

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1986 - 91

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, March 10, 1987

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

PRESENT

His Honour L. A. Weekes, (Speaker)
His Honour J. J. Payne, (Deputy Speaker)
Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow, Q.C., B.Sc., LL.D., (Prime Minister and Minister of Economic Affairs)
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. B. M. Taitt, B.A. (Hons.), M.A., LL.B. (Hons.), (Minister of Tourism and Industry)
Hon. P. M. Greaves, Q.C., B.A., (Minister of Transport, Works and Telecommunications)
Hon. E. E. Greaves, B.A., Ed.M., (Minister of Trade and Commerce)
Hon. Dr. R. C. Haynes, M.B., Ch.B., F.R.C.P. (Edin.), (Minister of Finance)
Dr. D. G. Blackman, B.A., M.A.
Hon. M. A. King, Q.C., LL.B., (Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs)
Hon. W. O. Franklin, A.I.C., M.I.A.S., J.P., (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries)
Hon. N. K. Simmons, (Minister of Health)
Hon. H. A. Blackman, B.Sc., (Econ.), (Minister of Housing and Lands)
Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, Q.C., LL.M.
Mr. O. S. Arthur, M.Sc., (Econ.)
Mr. C. V. Walker, (Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Education and Culture)
Mr. L. L. Brathwaite, J.P.
Mr. E. Bourne
Dr. E. A. Simmons
Hon. W. W. Hall, (Minister of Employment, Labour Relations and Community Development)

Mr. C. A. Neblett, B.A.
Mr. C. L. Trotman, M.A.
Mr. R. L. Morris, B.A., Cert. Ed.
Mr. P. J. M. Miller

Prayers were led by the Rev. Ivan Harewood.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in session.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, March 3, 1987.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Minutes of the meeting of this House of Assembly of Tuesday, March 3, 1987, have been circulated.

I beg to move that these be taken as having been read and that they be now confirmed as a true and accurate record of the proceedings of this House on that day.

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that I am recorded as being present, but I was not.

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

PAPERS LAID

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister, I am commanded to lay:

The Shipping (Incentives) Order, 1987.

I am also commanded, on my own behalf, to lay:

Diplomacy and Development — A Review of the Foreign Policy of Barbados.

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay:

The Estimates for fiscal year 1987—88, including the Schedule of Personal Emoluments for fiscal year 1987-88.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$596 887 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. 26 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Bill to amend the District Auctioneers Act.

A Bill to grant the sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and to appropriate the same for the service of Barbados for the year ending 31st March, 1988.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 52, asked by the honourable Member for St. George South, is ready.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

On separate motions of Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, the following Bills were read a first time:

A Bill to amend the District Auctioneers Act.

A Bill to grant the sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and to appropriate the same for the service of Barbados for the year ending 31st March, 1988.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is now the instant order of the day.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I gave notice a few minutes ago of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$596 887 from the Consolidated Fund. I will be seeking leave of the House to deal with that particular

Resolution in all of its stages today, because of the exigencies of public business.

I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting, subject, of course, to the rights of honourable Members, including Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition.

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

The question that the cited Standing Orders be suspended for the day's sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 12.25p.m.

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.

On the motion of Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. C. A. NEBLETT in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This Honourable House is now in Committee of Supply.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1986-87 No. 24
- \$ 188946 "

HEAD 74 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE
AND NATURAL RESOURCES

SUBHEAD 1 AND SUBHEAD 25 - \$66 872

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Mr. Chairman, under Subhead 1 - Object No. 29 - Investments - the sum of \$62 200 is required to purchase >. •» some 337 additional shares, giving us 11.23% ownership, in the Caribbean Food Corporation.

The Caribbean Food Corporation, Mr. Chairman, came about in 1976 with the major objective of assisting the region by promoting the production, processing, distribution and marketing of foods throughout the Caribbean in an effort to reduce the tremendous food bill that we now have. Since its inception, the corporation has had investment in some 22 projects, at a total cost of TT\$123.5 million. To date, the story of the Caribbean Food Corporation has not been one of the successes that we had hoped for, in that most of the projects that were undertaken have not been succeeding as we hoped they would have, and some of them are very marginal projects, to the extent that the amount of funds now available to the corporation are very low and the corporation is in very desperate straits.

At a meeting held in Antigua, on June 13 last year, the Board of Governors of the Caribbean Food

Corporation approved a set of proposals aimed at enhancing the financial operational viability of the corporation. These proposals are embodied in a document entitled, "A Corporate Strategy and Financial Planning, 1986-87." Among the things they decided on was the additional share offer. Barbados has been offered, as I said, an additional 337 shares at a value of TT\$561 500. It is to be paid at the rate of Bds\$62 200 per annum over the period 1986-87 to 1990-91. This Resolution seeks the authority of Parliament for the first payment.

Of the CFC's projects, Mr. Chairman, there are two projects located in Barbados, one is a private sector project, which is Barbados Packers and Cannery Limited, and the other one is to have direct participation by Government in the Barbados Broiler Breeders Hatching Egg Project. This project has a long history and has gone through a long analysis. I think it is fair to say that the present Administration has reached the stage where we are not certain about it, and I think we are fairly definite now that the project will be abandoned. The reason I say that is that the final report is being awaited from one of our directors, Mr. Jordan. We have commissioned him to do a final report resulting from some changed factors, namely the cost of hatching eggs to the poultry people and the price to which they have now decided to reduce the cost of the infrastructure.

The project in Barbados has had fierce objection from the poultry producers in Barbados, based mainly on the fact that they are fearful of the disease problem and the possibility that if any disease arose as a result of the project being here, it could wipe out the whole poultry population in Barbados. It has also always been a very marginal project. As a result of this, the Ministry has examined it very carefully, and on the submission of the final report by our director and one of the accountants in the Ministry of Finance, a decision will be made on this project.

I therefore seek the permission of Parliament, Mr. Chairman, for the appropriation of the amount of \$62 200 for the purchase of an additional 337 shares by Barbados in this form.

Under Subhead 25, is the National Fruit Orchard Project. This is a project that is designed to reduce the dependence of Barbados on imported fruit by increasing the local production of fruit. We are doing the project in conjunction with IICA. The main focus of the project is a ten acre orchard on Government lands, at Waterford. To date, it has been a success story, in that at that ten acre plot at Waterford, one can see very successful plots in paw paw, after the bunchy top disease which wiped out the whole paw paw population in Barbados. They have been able to develop a tolerant strain to it, and it has been doing extremely well, so much so that we have been testing the markets over the last couple of

months for the exportation of paw paw. We have exported some 25 tonnes of paw paw to date.

We are also having a look at avocados, particularly different breeds so that these avocados will come on the market about the time the normal avocados in Barbados are out of season, which would give us the ability to have avocados throughout the year. There is a special variety that has been tailored towards the export market. We are also having a look at the production of passion fruit in commercial quantities.

A second component of the project is to allow us to go to private farmers, and there is a credit component which would allow people who are interested in this project to participate. It has generated quite a lot of interest, and is one of the projects undertaken by IICA which, in the opinion of the Ministry, has been successful and shows good prospects for food development in Barbados.

The amount of \$4 672 is needed to supplement money already voted for two vehicles. Between the time of ordering and the arrival, the price of the vehicles has increased by \$4 672, and we need that additional money in order to purchase the vehicles.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 74 do now stand part.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question that Head 74 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
12.35 p.m.

HEAD 83 - MINISTRY OF INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT - \$122 074

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John): Under Head 83 — Ministry of International Transport — Subhead 2 — Construction — the object of this Resolution is the payment of professional services. The amount of \$122 074 is required to complete the payment to British Airports International for the provision of consultancy services on the runway at Grantley Adams International Airport.

The resurfacing of the runway and the provision of the ancillary services, such as runway lighting, have all been completed, since August last year. The amount which is now being requested is for the final payment of the consultants, who were responsible for the supervision of the work.

I beg to move that Head 83 stand part.

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

The question that Head 83 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1986-87, No. 25 -
\$600 130

HEAD 12 - PARLIAMENT - PART I -
CURRENT-\$81834

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Sir, as the Addendum indicates, the amount of money provided in the Estimates for Parliament, and General Administration is insufficient to meet the requirements of Parliament for the remainder of the financial year. Therefore, a supplement in the sum of \$81 834 is required to meet that anticipated shortfall.

I believe there will be opportunity, Sir, in the not too distant future, to look, if Parliament wishes, at the policy behind these allocations. At this stage, this is largely a bookkeeping exercise. If, of course, Members wish additional information, I will be happy to supply such information as may be available.

This relates to payment for the part-time assistants, allowances for the Clerk, night allowances for the Deputy Marshal and for the maids, as well as a gratuity for the Secretary to the Leader of the Opposition.

As I said, the sum of \$81 834 is required, and I beg to move that that sum stand part.

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

The question that Head 12 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 15 - CABINET OFFICE - \$3 400

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John): Mr. Chairman, under Subhead 1, the amount required is to meet the expenses of the Cabinet Office until the end of the financial year. The amount required under Utilities is \$1 300, and Operating Expenses, \$2 100, a total of \$3 400.

I beg to move that this Subhead stand part.

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

The question that Head 15 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 25 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND
NATURAL RESOURCES - \$250 000

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Mr. Chairman, Head 25 - Subhead 4, Object No. 13 - Subsidies is for the sum of \$250 000. This Resolution seeks to provide additional funds to give effect to the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals of the Minister of Finance. The Statement, which was delivered on July 15, 1986, stated *inter alia*:

"During this fiscal year the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries will be provided with funds to make a grant of \$250 000 to the Barbados Agricultural Society for Research and Development Purposes."

It is therefore necessary to supplement Head 25 — Subhead 4 - Crop Research and Extension - Object No. 13 — Subsidies — in order to make the grant to the Barbados Agricultural Society.

The Barbados Agricultural Society, as you know, Mr. Chairman, is the umbrella body of five commodity groups - The National Association of Pig Farmers, the Food Crop Farmers Association, the Barbados Sheep Farmers Association, the Barbados Milk Producers and Dairy Stock Breeders Association and the Barbados Egg and Poultry Producers Association - with a membership of over 700 farmers. It is figured that this being the umbrella body for most small farmers in Barbados, the Ministry of Agriculture and this Government would like to see it with finances provided for research, and this amount is now needed.

I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that Head 25 stand part.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question that Head 25 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 12.45 p.m.

HEAD 28 - MINISTRY OF LEGAL AFFAIRS
- \$9 500

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Chairman, the amount of money provided under Subhead 4 is inadequate to meet the requirements until the end of the financial year, and, as the Addendum states, the sum of \$9 500 is required as inescapable payments in this regard.

I beg to move, Sir, that the sum of \$9 500 for that Head 28 stand part.

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

The question that Head 28 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 41 - MINISTRY OF INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT - \$255 396

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John): Mr. Chairman, the amount required under this Head is for the Ministry of International Transport.

The sum of \$48 296 is for the payment of salaries until the end of the financial year under Personal Emoluments, and the amount of \$207 100 is to supplement the original amount of \$602 500 provided under this Head, which has also proved to be inadequate to maintain the existing plant, in addition to satisfying the demands by other Government agencies for the upgrading of the security provisions for the airport.

The amount then, together with the previous amount mentioned of Personal Emoluments, will meet the requirements until the end of the financial year, March 31, 1987.

I beg to move that this Head stand part.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I beg to second that.

The question that Head 41 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1986-87, No. 26 - \$596 887

HEAD 19 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE - \$24 186

SUBHEAD 1, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Chairman, consequent upon the increase of staff in the Ministry of Finance and Planning and the Departments under its control, it will be necessary to supplement the items of National Insurance Contributions and Transport Levy to enable the full payment of these statutory levies during this financial year.

Subhead 1 makes provision for \$4 644 for National Insurance contributions, \$195 for the Transport Levy and \$19 347 for Utilities.

I beg to move that Subhead 1 stand part. Hon. P.

M. GREAVES: I beg to second that.

The question that Subhead 1 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUBHEAD 4 - MANAGEMENT AND ACCOUNTING

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, under Subhead 4 - Management and Accounting - permission is being sought to supplement the sum of \$9 625 by \$37 for the purpose of National Insurance Contributions.

I beg to move that Subhead 4, Object 3, stand part.

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

The question that Subhead 4 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUBHEAD 5 - ECONOMIC PLANNING

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, under Subhead 5 - Economic Planning — this item is seeking another \$1 584 for National Insurance Contributions and \$40 in respect of Transport Levy.

I beg to move that Subhead 5 stand part. Hon.

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

The question that Subhead 5 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 20 - REVENUE SERVICES

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Chairman, under Head 20 - Revenue Services — Subhead 2 — Customs Department - a further supplementary sum of \$29 834 is being sought for the purpose of National Insurance Contributions.

I beg to move that Head 20 - Subhead 2 - stand part.

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

The question that Head 20 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 21 - STATISTICS

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, under Head 21 - Statistics - Subhead 14 - Statistical Department — I beg to move that the sum of \$58 628, which was previously provided, be now supplemented by one dollar, and that the Transport Levy in the sum of \$2 503 be supplemented by \$40.

I beg to move that Head 21 — Subhead 14 — stand part.

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

The question that Head 21 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 12.55 p.m.

HEAD 38 - MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS - \$15 614

Hon. P. M. GREAVES (St. Michael North): Mr. Chairman, at the time of consideration of this year's Estimates, the amount appropriated was predicated on the amount of payments made during the last financial year as subscriptions to certain agencies.

The amount then voted was \$89711. It has been discovered that there has been a shortfall in the amount of money that Barbados has to pay to the International Telecommunications Union and the Universal Postal Union by the sum of \$15614, and that is the sum required to supplement Object No. 17, Subhead 8.

I beg to move that this Head stand part.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I beg to second that.

The question that Head 38 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 43 - MINISTRY OF TOURISM AND THE ENVIRONMENT - \$523 422

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN (St. Philip South): Mr. Chairman, this is the Ministry of Tourism and the Environment because, originally, the National Conservation Commission fell under that Head. It is now under the Ministry of Housing and Lands.

This is a supplementary provision required for the National Conservation Commission for the purpose of maintaining the employment of the workers who were employed from December 1 in a debushing, landscaping and beautification programme. This supplementary will allow them to continue working until March 31 this year.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): Mr. Chairman, in November, I anticipated that the Government would have been obliged by the sheer pressure of unemployment to try and find some short term measures to work as palliatives in regard to the unemployed. At the time, we were all concerned about the large number of rats and mosquitoes, problems that could be occasioned by flooding, the fact that beaches were in need of cleaning, and that, generally, there was need for a clean-up campaign in the country to make our surroundings more congenial. I recall then having urged Government to employ about 540 people.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It is a fact. It is recorded in Hansard. That Government took my advice and did what I wanted a week later is no fault of mine. I asked for 540 to be employed. I do not know how many were employed.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I did not expect that I would be asked to nominate any from my constituency. I believe that Mr. Rock had not yet been exported.

We have not heard from the Minister since the implementation of the programme how many people have been employed and what progress has been made; I have observed people in certain areas working. I observed about 33 one morning on Bay Street working in a confined area, as big as in here, just above a certain night club in Bay Street. I would like to hear from the Minister how these 540 persons have been deployed, where work is going on and what is the plan, because when I saw the supplementary, I remembered the Minister saying that it was not only a question of debushing, but he had in mind an integrated programme involving landscaping.

In view of the fact that the Note in the Addendum of this says "for the purpose of maintaining the employment of workers in the debushing, landscaping and beautification programme until the end of March, 1987." I also want to know from the Minister whether the full stop at the end of "March, 1987" mean that the programme will come to a full stop at the end of March 1987, because honourable Members will recall that when I called for these workers to be employed, ...

Asides

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: what is so funny? It is a matter of historical record..... later in that day's sitting the Minister of Finance drew attention to the fact that he did not have money to keep these people working continuously and — I will sit down if he want to explain — in fact, his language, as I am reminded, was one of caution to the Minister to proceed in modulated terms, otherwise interpreted to mean that financial lessons were tight. So I want to know if the Minister intends to continue this programme.

I am not going to ask him today, because we have the Estimates next week, to tell us what he envisions for the future and how the programme will be integrated. I am assuming that there is some policy.

(*Aside:* Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: There is now a policy)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: There is now a policy! You will be able to tell us about the policy next week.

I think that the Minister of Housing, who is responsible for this, and the Minister responsible for Labour would be able to take some comfort from the fact that the Task Force on Unemployment, in paragraph 57 of their report, entitled Beautification Programmes, did, in fact, recommend programmes such as I called for in November, and such as have now been implemented by the Government.

I do not know what is the optimum capacity of this programme, if 540 is the optimum number or whether there is any room for expansion, but, certainly, the large number of persons who comprised the Task Force on unemployment saw that there could be some short term job creation, which, of course, would imply an equal short term expenditure. I shall have more to say about the conundrum that the Minister of Finance would have to unravel, since his present policies are based on a reduction of expenditure. We will leave that until next week because the whole business of the Task Force's programme will be carefully examined next week.

Asides

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: They cannot be rationalised in the light of Government's present policy. In terms of an altered policy, the Task Force's short term programmes can be rationalised. In terms of an altered policy, not in terms of Government's present policy! 1.05 p.m.

I would be grateful if the Minister would tell us whether it is intended to continue the programme and how many are employed, and, if he knows, the kinds of areas of their operation.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

Applause

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS (St. Michael South East): Mr. Chairman, I find it rather interesting that the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) should get up and say that he was the one who called for a programme of beautification in this country and named the figures. I think it is knowledge in this country that he sat in the last Parliament and was a member of the Government, and I can only assume that if he had this idea to call for a programme for the employment of people, he had the idea before May 28 - but that his Government did not listen to him!

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of elucidation: The ignorance that informs that statement from the

honourable Member for St. Michael South East (Dr. E. A. Simmons) is appalling. His own party criticised the number of persons employed in the debushing programme under the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Tourism, and great criticism was levelled at a former Member of this House, Mr. Aaron Truss. You cannot talk foolishness in here!

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I still make the point that, if the honourable Member for St. Thomas had this fantastic idea, he should have sold it to his party. Therefore, since we implemented the programme, he should come in here and compliment us.

At the beginning of his speech he talked about the mosquitoes and rats that were in Barbados. If they had implemented the programme, he would not have been able to come in here and talk of mosquitoes and rats, because the programme they would have implemented would have cleared up some of the problem. That is testimony of the fact that, if you had started a programme, your programme was a poor programme.

You can look around the constituencies in Barbados and see the kind of programme that is continuing in Barbados and which will do Barbadians proud. A lot of us are very quick to criticise young people in this country and say that young people do not want to work, but my experience is that the majority of young people who are involved in the present programme are working very, very hard, and they can be an example to a lot of people in this country. It shows that young people in this country are very interested in work.

I want to get to another point. I want to know how, in the light of the past Administration, they can come here and criticise a programme that immediately employs 540 people, when we come to this Honourable Chamber to ask for a supplementary vote of \$¹/₄ million, when you went and borrowed \$100 million to build a highway leading from no place to no place, destroying people's properties. As you drive up and down this country and look at the highways, tell me how many people you see employed in this programme? You say you saw 37 people on Bay Street. I have never seen six people on any one site on the highway that is costing \$100 million, and the people of Barbados will have to pay for that. And the majority of people who are employed on the highway are not Barbadians, and the money is not going into the pockets of Barbadians, but the taxpayers are saddled with this money! We have to be serious about this country, and we have to look at ways of employing Barbadians and putting money back into the pockets of Barbadians.

I want to compliment my party on implementing such a programme, I know that it will do Barbados good not only for Barbadians, but, the beautification and the

improvement to health that will result because of the programme will be of benefit to Barbadians.

I beg to support this Resolution.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, the records must be full and complete. I did not criticise, even by implication, the Government's programme for debushing. But the honourable Member obviously found something that I said as an implied criticism of Government!

But the more he talked, the more he opened himself to account, and this is the second time I have had to get up and speak twice in one of these supplementary debates. I do not like doing it. The honourable Member forgets that when the Government changed on May 28, 1986, there were a number of workers attached to the National Conservation Commission, the Environmental Division of that Commission, and some of them so offended the Honourable Minister responsible for Housing that he found it necessary to send home 322 of them. They were people who were working in the debushing and clean-up programme from November 1985, both under the Ministry of Health and Tourism. If it is untrue to say that you sent home 322 people, I will sit down and you can correct it. They were working in this programme for the beautification and clean up of Barbados.

After the people were sent home, there was no attempt made by the Government, from June 1986 until December 1986, to fill that gap. In that six months' period the mosquitoes murdered us at night, the rats increased the level of leptospirosis in this country! In that six months' period, when the present Government stopped the debushing programme, sent home 322 persons, and failed to tell me how much it cost them in termination benefits to send them home! I was told that the 113 cost \$120000. If you had not sent those 113 home, you would have had \$120 000 more there.

The programme was started in December, so the Government must accept full responsibility if there was an increase in rodents. The Minister of Health is in a position to give the House the figures of the number of persons who suffered from leptospirosis. There can be no doubt that there was an increase in the mosquito population. Do not forget that, before the Government changed, a call was made by the then Leader of the Opposition to send home the *Aedes Egypti* officers.

(*Aside*: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: They should have gone home a long time)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He said "they should have gone home a long time." I presume they have implemented your desire and those officers are now cooling out at home, adding to the unemployment and adding to the mosquito population, because even now there are great

complaints about the persistence of the mosquito problem, even in February and March 1987. There are some times of the year when you do not suffer the problem like you suffer in the rainy season. People complain to me. •*

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I do not know about malaria. We do not suffer from malaria in Barbados. Nobody is saying that. What we are saying is that the mosquitoes are a nuisance. I am not saying that they are distributing any disease like malaria or dengue. I have no evidence of that.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mosquitoes cause AIDS? You are a doctor, and if you say that, I will have to accept that. Tell the general public that.

I would be grateful if the Minister responsible for Housing would let us know how the problem of pests was controlled in the period when the National Conservation Commission was short of 322 workers at his instance. If this Government was serious about continuing the programme, you could have brought a supplementary in September, as soon as we came back from the August recess, and started the programme, and assisted in the relief of all of these problems in the last quarter of 1986. Instead of that, you had to wait until you were cajoled in December to do something. I wanted to make that clear, that if there were a period of time in 1986 when there was no debushing going on, it was entirely as a result of a conscious decision made by the Government to turn off those people who, prior to the election, had been engaged in that programme. 1.15 p.m. ^

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER (City of Bridgetown): Mr. Chairman, I am going to make a very short contribution to this, because, obviously, any right thinking Barbadian would have to support this.

It was interesting that the Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) did not defend the highway that was mentioned by the Member for St. Michael South East (Dr. E. A. Simmons).

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Tell us about the massive employment that was promised as a result of the highway! That is what it has to do with it. We were talking about employment.

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order.

(*Aside*: Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sorry, Sir.)

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: As I was saying, I thought that the Member for St. Thomas would have explained to us why the highway that promised so much employment was not delivering the employment. However, he went on, in my opinion, to just repeat what he had said before.

My feeling is that the debushing programme by itself, even though it was introduced by the last Administration, was not necessarily a bad idea. The exception is that it was not carried on, and that we did not go on to the extent of beautification and landscaping that our programme includes.

The other thing, and I am glad to see it did not happen this time is that we did not include the vote-catching aspects, where, instead of allowing an organization that was set up to do that sort of thing, the National Conservation Commission, the last Administration saw it fit to include other Ministries, like Health and Education, so that a few Minister at the time could provide some vote-catching employment. I am very glad to see that we have shied away from that aspect of it.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Nobody is debushing for the Ministry of Health or Education any more. Did you not know that? In respect of the productivity that ones sees, I think the NCC should be lauded for the work that they are doing. I know that at one time the Minister of Transport mentioned that he had some serious difficulty with productivity at MTW. Maybe there is something that NCC is doing that MTW can emulate.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to add to what the Member for St. Michael South East said and compliment the number of young people who are involved in the landscaping and beautification programme, and that is what it is, and compliment them particularly for the level of productivity that we all can see daily as we go around the country.

Thank you.

Applause.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John): Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) has suggested that he was the originator of the idea of a debushing and beautification programme. If he likes to feel that way and it makes him feel better, we are not going to deny him of his self-adulation. That is part of his general character.

Laughter.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: It is also part of his, let me say, cachet, that he is the greatest garbage collector in Barbados, like his effusion last week when he suggested that I had a toothache, which I have not had for 42 years, and which no Member of this House suggested, when the consideration of the Establishment Orders was postponed at my behest, for reasons which were given by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford).

On the whole question of debushing, the Ministry of Health from time to time sends notices to land owners suggesting that it is an offence against the Health Services Act that their premises should be overrun by bush and calling upon them to clean up the premises. There are several unoccupied areas of land, unoccupied by buildings or housing, some by derelict housing, which the owners are responsible for. I do not think that it is generally known that the National Conservation Commission will undertake the debushing of premises for a modest fee to assist in the cleaning up of those areas. I think greater publicity ought to be given to this.

Last week, one of my former clients, who lives in the United States of America, on arrival in Barbados was confronted with a bill of over \$2 000 for clearing one house spot. Over the telephone, an estimate had been given by a plantation owner of \$800, but when the lady arrived in the island last week, she was presented with a bill for \$2 000, for a house spot which is not more than 7 000 square feet of land. I think this is ridiculous, and I am suggesting that the Minister should advertise that the National Conservation Commission would undertake to debush people's premises and state the rates at which they are prepared to do it. This would provide additional employment.

I feel that the whole question of beautification is a question of pride for the local inhabitants of the villages and the various centres of habitation of this country. I am inviting the honourable Members of this Chamber now, when they get an opportunity, to leave Bridgetown, or wheresoever they may abide, and travel to the constituency of St. John, and go by way of Andrews Factory and first pass through Claybury Tenantry. He or she will see that the young people of St. John have spread out a beautiful garden on the side of the hill by Claybury, without any playing facilities, except some for small children, by asking the manager of Claybury to allocate a certain area that they could go in and beautify. They have done this unassisted by the public revenue of Barbados.

Leaving Claybury, you should go to Wilson Hill, pass the new church up there, I do not know what they

call it — I cannot remember what they call it — it is either Abundant Life or something like that — and they will see an abundance of life, because, on the right hand side, at the bottom of Wilson Hill, the young people of Wilson Hill, not to be outdone by the young people of Claybury, have beautified a considerable area there, and there is no debushing going on in St. John. If there is debushing going on, I am inviting the Minister to withdraw the workers and send them to other destitute parts of the island to debush, because we do not want idle people in St. John — we do our own debushing.

Having left Wilson Hill, you should then travel to Codrington College by way of Sargeant Street/Soon after you pass the entrance to Codrington College, on the right hand side at the bottom of Society Hill, you will see another beautiful area there, beautified by the young people without any assistance, with encouragement perhaps of the Representative of the constituency but not much financial assistance, except that in those three areas we helped them with lawn mowers and so on. You will see another area there which has been beautified by the planting of all kind of flowers and the building of a nice shelter so that they can do what we call "lime" and play draughts, without being the victims of the adverse weather conditions, and you will therefore see what, with the proper kind of encouragement, the young people of this island can do. If you go to the constituency of the honourable Member for St. Michael South East (Dr. E. A. Simmons), you will find that the young people there have been active.

1.25 p.m.

These young people would like to have some jobs, but they are not prepared to sit down and see their neighbourhoods get into states of devastation and dilapidation and become run down, because they are taking pride in their surroundings. I should like to enjoin honourable Members, instead of saying what they have done or said, because there is a lot of rhetoric on these matters and very little action, that they should get among their constituents, among the young people, and give them some leadership and, where required, some assistance in the way of lawn mowers and matters of that kind, like I have tried to do in my constituency. I am not blowing my own trumpet, but if you do not blow your own trumpet nobody is going to blow it for you. I am very proud — no self-adulation - of what the young people are doing in my constituency, and I should like honourable Members to have their young people emulate it, because they are providing work for themselves, although they are not being compensated for it in monetary terms.

I would like to come back to the question of laying off of workers. When the Government came into office at the beginning of June — I was the only person working in May 1986 — we discovered that people had been hastily recruited, drafted and dragooned a few weeks before the

election under the guise of debushing programmes. We also discovered that there was no money allocated for the payment of these workers, and that has been stated here unequivocally on the floor of this Chamber. I cannot say ' "this House," because we still do not have a roof over our heads. We have got somebody else's roof over our heads, and if we went half way down in this building, we would not have any roof at all, although they assured me that the rain is not coming in. But that is another matter. It has been stated on the floor of this House by the Minister of Finance and by other Ministers, on several occasions, that these people who were taken on shortly before the election, without any reference to the Financial Rules, had to be laid off, not because we did not believe in debushing but because there was no money to pay them and the method of their recruitment left a lot to be desired. There were a lot of - I do not want to be pejorative — what a former Minister of Finance described as "voluntary idle" people who continued to be voluntary idle after they were receiving money from the various Government departments, which money had not been voted by Parliament. There was no money whatsoever to pay them, and, therefore, in order to clear the debt and to get a constructive programme going, the Government then had to analyse what should be done on a short term basis in order to relieve the industrial reserve arm of the unemployed of the unemployment under which they were suffering.

I think that when we are thinking of creating work for people, it is absolutely necessary for us not to look upon it as an act of personal largesse, because nobody in here, using the taxpayers' money, is performing any act of largesse. We are merely performing the work that the people of Barbados put us here to perform, and our first job is to reduce unemployment. I have seen that a lot of the people whom I am associated with in and out of Parliament have come around to the idea that there is ^ nothing iniquitous about a crash programme to relieve unemployment. A lot of professional economists, people who rejoice in professorial titles at the institutes of tertiary education, were quite vociferous in 1985 and 1986 that we should not have any crash programme when we assumed the Government of this country. They knew that we were going to win the election and they were warning us that crash programmes are not solitary ways of generating employment. I lived to see the day when some of the same persons turned around and recommended what is tantamount to crash programmes — I said some of them — some of the same persons who were against crash programmes. Some of the people who were taken on in our crash programmes as far back as December 1961, a week after we came into office, have not stopped working up to now. Go and ask them, the people who went into Bridgetown and said, 'I want some of ^ , Barrow's ham,' and 'I want some of Barrow's turkey/ are still working and gainfully employed as a result of a crash programme.

Beautification is one thing. I should like to see more beautification in the lines of the St. John beautification programme. I should also like to see more people employed in productive sectors, such as planting pangola grass for the feeding of our increasing cattle industry and doing matters of that kind which are of permanent benefit to the society and which in themselves will help the economy of the island. I hope that the people who are being paid out of the money which we vote now will continue to be employed, but I should also like to make it clear that at anytime that I see the programme being abused by people just coming up to draw money on a Thursday or a Friday, as the case may be, because they feel that this is part of the "Speenhamland" system. Those of you who have studied Economic History will be aware that the "Speenhamland" system, like the British Empire, was a gigantic system of outdoor relief. I think it was no less a person than someone rejoicing in the same name as the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Mr. R. L. Morris), the inventor of the Morris Chair, who said that the British Empire was a gigantic system of outdoor relief for the British middle classes. The "Speenhamland" system was a system of outdoor relief, instead of putting them in the almshouses, for the British working class who were unemployed at that time. I do not wish this inverted into a "Speenhamland" system or into a system of outdoor relief for any of the classes of people who are without work in Barbados.

I think that the next aspect of our programme will have to be the generation of not only beautification programmes, but programmes for production in Barbados, and that the small communities do what the people in Grenada in the rural areas used to do, take it upon themselves to beautify the surroundings which they inhabit.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE (Christ Church West): Mr. Chairman, this debate is probably going to be prolonged much longer than many of us anticipated, for the simple reason, Sir, that what normally is a very simple matter usually leads, one way or other, to the characterization of one side or the other as doing something for only limited and particular purposes.

I want to remind this Committee that, under the Barbados Labour Party, there was for years, since we came back into power in the second term of office, a programme for the beautification of the island and the debushing of the island. The National Conservation Commission and its predecessor has carried out this programme, in my view, very assiduously, and to the benefit of the beautification of several areas of Barbados. I need only mention the name of Iris Bannochie — those persons who are objective would recognise the contribution which the Commission made under her chairmanship leading to the beautification of our island. One has to

look at some of the roundabouts to see the work that that Commission did. Unfortunately, when I saw the one near to the new Port Authority, I was surprised that the usual flowering shrubs which one saw there for years have disappeared now.

Aside

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am told they are now growing back. Fine. I am glad they are growing back. They never used to take such a long period, because the planting period was well organised under Iris Bannochie. 1.35 p.m.

Honourable Members could look at various other areas. If we take the Hall's Road area, it is now certainly a pleasure for me to drive along Hall's Road and see the beautification programme that took place there under the Barbados Labour Party. In fact, we had plans for beautifying the whole area of Constitution, from here right up to the bridge at Bridge Road.

I could go on and on and cite these programmes. If the DLP wants to continue to convince themselves that the Barbados Labour Party had no programme under this, they can do so, but the facts are there for people to see. It is not true that the Barbados Labour Party had not set out on an overall programme for this island. Individual programmes were closely linked as well to the improvement of the highways. As a matter of fact, almost every major road construction and improvement programme continuing now was commenced under us. Have a look at the Collymore Rock area and the programme planned for there. The honourable Member is laughing because he has been a beneficiary of a lot of the work done. If you have a look at the Pine Road, you will see that work was done in that area.

The honourable Members made the point that just before election, people were employed by the Barbados Labour Party and that that was for purely election purposes. I have taken the trouble to read the debates of this House after the DLP lost in 1976, and as a matter of fact, when you read those debates under this Head, you will see almost similar allegations being made on both sides of the House. You will see similar allegations being made then against the Democratic Labour Party.

Aside

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Apparently, according to the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes), we were telling lies then, but they are telling the truth now. The trouble is that we presume that people are so jejune to believe that none of the 27 politicians, having the pressure on them to get jobs for their constituents, is going to try to find a job

for the constituent and send him in the National Conservation Commission. I know for a fact that in respect of the present people who have been employed, some of the Members sitting around this table, sent up their lists of recommendations. That is to their credit. Do not come in here and try to give the impression that the same pork barrel type of politics, if you want to call it that, has not touched the DIP. Do not come in here and say that.

Aside

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member wants to know if I sent in a list. I was not even paid the courtesy to be asked by the National Conservation Commission as to whether or not I wanted to recommend anybody from my area. What are the honourable Members trying to say? I can tell you, even from the constituency of the Honourable Prime Minister — although he does not deal with the matter, his Personal Aide deals with it — the names of several persons who were selected in the debushing programme. They got selected. I can tell you how much they are working for, because I talk to some of the people.

The Honourable Prime Minister is mistaken. He is quite right that in parts of his constituency, by voluntary effort, some of the very beautiful young people of St. John have taken steps to beautify their areas. He cited Wilson Hill and he cited just under me in Sargeant Street. That is quite true, Sir, I stop and talk to them very frequently. But the Prime Minister is mistaken — debushing has taken place in his area and a large number of people have been employed there. Debushing has been done. The whole area going right through Sargeant Street, Codrington College, even in Society - I can give you the areas, because I drive through the country quite a lot where debushing has been taking place — and in St. Philip as well.

I want to suggest to the Government — and this is following up on a point which the Prime Minister has made — that they must make sure that when the debushing is taking place on private property — I am not talking about the small man for whom you are doing a few things, but on a mass scale — that a bill is sent, because what has happened is that a large number of the persons have gone on to private property and done debushing there and have never even sent a bill in order to recoup the cost. The honourable Member must know that.

Honourable Members must also know that, prior to this programme the Barbados Labour Party also used to advertise the services of the National Conservation Commission, and they will see that the National Conservation Commission earned fees from doing work for private persons on their lands. That is a fact. If the

honourable Members do not follow these things, I have followed them for some time. It is no big and new thing. In fact, at times their fees were lower than the fees which were being charged by some private contractors doing a similar job.

One would hope that landscape architecture will be developed to the stage that they can go beyond mere debushing and be able to produce persons who at the para level can, of course, do landscape architecture. I do not believe that the Commission has a landscape architect on its staff. Perhaps the Minister should think of these things. There are now a couple of them in Barbados. It is possible to take one or two young people and train them in this field if you are looking at long term structural employment and not looking at the area of merely short term occupation or pork barrel politics, as Members are saying.

Aside

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member says he will do it, Sir. Also take this into account, as much as you are talking — go now and look at the Constitution River and see the state in which it was. I agree that when the honourable Member came in in 1961, as part of his crash programme, one of the first things he did was the Constitution River. After that, it was only cleaned up by us once. Now it is back in a similar state. If there really was long term planning on these matters, one would expect that people would attend to those aspects of the matter.

The truth is, Sir, when you look at it, that this type of programme, whether you call it a crash programme or otherwise, is perhaps the easiest one for any Government to indulge in immediately, because the persons that you are employing are generally persons without skill and > there is no large capital outlay involved. But it is possible to train the persons after a period of time to bring them into the work force and to make sure that the projects that they are performing could have a long term effect on the building of the economy as a whole.

I am not accepting for one moment the statement from the honourable Member for St. Michael South East (Dr. E. A. Simmons) that the majority of persons employed on the West Coast to Airport Road are non-nationals. That statement is not correct. The honourable Member should take the time to look at the *Official Gazette* as they are published bi-weekly. He will see that the number of persons obtaining work permits to work on that project are set out, so he has no problem if he wants to find out how many non-nationals are employed. I do not believe him. I know it is not true, because the >• Minister with responsibility for work permits would also have revoked work permits, if it was necessary, to make

sure that the project is not over-burdened with non-nationals.
1.45 pin.

There are a few areas in which non-nationals were given work permits. It is not hidden. One of the things that the Barbados Labour Party implemented was the publication of every work permit granted.

Asides

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member says he knows why. But since it has been done, you do not hear any allegations being made against anybody. Every work permit granted, to whom it is granted and for what period it is granted is published in the *Official Gazette*. It is a good measure.

The position is that the road, contrary to what the honourable Member may feel, is going, in the long term, to make a greater economic impact, structurally, to the Barbados economy than the honourable Member can possibly envisage now. If he does not recognize it, he will realize that it is not simply a question of debushing. But there will be tremendous opportunities for beautifying the landscape of Barbados, and even now, in its rudimentary stages, it is revealing some of the landscaping of Barbados that is a pleasure, and I would hope that when the road is completed, the National Conservation Commission could maintain that highway as a place of beauty. It will, in those circumstances as well, contribute to Barbadians and visitors who drive along it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member has one minute more.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member should be aware that already several businesses are looking at the economic possibilities accruing from the construction of that road. It was the vision of the Barbados Labour Party that foresaw that, and it is going to come about. You might be the beneficiary of it. Without self-adulation, we can see the vision that we had in pointing to such a programme to the overall benefit of Barbados.

We do not have at all to be bothered on anything on this programme. The honourable Member is quite right — we would like to, see the people continue to be employed. I regret very much, however, that many of the 321 terminated for whatever reason, were not re-employed, including some from the constituency of the honourable Member who wants to speak after me, the honourable Member for St. Michael North East (Mr. L. L. Brathwaite). Some of his very constituents who were employed the last time, did not get a pick this time. He did not get the numbers he asked for. There is none from my constituency.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE (St. Michael North East): Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this subhead and to make known some of the individual concerns that I have, but not without looking at the contributions made by the honourable Members of the Opposition.

It is interesting to hear them talking about the number of persons who were sent off after May 28. I think I had cause to refer to letters which were written to persons who had been given temporary appointments to the debushing programme some time in November 1985 and to say that they were only employed on a day-to-day basis and that the period during which they would be working would be until the end of June 1986. It seems to me that they are complaining that the Ministry terminated employment at that point while not taking cognisance of the fact that the Minister took time at that point to explain that there was no provision made to pay the people for the period during which we would have had difficulty in finding funds for them at that point.

If you look very closely at what happened in that period, you would see that a large number of persons concentrating in the area of St. Michael Central and a small section of St. Michael North East had been the beneficiaries of that pre-election programme. So when you look at a total beautification programme of the island, you will find that what had really happened is that these people who were employed were employed in areas which the honourable Members from the other side had been referring to, and that is on the highways and the roundabouts. What we have been seeing in this present programme is that areas other than the highways and the roundabouts have been attended to.

I would like to compliment the Minister for having this programme implemented as smoothly and as successfully as it has been going so far. However, there appears to me to be some little conflict. After the areas have been debushed, there seems to be some problem in having the bush and shrubs removed from the areas, and I understand it is because the National Conservation Commission does not have enough transport to take care of the amount of work that the workers are doing. I understand, also, that there is some liaison between the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of the Environment about taking up this garbage, but it remains on the road much too long for my comfort, and I am just asking the Minister to improve this situation by whatever means he can.

I just thought that I would raise that particular issue and state my support for this Resolution, because I believe that it is in this that Barbadians can be very proud of a meaningful landscaping and beautification programme.

Thank you, Sir.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, this is about the third occasion that I would have had to speak on this matter of the employment of the 321 persons who were laid off, and I hope that this will be the final time that I have to speak on this 321.

Before I get to that 321 persons, Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member for St. Thomas, (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) said that he called for the employment of those persons and within one week they were employed. I have always believed that that statement would be made by anonymous persons like Henry Christopher and Percy Smith. I never thought it would have been made by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas, because the honourable Member for St. Thomas, being a member of Cabinet for some time, must know that decisions like these have to go to Cabinet. In fact, before they go to Cabinet, they have to go to the Ministry of Finance, then to the Cabinet, and then to the House of Assembly. But Henry Christopher, Percy Smith and the honourable Member today believe that all that can be done in one week! Well, they may be one and the same person, I have been told. This Administration does not operate that way, where all of that happens in one week. 1.55 p.m.

The honourable Member wanted to know the number of persons employed in this programme. At the moment there are 465 persons employed.

The honourable Member also made a statement which is untrue. He said he saw 33 persons working in one place in Bay Street. He would have to be speaking of before May 28, because one of the stipulations in this programme that we are now doing is that not more than 15 persons must be in one place at the same time, and you can check it and see. It is one of the directives that not more than 15 persons can be in one place at the same time. You had your reasons for saying that, but your reasons are wrong. You can check any place and you will not see more than 15 persons.

He wants to know about the work that is being done. All the reports coming in to the Ministry of Housing and to National Conservation Commission speak of what a good job these workers are doing. You only have to look at the Spring Garden Highway, University Drive and Bathsheba. It is all over Barbados. Those of us who travelled this Island before May 28 know what we saw. We saw 30 and 40 persons standing up beside the road and only three people working. Over 27 or 37 were talking. You will not see that now, because there is a directive that there should be not more than 15 persons working on any one site.

The honourable Member also mentioned mosquitoes and gave the impression that mosquitoes proli-

ferated after the 321 persons were laid off. Even the honourable Member for St. Thomas knows that the rainy season in Barbados starts in June and that mosquitoes tend to increase during the rainy season, so it has no connection with the workers being laid off. Every year mosquitoes tend to increase in the rainy season, whether 321 persons are working or not.

I am going to turn to the 321 persons — I hope for the last time. Of the total of 321 persons — this is the first letter in the file — 194 were recruited from the Ministry of Tourism and the remaining 127 from the Ministry of Health. The 194 persons employed by Tourism and the Environment came as a result of a ministerial directive. That is Truss! And hear this:

"The Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Tourism has informed the Commission that those persons should have been terminated as of June 4, 1986."

We kept them on until July. You all had decided to terminate them on 4 June.

(*Aside:* Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Who signed that letter? I do not believe the person who wrote it.)

Laughter.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: This is in the file: "The Commission was also instructed," this is NCC,

"to meet wages for these workers in the interim with monies from our Capital Vote for the present financial year."

You see what happened. You had to take money from the Capital vote to pay recurrent expenditure which means your Capital programme had to stop. That is one reason why we had to lay them off.

You will realise they were to be laid off on June 4. When this decision came out, the Minister instructed that a Cabinet decision was taken to get a supplementary and employ those persons. That was the instruction from the Minister. It was then referred to the Cabinet Secretary, who wrote:

"There is no record in the Cabinet Minutes of any directive mentioned."

This means that the person who was Minister then was using a little underhand work as well, because there was no record in the Minutes. I told you that already.

"The Minister directed the National Conservation Commission to hire 150 workers. These workers were recruited with effect from May 1."

So you see that from May 1, four weeks before a General Election, you were bringing on 150 people.

"The Manager of the NCC also informed me by telephone as follows;

"These workers were sent to me from the Minister with letters of employment."

So the Ministers were giving them letters and saying to give employment to these fellows.

Loud asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order in this House, please!

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: They were given letters and told to go and work. That is the difference.

Let me say something about the 465 workers. In a programme of this sort, if you are going to employ a large number of persons

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we are straying. Can I have some order, please?

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: In a programme of this sort, if you are employing a large number of workers and you do not wish all 465 to come from St. Philip, or St. John or St. Peter, it is only natural and normal for you to discover from the different constituencies how you are going to get people employed from the different constituencies, otherwise you will end up with 200 being employed from St. Philip.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Gentleman, we are off track.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: I believe, Mr. Chairman, that I have once again tried to set the records straight. Each time the honourable Member for St. Thomas gets up, he goes down the wrong road and I try to put him right. I am going to walk with this file every time anything about the NCC comes up.....
2.05 pm.

Laughter

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN. .in order to put him right every time.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Loud applause.

The question that Subhead 5 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

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

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I believe that brings us to the end of the pre-lunch session.

Before we suspend, Sir, I crave the indulgence of the House to ask that the item "GOVERNMENT BUSINESS" be recommitted so that we may give notice of a Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection, then leave is granted.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, I beg to give notice of:

A Resolution to approve payment of increased cost of living allowance to Government pensioners and to fix the minimum pension and cost of living allowance payable to all Government pensioners. I will also seek leave for this to be dealt with in all

Sir,
stages today.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I beg to move, Sir, that this sitting be now suspended for one hour.

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

The question that the sitting be now suspended for one hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 2.10 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) ORDER, 1987

Order No. 2 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (C^ieral) Order, 1987.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John): Mr. Speaker, the Resolution which we are being asked to approve reads as follows:

"RESOLVED that the Order entitled the Civil Establishment (General) Order, 1987 made by the Minister responsible for Establishments on the 30th day of January 1987 under section 2 of the Civil Establishment Act, be approved.

RESOLVED THAT His Excellency the Governor-General be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, from time to time, one reads in the media in this country that the Government has taken steps to legislate for the revisions of salaries of members of the public service of the island. The truth of the matter is that there can be no increases of salaries granted to any public officer in this island unless it is done by legislation. I think that what the hierarchy of the National Union of Public Workers has sometimes objected to, not entirely understood by the Press, is that when the Government fails to reach an agreement with the organizations substantially representative of the public workers of this island, the Government, sometimes after long negotiation, as in our case in 1975—76 when we had 23 meetings with the different organisations, certainly 23 meetings with the National Union of Public Workers, or in the case of the previous Administration, after two meetings, would come to the Legislature and ask Parliament, particularly this House, to approve the level of salaries which the Government was prepared to grant to the public workers. So this has been elevated now into a battle of "to legislate or not to legislate", and there is no such contention in the constitutional procedures of this country, because all salaries have to be legislated.

Since the negotiations, at least in my time recently, have been relatively peaceful, I should not like to express an opinion on the motivations behind the agitation which is frequently stirred up by the leaders of particularly the National Union of Public Workers, who obviously consider that their reputations stand or fall on the quantum of increases that they are able to secure for their membership. Their prospects of re-election to the high offices of the organizations are frequently predicated by (a) the amount of noise they keep; (b) by the amount of trouble they give the Government in office; and (c) by the continuing battle which they appear to wage on behalf of the members of their particular unions. I do not want to say anything more on that. We are dealing with human beings. We are dealing with people who obviously like positions of power and authority, short of running for elections themselves. We are also dealing with people who are prepared sometimes to subjugate the interest of their fellow workers for political

considerations. The chief beneficiary of that kind of attitude was a former Minister of the former Government of this country, who kept all kinds of noises about 80% at a time when the finances of all our Caribbean islands were under stress, and at a time when the Government had offered the public workers of this country a 35% increase in their salaries, a figure unheard of in the annals of any highly industrialized country — the United Kingdom increases are usually of the magnitude of 2% and 3% and in addition to the 35%, which after 23 meetings I came and asked the legislature to approve, there was an additional 15 per cent in the second year of the operation of the increases. 3.25 p.m.

When I came into Parliament — let me put it this way, I have never served in the Other Place - I do not think I look forward ever to serving in that august Assembly - in December 1951, the way that salary revisions used to be handled was that the officer administering the Government of the country at the time, in consultation and collusion with the political directorate, would send overseas for a Salaries Commissioner — I can from recollection name some of them, Mr. Pusinelli, Mr. Gardner Brown and people of that ilk — would come to Barbados, from some relatively obscure position in the Treasury of the United Kingdom, and hand their recommendation to the representatives of the people, which, without any kind of amendment or correction, was brought to the Legislature as the recommendation of the Salaries Commissioner, whoever he was at the time, and passed by the Assembly in its collective wisdom of Barbados. What is extremely interesting is that some of the leaders of the Civil Service Association, who later became high officers in the Government of Barbados — the non-elected division of the Government of Barbados — I do not mean the Senate, I mean the Government Service — did not see anything wrong with that procedure.

I remember that in my first salaries revision as a Member of Parliament, the public workers were given an increase of \$11.07 per week, Mr. Speaker, and the only protest of that kind of treatment came from some of what used to be described as "the recalcitrant back-benchers of the Barbados Labour Party", like myself. As a matter of fact, the second salaries revision that we had at that time in the 1950s, was an occasion when the key scale of established and non-established workers, the clerical grades and others received no increase at all, and the person responsible for the passage of these matters in the House, who I elect not to name at this juncture, asked the House of Assembly to pass increases of over 50% in the salaries of the senior members of the Public Service, such as the Accountant General, the Attorney General, the Colonial Treasurer

and a few of the Senior Doctors at the Barbados General Hospital. It was at that time I parted company with the then political directorate of this country, as I "could not see my way to grant increases to those usually non-national personnel while the general workers of this country were suffering with wages of under \$20 a week. It may sound fantastic. I was not born in the 19th century, and those wages were probably related to the conditions which immediately succeeded the manumission of the unfree workers in this country. Our people had nowhere to go, so they had to go and work for things like a shilling a day, if they were lucky. Some boss carpenters in the 1950s were getting 84 cents a day. So \$ 11 a week was not out of alignment with the general wage structure of this country.

When the Democratic Labour Party came into office in 1961, one of the first things that we did was to legitimate, if not legalize, the organizations of members of the Public Service and to regard them as persons who were fit and proper to represent the interest of people working for the Government of Barbados. In other words, the settlement of the level of remuneration which was to be received by members of the Public Service was negotiated on the basis of collective bargaining between the Government and the representatives of the workers of this country.

Some of these latter-day novitiates would have you believe that they were interested or that their party was interested. Having, as it had, at the pinnacle of their organization the pre-eminent officers of the trade union movement, one would have thought that they would be the people who would insist on the introduction of collective bargaining in so far as Government workers were concerned. But this was not to be, because they had the old colonial mentality that people who worked for the Government of Barbados were not to be mixed up with anything like trade unions, although they themselves were trade unionists. That is a fact and, therefore, it was left to the Democratic Labour Party to introduce the principle of collective bargaining, and you will find that after 1961 there were no Pusinellis or Gardner Browns, or Gardners Brown, neither side, nor Gardners nor Browns, brought down from the United Kingdom to hand down edicts to Parliament about the kind of wages and conditions of service that should be attendant upon the Public Service in this country. That is a fact.

So you can understand how distressed I was to hear the Minister of Finance accuse the DLP Government of not being interested in the workers because we did not give them 80% increases in 1976. And the first thing that he did when he became Minister of Finance in the first salaries revision that came up was to say that they were not going to get any increase at all. Zero! When he was challenged on that afterwards, he said that you got

to start off with something. That was the first time that I heard that zero was something. The first time in my life! His political arithmetic was better than the late Dr. Eric Williams who said one from ten leaves zero. He said that zero equals something. His further excuse was that in 1976 they had received too much, when his O'Brien Trotman was saying that they should have received 80%. 3.35 p.m.

I do not blame the present members of that party who are present here. I am not attaching responsibility to them, but I also know that the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde), who has taken upon himself the responsibility for criticising everything that the Democratic Labour Party does and always talks about the previous Administration, can explain his political arithmetic to me, how zero was the start of something. That kind of higher mathematics, I was never very good at anyhow, so I do not profess any competence in that area. I will be pleased to learn from him.

We have to put things in the right perspective. I heard that last week they were annoyed because I was unable to attend the Chamber and present these proposals. I suppose they are glad to see me now. But the general public should know that these negotiations started in 1985—86, 1985 for a possible conclusion by April 1986. The first letters were written in 1985, and possibly, because there were elections coming up, the Government did not see fit to try to reach any conclusion of these negotiations. They were so confident that the Democratic Labour Party was going to take over that they said to themselves, 'Leave it to them and let them have the headaches.'

I come to that conclusion because if you go through the history of parliamentary Government in the Caribbean, you will see that every single Government in face of elections has tried to reach some accommodation with their public workers. They do not like the public workers to go to the polls with the possibility of salary decreases or increases hanging over their heads. So they did not even learn from history. Every single Government, as we did in 1976, tries to reach accommodation before elections. If this is the act of final absolution that a Government makes, they make it in full knowledge that it is better to do that and lose than never to do it at all. They did not do it — and they still lost! But they will learn wisdom as they go along.

I am the person who was threatened in the courtyard when we said we would give them 50%. I was threatened with afro combs and knives and pern and everything else by the minions of Mr. O'Brien Potman, who was the General Secretary of the National Union of Public Workers. I said on the floor of the House that

we had the General Secretaries of the various organisations but I was the General Secretary of the taxpayers, and I am still General Secretary of the taxpayers because I am one.

Fortunately for us on this occasion, without any intervention by any of the political persons, we have managed to reach accommodation with the various organisations, after protracted negotiations. I should like to compliment the public officers, who understand these matters, who sat down and discussed the negotiations with the representatives of the workers in their different organisations. To us it is not a political matter at all, and I think that if in future the politicians will stay out of these discussions, we will have less acrimony and less misunderstanding.

I deliberately stayed out of these negotiations, because I know how it is, having had 23 meetings and having in the final stages Mr. O'Brien Trotman absenting himself but advising the late Minister of Finance that, he the Minister, should hold out on the floor of the House for 80% increase for public workers, in a year like 1976 when all of us were feeling the stress of the oil crisis and inflation. An 80% increase! The only thing that I could say about that gentleman, using the word in its loosest sense, is that when somebody in Port-of-Spain asked me what he was like, I said I did not know him very well, but General Austin was a refined edition of O'Brien Trotman. The physiognomy was there but the perfidy did not exist in General Austin. "I dun wid dat!"

I have given a brief history, Mr. Speaker, of salary negotiations because this is not my first salaries revision - my first was in 1952, and I have been a Member of this House off and on ever since — and I wish to say that it is the policy of this Government to continue collective bargaining with its public officers and their representatives, and we will always come to the House to legislate salaries, but we will only come and ask the House to approve of the salaries revisions, whatever they are, when we are satisfied that we have exhausted the total machinery and devices of collective bargaining. I make that statement and I make that statement on behalf of myself and my colleagues. Since we introduced collective bargaining, no one can accuse us of abdicating our sworn principles of collective bargaining, not only for public workers but as a means of settling all industrial disputes in this country.

I should like now, Mr. Speaker, to give a background of the current negotiations leading up to the Civil Establishment Order, which, incidentally, was signed by the Minister responsible for Establishments on January 30. The Order was made on January 30. The Order, according to the Civil Establishment Act, is subject to affirmative resolution of this House. The Order is an Order, there is no new Order going to be made. The

Order is dated January 30, but it will not become effective until the Legislature, that is, this House, since it is a monetary matter, approves this Resolution, and that is the purpose of this debate here today. —*

The proposals for the increase in salaries and wages for the period beginning on April 1, 1986 were as follows: The National Union of Public Workers submitted proposals for 25% at the bottom of the salary scale Z.39, which will be the equivalent of \$812 a month, to 15H% at the top, which will be S.I., \$5 250 per month. The estimated cost of those proposals would have been \$27.1 million.

Asides
3.45 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The salary of a Permanent Secretary now is approximately \$63 000 plus — you can see it in the list. That is the salary of a Permanent Secretary.

Asides

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: This is the salary of a S.I. This is what they proposed. The estimated cost was \$27.1 million.

The Barbados Union of Teachers submitted proposals for 27% at the bottom of the teaching scale, Z.36, which would be \$890 a month to 17% at the top of the scale, S.5, which would be \$3 675 per month, for a head-teacher in a Secondary School. The estimated cost of those proposals was \$12 393 000. This was on top of the NUPW proposals.

The Barbados Secondary Teachers Union submitted proposals for 23.5% at the bottom of the teaching scale, ^ Z.36, that is \$890 a month, and 14.3% at the top of the scale, S.5, which would be \$3 675 a month. So the minimum scales and maximums were the same for the Barbados Union of Teachers and the Barbados Secondary Teachers' Union. The estimated cost to their segment was \$1 685 000.

The Barbados Workers Union submitted proposals for 18% on salaries and wages at the bottom, Z.39, to 10% for salaries at S.I, which is the top, of \$5 250 a month. The estimated cost of their proposal was \$9 million.

The Barbados Association of Principals of Public Secondary Schools submitted for them alone 14.2%, which would be \$3 675 monthly salary.

To do a very rough calculation, the collective proposals would have amounted to an annual additional expenditure of approximately \$50 million. —

You will notice that the Police Association was not in this. By letter dated April 21, 1986, the Association advised the then Government that it wanted to conduct negotiations at the conclusion of the negotiations with other unions and associations. That is their bottom line. By a letter dated September 15, 1986, the Association advised the Government that it wanted to conduct negotiations for regradings in the present salaries and allowances for members of the Force. Then on February 13, 1987:

"The Police Association has conditionally accepted the level of increases accepted by the other unions.

"The conditions proposed by the association are that there be a regrading of the present P salary scale by two points in each rank from inspector to constable.

"Secondly, the removal of conditions attaching to the award of the long service increments to a constable so that there be continuous advancement to the top of the scale."

Under the existing arrangements, a constable proceeds to P.26 after 12 years' service and to P.25 after 15 years' service. I strongly advise Members who have copies of the Schedule of Personal Emoluments to look at them. You will be able to follow me so that I do not have to revert continuously to the Schedule to explain to you what P. 35 or S.I is. S.I is the top of the scale and the bottom of the scale is Z.39, of all salaries. Below that no one can fall.

The Prison Officers Association sent a letter in August 1986 asking the Government to make an offer since they did not know how to submit proposals. It is proposed that we will make an offer to the Association within the settlement arrived at with the other unions.

The Fire Service Association up to now has not submitted any proposals, so they will be treated in like manner.

The common bases, common to all of them, on which they submitted their proposals were (1) the upper movement in the cost of living since the last contract, which was from April 1, 1984 to March 31, 1986; (2) the fact of taxation, especially Income Tax, on the disposable incomes of workers; (3) that there were comparable wage heights for workers in other sectors, the private sector particularly of the community, and (4), the estimated growth rate in the economy over the two year period between 1984 and 1986.

In addition to a meeting with the Prime Minister Bernard St. John at an early stage, negotiating sessions were held with the union of Public Workers and the Bar-

bados Union of Teachers Jointly after May 28, 1986, of which there were seven joint sessions. Before May 28, 1986, three meetings were held with the National Union of Public Workers and two with the Barbados Union of Teachers. There were three meetings with the Barbados Workers Union and four with the Barbados Secondary Teachers Union. No meetings were held with the Association of Principals of Public Secondary Schools.

The negotiations began on May 2, 1986, with the Government's initial offer of 5% at the Z.39 level graduating to 3% at Z.4 and 2% thereafter. The unions did not accept this. When the negotiations were suspended, prior to the General Elections on May 28, 1986, Government's offer for the first year was then 8% at Z.39 graduating to 5.8% at Z.I6 and 4.6% at Z.I. For the second year, the offer was an additional 2% for posts from Z,39 to Z.4.

Negotiations resumed after the election on July 24, 1986, and from that meeting the National Union of Public Workers and the Barbados Union of Teachers negotiated as a joint team. By this time the Government's new fiscal measures were implemented, and taking into consideration that a large number of public workers would be exempted from the payment of Income Tax, Government's offer was varied to 3% at Z.39 graduating to 1.4% at S.I. The Government emphasised that the tax concessions satisfied one of the union's main complaint, which was that there should be improvement in the workers' disposable income.

Can you hear me, Sir? I cannot hear myself.

Mr. SPEAKER: Try again.

3.55 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: None of the unions accepted this argument, although it was pointed out that, because of the tax concessions, the offer resulted in more disposable income than the latest offer that had been made when the negotiations were suspended prior to the general elections. The unions argued that the tax concessions did not benefit the workers at the bottom since they were paying very little or no tax before the concessions. In an effort to address this situation, Government's offer was eventually improved to 9% at Z.39 graduating to 1.4% at S.I for 1986-87 and an additional 2% across the board for 1987-888.

This offer compared favourably with the level of settlement in the private sector during 1986, which averaged between 8% and 12% to the lower paid employees. In addition, over the two year period April 1, 1984 to March 1, 1986, the index of retail prices showed an annualised cumulative increase of approximately 8%. The offer was accepted by the Barbados Workers Union and the Barbados Secondary Teachers Union, but the

joint delegation of the NUPW and the BUT maintained that further relief was necessary for the workers at the bottom of the scale.

On the direction of the Cabinet, the Head of the Civil Service chaired two meetings with these unions. Certain pre-conditions were suggested by the unions which, if met, would influence the unions' position on salaries. The issues raised included matters affecting the National Insurance Scheme and the Widows and Children's Pension Scheme. The unions accepted that such matters could not have been examined satisfactorily within the context of the salaries revision and agreed to submit proposals in writing.

Other proposals by the unions were: the deletion of the first point, Z.39, in the salary scale, with consequential adjustments to the grading of any posts which have such a commencing salary, and a further corresponding adjustment to those key scale categories which now have an annual wage comparable to Z.39. Secondly, that the servers in the School Meals Department be placed on the regular salary structure and be not considered as part-time workers. Thirdly, that all outstanding matters affecting teachers, including reclassification, should be addressed.

These proposals were considered and our response to them was, firstly, that immediately after the salaries revision, action would be taken to delete the first point, Z.39, and that a consequential adjustment would be made to the key scale category with wages comparable to Z.39 — and these adjustments will be effective from April 1, 1986; secondly, an exercise in reclassification of posts would commence not later than April 1987 to be finalised by March 1988 — the effective date of any adjustments will precede or coincide with the effective date of the next salaries revision; thirdly, that there should be an early review of the basis for determining the salary of the School Meals servers.

At present, the School Meals workers are paid at the rate of \$7 692 per annum, but their hours of duty are 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. They are considered as part-time employees. I am sorry, that is not School Meals workers; that is School Meals servers, because some School Meals workers go to work at five o'clock in the morning, as most of you will know. They are the servers, the ones who serve the meals, and it was in respect of the servers that the unions had made these representations. I want to get that clear. They did not make any specific recommendations about the other School Meals workers, most of whom are on the establishment already. Thirdly, it was agreed, as I said, that there should be a review of the basis for determining the salaries of these School Meals servers.

On the basis of this commitment given by the Government, the two unions, by letter dated 22 January, 1987, accepted Government's salary offer of 9% at the bottom graduating to 1.4% at S.I for 1986-87, and an additional 2% across the board for 1987-88.

The estimated cost, Mr. Speaker, of the proposals is \$18.6 million for 1986-87 and an additional \$7.5 million for 1987-88. One must remember that the 2% is not 2% of the increase but 2% of the total salary. That is why it appears to be almost half again as much as 2% of total salary.

Arrangements will be made for the arrears of salary from April 1986 through March 1987 to be paid in the new financial year, and for the 1987—88 agreed revised salaries to be paid from the month of April 1987. That is, all Government workers will get both their arrears and their new salaries by the end of April this year.

There are one or two small amendments which I will make before the passing of the Resolution, and they are to sub-paragraph 11(4) of the Civil Establishment (General) Order.

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

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE (Christ Church West): Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the Prime Minister on more than one occasion speak on Civil Establishment Orders, and indeed, I have heard him on several occasions recount the history of collective bargaining between the Government and the public workers, whether they be represented by the former Civil Service Association, or represented by the National Union of Public Workers, or now by the Barbados Workers and other unions. The mood which he adopts varies from time to time. It depends on whether he is like now, fortified with 24 Members on his side, or whether he is facing the wrath of the electorate, as in 1976, who had become turned off from the inept government which had been given during the period of 1971—1976. On that occasion, it was no nice and mellifluous voice from the Prime Minister. It was harsh words for members of the Public Service who dared challenge his right to legislate salaries. 4.05 pjn.

If I may rather fleetingly look at some of the words that he has used on them, as early as 1972, the Prime Minister, then speaking at the Budget Debate of 1972 - I read them from Hansard for Tuesday, I believe it is the 6th June, 1972, at page 1031 - had this to say on salaries revisions:

"The first proposal which I intend to implement is a policy on incomes of persons who draw salaries and wages out of the public treasury."

Incomes policy in short.

"I said earlier this year, on the first day of May to be more precise, that persons in the higher brackets — including the Prime Minister, other Ministers, Members of Parliament and others who cannot be deemed to be mere wage earners — cannot expect that I will widen the gulf between them or us and those wage and salary earners who are finding it difficult to make ends meet."

This is his view on the Civil Service.

"There is some kind of superstition that the public service is automatically entitled to a three yearly upward revision of salaries. This is the main pre-occupation of the Civil Service Association, which has now dispensed with the term "civil" and changed their sobriquet to the National Union of Public Workers, and which registered as a trade union in 1964 and not at any time during the regime of the National Conservative and/or Labour Party.

"They are demanding salaries for some public officers higher than those currently paid to Ministers of Government, increases in pensions from 30% to 50% without any explanation as to the manner in which these increases can be justified.

"The militant and churlish opposition leadership of the Secondary Teachers Union has staked its own claims on the earnings of the taxpayers, still entrenched in the belief that they can go further than holding up the nation's children to ransom, but that they can blackmail the whole community and even overthrow the Government.

"I wish to make it clear that what I decide as a Minister of Finance is not predicated by exhibitions of bad manners and ill-will of the detractors, but by a concern for the overall good of the country rather than the wide ambitions of any narrow sectoral interests."

Loud applause.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE:

"I will therefore look at the emoluments of those less well off members of the Public Service and postpone consideration of the demands of those higher up until the country can afford them the luxury of three or four motor vehicles in each family compound."

Loud applause.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Love, it! Love it! Love it!

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE:

"Negotiations may take place provided that a sensible rather than the present insolent and truculent approach is adopted."

(Aside: Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Full stop!)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE:

"The appropriate time for increases will be the time when the country can afford them."

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: O'Brien Trotman was there.

That is the Prime Minister in 1972. At that stage, of course, his argument was principally with the Barbados Secondary Teachers Union: He felt that there were giving him trouble, and his well-known phrase, the "army of occupation" was on his lashing tongue. It was not any calm Prime Minister who is going to exhaust all of the remedies of collective bargaining until he grows aged in his seat. It was a Prime Minister who, in those words which his members now applaud, recognized that, ultimately, if he is sitting in the seat of Chairman of the Cabinet, Chairman of the Government and being the Prime Minister in charge of the Ministry of Finance and Establishments he has a duty at some stage to come in here, regardless of whether the negotiations have come to a conclusion or not, and legislate.

The DLP cannot all of a sudden forget the history that they have had, on occasions, of concluding talks without the collective bargaining process being exhausted to the satisfaction of the unions.

(Aside: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: To the satisfaction of the Government.)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Well, the Prime Minister said exactly what I expect him to say, "To the satisfaction of the Government".

(Aside: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: It has to be both, it cannot be one.)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: It has to be both, it cannot be one. But not to the satisfaction of the raions, the Prime Minister has come in and always four.a it necessary to legislate. He did it is 1976.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, there are only three of us, you know. The really cannot take it!

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: They really cannot take it, despite the 24 voices. He did it in 1976, because he recognized that eventually, if the two parties cannot agree, he still must run the country, given the mandate which he had from the people of the country.

It is obvious that the policy he'enunciated today is really nothing new. I interpret his policy to be that with him sitting in the Cabinet with ultimate responsibility, when he judges that the collective bargaining process has been exhausted, not to the satisfaction of the union but to his own judgement, he will come in here and legislate the salaries. So I do not understand why they are going to be making such a song and dance, as though that policy has differed from Government to Government.

We have from time to time negotiated salaries. I am not here, as he says to get up and run down anything the DLP is doing. I am not doing that. But what I have recognized is that, despite the speeches which he may make, depending on the mood as he judges the country, as leader of the country he recognizes, as former other Prime Ministers have recognized, that there is a time when the Government and the unions may not agree and the Government may have to take a decision in the national interest. And no amount of talking is going to vary that position, no matter who sits in the position as Prime Minister.

One has to be candid and say that one would like to be able to negotiate on each occasion and reach agreement with all of the unions at the first set of negotiations. But the Prime Minister has given a series of demands from the unions which show that the unions themselves did not even agree as to what was the proper base rate from which to begin negotiations. Of them all, the most responsibility was shown by the Barbados Workers Union.

(Aside: Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: As always.)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member for St. Michael Central says, "As always." That was our experience with the Barbados Workers Union on almost every occasion that we negotiated with them. I believe that both Prime Ministers who represented us from the period 1976—86 have said so.

It is significant that the Barbados Workers Union began negotiations some 7% below the request of the National Union of Public Workers. So the unions themselves could not agree on what was reasonable. It is —, significant, too, that agreement was reached with the Barbados Workers' Union ahead of agreement being reached with the National Union of Public Workers or the Barbados Union of Teachers. It is significant that the union that has the greater maturity in these negotiations, in collective bargaining, understands that you have to advert overall to the national interest. 4.15 pjn.

A lot of song and dance was made in the period leading up to May 28 that the Barbados Labour Party was anti-worker. It was nonsense. I adopt the very principle of which the honourable Member spoke. We had to be conscious of the overall public and national interest. There is legitimate room for disagreement as to what that interest may be at any time, and how much can be given. I have no quarrel with the unions for trying to get the maximum that they can get for their workers. I think ^T that that is necessary. But they must show some good faith in respect of the parties who were negotiating for the Government prior to the change in the elections. Those advisers to the Government have basically remained the same advisors to this new Government, and the differences which have been negotiated have led me to the firm conclusion — and I am going to name the unions, because I do not want any mistake in this place — that the National Union of Public Workers and the Barbados Union of Teachers were not motivated by only the interest of their members when they were negotiating with the Barbados Labour Party Government. I believe very strongly, and I have said it before, that they led a demonstration for political purposes.

The Prime Minister said that the politicians should keep out of these negotiations, and he spent a lot of time naming one particular member of the Labour Party Government who was formerly the General Secretary of the National Union of Public Workers. But he should likewise tell some of the existing officers in the BUT and the NUPW that they should have stood out of politics in May 1986. He should have told them then. Some of them have not learnt that lesson.

I am not saying that trade unionists should not be represented in the House or in any political party. I am not saying that at all. But there is a vast difference between . the trade unionists who understand their role as trade unionists and some of them who do not understand their role. That is the point I am making.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I have to make the point. The Right Honourable Member is going to interrupt, but he has to recognize that.

He said that we should have settled the matter. We did not show political nous. Probably he is right. But leading up to the last General Election, the principal aim of those two unions was not to get any maximum position for the workers that they represent, but to bring down the Government. I do not lay that charge against the other unions which were engaging in those negotiations.

(*Aside:* Hon. B. M. TAITT: Everybody, including some BLP supporters, wanted to bring down the Government).

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, in 1991, I am going to hear a different story from them.

It is significant that, early in the negotiations, the then Prime Minister, Mr. St. John, took the opportunity to reveal to the unions the Government's position and to say what were the bases on which the Government could negotiate. My view is that if the collective bargaining process was to run its own course, one could not really truthfully say at that stage that that collective bargaining had been exhausted, and that it is significant, however, that two unions saw fit to treat the matter as though the collective bargaining process had been exhausted.

Sir, we have been the Government during a period in which we have dealt on many occasions with the Barbados Workers Union. I have looked very carefully at the speeches made by former Ministers in charge of Establishments, both Prime Ministers, and never once did I hear them have to attack the Barbados Workers Union, even when in one year, I believe it was 1984, we disagreed with the Barbados Workers Union. I believe a settlement was reached with everyone but not with the Barbados Workers Union, and I believe that then what we said was that they were unable to accept. There was no attack on the union membership, because one recognized that that union took a different position in the manner in which it conducted its negotiations.

I am happy to see that at the end of today some agreement has been reached. I say that it is significant again that the leadership of the NUPW found itself on a sticky wicket — out on a limb. It is not a question that they eventually found some face-saving devices, all of which have been rejected, virtually. But it found itself in a position where two unions had accepted the Government's terms and eventually a face-saving device was found for it. I do not believe that when you look at the manner in which the NUPW have finally had to settle this, you can say that genuine collective bargaining took

place with them subsequent to the acceptance of the position by the Barbados Workers Union and the other union.

I want, Sir, to go back a little bit on the history of these negotiations, because the Prime Minister spoke of what happened down through the years that he was in the House. I believe that not only his speech in 1976, I believe, but the speech of the then Prime Minister, the late Tom Adams, in September 1984 set out quite accurately for those who are interested in the historical development, the course of negotiations about public sector wages. I will draw that speech to the attention of Members of the House. It is contained in September 4, 1984 Hansard, at page 1228.

It is true to say that prior to 1961 most negotiations took place, if there were negotiations at all, by the public servants making representations before a Civil Service Commissioner, usually a person appointed from outside of Barbados, and perhaps the first real attempt at negotiations began in 1961, just prior to the honourable Member's Government taking over. Even then, there was not full agreement, because the Police Association disagreed, and when the DLP took over they appointed a special commission to look at the reasons why the Police Association disagreed, and a revision of police salaries took place at that time. In 1966, a reasonable measure of agreement was reached — there was no real controversy between the parties — but by 1972 it was a different position.

(*Aside:* Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Nineteen hundred and sixty-nine) 4.25 p.m.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: In 1969, there was general acceptance of the position and there was full agreement on the salaries. I think the Barbados Union of Teachers did not agree immediately, they came in later. But in 1972, it was not possible to reach agreement. At the time they reached an interim agreement, and subsequently after, the legislation, they had to negotiate further on a classification arrangement.

In 1976, of which the Prime Minister has spoken quite a lot here, agreement was not reached at all. In 1978 — I have not heard about that — agreement was reached with all except, I believe, the Barbados Union of Teachers. They did not agree at that time. In 1984, an agreement was reached with the National Union of Public Workers, but the Barbados Workers Union would not agree. I believe that that involved 26% and 15% and then a reclassification.

So the history that you really have is that because there are so many public sector unions representing the Public Service that it is possible for a Government to reach an agreement with a group or a substantial number of the public workers represented by one or other of the two major unions and find that the other unions has not reached agreement. That has happened under their Government and it has happened under ours, and I really would not like to characterise the occasion on which no agreement was reached with the DIP in an unfavourable light, any more than I believe that they are justified in characterising the times when full agreement was not reached with us in an unfavourable light.

The Prime Minister said that at one stage, in 1976, he had at one stage 23 meetings with the National Union of Public Workers. I have heard a different version of that. At one stage I think 20 was said by the Prime Minister, at another stage 23. I have heard the union say at some stage there were 11 meetings, and I have understood it to have been said at some stage that 11 means one plus one rather than really 11 meetings. Regardless of how many meetings he had, the point is that, at the end of the day, the collective bargaining process had to be terminated by legislation because there was an impasse.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member for St. Michael West (Hon. B. M. Taitt) from his seat said that even when you reach agreement, the process is to legislate. We all accept that. The Prime Minister stated as he began, and we accept it, that eventually Parliament has to legislate salaries. But we are talking in the context of both parties going away from that table finally satisfied. Therefore, when the NUPW and the BUT can believe that they have to pull out and take to the streets — they have the right under the Constitution — they could show a little bit more responsibility as to the timing of such an exercise.

I want to take issue with the Prime Minister in the manner in which he approached the failure of the last Government, as he calls it, not to do what has become a Caribbean tradition, that is to try to reach an agreement before an election. I am sure that it was nothing better than some of the unions would have wished, because a Government in an election year — and let us face it — is at its weakest in the bargaining process. The Government in an election year is conscious of the fact that it has an Opposition on it which, obviously, is going to seize any cause that could improve the Opposition's position, and the workers themselves recognise that the Government wishes, if possible, to reach an agreement satisfactory to them in order to achieve the maximum political mileage.

Sometimes it takes people of character, people who should not be derided, to stand up and say this is how we see the national interest, even if it is to our disadvantage. Not many people can take that stand. It takes people of character, and I can say that the former Prime Minister, Mr. Bernard St. John, in these negotiations went in with good faith, he stated how he saw the public's interest, not his own interest, and he made it quite clear that he was not going to be bulldozed into an agreement merely because he was in an election year. Instead of this House in any way judging his stance as though it was one lacking in common sense, I think you should judge it as it was taken, from the highest national interest. As the Government at that time, we were not looking down the line for the politics of it only, but rather the national interest, and if we had to say to the NUPW and the BUT, not to the other Unions, that we were not going to be bulldozed into a settlement, we were saying it not from a position of arrogance, but from our conviction that in the long run, one has to represent the national interest as you see it. Therefore, I really have to disagree with the Prime Minister's approach on that matter. I do not think that he genuinely believes it anyhow, because he ended up that criticism by saying that he is now announcing his policy for everybody over there. He will only come to the House to legislate when "we" — not himself and the unions — when the Government, we — "are satisfied that we have exhausted all means of collective bargaining."

I want to get his principle clear, because it is no big thing for anybody to cheer about. It is no big announcement. It has not varied from the policy you have followed or we have followed. When we, the Government! Power still resides there. Power does not reside up in Dalkeith Hill, at Dalkeith House or the Horatio Cooke Auditorium. Power does not reside up in the Barbados Union of Teachers. Eventually, when the national interest has to be determined, power has to reside where the people have given the power.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member is really making some fun, Sir.

I want now, Sir, to talk about the payment of the salaries. The negotiations started in early 1986. I think we had about five meetings in all with the two main unions, the Teachers' and the NUPW. At that stage, their position was they wanted their money. A change of Government occurred in May 28, 1986, and the next negotiations did not start until July, but those negotiations were protracted over a period of time. I have not seen any of the goodly gentlemen come out and march and say they want their money.

(*Aside:* Hon. B. M. TAITT: Do you forget Haynes gave them a lot of money? They do not want the money now).

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Let me make it clear. Haynes gave whom a lot of money? Haynes has not given any lot of money.

Mr. SPEAKER: Who is Haynes?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I do not know, Sir. I am only replying to the honourable Member.

Mr. SPEAKER: All members in here are honourable Members.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, if I was speaking about the Minister of Finance, I would have said 'the honourable Member.' 4.35 pjn.

Gave whom a lot of money? What lot of money one is talking about? The Z scale, Z.39 - the Prime Minister had to concede the point — got no benefit at all from the Budget. Those at the bottom of the scale had not been paying Income Tax at all under us. What is the point you are trying to make? None of the people in the Z.39 scale, the bulk of the public workers under us, was paying Income Tax. That is a fact. What are you talking? The negotiations would not have. They got a point more than what we were offering. They are not affected by the tax proposals of the Minister of Finance, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, in that sense. This must be made quite clear. What is the honourable Member talking about? He knows it as well. The bulk of them was not touched by those proposals. Even now in the new salaries negotiated, the Income Tax proposals have brought them no benefit whatsoever, and I agreed with the unions' submission when they tried to hold out and bargain for a further point. They only got 'a point that the Barbados Workers Union had agreed on anyhow. But it is significant that all of their strident shouting and demonstration has ceased and again I am not talking about other than the NUPW and BUT.

Asides

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member says that I am attacking the unions. You had better believe that I am like the Prime Minister in this regard. I do not have to attack the unions, but I would tell them if I were sitting in the Prime Minister's chair, that you would have to recognise the national interest and the interest of others. There are times when the national interest would be synonymous with the interest of the unions *per se*. But there are times when it might be a little

wider, and the sooner those of us in public life are prepared to have the guts to say that, the better it is going to be for Barbados and the Caribbean.

(*Aside:* Hon. B. M. TAITT: That is purely to carry favour.)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: You do not make any mistake. I have never ever on a political platform sought to curry favour by saying other than my conviction, and I have the greatest respect for unionism. You read my speeches on it and you will see it is so.

The honourable Member cannot say that I am attacking the unions. It must be understood that there are times when sectors of the country are not always going to act in the country's interest and you have to say so, whether it is the private sector, the public sector or any other sector, even politicians. Why does the Member not understand that? Does he believe that, because we are in Opposition, we are currying favour at any cost? We will come back to power on principle. We do not have to come back to power on currying favour at any cost. Let the Member understand that. And we are going to come back with genuine interest in the workers and not merely currying favour with them with words. That is the stand that we are going to take. The honourable Member knows it.

Asides

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Yes, we are ready all the time. Whenever you are ready, we are ready for you. That really is the position we are going to adopt. I am saying that we are not satisfied that those two unions — the two that I have named, the BUT and NUPW - were genuine in the manner — in which they have faced these negotiations and have carried on about it. The Barbados Workers Union has not varied its stance one way or the other, although it has two Members in the House who are Members of the Government.

(*Asides:* Three.)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member is a Minister, he has resigned from the post. He has moved to the national interest, more or less.

I have never seen them move from the position whether they are dealing with the BLP or the DLP. In fact, I look forward, when I am sitting right where the honourable Member is now, to negotiating with them.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am going to ask people in the gallery to restrain from cheering.

¹ Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I look forward to negotiating with them, and they can be assured that they will get the best of negotiations.

(*Aside:* Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Speaker asked you to restrain yourself.)

Mr. SPEAKER: No, I asked strangers in the Gallery to restrain themselves.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I want to deal with the month of April. I saw in the paper that the union said they had agreed — the NUPW, the BWU has not said anything — that they were going to be paid in April. Now, they are satisfied to wait a full year for their salaries - let us give it from May then, not even a full year, 11 months — but with us, although the negotiations were not concluded, they were not satisfied to wait for two months. I do not believe that that is the attitude that should be taken if they are to be taken seriously as negotiators and I am appealing to them that they must recognize in future that the country has the right to change a Government, but when they are dealing with a Government, they cannot deal with a Government from a political perspective. That applies whether we are talking about a union that has as its General Secretary a member of the BLP, or one that has as its President and General Secretary now members of the DLP. We must lay down those rules now to avoid the problems of the future. It is about time we lay them down.

We will always have the position where both political parties will have in them persons who are unionists or union leaders. There are members on the executive of the Barbados Workers Union who are members of the Barbados Labour Party. There was a time when the present General Secretary was a member of the Barbados Labour Party, like the Prime Minister. But I do not expect them to use their political association to frustrate their union leadership, anymore than I expect them to use their union leadership to frustrate the political running of the country. That is all we are asking from the Barbados Labour Party for the future. My position in this debate is to let us wipe the slate clean with that type of attitude, and let us assure that, in future, when we come to deal with these matters, we adopt the right, position and perspective. I want again to make it quite clear that the statements I have made do not apply other than the two unions that adopted that stance.

The Minister of Finance looks very happy and very satisfied. He must be happy enough this afternoon that he does not have to pay this bill in this financial year. I am quite sure that the Government's finances, which was a consideration in the negotiations, would probably not have afforded him to pay them this financial year. Maybe he may be able to pay from the \$77 million of Treasury

Bills that he is now seeking to float. I recognize that he cannot, because I know that this month the Government has only money to pay the current salaries and any allowances flowing therefrom. The Minister knows that he is not honouring any other bills, except in absolute emergencies. The Minister says he knows that. You only have to look at the Ways and Means.

So I do not want the Prime Minister to sit down making us believe that this April date is some freely negotiated date taking into account only the interest of the workers. It has had to take into account the exigencies of the Government's finances. Therefore, when Mr. St. John earlier set out the bases, he was doing no different at that stage than the Government has now found itself doing. You must recognise that, and I do not see for one moment what there is that we could have been faulted about in the way that we approached these negotiations. However, Sir, as I said, the negotiations have come to an end. 4.45 p.m.

* >

This is probably not the occasion to deal with the Public Service, because we start the Estimates next week, and we are going to have to look at the whole Public Service in a broader light and its role. I will perhaps do that next week when we start the debates. But I just want to say one thing, Sir, and I say it now in my role as a person who had to look down the line at the overall interest of Barbados. Regardless of what political plums the DLP may have garnered from these negotiations, regardless of what political losses the BLP may have suffered during the course of negotiations, I believe that any responsible Opposition and Government must also make it quite clear that, in the long run, the taxpayers of Barbados will require of each one of us who set our hands to public or any other tasks that we match the remuneration with productivity. I do not want to put it any higher.

I am fully aware that there are a lot of civil servants who are quite capable of excelling in their jobs. However, the country as a whole has to be conscious of its duty to produce more if we are to find more to pay for public and other sectoral increases in the future. It is not going to be possible for us to maintain an adequate level of growth in this economy. My estimate of the required level of growth to sustain the growing numbers of workers is in the region of between 5% and 7%, maybe higher, and that is not even reducing unemployment to the level lower than 12% on those figures that I have just given. We will probably need a higher percentage of growth if we are to bring unemployment down to the pre-1980 figures of 10%. We need that level of growth, and we need to sustain the level of growth systematically. Somebody will have to say it. If I had 24 Members on my

side, I would be more than saying it — I would be kicking it all over the country! We only have three, but we are not afraid to say it. We need that level of performance in the private sector as well, and despite all of the faith that we may express, sometimes we are not getting it.

It must be made clear, Sir, that Barbados has done quite well since emancipation, and I hope to listen to the lecture on Emancipation and the Depression. We have done quite well. Never mind that the other side, with its 24 Members, will try to paint the Barbados Labour Party as the worst thing that has happened, there has been a tremendous advance of the standard of living in this country ever since we started the first political party, almost 50 years ago, and although both political parties have from time to time slipped, the performance of Barbados under the leadership of the people has been more significant than at any time of its history.

Aside

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, the honourable Member is begging me to write an epitaph for the Prime Minister, but I have to remind him that the Prime Minister is not yet prepared to resign or die and let the honourable Member move to the chair. He must wait for me to praise the Prime Minister at the proper time. Do not urge me on.

Aside

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member must recognise that I am not one of those politicians who gets up and attack people needlessly, or do not give due when it should be given. Perhaps it is unusual for some people to talk in this manner in politics, it is probably dangerous, in the views of someone. In my view, this country has made progress under Governments of the people. It can only go on to do so, though, if all of the people recognise the constraints under which Barbados is existing and competing today. That constraint is not always recognised by some of us.

I hope, therefore, that with these negotiations, we will escape from some of the rigours of 1986. We are no longer the Government. They cannot blame us. The time for them to blame us for everything under the sun is running out. You have at least two sets of negotiations to face next time. You cannot be blaming us for them. I can promise you that we are not going to make political capital by trying to get anybody to see the negotiations only in a political light and not in the national interest. I believe that you would not be able to blame us after 1991 for anything that has gone wrong prior to 1991.

Aside

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I choose my words very carefully. I said that I believe after 1991 you would not be in a position to blame us for anything that has gone wrong between 1986 and 1991. They will not be blaming us for that, Sir, and as far as we are concerned, we just want to wish the Government well in negotiations in the future. We hope that they do not find themselves confronted in future negotiations with at least a union that does not understand its correct role in the bargaining process.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS (St. Michael South East): Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few observations arising out of what the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) said. He launched an attack on the NUPW, and it reminded me of a law in Physics which says, for every action, there is an equal and opposite reaction. If the honourable Member wants to take himself back to the days before May 28, 1986, he will remember that the expression made by the NUPW was not a unique expression. There was hostility throughout the country to the action expressed by the then political leaders of this country. The NUPW and the BUT, if you want to categorise those two, were therefore in climate and in tune with the total population of this country. 4.55 p.m.

Those of us who like the comic strips know that any time the scientist creates a monster, the monster turns around and destroys the scientist. I can understand his great concern, because it was the NUPW under the leadership, if you want to call it that, of the man who, I think it was a day or two after the 1976 election, when the civil servants thought that this man was really acting in their own interests, they found that two days after the election.....

Aside.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS:..... O'Brien Trotman, yes. That is who I am talking about.....the monster that they created in the NUPW realized that he was not really bargaining for them. If now, in 1986, the NUPW finds its own footing and decides that it is really going to go along with the feeling of the people of this country, one does not really have to wonder why it has happened.

I noticed that the honourable Member for Christ Church West talked about marches in 1986. He must be suffering from amnesia. Did he forget the marches of 1976? There were union marches in 1976. At that time he was a Member of Parliament. He did not castigate unions for putting pressure on Government in 1976 when they were marching. How all of a sudden now when unions were marching before the election in 1986, it is so anti-people to do it. The same unions that marched in 1976 marched against the Democratic Labour Party in 1976, and some of the members of the Barbados Labour

Party were seen with them marching. They condoned it. So how can it be so bad a thing?

He went on to talk about the fact that there were people in some salary scales who received no benefit because of the Income Tax concessions. But those were not the only benefits to be gained since the Democratic Labour Party took office in May last year. There has been a reduction in gas, a reduction in water rates, a reduction in electricity, and stamp duties went down. So although a man might not get more money in his pocket, he is paying less in his bills. The net effect is that he had more money to spend. And while we on this side for the last year have been saying that people in this country could benefit from better wages, they on that side, with the honourable Member for St. Peter (Mr. O. S. Arthur) as their spokesman, have been saying it could not happen. Indeed, in one of the first statements in this House when the new Budgetary Proposals were laid, they went so far as to say that by December last year this country would become bankrupt.

(*Aside:* Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Who 'said that?')

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: On the front page of your favourite newspaper, the country would become bankrupt!

Mr. Speaker, the people in this country have demonstrated that they have undaunted faith and confidence in the Democratic Labour Party. It is no mystery to understand why all the unions in this country would sit down in good faith and negotiate with a political party in whom they have got utmost confidence. There was some nonsense article in the paper last week about the fact that representatives from the NUPW and the BUT did not come to Parliament. They did not come to Parliament because they knew that when they sat down and negotiated with the Democratic Labour Party, they were negotiating in good faith with people of honour. There was therefore no need for them to come to Parliament to experience what they knew would happen as a result of course. To hear the Opposition lambaste them? So when people talk about trying to score political points, it is these articles written by the Henry Christophers, the Philip Georges, written, obviously, from the pen of people who pour forth the BLP philosophy. I do not hear them come in here and deny association with the garbage that they pour forth in the paper every day. Let them deny that they are part of that nonsense. People in Barbados are intelligent people, they read it and they understand who is on their side.

I want the honourable Member for Christ Church West to know that I can understand why he is hurt. But the feeling of the NUPW as they sit down and negotiate with the Democratic Labour Party, the political

directorates of the day, is the gut feeling of the people in Barbados — the feeling of confidence, the feeling of relaxation. The union delegates no longer go to negotiate with Government and feel afraid and trembling as they walk through the door to the bargaining table. Those days are gone.

The people of Barbados now feel confident and relaxed. Therefore, I can understand why the Honourable Member for Christ Church West is so upset, because in this particular mood, he can forecast that he, if he is lucky, will be sitting on that side for a long time, maybe with one or no more of them.

We in this political party will always take the masses in our confidence. We will always bargain and will always do what is best for the majority of people in this country. Our record since May 28, is one that cannot be matched in the history of this country and indeed, in the Caribbean. The concessions that we have made to the citizens of this country, under trying economic times, when others said it could not be done, we have done it.

I want the honourable Member for St. Peter to understand that we in Barbados are an intellectual people. It is one thing to be an economist and read the book and follow the book word for word, but it is another thing to be an economist who is innovative and see yourself as the pioneer, as the leader of the Third World. That is what the Democratic Labour Party is. We are the leaders of the Third World. Other countries will follow us as a model. That is what you are to understand.

(*Aside:* Are following!)

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Are following us as models! We do not see ourselves as people who read the third book and follow it. We have to be beyond that. So when you come with these economic principles, we understand those economic principles, but we are prepared to go beyond them. We in Barbados will make sure that other Third World countries follow our model. And our model will be called, "The Democratic Labour Party model under Errol Walton Barrow."

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot address the Prime Minister like that. He is the Right Honourable Prime Minister.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: I am sorry. The Right Honourable Errol Walton Barrow.

Mr. SPEAKER: You still cannot call his name. He is The Right Honourable Member for St. John. ^

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: The Right Honourable Member for St. John — I am sorry — and Prime Minister.

With those words I support the Resolution before this House.

I thank you.

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Speaker, I rise to give my full support to the measures brought by the Government and introduced by the Right Honourable Prime Minister earlier today. 5.05 p.m.

I should like to point out that the appropriate answer to the Leader of the Opposition is not that the unions in Barbados have favoured one political party or another. They have adhered to a principle. They sought given levels of disposable incomes, and the combination of the tax measures and the tax concessions, plus the increases which have been agreed to, happen to coincide with their objectives. Therefore, it was possible to embark on negotiations in an informed and sensible manner, with both sides respecting the goals of the national interest, and I am very happy that we are in a position to come to Parliament today, having achieved an agreement with the unions of this country. The Government should be congratulated for achieving that.

We wiped out all the bitterness. We wiped out all the hate. We have managed to make levels of disposable incomes available to the workers of this country. We hear all this nonsense about the unions supporting one party or another. That is not the point. They supported a principle, and the coincidence of the claims that they would accept and the disposable incomes granted by Government were such that this was the level arrived at.

Again, Sir, I think that it was totally misleading for the Leader of the Opposition, the honourable Member for Christ Church West, to say that persons below a certain level did not benefit from the July budgetary measures. I say that every single person in Barbados has derived some benefit. Those measures were so designed that those who were not paying Income Tax nevertheless, because of relief in other areas, would benefit. Apart from those measures, things like reduction in water rate, maintaining the rate of inflation at 2%, reductions in electricity, reductions in gasoline, a reduction in diesel — all of these things mean a substantial amount of money in the pockets of the people, and the people know that. They know that their disposable incomes were substantially increased either by a combination of direct tax relief or by those measures which we introduced. Indeed, those measures were carefully designed to bring equity to the tax system and to make sure that every single person in Barbados derives some benefit from it. That is why the support for this Administration has grown steadily since

May last year, because already they have begun to see the benefits of it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to one or two things relating to the Ministry of Finance in the speech of the Honourable Leader for the Opposition. I was really disappointed when one of your representatives in the Other Place could not distinguish between a rollover of a Treasury Bill and a new issue. When the honourable Member gets up in here and says that the Government is trying to raise seventy-something million dollars by Treasury Bills because they do not have money, I say it is a total untruth. I say that what we are seeing here is a rollover of Treasury Bills, and, therefore, there will be no net increase in terms of Government borrowing. In point of fact, if you look at the roll-overs of Treasury Bills at any given year, this year, last year, or the year before they may amount to \$300, \$400 or \$500 million in roll-overs, but the net increase may be \$10 million, or you can rollover \$500 million in Treasury Bills and end up with a net reduction in your borrowings. That is the point.

You are going to be very embarrassed in a short period of time in this House, when I choose the appropriate opportunity to announce to this country what is the position of the Government's Ways and Means now as compared with how I found it, what is the position in relation to funds available to Government that are not going to be used in this fiscal year, and various other areas. You are going to be very embarrassed! I can guarantee the people of Barbados that the overdraft, which was above the legal limit when I came into office, has been kept well within the laws of this country, and that will continue. I do not want to give a full breakdown of our fiscal position now. There will be plenty of time next week and plenty of time in the weeks to come, and there will be an appropriate answer.

Each time you look in the newspaper and see a Treasury Bill issue> it is important to distinguish between new issues and roll-overs. As a matter of fact, if we go for an issue of \$70 million in Treasury Bills next week and we only raised \$60 million, the Government has to find \$10 million to pay out. So it is complete nonsense and it is a tragedy that the Leader of the Opposition should have been making this kind of statement in the House. It is a wrong thing to do. But I tell you this, one of the best things that has happened as far as the Ministry of Finance is concerned is the constant propaganda that we do not have money. It has certainly done a lot to help us in our expenditure control, so keep it up.

These people proudly announced that Barbados will collapse by the end of the year. Up and down this country they went, between April and May, and after that, stating that the country will collapse by the end of the year 1986. What has happened to Barbados? Was there any collapse in Barbados in 1986? I do not need

to reveal the precise figures of growth, but I can say that there has been significant growth. My target for growth will be in the region of 3% per year. All I can say is that we have exceeded that target in the first year.

What is important, and what the honourable Member does not understand, for a variety of reasons, is that there is not necessarily a correlation between growth and employment generation. It depends on what constitutes that growth. This has been a factor that I have argued in this House again and again. If you look back, for example, to I think, 1984 or thereabouts, in one of the years in which the Government recorded some growth in the 1980s, in that particular year there was no significant increase in employment. In this particular year, the first time for a long time since the 1970s, you have had a coincidence of growth, job creation and a reduction in the rate of inflation. It has not happened in Barbados for a long time since the 1970s. That is a fact. There have been times in Barbados where we have had high growth with increased unemployment, we have had high growth and high rates of inflation, but in 1986 was the first time where you got that kind of coincidence of those three indices operating in that particular way. S.lSpjn.

The final point that I would like to make is that this Government is very heavily committed to a development and expansion of the capital markets in Barbados, and one of the things that I intend to do is that whenever there is a significant amount of money being paid out to public servants in Barbados, I am going to make the savings instruments available to them so they can choose and participate in the levels of public savings in Barbados, because what has happened is that, over the years, a few have been sophisticated enough to get hold of these instruments, which have proved very valuable in times of low interest rates. In all fairness to the past Administration, I believe that they tried the check off system whereby public servants can participate in instruments and so on. In all fairness, that was made available to the public servants, but it has not worked, and it has not developed to the extent that one hoped that it would materialise. With the growth of the capital markets in Barbados, I want to see all Barbadians at all levels in 1987 have an opportunity to participate in those developments if at all possible, if they wish to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that I have corrected the major errors made by the Leader of the Opposition. I would caution him to let the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) make statements of that nature.

Aside

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The honourable Member says he is not making any foolish statements about

Treasury Bills. But as Leader of the Opposition, either you understand what is going on or leave it to your spokesman on Finance.

Asides

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is what you said, there is no question about it. It was an error. You were prompted by the honourable Member to your left, who now makes it quite clear that you can talk foolishness but he is not going to talk the same foolishness. It was quite clear to me that that is what transpired.

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot refer to another honourable Member's statement as "foolishness."

Hon. Dr. R. C. HAYNES: My apologies, Mr. Speaker. I beg to withdraw it. To make the sort of statements which persons not over endowed with wisdom would be inclined to make, if I could put it that way.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, I am very pleased to support this measure. I am also very pleased with the levels of support and co-operation which the Public Service is giving to the new Administration as professional, as they seek to implement their new programme, travelling along a new path for a better and brighter future for the people of Barbados.

Thank you very*much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Speaker, I think that perhaps all of us have not grasped the importance of the exercise that we are pursuing this afternoon. I, for one, believe that Government deserves the full credit for its achievement in 1987 of reaching a negotiated settlement with the trade unions in Barbados, a settlement that comes after negotiations that were difficult and, in fact, unique in some ways.

Mr. Speaker, we need to recognise the peculiarities of the industrial relations system in Barbados. I would maintain anywhere that we have a very sophisticated system, one of the best in the world when it functions, and it functions best when the participants in the system are willing to operate within the various parameters that make the system as good as it is.

I heard some comments this afternoon which suggested that certain persons take positions at one time in industrial relations and then take a different position at another time, positions in terms of attitudes. I would suggest that while this is used as a criticism of those various persons, it can only be a criticism if one does not understand the nature of industrial relations, because industrial relations can go through a spectrum of different positions, depending on circumstances. Sometimes one can find oneself in a conflictual approach because of

certain circumstances, one might move to a position of containment if the circumstances change, and one can move to a position of co-operation depending on the circumstances. So I do not think it is fair to categorise a particular individual - for instance, the Right Honourable Prime Minister — if he took a particular position in 1976 which is different from the position he is taking now, because circumstances change and one has to react to these circumstances. The entire ball game, the whole parameters of the negotiations, would have changed.

In the same way, certainly one cannot castigate the National Union of Public Workers and the Barbados Union of Teachers because they took a particular position, which might be a position based on containment at a particular time, because it suited them and suited the interest of their members. I am not really defending anybody here, I am looking at a system that operates, and operates effectively, because it is flexible. It is a system that changes from time to time, and those who are expert in utilising the system are able to get the best out of the system.

It seems to me, Sir, that perhaps we have to recognise that we had become accustomed, for some time, to an industrial relations system that was being characterised by conflict and containment. It would appear to me that if one looks at the legal parameters of the system, there were attempts to change them dramatically in the period after 1976. One can talk of the Employment and Related Matters Bill of 1980 which sought to bring in modified essential services legislation to control industrial relations in this country. One can look at a draft White Paper on industrial relations which went along the same route. One can look at the Emergency Powers Bill, which included changes that would have given more teeth to an outmoded 1920s Better Security Act. And one can understand why within that period of time trade unions were becoming wary of the changes in the parameters of industrial relations in this country, why there was a certain fear, a certain tension in the industrial relations climate, and one has to see the negotiations in the public sector throughout that period within that particular framework of the changing parameters of industrial relations.

It is one thing to say as an individual, as the Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde), says, that he is in favour of trade unions, and he has respect for the trade unions. It is a different thing when the party to which he belongs has taken a consistent attitude against the trade union movement. These are facts. The Employment and Related Services Bill, the White Paper - you know about these things. These are not things that disappear in history, there are documents there to be studied and to be read. 5.25 p.m.

We are talking about a situation when, in negotiating with the late Prime Minister, the attitude was one of containment. His attitude was putting it to you as a trade union what the position should be. It was not a matter of 23 meetings, as happened in 1976, before there was a legislation of salaries. It was a matter of going and sitting down with the Establishments Division, but understanding that there were only the bringers of news from the Prime Minister, then the Prime Minister coming and sitting down twice with you and then going to Parliament to legislate salaries. Let us be very, very clear about this. These are facts we are talking about. We are talking about the human actors in the system, how they perceived themselves operating in this system and how it reacts on the persons with whom they have to deal with.

So do not let us give any impression that industrial relations between 1976 and 1986 was easy and simple. It operated against a strong background of conflict, a background of containment. One can understand, for instance, when the honourable Member for St. Michael East (Dr. D. G. Blackman) commented publicly in Barbados about the position of the Cabinet of the Barbados Labour Party in the case of the Telephone strike when he said that that was to be used to break the unions in this country. One can look at the question of recognition for the Barbados National Bank and one has to understand, as the honourable Member for St. Michael South East (Dr. E. A. Simmons) said, the law of Physics, that every action bring an equal reaction. If the Barbados Labour Party, over a simple matter of recognition of the NUPW and the Barbados National Bank, when the NUPW had most of those BNB members unionised, refused to give the people recognition for something like five years or more — they had organized the workers in the Barbados National Bank but could not get recognition from a Government institution, when Government should be setting the example in this country — what kind of attitude would one expect from that kind of union?

Furthermore, I would suggest that the Barbados Labour Party used circumstances like that to try to brow-beat unions into accepting things like legislation that would call for compulsory recognition based on the 50% + 1 formula, because they felt that if you forced those persons in this situation, they would go for that type of legislation and we would adopt a more legalistic approach to industrial relations in this country. What the NUPW did not know at that time, but they learnt afterwards, is that you do not have to change laws to get what you want done. Sometimes the simple formula is to change the Government. They learnt that. They understood what they had to do, and immediately after the Government was changed, they now have recognition at the National Bank. That is certainly significant for any trade union in this country, because basics are not easily unionised in places like the Caribbean, where there

are certain concepts of status among white collar workers — they do not want to get involved with trade unions. So this was a significant breakthrough for them.

I am not suggesting, because I cannot speak for the NUPW, that they were motivated by elements of revenge. I do not think that that would be a fair assessment of how they behaved in these negotiations. But I am suggesting that one has to understand that the game is one which depends on the integrity and the attitudes of all of the players in the game, and I believe that the NUPW could not have been satisfied with that kind of treatment. I believe that that might have been one of the factors why they took a particular position. You have to understand that human beings would react according to the interests that suit them most.

I could not understand what could have been Government's interest in this matter not to grant recognition to a *bona fide* trade union, one which I do not think we can say is an irresponsible trade union. I am not in a position to say that the NUPW acts irresponsibly. I am not in a position to say that about unions in Barbados, except for the friendly ones like BIGWU, which might stir up every ten years or so, or every ten years might come into being. And again, some Governments in power might try to use that kind of flurry to try to bring in legislation to try to control all the other trade unions in this country. But, generally speaking, I think that the history of industrial relations in Barbados is a good history, one that we can all be proud of.

I think one has to recognize, however, as part of this discussion, that there are certain peculiarities in public sector negotiations in Barbados. I do not think that these come from the fact that you have a variety of unions negotiating for the same group of persons. This does have its problems, but I think one of the problems in public sector negotiations stems from the fact that the machinery for conciliation is not as complete as the machinery for conciliation in the private sector, where there are various stops along the line where one can seek to mitigate conflict. I think that in the public sector, this machinery is, perhaps, incomplete, and that is why very often political persons have to come in in order to bring some conclusion to disputes and also to collective bargaining in the public sector. Perhaps, we need to look at that machinery. We need to assess it and to see how best we can improve it so that the system works efficiently. I think that is really what we are talking about. We should not be blaming any particular trade union when there are problems that develop from time to time. I think we need to look at the system as it exists.

We got a lot of praise — when I say "we", I am talking here in terms of the Barbados Workers Union — from the honourable Member for Christ Church

West. We thank him very much for this praise, this, as he said, is maturity in the Barbados Workers Union.

I have always taken it that the Barbados Workers Union is a very militant trade union, and we define militancy very simply. We try to get the best possible for our members, taking all matters into consideration. That is what we consider to be a militant trade union, not going out there fighting, tilting like Don Quixote, at imaginary windmills. We try to assess the situation.

This does not mean, however, that we do not recognize when we have to flex our muscles. As he said, there were circumstances when we did not agree with Government. We did not at the same time go out on any kind of strike and so on, because we did not believe that we could best represent our members through that kind of action. But the impression must not be given that because we sent in proposals that were lower than those the other unions submitted, and because we reached a settlement earlier, this means that we did not represent our membership to the fullest. I want to be very clear, because there can be an impression.

I read an editorial in today's *Advocate*, I think it is. It is one of these difficult editorials, when some sort of diplomat wants to hide behind a cover of verbiage, words not saying anything much. But you are sure about one thing, that the writer is not really trying to give an objective assessment of a situation, so ten people will read that editorial and ten persons will come away with different interpretations of what was said. That is the artistry, the sophistry of some politicians who get an opportunity to write an editorial from time to time.

I want to make it very clear that when we submitted our proposals, and then when we modified our proposals, this was done against a background of analysing the cost of the proposals as against the concessions that the workers had been able to receive through the various budgetary measures, and also because we realize that to come from 25% eventually to 10%, one could start at 8%, 18% sometimes, instead of starting way off at an impossible figure. You get a negotiation that is more efficient, I would say, and once you have reached agreement, it is easier to service that agreement, because it is an agreement that was given thought of out front and not from behind. So I would like to state very strongly that we did not hang out at the end of the negotiation for one point more, or two more points, and things like that, because we recognize that collective bargaining is an ongoing process, and what you do not ask for at the end of this two years, you can ask for at the end of the next two years. 5.35 p.m.

One has to understand that at some time there has to be closure, you have to stop at some time, and one has

to decide when it is reasonable to stop. That is extremely important. There are some speakers who start, to speak and do not know when to end — they wind up about five times. There are some people who do not know how to stop at all. In negotiations, it is the same thing. You have to reach a point where you have to say, 'This is the end of the negotiations, we cannot keep going on.' Perhaps, that may be a problem with some trade unions.

I think we recognised that we had reached a point where it was in the best interest of all to settle, and we did that. Good faith bargaining! It was not a matter of trying to score any points against any other trade union, because we understand the difficulty when you are negotiating with a background of three or four trade unions if you go out front and settle, and that is based on principle. If you have responsible trade unions, then they will try to jockey and say, 'We got a little more than you, we are better,' and try sometimes to steal your membership.

I maintain that we have a better system here in Barbados than obtains in Trinidad, Jamaica or Guyana, where you have multiple unionism and you have that jockeying. Governments have therefore been forced to bring in Industrial Relations Acts and Industrial Stabilisation Acts. I think sometimes we do not appreciate the system that we have in Barbados. During the period of the Barbados Labour Party Administration, there was a lot of rhetoric attempting to control the trade union movement, the trade union movement was getting too strong. It was not coming from individuals necessarily within the Barbados Labour Party, but it was a projection coming from the Governor of the Central Bank sometimes, coming from the late Prime Minister, not particularly perhaps from the persons here, but it came from various areas all emanating from the Barbados Labour Party, and their acolytes would take it up, because they knew it would have been popular to carry that song, that unions were becoming too popular and they needed to be controlled.

This brings me to my final point, Sir, the question of the locus of power, the locus of decision making. I heard the honourable Member for Christ Church West hammering the point all the time about if he was sitting down in that chair and the kind of decisions he would make. The person in the chair now respects his position. If you are serving notice on the members of your party, that is quite all right. You can use this forum to do that. You are not giving up that position, fine. It is possible that you might not get there, we have no control over the laws of nature, but you may have to wait a very long time to get there. It is entirely possible to get there, but you may have to wait a very long time.

I think the way how our parties think is significant. The person who is in that chair thinks that he is not in

power. You cannot use the word. He does not talk about the locus of power anywhere. He usually says that he has been taken over the reins of Government or something like that, euphemism because of how he interprets the responsibility that has been put in his hands by the electorate of this country, because he recognises that the locus of power is not in here or in a seat, but is out there in terms of what the masses of this country want.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I do not think I got that very clearly. To me it was coming through very strongly that when you sat there, that is where the power was, and that you had all authority to decide what was in the national interest. That was my interpretation and my understanding. I might be wrong, but that is what I read you to have been saying.

I think that one has to understand that the locus of power is diffused in democracies like ours, is diffused in institutions like trade unions, employers' confederations, on the boards of some of the businesses which you represent and which you sit on and in the churches. Power is diffused throughout that country, and I think that the mistake that the Barbados Labour Party made between 1976 and 1986 is that they felt that they could retract that power from where it had been diffused and bring it to a central point, and it seems to me, Sir, that the Leader of the Opposition is continuing to make that mistake. I do not profess to be a prophet, but I think he is going to lose if he continues to maintain that position, and therefore I might encourage him to continue to maintain that position.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order: I would not like the honourable Member to sit down misrepresenting my speech. The honourable Member is a very good debater, very skillful. I made it absolutely clear, and the honourable Member must know this — if he does not understand it, he should try to get it clear — that ultimately, in a Constitution such as ours, finally the power resides in Parliament as guided by its Executive. That is all I said.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: We all understood the Leader of the Opposition in that sense. We took the constitutional point. I think that did not go past the understanding of anybody in here, but I wanted to go beyond that, and I will maintain that power goes beyond the Constitution. Power resides in persons, groups and institutions, and perhaps a legalistic look at power would maintain the position that the Leader of the Opposition continues to maintain, but he has to bring a humanistic interpretation to the law. You have to understand that real and practical politics do not reside within a Constitution, basically, because people made that Constitution and they

change it, and if the Constitution becomes too rigid and inflexible, then a kind of very sharp change will come about.

I would like to assert again, Mr. Speaker, that I think perhaps that this is a very important moment that we are all experiencing here after ten years. Negotiations in the public sector have reached a position where a collective agreement was reached through peaceful means with all the trade unions and the Government, and I would like, as others have done, to congratulate the public servants who were involved in this exercise. One is now no longer in the Service — he has retired — and another one has just started really his future in that position as a negotiator for the Government. I think we need to congratulate them and to congratulate all the actors in this particular exercise, and to appreciate the kind of patience that has been exhibited so far. I think this patience is only a demonstration of the goodwill that the masses of persons, the 17 000 or more public servants and their dependents, have in the country. They are quite more willing to give the Government the opportunity to prove its ability and its intentions than perhaps the Opposition and the Press are at this time.

I think that the Opposition is a bit forward. The Opposition is looking already to 1991. They have not even got out completely of the year after 1986 and they are looking towards 1991. I do not know what the anxiety is. I do not know what they have missed so much in the last ten years that they want to get back to it so quickly. I would like to encourage them to be patient. Our system has been built up through years of patience and hardwork, and an appreciation of good things when people can experience them.

I have great pleasure in supporting this Resolution.

Thank you.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR (St. Peter): Mr. Speaker, this debate raises a number of issues, among them being the responsible role of unions and the role of responsible unions. It raises the question as to the distribution of income and the steps that the Government should take, and that Government takes, in effecting the distribution of income. There is even, Sir, a public finance aspect to it, the capacity of a small country, during difficult economic times, to add substantially, ever so intermittently, to the public purse, knowing that in so doing it will be setting a pattern that could affect the wage structure across the length and breadth of the economy, and affect the competitive position of Barbados in relation to its exports to the rest of the world. I want, Sir, to tread on those three issues, talking first about the role of trade unions and the role of responsible trade unions. 5.45 p.m.

We cannot at all, Mr. Speaker, shy away from the fact that this matter that confronts us today is a political issue, if only because certain unions have made it a political issue both prior to May 28, 1986, Mr. Speaker, and, equally so, after May 28, 1986. We must recall that based upon the numbers presented to us by the Right Honourable Prime Minister the honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow), tremendous political battle was, waged by the unions to reach a settlement that would have cost the public of Barbados \$50 million, by the Prime Minister's estimates. And to reach a degree of increase in wages ranging between 15% at the top and 25% at the bottom, which were markedly in excess of the cumulative rate of inflation of 8%, as cited by the Prime Minister, and despite the fact that negotiations had only reached a preliminary stage, demands of this sort of magnitude, which clearly cannot be in the public interest, caused a situation to emerge in this country where long marches were taken and a Government of the day was brought under pressure.

I say, Sir, that this matter is a political matter, and it has remained in the realm of politics, because we must also remind ourselves that subsequent to May 28, 1986, the NUPW, as far as I can recall, kept hammering home the point that the level of wages being proposed by Government were of an order that was totally unsatisfactory. The NUPW also kept hammering home the point, I must remind the House, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of the day, the DLP Government, was not acting in good faith, that there was a reluctance on the part of the Prime Minister's Office and Establishments to meet with the unions, and the NUPW also adopted a quasi-political stance in implying that there seemed, from their vantage point, to be a lack of good faith on the part of the DLP Government to reach a satisfactory settlement on this particular issue.

»

Mr. Speaker, if the NUPW has brought this matter into the realm of politics, then they stand to be dealt with by reference to the political postures that they have adopted. And having regard to the stridency of the NUPW both before May 28 and after May 28, this Resolution brings to an end a very rancid and a very sordid chapter in the history of that union. You could never believe, Mr. Speaker, from the words of the NUPW even after May 28, 1986, that that union was of a mind or disposed in this country to reach a settlement with the Government in the order that we are being called upon this evening to agree to. We on this side can only react to the NUPW by reference to what the NUPW says, and if the NUPW says that it will not accept 9% from the Government because the acceptance of 9% does not address the problems of the workers at the bottom, Sir, then what are we on this side to judge when that same union, which was giving the public appearance of being stridently on behalf of the workers of this country, comes and meekly acquiesces in

a settlement of the kind that we are being called upon this evening to address.

I make no apology this evening for saying that the attitude and the manner in which the NUPW had gone about their negotiations before May 28 and after May 28, leave a lot to be desired. I say that, Sir, very conscious of the fact that there was even a decision in force upon the negotiators of the NUPW requiring the NUPW not to accept an increase less than 15% at the bottom, and that that decision could not have been breached by the negotiating team unless the matter was referred to the general body of the NUPW for further ratification. For those of us who are timid about attacking the NUPW, I want to ask the NUPW, from this forum, have you in point of fact carried back these particular settlements that have been arrived at to the general body, as required by the democratic processes of that particular body?

Mr. Speaker, I said that, from a political point of view, we are this evening seeing an end to a very rancid chapter in the history of this country. I would like to believe that in the future of this country, no matter whether it is an election year or not an election year, parties to negotiation, irrespective of whether they are the BLP Government or the DLP Government, could perceive the national interest and act in a manner that would suggest that they do not feel that a Government should use the public purse so merely as to buy an election. That is what is particularly rancid about this whole issue, because there is a view abroad in Barbados that the Barbados Labour Party should have settled with the NUPW, merely because we were in an election year, for 25% at the bottom and 15% at the top, totally disregarding the capacity of the country to pay. I believe that the time has come when we must take that kind of attitude out of the political life of this country once and for all.

But the issue still remains, Mr. Speaker, because the NUPW, in my view, has a point, that any actions which are designed to affect income in this country, have not only to be discussed in relation to Government's capacity to pay, but they think, Sir, they also have to be discussed with reference to the manner in which such changes in wages would affect the distribution of income in this country. And for the first time in our history wage settlements are being discussed not only by reference to rate of inflation or the growth of the economy, but also with reference to the manner in which a set of tax proposals and other non-tax benefits have affected, or can affect, the level of disposable incomes in the country. I want to say that that is the appropriate framework within which we should see this debate, because, at the end of the day, having regard to the size of the wage settlements, having regard to the scope of the tax changes and having regard to the range and the scope of the

non-tax benefits which now form part of our total thinking, it obviously has to be true that the distribution of income in this country is being changed for the worse where the lowest paid workers in this country are concerned. The Governor of the Central Bank perhaps stated it best when he said that he had his largest ever wage increase through the tax proposals. And there have been studies done at the University of the West Indies which would indicate that, on average, persons at the top will benefit by as much as a 20% increase from the tax proposals alone. 5.55 p.m.

The other side wants us to believe that we should bring the non-tax benefits into account. But I want also to say to them that when we bring the non-tax benefits into account, it must be clear that those non-tax benefits will redound more to the advantage of the people at the top than the people at the bottom. I challenge anybody on the other side to tell me that a maid in the Public Service will benefit at all, or benefit in any relative sense, as compared to a Permanent Secretary, by the reduction of gasoline prices. I challenge anybody on the other side to prove that a drop in gasoline prices will affect the maids and the general workers at the bottom in the same way that it will affect the people at the top. And I am saying that when we add the cumulative non-tax benefits to the tax changes, the net result must be that the people at the bottom, in a relative sense, have come out with the short end of the stick where this particular round of negotiation is concerned. If we are to subscribe to that as a new tenet of public policy in Barbados, that Government must by design put in place measures, or agree to settlements, which worsen the distribution of income in this country — thy way, not mine.

I ask the House, Sir, to compare and contrast the effects of this present wage settlement with those which have gone on since 1978, because the comparison is instructive. In 1978, it was 20% at the bottom and 10% at the top. In 1980, when the unions were asking for 50% at the bottom, and 39% at the top, the Barbados Labour Party Government had to legislate 38.3% at the bottom and 22% at the top. In a sense, Sir, we have now to weigh carefully the question as to whether the poor people of this country are better off when a Government legislates 37% at the bottom and 22% at the top, or whether they are made better off by a Government not having to legislate 9% at the bottom and 20-odd% at the top. That is the real issue that this debate raises this evening.

A lot, Mr. Speaker, has been made in this ChamKi, about the importance of Government either legislating or not appearing to legislate. I want to say to the House, Sir, that is an exercise in sophistry. What matters where people are concerned is real disposable income, and what

matters where the social cohesiveness of this country is concerned is the difference between the settlement for those at the top and the settlement for those at the bottom, rather than whether it is legislated or not legislated. I can only say that against the background of what has gone before, the large mass of workers in Barbados who fall within the lowest category of income earners in this country has derived no special advantage from the fact that the Government and the unions have reached an agreement to grant them 9% rather than to have to bring it to the House and force the House to decide it. There is no special advantage whatsoever. The reality is still that the gap between the top and the bottom has been widened — not by legislation, but by negotiation — and that stands as a matter of public record.

Mr. Speaker, I said that this debate raises questions about the public revenue and Government's capacity to pay, and the role of the unions in facing these particular realities. It is a pity that the Minister of Finance spoke after the honourable Member for St. Michael South East (Dr. E. A. Simmons) since he obviously appears to have caught what the honourable Member for St. Michael South East suffers from — a very extreme case of mouth disease. The Minister of Finance made one or two rather sweeping comments about the present state of Government's finances, but he knows that there is a very precise reason why the Government would prefer to have this particular wage settlement reflected in the financial year 1987-88 rather than the financial year 1986-87. He knows that even in advance of the payment of the wage increase, as set out in the Estimates of Expenditure which have been laid in the House today, the projected deficit on Current Account, net of the wage increase, is now projected at \$35 million.

Asides

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Hold on, hold on.

(*Aside:* Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Show them!)

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I said the cost of the proposals, not the Current Account deficit.

Mr. Speaker, let the records of the House show that such Estimates as I provided last year and the former Prime Minister provided last year, were estimates in relation to the cost of the tax proposals, and that the former Prime Minister of this House made a statement on the floor of the House indicating that the cost of the tax proposals in a full financial year would amount to \$109 million. If the Prime Minister cannot distinguish between the cost of the tax proposals and a Current Account deficit, Sir, I can only say that the financial distress in the Democratic Labour Party is greater than one imagines.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir: The record cannot show anything different from what the honourable Member said. Even if the honourable Member has said that was going to be the cost, the deficit would have to be more than the \$109 million, because it was a deficit already. I said that the deficit would be \$35 million. He said, no, that it was going to be \$109 million, and the following week, he went back and said that the officials corroborated what he had said. How can the honourable Member now ask us to change the records of the House and say let the records show this? He has seen too many movies!

Laughter

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, on one occasion, Honourable Mr. Sheridan in the British Parliament said of Lord Dondos, "the honourable Member is indebted to his memory for his jokes, and to his imagination for his facts." I think, Sir, that the same applies to the honourable Member for St. John. The fact of the matter, and the records of the House will show it, is that the former Prime Minister of this country made a Ministerial Statement setting out the cost of the tax proposals at \$109 million, and that the Right Honourable Member for St. John himself said on the floor of the House that the cost of the tax proposals, and I remember very correctly in net terms, would be \$35 million, and that is a matter of public record, and that he and a team had studied it for seven and a half months. We did not get into a discussion on Current Account deficit, Sir, we were speaking about the cost of the proposals. That is a matter of public record, and I stand on my point, Sir, that he is indebted, as usual, to his imagination for his facts.

(*Aside:* Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Man, go and read the record!)

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: You must go and read it!

(*Aside:* Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: There was a deficit already. So if the cost is \$35 million and now the deficit is \$35 million, I was more than right.)

Mr. SPEAKER: You must not listen to asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: The honourable Member must know, Sir, that last year there was no projected Current Account deficit. Last year there was a projected current Account surplus, if I can recall of about \$4 million.

But I will not be distracted by the Right Honourable Member for St. John. The point I want to make.....

(*Aside:* Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Is no point at all!)

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Man, I have dealt with you already. 6.05 p.m.

The point that I want to make is that it would be really embarrassing for the Government to have to come and report a Current Account deficit in the order of over \$50 million in this financial year, that the Current Account deficit not taking into account the wage increases are now set at \$31.6 million, and that is on the basis of assumptions which we will get into next week in the Estimates debate. It is based on assumptions that you can keep expenditure in March down to a heroic level of \$54 million, when everybody else in Government knows that it is in March that the Government has to settle most of its accounts, and we are beginning to wonder whether the Government is in a position to settle its accounts that are outstanding. The reason is that the Government right now is in no position to pay, because, even before the wage increases, it is carrying a Current Account deficit that is the highest in the history of this country.

Aside

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Thirty-one million dollars.

Aside

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: You have not read your documents. Look at Memorandum on the Estimates. Do not look at the back page, look at the front.

I thought, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Finance and Planning may have been serving a warning in relation to things to come. He spoke very broadly about his wanting, when the wage increases are paid, to encourage Barbadians to utilise certain savings instruments. I must ask the Minister of Finance if he has anything specific in mind, and, without trying to create a controversy, I must ask the Minister of Finance if there is going to be any tying in of the wage increases and the back pay settlement with the creation of any special financial instruments.

The last time that back pay issue came up in this House, there was a lot of mis-representation ensuing therefrom. It came up in the House under the guise of a Schedule to a Resolution which said that the advances made to public servants in December of last year, if not fully repaid by March, or if there was a wage settlement by March, workers in the country who had got the benefit of the advances from Government in December would have had to allow monies to be drawn from their back pay to settle the outstanding balances in full with the Government. I took great objection to the Government pre-empting the manner in which people should utilise wage settlements to which they were entitled. I

also recall that the honourable Member for St. Michael Central (Mr. C. L. Trotman), indicated that it would be contrary to the Wages Act, and that I was accused, because I took objection to the Government tying the advances to back pay, of fighting a fight against the Government lending money to people. The Minister has broadly spoken in terms of certain savings instruments being created, and I am really asking the Government if there is going to be the creation of any special instruments, like bonds, which would enable the Government to shield itself from the full effects of the wage increases when they fall due in financial year 1987.

Next week, Mr. Speaker, I will have a more than ample opportunity to talk about the full financial implications of the tax increases, but I really must say that when the Minister of Finance makes statements that he will next week show that the Ways and Means in March are less than the Ways and Means in May or September, he is showing the same kind of amateurism as he displayed when he, for example, indicated that the level of employment between January and March would be higher than it was between September and December.

There are seasonal trends in these things, and the Minister of Finance must know, if he were to analyse every seasonal pattern, that just as you have the hi&iicst level of employment between January and March when tourism is at its peak and the sugar crop has started, similarly so March is the best revenue month for Government, and it is the month in which, therefore, Government is in a position to bring down its overdraft with the Central Bank. So if you think that you are performing a major feat in proving to the House that the Ways and Means have been brought down in March to a level below which it was in May, you are only going to be reporting a seasonal pattern which has been as much a part and parcel of the Barbadian economy as has been the increase in employment from January to March as compared to September to December.

Mr. Speaker, one outstanding point at issue concerning this whole settlement rancours. It is the unresolved point at issue which raises the question as to whether we are going to be now involved in this country in the creation of a wage structure whether by legislation or by friendly negotiations between Governments and unions so disposed, lends itself to the worsening of the distribution of income in this country. It is the most serious issue that this debate raises. And the Government side can speak all it wants to speak about the anti-worker attitude of the Barbados Labour Party, you can create as much propaganda as you want to create about rumours and threats by members of the Barbados Labour Party to destroy the union movement in this country - our record where settlements with the workers of this country are concerned, regardless of whether it is by legislation or

by negotiation, is a record which says that it is a responsibility of a State, in a society which starts a skewed distribution of income, to do nothing that will worsen the lot of those at the bottom as compared with those at the top.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful, as I said, that we will be entering a new era where the public interest can be put in the forefront of all of our considerations, particularly where the most sensitive issue of income formation is concerned. We have to recognise that we are a small country, and that our capacity to maintain and to improve our standard of living, to protect jobs and to expand employment, has a lot to do with the rate at which we pay ourselves as compared to the rate at which persons with whom we compete pay themselves. We have to recognise that operating under a fixed exchange rate regime — and the honourable Member for St. Michael South East whose knowledge of Economics is nothing, of course, to cite as a reference — it is a truth that we reduce our own competitiveness when we pay ourselves massive increases that are far in excess of those paid by employees in other countries with which we have to compete. It is one of the ways in which we can undermine our competitiveness, and the public interest of Barbados requires us at this juncture to be as concerned with protecting jobs and expanding employment in this country as with any other consideration. I believe that on the question of employment generation in this country, our capacity to hold the jobs that we have now and our capacity to create new jobs for the new entrants to the labour force, together with the backlog of unemployed, we are coming more and more to a national consensus, I am pleased to say that our capacity to do those things, while it may depend in part on an occasional crash programme of beautification or afforestation and so on, depends upon our competitiveness in the external environment. 6.15 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: One minute more.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I have said all that to say this that I hope that the public interest will mandate all parties concerned in the future that when they get involved in wage negotiations, they must remember that our main priority problem in Barbados is increased employment, that we cannot expand job creation unless we are competitive, and that that also must be a consideration which informs all parties to the negotiating process in the future.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN (St. Michael Central): I wish, Mr. Speaker, at the very outset to take very strong exception to certain remarks made by the honourable Member for St. Peter (Mr. O. S. Arthur). He has said that, in negotiations, Governments and trade unions must not

enter into friendly negotiations in an effort to arrive at settlements.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The honourable Member is trying to mislead the House. I have never said anything of the kind. The records will show that I never said that Government and trade unions should not enter into friendly negotiations. The honourable Member knows that I did not say that and he should not try to make that a record of the House.

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have not misunderstood. I do not withdraw the comments. I take strong exception to anybody casting calumny on my professionalism, and the honourable Member for St. Peter has suggested that trade unions negotiators enter into sweetheart contracts with employers, and whether that employer is the Government, the Barbados Shipping and Trading, or anybody else I take exception to the comments of the honourable Member for St. Peter. Let us get ourselves straight, Sir.

When we have been accused of being a very mature trade union, I do not see how in the same breath it can be suggested that we are involved in negotiating in sweetheart contracts. I would rather go with the fairer comment of the Leader of the Opposition, who recognises that, whatever the Government, negotiators in Barbados and particularly in the Barbados Workers Union, have always acted professionally. If he wishes to maintain the great respect that we have for him sometimes, then he has to recognize that persons who go to negotiate contracts put their integrity on the line every time they do so, and they are no less professional than the lawyer who goes before the courts and appears to the eyes of some uninitiated people to have won a case by unprofessional means.

I wish secondly, Sir, to make reference to the comment from the honourable Member regarding the levels of settlement where he would wish this Honourable House to draw comparisons between a 38% increase — and it is a 38.3% increase, he said 37% — in 1980 versus a 9% in 1986. I do not want particularly to be too concerned about how much 38% represented in actual dollars. That is not the point. The point I wish to make is that when we are speaking at a level like this, I would think that as the persons entrusted by the people of Barbados to do their business, we have to do so with a certain degree of recognition for accuracy and for conveying the right impression.

There is no point. Sir, making reference to 38% unless we say 38% of what. There is no point making reference to 38% unless we indicate what 38% was given and in what circumstances. That is to say, 38% only makes sense as a good or a bad increase if we know what the

cost of living was for that said period, and anybody who gets in this House or goes anywhere else and talks about an increase of 38% without making a reference to the cost of living during the period under review is not giving a full story. If the person is a professional, and an economist, well, then he has to know so. Of course, we would not making any reference to any motives.

Asides

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: The cost of living was well in excess of 38%. When we reviewed that two year period it was well in excess of 38%. You see, the thing about us, Sir, is that we negotiate in our circumstances in Barbados historically, and we always endeavour when we are negotiating, first of all to recapture the loss in purchasing power of the worker, and when the worker perceives that the increase that he has got at least matches up to the cost of living erosion, then he is likely to find himself satisfied with that offer. At the point where he believes that what he has been offered is less than the erosion of his purchasing power, then he has problems. That is why we had problems in 1976, that is why we had problems in 1980, that is why we had problems in 1982, and that is why there were difficulties in 1984. There was the perception that the increases offered did not match the levels of the erosion of the cost of living.

The honourable Member also said that the gap between those at the top of the ladder and those at the bottom has been widened by negotiations. That is not a fair account of what has transpired, and I would like, during my main presentation, to show why that is not so, and to show why it is clear, and it should be clear to all and sundry, that that is not so.

The fact of the matter is that there were certain tax concessions which were given to the workers of our country, and there were also negotiations. But as I will again point to later on, the negotiations were not conducted with the Democratic Labour Party as the Government - they were conducted spanning two Administrations. The same tenets and the same ideas which influenced the unions, and I say the unions, at the beginning of negotiations when the Barbados Labour Party formed the Government were the same ideas that informed the judgment of the trade unions, at least the Barbados Workers Unions, for which I can speak, when the Democratic Labour Party became the Government, and I make bold to say, Sir, that only to speak of the tax concessions without recognising that a very important ingredient in any negotiations has to do with comparable settlements is to mislead this Honourable House. Anybody who has looked and tried to understand the nature of settlements in 1986 will have to concede that, with very few exceptions, there was a period, as my colleague from Christ Church East Central (Mr. R. L.

Morris), has said, of containment in the levels of settlements that we arrived at. As a matter of fact, in some instances, contracts moved from being two year contracts to three year contracts, and the level of settlements covering the three year period for comparable workers was at some times only a mere 10%. 6.25 p.m.

No trade union is going to accept the least amount of money that it can get. It will try for more whenever to get more is possible. I merely make the point to observe that it was not a negotiated position to extend the gaps between the top and the bottom, and therefore it is not fair to suggest that the labour movement has been involved in any distribution exercise of the nature mentioned by the honourable Member for St. Peter. As a matter of fact, the very opposite is true, that when the Democratic Labour Party has formed the Government, and when the Government of the day has listened to the Barbados Workers Union, the increases for public servants have been graduated moving from a higher percentage at the lower level to a lower percentage at the higher level.

Compare and contrast that, Mr. Speaker, with 1982 and with 1984. I will venture to say that because of the discussions we had with Prime Minister St. John, a change was brought about, but the same position was going to be adopted in 1986 that there was going to be an-across-the-board increase for all public servants. And the Barbados Workers Union made the point in March 1986 that if the Prime Minister was talking about having the trade unions recognise the difficulties of the economy of Barbados at the time, and if the Prime Minister was hoping that the Barbados Workers Union would join him in a position of constraint, one of the first things he had to do was to recognise that the people at the top could most accept the position of holding strain, as my colleague is supplying the language for me, and that if he was going to come with any increases at that time, they had to be graduated. But look at 1984, Sir, a 12y2% across-the-board, the Prime Minister 12/2%, the maid 12/i% Do you want anything more abysmal than that position?

Aside

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: I do not wish to say wickedness, Mr. Speaker. I do not use language like that on a Tuesday. It was a situation abysmal in the view and perceptions of the working class people of this country. When would they ever catch up when at the level of the Prime Minister the same 12Vi% was given that was given to the maid, and sometimes a part time maid.

In 1982, Mr. Speaker, there was a \$108 across-the-board for everybody. I apologise, Mr. Speaker! That was not for everybody, that was an interim measure until

special legislation was gone into for some other special creatures who did not get \$108, because, as you know, Sir, Parliamentarians of the day, especially at the ministerial level, were able to get more than that \$108.

The point I want to make is that we have to be careful about this suggestion that the trade union has been involved in an exercise which has led either to sweetheart contracting, or to widening the gap through negotiating, or to moving to across-the-board increases. There may very well be trade unions that prefer across-the-board increases, but the Barbados Workers Union is not interested in that kind of negotiation of any settlements.

I believe, Sir, that the Government of the day should be congratulated for negotiating a settlement. I think that the negotiating of a settlement is important, because it has something to do with the industrial relations climate of our country, it has something to do with the integrity of the collective bargaining process and it has something to do with the morale of the workers of our country.

The industrial relations climate needs to be recognised as one that has been good over the years. Whether we have had a Barbados Labour Party Government or a Democratic Labour Party Government, or in spite of the Governments, we have still been able to have a good industrial relations climate. If we understand that it is the relationship between the employer and worker that will be able to address the question of worker productivity, will be able to address the question of attendance at work, punctuality at work, of the general relationship governing the work place, then I think we need to recognise the importance of maintaining a decent industrial relations climate. That climate cannot be sustained, Mr. Speaker, by the frequent imposition of levels of increases. It has rather to do with having the kind of machinery and using the kind of machinery that eventually will satisfy both sides that, the considerations having been exhausted, both the employer and the worker have been able to find a solution to the problem before them.

We are concerned as well, Sir, for the future of collective bargaining, because it is that exercise by which the workers and the workers' organisations are able to involve themselves in a meaningful way in the democratic process of our country. When at the highest practising level of democracy for the worker of a country, he finds himself being denied the very tenets of democracy that he adheres to, when he votes he is likely to find himself in a situation where he becomes frustrated and he takes out his frustration in one way or another, I am assured that the future of collective bargaining can, in fact be, made secure by the exercise which we are completing this afternoon.

Of course, there is a matter for the morale of the worker and morale and psyche of our labour force as

a whole. It is very important that it is recognised that a person has to have confidence, that the employer recognises that he is a person first, equal with any other person, and then a worker afterwards. The morale of "•* workers in Barbados, in my view, Mr. Speaker, has again been upheld as a result of our moving to this exercise this afternoon.

I think, Sir, that the nature of our 1986 negotiations would need to be touched on. The 1986 negotiations were difficult, although not as difficult as one might perceive for mature trade unionists. I wish, in modesty, to make that point, that mature practising trade unionists might not have found it very difficult, or as difficult as others, because we have already been concerned with, and we have been made aware of, the concepts of concessionary bargaining. But it is quite possible that casual negotiators, part time negotiators, or from-time-to-time negotiators might have found a certain difficulty in approaching the 1986 negotiations, because it broke new ground for a number of people. It would also have posed difficulties, Mr. Speaker, if there were any, for any ego trippers who were involved in the negotiations exercise. One cannot be involved in ego tripping in such a sensitive exercise as national negotiations in 1986 or in any other year. 6.35 p.m.

I think it is necessary, Mr. Speaker, for us to make that point especially in the light of certain malicious comments which were made from time to time regarding the position of the Barbados Workers Union in the 1986 negotiations. Some of those comments were made by certain supporters of the Barbados Labour Party and some were made by certain other trade union leaders. In both cases we would say that the comments were made and were understandably made. As a result of those comments, Sir, I think I would need to make some passing reference to the nature of the contract to the totality of the negotiations in 1986, and to something which I choose to call 'a point of collective bargaining and fools.'

The starting position in the 1986 negotiations, summarized briefly, Mr. Speaker, were: the Barbados Union of Teachers, a range of between 20% at the bottom and 17% at the top; the National Union of Public Workers, a range of 25% at the bottom, 15% at the top; the Barbados Secondary Teachers Union 23H% at the bottom to 14¹/₁₀% at the top. I think you should note, Mr. Speaker, that in some of those cases when they refer to the bottom, they are not referring to the level of maid, because in their membership structure their lowest position would have been much higher than that. So, in fact, in real terms, the demand might have been higher.

The Barbados Workers Union, on the other hand, submitted a proposal for 18% at the maid level and 10% at the S.I level. At our meeting in March with the former Prime Minister, we entered into some discussion recognizing that the economy was undergoing certain difficulties, and we addressed that subject and made certain commitments regarding the approach that would be had in 1986 regarding the negotiations. I venture to say that other unions were similarly involved and may have made similar commitments. We were speaking of Prime Minister ' St. John in a Barbados Labour Party Government. The point about all of that, Sir, is that at that point of our speaking, we were very conscious that the levels of settlements at the levels of maids and messengers and general labourers was, in some instances in the country, less than 10% over three years. As a matter of fact, in some instances we have had to allow employers a moratorium during which they paid no increases whatsoever, because an overriding consideration in those negotiations, as indeed in any negotiations, as indeed in the negotiations with the Barbados Labour Party as a Government, was then, and still is, the ability to pay. That was recognized by Prime Minister St. John, and he invited the trade unions to go along with him to recognize that the country had a difficult position in regard to the ability to pay. But even before the Barbados Workers Union met Prime Minister St. John, our Research Department and the leadership within our negotiating strategy team were together able to recognize the difficulties, so the level of our negotiations was one moderated and intended only to be reasonable, as we always are and as have been recognized by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

It was intended that we would get approximately \$44 million by the submission we made. When the new Government of the Democratic Labour Party came along and they gave the tax concessions, and we examined the tax concessions against our submission, which was supposed to give us \$44.6 million in year one, we recognized that the offer of the Government overall gave us \$45.3 million, made up of \$27.6 million in tax concessions and \$17.7 million as a wage increase in the first year. Therefore, we considered that it was a reasonable level at which to settle, because reasonableness dictates that one looks at the overall package and not merely look at what one submitted at the very outset.

Sir, I wish to make reference to collective bargaining and fools. With your permission, Sir, I wish to make the point that negotiations within the public sector here, and indeed in any other public sector or pseudo-public sector, has to recognize the maturity and the professionalism of all parties. Sometimes persons rush to print and they make spurious comments regarding what they would like to put forward as a fact in matters of collective bargaining. One such spurious comment came recently from one Percy Smith in the *Nation* newspaper in which slanderous comments were made of the BWU

negotiator in a CBC negotiation. I merely wish to make reference to the fact that where that speaker had referred on one occasion to the Barbados Workers Union negotiator refusing to accept increments for the workers and turning down a 12% offer to take a 10% offer, if that person had been interested in finding out, he might have asked and may have been given the facts.

The fact of the matter was that for those negotiations, when the Barbados Labour Party formed the Government, the workers were offered a mere 5%. Then on May 14, 1986, they were offered the very handsome increase of one more per cent, or 6%. And whereas we had been talking about giving an increment to all the workers at CBC and bringing them back to an incremental basis, the Administration of the day in May 1986 refused to go that route. We wrote them then in May to indicate that 6% could not do. After the elections we were able to get a 10% agreement, after the workers themselves had reached that decision. But the Percy Smiths of this world they will sometimes come a little closer to the wind and perhaps we would catch them in an area different from this Honourable House.

I wish to suggest that we should not blame the NUPW for the settlement that was arrived at. After all, the leaders in any negotiations can only go as far as their members demand. I am satisfied that the workers in Barbados, generally, were satisfied that the level which was agreed to was a level where a fair settlement might be arrived at. Instead, I have a different kind of concern. My concern lies in the indication last Wednesday out of the *Nation* newspaper that the DLP was looking for a demonstration by the NUPW and BUT in the yard of Parliament. My concern is why is the impression being given that there was, or should be, a dispute between the Government and the trade unions, and why by implication by not mentioning us, not the Barbados Workers Union. Is there the impression that there is a dispute between the Barbados Workers Union and the NUPW and the Barbados Union of Teachers?

I think that the trade unions and the Establishments Division of Government have reached an agreement on salaries and wages and that a demonstration would not have addressed that matter. I say, secondly, that there is no dispute between the Barbados Workers Union and the Barbados Union of Teachers. I further say that there is no dispute between the Barbados Workers Union and the National Union of Public Workers, although there have been scurrilous remarks made from time to time by certain members of the hierarchy in that union and that those scurrilous remarks might suggest that there is a dispute. 6.45 p.m.

Those remarks may, perhaps, spring from jealousy — one can never tell — and there may very well be a wish

by some persons to attain the heights reached and attained by the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union. But it is still true today that the heights by great men reached and kept were not attained by sudden flight. Those persons who had reached those heights, while their companions slept, went toiling onward through the night, and the leadership of the Barbados Workers Union is one founded on struggle - struggle for the workers of Barbados, struggle at great sacrifice to the leaders, and struggle which cannot be gainsaid by anybody of any other organization, be it other trade unions, political party or otherwise. And the fight, Mr. Speaker, continues. The mantle may very well have been torn in bits, but those of us on whom the mantle has touched from time to time have continued the fight with the same vigour and dedication, and will continue that fight. We say there is no dispute, although there may be a perception in some quarters.

For our part, when we negotiate we do not have to go to any organization, and surely we will not go to the Barbados Employers Confederation as a union to get their advice to negotiate with the Government. We will not seek to negotiate a settlement with the Government, or with anybody else, by any misrepresentation of the salient factors which impinge on those negotiations. If there is a cost of living increase of 6%, or perhaps 8%, depending on how you are accounting, we will not come to the public and say that the cost of living increase has been 15%, just so we can make out a case for a higher percentage increase. We have maintained, and we will maintain, a mature, responsible and professional position in our negotiations.

I want it to be recognized that that has nothing whatsoever to do with what party forms the Government. In 1971, the Annual Delegates Conference of the Barbados Workers Union endorsed the programme of the Democratic Labour Party for the September elections in 1971. Yet, by 1972 the Barbados Workers Union was calling out the entire work force of Barbados in a national strike in representation of, and support for the workers, of this country. That was the measure of the struggle that the Barbados Workers Union perceived that it had, and there was no personality involved in that struggle — it was a struggle for principle. Between 1976 and 1986, on the other hand, the only major strike within that period was what is now popularly known as the David Giles strike, which was not against the Government, but rather was a strike to establish a principle regarding the representation of workers at the work place.

I believe that in 1986 we will maintain that maturity and that responsibility. If it becomes necessary to have a strike, well, so be it. On the other hand, a Government which sets out to live up to its Manifesto pledges to bring relief and the benefits to the workers of the country will get the support of the labour movement and certainly of the Barbados Workers Union.

My final comment, Sir, relates to the matter of negotiated wages settlements and productivity. I have no doubt whatsoever that within the Public Service, and indeed throughout the country, it is fair to say that ~*~> productivity levels might be improved and can be improved - might be improved if something was done about them and can be improved when something is done about them. The problem sometimes has to do with wastage, and that wastage very often has to do with inept and sometimes unwilling management. It is pointless, Mr. Speaker, for us to refer to a person who is not producing at the lower levels if his supervisor is hardly at work, or is at work but is not working, for whatever reason. When all is said and done, the underlying need is for us, at all levels in Barbados, to train our managers and to ensure that they have the capacity and the will to manage, and that they are made to manage. If that were to happen, I am satisfied that productivity levels can increase. But I am satisfied that if a worker cannot see a proper example in the person who gives him instructions, then he will have no motivation whatsoever to go forward and to produce more. ~

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Government has moved to re-establishing the Organization and Methods Division within the Establishments Division. I would like to suggest that the Establishments Division should be given, as speedily as possible, more persons to help to do the job of managing Establishments. We must not relax ourselves into believing that a worker is satisfied once he has been given an increase in wages. Far too often employers in Barbados, and I venture to say that Governments have been part of that mistake, have been of the mistaken view that all you need to do is to give the worker a certain percentage increase and that that will satisfy him. Very often, Mr. Speaker, the conditions under which that person works and the way that worker sees himself in relation to other workers are, together, more important than the up-front wage increase that you may give that worker. I hasten to say that we in the Barbados Workers Union are looking forward to discussions with the Establishments Division of Government to ensure that those conditions which have been long outstanding, in some cases for four years, and that discussions be held speedily and urgently to resolve those matters.

Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that this measure this evening, this coming together to discuss and to arrive at a conclusion where the unions have agreed, is to the advantage and the benefit of all the workers in Barbados, and for that I highly congratulate the Government.

Applause.

The question that the Resolution, as amended, do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 6.55 p.m.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, Order No. 3.

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (TEACHERS)
ORDER, 1987

Order No. 3 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) Order, 1987.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John): Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is in relation to the Civil Establishment (Teachers) Order, 1987. I think we have had a debate which subsumes most of these Civil Establishment Orders.

I beg to move that this Civil Establishment (Teachers) Order, 1987 do now pass.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I beg to second that, Sir, and reserve my right to speak.

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

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (PART-TIME OFFICERS)
(AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1987

Order No. 4 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Part-time Officers) (Amendment) Order, 1987.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John) Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution in relation to the Civil Establishment (Part-Time Officers) (Amendment) Order,, 1987 do now pass,

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION RE INCREASES OF WAGES OF PUBLIC
AND CASUAL WORKERS

Order No. 5 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the increase of wages of the Public and Casual Employees of Government 'with effect from 1st April, 1986.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John). Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Schedules to the Resolution relating to the wages of public and casual employees of Government with effect from April 1, 1986 do now pass.

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

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that in 1984, when there was the last salaries increase — 15% and 5% — it was also agreed that a regrading and a reclassification would be carried out. I am aware that on March 3, last year, before the election, the Permanent Secretary in the Prime Minister's Office notified all Heads of Department and other Permanent Secretaries that Parliament had given approval to the regrading of a number of posts in the Public Service and reclassification of some of the posts on the established and casual staff, but that the effect of that regrading and reclassification was back dated to the April 1, 1984.

*

I have not heard it mentioned in the debate today at all and indeed it was only brought to my attention — at least, I was reminded of it and then sought to dig up among my papers to see what I could find — when an employee of a statutory board pointed out to me that in all of the talk about 9% at the bottom and 1%% at the top, we have somehow forgotten that in his case, for example, in December or early January he took home in excess of \$3 000 as a result of this regrading and reclassification exercise, which was the product of the Barbados Labour Party Administration. It is nothing to do with the present Government, but rather the benefit that accrued to him in December last year, or early January this year, as a result of that regrading exercise.

Aside

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: How many people benefitted? I cannot tell you how many people benefitted, but the honourable Member for the City (Mr. P. J. Miller) forgets that he voted in here to give workers at the IDC money, for example, over \$100 000, a couple of months ago arising out of the same thing.

Digging up, Sir, particularly in regard to the artisans and so on, you see that an Artisan A, who before the reclassification was at Category IV and paid at \$6.01 an hour, was upgraded to Category III and paid at \$6.49 now. Similarly, an Artisan B, who was in Category V and paid at \$5.77 an hour, went up to Category IV and was paid at \$6.01 an hour, and there is a long list of these persons. All artisans, I was advised when I checked it, have benefitted from that regrading and reclassification exercise. So the 5% that was offered earlier by the Barbados Labour Party during its negotiations last year in truth and in fact was more than 5%, because there was a 5% plus the benefit of the regrading and reclassification back-dated to 1984 April, and that was from 1984 April to 1985, and then from 1985 April to 1986. I think that that has to be recorded, and I only speak for the sake of having the record set right and all the facts laid bare, because I think that most of us probably forgot it, or some of us were unaware, and we did not do justice to

the content of what was being offered in the early days of the Barbados Labour Party's negotiations with the workers.

Sir, the Honourable Prime Minister earlier today, as is his wont, assumed that it was an easy thing to insult me and pass on....

Aside

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: we will get a lot of that next week..... because the Barbados Labour Party issued a statement last week about the fact that he was indisposed, as we were told, from oral surgery, or a toothache or whatever it was, and was unable to do justice to these Civil Establishment Orders. But the Opposition has been of the view that it was not only indisposition or personal hardship, discomfort, even infelicity, that prevented an earlier debate on these matters. 7.05 p.m.

We were told today that agreement was reached early in January, and I believe an Order was signed, but has not yet been enforced, towards the end of January this year, January 30 or some such date. February has passed, we are now into the second week virtually of March, and the workers will probably get their money some time in April. We cannot see what good reason there was to deny the public employees the benefits of their agreement and settlement earlier. If the Order was signed on January 30, why could they not have drawn the money in the middle of February? If the Government had the money, surely the workers were entitled to draw. Why are they being protracted? In the absence of any good explanation, we were left to draw the inference that either the Government did not have the money, and we believe, as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has earlier said, that they did not have the money.....

Asides

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You are the Right Honourable Prime Minister and you will remain so for the next three years. When the Queen leaves here after the 350th anniversary, we are going to the tape. As she goes, all the hullabaloo, we call it, will start. We are not going into 1991. You are not going to make that mistake again as you made in 1976. We are coming in before 1991. We will be ready.

Asides

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Tom what? If Tom was here, he would have had elections in October 1985. You know that and you all would have been "catspradled."

Asides

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The Honourable Prime Minister said that he knew in November or December 1985 that he had won.

Asides

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You knew?

Sir, we are concerned that there has been no satisfactory explanation all day for the delay in bringing these Orders to Parliament so that the workers can get their money.

Asides

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Well, if you did not have the money, as the Honourable Minister of Tourism is suggesting - he said to me, Sir, "Suppose we did not have the money" — even let us assume that they did not have the money, do you not think it would have been good, instead of pretending that things are so good, to come and tell the people we do not have the money?

Asides

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You have engaged in a conspiracy to silence. You have refused to tell the people what was the truth - that the country was strapped for money. It is a problem. There was no need, if it was not a problem, to call a meeting last Wednesday of Permanent Secretaries and tell them! only salaries can be paid this month. It was out by 3 o'clock last Wednesday evening. Everybody was hearing it then. People were calling us, and saying that the Minister of Finance had a special meeting with the Permanent Secretaries and said only pay salaries.

Asides

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Only pay salaries. That is the report that was around all Bridgetown. The Minister of Finance would be able to put us right.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition talked about allowance, but my report was that he said do not even pay allowances, only salaries. That is what it was, and not only once, so much so that the Permanent Secretaries had their own meeting for an hour after he was finished with them.

Asides

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You allow all of that speculation to run riot in the country if the people are

not taken into your confidence. Everybody knows this is the end of the financial year and things could be a little tight. Do not try to paint a picture that things are good and rosy when they are not. Come and say you are a little short of money, or it would not look good to inflate the deficit by paying them in March, so you will pay them in April. Otherwise you allow us to speculate and arrive at the truth.

We are very happy that after all of this protraction, the various categories of workers can get the benefits of settlement. I am not going into the history. All the others have spoken about the history of wage settlements and the record of wage negotiations in Barbados.

I must say that the honourable Member for St. Michael Central (Mr. C. L. Trotman) in his speech led me to ask myself, 'why doth he protest so much?' It was a most defensive speech by one of the most senior members of the Barbados Workers Union. I have never heard him so defensive. I have never heard that particular Member in dealing with matters close to himself and of import to the union so defensive.

Everybody knows that there is competition between the NUPW and the BWU for territory, poaching, but I do not think that honourable Members in the Barbados Workers Union, and we are sincere when we say this, need to worry about those fellows who are now learning to play the game. Do not worry about them! I think there needs to be a higher level of organisation and perhaps more drive and not a question of resting on laurels by virtue of past achievement, because I have seen something only a week ago in this Chamber, not on a Tuesday, but on a different day.

Asides

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I have seen in this same room something that tells me that my friends from the BWU may be slipping a little bit. But we will talk about that otherwise.

I think the National Union of Public Workers overstepped their jurisdiction because the membership mandated them at 15%. Subsequently, the executive agreed to take 9% without getting the approval for the 9% from the general membership, and it has been alleged in breach of the NUPW constitution, because they should have gone back to the general body for a new mandate. 7.15 p.m.

The thing that concerns me is that the reason advanced on the Monday night for the need to settle was that the Government had to know by the next day, and those present said, "Okay if they say settle, settle for the 9%." But they did not understand. They were outflanked. If the BWU and the NUPW both represent groups

of civil servants and the BWU settles for 9% and sits down, show me how the NUPW is going to get 15. The BWU have already "huffed" them, and if you play draft, you would know what I mean. They had tricked them — not tricked, because tricked implies some machination — I am not suggesting that there was any impropriety. They have more *savoir faire*, and my French pronunciation is exquisite. That is self-adulation. Ever so often I resort to the garbage heap and come up with some Latinisms as the collector of garbage, and some French quotations and so on.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do you want that to go into the records?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, that can go into the records. I was called a garbage collector today.

When the general public expresses distrust in unionism and the *bona fides* are questioned, it is because of incidents such as those. It is not only to do with the fact that openly the unions appear prior to May 28 to be anti-Barbados Labour Party, it is not only to do with the fact that the BWU tended to endorse as candidates only members of the Democratic Labour Party — it is also to do with the perception that the public has as to the quality of representation they get from the unions. I am not accusing the unions of engaging in sweetheart contracts, as the honourable Member for St. Michael North Central said, but I am saying that it may be a perception that the general public has of the relationship between the Government and the Union and if it is a perception, it is something that needs to be worked on. Over time it will require an exercise in public relations.

Asides

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The only thing the Chamber of Commerce ever did for me was to pay me some money to fight the telephone enquiry, and win it so that all of us do not have to pay the rates claimed by the Telephone Company.

I say that if there are these perceptions of unfortunate relationships between the union and the Democratic Labour Party, if there is a perception that, because of the closeness, the best interest of the worker is not consulted, then it behoves the Party and the BWU to improve their public relations. I say in all sincerity, as one who has dealt over many years particularly as chairman of a number of statutory boards with members of the BWU in particular, and the honourable Member for St. Michael Central, Mr. Richards and so on, far be it from me ever to accuse them of acting in other than the best interest and at the highest professional standard, but there is that

perception among the people. I remember honourable Members on the other side used to say to us when we were in Government and we assumed that we were listening, to the people, 'the people are saying so and so, wait and see.' We did not take it. You were right. Do not discount what I have said, that there is a perception that needs to be dealt with, and you will know how to deal with it.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

Hon. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Oppositions insist that they draw me into this debate.

Asides

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I may be Minister without Information, but I am not yet a garbage collector in this session of Parliament. You are going down as the garbage collector.

Mr. Speaker, the record will show, if these statements are allowed to go without challenge, that the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) made very grave and deep statements about the perception of the public out there, about the NUPW and a whole number of other statements. The fact is a very simple one. At the time when the NUPW was anti-Barbados Labour Party, they were only one of a very large number of institutions, individuals and the general conglomeration of the society that were against the Barbados Labour Party. Everybody was anti- the Barbados Labour Party because the Barbados Labour Party was perceived, correctly, as an enemy of the people. So it is not proper for us to single out the NUPW and try to give the impression that the NUPW has committed some heinous crime. The fact is that they represented the membership. Furthermore, the honourable Member knows that the Executive Council of any institution, especially a trade union, is capable always of making decisions for and on behalf of its membership.

What I really rose to speak about is this question of when the money should be paid. To whom does the money belong? When the money is paid, would we have stolen any of it from them? Would we have kept it from them? Do you mean that by not paying them a month early we have deprived them of the ability to buy something? Somebody has been deprived of medicine.

(*Aside:* A woman said she wanted to buy her false teeth.)

Laughter

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member is now ' saying that they have charged the four people they have who call Gutterperk every day on behalf of the Barbados Labour Party to say that somebody wanted to buy false " ^ teeth. What the honourable Member does not understand is that buying false teeth went out a long time ago. Nobody buys false teeth now, and I think it is really improper.

I really do not wish the public to get the impression that some wrong has been done to the people. The NUPW, which is being represented as being irresponsible today, and the Barbados Workers Union, which the Leader of the Opposition, the honourable Member for St. Thomas and his colleague and I agree is very representative of what is proper in trade unionism, is being represented today as the good boy, both of them have said that they were told by the Government that they are going to be paid at a particular time and all is well. It is well with the Barbados Workers Union it is well with the NUPW, it is well with the BUT, it is well with everybody ^ else — except Eenie, Meanie and Mo. ,7.25 p.m.

Laughter. •

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I do not understand why the Leader of the Opposition and the Honourable Member for St. Thomas should try to give the impression that this Democratic Labour Party has wronged somebody by not paying them. Look, Mr. Speaker, I just received a cheque for \$324.70. I just received it today, Sir. Do you know what this is for? This is payment for work done for the first three days in June, 1986, and nobody went and broke anybody's hand, although the late Prime Minister, in a similar situation, did threaten an officer of this Parliament to break his hand for a similar sum. All I am saying is that these matters happen, these things occur. The honourable Members on that side know that even if we ^ " had had the debate last week, the Civil Service would be unlikely to be able to get the large sums of money which are going to be paid.

The Prime Minister never said that he had any toothache. The Leader of the House never said that he had any toothache. The Leader of the House said he was under his dentist's care. Those are the words I heard. Just like the honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition, is under his doctor's care, but he is still here.

(*Aside:* Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Under the doctor's care? For what?)

Laughter.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: He wishes me now to put it in 4 ^ *i the record. I will not do that. I will not put it in the record, in spite of what the Prime Minister is telling me to say.

Laughter.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The fact is for the Leader to say that the Prime Minister is under the care of his dentist.....

Laughter.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member is delaying the House to delay the Right Honourable Prime Minister. Just for the purpose of the record, I really have not been under any doctor's care. If the honourable Member thinks that I need to see a doctor, I would do so if he pays for it.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, anything the honourable Member says about money, I do not accept, because he owes me a case of champagne

Laughter.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: for a very long time now, nearly seven years, Sir, and he has not paid it.

Laughter.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to say for the record that it is not right to give the public the impression that there is some wrong committed against the workers because they have not got their money. They will, in fact, get a full year's pay, which would be much more significant for them, in the final analysis, than eleven months, or nine months, or eight months. They are going to get a full year's back pay. They are going to get every cent that is coming to them, including everybody who was working at that time, which the honourable Members were hoping they would have an opportunity to speak about. So, Mr Speaker, the honourable Member for St. Thomas need not concern himself about these matters.

I do not think it is fair to leave the impression that there is distrust of unionism in Barbados. It is not proper. Even if the three honourable Members cannot find issues with which to catch the imagination of the public, they should not be trying to give the impression that there is some conspiracy between the Democratic Labour Party and the Barbados Workers Union. It is a bad tactic and it is not good for the body politic. As the honourable Member for St. Michael Central has said, I recall when the Barbados Workers Union treated an honourable Member in this House, who was a Member of the Cabinet at the time, in a distinguished way that he does not like to remember, and we do not like to remember and, he was a member of the Democratic Labour Party.

The Barbados Workers Union has distinguished itself as having a very high moral principle when it comes to

defending the rights of workers in this country, it is wrong for any honourable Member to seek, for political or any other purpose, to suggest that the union is interfering with the rights of workers because of the Democratic Labour Party. This is not like when the Barbados Workers Union was to be destroyed by the Barbados Labour Party. We will have other things to say about that next week.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Yes, we will talk about it next week, Mr. Speaker.

(Aside: The question.)

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

INCREASED COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE TO CERTAIN GOVERNMENT PENSIONERS

Order No. 10 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the payment of increased Cost of Living Allowance to certain Government pensioners.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the Resolution to:

"approve the payment of increased cost of living allowance at the rate of \$20 per month with effect from 1st April, 1987 to Government pensioners who retired after 1st April, 1976 and who did not benefit from the increased cost of living allowance granted in the budgetary proposals of 2nd April, 1986.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the minimum pension and cost of living allowance payable to all government pensioners be \$325.00 per month with effect from 1st April, 1987.

RESOLVED that His Excellency the Governor-General be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this Resolution."

It has been the policy since 1966, the year of Independence, to increase the pensions paid to former Government employees at the time of the revision of salaries and wages of Government employees, which we have done today.

On April 2, 1986, the then Minister of Finance made an award in the Budget of that date to pensioners who had retired prior to 1975-76 of a 50% increase in their cost of living allowance with effect from April 1, 1986. The result of this increase meant that the minimum pension payable to pensioners in that category rose to \$321.60.

Accepting the principle of a minimum pension, and that it should bear some relation to the minimum resulting from the increase in the Budget of April 2, 1986, we now propose that the minimum pension for all Government pensioners should be fixed at \$325 per month with effect from April 1, 1987.

We also propose, Sir, that those pensioners who had retired in 1975—76 or after, and who had not benefitted from the award of the Budget of April 2, which related to only those who retired prior to 1975—76, should also have their pensions adjusted. We therefore propose by this Resolution, through the fixing of the minimum pension of \$325 a month, that they should receive an increase of \$20 per month, where they did not benefit by less than \$20 a month, to bring the pension up to that level.

The estimated cost of these proposals, Sir, is \$2.4 million.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, in seconding this Resolution, I wish to make it clear, Sir, that this is Order No. 10 on the Order Paper.

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

MAGISTRATES JURISDICTION AND PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1987

Order No. 7 was called - To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Magistrates Jurisdiction and Procedure Act, Cap. 116.

Hon. M. A. KING (Christ Church West Central): Mr. Speaker, this is a short amendment to the Magistrates Jurisdiction and Procedure Act, Cap. 116.

The problem which it deals with is that we have found that, in several instances, situations have occurred where persons who have been convicted of an offence under the Narcotic Drugs Act, or Regulations appeal the sentence from the Magistrates Court, enter into the required recognizance as provided in the Magistrates Jurisdiction and Procedure Act and they are thereupon released, as the Act requires. These offenders, especially if they are non-nationals or non-residents, then tend to leave the country, and if the appeal is subsequently dismissed and the sentence of the magistrate upheld by leaving the country they tend to evade punishment. 7.35 p.m.

This amendment, Mr. Speaker, is an attempt to prevent this abuse in the law by plugging this hole in the Magistrates Jurisdiction and Procedure Act. In fact, the Bill

before this honourable House seeks to do 2 things. It seeks to increase the amount of recognizance which may be required by a magistrate in the case of a person convicted of a narcotics drug offense and, secondly, it seeks to allow an appellant, who has been convicted of a narcotics drug offense and sentenced to a term of imprisonment, to be released only on a bail application granted by the High Court pending appeal.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. C. A. NEBLETT in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This House is now in Committee.

Clauses 1-3 inclusively were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to His Honour the Speaker the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE LEASE OF LAND TO BARBADOS PORT AUTHORITY

Order No. 6 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve of the lease of land at the Bridgetown Harbour, St. Michael, to the Barbados Port Authority.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN (St. Philip South): Mr. Speaker, under the terms of a loan agreement on February 21, 1975 between the Government and the Inter-American Development Bank, a loan of US\$9 million was made available to the Government of Barbados by the IADB to assist in the financing of a project for the expansion and improvement of the port. One of the conditions included in the agreement was that all of the assets and liabilities of the Port Department, and the assets of Port Contractors Limited as well as the assets of any other entity considered essential for the operations of the Port Authority,

CONTENTS

Confirmation of the Minutes of the meeting of
Tuesday, March 3, 1987.....681

Mr. Sandiford, 681; Mr. Brathwaite, 681.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: 681

The Shipping (Incentives) Order, 1987.

Diplomacy and Development — A Review of
the Foreign Policy of Barbados.

Hon. D. R. C. HAYNES:.....682

The Estimates for 1987-88.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: 682

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$596 887 ' 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. 26 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Bill to amend the District Auctioneers Act.

A Bill to grant the sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and to appropriate the same for the service of Barbados for the year ending 31st March, 1988.

A Resolution to approve payment of increased cost of living allowance to Government pensioners and to fix the minimum pension and cost of living allowance payable to all Government pensioners.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: 682

A Bill to amend the District Auctioneers Act.

The Appropriation Bill 1987.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS..... 682

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1986-87 NO. 24
\$188 946.....682

HEAD 74 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND

NATURAL RESOURCES - \$66 872.....682

Mr. Franklin, 682.

HEAD 83 - MINISTRY OF INTERNATIONAL

TRANSPORT - \$122 074.....683

Mr. Barrow, 683.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1986-87 NO. 25

- \$600 130.....684

HEAD 12 - PARLIAMENT - \$81 834 684

Mr. Sandiford, 684.

HEAD 15 - CABINET OFFICE - \$3 400 684

Mr. Barrow, 684.

HEAD 25 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND

NATURAL RESOURCES - \$250 000.....684

Mr. Franklin, 684.

HEAD 28 - MINISTRY OF LEGAL AFFAIRS

_ \$9 500.....684

Mr. Sandiford, 684.

HEAD 41 - MINISTRY OF INTERNATIONAL

TRANSPORT - \$255 396.....685

Mr. Barrow, 685

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1986-87 NO. 26

- \$596 887 685

HEAD 19 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE - \$24 186 .. 685

Dr. Haynes, 685.

HEAD 20 REVENUE SERVICES - \$29 834.....685

Dr. Haynes, 685.

HEAD 21 - STATISTICS - \$41.00..... 685

Dr. Haynes, 685.

shall be transferred to, purchased or assumed by the Port Authority.

Section 47(1) of the Barbados Port Authority Act, Cap. 285(b) provides that when the Act commences, all property other than lands and buildings and all interest therein of whatever nature belonging to the Crown and used exclusively for the purpose of the Port Department shall be transferred to and be vested in the Authority.

Cabinet on June 8, 1978 concluded, among other things, that the lands to be used by the Port Authority should be leased to it for 50 years at a peppercorn rental, with an option for renewal for a similar period. Then, on January 19, 1984, Cabinet noted that the lands to be leased to the Authority consist of two parcels of 27.527 hectares and 1.457 hectares. It agreed that the Authority should be charged rental of \$100 a year, that the existing lease arrangements between the Crown and those companies which occupy land falling within the area to be leased to the Authority should be terminated and that the Authority should be authorized to sublet that land to those companies, for example, Barbados Sugar Industries Limited and Barbados Molasses Terminal Limited.

A draft Resolution was prepared in this connection and submitted to the Port Authority for consideration. The Authority, however, requested that the area of 1.061 hectares of land occupied by the original BICO Limited buildings and plant, and which forms part of a larger area which is vested in IDC, should be revested in the Crown and be included in the lands to be leased to the Barbados Port Authority. Part of the land occupied by BICO Limited, lots 40 and 41, consisting of the 1.061 hectares, is leased from IDC and the remaining portion is rented from the Port Authority. It was considered that it would be a tidier arrangement to have the land occupied by BICO Limited leased by one body, which is the Port Authority. The IDC has agreed to release the two lots back to the Crown to facilitate the inclusion of this area in the total area to be vested in the Port Authority. The area to be vested in the Port Authority has been fenced in for security purposes.

Cabinet has agreed to the above proposal, that the 1.061 hectares to be added to the area of 27.527 hectares previously mentioned in the total area of 28.588 hectares

to be leased to the Port Authority. This Resolution, therefore, seeks to lease two areas of land, consisting of that total of 28.588 hectares and the 1.457 hectares, to the Barbados Port Authority for a period of 50 years at the rate of \$100 a year, with an option for renewal for a similar period.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. B. M. TA1TT: I second that, Sir.

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

QUESTION TIME

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 52.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Parliamentary Question No. 52 be laid, in the absence of the Honourable Member for St. George South.

Mr. SPEAKER: That Question should then be laid on the Table.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, that brings us to the end of business for today's sitting. I would like to thank all honourable Members for their co-operation in dealing with the business before us today.

I now beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Monday, March 16, 1987, at 10 o'clock in the morning.

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

The question that the House do now adjourn until Monday, March 16, 1987 at 10 a.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
7.49 p.m.

HEAD 38 - MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND

Mr. King, 728.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS - \$15 614..... 686

Mr. P. M. Greaves, 686.

HEAD 43 - MINISTRY OF TOURISM AND THE

ENVIRONMENT - \$523 422..... 686

Mr. H. A. Blackman, 686, 694; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 686; Dr. E. A. Simmons, 687; Mr. Miller, 688; Mr. Barrow, 689; Mr. Forde, 691; Mr. Brathwaite, 693.

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL)

ORDER, 1987 695

Mr. Barrow, 696; Mr. Forde, 700; Dr. Simmons, 707; Dr. Haynes, 709; Mr. Morris, 710; Mr. Arthur, 714; Mr. Trotman, 718.

"CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (TEACHERS) ORDER,

1987 723

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (PART-TIME) ORDER,

1987 723

INCREASES OF WAGES TO PUBLIC AND

CASUAL EMPLOYEES.....723

Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 723; Mr. Taitt, 726.

INCREASED COLA TO CERTAIN GOVERNMENT

EMPLOYEES..... 727

Mr. Barrow, 727.

MAGISTRATES JURISDICTION AND PRO

CEDURE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1987..... 728

LEASE OF LAND TO BARBADOS PORT

AUTHORITY 728

Mr. H. A. Blackman, 728.

QUESTION TIME**Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: 729**

Reply to Question No. 52 (Laid) asked by the honourable Member for St. George South (Mr. R. P. Byer.)

SUSPENSION 695

ADJOURNMENT 729

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, O. S. (St. Peter) BARROW, Rt. Hon. E. W. (St. John) BLACKMAN, Hon. H. A. (St. Philip South) BRATHWAITE, L. L. (St. Michael North East) FORDE, Hon. H. deB. (Christ Church West) FRANKLIN, Hon. W. O. (St. Philip North) GREAVES, Hon. P. M. (St. Michael North) HAYNES, Hon. Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central) KING, Hon. M. A. (Christ Church West Central) MILLER, P. J. M. (City of Bridgetown) MORRIS, R. L. (Christ Church East Central) SANDIFORD, Hon. L. E. (St. Michael South) SIMMONS, D. A. C. (St. Thomas) SIMMONS, 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)