re pressing need for regular public transport in Parish Land and Fairy Valley.

Mr. E. BOURNE: To ask of the Minister of Transport, Works and Telecommunications:—

"1. Is the Minister aware that there is a pressing need for a regular public transport service in Parish Land and Fairy Valley Christ Church and, if he is not so aware, would he kindly give this matter his urgent attention?

2. Would the Minister direct some of the mini-buses, which crowd the shorthaul routes, to the Parish Land/Fairy Valley area and to the other areas of the country which are crying out for service and, if this cannot be done, would the Minister issue a permit to a newcomer who is prepared to ply that route?"

Mr. SPEAKER: The same honourable Member re lights on the hard courts at St. Christopher Boys' School.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Mr. Speaker: To ask of the Minister of Education and Culture:—

"Would the Minister cause the lights which were on the hard court at St. Christopher Boys School, Christ Church under the former D.L.P. Administra-

tion to be lit again to coincide with the rebuilding of the school which is now in progress so that that part of the school's facilities can be restored to full service?"

Mr. SPEAKER: And your last question, the honourable Member for Christ Church East re introduction of lighted crosswalks on the main roads between Oistins and Bridgetown.

Mr. E. BOURNE: To ask of the Minister of Transport, Works and Telecommunications:—

"Will the Minister consider the introduction of lighted crosswalks on the main roads between Oistins and Bridgetown, in view of the considerable vehicular and pedestrian traffic, including that of the tourism sector, and especially to improve the safety of pedestrians?"

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

On motion of Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, seconded by Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES, a Bill to amend the Judges Remuneration and Pensions Act was read a first time.

Hon. M. A. KING entered the Chamber and took his seat.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, there are Replies to Parliamentary Questions which are now ready and the Honourable Minister of Finance will indicate.

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 9, 20 and 21 are now ready.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, before we proceed to Government Business, I wish to indicate that two Resolutions of which notice was given earlier today are deemed to be important and that they should be dealt with by the Honourable House in all stages today subject, of course, to the availability of time and any other consideration which may arise.

These Resolutions have been circulated and at a later stage I will seek the indulgence of the Honourable House to proceed with these matters, but I am just giving that indication at this stage. These are the Resolutions of which notice was given today, one for \$4 418 461 and the other for \$152 629.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Again, before we get into Government Business, I wish to move that Standing Orders 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting subject, of course, to the customary rights of the Opposition.

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

Hon. B. M. TAITT entered the Chamber and took his seat.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Order No. 1 is the instant Order of the day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1.

Order No. 1 was called — To move that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of this Island.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, the Order we wish to start with is Order No. 2 so that we may proceed into Committee of Supply immediately.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2.

Order No. 2 was called — To move that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of this island.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the Honourable House go into Committee of Supply to consider a number of money Resolutions.

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

The question that Mr. SPEAKER do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. R. P. BYER in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is now in Committee.

Order No. 2(a) was called — To move the passing of a Resolution to amend the Explanatory Note to Subhead 4 — Sanitation Service Authority — Head 85, Ministry of Tourism and the Environment.

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE EXPLANATORY
NOTE TO SUBHEAD 4 – SANITATION SER-
VICE AUTHORITY – HEAD 85, MINIS-
TRY OF TOURISM AND THE
ENVIRONMENT

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution really is in the name of the Honourable Minister for Tourism but, I believe, what has happened is that under the previous Administration the designation of the Ministry was Tourism and the Environment but with the change of Government, Environment now falls under the Ministry of Health, and as I understand it, this seeks only to add the name of Mangrove to the Head.
12.35 p.m.

What has happened is that previous to this we had one land fill in the South at Kingsland. That has been taken out of use, and we are using the land fill at Mangrove, and this is the extent to which they want to change it so that Mangrove can be included in the Head.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. W. W. HALL entered the Chamber and took his seat.

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

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, there are two Mangroves in Barbados.

(Aside: Your Mangrove.)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: They are bringing the rubbish up to St. Thomas.

Asides

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: They have been using a land fill at a place up by what we call Mango Pond, but I would admonish the Honourable Minister to take steps to ensure that it is properly policed. Residents in the area have complained to me very recently about the fact that people are dumping rubbish even in the road. I think you need to have the presence of a security guard or somebody to ensure that the rubbish is dumped in the designated spot, because it is a very narrow road and even though there are few houses up there, it is still an inconvenience and a potential health hazard.

While I am on it, may I ask the honourable Minister what is proposed in respect of the dump at Melrose? Will that continue, having regard to the establishment of this? The honourable Member for St. George would know it.

He used to live in that area. What I am trying to find out is if you will have two in St. Thomas or whether you are going to use Mangrove now and develop that as the dump for the central parts of the Island.

Aside.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: That is not the final reply.

I think we have to understand, Mr. Chairman, that there is a lot of illegal dumping in Barbados. Melrose is not an authorised dump. It was opened and it was supposed to have been closed, but we have got very bad health habits in Barbados. People drive and if they see an open lot, they throw the garbage there, and then people start doing the same.

As far as policing Mangrove is concerned, we are trying our best, but people make a living out of dumps not only in Barbados, but throughout the world. People go and salvage things. A lot of things which normally can be used by experts in areas, people dump. Others go in, take them out, refurbish them and sell them. It is a problem throughout the world, but I still am mindful of the point of dumping in the road. It has been fenced as far as I know, and this is to assist people who take their trucks in and dump. Again as I say, when we do it, the Sanitation Service Authority, we go in, but there are private people who feel that they can dump any place, and that is the problem.

The law has to be changed in short in order to deal with people who behave in that manner. I thank you.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to hear the Honourable Minister has given the assurance about changing the law in order to ensure that people do not go to sanitation dumps in order to salvage things. I note that the Honourable Minister is aware that it is a habit that one has seen throughout the whole world.

I recall that, prior to May 28, 1986, when persons went to dumps to salvage things Barbados was being then billed that people had to go to the land fills in order to get food. I have noticed that they have gone to land fills since May 28, 1986, and I agree with the Honourable Minister's reasons, but these reasons existed prior to May 28, 1986.

I have seen these reports even occurring in the international press that Barbadians were going to the land fills in order to gather food because they were so badly off. It was of course untrue, but it was very good political jargon of the day and jargon which of course was used to the maximum effect.

This Opposition does not intend to misstate positions in Barbados. The position is that it is a very bad

habit of people to try to recoup things from land fills. It creates a danger to themselves and I can assure the Honourable Minister that any legislation that will deal with the matter will receive the support of the Opposition. I hope for the future that we will not seek to use people's lack of education merely for partisan political purposes.

Now, Sir, I wish to ask the Honourable Minister a few questions though about what appears to be a change in policy in relation to trucks working in the city of Bridgetown and moving garbage.

The Sanitation Authority had the policy where such trucks would not move garbage during peak hours. I think that there is a case for so organising the work of the Authority that they are not on the highways in major peak hours, particularly in the Bridgetown area because of the traffic congestion problem, and I hope that this practice which has been existing for some time will be continued rather than the new practice which I see now of trucks at peak hours on Roebuck Street and other parts of the City of Bridgetown.

Sir, we have a duty to ensure that Barbados becomes a very clean place, not only the City of Bridgetown but the whole of Barbados. Sanitation is extremely important for the Island not only as some people think for the purpose of tourism, but I think for the general standard of health of Barbados as a whole.

We have unfortunately got into the position in Barbados where the cleaning of our streets at week-ends has become almost a thing of the past. Whilst I recognise the reason why this change came about, because a five-day week was implemented in such a way that any working time on Saturday or on Sunday attracted time and a half or double time, that obviously added to the bill of the Sanitation Service Authority, and hence you cut back on such costs; cleaning the streets during the week-end has been curtailed.

Now I think that one has to take into account the necessity to make sure that cleaning continues on a regular basis. I realise that the policy had been implemented by the Authority of having some limited handcart cleaning on certain crucial streets of the City in the afternoons on a continuous basis. I have seen that this practice does not seem to have been continued either, and perhaps the Honourable Minister would let us know what is his policy on that.

Sir, I am also concerned about maintenance of the pulverisation plant at Workmans. There is no doubt that the residents of the Workmans area are suffering from the stench and problems occurring from that plant, and I believe that it is a question of maintenance. Wherever you locate whether it is a sanitation plant or a sewerage

plant there is going to be some problem, but these plants call for maximum maintenance if you are to minimise the problem, and I wonder whether the Honourable Minister is in a position today to make a statement as to whether the maintenance problems of the plant at Workmans are being attended to.

The other point, Sir, that the Honourable Minister could probably help us on is what progress has been made in the development of the sewerage scheme both for the West Coast and for the South Coast. I am particularly concerned about the continuing problem of sewage from the hotels and other establishments in the Rockley area, and the problem of beach erosion which has increased as a result of damage being done to the natural reefs around the South coast. Whilst I recognise that the sewerage plant will eventually provide some sort of temporary halt to this problem — I hope long term as well as temporary — I wonder what present measures are being taken by the Sanitation Service Authority to deal with the problem of sewage along the South coast.

12.45 p.m.

A couple of weeks ago, one honourable Member in speaking of the housing areas also made reference to the problem of sewerage and sanitation in those areas. In the Pleasant Hall area, in my own constituency, we have the problem of those pits and the continuing bad sewerage problems that occur there. And I wonder again whether the Honourable Minister, even ahead of the South Coast Sewerage Scheme, can tell us what temporary measures have been instituted by the Sanitation Service Authority to deal with this recurring problem in that area as well, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for St. Michael North East.

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, Sir, there is a matter of concern, and I am not quite sure where the blame is to be put, but it has to do with the amount of stuff that is left on the roads after some weeding has been done. It has been very evident in the heavy rainfall that we are experiencing that a number of the wells have had to be receiving this stuff, therefore creating a problem with flooding in some areas or heavy catchments of water.

I believe that something should be done, if we are going to weed the roads, to remove this stuff at an early enough time that you should not have a continuing problem.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for St. Andrew.

(Aside: You too?)

Laughter.

Mr. C. A. NEBLETT: Mr. Chairman, Sir, there is just a small observation here.

For quite some time, one notices that some private vehicles have been used by the commercial houses to remove garbage from their business places to the various authorized dumps. I notice some of these vehicles will carry nets, others just leave the garbage strewn along the streets and that is adding to our problem.

I should like the Honourable Minister to look into that situation whereby we can either have some legislation or some serious rules laid down to ensure that this situation does not continue much longer.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for St. James South.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think I can wind up now.

In reply to the honourable Member for Christ Church West, I am not quite sure what he calls "peak hours" but I can say that the Sanitation trucks work outside of peak hours, as far as I know, in the city to collect garbage. Streets in the city are cleaned on weekends. At least when I passed through Baxters Road at 6.30 last Saturday morning they were clean and Broad Street was being washed.

(Aside: Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Saturday morning?)

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Sunday morning. I saw it myself. I was on my way from home.

Laughter.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: As far as the maintenance of the Pulverization Plant is concerned, we have a serious problem in that people are taking what we do not consider to be garbage to the Pulverization Plant and, therefore, you will always have that stench because the wrong things are going into it. It is not designed for dead animals, excreta, et cetera. But people are doing that. And up to last Wednesday morning when I went to the sanitation workers, I think at 6.00 o'clock, they were complaining about this.

I am not quite sure how we are going to get over the problem except to say that in certain areas people must not keep animals like in the Pine and various housing areas animals must not be kept. But the wrong things are going into the Pulverization Plant in the city. And unfortunately, I have to raise the Central Bank again. If half the money had been spent on the Central Bank, everybody could have been hooked up to the Sewerage Plant in the city and we would not have to have the human excreta being collected

by garbage workers and carried to the Pulverization Plant. These are practical problems over which we have no control at the present moment.

As far as the progress on the West coast and South coast is concerned, I think it is the South coast we are dealing with now, and we are in the planning stage to draft the type of system we are going to use there. I must admit that I myself am in some doubt as to what system we would use.

In September or October I took a trip to Atlanta, Georgia and Miami looking at various systems, and whatever system there is there, there is some odour coming from it. We are in a very small and densely populated country, and I am not quite sure what we will use.

I must say that the one system from which I did not have an odour was a lagoon but at the same time, the temperature was 65° fahrenheit. So I do not think that I could have judged carefully as to whether that is best for Barbados. It was 65° fahrenheit, we are 75°, 80°, 85°, so I could not judge. But all I can say to you is that the most sophisticated systems in America have some odour coming from them. What the solution would be, I do not know.

There are no temporary measures for the South coast except that the sewerage treatment plants from the hotels there are not properly maintained. That is the problem with most of the hotels on the South coast with sewerage treatment plants. We constantly go to them, and we try to do what we can.

Again, unfortunately, the law does not seem to have much teeth here, and we are looking at that because from what we can see only the General Manager of the Sanitation Services Authority can initiate proceedings, and we want to put it in the hands of the supervisors, et cetera. I think the former Attorney-General would be in a position to agree with me in that respect. So that we are trying to make sure not only on the South coast but also on the West coast. And the hoteliers are the main culprits. They put in the sewerage systems but they do not maintain them. We are trying to make sure that they do it now.

In respect of the queries made by the honourable Member for St. Michael North East, weeding is really the responsibility of the Ministry of Transport and Works, and this too is a problem. As I understand it, if they leave the weeding out, after three days we are supposed to take it up. I am sure the workers who complained to me last Wednesday morning about this — I will have a word with the Honourable Minister of Transport and Works to see if we can get it resolved, but it is a problem, but it is not Sanitation's problem — as one fellow said, if he sees paper in the weeding he will take it up but he is not taking up grass. So you understand.

In reply to the honourable Member for St. Andrew, you have made a very valid point about the nets. Again, the Law must have some teeth. But I can say that the private movers of garbage are the main culprits, as far as this is concerned. They will not put nets and also they go to the nearest place to dump their garbage. That is why the Belle, although it is not an official landfill, they dump there all the time and also in Jack..... the gully in St. Thomas.....

Aside.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS:.....Jack-in-the-Box gully. They also go there. But unless we have people on the spot seeing what is happening, you cannot prosecute them. And this is something which we are looking into.

Now, Mr. Chairman, back to the original point. We are just asking that Mangrove be included in the subhead.

Thank you.

The question that Head 85 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Item 2 (b) was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$12 085 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1986–87, Part I – Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1986–87, No. 12, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES entered the Chamber and took his seat.

PART I – CURRENT – HEAD 10 – GOVERNOR-
GENERAL – \$12 085

12.55 p.m.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution that is before us is a very simple Resolution and I do not think that it will detain us for very long.

The whole purpose of the Resolution first of all is to provide an additional sum of money for travel in relation to the office of the Governor-General, and it directly relates to the travel of the Aide-de-Camp.

When the Estimates were drawn up one Aide-de-Camp was in place and in relation to the travelling that he was required to do an amount of money was provided. That was the sum of \$1,500. Now at the time when the Supplementary was being sought there was an amount of only \$249.85 remaining in the Vote and that is inadequate to meet the travelling of this official for the remainder of the financial year.

Therefore, a Supplement is being sought of \$1,850 in order to supplement that particular item of travelling, and it includes travelling outside of the normal working hours to attend on His Excellency, and there is an Aide-de-Camp in place who lives at a farther distance away than the previous holder of the office

Mr. R. L. Morris entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Now in respect of the item, Purchase of Vehicles – Item No. 24 there is a very simple explanation for the need for the Supplement.

Again, the amount provided under this Item has proved to be inadequate. A sum of \$103,000 was provided in the Current Estimates of Expenditure to replace the old No. 1 State car, the Daimler at Government House. However, the new car, a Daimler Limousine, which was delivered on August 28, 1986 together with a supply of spare parts recommended by the makers amounts to \$113,234.89.

There is, therefore, an outstanding amount that would have to be met of some \$10,235 which is required in order to complete the purchase of this particular vehicle and, when we take those two items together, one for travel and the other one for the purchase of vehicles, the amount required is \$12,085.

Sir, I beg to move that this Head stand part.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1986–87

PART II – CAPITAL

HEAD 79 – MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND LANDS
– \$1,600,000

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, the sum of \$1.5 million had been approved or provided in the Capital Estimates 1986–87 under this Object for the purpose of meeting the purchase of lands and property acquisitions. So far this year the sum of \$1,498,728.20 has already been disbursed to meet the payment of compensation for properties acquired leaving a balance of only \$1,271.80. To date the claims in respect of properties for which negotiations have been completed and which owners are awaiting payment total \$560,750. So, in order for the Ministry of Housing and Lands to settle these outstanding claims as well as any others that may subsequently become ready for settlement, and to avoid any additional

claims for the payment of interest in some cases, it is considered that Supplementary provision in the sum of \$1 million be granted.

The other Object under this Head, Mr. Chairman, Object No. 16 – Grants to Public Institutions – the sum of \$1.6 million had been included in the Estimates to meet the cost of resurveying of all the old estates of the Corporation. The Ministry of Housing had asked for \$27 million in the Estimates to cover everything, and actually they only got \$6 million and the \$6 million was divided \$2.5 million Pondsider, \$2.5 million at Bonnetts, and \$1 million for Sites and Services. So the Corporation had to shelve many of its other programmes including the resurveying of the old estates.

It is considered that the provision of funds for this project merits consideration for the following reasons: (1) There are a number of persons who have already paid the Corporation for their properties, but the Corporation is in no position to offer these persons the necessary conveyances because the respective lots have not yet been surveyed, (2) some Attorneys-at-Law representing these persons have threatened to sue the Corporation for specific performance in these matters, (3) some tenants have made deposits for their properties and are currently paying instalments towards the settlement of the purchase of the properties, but these persons will soon be eligible to receive conveyances as well, so if you do not survey the land, they cannot get their conveyances, and (4) the Corporation is in dire need of funds to carry out its housing programmes.

The surveying of these old estates will enable the Corporation to sell the properties and acquire much needed cash. So in these circumstances, it is recommended that a Supplementary provision in the sum of \$600,000 be granted to enable the National Housing Corporation to initiate this programme of surveying its old estates.

With that brief explanation for the two Heads, Mr. Chairman, I beg that Head 79 stand part.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will someone second the Resolution?
1.05 p.m.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak specifically on the survey of the old estates, and before doing so, let me declare an interest in that I have acted for persons who have been inconvenienced for several years now in obtaining conveyances to their land. The problem is essentially in the Bay Land.

The Bay Estate was developed several years ago, and an initial survey was done then. What has happened is that other lots have gone up sometimes on areas that have

been sold to people, and there has been great confusion created in that part of St. Michael. I believe that in a resurvey the Government may well have to provide additional house spots for some people arising out of that resurvey, if the Government is to live up to its contracts with some of the persons who have already bought.

I cannot promise the Honourable Minister that he can expect much money coming from the sale of lots in the Bay Land, because most of these persons have paid their money for several years. Some of them have lived on the land for several years as well and they have been inconvenienced to the extent that, as the Honourable Minister will be aware, they have not been able to convert their houses into wall.

In addition to the problem of surveys, there is also the problem of course of sanitation and sewerage, but I am happy to see that at least in the near future the survey will be carried out. In fact, the National Housing Corporation, from as long as I can remember, from the time I came into this Honourable House, was making the promise that they had a survey problem – and I have been in the Honourable House now since 1971, and I think that this problem existed even prior to 1971 – and they continue to say that they have this problem of resurveying, and it has never been solved, so that I am happy myself to join in the vote for money for this purpose.

Most of the older housing estates are in addition in need of refurbishing. The Honourable Minister ought to be aware, for instance, that the housing estate at Six Cross Roads – I am not sure whether it is in his constituency or the constituency of the other honourable Member; I am assured it is in the Honourable Minister's constituency – was built in the Labour Party Government prior to 1971. It has not been upgraded or regraded for a long time. Some of those residents would like their plots as well, and the same too goes for the housing estate at Coach Hill, St. John, another area constructed during the Labour Party's time, and again in need of upgrading, and I hope that the Honourable Minister will conceive of his task in respect of these old estates not only simply in bringing the Resolution for resurveying but actually assisting with upgrading the houses before the final transaction takes place between the current residents and the Government as well.

Now, Sir, in my own constituency at Pleasant Hall, the problem we have there is that the Government does not know what it owns. Within the Ministry of Housing and Lands there is no proper list of property owned by Government. At times the Government finds it difficult to find the title deeds to properties which it has acquired, and I believe that an effort was made in the last five years to have some responsibility for this assigned to an officer to keep a list of every compulsory acquisition that has taken place, and we need also to keep a list of those properties that Government

has acquired by private treaty, and we need further to research for the last eighty to one hundred years what other properties have come into the public domain.

In Pleasant Hall the problem is that we do have areas of land that are there and are ready for sale. Numerous letters have been written on behalf of potential purchasers, people who live in the area, on their behalf by myself as the representative of the area, on their behalf, in order to purchase the lots rather than allow the lots to remain overgrown. There are lots opposite Marine House wall, some of them facing on to the old Pleasant Hall estate, but up to today the Corporation seems not to be able to find out whether it owns title to these lots or indeed what are the lots. It does not seem to have any plots of the lots either. Perhaps the Honourable Minister will give consideration to looking at that particular problem.

Now, Sir, in the newer estates, although this is dealing specifically with helping the older estates, the problem here is that we come into Parliament very often and we pass Resolutions for the compulsory acquisition by the Crown of land, and then we have to come back into Parliament some time later to pass a Resolution for vesting this land in a particular Statutory Board. That is not only a waste of Parliament's time, in my view, but it is also an untidy way of doing business, because as a result people have to wait for a long time to get a plot.

The Honourable Minister should be aware that in Clapham Park almost all of the residents have expressed a willingness to purchase the lots that are there, and I would hope that the question of lots and plots and surveys would be readily completed so that the Ministry of Housing and Lands would have some money which it needs — the Honourable Minister of Finance is certainly not going to give it \$27 million next year nor even \$6 million next year — so you will have to find, Mr. Minister, your own sources of revenue, and this is one of the areas in which revenue could be easily found.

I would hope also that in an area like Simmons Road, where the lots are already available for sale, that the delay in allotting lots to people who have expressed a willingness to buy them would not occur. There should be no problem in surveying here because a recent survey was carried out of this land.

Now, Sir, I also want to deal briefly with the policy towards paying for compulsory acquisition of land. This subject has become, to some extent, bedevilled in a lot of rhetoric, but I am still seeing in the Ministry the Ministry making an offer of \$1.25 per square foot for a piece of land, let us say, about 3 000 or 4 000 square feet of land, and turning around and offering 90 cents per square foot because the next lot of land is 8 000 square feet of land, and they are contiguous. Either land in that area is worth 90 cents or it is worth \$1.25, but the distinction that is

being made at the level of negotiations and offer seems to me to be very unnecessary and not based on any scientific valuation of land ownership.

The same problem is occurring — and again I express an interest, because I can cite two cases in which I have tendered advice to the persons, not in my legal capacity but in my capacity as their representative, or somebody interested — at Top Rock. At Top Rock there is a typical case of a change in values, although these two bits of land are next to each other. We are not talking about a great difference of acres, a few hundred or thousand square feet. The same is happening at the very Simmons Land in that area. Surely the Government must have an overall policy on this.

I realise now that a person whose land is being compulsorily acquired is advised normally to get a survey done, but even when that valuation is done by recognised valuers, one finds that there is a reluctance on the part of the Government to deal with this problem.

Now, Sir, in the Other Place reference has been made to the need to upgrade, to revise and modernise the Land Acquisition Act. It is a call that has been made from this Honourable Chamber on numerous occasions. I must have spoken on the same subject on numerous occasions.

When the changes were made back in the 1960s to the Land Acquisition Act, we took out as a head of compensation or claim — a proper head of claim — the potential which the land may have, and it is my view that that is wrong and we should really re-institute that provision, the potential which the particular property may have. A lot of the quarrel which comes over land acquisition is really about that particular part of it.
1.15 p.m.

In addition, I think the time has come for us to look as well at the interest which is payable. The rate of interest allowed is now 6%. How realistic is that rate of interest for persons who have been denied the use of their money for some period of time?

The Honourable Minister would be aware that if it were a normal action in the High Court the judge has the discretion to award interest, and the rate being awarded now is at the rate of 8% rather than at the 6% stipulated in the Land Acquisition Act.

I am conscious of the fact that there are claims which have been outstanding for some time. I must say that there has been an improvement in the processing of claims. I think the honourable Member for St. Thomas has, in this Committee, spoken before about the steps taken to upgrade the Legal Unit in the Ministry of Housing to deal with the problems of stale claims in land acquisition, and there is no doubt in my mind that the

setting up of that unit two years ago was a wise step, and that already we are seeing that it is having an impact on the processing of claims much more quickly, and whilst there are some problems of valuation, I believe that the work of the Ministry is proceeding in this respect much more efficiently given the establishment of the new unit therein in the Ministry of Housing and Lands.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to state at this stage that the Resolution which is before us is one that is worthy of support by this Committee and as a representative for one of the areas which will be affected by this Resolution, I am bound to say that I certainly hope on behalf of my constituents that this measure will be pursued with alacrity.

I remember raising in this Honourable Chamber the question of provision of house lots for the persons who rent them in the Bayville Estate and, I believe, it is the honourable Member for St. Thomas who indicated on the floor of the House that steps were being taken to ensure that the lots were surveyed, and I know that he did express some concern about the time being taken in order to get the matter done.

The fact is that it was a policy of the present Government to sell the lots which persons were renting on Government's Housing Estates to those tenants wherever such sale was feasible, but, immediately, there was a problem because the number of land surveyors was small in relation to the work that had to be done. So we had a bottleneck and I think it is time that the entire country must or should realize that, however desirable a policy may be, sometimes in the implementation of the policy, certain bottlenecks occur.

The question is, how can we deal with those bottlenecks? The then Government — in other words, I am talking about the Democratic Labour Party Government, — proceeded to deal with this bottleneck in two ways to try to increase the supply of land surveyors and that was by two methods. One was to initiate a training programme for land surveyors at the Barbados Community College, and that particular programme is still in place and quite a number of land surveyors have been supplied for that profession as a result of that programme.

The second approach was to supply a number of National Development Scholarships, so that persons interested in the field of Land Surveying could go and get training overseas and, again, some persons were approved by the National Scholarships Committee, and they went abroad and had their training, and some of them are back working in the profession in this country as well.

Well, in as much as that particular bottleneck has been dealt with or is being dealt with, I do hope that at this stage now the Ministry and the National Housing

Corporation should be in a position to enable persons to own the lots which they have been renting, so that they would be able to get funds in order to carry out whatever improvements to their housing they would require.

This is both an economic measure and it is a measure of social amelioration to improve the lot of people in this country, and also to improve the stake which people have in the country because it is clear that those who own property have a greater commitment to the development and improvement of that property than persons who do not own property, and if we put this particular measure, therefore, against this social and economic background, we see the perspectives from which the Government is operating, and I only hope that, on behalf of my constituents and, indeed, on behalf of the other persons in other areas who stand to benefit from the successful conclusion of this measure, the agencies dealing with this matter would proceed with all speed in order to get it completed.

Quite a number of the lots have already been surveyed, certainly, on the Bayville Estate, but there are problems relating to dissatisfaction over some of the surveys that have been carried out and conflicts as to whether the line-marks and so on satisfy the requirements, or the hopes, or beliefs of the existing occupiers of the lots, and then there is the other problem that, even when the National Housing Corporation indicates to persons, "yes," there is an agreement to purchase and they may give a piece of paper, sometimes that piece of paper is not bankable in that those who supply or may be willing to supply mortgage funds are not prepared to put up those funds on the basis simply of an undertaking that the land will be conveyed in due course.

So this is an outstanding matter, and I hope that the agencies will proceed with all speed to bring it to a successful conclusion.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think the speech today by the honourable Member for Christ Church West was very enlightening.

I must say that today he mentioned some problems with surveying of estates. The main problem with the surveying of Government estates at the moment — we have a few problems — but the main one is a shortage of funds. If you do not have the funds, then you cannot move.

1.25 p.m.

There is a lack of surveyors in the Ministry of Housing, I admit, and we may need to look in the private sector for surveyors in order to carry out the surveying of the Government estates, but we cannot do that either unless we have the funds.

At the moment a great amount of land is vested in the National Housing Corporation, but the land is not surveyed, and it comes back to the two problems that I have just mentioned, the problem of funds and the problem of surveyors. I believe that this Resolution will go a long way in alleviating a lot of the hardship being faced by the National Housing Corporation in surveying of the estates.

There has been a tentative proposal put forward by certain construction firms in Barbados where they are saying that they are willing to come forward and do the surveying of the land if they are assured that the land will be given to them to build on. Now this matter is not a small matter. It has to be looked at very seriously, because, although we are interested in encouraging the private sector to get involved in house building, it is a departure from what has been happening previously, and the matter is being looked at by the Ministry of Housing.

A question was raised by the honourable member for Christ Church West as to the pricing of Government land. The pricing of Government land is not an easy matter however. I am sure the honourable Member realises that the first thing he has to ask himself is whether the Government is in the business of housing to make a profit or not. We in this Administration do not believe that the Government is in the housing market to make large amounts of profit, and we believe that the pricing of land has to do most of all with the type of persons whom you are catering for, and Government usually or always cater or should cater to the less well off people, as far as money is concerned, in a community, and therefore the price that you charge for land has to reflect the people whom you are selling land to.

I accept the point that the acquisition and the vesting of the land in the NHC should be done at the same time. We also believe that it is a waste of time coming to Parliament to acquire land, say, in January, and then have to come back to Parliament in probably June or July to vest the land in the National Housing Corporation. We in the Ministry of Housing believe that the two things should be done simultaneously, and this will speed up the work of the Ministry of Housing.

The problem of conveyances faced by persons waiting on Government is a serious problem, but my information is that this is also a serious problem in the private sector and not only in Government. I have an example in a place in St. Philip South, Ocean City, where persons have bought land in Ocean City twenty to twenty-five years ago and cannot get a conveyance up to this present time, and I am sure that the Ministry of Housing, this Administration, will have to look into this matter seriously to see what we can do to allow these persons to get their conveyances, because there are persons who I believe have already paid all the money for the land and cannot get a conveyance. When they want to leave the land now for their children, they cannot do it because they cannot get a conveyance. Very shortly I will

be going to Cabinet with this matter, because I believe the Administration has to look into this matter to see that these people get their conveyances for their property.

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: The honourable Member for Christ Church West also mentioned the Property Management Section, and he did mention a fact that we are aware of, where there is a lot of Government property in Barbados, land as well as houses, but I believe Government does not know where the land is that it owns. The problem with the Property Management Section is that I firmly believe that the Property Management Section is badly understaffed. The Property Management Section in the Ministry of Housing needs to be staffed properly because it is one arm of Government that can pay for itself. I am happy to say that over the past year or so, I believe, there is a new person who is heading the Property Management Section. She is a very knowledgeable person and at the moment she is preparing a paper to sent to Cabinet on the whole idea of property management in Barbados, and I believe that some good will come out of it.

With those few words, I beg to move that Head 79 stand part.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1986-87 No. 11 - \$346 000

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, the first part of this Resolution deals with the payment for rental of property. Because of a fire in 1984 which damaged the Supreme Court building, temporary accommodation was provided at Roebuck Street for the Court Process Office at a rental fee of \$4 000 per month while the Ministry of Transport, Works and Telecommunications carried out repairs to the damaged building. In order to meet this unforeseen expenditure, funds had to be drawn from the provision of \$48 000 which had been made in the 1985-86 Estimates for the lease of a building at Walrond Street currently used as an office accommodation for the Registrar of Companies and Industrial Property. It sounds a bit confusing, but what we are saying here is that we had to find accommodation for two parts of the judiciary: we had to find accommodation for the Registrar of Companies and Industrial Property and we had to find accommodation for the Court Process Office.

It had been anticipated that the Ministry of Transport, Works and Telecommunications would have completed the repairs and renovations to the Supreme Court building by September 30, 1985, but this deadline was not met. In fact it has not been met yet. The

result was that the provision had to be supplemented so that the necessary rental charges in respect of the two buildings could be met up to March 31, 1986.

Now no provision was made in the Current Estimates 1986-87 for the rental of office accommodation for the Court Process Office simply because it was thought that the Ministry of Transport and Works would have finished the building. Now the repairs and renovations have now been completed, but the Court Process Office has not been relocated, and the reason being given by the Ministry of Transport, Works and Telecommunications is that they do not have enough funds to provide air conditioning for the building. Now the question arises here: Is it cheaper to continue to pay \$4 000 a month rent for a length of time or to provide the air conditioning? At the moment I do not know which one is the cheaper, but it is a matter which in my view should have been taken up by the Ministry of Transport, Works and Telecommunications to see if it is cheaper to pay \$4 000 a month rent or to acquire the air conditioning and let the Court Process Office go back into the building.

Anyhow the point is that the building has not yet been re-occupied. In these circumstances the Court Process Office is still occupying a rented building on Roebuck Street paying \$4 000 a month rent, and it is expected that this arrangement will continue to the end of the current financial year, which is saying that MTW does not believe that it will get the funds or it does not have the funds to purchase the air conditioning unit. So supplementary provision is being sought in the sum of \$36 000 to meet expenditure for this Head to the 31st March, 1987.

1.35 p.m.

The other Head which is Head 37 (1), Object No. 26 — Professional Services. The Government of Barbados and the United States Agency for International Development, these two bodies made an Agreement whereby funds would be made available to meet the cost of carrying out the Housing Credit Fund Programme. Now USAID because of this Housing Credit Fund Programme in which they have an Agreement with the Barbados Government, give a grant every year to help with the financial assistance to technical matters in property management and administration and also the development of a comprehensive national housing plan. The direct result of this grant is that the credit unions' ability to participate in the Housing Guarantee Programme which is the Housing Credit Fund Programme will be upgraded. This grant also assists the Barbados Mortgage Finance Company to bring its records up-to-date. It also helps to provide a comprehensive national housing plan, and it also helps with the training of staff.

Now USAID is expected to contribute US\$470 000, and to date approximately US\$270 000 of this money

has been provided for short-term technical assistance, long-term technical assistance and training. Previously, USAID handled most of the money from the funds but what is happening now is that the Ministry of Housing is being called upon to put the money up front and then USAID repays the money.

So actually what we are coming for here is not really money that we are taking out and not putting back. We are taking it out but USAID is putting it back, but we have to get it up front. And you could only get out the money — because the money when it is advanced from USAID is paid into the Consolidated Fund — by coming to Parliament for it.

Apparently, in the Estimates, a sum of \$10 000 has been provided under Object No. 26 — Professional Services in the Current Estimates 1986-87. This item would have to be supplemented. And the point must be made that the money is being provided by the USAID and it is not a sum which Government would have to look for. The sum of US\$34 878.22 has been advanced so far this Financial Year and has been placed into the Consolidated Fund. To meet expenditure up to the end of the current Financial Year, it is estimated that the sum of BDS\$310 000 will be required and a breakdown of it is as follows:

Technical assistance to institutions like the Credit Union League and the credit unions	\$30 000
---	----------

Barbados Mortgage Finance Company	\$20 000
-----------------------------------	----------

Then, in the other section, the housing policy and planning implementation:

Outside consultancy fees	\$100 000
--------------------------	-----------

Local consultancy fees	\$ 20 000
------------------------	-----------

And the other breakdown in training:

Overseas training for staff of the

Housing Credit Fund	\$ 75 000
---------------------	-----------

Local training	\$ 15 000
----------------	-----------

And the final category in which the money is broken down, commodities:

The computer hardware and software	\$50 000
------------------------------------	----------

That adds up to \$310 000.

As I have said before the funds that we are coming here for will be paid back by USAID but the Ministry of Housing has to pay the money up front so we have to come to Parliament in order to draw the money from the Consolidated Fund.

With those remarks, I beg to move that this Head stand part.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for St. Thomas.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, just on the matter of the Court Process Office. I think it was about October, 1984 when we had the fire. I agree with the Honourable Minister that the problem in getting the buildings in habitable condition have been entirely due to the tardiness of MTW. I visited — I believe it must have been about March just before Estimates — to see what was happening and, as I recall now, the problem was that in the burnt out building that used to be the Civil Office and the Marshals' Office, we had converted the top floor into the court for a Magistrate Civil Court, Mr. Walcott's Court. Downstairs was to house the Marshals and that had been redone to allow for the transfer or the retransfer of the Marshals back from Roebuck Street in the Simeon Hunte building to their own building.

I do not recall that there was a problem with the airconditioning insofar as I do not believe the plans called for airconditioning for the Marshals. The Magistrate wanted airconditioning and there was a little argy — bargo between himself and the Ministry.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, that is an English expression. When I say English expression, straight out of the cockney part of London.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But not found in the Oxford English Dictionary.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, Sir. I will withdraw it, Sir. It definitely would not be found in the Oxford. Oxford is nowhere near the cockney part of London. You could not find it there.

But there was a little argument as to whether

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am being euphemistic, Sir.

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am being euphemistic as to whether he should be provided with a fan or an air-conditioning unit and so on.

But I do not believe that the Marshals were insisting on airconditioning. I believe that a situation of fan ventilation would meet the justice of their case. I urge the

Honourable Minister that when he is weighing the two alternatives as to whether to let them stay at Roebuck Street and pay the \$4 000 or bring them back down to town, look at the question of the fans because it is on a ground floor. Secondly, bear in mind, Sir, that they will be in the hub and the centre of legal activity, as you know, Sir. And I think it would be more convenient for them, the lawyers, litigants and everybody to have them back down in the Supreme Court complex near the 3 Magistrates' Courts or 4 Magistrates' Courts now rather than up in Roebuck Street where they are a little cut off.

So I think from the point of view of convenience, it would be advantageous to have them back down in the complex in Coleridge Street. At the same time, we had taken steps to rehabilitate the accommodation satisfactorily, and if it is only a question of ventilation, try, Sir, to examine the possibility of using fans.

I am obliged, Sir.

The question that Head 37 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
1.45 p.m.

On the motion of Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of 4 Money Resolutions in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD each seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, the Resolutions were read a first time, a second time, and passed.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 3 o'clock, for lunch.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Order No. 3, Sir which will be dealt with by the Honourable Minister of Finance.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3.

**RESOLUTION TO GRANT THE SUM OF \$6,300,000
FROM THE CONSOLIDATED FUND FOR THE
PURPOSE OF MAKING ADVANCES**

Order No. 3 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to grant the sum of \$6,300,000 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government for the purpose of making advances of salaries or wages on the terms and conditions set out in the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, it gives me the greatest pleasure to be able to announce on behalf of the Right Honourable the Prime Minister of Barbados that the Democratic Labour Party continues to remain faithful to the pledges which it made to this Nation and, as one of its Budgetary Proposals, it made a commitment that it would make advances of salaries and wages available to certain Government employees to assist them in meeting the additional expenses of the Christmas season. We have so managed the affairs of this country that there is no difficulty in making in the month of December the \$6,300,000 available, without causing any undue increase in the deficit for the calendar year.

When I reflect, Sir, on the performance of this Government since it assumed office on May 28 and, when we look and see what we have done in that period of time, it would be fair to say that never in the history of Barbados, and to the best of my knowledge in the history of any other Caribbean Administration and probably in the history of any Administration in the world in any democratic country has so much been done in so short a period.....

Applause.

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES: while at the same time remaining faithful to each and every pledge which the Government has made to the people of Barbados.

Only a week ago, Sir, by the appropriate Order, we were able to reduce the down-payment on stoves and refrigerators used by the poor people of this country as part of the package which we announced in our Budgetary measures.

Today we have come with this Resolution which fulfils yet another pledge that we made to the people of Barbados. It is a pledge, Sir, that arises out of a humanitarian consideration and the recognition that Christmas has a special place in the hearts of our people, and we are very pleased to say that we can restore this Christmas benefit to our people and set it in a framework where it will cause no particular difficulty in terms of repayment.

It is, Sir, symptomatic of the kind of humanitarian approach which we have to the management of this country, and I believe that it will send the appropriate signal to the people of Barbados that wherever we have the opportunity we would be putting at all times humanitarian considerations foremost.

Now Mr. Speaker, we have so structured the repayment of this money as to make sure that it causes no undue burden to those who may wish to make use of the benefit on the one hand and, secondly, to make sure that the money is repaid in full by March 31.

As is clearly set out in the Schedule, the advances of salary and wages will be made available to Government employees on the following terms and conditions.
3.05 p.m.

Firstly, all members of the unestablished staff, casual employees and monthly paid Government employees who would normally continue to be employed by Government to the end of March 1987 should be eligible for an advance of wages and/or salaries at Christmas time 1986 in addition to wages and/or salaries normally receivable by them for the appropriate period on the following basis:

- “(i) In the case of unestablished and casual staff, an advance equivalent to twice the net weekly earnings during any average week in the period of eight (8) weeks immediately preceding the date of payment, subject to a maximum of \$400.
- (ii) In the case of monthly paid employees an advance equivalent to 50% of the net salary receivable by them for the month of November 1986, not exceeding \$400.”

The method of repayment will be as follows:

“Advances for 1986 should be deducted from the salary and/or wages of each employee receiving the same in equal monthly or weekly instalments as the case may be during the months of January to March 31, 1987. However, the advances are to be fully recovered from arrears of increased salaries or wages, if not fully reimbursed when salary or wage increases are being made.”

Of course, the consent of the employee to make the deductions from salary or wages should be obtained in writing before the advance is made.

In other word, Mr. Speaker, whilst we are making this money available, we are at the same time setting up appropriate arrangements for full recovery within the fiscal year on terms that are easy to the recipients of the money.

I believe, Sir, that it is essential in a democratic system, that political parties, when they make pledges to the people, should set about honouring those pledges as expeditiously as possible. We have tried very hard within the limitations available to us, and I am very pleased to move that this Resolution which I think would attract the support of both sides of the House should pass.

Thank you very much.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Finance is more and more acquiring for himself all the attributes of the boy who stood on the burning deck when all around had fled, when he comes to the Honourable House and speaks rather grandly about the wonderful state of affairs in this country and the wonderful state of affairs at the Ministry of Finance in particular.

Week by week we are now being bombarded by statements from Honourable Ministers regarding the desirability on the part of their Ministries to undertake programmes which they regard as being critical, only to be told that these programmes cannot be undertaken because of a shortage of funds. Today the Honourable Minister of Housing told us about how necessary it is to do some surveying but that this work cannot be undertaken because of shortage of funds.

Also, Mr. Speaker, last week we were told on both sides of the Honourable House as to how desirable it would be to have a permanent beautification programme undertaken to employ at least 540 people, perhaps costing as much as \$6 million, which programme cannot be undertaken because of lack of funds.

So that, Mr. Speaker, I ought really to begin by making the point that the Honourable Minister of Finance is perhaps being a bit too grandiose when, in the face of the evidence pertaining to Government revenues, he leads the Honourable House to believe that there is peace and there is rest in Paradise.

In relation to this particular matter, Mr. Speaker, I really must make the point that all we are basically concerning ourselves with, in a sense, is a system by which public workers can be granted an advance against the back pay that is due to them at some point in time.

If you read this Addendum, Sir, it recognises that the Government has not fulfilled the promise as is stated in the Democratic Labour Party's Manifesto to arrive at a satisfactory wage increase, and that this particular mechanism that is being put in place is simply a mechanism to give the public employees of this country some monies

in the absence of the Government having arrived at a wage increase of a satisfactory nature as promised in the DLP Manifesto.

Asides

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that the Schedule that forms part of this Resolution is very specific in stating that any monies lent to public employees under the auspices of this Resolution will be recovered from such back pay for which public employees become eligible when those salary increases are paid.

Asides

Mr. SPEAKER: I will caution honourable Members not to heckle or interrupt against the rules of the Honourable House. Please continue to speak.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I am obliged to you, Mr. Speaker. It is an advance against the wage increases and an advance against the back pay to which the Public Service is entitled.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member has risen on a point of order.

Asides

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. Do not mislead the youngster, and tell him don't sit down when Mr. Speaker is speaking. You should know better, Mr. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member is admittedly young in these matters, and therefore — I am explaining my point of order, Sir — and therefore, Sir, he might be forgiven, but when he has in front of him the actual Resolution, he cannot by inference or otherwise purport to mislead the Honourable House on what the Resolution says, and I submit that there is no such thing as a fair inference from any Resolution, that if he looks at the Resolution as it is stated and then says what he said, he is misleading the Honourable House, which is contrary to rules.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, the absence of the honourable Member from the country is becoming quite apparent in the statement that he has just made.

The Schedule to this Resolution very clearly states that the advances are to be fully recovered from arrears of increased salaries or wages if not fully reimbursed

when salary/wage increases are made, and the point I am making, Sir — a very simple point — is that what we are doing here is granting the public servants of Barbados an advance against the wage increase and the back pay to which they are entitled, and that this \$6 million so-called advance is no substitute for the Government arriving at a satisfactory wage increase settlement with the Public Service of this country as promised in the DLP Manifesto.

I want it to be made clear, Sir, that it is stated here very clearly in the Schedule to this Resolution that the advances are to be recovered, if there are any arrears, from the wage increases that the Government grants, if it chooses to grant them, by the end of the financial year.
3.15 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, there is a history to this particular motion of advances to public servants which this Honourable House really ought to be made aware of. When this motion of an advance to Public Servants was first introduced by the Right Honourable Member for St. John, he made it very clear that they were to be regarded as non-refundable, non-reimbursable advances and, as a result, a long history of non-payment by civil servants built up.

In 1978 there was a coincidence of two developments in this country, one development being a fairly substantial wage settlement in December and the payment of a fairly large back-pay settlement to public servants, and, in addition, Sir, and more important, there was a commitment on the part of the Barbados Labour Party Administration to give the fullest support possible, particularly by way of tax relief, to the development of institutions such as the Credit Unions as the preferred mechanism through which people's needs for credit to deal with their ongoing needs could be satisfied.

We did not at that point in time believe that the Government of Barbados and the state should encourage the perpetuation of a paternalistic relationship between public employees and the state, that it was preferable, Mr. Speaker, that the public employees of this country should be encouraged to develop their own institutions, institutions through which their needs — whether there was a need for Christmas spending money, need for house repairs, need for education, car loans — it was our view that this business that there being a paternalistic relationship between state and the employee should stop, and that we should encourage instead the growth of institutions managed by the people themselves to provide for needs like this on an ongoing basis.

So that the decision by the previous Administration — and I will speak despite the heckling of the Democratic Labour Party, Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The rules of this Honourable House do not permit for heckling.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I am obliged to you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: You can only interrupt an honourable Member on the rules provided, and I would caution honourable Members to adhere to the rules of the Honourable House.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: So, Mr. Speaker, the point I really am trying to make is, yes, there is a DLP Manifesto pledge which says we will re-introduce the notion of Christmas advances, but it is part and parcel of a grand gesture and approach to create the impression that the world stopped in 1976 and nothing progressive happened since then, but a lot of a progressive nature has happened since then, Sir.

Since then we have seen the growth of the Credit Union Movement and particularly the growth of the NUPW as a Credit Union to fulfil a large number of the financial needs of the members of the Public Service.

Asides

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: No heavy strain, and that has, in its way, changed the former paternalistic relationship that existed between the Government and public servants in relation to some money to spend at Christmas.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the view that rather than our trying to go back to a pre-1976 situation and believing that the hands of the clock stopped there, we should recognize that we have been attempting systematically to develop a particular relationship between credit unions and employees, a relationship based upon people doing things to help themselves with rather than looking to the Government to do everything for them because that is part and parcel of what is wrong with this country, that we are encouraging paternalistic relationships in Barbados. Rather than allow people to build their institutions to help themselves, and the Government act as a catalyst in that, we are incrementally and step by step trying to re-introduce that paternalistic relationship where you encourage people to be distracted from the essence and requirement of their own institution building and look to Government for solutions.

Mr. Speaker, I see this particular move as falling within that scheme of things, and it would have been preferable, in my view, if the Government was to recognize that civil servants have needs, not only at Christmas, but that they have needs throughout the course of the year and if you have \$6 million to spend, that you might have thought not just in using it at Christmas. We must get away from this needing at Christmas attitude too. People have needs all through the year. Put the money in the credit unions if you must, so

that what has started in this country and is so beneficial, can continue to the benefit of the people of this country, and people can stop looking to Government for all of their solutions and look to themselves to help themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I am saying, therefore, in relation to this advance, there are two fundamental things that are wrong with this advance as far as I am concerned. It is an advance made in lieu of Government arriving at a satisfactory settlement for civil servants, and it is also in my view, bringing back that old idea that people cannot help themselves but must look to Government for their solutions.

Mr. Speaker, I must also go on.

Asides

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable Member address the Chair. Do not listen to asides. Address the chair!

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, this reminds me very much of the statements that were made in Roman times when they had a restive population. Rather than dealing with the fundamental problems of the society, the Romans were very much encouraged to give them bread and the circus. This is the same attitude, Sir.

We have a restive population which is satisfied that Government is not solving the problem of unemployment. We have a restive population, particularly in the Public Service, which is satisfied that the Government is not serious about arriving at a satisfactory wage increase, and we have a restive population in Barbados as a result of the drift in the Democratic Labour Party Administration and its lack of central direction. No central direction whatsoever, and week by week we see the bread and the circus.

This week it might be an advance on salaries in lieu of a wage increase. Next week they might be bringing back the fireworks, all the little trifles and tripe approaches to fundamental problems to distract a population which has become dissatisfied about Government's capacity to deliver, and I see this particularly, Mr. Speaker, in that broad context that the Government is not seeking fundamental solutions to the problems of this society. It is trying to use week by week little gimmicks, little trifles to stave off the day when it has to come to terms with the serious issues that are facing this country.

So that when one comes to deal with the question of an advance to public servants, one must ask oneself the question: What is the nature of the financing arrangements in this country at this point in time which urges a case for Government to enter into a relationship with

public servants as a lender to public servants? Because this is all they are doing.

3.25 p.m.

Are we now satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that there is such a deficiency in the financing systems of this country, whether it is the banking system, the credit unions or whatever else, that there is such a deficiency in these financing systems that there is a need now for Government to put itself in a position where it has to be a lender to anybody? I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that when we look at the development of the financial system in this country, particularly since 1976, when we look at the situation, the excess liquidity in the banking system today, when we look at the way in which the credit unions and particularly the NUPW Credit Union, have step by step developed capabilities to perform the role of lenders to people in the Public Service, then I can say, Sir, that when we analyse this situation in its broadest context there is nothing of any worth which should suggest to Government that it has to interpose itself as a lender between itself and the public servants of this country. We are sufficiently well served, Mr. Speaker, and that is the burden of my argument this evening. We are sufficiently well served with financing mechanisms in Barbados today for there to be no need for Government to enter any arrangement which re-institutes its former role as a lender to public servants, and I urge upon the Honourable House that, rather than seek to perpetuate this type of development, rather than trying to put back the Government in a paternalistic relationship to the public servants, to let us more realistically and more constructively focus upon how best we can continue to carry forward the role of the credit unions, the role of the banks, because that is precisely what development is about.

Aside

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: There is a point of philosophy, a point of principle that the Democratic Labour Party wishes to miss. It is popular, it is nice to be able to say that I am giving advances to the public servants. It is a nice thing, it is a popular sounding thing, but are we putting it in the context of the development of lender-borrower relationships in this country as we want to see them evolve? That is the issue and there is no other issue, Mr. Speaker, and with those remarks I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I will find it impossible to support this Resolution on the grounds that I feel that the Government should at this time be paying the civil servants the satisfactory wage increase which was promised rather than lending them money, and I cannot support this Resolution because it is at variance with every good principle by which we should seek to develop lender-borrower relationships in this country, and in addition, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support it because there is no objective ground upon which one can reasonably argue that our lending

mechanisms are in such a deficient state that there is any clear reason for Government now to come in and perform this function.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Michael West.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I must confess that the last speech, the speech by the honourable Member who just sat down is really a very sad speech. I regret very much that it had to fall from his mouth, because there are a lot of people in this country who had come to believe that he was representative of a younger, more progressive element in the Barbados Labour Party, and there are some of us on this side who from time to time albeit infrequently have believed that there was a glimmer of hope in his philosophic approach to the development of people.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member who is the Leader of the Opposition, who on that side is saying that these are mere words, could have been forgiven if he had made the speech which the honourable Member who just sat down made, because the honourable Member who is Leader of the Opposition has been known to take whichever position is the position of the moment, but the honourable Member who just sat down clearly did not make a speech which could be said that he made with his full and whole heart. How can he possibly come into this Honourable House on this day, after the Barbados Labour Party brutalised the people of this country for so long, and seek to defend that philosophy? How can he sit in here among honourable Members and suggest that a party that suggested that a refrigerator and a stove were a luxury, that the people of Barbados did not need to have refrigerators and stoves unless they belonged to a particular class, and make this comment that we must leave the people to the credit unions, that we should leave the people to this? We are not giving the people anything. We are making available to them their own money, and that is the difference between the Democratic Labour Party and the Barbados Labour Party. You seek constantly even now in Opposition with 3 Members, to deprive the people of what is theirs. This Resolution does not take any money from you or from the Barbados Labour Party or from the interest which you defend and give to the civil servants. This Resolution makes available to civil servants their own money which they get paid every month, and the red herring of trying to attach these loans which started in the year 1962 to some arrangement, some discussion, some negotiations with the Union is unworthy of the honourable Member for St. Peter.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: What is in there is available to be read by a blind man on a trotting horse. What it says is that, unlike when the Prime Minister Tom Adams recommended on the file that they be put in the hands of the debt collector if they did not pay — it is here on the file — unlike that time, what this Resolution says is that at the time when repayment is due, if there is anybody who has not repaid, that person will repay out of any back pay which is due to accrue to them as a result of the settlement whatever that settlement is.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member sought to give the impression to the public that rather than reach an agreement with the Unions on a legitimate increase, we would seek to obfuscate the issue and give them this in place of the increase. That is the impression you sought to give this Honourable House. Either the honourable Member is suffering from delusions brought about by a long weekend or the honourable Member is seeking deliberately through the use of words to confuse this Honourable House.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: It is an advance on wages, it is an advance of money it is an advance of payments, and Mr. Speaker, it has been in existence since the year 1962, and it remained in existence until the unconscionable Barbados Labour Party Government in its quest to relieve the population of this country of anything at all that could make it comfortable abolished this principle in 1979.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day in the history of politics in Barbados when the Barbados Labour Party can allow itself to be headlined, and I hope that the newspapers in this country will have the courage to headline that the Barbados Labour Party is against the advances. It is nothing new because you were against them before you abolished them, and I thought that the three of you — you call yourself three blind mice

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Well then you are three blind mice.
3.35 p.m.

Laughter.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The voice of the people spoke and if we are 24, we say so. But you, the 3 of you, 3 hon-

ourable Members, Sir, we thought they were different. We thought that somehow they would have taken out the best elements of the Barbados Labour Party and carried it forward.

Lo and behold, he comes in here today and advances a political and economic philosophy that would make President Reagan and Mrs. Margaret Thatcher look like liberals.

(*Aside:* Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Your Party is more capitalist now than any time in the history of Barbados.)

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is saying that my Party is more capitalist than at any time in the history of Barbados. This capitalist Party just brought to the House of Assembly a loan for civil servants and you say you are against it.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: You say you are against it! Mr. Speaker, they cannot be serious. Let me put the lie.

The press has a way, Sir, of not being able to follow, or to pretend not to follow, certain facts, so the honourable Member gave the impression that large sums of money have gone floating arising out of this policy.

Fortunately, when you are speaking from the point of view of the Government, you have at your fingertip the files. Mr. Speaker, since 1962, the people who borrowed this money have always, in large measure, returned it. It is not as if they have taken the money and run off with it. In 1962-63, Sir, the amount outstanding at the end of the day was \$724.46, in 1963 it was \$3 216.00 and in 1977 when the most wicked and

(*Aside:* Cruel.)

Hon. B. M. TAITT: cruel, spiteful Government that was ever visited on poor people ruled in Barbados, the amount was \$6 089.94.

And you have the temerity if you look at the file, you were a Minister. If you get to be a Minister you get to look at the file.

But I assure you, Mr. Speaker, and you know that it would be dishonourable to read from these files and say what is not here. \$6 089.94 was the amount in 1977. It was during that time that the Prime Minister as Minister of Finance and the Cabinet the following year stopped these advances.

(*Aside:* True.)

Hon. B. M. TAITT: It is the clearest expression of Barbados Labour Party difference with Democratic Labour Party difference.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: If it is so much foolishness — the honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition says it is foolishness, to lend somebody \$400, that we are making a big thing of lending somebody \$400. If we are making a big thing

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

Hon. B. M. TAITT:.....how come he can get up and talk about not giving them?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member will have to give way.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: How come he can get up and say that?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am on a point of order.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I did not hear you. You know I would give way if I had heard you. If I had heard you, I would give way.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member has brought me into this debate by making a statement that I did not make *sotto voce*.

The honourable Member is saying that I am saying to the House that lending people \$400 is foolishness.

(*Aside:* Hon. B. M. TAITT: What did you say?)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: That is not what I said, Sir.

The statement that I am making is that the honourable Member is talking foolishness. That is what I said *sotto voce*.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir,.....

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir,.....

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, my only regret is to see a man of his stature, an honourable Member who has been so regarded by the Honourable House, get up and say what he just said in the light of what I heard, Sir.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: In the light of what I heard. In the light of what I heard, that he could get up and say that, Sir, is a disappointment to me.

I am going to repeat that I heard him say that it is foolishness to make a big thing of \$400. I heard him say it. And now he gets up in here, trying to give the impression that he did not say it.

If it were possible I would tell you what I would call you in here.

(Aside: I heard)

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The fact is that you, the Barbados Labour Party ought to be ashamed to come in here at this time, and try to obfuscate the issue talking about negotiations which are separate and apart.

The National Union of Public Workers have agreed at the 1.4% level at the top. The Barbados Workers' Union has agreed. The BUT has agreed up at the top. There are some matters to be settled between them, some simple matters to be settled between the Government and the union, the National Union of Public Workers and the BUT in the middle and at the bottom. These are matters to be settled.

And this Democratic Labour Party in keeping with the pledge which it made to the people of this country has decided that it will negotiate. It said it will negotiate.

(Aside: Hear, hear!)

Applause

Hon. B. M. TAITT: And we cannot be wrong now, if we are wrong, when you came in and legislated. You cannot be wrong for negotiating.

And how can the honourable Member come in here today, Sir, and offer the suggestion that by negotiating we are wrong?

The honourable Member who introduced this Resolution said that we are a humane Government, and we are a humane Government because we can make the decision that in spite of the fact we disagreed or that we are in a state of disagreement with the union in this

country, we can still reach into the Treasury, find the money that will make sure that the people of Barbados can have the kind of Christmas which we believe they ought to have.

(Aside: Hear, hear!)

Applause.

(Aside: Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES: We are Christians!)

Hon. B. M. TAITT: We have said, Sir, by virtue of the Orders which we have passed, that those persons who wish to get a refrigerator and a stove ought to be able to get them in peace and comfort.

(Aside: Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES: We brought in the Order last week.)

Hon. B. M. TAITT: We are saying to the population of this country that we made promises to you, and we have committed ourselves to making this country a better place to live in. We are saying that we have been successful so far in the commitments we have made.

And now we come here to this Honourable House, not to do something new, not to do something different, but to restore a position that has been part of the administrative culture of this country since 1962. There was a hiatus when the Barbados Labour Party interrupted it. We are restoring it and we are saying that it falls and forms part of the administrative landscape of this community.

It has nothing to do with the attempt which the honourable Member makes to fall into line with some of the things which are said by some of the crypto-capitalists who insist that you must not let the people get anything, you must make the people work for everything they want.

We are saying that this is what the people will work for. This is the people's money. It is not a grant, it is a loan. And the only difference between this and the friends of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition who can go and borrow \$100 000 by simply walking into the bank is that these people are borrowing their own money from their own Government.

(Aside: Interest free.)

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Interest free.

(Aside: Hear, hear!)

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am disappointed, Sir, that I have to get up on the Floor of this Honourable House

and make this speech. I am disappointed that I have to call on any Barbadian, furthermore a Barbadian who holds himself out to be a representative of people, to discuss a matter so fundamentally simple in the context of the growth and development and the quality of life of our people.

The honourable Member can come in here and give us proper argument on economic policy. This is not a point of departure. At least, I did not think it was, until today. Today I now understand....

(*Aside*: Hon. H. deB. FORDE: You missed the point.)

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am not the only one who missed the point. A whole large number of the population will miss the point. If the population, if the civil servants — there are civil servants among your constituents — you ask them, if they believe that the making available a facility.....

(*Aside*: They want the wage increase.)

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, what is even more dastardly, Sir, what is even more dastardly.....

Aside

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Dastardly? I said, Mr. Speaker, "What is even more dastardly", I have not said that he is a dastardly fellow. I have said, "What is even more dastardly". The persons who made the \$4 000 may not have used the language as solicitously as it is being used now, Sir.

Aside

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I said, "What is more dastardly".

Aside

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Well boy, all of us get to be something at some time and if mine is that, I will leave you to be whatever yours is.
3.45 p.m.

The fact is, Sir, that the people to whom this money is being made available do not have to take it. No one is required to take the money. This is a loan that is being made available interest free in the same way that car loans are made available interest free, in the same way that house loans are made available to people. What this does is that it gives people the opportunity to have a certain kind of facilitation at a certain period in their history. At Christmas time it is well known that everybody's expenditure rises, everybody including

Parliamentarians has a rising expenditure. Suddenly, the honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition, who on another occasion will tell the world what a churchman, what a Christian he is, wishes to come today and for the expediency of politics, wishes to change colours, wishes to become somebody else....

Aside

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition, Sir. The Opposition is pathetic in their understanding. In fact, Sir, I go further. I say that they understand what they are saying. I say that the honourable Member for St. Peter really understands what he is saying and because he understands what he is saying he should be doubly damned. The honourable Member for St. Peter suggested that this Government is substituting a loan for a wage settlement. Even a fifth standard child would know the difference between a loan and a wage settlement, and he went on and criticised himself, Sir, in saying that it was a manifesto promise...

Aside

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Yes, because he is an honourable man, and I listen to you from time to time. I listen to the honourable Member, Sir, from time to time but today the honourable Member is an embarrassment.

I rise, Sir, to support this Resolution. I and all of my colleagues will support this Resolution because we have the civil servants in Barbados. We ourselves are servants of the people, and we understand that not every time that a person will have liquidity, not every time will a person have the cash at their disposal. We understand on this side that there comes a time when a person will need to take a small loan, and that is why the amounts which are made available fall within a certain ambit or certain level so that they will not be beyond the capacity of people to repay them.

Aside

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, even the \$400.

Mr. Speaker, this \$6 million plus Resolution is a restoration. It is a manifestation of the Democratic Labour Party's philosophical belief that the people of Barbados are paramount. It is their belief that they are not able to stand in the place of the people. It is their belief that they will be guided by the wishes of the people; they will set out to be servants of the people and never masters of the people.

The Barbados Labour Party have faltered along the way, because constantly it has missed the boat, it has missed the opportunity to listen to the voice of the

people and to hear it and be guided by it. Constantly they have believed that they had some inherent right brought on by divine providence to guide the people of this country without reference to the people of this country, and hence they have imposed policies on the people of this country.

The Democratic Labour Party has constantly and will continue to keep its ear to the ground, keep its ear to the voice of the people. The mouths of the people will speak into the ears of the Democratic Labour Party, and we will hear them, like the Psalmist — "like as the heart desire, the water falls." Yes, like the Psalmist, we will always listen to the people. If we must lead, we will always lead from a short distance. We do not wish the people to fall behind us. We are going to be with them always, and this is a Resolution for the people, of the people, and by the people — 24 of them in this Honourable House.

Thank you, Sir.

Applause.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Michael South East.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this Resolution, and I would like to make some comments coming out of what the honourable Member for St. Peter said. I think his comments, which represent the philosophical approach of the Barbados Labour Party which is quite in keeping with how they feel, demonstrate beyond all shadow of a doubt that, whereas the Democratic Labour Party is a people's oriented party, the Barbados Labour Party is anti-people, and it is precisely why they should listen to some of the words of our greatest artistes and probably the one that is most applicable in this particular setting is the words of the Calypsonian, Classic, when he said "Great celebration in the land because the people take a stand against oppression."

Those of us who are listening to the people out there — and our job is to represent the views of the people, not to impose our thoughts on the people, we were elected to speak for the people not to speak for ourselves — and those of us who listen to the people will know that one of the most popular things in this country was the advances for Christmas. Those of us who have come up in the Christian tradition in Barbados have got to recognize that Christmas means a lot to a Barbadian. If a Barbadian has to starve himself all year and his family, he looks forward to December 25, for that relief for himself and his family. Therefore, any representative of the people who can come in here and oppose an advance for the people of Barbados, especially the people in the

lower economic strata, can only be against the people. And may I add this: The fundamental thing about this loan is this, that it does not discriminate according to political lives. Everybody is eligible once they belong in that category.

But what they are saying is that you should not do that. You should go to some individual who would determine by your political persuasion whether they like you or not, whether you are eligible for a loan. We do not believe in that on this side, and we say that in true Barbadian tradition. If you understand the feelings of the people and if you canvass them, you will know this was one of the most popular things that ever happened in Barbados. But the honourable Member for St. Peter should never get up in this Honourable House and talk about civil servants advances. I want to quote from the Barbados Labour Party's Manifesto of 1976.

I think it is already a document of this Honourable House and it is on page 20, and the Subheading is "Strengthening of Collective Bargaining." This is what it said in their Manifesto of 1976:

The party is unswervingly committed to the principle of collective bargaining and will neither countenance nor be a party to any measure or act which undermines this process. That is why the party condemns this recent action of the Democratic Labour Party Government in its attack on the principle in the manner in which it dealt with the civil servants and the teachers salaries. The party will strengthen the collective bargaining process and see that it applies both to the private and public sectors.

In the ten years that the Barbados Labour Party was the Government of this country, there has never been a Civil Service negotiation settled except they came to Parliament and legislated the salaries. That is the history of this country. Every salary dispute was legislated in Parliament. So we on this side do not have to be too concerned about what they say, because they write one thing and then they practise something else. They are never true to the promises that they put. But what has got them under great stress is that, within the 6 months that we have come back to this Parliament, there are a host of things which we have promised to the people which they said were impossible and before Christmas we have implemented all of them. So I can understand.

But what bothers me in 1986 is that we can have in Barbados among us a philosophy like the one I heard from the honourable Member for St. Peter, because those of us who are with the people must understand the sufferings of the people. He is one of the first to jump up and say that the people are under economic strain and, if people are under economic strain, it stands to

reason that at times one bread-winner has to take care of not only his children but his brother's children sometimes and sometimes his neighbours' children. Therefore, it would only be logical that that little economic reprieve that he gets at Christmas is fundamental.

Aside

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: I know you would make the point that I am not saying anything because you all are not interested in poor people and that is what I keep saying. The economic interest which you represent will never be for this kind of a programme. That is why I must remind you of the words of that calypsonian, because it is very, very important.

3.55 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, again the point that we have made is that we on this side will make sure that the people of this country will be able to go to the stores and with small down payments, get their stoves and refrigerators again, something that they, after 1976, made sure that the poor people could not do, because there is a philosophy in this country among certain people that if somebody works for you, whether they be a chauffeur or a maid, that when they go home they should be begging for a piece of ice to carry home. We do not believe in that philosophy and any political party in the Caribbean who denies poor people what must be the necessities of life in a 1986 world, in the second half of the 20th century, cannot be serious about the people of this country.

Aside

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Yes, I will say it, and you have a chance to speak after me today, so you will be able to counteract the things I say. But you were part of that Great Combination who considered a fridge and a stove a luxury. You were part of that.

But, Mr. Speaker, I only hope, as the honourable Member for St. Michael West said, that the newspapers of this country will make bold enough to say that the Barbados Labour Party opposes Christmas advances for the workers in this country, because then and only then will the people of this country understand how anti-working class the Barbados Labour Party is.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues have said that we have fulfilled several of the promises which we made in our Manifesto, and when I sat down here I really did a cursory glance at just about 20. Quite frankly, I just found about 20 without digging too deep:—

- (1) Reduction of personal and corporate taxes.

- (2) Reduction of diesel and gasoline costs.
(My light bill has gone down — I have been checking it very carefully)
- (3) Reduction of down payments on stoves and refrigerators
- (4) Return to granting study leave.
- (5) The status of Erdiston is restored.
- (6) More National Development Scholarships coming, according to the Deputy Prime Minister.
- (7) Old age pensions increased.
- (8) We pulled back in the ML and the MP cars.
- (9) We started the St. Joseph Hospital acquisition.
- (10) We have a consumers' association starting.
- (11) We appointed an Ombudsman.
- (12) We have established a Ministry of Public Service.
- (13) Reorganised the O. & M. Unit.
- (14) We have a task force on employment, no matter what they are saying, that is going to come out properly and in due course, in good time for the people.
- (15) Abolished annual T. V. licences.
- (16) Reduction in water rates.
- (17) We are negotiating seriously with the public sector Unions.
- (18) We have renewed trade with Trinidad, which they said could not happen, and which the Honourable Leader of the Opposition wants to make seem less significant than it really is.
- (19) We have got May Day 1987 again.
- (20) And now we are talking about advances at Christmas.

Only 20. I did not have to think too much, I just sat down here and wrote them down, in a short period of time and now they are jealous. They are really jealous. They cannot understand how we can promise people these things, and deliver so easily and so casually. We have the honourable Member for St. Peter saying that in

eighteen months, there will be Domesday in Barbados — do you remember that? — by December 31? All right. So D-Day is coming up, and they are getting scared because they know their predictions have no basis in fact, so they are scared, they are desperate people.

I would have felt that he would have sat down there quite frankly and allowed this one to ride, but he decided to be on the side really of the devils. If he wants to be on that side, if he wants to take that kind of position, he will only give us all a field day on the other side talking about what he has to say, nothing of substance really.

I just want really to discuss a few of the points that he raised. Just as the honourable Member for St. Michael West said that we do not have to force public servants to take the advance, we cannot tell them what to do with it either, and I am the Secretary of a Credit Union and if they decide to take the \$400 and put it in the Credit Union, I would say welcome.

His argument is an argument without any basis at all, because the point is that the workers might very well feel, as they had to under the Barbados Labour Party regime, that whenever they draw a lump sum of money, they are going to take it and they are going to put it down. Because I would suggest to him that the major reason why Credit Unions flourished during the last 10 years was because of the strictures and the tight money policies that were developed between the Barbados Labour Party and the Central Bank of Barbados. It was very difficult for poor people to get money out of banking institutions and they had to turn to the Credit Union for deliverance. So they cannot take any credit for that!

Furthermore, some of them were being laid off and being made redundant, that when they got the lump sum of money they put in on the Credit Union. That is why the Credit Union flourished, because the people were getting laid off and they were getting money in their hands. This is nothing to do with any liberal policy on their part. Don't let them fool anybody about that.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Unlike the honourable Member for St. Peter, I am not going to say that I am going to give you all the reasons why they flourished, but these are some contributory reasons. The people were being brutalised by the financial system, and they turned to Credit Unions.

But there can be no suggestion whatsoever, and you are really scraping the barrel, when you draw a comparison or when you try to suggest that because you are lending people money, this is going to get in the way of self-reliance. When you are lending somebody money

you are asking that person to take money up front but then come back with it at a later time. It is not a matter of a gift, it is not any hand-out that you are giving people, you are telling some person I am going to give you some of your money — and you can stretch it out and pay me back at a particular point in time — at Christmas, which is not a normal occasion.

But the same group of people would lend money or make money available, for instance, to cane cutters, agricultural workers. I have heard them say on occasion after occasion that the agricultural workers should get some money in their hands. That is paternalism, when you isolate a particular sector in the economy, because you have notions about their deprivation, that we should help them in a particular way, we can give them a loan or a grant, but we cannot do it for public servants. I suggest to you that that is more paternalism than when you make a loan available to public servants. I cannot agree with him at all.

When he looks at the question about negotiations, I have been party to these negotiations and I know the experience of sitting down in front of Tom Adams. I know the experience of going up to Establishments and going through *pro forma* meetings, nothing serious, meeting you twice because in fact Tom was holding all the decisions.... and then he decided to legislate. I know that experience, no serious discussions, as against the discussions that are going on now that we have held, where people have been coming before you and making every effort — this is not, as we call it in the Trade Union Movement — bouldardism.

4.05 p.m.

This is not practising bouldardism. This is practising, sincere, good faith negotiating, bringing information, putting it on the table, discussing, people taking steps backwards, looking at information and sitting down again. And if, in fact, negotiations have been going on very long, it is because skilled negotiators on both sides are trying to get the best deal out of a situation for themselves.

It is not a question of the Democratic Labour Party deciding that they are not going to reach good settlements and just settlements within the situation. We are negotiating against the background of a novel situation. Tell me where else in Barbados, or when else in Barbados you have ever known of negotiations against the background of reductions in personal Income Tax at that kind of level — a novel situation I believe not only in Barbados but in the Caribbean and possibly in the world — and, therefore, we have to bring a different level of expertise into play, so that if you find that the negotiations are going on a little bit longer, it is because we are going to have to re-assess the position because,

half way in the game, the rules changed. You had to look at the situation again.

I can say frankly and boldly that there is no doubt that negotiations have been going on in the kind of spirit that the Democratic Labour Party has established, and I feel confident that sooner or later all the public sector unions will sit down and agree with the negotiators from the Democratic Labour Party Administration. I have no doubt about that because the BUT has already come in. There is no question about that. The BSTU has come in.

As I understand it, negotiations are still going on with the NUPW. That is how I understand it, and the honourable Member for St. Peter, as far as I am aware, was an advisor to that group. In previous times he was an advisor to the group. I do not know whether he is still advising them, and I hope that he will give them the best advice at all times, and the advice that he would give them at this time is that they have a reasonable offer. I understand that the honourable Member for St. Peter is an advisor to the group, the NUPW, or used to be, or might still be, might even be a member. I do not know. He might be a member of the Credit Union.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Peter is on a point of order.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I am not an advisor to the NUPW. I have never been an advisor to the NUPW and will never be an advisor to the NUPW, and the honourable Member is misleading the Honourable House when he says that I am an advisor to it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point taken.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: But he might be a member of the Credit Union.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the honourable Member rise?

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

The honourable Member is misleading the Honourable House again. I am a member of the Speightstown Cooperative Credit Union which I have been instrumental in setting up as a member for St. Peter, and I am proud to be the Chairman of its Supervisory Committee. I am not a member of any other Credit Union.

Thank you, Sir.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I know that you are the founder of the Speightstown Credit Union. I know that, but I thought you were also a member of the NUPW. I was sure that you were a member, but I would have to go by what you say now.

I cannot see how, Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member for St. Peter quite seriously, could make the point that the fact that the Government has returned to the situation where they are making loans available to the Public Service goes counter to the spirit of the Credit Union.

He is supposed to be a serious supporter of the Cooperative Movement. I am also a serious supporter of that Movement, and I cannot see any basic and fundamental conflict in the fact that you are loaning a number of people or you are making available to them a loan which they, in turn, can put in the same Credit Union. I do not see any fundamental conflict in that. The whole Cooperative Movement is on a much wider basis than the kind of stance that he is trying to put here.

The whole Cooperative Movement is a philosophical Movement, that is, in a way, challenging other financial institutions in the country, but I cannot see that relating to making loans available to public servants. I think that he is really stressing the point. As I said earlier, I believe he realizes the importance of this loan in a political sense to the people of Barbados and he feels that he has to say something about it. But, clearly, he can only be putting himself in the wilderness; because when he stands up here and speaks against that advance — and I hope that the Press would let the public know in no uncertain terms that he has said that he is going to vote against this Resolution. I hope that they would let the public know that the honourable Member for St. Peter has said that he will vote against this Resolution — I am sure he will realize the lack of wisdom in his position.

Mr. Speaker, I support this Resolution.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I always find that there is solace in Shakespeare and, on this occasion, one of his comedies "Much Ado About Nothing" comes really readily to mind.

Sir, I would have thought that, if the Government had simply come in here and said that they are fulfilling a Manifesto pledge and sat down, we would not have had much debate on this issue at all. You have heard a good deal of talk about soulism coming from the Government side. It has taken 4 of them so far, and I have no doubt many others, to reply to what was a very good speech made by the honourable Member for St. Peter.

I believe that, if honourable Members analyse the statements made by the honourable Member for St. Peter,

they will find in them great food for thought, particularly the Honourable Minister of Finance, on how he should structure financial institutions in Barbados to see that they do the job which the Government is purporting to do. That was the onus of his speech in this Honourable House, that you needed financial institutions that would provide lines of credit for the small man; and if that speech has been lost on honourable Members, it is not because they have not got the capacity to understand. It is simply because honourable Members wish to extract every ounce of political credit from this matter and do not pay regard — you can shout as much as you like — to what is a fundamental principle for running this country.

If we can build up the financial institutions in Barbados, whether it is by way of credit unions or whether it is by way of institutions catering to the housing needs of the country, the Government will not have to be the lender of first resort and to be intervening in ways which financial institutions should be undertaking. This is a point which has been made not only now, and I am surprised at the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central on this. It has been made so graphically and sensibly as well by the Leader of the Barbados Workers' Union when the union took the initiative, as it did in housing, in order to underscore that in this community we still have a situation where the institutions are not catering for people at a certain level.

Now, the Barbados Labour Party cannot be characterized, as honourable Members continue to characterize it, as an institution which is not on the part of poor people. That is pejorative nonsense and we know it, but it is repeated for the Press. The honourable Members seem more concerned, Mr. Speaker, in this Honourable House every Tuesday, and particularly the honourable Member for St. Michael South East, as to what the Press is going to carry the next day, rather than concerned with debating these issues, and trying to make sure that the country gets the best form of Government.

Now, Sir, what is the Government boasting about? The Government is boasting about the fact that it is lending people \$400 for Christmas, and the Government is making the point that people want to spend money at Christmas. The Government must also make the point of the numbers of thousands and the hundreds of thousands that cannot even borrow a cent because they do not have a job, and the honourable Member has been making the point....

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, there are only 3 of us. There are 24 of them when they shout. You cannot even hear yourself when they are shouting.
4.15 p.m.

The Government, Sir, must recognise that what the honourable Member characterise as bread and circuses is not an alternative for concrete policies. That is the other point he made.

Now, Sir, when the Labour Party changed the policy of making advances to civil servants — and the policy was changed in 1978 — it was in the context of the fact that the Government had not only entered one of the best wages settlements that civil servants had ever had in this country, a negotiated settlement because the point is being frequently made that we legislated each settlement — that is not true either — but the economy had begun to revive and it was felt that if impetus could be given to the credit unions that you would find in those circumstances that the institutions which should be lending to the National Union of Public Workers and other public workers would have been encouraged.

Now I really regret very much that the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central again forgets his objectivity in instances like this. The honourable Member cannot seriously advance to any right thinking people that the reason why credit unions flourished was because people were being brutalised and they were forced into saving money. That is not true. If you want a greater period of brutalisation of hard economic policies, it was the period after 1973 when the Right Honourable Prime Minister had gone to recharge his batteries leaving the ship of state in the hands of some of his other Ministers. One honourable Member who was acting Minister of Finance is not here today, and what happened is that you had an economic recession, and you found some of the most stringent hire purchase terms being put on in order to restrict the outflow of foreign exchange. That was the reason. The honourable Member well knows that between 1973 and today the number of people who have access to refrigerators and stoves has more than doubled. The honourable Member knows that. If he doubts me, he can go and read Dan on the "Quality of Life in Barbados" where the statistics are well accumulated for the benefit of Barbadians.

There is no point trying to misrepresent history in this way. I have said before that the country has made progress under both Governments. We have disagreed on some policies, but don't give the impression every Tuesday that we come in here that in the last ten years Barbados stood still. Not when the GNP per capita has more than doubled in that ten years. Not when the number of motor cars on the streets have more than increased. Not when people know that they have more amenities now than they had in 1976. And we do not do ourselves any good if we try merely to characterise each period in this country as a period of regression merely because we were not in power. Honourable Members

know this. It is about time that we begin to try to put things in perspective in the country.

We may disagree as to whether the Democratic Labour Party at this particular time will put the emphasis on building up small institutions, institutions catering to the man who is at the lower end of the economic calendar, or whether it believes that until it thinks that it has built up to that situation it needs to make these advances. But one thing we should not set out to do is so to decry the work of everybody who has gone before, that we believe that we are the only pioneers and that we are the only builders and that we are the only achievers in this country. So I want to put this in its true perspective.

Normally if one were coming with a Christmas do, I would expect the Government to say they are giving the civil servants an extra month's bonus. At this time the private sector gives a bonus. If the economy is so good, I would expect you to be boasting. Your economy is so good, everything is being so well done, you have no pressures, why don't you come and say you are giving a thirteenth month or a gift? All you are saying is that you are giving — coming and lending — somebody a maximum of \$400 and that they have to repay the \$400 in 3 months' time. They have 3 months to repay the \$400, and if you manage to settle the wages with the National Union of Public Workers, because from what the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central has said, you have already settled with the Barbados Workers' Union, he has no more negotiations — I drew that inference from his speech — if you manage to settle with the NUPW in time that they will have to pay back before this. So it is a maximum of 3 months possibly, because according to you, negotiations are going so well that there is no reason why you should not be signing on the dotted line next week, and we give you the undertaking that if you have to vote the money and you have reached a settlement, we can come in here on Christmas Day if you say you can make the payments. We will come in here on Christmas Day, if necessary for you.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. I should like to remind honourable Members of Standing Order No. 33(1) which says:

"A Member whilst present in the House during a debate must at all times conduct himself with dignity and decorum."

I am asking honourable Members to pay great attention to this particular rule since all honourable Members will have an opportunity to speak.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I am indebted to you, Sir. I think, Mr. Speaker, those 23 voices..... how many voices have they? Seventeen were really the

voice of the honourable Member for St. Michael West though, Sir. He speaks like Babel with several tongues, and that is why you have heard so many different voices.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order.

The honourable Member is deliberately making a statement since he claims to be a Christian — although I do not know why he would want to come in here on Christmas Day if he is a Christian — Sir, speaking in the several tongues of Babel you know from our Christian training is a pejorative comment, and I ask the honourable Member to withdraw it as unparliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER: My understanding was that he had withdrawn it.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If the honourable Member does not want to be likened to anyone who has any gift of prophecy, I will withdraw it. Sir, he is not that prophetic. prophetic.

Let me tell the honourable Member, if they get a settlement, then this loan would become irrelevant according to their own words, and therefore the honourable Member for St. Peter was making the point.....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of elucidation.

The honourable Member cannot so misunderstand. The persons would be borrowing the money and would be repaying their own money whether they got a settlement or not. What it says is that at the end of the period when the money is to be paid back, if there is a settlement and there is any money outstanding before they receive the backpay, the outstanding amount would be subtracted from the amount due to them.
4.25 p.m.

The honourable Member must understand that he should really not persist in misrepresenting what honourable Members have said. We have all said it, and all three of us have spoken articulately.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am going to read from the Addendum to this Resolution:

"However, the advances are to be fully recovered from arrears of increased salaries/wages, if not fully reimbursed when salary/wage, increases are being made."

Now, Sir, I posit this situation very simply. Let us assume that the Government reaches total settlement with all of the unions involved, and it reaches this agreement within the next week, and this Honourable House passes any additional money — although most of it is statutory and we do not need to come back in here — therefore that the money is available to pay civil servants increases and arrears, what is the Government's position then? I am not going to put it any higher.

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation, Sir. I think the Honourable Leader of the Opposition probably should be elucidated on this matter.

Some attempt is being made to link the principle of the advances with the method of repayment. The facts are that whether or not negotiations were taking place, the Christmas advances would still be made. It simply happens that in this particular year negotiations are taking place and evidently, if the Government lends you the money then they will take the money out before they repay you. Next year there will be no negotiations but the advances would also continue.

So that I do not think the linkage that is being established, I do not think that the linkage which you are.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable Member making a speech?

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No, I am trying to elucidate. It is very important, Sir.

I do not think that the attempt to establish this linkage is correct. It is only a massive repayment.

One final point. If, for example, tomorrow there were a settlement of the negotiations, they will still get the \$400 next week. That is the point. You would still get the \$400 and it would be recovered out of your wages.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member.....

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES: between January and December. It is as simple as that.

Aside.

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES: January and March, sorry.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, the honourable Member is forced, on the basis of the Government's own Schedule.....

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: which obviously went before the Cabinet, to come in here and elucidate. Yet it is the very point when the honourable Member for St. Peter made it. They are now having difficulty to clarify the position because the honourable Member for St. Peter is saying, if you reach a settlement and you have to pay before the time, are you still going to make an advance or are you going to pay the arrears, or are you going to do both?

And it is not inconceivable, having heard the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central that the agreement will be reached and if the agreement is reached this week, cannot we next week then pay the civil servants? That is all he is asking. And in those circumstances, am I to understand from this Government, on this Resolution, that they will still be making advances this year or will that have to wait for next year?

(*Aside:* Hon. B. M. TAITT: Do you want the answer? Yes.)

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of elucidation. The honourable Member seems not to have understood. The answer to the question which the honourable Member has asked is yes, one hundred times yes. We will make the advances to the civil servants and they will have three months to pay. If at the end of the three months, they have not paid — as I pointed out in my speech, we have persons who did not pay \$724 for the 1962–64 loan — and agreement comes after March then the person will be able to have the amount outstanding extracted from the back pay.

Now the honourable Member, Sir, is referring to the Objects and Reasons. He cannot refer to the Objects and Reasons while referring to what I have said or what the honourable Member has said. What he has to do is deal with what the Honourable Minister said. And I am now saying categorically yes, there will be an advance; they will get the advance next week, if there is a settlement next week. They have three months in which to pay it back, otherwise we would be misleading the Honourable House to come in and ask for \$6 million. So if you read it your way, read it your way, but do not misunderstand what we say.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is significant again that as I said, such a simple Resolution has the Government jumping every minute. Now if the honourable Member has brought an Addendum that is confused, he cannot quarrel when I say that we see the Tower of Babel. He cannot complain because the honourable Member is telling me that we must tear up this, do not matter what is written, get rid of what is written and listen now to what he has said. It is not the first time that these honourable Members have got in here and

said different things to what is written in a Resolution. But this is what is being said here, and therefore that is why I posit the position again because the honourable Member is not speaking with the same tongue as the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has spoken.

As I understand it, if the Government reaches an agreement tomorrow with all the unions, the money becomes payable next week, so they get arrears of salary due to them. On the basis of this Resolution, the Government will make no advances if the advances have not been made up to them.

Asides

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: So that what the honourable Member for St. Peter was saying, based on this Addendum, is that the thing the Government has to do is to pay people the arrears of salary that you have agreed with the Barbados Workers Union, according to you. If you owe them, pay the people the arrears. Do not delay the payment of the arrears. Surely, if they need a little money at Christmas, and we go along with you as needing a little money, and you have more than \$400 for them, give them what you have for them. That is what the honourable Member was saying. Do not only say you are going to lend them \$400. Give them the money because in each case, the arrears must be more than \$400, on the basis of whatever negotiations have gone on.

But why that statement was not right was that it appeared to steal some of the political thunder from the Democratic Labour Party. They are so touchy that they cannot understand. If they believe you are stealing any thunder, they are immediately on their feet and instead of saying, "Look, our policy is to make advances willy nilly, we believe in it. You think that there is another way of doing it, we think that there is another way of doing it", there must be bad faith always ascribed to members of the Barbados Labour Party.

(*Aside*: Hon. B. M. TAITT: Because we know you.)

Aside

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, there must be bad faith always ascribed in whatever policy you bring forward in this country.

But I would say, Sir, on this measure I hope that the economy will improve because I believe that we should continue to build up institutions. I believe like the honourable Member on this point that I would like to see Barbados at the stage where a Government does not have to come and talk about making a meagre advance of \$400 and boasting of it. My mother always

said "if you did give charity, you never boast about it because in the process, you made those persons to whom you gave charity less well off". And therefore I do not want to come in here and boast about making an advance of \$400. That is not any big thing. What are they talking about, Sir?

Asides

(*Aside*: Hon. B. M. TAITT: It is not charity.)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I have not represented it as charity. I am saying that the honourable Members put it forward as though it is this great charitable act, that the Barbados Labour Party has no humanitarian spirit in them, to quote them, Sir. That is the sort of process that they are putting forward, Sir.

Aside

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: All sorts of pejorative language.

Aside

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: And when it is.....Mr. Speaker, Sir, I assure you should hear some of these matters, Sir.... when it is put on that basis, really we lose the whole point and significance of where we should be putting out heads together.

And with respect, although I have a lot of admiration for the strong manner in which the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central defends his Party, I have respect also for his objectivity as a historian and a scholar. And I hope that he would not think that the defence of his Party's policies willy nilly — something he accuses me of himself and the honourable Member to his right, which is really not correct, but they always accuse me of it — should be at the sacrifice of objectivity in the history of this matter.

Now, Sir, honourable Members.....

Aside

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Capitalists, Sir? That is another debate. Mr. Speaker, I would not delay the Honourable House on a debate as to capitalism and socialism out of a Resolution such as this, because if I had to, I am sure it really would embarrass the Democratic Labour Party to show them how far to the right they have begun to drift. Not on this Resolution. It is not for this Resolution. It is for certain matters in a complete *volte face* at the policy that inspired them at their foundation which is no longer a policy that anybody can look forward to. But it is in this Resolution. This Resolution is a little bit of electioneering continued, and

we have said that that is what it is. But we have offered as well other areas in which we can give true dignity to the small man in the community, what is always called the poor man in the community, not by letting him believe he is always indebted to a politician, or to an employer or somebody for charity, but that he has it within his own resources, by putting his own resources up to build up the things that he wants.

The honourable Member for Christ Church East Central who, like me, has listened quite carefully to Mr. Lloyd Best and some of the things that have come out from that group of economists would understand how a piggy bank can be built up into an effective institution. And this debate, if put in its true perspective..... was the honourable Member for St. Peter advocating such a policy. And I think the honourable Members now clearly understand where the Opposition has come from.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Michael Central.

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I agree with the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in one thing, and that so far as it seems to be coming from his side, the Shakespeare play is correct, "Much Ado About Nothing".

I have some suggestions, Sir, which may help to clarify the matter and put it to rest once and for all. First of all I want to make the observation, Sir, that there are persons who work in statutory boards who already have approached me — and I suppose who approach my colleagues — to ask whether Government in this Christmas offer of loans to the workers are remembering that boards like the Transport Board and CBC are statutory boards, and that they are therefore entitled as much as anybody else to the Christmas loans; and if that were not envisaged by the Honourable Minister, I would wish, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that the change be made sufficiently and adequately enough to allow those statutory boards which do not derive their monies directly from the Treasury to be able nonetheless to get those loans. I do not wish to say advances, Sir, I wish to address that later on and I wish specifically to be referring to matters and areas like the Transport Board, CBC, *et al.*

I wish further, Sir, to look particularly at the Addendum or the Schedule to the document we are looking at, and to make the observation that perhaps the language is unfortunate in that area, and can be looked at again and thus correct a problem of misunderstanding.

There cannot be any doubt in my mind or in the mind of any of my colleagues whatsoever that because it is an election commitment that whether there was a salaries negotiation or not that the Christmas loan would be possible. Consequently, it may be unfortunate and I could see capital being made of the point where it says, and I quote, Sir, from the Addendum, that:

"The advances are to be fully recovered from arrears of increased salaries/wages, if not fully reimbursed when salary/wage increases are being made."

It is very unfortunate, Sir, for our side fully recognizes, in any event, that the Protection of Wages Act would not allow for that kind of arrangement and that monies could not be taken from the people's wages, unless by their consent.

4.35 p.m.

As a matter of fact, the Addendum continues to say that the Minister responsible for presenting the Resolution did, in fact, say that he would not have those monies reimbursed until and unless the workers had consented in writing on a personal, person by person, basis. Consequently, I have no difficulty with understanding it, except to say that because it has been written, it has caused some degree of misunderstanding and perhaps it has taken us beyond much ado about nothing to another Shakespeare play which is more "As You Like It," because I understand, Mr. Speaker, that most of the workers in the Public Service like it this way.

I wish further, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of those persons who may feel that the money is minimal and may not have an impact, to make the observation which I think that all of us representatives have had to make. From time to time our constituents come to us, and they ask us to support them in one way or another. They want assistance in being able to have a bank manager discuss with them the possibilities for loans, and there have been occasions in my own experience, Mr. Speaker, when all they wanted was \$500 or \$400, and I have called some banks on this matter and have been shocked to recognize that the banks have said very politely, but have said nonetheless: "We are very sorry, we do not lend amounts of money as small as \$500 because the same administrative work that it takes to lend \$50,000, it takes to lend \$500. We are sorry you have to go to some other source to borrow that money."

Now it is possible that people can go to the Credit Union as perhaps some people would say. But Mr. Speaker, in order to borrow any money from a Credit Union, you have first of all to be a member. So you have to encourage them to join, and we would want to encourage them to join, but you cannot join now in November or even have joined in May 1986 and be able to borrow that amount of money in December 1986

because, as the honourable Member for St. Peter will tell us, you have to be a member of the Credit Union for at least 6 months before you can go back to that same Credit Union to borrow money. They say this is an ease for poor people. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I am not eligible for that loan. I do not know. I am a public servant I think, Sir, and I would like to be able to think that if I had some money like that I could borrow, to be able to buy some Christmas gifts for my children — two, Sir — just in case the honourable Member for St. Peter misunderstood me.

During the debate, Sir, there have been some comments made which again seek, perhaps innocently, to slay the industrial relations process, and I would wish with your permission to address those issues. The comment has been made that the way to settle the problem is to pay the public servants their money. I could not agree with that comment more, Sir. I believe the public servants should be paid, but before you can pay the public servants there has to be total agreement and, in order for there to be total agreement, the Government's negotiators and the unions' negotiators must be able to sit down and reach a level of accord. The truth of the matter at the moment, Sir, is that there has been some level of agreement by some of the unions, and I should wish with regard to the Barbados Workers Union to deal with that level.

I would wish first of all though, Sir, to deal with the history of negotiations ever since 1976. In 1976 wages were imposed in this Honourable Chamber, a sad day in the lives of the people of Barbados, and I believe we also remember it and we also regret it. We hope never to have to come back to that situation because I am afraid that we will still have to take similar positions in matters of that sort.

In 1978 — the Leader of the Opposition was correct — there was a negotiated settlement of 30% for those people at the bottom of the ladder and 10% at the top for those persons earning at the very top of the income ladder. In 1980, Sir, there was an imposition of wages and salaries and there was some coercion so that it appeared before the Press towards the end of the very last day as though the NUPW had settled.

In 1982, we had the question of a further imposition of that famous \$108 settlement for everybody. Whether you were rich or poor, earning a lot or not, everybody got \$25 a week increase in 1982, Sir.

When the Barbados Workers Union made further representation on the issue, the Prime Minister of the day, the late Prime Minister now, agreed to give \$5 million more, but that was in the form of an advance against the 1984 increases. Consequently, when in 1984 we had what really in essence was an imposition of a settlement,

2½% of that 15% went towards the advance that had been given in 1982, and in real terms therefore the settlement was 12½% across the board in the first year and 5% in the second year, and the reprehensible part of it was that the maid who was getting \$100 a week got the same 12½% as the Prime Minister who got that amount of money per half hour, a position that is untenable and should not be accepted by any person, in any country, who loves to see social justice. But that was the nature and the level of those kinds of impositions. The 1984 settlement and the 1982 settlement reflected the fact that some people were of the view that not even God could make them poor again. Thus, Sir, I hope will never be the situation that we will find in our country.
4.45 p.m.

When in 1986 the negotiations took place, they took place against an understanding that the people in Barbados should in fact be proud of. When these negotiations were started, Mr. Chairman, the Barbados Labour Party was the party that was serving as the leaders of the country. The Prime Minister was the Honourable Bernard St. John, and I believe that he alone of the persons within the Barbados Labour Party endeavoured to deal with page 20 of the BLP Manifesto of 1976 where he endeavoured, before he negotiated in 1986, to meet the Unions to give a commitment towards the principles of collective bargaining, and to ensure that there was no undermining of the process, and therefore in 1986 the Prime Minister met — I believe he met other Unions — but he met the Barbados Workers Union and he endeavoured to point out what were the problems that were facing the country.

Aside.

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: 1986 in March, Sir, and it was very early in March. I do not think an election date had been announced yet, Mr. Speaker. Consequently nobody, not even the illustrious Percy Smith or whoever it is that writes those articles, nobody could have been aware at the time that the submissions being made by the Union would have been made to anybody except the Barbados Labour Party as a Government. When Mr. St. John, the Prime Minister at the time, spoke, he indicated that the economy was not performing well. He indicated that there was an increase in sugar production but that the increase in sugar production in 1985–86 was like an albatross around the neck of the industry, because the price of sugar had fallen so much that it only caused problems for the industry to have surplus amounts of sugar beyond the guaranteed sales that they had.

The manufacturing sector was not doing well. In fact, domestic exports had fallen by 11½%, Mr. Speaker, and the prospects for 1986, according to the Prime Minister, looked very grim with the Central Bank ex-

pecting a growth of only 2%. We understood in the Independence Day Message from the present Prime Minister that a growth of 4½% is much more what Barbados is to expect, and I think that we can all take some degree of pride in that particular matter. Prime Minister St. John therefore asked the Trade Unions to recognise that, given that situation, and given a projected cost of living increase of only 3.3%, they would be prepared to negotiate in 1986 a contract which recognised that the Government was not able to do well.

The Barbados Workers Union indicated on that occasion an appreciation for the position of the Prime Minister, Bernard St. John, in March 1986, and the understanding at the end of the meeting was that the Prime Minister would look towards job security for the workers, and that the Union would be prepared to look at the negotiations from a position, as it always did, of national consciousness and a desire to see Barbados do well, regardless of who the Government is or was.

Now the submission, Sir, that was made on that occasion to the Establishments Division of the Prime Minister's Office was made on the 17th February, 1986, and I am not going to read it, Sir, I am just going to refer to a detail. It called for an increase of 18% for wages or salaries up to \$1,300 per month or the equivalent, and between \$1,300 and \$2,000, 12%, and over \$2,000 per month an increase of 10%. That is what the Barbados Workers Union was calling for.

I cannot, Mr. Speaker, refer to any other Trades Unions or what they submitted, but I would challenge anybody to say that in 1986, as in 1984, as in 1982, as in 1980, as in 1976, the Trade Union did not look at the negotiations from a position of maturity and not from a position as to who formed the Government. Compare and contrast, Mr. Speaker, with 1976 when we understand that in some other areas a demand of over 80% was called for when it was known and recognised that no way could the economy bear that level of demand.

We are saying that we were down to 18% as an asking figure, and when we looked at the figures, we put our Research Department to examine the matter carefully, and to discuss the basis on which a submission could be made, and that submission was made on the basis of the performance of the economy since the last agreement. So we were reviewing the period of 1984 to 1986. We were looking as well at Government's finances and Government's ability to pay, and remember, Mr. Speaker, that this was in February 1986 and the Government was a Government headed by the Barbados Labour Party, so we were looking at the ability of the Government to pay. We were looking at comparative settlements in other areas. We did not have to go as some people, we understand, have been going to the BEC and other

places to ask for advice, because we know the levels of settlement, some of which we will let you be aware of, Sir.

We were looking as well at the movements in the retail price index, commonly referred to sometimes as the cost of living index, 3.3% the projection for the two-year period under review, levels of settlement which in some instances call for giving moratoria, call in some further instances as in the sugar industry for 5% plus 2½ plus 2½ for a three year contract. It is true that, at the other end of the scale, if you are somebody like Banks Breweries, you could talk about 15% or 14% over two years, but the underlying consideration, Mr. Speaker, would be the question of the ability to pay.

When furthermore, Sir, the Government gave the tax concessions in 1986 after there was a new Administration and the Democratic Labour Party became the Administration, the Government itself asked for a review by the Unions, but even before that, all of the Trade Unions in Barbados, not just the Barbados Workers Union, indicated that in the light of the real increase in purchasing power, they would review their stance in so far as the 1986 negotiations were concerned — all of them, not under pressure, Mr. Speaker — but because they recognised that what was fundamental was the increased purchasing power of the individual. All of the Unions did their mathematics, not just the Barbados Workers Union, in my view, and what they looked for was the question of what would the wage increase under the old tax structure give in real terms versus a wage increase under the new tax structure.

4.55 p.m.

In February 1986, we were satisfied as the Barbados Workers Union that if we were able to get 10% then that was a good agreement. In fact, most agreements in 1986 in the first year are representative of less than 10%, so that when we talk about 10% in this area with everybody being responsible for paying the cost, we thought that it was not unreasonable, and we stand by reason, and whether it was the Barbados Labour Party Government or the Democratic Labour Party Government, that was the position we were taking in February 1986. That is not to say that we were amenable to whatever and everything that the Democratic Labour Party was prepared to do, because right after the tax concessions when they put a proposal to us that we found to be unacceptable, we had to tell them in no uncertain terms that those numbers would not play.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it was the Barbados Workers Union letter sent to the Establishments Division of the Prime Minister's Office that was the basis of the agreement. In fact, we put to the Government that the BWU would be prepared to take a graduated increase from 9%, graduating downwards to the very

people at the top of the earning ladder, and that was the position put some time in September 1986.

Now, Sir, if we have subsequently agreed to that, then there is no problem in that regard, especially when we recognize that the Barbados Workers Union has agreed. The Barbados Union of Teachers has also agreed. The Barbados Secondary Teachers Union has agreed. I understand that the wardens at the Prison have agreed. I do not know for the Police. I do not know if "Boy Blue" will say anything in this particular area, but that would be a question for the Police to determine, but by and large, there has been agreement, and it is now only a question as to what will be the position in regard to the payment.

I am a believer myself that it would have been very desirable, Mr. Speaker, if workers had been able to get their increases determined before this offer of a Christmas loan, for I am of the view that the mathematics may be at fault for if the Honourable Minister of Finance did not include the 9%, or the 8% or the 7% in the Christmas loan, then I am suggesting that he may, in fact, owe some money to persons whose income, had the agreement been concluded before, would have been higher and would therefore, have qualified for a larger loan.

Now, I think, Sir, that one has to recognize that although the quantum of the loan is not very great, it represents two weeks' pay to some people, and I would not suggest that it should have been something to cause a great deal of problems. What we need to recognize is that that amount of money is repayable over a three months' period, but that it would give some degree of easement to persons at a time when cash is desirable to be had.

There can be no denying of the fact, however, that is very desirable if we were able to have a situation in Barbados where no worker had to borrow any money, although we need to recognize a larger point that lending and borrowing are all parts of our developmental process that is our country's. I would think that if, in fact, we are able to borrow money, we should not see any difficulty in that, and we should be able to respect it for what it is intended.

One last thing I would want to say and that is that the honourable Member for St. Peter indicated that the beautification programme cannot be implemented because of the lack of funds. Well, that is a cause of some concern for me. I thought that he had some particular information that the rest of us may not be privy to, but I would like to think that we would have an assurance in here today that indicates that the honourable Member for St. Peter is not correct in this area, and that there will be some degree of beautification for our island, the immediate and satisfactory result in the increase in the number of unemployed people.

One final thing, Mr. Speaker. In this same matter, we have to be thankful for small mercies and if the Devil brings it then I believe God has sent it.

The final thing I would want to say is that in reference to the approach that has been adopted to matters of industrial relations significance, we need to bear in mind that the Barbados Labour Party in the same 1976 Manifesto promised that the Severance Payment Act would be simplified, and that all provisions which worked to the disadvantage of the worker would be removed.

I believe that very shortly I will be able to say very much more on this, but I want to say that far from this particular measure being implemented, that the present Severance Payment legislation by the Barbados Labour Party represents a retrograde step and that when we, therefore, come into this Honourable House to look at what has been done in terms of the advancement of the workers, we have to recognize the errors that took place, and to treat them in the way they were treated.

Now, I can say with some degree of satisfaction that on occasions we met, before the unfortunate statements he made a few weeks ago, with the honourable Member for St. Thomas that he proved to be a good Chairman of the Board except that when it came down to the policy of his Minister we found that his Minister was opposed to the advancement of the workers in those areas where he was serving and, as a matter of fact, he himself had to resign as the Chairman of the Board because those policies were not satisfactory.

I want, therefore, for us when we come to this place to recognize that the worker will be able to see in a Government, more than that. The worker will be able to see in a representative that person or those persons who will work in their better interest. It is for this reason that I do not hold it against the honourable Member for St. Peter when he said that he would vote against this Resolution. I understand that his better judgement will eventually prevail upon him and when the Honourable House is divided, if it is divided on the matter, he will vote for the measure.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, as I said when I first started it was a great pleasure to introduce this humanitarian measure into the Parliament of this country. There was only, I think, one point of substance raised by the honourable Member for St. Peter where he brought to our attention that there could be some slight misunderstanding of the wording of the Schedule.

I sought by intervention to give a clear explanation and it is a simple matter. It is Government's policy

this year and each year to make a Christmas advance available to the Public Service. That advance would be recoverable during the succeeding three months, that is by March 31 in the succeeding year. If in a year in which there is a settlement that settlement occurs, and the Government owes money to the public servant then, of course, there would be a settlement at that point in time but there is no connection whatsoever between the policy of the Government in terms of the Christmas advances and the question of back pay. Back pay just relates to the method of recovery. For example, if there was no negotiation in this year, the policy would still have been instituted, and I hope that is absolutely clear. That should be crystal clear.

5.05 p.m.

Now I will move on. I will concede that there is some slight ambiguity in the wording, and in future since each year we will have to bring down a Resolution, then the ambiguity will be clarified.

One other point made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is that instead of going in this direction, we should be trying to move financial and other intermediary institutions in the direction where they would make such loans available to the people. I would say first of all in reply to that that there is nothing compulsory in terms of people borrowing money from Government.

Secondly, I think that many people might opt to continue a continuing relationship with their financial institution rather than borrow from Government.

The third point is that there are many people who would not be eligible for a loan from the Bank because of the collateral required for these loans, when in point of fact Government will make a loan and the only collateral needed as you know, is that they have a job and the fact that they can continue. So that in point of fact there are many people who would not qualify under the usual banking criteria in Barbados who will qualify under this particular arrangement.

I still would like to make the further point that since the Democratic Labour Party has assumed office — and this is a fact — the interest rates have generally come down and a lot more money has been made available by the commercial banks to the people of Barbados, lending for different purposes, although as you have mentioned, not in the area of personal lending. That is true, but you may recall that I did point out when I introduced our monetary measures in August this year that in January of next year, we would be reviewing the monetary position particularly in the area of personal lending, and that would of course relate to our overall external position. It depends on a whole lot of other

factors. You just cannot do it just like that. But we are actively looking at the whole area of personal lending, what qualified for personal lending, and what is excluded from it, and we know that there are problems in this area. So I can give you my personal assurance that certainly as an integral part of the fiscal policy options which the Government is pursuing and has pursued that the whole question of the approach to lending in the personal area will be reviewed in January next year, but of course we will take the most liberal position depending on the macro-economic constraints within which we will have to formulate those decisions, and I think that this will be understood by most honourable Members, but it is the only sensible thing to do.

There are several other points which I at one stage would have liked to reply to. The question of paternalism — it is not true to say that this measure in any way smacks of paternalism. What it does in fact recognise are two things: that the increase in purchasing power at Christmas in point of fact has some job generating activity around Christmas time. This is a fact, and consequently there can be no doubt that we are a Christian community and deep down in the psyche of all of us we would like to have that little extra to be able to spend at Christmas, even if we make the sacrifices after Christmas and repaid it, and I think it is a gesture for which the Government should certainly make an effort, and I think that even within the general conceptualisation of the role of Government and other institutions in this particular matter, there does come a time when certain social factors can play a role, and in this instance I think it is justifiable, particularly as there is no chance of any net loss to the Treasury over the three-month period.

By and large I think it has been an interesting debate. I think it was a little unfortunate that the debate got linked somehow or other with arrears relating to salary settlements, but that is not the policy of the Government. I think I have set it out pretty clearly, and I trust now that the thing has been adequately clarified.

One final point, and I think I had better make this so that there should be no doubt as far as the Press is concerned. My colleague, the honourable Member for St. Philip South, did make the point that there was some \$26 million needed for the housing surveys.

Asides

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The point I am trying to make is that whatever the amount quoted as the amount which he recognised should have been spent over a period of time, and what we have done now in six months, I think, is that we have made about \$600 000 available, and if we continue at this rate over a five-year period, I think we would make some progress in the area

of getting surveys done, so that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would be happy in that his constituents can get their houses, and the Ministry of Housing would be equally happy in that they would get some funds coming in from the sale of the houses.

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

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED
APPOINTMENT OF SIR FRANK BLACKMAN
AS OMBUDSMAN OF BARBADOS**

Order No. 1 was called – To move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor-General approving the proposed appointment of Sir Frank Blackman, K.A., K.C.V.O., O.B.E., J.P., as Ombudsman for Barbados.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am certain that this Resolution which I am proposing to move will meet with unanimous support of this Honourable Chamber. The background to it, Sir, is that in 1980 this Honourable Chamber passed a measure for the provision of an Ombudsman and that particular Act relating to that provision was brought into force, I believe, in 1981. It calls for the appointment of an Ombudsman to be appointed by the Governor-General on the recommendation of the Prime Minister after consultation with the Leader of the Opposition.

5.15 p.m.

And the holder of this particular office is expected to carry out investigations in areas relating to maladministration and in areas relating to any injustice which any person may claim that they suffer at the hands of the administrative machinery, and I believe, in certain other areas.

The Act quite clearly sets out the ambit of the powers of the Ombudsman and it also sets out certain areas in which he may not operate.

It may be that, in due course, we may have to examine or re-examine the whole scope of the powers of the Ombudsman in order to make them a little wider, but that will be for our determination.

At this particular stage, we are concerned with the appointment to the post in order that the appointment may be made.

We are in receipt of a Message, Message No. 3 from His Excellency to this Honourable Chamber informing us

that the necessary consultations have been made, that the Honourable Prime Minister has made a recommendation and that consultations have been carried out with the Leader of the Opposition, and that as a result, he proposes to appoint Sir Frank Milton Blackman, Knight of the Order of St. Andrew and Knight Commander of the Royal Victorian Order, Officer of the British Empire and a Justice of the Peace to the office of Ombudsman, under Section 2 of the relevant Act.

I beg to move the following Resolution:

“BE IT RESOLVED that an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor-General approving his proposed appointment under Section 3 (1) of the Ombudsman Act, 1980–68 of Sir Frank Blackman, KA, KCVO, OBE, JP to the office of Ombudsman established by Section 2 of the said Act.”

The actual terms of the Address as proposed are as follows:

ADDRESS

BY

THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

TO

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

This Honourable House presents our humble duty and is pleased to approve the proposed appointment by Your Excellency of Sir Frank Blackman, KA, KCVO, OBE, JP, to the office of Ombudsman for Barbados established by Section 2 of the Ombudsman Act, 1980 (1980–68).”

5.25 p.m.

Sir, all of us in this Honourable Chamber hold Sir Frank Blackman in the very highest esteem, and we believe that he is a most suitable and capable person to hold this particular office. We all are fully cognizant of the fact that it is a post dealing with the redress of grievances in this country, that because we have a Governmental machinery that it will be necessary from time to time for citizens who are or may be aggrieved or feel aggrieved as a result of the workings of that machinery to seek redress of their grievances.

There are a number of traditional ways by which such grievances may be redressed; for example, through the activities of a Member of Parliament, through representations to any inquiries which may be set up before any proposed action is taken, or it may be through

other tribunals of inquiry after certain actions or steps have been taken and, of course, there is also the traditional role of the courts in terms of the redress of grievances. But it has been found that over the years there is still a residual area in which persons feel that their grievances may not have been fully redressed and hence the need for an Ombudsman to give greater measure of access to sources for redress as they come into contact with the Governmental machinery.

Sir Frank Blackman has had a very long association with the Governmental machinery. He has worked in very close relationship with the Legislature, having seen service as Clerk to part of the Legislature of this country, and he has worked his way up through a long and distinguished career through the ranks of the Civil Service going from the lower grades — clerical grades of the Civil Service — through the middle management grades and up to the top of Civil Service Administration in the administration grades. So he has a very sound knowledge of the operations and procedures of the Civil Service. He has an understanding of the functionings and requirements of the Legislature in seeking to deal with the problems of the citizens and the kinds of personal qualities which he possesses, the ability to hear a case, the ability to hear the other side, the ability to judge and to discriminate between the various arguments and the various propositions which may be made, and his commitment to a sense of fair play and justice all recommend him as a suitable person for appointment to this very high office.

It is, therefore, with very great respect, Sir, that I move the Resolution in the terms that I have done. I beg, Sir, that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I consider it not only my humble duty but a personal pleasure to second this Resolution.

Sir, I think the Ombudsman Act is perhaps innovative in several respects, but one respect in which it has been particularly innovative is the question of the approval of the person who holds the office of Ombudsman to a vote of this Parliament, and I think that by that provision we ensure that the person who comes to hold the high office is acceptable to this Honourable House and to Parliament as a whole and also, of course, is acceptable to the main political parties whose Members comprise the broad membership of this Honourable House.

In its report to the Government and a report which has been made a document of this Honourable House, Sir, the report of the Commission to review the Constitution and to consider a system of national honours and a national table of precedence, a report which is now known by the name of the Cox Commission Report, the Commission at page 60 said that the person appointed

to the office of Ombudsman must have a wide knowledge including preferably also of the law, high prestige and personal merit. He should be so carefully selected that there could never be a question of his honesty, integrity, ability or motive.

I believe, Sir, that in selecting Sir Frank Milton Blackman to hold this post we are carrying out quite carefully the criteria and the recommendation set out in the Cox Commission Report, because almost every word written in that Paragraph 24 is applicable to Sir Frank Blackman, and despite the fact that he is not a trained lawyer, I am satisfied myself that he has had so much contact with the law and particularly the making of legislation, that he has acquired in the process quite a good grasp of the legal principles. He certainly will bring to this high office a wide knowledge of public affairs. In many respects he has been the longest serving civil servant, even longer than Sir Carlisle Burton who before him was Head of the Civil Service, and he has risen through the ranks of the Civil Service and has distinguished himself at every step that he has made. He is no doubt, Sir, a person of the highest prestige and his personal merit I think has been well established to the satisfaction of us all.

There can be no question, as the report said, of his honesty, integrity, ability or indeed his motives. Sir Frank has served under successive Governments, and none of us at all who have served with him would ever accuse him at anytime of betraying in any respects the secrets of the Cabinet. He is a tremendous advisor to successive Prime Ministers. His advice has always been pitted on the highest principles of serving the public of Barbados, in particularly its Public Service. He has given advice that I think each Government and every Prime Minister whom he has served has respected as coming from a person who has no political axe at all to grind. I think, Sir, and certainly my knowledge of him, and having listened to the advice he has given during the time that I served in the Cabinet, I am satisfied and was satisfied when the Prime Minister asked for my consideration of the matter that he was an ideal person to be appointed to this post.

I can say, Sir, that when the Act was passed as long ago as 1980, the person whose name was on the lips of each one of us was that of Sir Frank Blackman. He held unfortunately the post of Secretary to the Cabinet and he used to be teased that the former Prime Minister Adams was hesitating to make money available for an appointment until Sir Frank had reached the age of retirement, and he very much wanted him no doubt to be the first Ombudsman.

I know for a fact and I have said it in the letter to the Honourable Prime Minister which I wrote that certainly Sir Frank commanded the respect of the past Government to the extent that his name was the name within our own consideration, and I have said that. I

think, Sir, that if Sir Frank was asked, and he is a person who would find a way of not answering because he never even at this stage would betray anything said to him in the Cabinet But I am sure, Sir, that if he was in a position to answer he would say that his name was the name in utmost consideration, Sir.

Sir, I am happy that this measure has now reached this stage. I recall when the Ombudsman Act came before this Honourable House, the debate which we had then, Sir, about it in 1980, I recall the arguments put up by my friend, the Deputy Leader of the Government, the acting Prime Minister at the time, as a student of political affairs, he welcomed the provision although he did not think that it solved all of the problems of the day. I remember then the argument put up by the honourable Member for St. Michael West in which he wanted some of the provisions widened to include a wider net of Ministries.

Now Sir, I want to perhaps address one fear, and the fear which has been expressed in the Cox Commission, the fear from the point of view of the body of the Civil Servants that the creation of such a post could possibly initiate a kind of fear with their dealings with the public.

I think the Commission went on to say at Paragraph 22 on page 60:

"They may become over-cautious in the performance of their duties since they will want to protect themselves from any possible disciplinary action."

The appointment of the Ombudsman could re-introduce much of the red-tape of which the Civil Service is presently trying to rid itself. In some countries where inquiries into the behaviour and actions of civil servants have been carried out it has been noticed that even senior civil servants become very defensive in their dealings with the public in order to avoid the possibility of public scrutiny.

I am sure, Sir, that the appointment of Sir Frank Blackman to this office will possibly allay any such fear on the part of the civil servants. He certainly was Head of the Civil Service and known to them. His sense of fair play, as the Honourable Leader of the House has said, is well known both within the service and outside of the service, and I have no doubt that he is as able to pronounce against them if he wishes to do so.

I hope that with the office being operational some of the problems which come before us as Members of Parliament and as representatives will be eased to some extent. In countries like the United Kingdom where Members of Parliament brought these instances to the attention of the Ombudsman, he has reported to the

Members of Parliament. I hope that a procedure will be established where Members of Parliament will bring to the notice of the Ombudsman matters, and that they are kept informed of the investigations and certainly of the results of the investigations.

I note that in Committee we have voted supplies for this officer. I think that in the initial stages no doubt the supplies which we have voted will be adequate. But I am sure that in due course when the office gets going that there may be need for us to review the number of officers and staff available to the officer.

Sir, if it is a pleasant duty that I have had in this Honourable House it is this: to second this Resolution and I do so very conscious of the fact that here this Honourable House today is creating history, improving the administrative machinery of Barbados and placing in charge of this office a person with a distinguished public record, outstanding personal qualities, and if I may be allowed, Sir, a little other comment, I am happy to say that Sir Frank Blackman is a resident and voter in Christ Church West, Sir. I have never known how he has voted. I can assure the honourable Members that I never know that, because I am sure he is a person who keeps to himself his feelings on any particular issue. But I could recall the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central, who is not now in his seat, when both of us ran in 1971 we were so deeply conscious of the special role which is performed by some Public Officers like the Secretary to the Cabinet and the Director of Public Finance and others that we agreed among ourselves that we never would canvas the house of the Cabinet Secretary, Sir.

Aside

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member *sotto voce* made a suggestion, Sir, that I know he does not believe it, Sir. But I think one has to respect the role performed in this country by the really truly impartial civil servant.
5.35 p.m.

I make bold to say, as the Honourable Leader of the House said last week in this Honourable House, that I personally believe that there is a role for impartiality in the Civil Service, and I believe that it is not a mystical role, that it is a reality and that the smaller the society we have, the more important that we should have people like Sir Frank Blackman who can carry out their duties in an outstanding manner, who can have the confidence of succeeding administrations and who can perform without bias, so that today in this Honourable House as he comes to the end of an illustrious career he is still being asked to serve a little longer and give of the

tremendous erudition and experience which he has acquired in his lifetime.

I willingly and lovingly, if I may use the expression, Sir, second this Resolution.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I think that the fact that this Address which will go to His Excellency is being sponsored by both sides of the Honourable House is sufficient eloquent testimony to the regard in which the first holder of the post of Ombudsman is held by all of us who have had the honour to serve in the highest levels of the Government Service of this country. Mine is not to therefore add to the very deserving praise which has been and will be heaped upon Sir Frank Blackman, but rather to address myself to the office of Ombudsman itself in relation to the historic step which we are taking today.

I think too that the Honourable House will not hold it against me if I say that the honourable Member who just sat down must take credit for the role which he has played in advancing administrative law in the country and the whole aspect of administrative justice in the face and in the teeth of bitter opposition by his own party when.....

Aside

(ASIDE: Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: This is supposed to be non-contentious.)

Hon. B. M. TAITT: It is not contentious. You have to be able to face the facts, David. It is not contentious. I am not going to interfere with anything, but the facts have to be put on the floor.

In the face of opposition by his own party which can be found in the fact that he and I from opposite sides of the Honourable House on occasion called for the proclamation of the Ombudsman Act when two years after it having passed this Honourable House it had not yet been proclaimed.

I speak in here with a divided voice, but so that the facts relating to an important office, an important historical landmark in our development should be recorded properly. I say that he should get credit because he was able in the office of Attorney General to place on the Statute Books of Barbados, having been advised by H. R. W. Wade, who is the foremost and perhaps the most prolific international writer on administrative law, in the formulation of three companion Acts which form the basis of administrative justice in Barbados, and which put Barbados well in advance of any other Commonwealth country in the business of provision of administrative justice. I speak of the Administrative Justice Act, 1980, the companion Act relating to tribunals, and of course the Ombudsman Act. These three must always be taken

together, because the one cannot be taken without the other if we are to understand what their intent and what their application must be. They themselves are steep in a belief in the principle of natural justice, and the recognition that however erudite the law itself may have been, and in particular the common law, that so far as the provision of justice for those who suffer at the hands of administrations and administrators, that there was a lacuna or perhaps lacunae in the provision of justice.

What we are doing today is therefore sealing a commitment and a promise made not necessarily out of political considerations but out of an evolution that has brought to Barbados a sense of maturity in regard to our administrative system. In that respect I join with those who say that there can be impartiality in the administration of a country, but I would go on to say that unfortunately in Barbados impartiality has too often been linked with the concept of partisanship. To suggest that a person is only impartial if he is a political eunuch is to deny a person the quintessence of his existence in a polity that is in fact democratic, for an individual must be able to survive in his own society and to hold his own views. In the holding of those views is the determination of whether he will be a person or whether in the words of the late Prime Minister "he will so sit on the fence that he becomes impaled by the fence itself."

A man and a woman in this country must stand up and be counted from time to time. There are many civil servants who have passed and who are still with us who have demonstrated that what is necessary and what is desirable for the impartial implementation of a policy is the matter of integrity. There are many civil servants whose political views are known and yet whose integrity has never been touched or never been questioned by either side. I shall lay that to rest, Sir, because we are not discussing the integrity of civil servants, we are merely noticing it because it attaches so fervently to the person who is going to fill the office of Ombudsman for the first time in Barbados. But Barbadians themselves need to be told and to recognise that this office of Ombudsman is not itself a final statement, it is not itself the end all, the be all and the final position of administrative justice.

It should be borne in mind that Barbados will not be the first Caribbean country to appoint an Ombudsman. There is the office of Ombudsman in Guyana, in Dominica, in Trinidad and Tobago, in Jamaica, and yet if one should peruse the reports of the Ombudsmen in these respective territories, one will discover that whereas they came in trumpeting with much promise, they in fact have made much ado about nothing in many respects.

The office of Ombudsman is one of the sorrier episodes in the administrative history of our countries, because taken without more from its habitat first in the colder climes and secondly as Parliamentary Commissioner from the United Kingdom, and watched as it has moved

over to Australia and New Zealand and Canada and elsewhere, we in the Caribbean have borrowed it as we have tended to borrow so many things without examining in detail how we may best apply those things to our peculiar circumstances.

Mine is a plea for Barbadians and for this Honourable Chamber to recognise in the coming of the Ombudsman the need for us to make sure that the adaptation which we are forging today by this humble Address to the Governor-General, that we are calling upon an individual to set a standard which will be emulated by those who will follow. We cannot require of the Ombudsman more than he is able to give without ourselves first laying the foundation and at the same time providing the framework within which he will work. If we expect too much from the Ombudsman, we will be the ones who will say that the Ombudsman and the office have failed.

5.45 p.m.

What must be recognized is that this deals with a thing, for want of a better description, maladministration in Government. Maladministration has not been so well defined that any two scholars have been able to agree on it precisely, and yet everybody has an idea of what is involved.

We have had many euphemisms, many words which have described maladministration but for us in Third World countries, in developing countries like Barbados, what it must mean for us is that where a citizen feels aggrieved by a decision of the state and where that decision seems to emanate from a faceless Government, from the Ministry, from that amorphous group which no one has been able to pin a tail on as the children do in the game "Pinning the Tail on the Donkey", where no one is able to discover who is responsible for what, it is the responsibility of the Ombudsman to ferret out by dint of his knowledge and his perspicacity the hows, the whys and the wherefores, such that a citizen when finally he receives a word from the Ombudsman can know that his cause was not in vain, that something happened, that there was a finiteness, if you would pardon the expression, about what occurred, and that he has some redress in this great giant of a thing called the Government.

For us in Barbados it is a great day because we are saying to the world and to the Democratic Labour Party itself that it is the instrument by which we say to the world that we are a mature people who acknowledge and recognize that mistakes are made in Government, sometimes innocently, sometimes quite deliberate but such mistakes when they are made ought to be redressed for, in the final analysis, Government is nothing if it is not Government for the people.

Mr. Speaker, the Barbados establishment of an Ombudsman, as the Honourable Leader of the Opposi-

tion has said, and as my colleague the Acting Prime Minister initiated, will eventually require us to expand the office. We, especially who are Parliamentarians will have to get accustomed to the use of the Ombudsman for in the first flush of the office, we may very well misuse the office by misunderstanding it.

I am sure my colleagues would not hold it against me if I suggest that all of us should take the opportunity to renew our knowledge of what the Ombudsman is, and that we should refrain to the extent that is possible from putting and placing more at the feet of the Ombudsman than is reasonable and acceptable and, indeed, required.

I think if we exercise some restraint while taking the time to educate our constituents, then, in the final analysis we are going to be proud of the office of Ombudsman and we are going to be able to demonstrate, in fact, that it is an office that can be adapted to the Caribbean and can be usefully utilised in the Caribbean.

The Ombudsman in one or two of the Caribbean countries has had a very doubtful distinction of being stillborn. In one celebrated case the Administration suffered it by refusing to pass to it the requisite resources. These are ways in which Ombudsmen who dare to go contrary to Governments find themselves curtailed. I think we owe it to ourselves to pledge here today that no matter what the circumstances we would recognize the Ombudsman as a referee for Parliament.

This form of address represents that he is a parliamentary officer. "He" here, of course, embraces "she", for there is nothing which says that the term "Ombudsman" must be related to the male sex. In due course I have no doubt that there will be an Ombudsman who will be a female, if there is not yet one, but, that person as appointed will be answerable only to Parliament, and it is to Parliament that that Ombudsman shall report and the manner of that report can be determined to a large extent by what is forwarded to the Ombudsman by Parliamentarians.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to join with the two honourable Members who have spoken in praise of Sir Frank Blackman. There is not more that can be said of him except that in all of this he remains humble. He is able to demonstrate a capacity for humility which may be somewhat alien to those of us who practise this profession and even so in the humility which he practises, he demonstrates that he grows taller and taller even though his stature might not be that of the nine footer.

Only last night I took the unprecedented step very innocently — of saying congratulations to him and he, with the aplomb of which all Cabinet Ministers have become accustomed, asked for what was I congratulating him. He then went on to make a comment which was so remarkable that one could only remember that it was Sir Frank Blackman who was speaking. Nonetheless he knew that he was going to become Ombudsman because he

knew that he had served both sides of this Honourable House with such a distinction that there would not be a voice raised against him today. There has not been a voice raised against him before, and I daresay there will not be a voice raised against him in the future.

I would hope, Sir, that his filling of the office of Ombudsman will redound to the credit, not only of this Honourable House, those who have participated in bringing us to the fruition of this day, but to the country itself whose 20th birthday can coincide with such a momentous occasion as the appointment of an Ombudsman.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day I gave notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$4 418 461 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, and at that stage I indicated that I would be seeking the permission of the Honourable House to deal with that matter in all of its stages today.

I am proposing, Sir, to proceed with that measure at this stage, and I now seek the permission of the Honourable House so to proceed.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection, then leave is granted to deal with this Resolution.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I beg to move that Item 2(e) be the instant Order of the day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item 2(e) is now the instant Order of the day.
5.55 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Order No. 2(e) was called – To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of this Island.

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

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. R. P. BYER in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1986–87 No. 13

Head 36 – Ministry of Health and Social Security – was called.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Mr. Chairman, as the clock slowly advances to six o'clock, I have no particular desire to prolong the issue, and as a consequence I crave your indulgence, Sir, to come here this evening, and having spoken on October 7 and given you the assurance, I recognised I would have to return at a later day with a Supplementary for the National Assistance Board, I refer to Head 36, Subhead 33 – Other Personal Emoluments where in the Approved Estimates for 1986–87 the sum of \$82 777 was approved to meet the cost of salaries and wages.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable Member would give way, I think I should explain to this Committee that the Honourable Minister of Employment, Labour Relations and Community Development will be the principal speaker and will introduce this motion because a number of the items relating to the Resolution fall under his responsibility, and therefore he is introducing this on behalf of the Government and not the Honourable Minister of Health as was indicated earlier.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Very well. Let the Honourable Minister proceed.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Sir, I think it is fair to say that before May 28 these issues fell under the Ministry of Health and Social Security, and since this Administration has assumed the reins of Government, they are now under the Ministry of Employment, Community Development and Welfare.

Sir, I alluded to the fact that under Head 36 Subhead 33 – Welfare Department, Object No. 2 – Other Personal Emoluments, the sum of \$82 777 was voted in the Approved Estimates of 1986–87 to meet the cost of salaries and wages of casual and unestablished staff as well as acting allowances, subsidies and overtime. This sum has proved to be inadequate and a further sum of \$58 856 is being sought to meet the needs of the department for the balance of the financial year.

Under Subhead 33, Object No. 3, National Insurance Contributions, this is as a consequence of these increases, so that the sum of \$67 954 voted in the Estimates for 1986–87 has become inadequate and an additional sum of \$3 219 is therefore asked for. Also under Object No. 5 Transport Levy again as a consequence of these increases the sum of \$2 851 is inadequate and the additional sum of \$94 for the Transport Levy is requested.

Moving on to Subhead 35 – Assistance to Persons, Object No. 14 – Grants to Individuals, the sum of \$5 131 200 was voted in the Estimates for 1986–87. Of course, Sir, this is to look after welfare grants, assistance in kind and also educational assistance. Truthfully, Sir, the problem here is that in April 1986, the then Prime Minister raised the level of grants in this country and as a consequence we found that some \$3 744 200 has to be paid out to children, able-bodied persons, disabled persons, and those who are in receipt of non-contributory old age pension payable under the National Insurance and Social Security Act. The Barbados Labour Party Government at the time did not come to Parliament to seek supplementary provision, and so we find that under the National Assistance (Amendment) Regulations, 1986, these Regulations shall be deemed to have come into operation on the 14th day of April, 1986, as stated in paragraph 3 of the Statutory Instrument. In other words, Sir, although the Barbados Labour Party Government did not come to the House of Assembly for a Supplementary, all persons were paid these increases and so it meant that the Welfare Department started as early as 14th April to pay these increases to some seven thousand and fifty children whose increases ranged from \$4 to \$8, and we had to increase the payment to one thousand six hundred able-bodied persons at \$10 per week, three hundred disabled persons moving from \$8 to \$12 per week, one thousand five hundred and fifty disabled persons moving from \$12 to \$16 per week, and one thousand one hundred and twenty-five disabled persons at \$20 per week.

As far as assistance in kind is concerned, the Welfare Department assists citizens of Barbados with artificial limbs, wheelchairs, repairs, clothing, dentures, electricity rates, help to fire victims, groceries for those in need, house rent, land rent, spectacles and water rates, so that it is easily seen that we had to come today for such a large amount of money, that is, \$2 386 292.

I do not believe that this is contentious. I do believe that the Barbados Labour Party probably did not have the time between April when the Prime Minister came to the country, and this was hailed throughout the country as a great thing. This was hailed by all and sundry as an increase for those in need, and as a consequence people in Barbados believed it was a great thing, but I am just saying that this should not be contentious and all we are doing is a little tidying up, because we feel that we have to make the records straight.

I am not promising that the other grants under Head 36 – National Assistance Board, those amounts to public institutions to which I alluded on October 7, when I said at the time I would have to return to this Honourable House with another supplementary for the current vote, would be easy.
6.05 p.m.

Approximately \$1.7 million was voted for the capital expenditure with the National Assistance Board which was debated in this House, Sir. I said at the time that I recognize that I would have to return to this Honourable House with another supplementary this time for the current vote.

I explained, Sir, that it had come to our knowledge that, at the beginning of the Fiscal Year, the rollover was something in the region of about \$511 000 and having started, Sir, with a rollover of that magnitude, it meant that the first draw-down around April 21, 1986 – something to the tune of \$740 000 – it meant that the National Assistance Board's current vote was in jeopardy from the beginning. I say so, Sir, because I know of a letter written by the then Permanent Secretary to the National Assistance Board saying that out of the vote of \$2.8 million for the current expenditure, they should take cognizance of the fact that the statement at the end of the month of March had shown that there was a rollover of \$471 000. Therefore, he alluded to the fact that they should start the year with \$2.8 million minus the \$741 000, so that the expenditure should have been \$2 329 000.

Now, Sir, if the Members of the National Assistance Board and the Director had taken cognizance of that bit of advice from the then Permanent Secretary, I believe that there would have been a cautious approach, and they would not have been in the predicament that they found themselves in.

I personally believe, Sir, that the intention was that they would go for a supplementary later. I say so because of the fact that by the end of May the \$200 000 for the "in kind" vote was completely spent. As a matter of fact they spent.....

(*Aside:* Hon. E. E. GREAVES: In two months?)

Hon. W. W. HALL: Yes, in two months. They had spent \$293 174.04 for the in kind vote. Now the "in kind" vote is usually for help to poor people in terms of beds, fridges, stoves and things like that, and the operational expenses also include the Chairman's fees and Board Members' fees. This \$293 174.04 was spent by the end of May.

I should also like to point out, Sir, that since the Democratic Labour Party has assumed office, and recognized that this "in kind" vote had been completely annihilated, we have not been able to spend any money at all in terms of buying these necessary utilities for the poor people of this country.

And therefore, Sir, I should like to say to you that even though the honourable Member for St. Peter did say that we should encourage the people of Barbados to help

themselves, I can say, Sir, that this is a classical example where the people of Barbados were not encouraged to help themselves at all. Indeed, what they were encouraged to do was just to sit back and receive things as if to say, "that is what friends are for."

I also should like to point out, Sir, that there have been cases where we have seen Local Purchase Orders for divan sets and cupboards. And we believe that this is irregular. I shall not dwell too much on this issue, Sir, because.....

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL:.....as you know — I have to say that on that same day, October 7, 1986 and subsequent to that, I have said to the people of Barbados that I am not particularly satisfied that all is well in the 'state of Denmark' and as a consequence, Sir, I felt that I should go to Cabinet and express my views that we should have an enquiry into the entire management of the National Assistance Board.

On September 25, 1986, Cabinet concluded that in the public interest, there should be a departmental enquiry into the administration and financial management of the National Assistance Board as from April 1, 1984 until September 30, 1986. And on October 2, 1986 the Cabinet further concluded that the Hon. Oliver Hamlet Jackman, CHB, Attorney-at-Law, Charles Richard Elijah Edwards, Esq., CSM, retired permanent Secretary.....

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL:..... and Calvin McCarteny Springer, Esq., Chartered Accountant should be appointed to conduct the enquiry. Sir, I am pleased to inform this Honourable House that these three gentlemen have all accepted Cabinet's invitation to be members of this Committee.

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Sir, without further ado, I should like to suggest that this Honourable Chamber concur in my views that the respective supplementaries that I have alluded to are necessary and, Sir, I should like to move that they stand part.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for St. Thomas.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, there are a couple of matters that I wish to refer to. I do not intend being contentious — as I indicated to the Honour-

able Minister earlier that we would hardly be contentious of this matter, but I was not following the Minister's presentation. Matters of understanding of course are subjective, so it might be my own fault.

In April this year — April 2 — the then Prime Minister, Mr. St. John in the House of Assembly Debate, Sir, for April 2 at pages 3746 and 3747 announced an increase in welfare grants to national assistance, and finished by saying:

"The Government's Social Security expenditure paid for out of the Government's budget, as opposed to the National Insurance Fund, will have to find an additional \$2.3 million to finance this additional expenditure."

That was a Budgetary Proposal that except in the very formal sense did not require an approval of the Honourable House. Money had been voted already but clearly the Honourable Prime Minister was saying that there was need for an additional \$2.3 million. He went on to say that with effect from April 14 new rates would be \$12 instead of \$8, \$16 instead of \$12, and \$20 instead of \$15. So that the increased burden to the Expenditure was realized then, and all that would have had to happen for what we are doing now is come in for the Supplementary to finance the \$2.3 million to make up the shortfall. So there is no secret or mystery in it. But the way it was presented by the Honourable Minister was as though again the Labour Party had done something wrong — another error.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It might have been how it was put across. So long as the Honourable House is agreed, I rest the case, Sir.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Now Sir, the Honourable Minister gave some figures about the indebtedness of the National Assistance Board and the fact that it was overdrawn and so on. I have here the Accounts and Statements prepared by the Accountant General for June 1986. On page 19, Item 36 — National Assistance Board, first column the total provision for 1986-87 is \$2.8 million as appears in the Estimates. The last column for June, Sir, and these are documents of the House — Expenditure from April 1, 1986 to June 30, 1986, \$740,000.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Man, I am reading what the man put out here — \$740,000.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Now Sir..... Well, if you have conducted the inquiry already, there is no need for it.

In September the Expenditure from April 1 to September 30 was \$2,344,904. So that at the end of September there was still.....

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I do not know. The Accountant General will have to explain to the Commission how at the end of September the account was still \$500,000 in the credit.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I mean, I am not in there, Sir. But it would appear that contrary to what is being said, the accounts put out by the Accountant General of this country tell a different story than those who have political axes to grind, and I feel that since this is a public document the facts must be laid bear that as of September 30 there was still approximately \$544,904 in the account, Sir.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: If you all are going to pay.

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Is the Government going to pay the cost? Right! I will send then up for a year — \$1,000 a day.

Sir, to that extent just for the sake of clarifying those points, Sir, the only other points that the Opposition want to make on this is that we want to compliment the Honourable Minister for keeping his word in setting up the Commission. Is it a departmental thing?

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Well, I was not sure. I want a public thing about 1978. But before the Honourable Minister replies, Sir, I wonder if the Honourable Minister and the Cabinet will be as kind as I was in relation to the inquiry into the death of the prisoner Agard and provide fees for the lawyers who may be required

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You never know People have rights who may be required to appear on behalf of any interested parties, Sir.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You got paid for the election case though. I was then the Attorney General looking after you boys.

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Before the Honourable Minister speaks, are there any other contributions? The Honourable Minister can reply.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Sir, I am very sorry if I confused the honourable Member for St. Thomas.

I must confess, Sir, that I have never found myself lost for words, but the National Assistance Board has done exactly that to me, Sir. Not only have you been confused — everybody else has been confused having looked at what has been happening at the National Assistance Board.

The \$2 million that the honourable Member for St. Thomas referred to is merely a draw-down, Sir. That was the draw-down. All that happened is that although some of these things were ordered say in May, they were paid for around June or July. But as I said before, we especially in the assistance and kind since June did not buy anything. So even though we were paying for our things, they were not things that we ordered. So whether they came in May or September it did not matter.

I wish to also state, Sir, in closing that on September 11, I told the Director of the National Assistance Board that I was rather upset at what was happening with the Capital Vote.

At this point certain remarks made by Hon. Members for St. Michael West Central and St. Michael West were asked to be expunged from the record by Mr. CHAIRMAN.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Sir, I was not carried away. I believe that I was tricked into it by the lawyer on the other side Sir.

Sir, I would like to move that this Head 36 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 43 – MINISTRY OF TOURISM AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, as with Head 36, this formerly fell under the Ministry of Tourism and the Environment and it is now under the Ministry of Housing and Lands. Last Tuesday the honourable Member took us away from what he should have been.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like that you should rephrase that last statement. I said on that occasion, if I may repeat it, that nothing that was said then was irrelevant or outside the scope of the debate, and I still maintain my position.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: What I was saying is that last Tuesday, there was a very long debate on this matter about employing of these number of persons under the National Conservation Commission. In fact, many of the persons in here spoke on this Resolution.....

(*Aside:* Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: You are begging.)

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: I am not begging. There is no question of begging, I am waiting for you to come. I am waiting for you all, because I have the files here for you, I am waiting for you.

Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, I am saying that there was a long debate on this matter, and I move that this Head stand part.

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

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister of Trade and Industry was not here last week, he was up in Montreal licking his wounds for not being taken by the Honourable Prime Minister to the Miami conference.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We do not have that Ministry in Barbados, do we?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, I am sorry. Tourism. I would not say that about the Honourable Minister of Trade at all. He got as far as Mangrove. The other one went to Montreal. Sir, the Tourism Minister was not here last week.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir, I am going to have that struck. On a point of order, Sir. I think the honourable Member has to have that struck from the record. You see, Sir, these little matters when they are not struck from the record they then get to form a part of the political discussion outside of here. That statement is not true, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Which statement?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The statement about the Minister of Tourism being in Montreal licking his wounds because he could not go somewhere. The fact is, Sir, that the Minister of Tourism and Industry was in Montreal and Ottawa and Missisagua and a lot of cities making sure that the boom in tourism is sustained and allowing the honourable Member and other honourable Members to earn a decent living in this country because of the way tourism is performing. So I will have him to strike that from the record.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point is made.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, I congratulate the Honourable Minister on his efforts to boost tourism. Everything depends on him, including his own security of tenure in the Cabinet, the success with which he pursues....

Sir, the only thing I want to say on this is that last week, I believe in the second speech I made on the Resolution, I was very careful,....

Aside

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am not reflecting on a vote, Sir. It is entirely within the rules for me to refer to....

Asides

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: But, Sir, if he is holding up Reagan as a paragon of all that is right and proper,....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Just allow the honourable Member to.....

Aside

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order! Order! Order!

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS:.....that is a matter that is open to opinion.

Sir, I have understood from all that I have read – because I did not read anything in the newspaper about what I said last week – that the Honourable Minister is alleged to have spoken last week, we were of the view that this programme for debushing and beautification would have been an ongoing programme of some permanence.

(*Aside:* Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: What is to stop it from being so?)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: What stops it from being a programme of any permanence is that the note to this Resolution says:

"The sum of \$1 070 000 is required to meet expenditure on the debushing, landscaping and beautification programme to be implemented by the National Conservation Commission during the months of December 1986 and January 1987."

(*Aside:* Hon. B. M. TAITT: We are coming back for more money.)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Are you coming back for more money? I would have preferred if it were going on even to the end of the tourist season, even to the end of April.

I asked last week that something be done by Government to employ a few people, even if it is five hundred and forty, twenty per constituency or whatever, to give them some work for Christmas, and the Government has answered in a positive way they have given them. They have come with the Resolution to give them work for two months.

But I also suggest that there is a lot that can be done by the collective wisdom of Cabinet and the cross-fertilisation of policies in Ministries that touch on these matters to concoct a programme — and is not a good word — devise, formulate a programme that would provide permanent work aimed at the beautification of Barbados, make it harmonise with all that the Honourable Minister of Tourism has just been doing in Montreal; getting the tourists to come here and see that we have a beautiful country, well kept, free from mosquitoes and so on.

(*Aside:* Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: We did that last week.)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You said it last week?

You see, we come today for \$6 million as loans. I think the time will come when Government has to channel \$6 million not by way of a \$400 loan to be repaid but by way of the creation of permanent jobs. It would be, I am sure, more appreciated if \$6 million could go into some Government projects where people get work but that is a matter for the Government I am only throwing it out.

The Government has its own policy and I am one of those who is not prepared to tell the Government how to run the country. When we were in Government we were allowed to run it our way. You are now to run it your way, but I only throw out the suggestion that Government must seriously look at the creation of long term jobs, and engage people in productive enterprises.

(*Aside:* Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Unfortunately you did not suggest that to the past Administration.)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The past Administration had functioned so efficiently that the past Administration was able to reduce unemployment from 22% to 10% in 1980–81. It never went to 40%. It was a lie that was told in the newspaper by members of the now Government. In fact, the Honourable Prime Minister on October 7, 1985 said that unemployment was 35%. I wonder what he is saying now. He has said in Bermuda when he called President Reagan a Zombie that unemployment was 20%. The latest figures will show that if it is not 20%, it is 19.7, and it has gone up four points under this Government in six months.

(*Aside:* Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Not true.)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Well, the Central Bank Statistics are wrong. I have read that in.....Do you want me to bring it for you next week? I will bring it next week. I will walk in here with it. I mean, I walk in here with all my books, all my material. The latest Central Bank report published said 19.7%, yes, it went up four points from 15% to 19%.

I have been watching the Government very carefully. The honourable Member for Christ Church East Central was boasting of how many things they have implemented. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was speaking earlier about the humanitarian policy which was in fulfilment of Manifesto pledges, and the one that the country wants to hear about is the instant jobs that were to be created the Monday after the Election and have not come, and the people are still waiting.

(*Aside:* Hon. B. M. TAITT: Is that in the Manifesto?)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: If it is in the Manifesto? No, you did not put it like that in the Manifesto. 6.35 p.m.

The Honourable Minister of Tourism on May 23 told the country on television in his party political broadcast, "we will put the country back to work." May they live very, very long.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I think it is good for the Honourable House at this hour as we come up to the dinner hour to have a little levity, because as Christmas is coming up after the Independence weekend you can get this kind of spirit, but in between some lies might get slipped in if you are not careful, and you have to be very careful in these circumstances.

I would just like to deal with this whole question of beautification and landscaping. I do not particularly like the idea that we might be beautifying for the tourists. I have said before and I maintain that we in Barbados

deserve and have to live in a proper environment and when I go, as I have gone to four different major countries — I have been to the United States to New York, I have been to Frankfurt, I have been to London, and I have been to all of the cities on the eastern seaboard in Canada — I have been telling the people that they must come to Barbados and see the experiment which we are carrying out down here.

I talk to them, not in terms of the sea and the sun, because every Caribbean country has sea and sun and sand, and some Caribbean countries might even have more beautiful beaches than Barbados. When I tell them is that Barbados has an unique experience going on, that they should come and see how we are running this country, they should come and see how we, as a community, are functioning, and they can come and look at the rich heritage that is Barbados, that is, the architectural heritage, the political heritage.

I am glad they did not come down to see the honourable Member for St. Thomas because that would have denied everything I told them, but, generally speaking, I have invited them to come to Barbados and see what is going on, and, yes, I agree that when they arrive here, they should find us living in a physical environment that is acceptable to us, and I believe that if we live in the kind of environment that we would like to have, then when tourists come here they are going to find that environment, and they are going to go back and tell people that they have found a place in the Caribbean, a place in the world where people really are clean, and, indeed, there are some people who have spoken to me in my travels who say that they are very moved by the cleanliness which they see in Barbados, and most people in this country do not realize that Bridgetown is much, much cleaner than New York by far. Bridgetown is much cleaner than a number of cities in the world. We are not as clean as others, and I maintain that we can become one of the cleanest cities in the world so that when the Honourable Minister comes for this money, it must not be seen as a temporary programme.

I think what we have is financing which is being spaced because one does not know exactly whether you are going to need larger numbers at the end of two months than you would have at the beginning because we have had an unseasonable amount of rain and it is very difficult to project exactly what you are going to need. I think the Honourable Minister has correctly and properly tried to plan in terms of 2 months and then let us see where we go from there.

I think, for example, that it is wrong that we should have — as did happen with Miss Miller — a debushing programme where they cut down almost every little young tree in sight, and left the whole environment bare, and left the country looking like a bare-neck chicken. What we need is to have a planned programme

of beautification, and, it is my understanding that that is what is being proposed, that is what is going to happen and I would like to see, for example, that the Spring Garden Highway is maintained at the level where it was, say, a month ago.

Those of us who walk early in the morning can observe what happens, and how the foliage can multiply very quickly, and I think that if we do not stay on top of it, it tends to run away. In fact, if you look at the roundabout at the end of the Spring Garden Highway, you can see what is possible if you maintain a schedule of landscape maintenance.

I think we also need to include in the programme an element of education. The Minister of the Environment started a programme of education and I think it needs to be intensified. There has to be a greater linkage between the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation and the Ministry responsible for the Environment and the other agencies because we are all in this thing together.

This is not the responsibility of any single Ministry or any single Department or any single party. This country is our country and, therefore, the people of Barbados need to be educated. We must all speak when we see children throwing things out of the car windows. We must all speak when we see people spitting on the street. There is nothing more unacceptable than people spitting. We must, in other words, join together in a massive education programme, and I expect that the beautification programme is only the beginning, only the restoration, as it were, of our going on course.

I want to say to the honourable Member on this question of job formation that there are a number of little things which are happening which are not, perhaps, immediately apparent, but we have been looking at improving the tourism plant, for example, and I would like to suggest that we are going to have for example, a submarine that is going to add to the sites availability, that is going to go up the coast and go on the reefs.

Asides

Hon. B. M. TAITT: A genuine submarine that was available and was used at Expo. The people have agreed. The Government has made application and we are discussing things like work permits, etc., but there are going to be about 35 to 40 people trained in all aspects of the running of that sort of operation and already recruitment has started.

I am saying that to give you some idea. You are asking, where are the jobs? We are going to have in the linkage between the Handicraft Department and the Tourism Department, as many as 200 jobs being created

in a relatively short time, and I do not wish to come to the Honourable House or to go anywhere and start saying we are going to produce "X" or we are going to produce "Y"

Let me say something else. Cruise ship passengers will improve in this coming season — in this financial year — by anything from 40% to 60%.

Asides

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Partly to Sisnett. Let no one mistake anybody's attitude. The Government of the past did not utilise Sisnett's capability, and they put him to do cruise ships and he did cruise ships, so I am not going to go and say that Sisnett had nothing to do with cruise ships. Suffice it to say that, partly as a result of Sisnett's effort, and our continuing efforts have resulted....

Asides

Hon. B. M. TAITT: If by the acquired expertise he is able now to continue in the private sector in the same vein, it is good for him, but the cruise ship passengers in Barbados will increase by something like 40% to 50%.

6.45 p.m.

I have met with the Presidents of five cruise ship lines so far. I am meeting tomorrow morning with yet another one. One of the difficulties which we foresee is that with the increase of cruise ship passengers to Barbados, when two or three of these ships come in at the same time, it can lead to chaos, and indeed tempers have been flying off with regard to the maximising of a few hotel properties at the expense of the rest of the country.

What we are doing in the Ministry is that it seems like we are going to be creating jobs for anything from 20 to 40 persons of a certain quality where we are going to have to prepare and produce cruise ship facilitation capability. We are going to have to utilise some of the beaches which are now not being used, and perhaps do it first temporarily, but eventually to provide other facilities on these beaches so as to relieve the pressure on certain hotels. We have to let the small hotels on the South coast benefit from the cruise ship passengers. It is a waste of time for us to have this massive increase in cruise ship passengers if only 5 or 8 hotels will benefit from what spin off there is.

Let me say something else. Not every cruise ship line is a cruise ship line that ought to be allowed to come into Barbados. One has to be extremely careful and meticulous in examining each new line. For example, we have discovered that there is a South African ship that was converted, and an attempt is being made for it to become a cruise liner. Obviously once we become

aware that it is a South African line, it would not be able to come into Barbadian territory. These are matters which require some diligence.

We discovered again that there is a particular cruise ship line that wanted to blackmail the stores in Bridgetown to pay them \$1 400 per ship in order for the people to shop in Bridgetown. We have had to get involved and tell the people: "No way!" And to turn them in the direction that they and their kind should go in.

The way it works was that they would announce to the passengers that they must not buy anything in Bridgetown unless the stores in Bridgetown had agreed to pay these sums of money.

I am saying all these things to indicate that putting together the jobs which we know will come requires some diligence and requires that we do not merely do it willy-nilly, but that we get into it and start to make sure that we have quality jobs.

Let me say that there is a company on the industry side that has said to us that they are going to produce 1 000 jobs in a year, and I have said to them; "Look, I have heard these kinds of stories before." I can announce, as used to happen, that this company is going to produce 1000 jobs, but I would prefer that the company is already set up and is producing 30 to 40 jobs. But we would prefer when we are certain of a high quality and a high level job production before we announce to the population that we are going to have another 1000 jobs. I would say this it is not in the interest of Barbados always to have any single company supplying any 1000 jobs. I would prefer to have 5 companies with 300 each than one company with 1 500.

I will tell you that when I was promoting industry in New York, there was a company that came to us and said that they were going to employ 1 500 people. I gave that company to Bill Whiting, and they established in Jamaica and I am proud of the fact that of the 1 500 people established in Jamaica to this day, that 700 that are there now are still being paid starvation wages and they are out in the hickies. That was not the kind of quality company that should come into Barbados.

We have a very small population and when this population is functioning and when all things are going well, we are going to have an employment situation of quality. As one goes into the area of electronics and voice communication and these kinds of things, you are suddenly going to find that in the same way we developed 60 high quality engineers in the 10 years that INTEL was here, that Barbadians are going to develop into high quality producers. There is no doubt in my mind whatsoever and there is no doubt in this Government's mind, but we understand that the political foxes

must bray at our heels; we understand they must mislead, we understand that you must say that we said that we were going to produce jobs on May 29.

The difference between us and you is that we will not come to the Honourable House, and do what Lionel Craig did, come in here and say that you had produced 3 600 jobs. We will not cook the books; we will not cook the statistics. We will not change any staff members so that they can produce statistics to suit us.

I tell you what we will not do. We are not going to get involved in any of this little inky-dinky tricks; we are not going to increase the level of the voluntary idle. We can show a change in the statistical position like your late Prime Minister did early after he came into the Administration by changing the configuration, and the voluntary idle became a phenomenon in Barbados. We are not going to any of these things.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: You got it from the United States. Let me say what we will not do. We are not going to swell the ranks of the voluntary idle. We are going to have genuine unemployment figures when we produce them, and I am going to take the chance and say this. Before long the 3 honourable Members are going to have great difficulty deciding if they are going to come to the Honourable House on Tuesdays. You are not going to know what to say.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: No, we are going to help you. We are going to come and give you a lift. We are going to drive up to where you are living, come to your offices and invite you to come and get into the car. We will even bring MP - 2 for you if you want, because you are accustomed to that kind of movement, and we will bring it and bring you down here, because you are not going to want to come in. If unemployment drops to 15 per cent, you are going to be saying, "I told you so and you followed my advice." All three of you.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Where do you want it to come to? He wants us to drop it down to 10 per cent. By what year?

(*Aside:* Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You promised the people since May.)

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Now the honourable Member has gone off talking about David Thompson. Poor David Thompson. He is not in this Honourable House yet, but I know what your problem is. You have heard something.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us stick to the substance of the debate and forget the personalities, please.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to put the record straight for the honourable Member. He must not get up for the public every week talking about the unemployment situation. We are the people who told the public what we were going to do, and the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central rolled off 20 promises that we kept. Do you want us to do 20 more now? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that I am committed to the matter of long term jobs, and the organisation that I have the honour to work for is also committed to having jobs on a long term basis, and together we want to see the Government enter into productive areas to provide jobs. I will plead guilty of having indicated during the election campaign that one of the things I would endeavour to do as the next representative for St. Michael Central would be to find jobs. I would try to find jobs for the constituents, and I still feel myself committed to that as an honourable objective.

In that regard, therefore, I think I would wish in supporting this Resolution to welcome the speed with which the Task Force has minded to move from an initial meeting to getting memoranda from various organisations and persons. I understand that a meeting is set for the 6th January, 1987, when these memoranda are going to be looked at with a view to trying to see where we can find productive, long lasting jobs for people.

However, Sir, I am pragmatic in my approach to this matter, and I wish to say that I welcome any short term jobs which there might be, and I hope that there will be some spill over from this Resolution in terms of the area which I represent. I do not know what the Honourable Minister might do, but we still have 250 people out there, nothing to do with the other people who have gone on the job market since then. So I can take the entire thing, and I expect and demand priority in the name of St. Michael Central.
6.55 p.m.

Aside

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: Well, I mean I am going to beg. I do not mind begging. I am accustomed to begging.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I wish to say that the Press carried the Leader of the Opposition as calling on private houses in Barbados to look, especially at this time of

Christmas, at the matter of employment to see whom they could employ. But I want to go beyond that to suggest that I do not believe that he has been alone in that regard. I suppose that all of us have made calls.

I myself have managed to speak to several employers. I spend part of every day speaking to employers and asking to have jobs for people and I would wish publicly, using this forum, to thank those who have responded not just to myself but to other Members, and who have helped to provide employment, thereby helping to make Christmas better for several families of Barbados. I believe that they should recognize that such an effort is not only altruistic, but that enlightened self-interest should make them concern themselves with finding employment for the unemployed in our country, because an unemployed person is a hungry person, and a long, long time ago we learnt that a hungry man is an angry man. And if a man gets angry, well, we are not too sure where that will lead us. Our thanks, therefore, should be very much in place for that and we hope that in the new year the businesses will be able to continue engaging those persons whom they may have taken on on an *ad hoc* basis at this time.

Similarly, I hope the Government will not just see the project, to which \$1 070 000 is to go, only as a December/January occasion but that we will find ways and means by which we will keep those persons engaged for a longer period, eventually turning the jobs into permanent and/or long-term jobs.

I would wish to take this opportunity as well, Mr. Chairman, to respond to one or two comments made by the Minister responsible for Tourism. I am pleased to note that we are going to have jobs coming out of the cruise ship business. I would wish to suggest, however, to the Minister that with all these cruise ships coming to Barbados, we should recognize that there are jobs on those cruise ships and that he should use his tremendous gift for negotiations to negotiate that Bajan seamen would be able to get jobs on some of those ships which come to Barbados, to the credit of our people who are unemployed. We have several Bajan seamen who need jobs and could do well from getting some of the jobs on those cruise ships.

Aside

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: Well, I understand, Sir, that there are going to be several cruise ships, from what the Minister has said, and if there are cruise ships and they are coming to Barbados, I see no reason why we should not negotiate with them to say that, if they are coming to Barbados and they are employing seamen, they should work towards having some of those seamen from here in our country. As a matter of fact, it is my understanding, Sir, that the Latin Americans and the

Trinidadians are going to be moving in that direction. I feel as Bajans we should go ahead and be a little ahead of them.

Hon. B. M. TAITT rose.

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: Do you want me to give way?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of elucidation: I do not wish to interrupt him, but, since he has raised the question, let me say that it has formed the basis of discussions I have been having with the cruise ship people. I do not wish to make any announcement about it until we have moved further. But, in fact, we have been discussing with the Presidents of three of the cruise ship liners coming in here about the provision of jobs for Barbadians on those liners.

Aside.

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: I thank the Minister for his comment. I do not know if he did it here in Barbados or overseas, but I keep reminding him that when he goes on these overseas trips, he may need an expert negotiator, and that I stand ready and able to be his negotiator on this occasion.

Laughter.

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: We are talking about competent able people.

I go beyond that, Mr. Chairman, to look at the matter of industry and.....

Aside.

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: No, we are not begging for any trips. We just want to make sure that the best people are there to negotiate in the interest of Barbadians.

(*Aside:* Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I can send you any time.)

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In the matter of industry, we are concerned as well with making sure that when we look for industries that are producing jobs, we do not lose sight of the commitment that we have to the people of Barbados.

Mr. Chairman, we find that there is a particular movement in certain parts of the Caribbean, a backward movement, towards engaging companies whose attitudes to working people are retrograde, very much outside of the 1980s, and take us much further back. I am very concerned, and I know my colleagues are equally concerned, about what that may mean, and therefore it is

very good to hear the Minister express his own view of that concern. I wish only to remind the Government that we as a people have to make sure that we get jobs, but be concerned that those jobs are jobs of quality and jobs where the dignity of our people is respected at all times.

Aside.

(*Aside:* Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Wind up. Wind up.)

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Head 43. Just a minute.

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, there is just one very brief point I should like to make. It is that I would not like the impression to be carried away from here that there was a 4% increase in employment under the Democratic Labour Party.

(*Aside:* Unemployment!)

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Unemployment.

The fact is, Sir, that there is always a seasonal change in employment levels in Barbados, or unemployment levels, if you want to put it that way, peaking of course, in the first quarter of the year, and at the end of the third quarter which ends at September, you get a fall.

What is important is to look at the period end of September, 1985 to the end of September, 1986. You will see that there has been a slight decline in the levels of unemployment.

Aside

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES: This is very important so as not to give the wrong impression.

What is equally clear is that the country lost somewhere in the region of 13 000 jobs between 1980 and 1985. It is evident that the job losses have stopped, the bankruptcies have stopped, the major lay-offs have stopped.

Aside

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Far from that, there is significant rehiring of people in the tourist sector, in the construction sector and in the commercial sectors in Barbados — there is significant rehiring — and in some areas of manufacturing.

So what I think we have been able to do, and I think it is a direct result of the new investment climate which we have created, is get a response from the private sector certainly, and my experience is certainly similar to that of the honourable Member for St. Michael Central.

I am pleased to announce that, so far, within the limitations of our private sector, I am very satisfied that there has been a very favourable response to the steps taken by this Government.

(*Aside:* For Christmas.)

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Not only for Christmas. I am very pleased that employment opportunities are being generated in the private sector in Barbados, as we anticipated. I think that this would be gradually incremental, so long as our domestic environment remains conducive to growth and investment, and so long as we continue to attract appropriate levels of foreign capital flows into Barbados.

On the motion of Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN, seconded by Hon. N. K. SIMMONS, the question that Head 43 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
7.05 p.m.

On the motion of Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one money Resolution in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, each seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, the Resolution was read a first and second time, and agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 8.10 p.m.

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

The question that the sitting be suspended until 8.10 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: The sitting is resumed.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 4 be the instant Order of the day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 4.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 5) ORDER, 1986

Order No. 4 was called — To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 5) Order, 1986.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, Government of the day has a responsibility to conduct the public affairs of this country to the best of its ability and in so doing it has to call upon the resources of the public services in order to help it implement those programmes. In so doing, there are certain principles and practices which are followed in most countries which pursue the Westminster model and they certainly pursue it in the Presidential model of the United States. It is accepted, Sir, that Ministers including the Prime Minister have a choice and should have a choice in the persons who should serve as Secretaries to those Ministers or to the Prime Minister. Upon the change of Government, the person holding the post of Private Secretary was not acceptable to the Honourable Prime Minister, and therefore, an effort was made to transfer that particular officer to another post without loss of emoluments.

Because of the peculiar grading of the post of Private Secretary, I am advised that in 1984 either grading or regrading, there was no post in the salary scale in 1986 to which that officer could be transferred which would carry similar or the same emoluments. It was thought that as an alternative she could be offered a transfer to a lower graded post of Executive Secretary with no reduction in salary. The post of Executive Secretary was in a lower salary scale than that of the post of Private Secretary, but it was proposed that in order to ensure no loss of emoluments to the holder of the post that a personal pensionable allowance should be paid to the holder of that post.

So I think we have got to understand the principles first of all. The Secretaries to the Ministers and to the Prime Minister are considered as very sensitive posts in which the Ministers and the Prime Minister should have some say, and I think this is a principle which operates not only in the public sector but in the Private sector as well.

Because of certain regradings which had put the post of Private Secretary to the Prime Minister in a grade above all other secretaries and with no similar post available and in order to find a suitable post for the person, it was necessary to offer a position at a different level.
8.15 p.m.

That level was a post of Executive Secretary, not now at the level within the arrangements of the Head of Government, but it was a post in the arrangement of the Head of State. There was no other similar post in the Civil Service to transfer her to, so it was a move that the person might be offered a post on the establishment of the Head of State, and not as a position or place which would be nearest in rank.

The officer refused to accept the offer of the post on the grounds that acceptance would constitute a demo-

tion and a fundamental change in her terms of employment, and that while the payment of a personal allowance might bring her salary or maintain her salary at the existing level, it would not compensate for the loss of status or other benefits attaching to the post of Private Secretary.

After involved consideration of this particular matter, and in view of the fact that no alternative post acceptable could be found to which the officer might be transferred, in as much as she had refused alternative postings, and no amicable settlement could be arrived at in relation to a transfer, and after all of the avenues for reaching a settlement on this matter had been exhausted, it was decided that the post of Private Secretary should be abolished and that appropriate compensation in accordance with the pensions legislation in force would become payable so that the officer will then receive a full pension.

It is proposed that with the abolition of the post of Private Secretary that the post of Senior Executive Secretary in the scale Z.10-6 will be attached to the Prime Minister's Office. So this Civil Establishment Order which we are considering, the Resolution rather, in relation to this Civil Establishment Order makes provision for the abolition of the post of Private Secretary, the Prime Minister's Office, and for the creation of a post of Senior Executive Secretary in the salary scale \$24 648 to \$27 852 in its place.

Those, Sir, are the facts relating to this particular matter. Ever so often these difficult and involved cases come up, and that is the matter that this Honourable House is being asked to consider, and I am certain that the issues relating to this matter will be taken fully into account, and that what we are being asked to consider here are the principles involved and the procedures taken in order to implement those principles and in order to ensure that there was no loss in emoluments to the officer concerned.

Those are the facts as we understand them, Mr. Speaker, and I commend this Resolution to the Honourable House.

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, it is not often that the honourable Member for St. Michael South is so tentative in putting forward a case for his party, the Democratic Labour Party. Usually he is very positive and speaks with conviction, and if I hear him clearly on this occasion, the conviction is lacking in his voice and whatever sign of positive nature there is, is in reading a brief which he has obviously not prepared and for which he obviously has no taste, and I am not surprised that he

has no taste for this particular Resolution, Sir, and I will demonstrate why in a minute.

The first point I want to make to remind this Honourable House is that the post of Private Secretary to the Prime Minister was created a long time ago. I think it was created some time in about 1966 if not prior to that date. It was not a post created by the Barbados Labour Party Government.

In the year 1969 that post was graded in the category Z.15-10 scale and the salary attaching to the post was from \$4 860 to \$5 940 per annum. The post of Secretary or Executive Secretary was at that time in the salary scale Z.17-16 with a salary of \$4 320 to \$5 760 per annum.

In 1973 with the salaries revision, the post of Private Secretary to the Prime Minister was graded in Z.12-8 scale, so that there was a regrading of the scale whilst the post of Secretary or Executive Secretary remained at its original grading.

Now in 1981 the post was again regraded from Z.12-8 to Z.12-6, so that we had a situation where prior to the change of Government, the post of Private Secretary was singled out by the Democratic Labour Party Government as a post deserving of a higher status than that of Secretary or Executive Secretary carrying consequentially more responsibilities and entitling the holder as well to a higher remuneration.

In 1982 the post was regraded again to Z.10-6, and the post of Secretary/Executive Secretary was again upgraded, but it is significant that it was considered that the person holding the post of Private Secretary to the Prime Minister should have a higher grade than other Secretaries.

In 1984, by Civil Establishment Order No. 3 of 1984 the post of Private Secretary was then graded in the category Z.10-3 with a salary scale of \$24 648 to \$30 660. The post of Secretary/Executive Secretary remained in Z.23-14 with a salary scale \$16 452 to \$19 620.

What therefore was recognised by both Governments is not only the principles which have been outlined by the honourable Member, but also the principle that the holder of the post of Private Secretary to the Prime Minister must of necessity be graded higher and have a higher status than the normal run of Secretaries.
8.25 p.m.

Now Sir, the fact that there is a change in Government does not, in my view, justify the abolition of a particular post. One must make a quite clear distinction between abolishing a post that has been recognized as worthy of a particular status and grade and transferring

an officer, obviously, because of the principle or the policy for which my friend contended that a Minister or Prime Minister wishes to have a say in the person who is working as Secretary or Private Secretary so that the Government has not, except on a personal level, by way of legislation *ad persona* rather than by legislation directed to a principle, given any case to this Honourable House why the post must be abolished.

If there was a case in the past for such a post and if there was a case in the past for maintaining a post at a higher level, what has suddenly occurred between May 28 and June 1, 1986 to warrant the abolition of this particular post? It cannot be that the post is lacking in any greater or lesser responsibility than it held before. The functions are the same as they were since 1966, as far as my research goes.

The person who is going to perform the job regardless of whom was the holder on May 28, 1986 or whoever is appointed now, must be a person who is justified and have the competence to operate at that level, and other than saying that there was an impasse between the present holder of the post and the Ministry of the Public Service and not the Public Service Commission — I must emphasize that — the Minister certainly has not made out a case as to why this particular post has to be abolished and downgraded. That is the first point I want to make. It is a point of principle and they cannot really make out a case because this legislation is really directed at a particular officer. That is the point.

The legislation is directed at an officer who is not only unacceptable to the Honourable Prime Minister, because he wants to have a say in who should be his Personal Secretary — no argument with that — but it is directed at this officer because she has fallen foul of persons holding Ministerial office. That is why it is directed at her.

(Aside: Hon. B. M. TAITT: You cannot say that.)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I will give chapter and verse for every word I say. The honourable Member can say "you cannot say that", but it is a fact.

Asides

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Do you want to know? I can give the reasons in a minute....

Asides

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Well, not the Deputy Prime Minister. The honourable Members must not anticipate me, Sir.

The point is that this particular holder of the post came into the Civil Service since 1956. I want to go back to the Civil List. She first entered the Barbados Service of the Civil Service on April 19, 1956 and came to her present grade on December 1, 1981, and was within the Prime Minister's Department from March 1, 1970. So we are talking of a civil servant with some 30 years of service in Barbados, who has served successive Governments and whose personal record, if it is examined by members, will show that she has given faithful and loyal service.

This is not a civil servant who has been recalcitrant, who has been obstructionist, who has been disloyal. None of those allegations can be levelled against her. If they have been levelled, why are they not levelled here in this debate before we have begun to speak? Why were they not levelled before we have begun to speak? How all of a sudden has she become recalcitrant? If not, why are not the usual channels followed, the channels of complaining to the Public Service Commission and having disciplinary charges?

I do not want to hear from Honourable Ministers *sotto voce* that people in the Civil Service are not giving proper service, and the proper channels for dealing with civil servants are not being used. That is the whole point, Sir.

Asides

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be diverted by the attempt of the honourable Member....

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition in the course of his speech indicated that the officer — who so far he has not named — has fallen foul of a number of Honourable Ministers, presumably Honourable Ministers of this Government. I am not aware that the officer has fallen foul of me. Therefore, I, submit that that statement ought to be struck from the record, one after the other...

Mr. SPEAKER: I have listened to your statement, and the statement made certainly has referred to individual Members of this Honourable House, and so I think that the honourable Member, if not rephrasing his remarks, should withdraw them.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, with respect I cannot quarrel with any ruling which Mr. Speaker gives, and I could not take a point of order by a point of order, but I would ask that you consider the following points and points of order, and be guided by your advisors. A point of order cannot be taken when the speech has gone miles beyond the point of order.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The honourable Member is out of order because he is challenging Your Honour's ruling where Your Honour has invited the honourable Member to take a specific action. Instead of taking that action, he seeks to challenge the Speaker's ruling.

Secondly, the honourable Member knows in the tradition of this Parliament that when the point of order was about to be taken he intimated that he was shortly going to rectify it, and we were waiting for it. The honourable Member cannot approbate and reprobate at the same time. The honourable Member knows that and I submit that..... Thank you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point taken. I very consciously listened to the honourable Member because he did intimate that he would explain his views which I have not heard. I gave the honourable Member enough time to explain his statement, and I must ask him either to rephrase or to withdraw.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I will rephrase a sentence made at the beginning of my speech to say that the particular holder of the post is unacceptable to the Honourable Prime Minister. If they want to know why she is unacceptable, I can give them the reasons.
8.35 p.m.

That is what I want to say a little later. If you fall foul of somebody, what does it mean? What is the honourable Member going to say?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: It could mean that she refuses to lie down with the person. That is falling foul too.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If the honourable Member's mind happens to be only in the gutter, I cannot account for that, Sir.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Since when lying down is in the gutter?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, I know the Government is going to be jumpy on this, and I know that some of them are going to try to dissociate themselves on the record, never mind the concept of collective responsibility. I know they are going to be jumpy on this.

I want to come back, however, to the theory that, because all the time from one particular Member on the front bench you hear in a *sotto voce* that you are going to hear somebody is recalcitrant in not doing their job, there is a recognised procedure under the Constitution of Barbados for dealing with civil servants who are obstructionists or recalcitrant. In all of the correspondence passing between this Honourable Minister and the Ministry of the Public Service, the Public Service Com-

mission or Establishments there has never been an allegation that she has performed other than outstandingly in her job; so I do not want to hear it even being said *sotto voce* in the Honourable House. There has never been that sort of allegation against her. There has never been an allegation of disloyalty or lack of proper service being given to the Government of the day.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If the honourable Member is impatient, he is going to have to wait. He cannot structure my speech for me.

I want to say that there has never been that allegation made against her. Obviously this must be very personal legislation.

I have demonstrated earlier to this Honourable House that, even if you want to transfer a person, there is no necessity to abolish a particular post and then create a new post in a lesser grade, none whatsoever in this case.

Now, Sir, the Government was changed on May 29 — a Thursday. Ministers had not even yet been appointed, most of them. On Sunday, June 1, the particular officer was telephoned by the Permanent Secretary, Establishments, and informed that it was intended to transfer her from the post of Private Secretary, Prime Minister, to the post of Secretary in the Ministry of Housing. The Honourable Minister when he opened this debate talked about transferring her to the post of Executive Secretary to the Head of State. The first intimation given to this officer of her transfer was a conversation with the Permanent Secretary, Establishments, that she was being transferred to the post of Secretary in the Ministry of Housing. The Officer pointed out then to the Permanent Secretary that it would be affecting her rights, and she made it clear that whilst she was subject to transfer she would expect that her rights were going to be respected.

Subsequently, Sir, ...

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I do not have an interest. I wish I was advising her. She was informed by the Permanent Secretary, Establishments that she should proceed to special leave. Now, Sir, no indication was given to the officer then on how long she should proceed on special leave, what was her next place of posting, or the reason for the proposal to downgrade her status. Sir, if the Honourable Minister would release the correspondence

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. I need a little guidance here, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what has the Honourable Minister risen?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. I need a little guidance from Your Honour.

The honourable Member is purporting to tell this Honourable House of a conversation which occurred between 2 individuals on the telephone. The honourable Member is stating as a fact that this is information. I believe, Sir, that this Honourable House is entitled to hear from the honourable Member the basis on which he is going to make that information a fact. If the honourable Member is stating it as a fact, all this side can say is that we have no knowledge of what he is saying. The files show nothing. All the files say is that somebody from Juris Chambers is representing the person concerned.

Now I do not know what that means. I do not know what Juris Chambers are, who they are, where it is; and it is not proper for me to call from the Chambers. If the honourable Member is going to give us specific information, we believe that the honourable Member should lay the foundation, so that this Honourable House and Your Honour can accept the information which the honourable Member gives as factual.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, the honourable Member occasionally likes to believe that he has some special debating skills in which he is trying to draw forth some response from me. I will comply with the Orders of the Honourable House and your ruling. I am telling the honourable Member that if he wants to do his homework, he should read the files or ask for leave to read the files.

The officer from the start, Sir, indicated that she knows that she could be transferred, but was merely seeking to have her rights protected, and there is nothing fundamentally wrong in that. Now, Sir, what was the response from the Government?

There are 2 things that happened: (1) the officer found herself being denied the special allowances to which she was entitled. Her special duty allowance was stopped and her telephone allowance was stopped. Read your files and you will find that on it too. Everything that I say you will be able to document from there. She had a running correspondence with the Permanent Secretary and the Services Commission about her allowances, and eventually her special duty allowance was restored, but her telephone allowance was not restored although she had not asked to go on special leave. These are facts.

Now, Sir, the Chief Personnel Officer, subsequently wrote to her and informed her — and that is when the statement made by the Honourable Leader of the House

and Acting Prime Minister is correct — that she was being transferred to the post of Executive Officer or Executive Secretary/Secretary. Nowhere was it specified to her on the July 24, 1986 that she was going to go to the Head of State.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Minister wants to know what happened. There was discussion that took place between the officer and the Chief Personnel Officer in which they were discussing an opportunity to see whether or not there could be a transfer without affecting her position in any way, and part of the discussions and the options being canvassed were her payment as Executive Officer at Government House with an allowance to compensate for the loss of salary.

The Government is today coming in for a post of Senior Executive Officer. What she was told then, according to my information, was that that could not be done. And as a matter of fact, Sir, that was one of the matters that the Chief Personnel Officer had promised to raise.

It is my information that the officer asked that if this was going to be done that the Government would then upgrade that post to at least the post of Senior Executive Officer. That is what was requested.
8.45 p.m.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Ungrading of the present post of Executive Officer, Government House, to Z.10-3. My information is that the Chief Personnel Officer promised to raise this.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of order, Sir: The Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Christ Church West, indicated that the Government is coming in to the House today for the creation of a post of Senior Executive Officer. The Order that we are dealing with relates to Senior Executive Secretary.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Member's point is taken, Sir. He is quite correct that it is the post of Executive Secretary. But it was being asked to upgrade it to the post of Executive Officer. You look at the grades and you would see what the grades being put up are, Sir.

Sir, now what was the response? The response was, 'you either take what we are offering or the alternative is to abolish your post.' No consideration of the matter on

the merits! She was given the excuse that there was no comparable post then in the Civil Service to which she could transfer. Members should search and find that there are posts on similar gradings which have since become available — if they would search and do their research — and for which no consideration has been given to her. That is the point I am trying to make.

So no effort was being made to accommodate this officer in any way, Sir. Obviously, as I said, this is very personal, what appears to me to be a very personal piece of legislation directed at a civil servant with 30 years' service, on whose records, I am informed, there happen to be no adverse comments of any nature whatsoever. That is the nature of the legislation.

Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for Christ Church West were ordered by Mr. SPEAKER to be expunged from the Record.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am going to accept your ruling, Sir, because I have to, but not because, really, Sir, I am convinced about it. I accept it because I have to.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir: I submit that the honourable Member's statement concerning Your Honour's ruling is itself out of order, in accordance with the Rules, and I submit that that should also be withdrawn and struck from the Record.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member understands very clearly what my ruling is. I take it that, from his remarks, he has accepted my ruling. If he has not, I would ask the honourable Member to abide by the Rules of this House.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not normally tangle with any Chair, and I do not intend to tangle with the Chair now.

I repeat what I have said, Sir. I accept your ruling because I have to, not because I am convinced about it. I have known nothing to be unparliamentary about a statement like that.

Now if the honourable Member is going to get up in the House every minute, because he knows that the points he is making are no points — the Speaker has accepted —

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: That is an affront to you, because you accepted it as a point of order. He cannot come in here and try to rule this House. This is not the days of the Barbados Labour Party and foolishness!

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want to apply fully the Rules of this House.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: And I am not going to allow honourable Members to dictate my rulings on matters. My ruling was clear in respect of one honourable Member's submission and I am satisfied that that is the end of that particular ruling and we can continue with the debate.

Continue.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we were told that the person holding the post of Private Secretary is not acceptable to the Prime Minister. I am saying that she must not be acceptable for reason. That is the whole point of what I am saying.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: What am I going to be told? That we are not to say the reasons that we believe there are? What am I going to be told, Sir?

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am saying that one of the reasons, if you want me to tell you what the reasons are, is because she gave evidence against him. That is one of the reasons she is not acceptable.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: You ask me to tell you what the reasons are!

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I do not understand On a point of order.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: This is a little high for you. Do not get in this.

The honourable Member is a Q.C., Sir. The honourable Member is

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the honourable Member rise.
8.55 p.m.

The honourable Member is a QC, Sir. The honourable Member is a.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what has the honourable Member risen?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The honourable Member is the second oldest serving Member currently in the House. He has served as Attorney General. So there can be no doubt that he knows the Rules. Therefore, if a neophyte breaks the Rules, you may forgive him. When the honourable Member breaks the Rules, it is a deliberate act and the honourable Member knows that he can say what he wishes to say in better language. You Honour just ruled.....

Aside

Hon. B. M. TAITT: No, I am making a statement of fact. Yes, I am going on to show why I say so.

Your Honour just ruled a statement to be unacceptable. You caused it to be stricken from the record. The honourable Member turns around now and repeats it. He cannot do that, Sir. I invite the honourable Member through you to withdraw. You can tell the public about it in any manner. You can go in the public yard and say so. But if we have to uphold the levels that he is always talking about in here, he knows better. I submit that he should withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already accepted from the honourable Member to withdraw his remarks, and I do not want those remarks to be used in the context in the way they have been used.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Minister who led off said that she was not acceptable to a Prime Minister. You cannot be not acceptable to him other than for a reason. So that, therefore, I am advancing the reasons why I contend she was unacceptable to him.

Mr. SPEAKER: But they must fall within the Rules of the Honourable House.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Precisely, you cannot advance reasons which impute improper motives to an honourable Member. This is the contention being made, and if you say that the honourable Member is operating from spite, that is an improper motive especially in the absence of the honourable Member.

Aside

Hon. B. M. TAITT: He knows that. He is just trying.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: It is not my fault if he so operates. But if it is a fact, it has to be stated. That is the point I am trying to make, Sir.

Laughter

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, you are going to have to rule the honourable Member as disorderly, Sir. He would have to be disorderly. He just slipped it in again, Sir. I submit that Your Honour should have everything he has said since you ruled stricken from the record out of an abundance of caution. He just slipped it in again, Sir — “if it is a fact, it should be so stated...”

Mr. SPEAKER: I have taken the point and I will not tolerate any further abrogation of my ruling.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, which ruling am I being asked to....

Aside

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I have to ask that. Mr. Speaker, Sir, can I be heard, Sir? I have a right to be heard! That is what I am trying to say, Sir. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am willing to comply with your ruling. If the honourable Member.... Mr. Speaker, I need your guidance on this, Sir. If the honourable Member gets up and says that I am accusing someone of spite, and I said “if that is the case it will have to be the case”, how is that flaunting a ruling, Sir? If he so operates, what would be the position — if he so operates? The honourable Member knows that. The honourable Member who has just sat down knows that. He knows that as well, Sir. He is going to take every point of order to prevent this debate from going on, Sir.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Out of what?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It is not a statement of fact. He said “if”, Sir. He did not lay it as a statement of fact before the Honourable House, Sir. So it has to be acceptable, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: My ruling was based on a statement made and the statement was in my view in contravention of Rule 28(7) which states:

“No Member may impute improper motives to another Member.”

Now I have already explained that I had no speech made by the honourable Member and that any statement made can only be an imputation therefrom. Now the honourable Member has agreed that he would accept my ruling for fair debate and I see no further contention in the matter in view of the fact that that particular aspect has been cleared. Anything else after that, I will probably have to give further consideration. But we must debate within the Rules of the Honourable House no matter how much we go near the line or over the line.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Right Sir, if I may offer some advice to the Honourable House. I am on a point of order, Sir.

I would suggest, Sir, that after you have made your ruling that all of the interventions after your ruling should be struck from the record and the honourable Member should be asked to continue his speech after that.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to be heard on that.

The honourable Member cannot ask for interventions thereafter. He can only ask for that part of the intervention that you have ruled that should not be acceptable.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have done that already and I have given the honourable Member permission to continue his speech.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am saying to this Honourable House that it is significant that the honourable Member sat down without giving the reasons why she proved unacceptable. Now, Sir, I do not believe for one moment that Ministers can choose secretaries according to their whims and fancies. I am not accepting that for one moment. So what are the reasons? Why is the Government afraid to state the reasons? Why are they afraid to state the reasons? If it is not a whim and fancy, what was it? What was the personal or other reasons or non-personal reasons for which the officer was not only being transferred but her post is being abolished?

I want to make it quite clear again, Sir, we are not arguing about transferring officers within the service. In this case, we are arguing about taking the drastic step of the abolition of a post in order to get rid of an officer out of the service.

(*Aside:* Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: She would not accept another posting.)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Now Sir, if this was a private sector employer that we were dealing with, you would hear how whimsical they are, you would hear how actuated by spite they are, you would hear how wrong they are, and you would hear all of the principles of good trade unionism used on her behalf. You would hear that, Sir. The principles of good trade unionism demand that an employer should have a subjective criteria in dealing with matters such as this. They do not demand that you may transfer an officer because you do not like them, because they may not wear their hair in a particular way, because they may say something

against you that you do not particularly like whether it was demanded by law or not.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: This is tantamount to firing her and I wonder where the Public Service Commission is tonight.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: That is what I want to wonder, Sir. I always said that when one had a Ministry of the Public Service whatever good it will be able to perform that there was also a danger, and we have seen the beginning of the danger here. Honourable Members may use their numbers as much as they like in this one, Sir. They may use their numbers as much as they like!

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Contrary to what the honourable Member said, I have no personal vendetta with any honourable Member in this Honourable House and least of all the honourable Member who introduced the Resolution. We have always to be able to conduct ourselves in that way.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: But Sir, regardless of the position, the point is that the Public Service Commission had a duty in this case to stand up on behalf of an officer, and I go further and say that one must be careful because if with every change of Government you are going to be having abolition of posts to suit particular persons, then we are going to be in a serious position. I let them know though, Sir. This officer will have to be paid all of the compensation, not only the compensation of pension rights, Sir, but all of the compensation to which she is entitled, Sir.

9.05 p.m.

The honourable Member began by saying that she would not accept an alternative post. I want to go on to deal with the alternative post that they are suggesting. Not only was there a demotion in downgrading her in status to make an example of her, to make you eat humble pie, but the theory that they are going to give you a personal allowance is only half of the story, because whenever there was a regrading of posts the officer will continue to lose benefits, and honourable Members know that, and I am not going to accept for one moment that there have not been cases where an anomalous situation such as has occurred in here, special legislation has not been brought to make sure that the officer loses no rights. There has been, there is precedent there for it on more than one occasion, so that I do not

accept one moment that this officer was not going to be worse off by merely accepting a special allowance and having her pension rights kept.

There was more than that. Whenever there was a regrading she was in danger of losing the status which she had legitimately acquired by her hard work and dedication to duty for over thirty years in the Civil Service. They must know that, so it is not enough to say that, she just refused that post. What safeguards were they giving to her? None whatsoever. And this is a woman that they are treating that way as well in the Civil Service. So regardless of what they are going to say, the Government cannot feel happy about this particular decision. They cannot come in here and feel happy about a decision such as this, Sir.

The result of this sort of thing is that you are going to create exactly the condition of fear that the Democratic Labour Party ostensibly says it came into the Service to get rid of. You are going to create exactly that atmosphere of fear that the Democratic Labour Party mouthed that it is dedicated to erase. That is the position, and it is not good for a Public Service for officers to feel that as soon as there is a change of Government their posts are going to be abolished. I want to know how many more you intend to abolish when they feel that they are not going to get on with you. I want to know, Sir. I want to know how long you are going to keep other people on special leave. That is what I want to know as well, Sir.

(*Aside:* Hon. B. M. TAITT: You should not talk about special leave. The Barbados Labour Party initiated special leave.)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, I don't have to draw Your Honour's attention to the Standing Orders of this Honourable House, but I must ask Your Honour to rule that I be heard in silence.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have on many occasions repeated the Rule that deals with behaviour when an honourable Member is speaking. I will not condone any further breach of that rule. Please continue.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: You get up and appeal to the Speaker on a lot of foolishness.

Mr. SPEAKER: Address the Chair.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: It is very difficult to address you in this position in which we are in the Honourable House. As Your Honour knows, no disrespect is intended at all in that way, but I wonder how many more people are going to find their posts abolished under this Government merely because some Honourable Minister finds them unacceptable. I want to know how many more are

going to find themselves sent on special leave because the Government finds them unacceptable. I have heard a Member of this Honourable House advance the theory that if a civil servant is obstructionist and what not, you have a duty to remove them.

(*Aside:* Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Right up Sandy's street. Depressurise and remove.)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: That was said in this Honourable House not so long ago in a debate in here. The honourable Member who said it is not now in his place, otherwise we would have him intervening in the debate, Mr. Speaker, as you very well know. But I am suggesting the Government has no case here for this.

I want to tell them further, Sir. I said that the officer ought to be compensated, and not only compensated in the terms of the Pensions Act. Whatever might be the views of people, Sir, the officer is being forced to retire prematurely through loss of office at the age of 50 because of the abolition of office.

Aside

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If you look at the Civil List, Sir, you will find the ages of almost every civil servant in there. Therefore to say that the officer becomes entitled to pension under the Pensions Act is not enough. What about the consequential loss in future earnings that must arise in these circumstances?

Asides

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, the honourable Members are saying that that is a matter for the lawyers to argue, but it is a matter before this Honourable House. I want to know the Government's position tonight. What has been the advice given by the principal legal officer to the Crown on this matter? What is the position on this, Sir?

(*Aside:* Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: The same advice you gave on Bourne and Yearwood.)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, the honourable Member for St. James South says the same advice I gave on Bourne and Yearwood. For his benefit, Sir, he has just got into the Ministry, he has not had time to read any files, but he speaks on everything, either *sotto voce* or otherwise. I was not Attorney General then. The honourable Member should know that, Sir. I do not want to have a clash with that honourable Member just yet, he is building up to my explosion in this Honourable House one day.

But, Sir, the position is that I want to know whether the compensation involves, not merely what the Acting Prime Minister has said, compensation in terms of the Pension Act and the Pensions Regulations. I want to know what about the loss that would occur between age 50 and age 60. You see, Sir, these things must be measured. I am being told about the humanitarian face of Government and the lack of a humanitarian face. If there is to be consistency, this would be a typical case in which the Government should show a humanitarian face. I am not satisfied that any humanitarian face is being shown on this particular case, and I also want to hear from the Honourable Minister whether it is proposed to take into account the monetary compensation which must go to an officer at this age for termination of office.

Were she not in the Public Service before her post was abolished, she can after that go and sue if she likes, but to sue the Government even now she has to get the permission of the Public Service Commission in order to bring an action, as long as she remains in the Public Service. That is a fact, according to the General Orders. If it was in the private employment, not only would the Union be out in full force defending her rights, but you would also have found that the law courts would have been completely open to her on this particular point immediately, and that the compensation involved would include not only loss of pension rights but loss of future earnings as well.

9.15 p.m.

That is why when the Honourable Minister of Employment brings down his Unfair Employment Act

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: That is one of the reasons, if it extends, I want to see it extend to the Government Service as well so that we will know whether or not and how serious the Government is about some of the provisions that we hear them talk about.

Sir, I am very unhappy about this piece of legislation. It is not very often that I have to be taking a very determined line on some matters in this Honourable House, even to the extent of courting the wrath, or the rebuke, or the disagreement of the Speaker, but there are times when we have to do these matters, because I am convinced about the justice of my arguments for this officer, and I am convinced that the result of this decision is to create an injustice for a civil servant who has given 30 years of service.

The Opposition will not be supporting this Resolution. We will divide the Honourable House on this. You can use your 24 to 3 against it, but we will divide the Honourable House on this Resolution on the basis of the principle involved. That is why we are dividing the

Honourable House and we are going to go further. Even if this officer dies before we get back in power, and if she is not given adequate compensation, the Barbados Labour Party gives the undertaking that it will rectify that whenever it gets back in power.

You know, Sir, when I look around this table, I see in this Honourable House and out of this Honourable House people who have made similar statements, and those of us who have survived — there are not many in here, the honourable Member and myself — when I first came into this Honourable House I was told I was going to be in here for 3 months.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is this the Resolution you are talking about?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Very much the Resolution. I am making the point that whatever time it takes — the honourable Members had better be aware that it is not going to be a long time, 1991 or whenever you call the election — we will correct whatever inequity you may work by this Resolution.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Whatever time it takes and whenever it comes and whoever is then leading the Labour Party, we will then correct it, if she is not given adequate compensation on this position. She must be paid her full pension rights. She must be given a monetary compensation for her loss of years, and if the Government has the decency that I expect the Government to have and the humanity, it will get up in public and let the public know that the officer has performed her job faithfully in the Public Service of Barbados for 30 years.

One of the things that you give anybody who is leaving is proper recommendation, unless they have done something wrong that you have proved and you have gone through the channels for doing it. That is what I want to know, Sir, her character reference.

This is not the first time that there has been a change in Prime Ministers and other officers have held the post. Some of them have been transferred to higher posts, so there has been no problem. It is not the first time that this has occurred, but we have not treated the problem in this way.

The Barbados Labour Party, despite all that the Democratic Labour Party would say about us, did not see it fit when there was change of Prime Ministers to cause a Private Secretary to the Prime Minister to have her post abolished. She was not any worse off by the fact that she was transferred to another department. Her responsibilities were more, and nobody has ever dealt with the position differently. Why in this case? Why

must she be so singled out in this case? I go back and I deal with the original point that I made. Why has the Government suddenly discovered that it must change the grading of the post to downgrade it.

I do not want to say anymore in this debate. There are going to be a lot of occasions to talk about this matter both in and without Parliament, and I hope that on one of those occasions we will have the Right Honourable Prime Minister here so that.....

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I do not abuse anyone, Sir. I will just talk the facts to the Right Honourable Prime Minister. I will just talk the facts, because it is his Ministry in which the matter is being dealt with, and one would hear from his side. I do not like to say anything behind anybody's back that I cannot say in front of their face.

So, Sir, I want to end by saying that the best thing the Government can do is to withdraw this Resolution and think again. Instead of abolishing the post of the lady, find her a proper post in this Service that she loses no status. If, however, the Government does not want to do that, give the assurance that she will be properly compensated. You cannot bring legislation that is going to hound people out of the Public Service as is happening here and at the same time say, as the Ministry of the Public Service is so fond of boasting, that it is coming in to correct all sorts of things that have gone wrong. If that is so, why is the first piece of legislation that you bring down here is not to correct, but rather to destroy? That is why this particular bit of legislation is so repugnant to everything that we have heard you all talking about, everything that you say, it is repugnant to. Everything that we understand that you were supposed to be changing, it is repugnant to.

It is repugnant to proper administration and it is repugnant to principle, and I cannot accept for one moment that there were not reasons that are not acceptable to the Honourable House, as they have not been stated here not only for the transfer but for abolishing the post of Private Secretary to the Honourable Prime Minister.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am going to turn around so and face you.

The Opposition is very concerned about this Resolution because it is a Resolution with a difference and the nature and extent of what we are doing here tonight is different from anything that we have observed so far since May 28.

9.25 p.m.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, you are going to have to rule the honourable Member as disorderly, Sir. He would have to be disorderly. He just slipped it in again, Sir. I submit that Your Honour should have everything he has said since you ruled stricken from the record out of an abundance of caution. He just slipped it in again, Sir — “if it is a fact, it should be so stated...”

Mr. SPEAKER: I have taken the point and I will not tolerate any further abrogation of my ruling.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, which ruling am I being asked to....

Aside

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I have to ask that. Mr. Speaker, Sir, can I be heard, Sir? I have a right to be heard! That is what I am trying to say, Sir. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am willing to comply with your ruling. If the honourable Member.... Mr. Speaker, I need your guidance on this, Sir. If the honourable Member gets up and says that I am accusing someone of spite, and I said “if that is the case it will have to be the case”, how is that flaunting a ruling, Sir? If he so operates, what would be the position — if he so operates? The honourable Member knows that. The honourable Member who has just sat down knows that. He knows that as well, Sir. He is going to take every point of order to prevent this debate from going on, Sir.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Out of what?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It is not a statement of fact. He said “if”, Sir. He did not lay it as a statement of fact before the Honourable House, Sir. So it has to be acceptable, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: My ruling was based on a statement made and the statement was in my view in contravention of Rule 28(7) which states:

“No Member may impute improper motives to another Member.”

Now I have already explained that I had no speech made by the honourable Member and that any statement made can only be an imputation therefrom. Now the honourable Member has agreed that he would accept my ruling for fair debate and I see no further contention in the matter in view of the fact that that particular aspect has been cleared. Anything else after that, I will probably have to give further consideration. But we must debate within the Rules of the Honourable House no matter how much we go near the line or over the line.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Right Sir, if I may offer some advice to the Honourable House. I am on a point of order, Sir.

I would suggest, Sir, that after you have made your ruling that all of the interventions after your ruling should be struck from the record and the honourable Member should be asked to continue his speech after that.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to be heard on that.

The honourable Member cannot ask for interventions thereafter. He can only ask for that part of the intervention that you have ruled that should not be acceptable.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have done that already and I have given the honourable Member permission to continue his speech.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am saying to this Honourable House that it is significant that the honourable Member sat down without giving the reasons why she proved unacceptable. Now, Sir, I do not believe for one moment that Ministers can choose secretaries according to their whims and fancies. I am not accepting that for one moment. So what are the reasons? Why is the Government afraid to state the reasons? Why are they afraid to state the reasons? If it is not a whim and fancy, what was it? What was the personal or other reasons or non-personal reasons for which the officer was not only being transferred but her post is being abolished?

I want to make it quite clear again, Sir, we are not arguing about transferring officers within the service. In this case, we are arguing about taking the drastic step of the abolition of a post in order to get rid of an officer out of the service.

(*Aside:* Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: She would not accept another posting.)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Now Sir, if this was a private sector employer that we were dealing with, you would hear how whimsical they are, you would hear how actuated by spite they are, you would hear how wrong they are, and you would hear all of the principles of good trade unionism used on her behalf. You would hear that, Sir. The principles of good trade unionism demand that an employer should have a subjective criteria in dealing with matters such as this. They do not demand that you may transfer an officer because you do not like them, because they may not wear their hair in a particular way, because they may say something

against you that you do not particularly like whether it was demanded by law or not.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: This is tantamount to firing her and I wonder where the Public Service Commission is tonight.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: That is what I want to wonder, Sir. I always said that when one had a Ministry of the Public Service whatever good it will be able to perform that there was also a danger, and we have seen the beginning of the danger here. Honourable Members may use their numbers as much as they like in this one, Sir. They may use their numbers as much as they like!

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Contrary to what the honourable Member said, I have no personal vendetta with any honourable Member in this Honourable House and least of all the honourable Member who introduced the Resolution. We have always to be able to conduct ourselves in that way.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: But Sir, regardless of the position, the point is that the Public Service Commission had a duty in this case to stand up on behalf of an officer, and I go further and say that one must be careful because if with every change of Government you are going to be having abolition of posts to suit particular persons, then we are going to be in a serious position. I let them know though, Sir. This officer will have to be paid all of the compensation, not only the compensation of pension rights, Sir, but all of the compensation to which she is entitled, Sir.
9.05 p.m.

The honourable Member began by saying that she would not accept an alternative post. I want to go on to deal with the alternative post that they are suggesting. Not only was there a demotion in downgrading her in status to make an example of her, to make you eat humble pie, but the theory that they are going to give you a personal allowance is only half of the story, because whenever there was a regrading of posts the officer will continue to lose benefits, and honourable Members know that, and I am not going to accept for one moment that there have not been cases where an anomalous situation such as has occurred in here, special legislation has not been brought to make sure that the officer loses no rights. There has been, there is precedent there for it on more than one occasion, so that I do not

accept one moment that this officer was not going to be worse off by merely accepting a special allowance and having her pension rights kept.

There was more than that. Whenever there was a regrading she was in danger of losing the status which she had legitimately acquired by her hard work and dedication to duty for over thirty years in the Civil Service. They must know that, so it is not enough to say that, she just refused that post. What safeguards were they giving to her? None whatsoever. And this is a woman that they are treating that way as well in the Civil Service. So regardless of what they are going to say, the Government cannot feel happy about this particular decision. They cannot come in here and feel happy about a decision such as this, Sir.

The result of this sort of thing is that you are going to create exactly the condition of fear that the Democratic Labour Party ostensibly says it came into the Service to get rid of. You are going to create exactly that atmosphere of fear that the Democratic Labour Party mouthed that it is dedicated to erase. That is the position, and it is not good for a Public Service for officers to feel that as soon as there is a change of Government their posts are going to be abolished. I want to know how many more you intend to abolish when they feel that they are not going to get on with you. I want to know, Sir. I want to know how long you are going to keep other people on special leave. That is what I want to know as well, Sir.

(*Aside:* Hon. B. M. TAITT: You should not talk about special leave. The Barbados Labour Party initiated special leave.)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, I don't have to draw Your Honour's attention to the Standing Orders of this Honourable House, but I must ask Your Honour to rule that I be heard in silence.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have on many occasions repeated the Rule that deals with behaviour when an honourable Member is speaking. I will not condone any further breach of that rule. Please continue.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: You get up and appeal to the Speaker on a lot of foolishness.

Mr. SPEAKER: Address the Chair.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: It is very difficult to address you in this position in which we are in the Honourable House. As Your Honour knows, no disrespect is intended at all in that way, but I wonder how many more people are going to find their posts abolished under this Government merely because some Honourable Minister finds them unacceptable. I want to know how many more are

going to find themselves sent on special leave because the Government finds them unacceptable. I have heard a Member of this Honourable House advance the theory that if a civil servant is obstructionist and what not, you have a duty to remove them.

(*Aside:* Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Right up Sandy's street. Depressurise and remove.)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: That was said in this Honourable House not so long ago in a debate in here. The honourable Member who said it is not now in his place, otherwise we would have him intervening in the debate, Mr. Speaker, as you very well know. But I am suggesting the Government has no case here for this.

I want to tell them further, Sir. I said that the officer ought to be compensated, and not only compensated in the terms of the Pensions Act. Whatever might be the views of people, Sir, the officer is being forced to retire prematurely through loss of office at the age of 50 because of the abolition of office.

Aside

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If you look at the Civil List, Sir, you will find the ages of almost every civil servant in there. Therefore to say that the officer becomes entitled to pension under the Pensions Act is not enough. What about the consequential loss in future earnings that must arise in these circumstances?

Asides

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, the honourable Members are saying that that is a matter for the lawyers to argue, but it is a matter before this Honourable House. I want to know the Government's position tonight. What has been the advice given by the principal legal officer to the Crown on this matter? What is the position on this, Sir?

(*Aside:* Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: The same advice you gave on Bourne and Yearwood.)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, the honourable Member for St. James South says the same advice I gave on Bourne and Yearwood. For his benefit, Sir, he has just got into the Ministry, he has not had time to read any files, but he speaks on everything, either *sotto voce* or otherwise. I was not Attorney General then. The honourable Member should know that, Sir. I do not want to have a clash with that honourable Member just yet, he is building up to my explosion in this Honourable House one day.

But, Sir, the position is that I want to know whether the compensation involves, not merely what the Acting Prime Minister has said, compensation in terms of the Pension Act and the Pensions Regulations. I want to know what about the loss that would occur between age 50 and age 60. You see, Sir, these things must be measured. I am being told about the humanitarian face of Government and the lack of a humanitarian face. If there is to be consistency, this would be a typical case in which the Government should show a humanitarian face. I am not satisfied that any humanitarian face is being shown on this particular case, and I also want to hear from the Honourable Minister whether it is proposed to take into account the monetary compensation which must go to an officer at this age for termination of office.

Were she not in the Public Service before her post was abolished, she can after that go and sue if she likes, but to sue the Government even now she has to get the permission of the Public Service Commission in order to bring an action, as long as she remains in the Public Service. That is a fact, according to the General Orders. If it was in the private employment, not only would the Union be out in full force defending her rights, but you would also have found that the law courts would have been completely open to her on this particular point immediately, and that the compensation involved would include not only loss of pension rights but loss of future earnings as well.

9.15 p.m.

That is why when the Honourable Minister of Employment brings down his Unfair Employment Act

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: That is one of the reasons, if it extends, I want to see it extend to the Government Service as well so that we will know whether or not and how serious the Government is about some of the provisions that we hear them talk about.

Sir, I am very unhappy about this piece of legislation. It is not very often that I have to be taking a very determined line on some matters in this Honourable House, even to the extent of courting the wrath, or the rebuke, or the disagreement of the Speaker, but there are times when we have to do these matters, because I am convinced about the justice of my arguments for this officer, and I am convinced that the result of this decision is to create an injustice for a civil servant who has given 30 years of service.

The Opposition will not be supporting this Resolution. We will divide the Honourable House on this. You can use your 24 to 3 against it, but we will divide the Honourable House on this Resolution on the basis of the principle involved. That is why we are dividing the

Honourable House and we are going to go further. Even if this officer dies before we get back in power, and if she is not given adequate compensation, the Barbados Labour Party gives the undertaking that it will rectify that whenever it gets back in power.

You know, Sir, when I look around this table, I see in this Honourable House and out of this Honourable House people who have made similar statements, and those of us who have survived — there are not many in here, the honourable Member and myself — when I first came into this Honourable House I was told I was going to be in here for 3 months.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is this the Resolution you are talking about?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Very much the Resolution. I am making the point that whatever time it takes — the honourable Members had better be aware that it is not going to be a long time, 1991 or whenever you call the election — we will correct whatever inequity you may work by this Resolution.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Whatever time it takes and whenever it comes and whoever is then leading the Labour Party, we will then correct it, if she is not given adequate compensation on this position. She must be paid her full pension rights. She must be given a monetary compensation for her loss of years, and if the Government has the decency that I expect the Government to have and the humanity, it will get up in public and let the public know that the officer has performed her job faithfully in the Public Service of Barbados for 30 years.

One of the things that you give anybody who is leaving is proper recommendation, unless they have done something wrong that you have proved and you have gone through the channels for doing it. That is what I want to know, Sir, her character reference.

This is not the first time that there has been a change in Prime Ministers and other officers have held the post. Some of them have been transferred to higher posts, so there has been no problem. It is not the first time that this has occurred, but we have not treated the problem in this way.

The Barbados Labour Party, despite all that the Democratic Labour Party would say about us, did not see it fit when there was change of Prime Ministers to cause a Private Secretary to the Prime Minister to have her post abolished. She was not any worse off by the fact that she was transferred to another department. Her responsibilities were more, and nobody has ever dealt with the position differently. Why in this case? Why

must she be so singled out in this case? I go back and I deal with the original point that I made. Why has the Government suddenly discovered that it must change the grading of the post to downgrade it.

I do not want to say anymore in this debate. There are going to be a lot of occasions to talk about this matter both in and without Parliament, and I hope that on one of those occasions we will have the Right Honourable Prime Minister here so that.....

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I do not abuse anyone, Sir. I will just talk the facts to the Right Honourable Prime Minister. I will just talk the facts, because it is his Ministry in which the matter is being dealt with, and one would hear from his side. I do not like to say anything behind anybody's back that I cannot say in front of their face.

So, Sir, I want to end by saying that the best thing the Government can do is to withdraw this Resolution and think again. Instead of abolishing the post of the lady, find her a proper post in this Service that she loses no status. If, however, the Government does not want to do that, give the assurance that she will be properly compensated. You cannot bring legislation that is going to hound people out of the Public Service as is happening here and at the same time say, as the Ministry of the Public Service is so fond of boasting, that it is coming in to correct all sorts of things that have gone wrong. If that is so, why is the first piece of legislation that you bring down here is not to correct, but rather to destroy? That is why this particular bit of legislation is so repugnant to everything that we have heard you all talking about, everything that you say, it is repugnant to. Everything that we understand that you were supposed to be changing, it is repugnant to.

It is repugnant to proper administration and it is repugnant to principle, and I cannot accept for one moment that there were not reasons that are not acceptable to the Honourable House, as they have not been stated here not only for the transfer but for abolishing the post of Private Secretary to the Honourable Prime Minister.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am going to turn around so and face you.

The Opposition is very concerned about this Resolution because it is a Resolution with a difference and the nature and extent of what we are doing here tonight is different from anything that we have observed so far since May 28.

9.25 p.m.

This is not a case where an employee is losing a job, being sent home on short time or being laid off. This is a case where the Government is legislating somebody out of a job — as simple as that — and so it is different in kind from those cases where the ministry might decide that it does not have enough money to maintain a programme and therefore brings the work of a number of employees to an end. It is a serious thing we have done. Since 1976 when I first came in this Honourable House I can recall no similar occasion, and all we have had from the Government is the language that the lady has been unacceptable. What constitutes unacceptability? The Deputy Prime Minister has been careful to avoid a description of unacceptability. He has therefore left it open for all kinds of ideas to be put forward — all kinds of motives to be suggested, and when true motives are suggested, then I hear points of order being taken on the other side.

I am sorry that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition perhaps got a little carried away. I do not understand why perhaps he was so carried away. This is not the first case where a public servant — somebody working in the public sector, not necessarily in the Central Government — has been badly treated by this new Government. Only last week Michael Griffith who was the Manager of the Tourism Investment Corporation....

Asides

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He is not there any more and I can call his name. He was on contract. His contract came to an end at the end of October, and the Chairman who is advertising a lot of bread for sale wrote a letter to him saying "you will be continued on a month to month basis on the existing terms and conditions of your previous contract". In the middle of the month he was told that. Even though — and I will use these words now — he was acceptable to the Tourist Investment Corporation Chairman, the Honourable Minister who just got up and went out of here does not want him. He was advised by the Chairman Leacock to reapply when the job was advertised, and despite that he was dismissed because that Honourable Minister of Tourism and Industry said he does not want him. You did it to Mike Griffith, and you are so mealy-mouthed that when you see him in meetings, you tell him: "Man, you should be running a big hotel like Glitter Bay and Heywoods." That is the greatest piece of intellectual dishonesty that has ever been about Barbados.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. The honourable Member is now accusing me of being mealy-mouthed, Sir. It is proof that Mike Griffith is in your hip pocket. He comes and tells you what I say. Well you tell him what to do next.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: If a man has been wrongfully dismissed, Mr. Speaker, and I am in the market.....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order for the records. He is giving the impression that one Mike Griffith was dismissed. The Barbados Labour Party gave him a two-year contract. The contract ran out and he got his 20 per cent gratuity under the terms of the contract, and he has got an extra month, so that we can help him look for a job. The Barbados Labour Party recognised that he was not qualified, so they gave him a two-year contract and he has fulfilled the contract. It is dishonest of anybody to suggest that after a man has fulfilled his contract and got his gratuity — I mean intellectually, Sir — that somebody was dismissed. Doesn't the honourable Member know the difference between dismissal and the end of a contract?

Mr. SPEAKER: Point taken.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, don't take that point. You really surprise me. Point taken?

Mr. SPEAKER: Would you....

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, Sir, I withdraw that, Sir. I was not meaning to reflect on Your Honour at all adversely.

Mr. SPEAKER: You were addressing the Chair and you could only mean His Honour.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You know I would not really reflect adversely on the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would not accept these kinds of remarks to any Chair whether this one I am sitting in or any other.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, I am not reflecting on you, and I am apologising profusely.

Mr. SPEAKER: What I am trying to say is that I take the point the honourable Member is making whether you agree with it or not.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: All right, Sir. I am saying that this is a pattern of behaviour that has been entered upon by the new Government. The Honourable Minister who just intervened on a point of order did not even know of the letter that Mr. Leacock wrote, the 2 lines, telling the gentleman that he would be re-employed on the existing terms on a month to month basis. He had a contract which came to an end. He did not even know that they have to pay him severance pay too, because the contract continued.

Anyhow, Sir, that is one. You had a manager of the Caves Authority. Now I am coming right down the wicket one after the other. The Manager of the Caves, because he was a supporter of mine — he got a job under me — they got rid of him one Friday afternoon. At 3.45 p.m. he was handed a letter of dismissal immediately.

I have no brief for the Director of the Cultural Foundation, but they gave him a letter. Now the Acting Prime Minister tonight is responsible for this, and he is the one who once used some very choice language in relation to the Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. SPEAKER ordered that certain words spoken by the honourable Member for St. Thomas be struck from the records.
9.35 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I was saying how the Ministry of Housing and Lands dismissed the Manager of the Harrison's Cave and how the Cultural Foundation gave the Director of Culture a letter at 4.00 o'clock to leave by 4.30 p.m., and had police present to see that the man left the premises. The Director of the Cultural Foundation was treated as a common criminal. There is no evidence that he committed any criminal offence. And now the Chairman comes to rewrite legalese, talking about, he is not sure if he were dismissed, he was terminated!

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am not tonight

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, if he

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the honourable Member rise?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am rising on a point of order.

I believe, Sir, that if we are conducting a debate on this matter, we must stick to the facts and not attempt to mislead this House in any way.

I am saying, Sir, that it is untrue to say that the Cultural Foundation dismissed

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: ... you said "the Cultural Foundation" the Director with half hour's notice.

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: You see his statement!

(Aside: Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I believe what he says. I do not believe what you say.)

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: You believe his statement, just as you believe the *Advocate* and the *Nation*. I think if honourable Members are speaking in here, they must come with further and better particulars than that.

It is untrue to say that, and I think this House expects a higher level of presentation from the honourable Member. It is just not true. It is also untrue to say that there were policemen there to see that he left in that particular way. It is just untrue. But there will be a time and a place for that.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, tonight I am not speaking about the former Manager of the National Housing Corporation who was dismissed on June 16 at 3.10 p.m. I am not talking about that. That matter is in court — the public of Barbados would hear about that in the new year — so I am not talking about that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member knows if a matter is sub judice

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: That is why I say I am not commenting on it. Sir. Definitely not commenting on it!

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am not talking about the Director of the National Assistance Board, who they sent on special leave. I am not talking about the head of the Ambulance Service

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir: We have to keep the Record clear.

On a point of order, Sir! On a point of order!

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am dealing with

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

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: all the civil servant.....

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

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: How much time did you give Maurice King? How much time did you give Maurice?

Mr. SPEAKER rose.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Speaker is on his feet.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Chase him out, Sir!

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: As I was saying, on a point of order, Sir:

The honourable Members have apologized to Your Honour.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: They got carried away, Sir. They are enthusiastic.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order, just to keep the Record straight: Earlier today, there was a ruling that there would be no reference to the matters relating to the National Assistance Board since these were matters forming part of an enquiry.

I thought the honourable Member would wish to withdraw his reference to the National Assistance Board, Sir.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, Sir! I am not withdrawing it, Sir, because the fact that the Director of the National Assistance Board has been sent on special leave was made public before tonight, when the announcement of the commission or whatever it is, the departmental enquiry.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Sir. But I am submitting, on a point of order, Sir, that the reason why he has been sent on whatever he has been sent on is germane to the enquiry. Whether he is guilty or whatever is a matter that would be examined by the enquiry. Therefore, Sir, it is not proper that any reference be made to him in debate in this House in a matter such as we are discussing, I submit.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure the honourable Member would abide by the feelings of the House on this matter. I do not need him to do anything but continue now with the debate before us.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I will abide by your ruling, Sir, but not by the feeling of the House. You would appreciate that, Sir.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Sir, on a point of order.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: With your ruling.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Sir, I got up to tell the honourable Member that it is not true to say that the Director of the National Assistance Board is on any special leave, Sir. The man is on simple vacation — I should just like him to know that — three and a half months accumulated vacation.

He is not on leave, Sir. It is not true, Sir.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, I withdraw it now, Sir, if that is the explanation. That is a vast difference. If he is on vacation and I said sent on special leave, I will withdraw that, Sir. Fair and square. The Minister has given an explanation and I accept that and I withdraw it. It will come out in the enquiry, leave them!

Sir, in virtually every department of Government — virtually every one, I have not said every one — we have found cases where public workers have been treated very badly.

(Aside: "Hog Pen.")

(Aside: Hon. B. M. TAITT: We have not got rid of Hog Pen.)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: "Hog Pen" does not work with you all. "Hog Pen" does not run a restaurant himself?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: And you know, Sir, like the Transport Board. The gentleman who was in charge of the workshop — Mr. Balfour Seale was in charge of the workshop, was dismissed one afternoon and given a cheque which was not a cheque that had the right money written in it.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, no, no! You will hear all kinds.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Pay no attention to those asides. Let us get on with the debate.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: of reasons ventilated tonight for getting rid of these people. But there has to be a halt!

Members probably feel very comfortable in themselves that they have been able to exercise power and get rid of people. The response to the cold pone two Sunday nights ago would show them that there is a lot of underlying dissatisfaction with the employment practices of this Government. Too naked!

Aside

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Who believes that? Fool yourself! When we were a Government we fooled ourselves about a lot of things. We did not hear what the people were talking. You all are doing the same thing.

Aside

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

Aside

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: That is a jail sentence.

Laughter

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I really get angry about this, because all of this we are seeing tonight,....

Aside

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: this very unique piece of legislation, has come under the aegis of the Ministry of Public Service, which has promised to do so much to streamline the Public Service of this country.

I am not surprised, though, that the result of the activities of the Ministry of the Public Service is being seen in a negative light, because when I think who is responsible for the Public Service, my mind goes back to the period 1978 to about 1981-1982, when a good thing was offered to the public of Barbados in the shape of the National Bank, and that person who set it up also set up its ultimate collapse. It was only through God's mercy that St. John intervened early, made some changes, and the result....

Aside

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Do not destroy him! The bank made a profit when Noel Symmonds was there. Do not talk foolishness! You read the latest Annual Report? It made a profit when Noel Symmonds was there. Do not distort the facts. But Lewis had gone by then. Sorry, Sir, I withdraw the word "Lewis". The erstwhile President, who had the first ML car — he had gone by then!

Aside

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Are you telling me? I used to see him driving — it is right next to my Chamber — a Peugeot.

Aside

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: If the man wrote a letter, the man is a liar! The whole of James Street could tell you otherwise. Why deny a simple thing like that? He had one, and Blackett had one.

(Aside: True!)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The old man that was seconded from the Ministry of Finance.

(Aside: True!)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: They did. And they had a lot of women in the bank, too!

Laughter

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am not saying any more.

(Aside: Hon. B. M. TAITT: There are still women in the bank.)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, yes, yes! The rest is for the platform.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I counsel the Government to be very careful in how they are dealing with public servants. This is not a good example tonight. What the Honourable Minister of Health did in here two weeks ago is not a good example. I am glad to see that at least the NUPW showed that they are not eunuchs, that they were able to upbraid him for the way that he has been walking about castigating civil servants publicly when it is his duty.....

Aside

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I had better not say upbraid. I said it already. Don't worry.

It is his duty to defend the civil servants in his Ministry. In breach of that principle of Ministerial responsibility, he is walking all over the place..... We had some clippings here today of various things.

Aside

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Excuse me, Sir. Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. On a point of order, Sir! The honourable Member must know that he cannot bring down clippings in here. He knows what I said. He is attempting to mislead the Honourable House again as usual.

Aside

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You are suggesting that the Supervisors at the Sanitation are crooks.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Government has not made a convincing case for the abolition of the post. There was no need to abolish the post, Sir — no need to abolish the post. If the lady could not work at Government House, certainly something else could have been found for her, perhaps in a Statutory Board and her pension rights would carry over.

The Honourable Member for St. Lucy has been in the habit of making fun at anybody. He is even making fun at the lady. I do not know what he knows about her. I do not know. Just that she happened to have worked as Tom Adams' Private Secretary is enough to incur his wrath and hatred.

Aside

Laughter

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Behave yourself!

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I just cannot believe what the honourable Member said. The honourable Member is suggesting that the person concerned has incurred my wrath and hatred. I think that that is imputing improper motives. It is a statement which is false. I do not know the lady and, therefore, I do not know who to hate.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: But you see, Sir, he should not be sitting down over there making *sotto voce* comments about the lady if he does not know her for the whole night — and when it was raised in here two weeks ago he was saying: "Well, who is Shirley King? Man, you should have fired her ever since."

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: On a point of order. On a point of order!

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member is on a point of order. The Rules are that when an honourable Member rises on a point, the other honourable Member sits.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: On a point of order, Sir. Mr. Speaker, the reference about alleged remarks which I am supposed to have made calling a person's name which the honourable Member for St. Thomas just stated must be withdrawn. I did not make such a reference. There is no record to indicate that and, therefore, Sir, I am asking you to ask the honourable Member to withdraw those remarks. They cannot form part of the record of this Honourable Chamber.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: But I heard him, Sir, and I am sure the honourable Member for St. Peter heard him, Sir. Did you hear him Honourable Leader? I heard him, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: In what speech did you hear him? The honourable Member has not spoken yet in the debate.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, Sir, but that is what I said, that he said the words *sotto voce* and that is the danger that you have been warning against all evening, Sir. You have been warning honourable Members not to make comments when others are speaking. It is one of the comments that he has been making that I have caught. I hit him with it, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is why I am going to ask you to withdraw and strike from the record any Asides that have been made.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Oh dear, Sir! But Sir, you are too hard, Sir.

Laughter

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You are too hard though. Good ruling, Sir. Your Honour is doing a superb job. I compliment the Chair, Sir.

But Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition spoke about the possibility of engendering fear among public servants by practices such as these we are witnessing, and it is a real fear, Sir. There are people who have come to us and complained that they are being threatened within their own department, that they are going to get the Minister of Public Service to deal with so and so. I have had 3 cases last week where people have been threatened — I am not saying that it is new — that the Minister of the Public Service will deal with them. They called the actual name of the persons and it seems, Sir, that the powers and responsibilities of the Public Service Commission are being eroded gradually, and people are seeing no place of resort after they conceive that they have been harshly dealt with by the Ministry of the Public Service.

I am very happy that today we have been able to regularize all that is necessary to have the Ombudsman functioning, because I can see that if this Government keeps on its present course, the Ombudsman will be more than amply — you will need two — and something will have to happen to put us on the right track, Sir.

We are a small society and I want to make this serious point in winding up, Sir. We know that there

are 2 major parties in Barbados and the population is virtually split down the middle....

Aside

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No. Do not mind the last numbers. Basically they are about 45% who are hard core for either party and you have another 10% who will float about. But in this small society a lot of us are related to people who are in other parties. I have family who are bigger Dems than some of them sitting over there and they probably have relatives who are "B's".

Aside

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Don't you all have relatives who are "B's"? Who?

Laughter

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: But Sir, the Honourable Minister of Finance has told too many things tonight that I could not believe to be true. The Honourable Minister of Finance once said that if the ship of the Labour Party was going down, I would be the last to get off. Such a yard fowl am I. In 1957 when I joined the League of Young Socialists nobody was talking about the Dems.

Aside

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, no, do not come with that that those fellows can tell you about me in London. Do you think that I am Don Blackman? Sorry, Sir, I withdraw that.

But in a small society we run the risk of disrupting all kinds of relationships if we perpetuate vicious practices in the Government, Sir.
9.55 p.m.

I have witnessed a trend — we talk about victimisation and we have given examples of victimisation — but I am witnessing a trend among the Members of the Government that I am going to warn them about.

The honourable Member for Christ Church East Central has got into the Press before I had a chance to make the same point, that we are pulling down and destroying our heroes. I hear in here every week some offensive remark about the late Prime Minister Adams.

Aside

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Now, I understand it. The Honourable Minister of Health says he is no hero, so I understand where they are coming from. I only warn Members on the other side, the time will come when some of you will die and pray to God that nobody from

the Labour Party says the kinds of things into the records of this Honourable House that you all have said. The time will come.....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS:.....when they will encourage people to tell lies about some of your own leaders.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I know the honourable Member is coming to the end of his speech.

Asides

Hon. B. M. TAITT: You cannot do that, David. You are getting carried away.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No. I am not getting carried away.....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The honourable Member is indicating that Members over here will die, and he is going all over the place. The honourable Member is the last person.....

Asides

Hon. B. M. TAITT: But there is nobody over here or over there or anywhere in the world that could be like Tom Adams; nobody at all. Don't liken anybody to Tom Adams, stop it! That is the end of that. Nobody over here or over there or anywhere in the world.

(*Aside:* Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: That is no point of order.)

Hon. B. M. TAITT: It is no point of order, but it is true, though.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: All that should be struck from the record. I agree with it. Tom Adams was unique and singular. None of us was his equal; he was superior to all of us. Do you see the response of the Honourable Minister of Health? He is so childish and immature that he is not.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Deal with the Resolution.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS:.....he is a big child.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do you want me to remind you of the Resolution?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, Sir, I know what the Resolution is about. The Resolution is about how the

Government is legislating for a woman no longer at age 50 to work in the Public Service.

I am surprised that we have persons in politics today who are unable to separate the personal thoughts of a man from his achievements as a public figure.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would wish that honourable Members desist from some of the side remarks and things of that sort. I would like the honourable Member to make this contribution.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Put him in his place, Sir. Thank you, Sir. Very kind of you, Sir.

We have asked the Government to reconsider, I am sure the Government is not going to reconsider, because they have taken a decision. What I would like to hear from the Honourable Leader when he replies is why the lady was unacceptable.

We have had cases where Public Officers have been held to be incompetent. The gentleman from the National Bank, Mr. Brathwaite, when he was dismissed, you were told, he was incompetent, he gave bad advice about interest rates, this, that and the other. You were told. I think that it is but fair for the Honourable Minister, if it is not going to stick in his craw, if he can truthfully tell us why she was unacceptable. He is in a position to tell us, if he can truthfully say.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, we have had a very heated, if not enlightening, debate on this particular matter and the time for continuing this debate is fast running out as well. I would just like to make a few points in reply to the debate so that there would be no confusion over the issues involved.

According to the information available to us and the brief that I have, it indicates that the Private Secretary was unacceptable to the Prime Minister, she was not acceptable to the Prime Minister. If the Prime Minister wishes to give further information on that, he will do so. It is not in my brief here, so I give you the information that is available.

I wish to point out for purposes of the record and to deny that this can be considered as any personal legislation. The fact is, or as you say, this is not a case — I am denying it — in which Government is legislating someone out of a job.

The facts are — again I repeat it — the facts are that the Private Secretary being unacceptable and there being no other equivalent posting to which she may be transferred, that an alternative posting was offered to her and

she refused. She did not find that post acceptable, there was no other post at that particular level, according to the information available to us, and therefore, according to the advice tendered by the Civil Service itself, the only option available was to abolish the post. That is the advice that was coming up from the Civil Service, and it was because peculiarly that particular post had been graded at that particular level so, that when you come to a question of transfer there was no lateral position to which she could be transferred, because the post was put in that particular grading. It was not at the level of the other Secretaries. So having refused to accept the post, the advice coming from the Civil Service was that the alternative would be the abolition of the post. She refused to accept the other post.

May I say at this stage, perhaps longer than any other Member in this Honourable Chamber I have known the lady for a very long time, since the 1950s. This is not a case of any personal legislation, it is the evolution of the particular circumstances, and I will give the assurance here, raised by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, who wanted to be certain that she would get all benefits to which she is entitled Sir, that she will be paid whatever entitlements and emoluments and benefits to which she is entitled under the law.

10.05 p.m.

If there is any dissatisfaction with that and the representations are made, those will be considered within the context of the circumstances. I give the Honourable House that assurance.

I think those are the points that have been made in the debate. I have attempted to deal with them, and if there is further information that is required, I believe other opportunities can be sought for debate of those matters.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put to the House.

A division was called for.

The bell was rung.

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

Ayes: Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Hon. B. M. TAITT, Hon. M. A. KING, Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES, Hon. E. E. GREAVES, Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, Mr. R. P. BYER, Hon. N. K. SIMMONS, Hon. W. W. HALL, Mr. C. V. WALKER, Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH, Mr. R. L. MORRIS, Dr. E. A. SIMMONS, Mr. J. J. PAYNE, Mr. P. J. M. MILLER, Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE, Mr. C. A. NEBLETT and Mr. E. BOURNE: 18.

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

QUESTION TIME

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, we will finish in a few minutes. I think there are just a few Questions to be dealt with.

I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Question Time. Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 9. The honourable Member for St. Thomas.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I ask that it be laid, Sir, and Nos 20 and 21.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member asks that they be laid.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business and the business of the Honourable House for today, and I beg to move that this sitting be now adjourned until Tuesday, December 9, 1986 at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The question that the House do now stand adjourned until Tuesday, December 9, 1986 at 12 o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
10.15 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Confirmation of the Minutes of the meeting of
Tuesday, November 25 406

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD 406

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$4 418 461 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1986-87, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1986-87, No. 13, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$152 629 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Annexed Estimates 1986-87, No. 14, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Bill to amend the Judges Remuneration and Pensions Act.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. C. A. NEBLETT (St. Andrew) 407

Question of the Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs re issuing of work permits to non-nationals.

Mr. E. BOURNE (Christ Church East) 408

Question of the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries re dynamiting of fish in Christ Church and St. Philip.

Question of the Minister of Employment, Labour Relations and Community Development re pavilions for various parts of Christ Church East.

Question of the Minister of Transport, Works and Telecommunications re regular public transport in Parish Land and Fairy Valley, Christ Church.

Question of the Minister of Education and Culture re relighting of hard courts at St. Christopher Boy's School, Christ Church.

Question of the Minister of Transport, Works and Telecommunications re lighted sidewalks between Oistins and Bridgetown.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD 408

A Bill to amend the Judges Remuneration and Pensions Act.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES 408

Replies to Questions Nos. 9, 20 and 21, asked by Mr. D. A. C. Simmons (St. Thomas).

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS. 408

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE EXPLANATORY NOTE TO SUB-HEAD 4 - SANITATION SERVICE AUTHORITY - HEAD 85 - MINISTRY OF TOURISM AND THE ENVIRONMENT. 408

Mr. N. K. Simmons, 409, 411; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 409; Mr. Forde, 409; Mr. Brathwaite, 410; Mr. Neblett, 410.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1986-87 No. 12
\$12 085. 412

Mr. Sandiford, 412.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1986-87 No. 10
\$1 600 000 412

Mr. H. A. Blackman, 412, 415; Mr. Forde, 413; Mr. Sandiford, 415.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1986-87 No. 11
\$346 000. 416

Mr. H. A. Blackman, 416; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 418.

RESOLUTION RE ADVANCEMENT OF \$6 300 000 FROM THE CONSOLIDATED FUND TO BE PLACED AT THE DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT FOR ADVANCES OF SALARY OR WAGES. 419

Dr. Haynes, 419, 438; Mr. Arthur, 420; Mr. Taitt, 423; Dr. E. A. Simmons, 427; Mr. Morris, 428; Mr. Forde, 430; Mr. Trotman, 435.

ADDRESS TO THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL
APPROVING THE APPOINTMENT OF SIR
FRANK BLACKMAN TO THE OFFICE OF
OMBUDSMAN..... 440

Mr. Sandiford, 440; Mr. Forde, 441; Mr. Taitt,
443.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1986-87 No. 13
- \$4 480 461

HEAD 36 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND
SOCIAL SECURITY..... 445

Mr. Hall, 445, 448; Mr. Sandiford, 445; Mr.
D. A. C. Simmons, 447.

HEAD 43 - MINISTRY OF TOURISM AND THE
ENVIRONMENT 449

Mr. H. A. Blackman, 449; Mr. D. A. C.
Simmons, 449, 450; Mr. Taitt, 449, 450, 454;
Mr. Trotman, 453; Dr. Haynes, 455.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMEND-
MENT) (NO. 5) ORDER, 1986..... 455

Mr. Sandiford 456, 472; Mr. Forde, 456; Mr.
D. A. C. Simmons, 465.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS 9, 20 AND 21
(LAID)..... 473

SUSPENSIONS..... 418, 455

ADJOURNMENT 473

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, O. S. (St. Peter)
BLACKMAN, Hon. H. A. (St. Philip South)
FORDE, Hon. H. deB. (Christ Church West)
GREAVES, Hon. E. E. (St. Lucy)
HALL, Hon. W. W. (St. Michael West Central)
HAYNES, Hon. Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central)
MORRIS, R. L. (Christ Church East Central)
SANDIFORD, Hon. L. E. (St. Michael South)
SIMMONS, D. A. C. (St. Thomas)
SIMMONS, Hon. N. K. (St. James South)
SIMMONS, Dr. E. A. (St. Michael South East)
TAITT, Hon. B. M. (St. Michael West)
TROTMAN, C. L. (St. Michael Central)
WEEKES, His Hon. L. A. (St. Michael North West)