

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1986 - 91

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, December 13, 1988

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.20 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour L. A. WEEKES, J.P., (Speaker)

His Honour J. J. PAYNE, (Deputy Speaker)

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A., (Econ.), J.P., (Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs)

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

Hon. B. M. TAITT, B.A., (Hons.), M.P.A., LL.B., (Hons.), (Minister of Health)

Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Q.C., B.A., (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of International Transport, Telecommunications and Immigration and Leader of the House)

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, B.A., M.A., (Minister of Transport and Works)

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 Employment, Labour Relations and Community Development)

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN, B.Sc., (Econ.) (Minister of Housing and Lands)

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

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

Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH, (Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Employment, Labour Relations and Community Development)

Hon. C. V. WALKER, (Minister of Education and Culture)

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE, J.P.

Mr. E. BOURNE

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

Hon. W. W. HALL, G.C.M., H.B.M., (Minister of Tourism and Sports)

Mr. C. A. NEBLETT, B.A., (Parliamentary Secretary Prime Minister's Office)

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN, M.A.

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

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER

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

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

Prayers were led by Rev. Father Ivan Harewood.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in session. MINUTES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Minutes of the proceedings of this Honourable Chamber for the meeting that took place on December 6, 1988, be taken as read and approved.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no corrections lei these Minutes stand confirmed.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I give notice of the following: —

A Resolution to approve the grant of SI 477 735 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1988/89, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1988/89, No. 6.

A Resolution to amend the Explanatory Note to Head 75, Ministry of Education and Culture, Sub-head 17, Industrial Schools, Object No. 24.

A Resolution to amend the Explanatory Note to Head 28, Ministry of Legal Affairs, Subhead 2, Subscriptions and Contributions.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the reply to Parliamentary Question, No. 85 asked by the Honourable Member for St. James North is now ready.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker,, on behalf of the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Sports, I give notice that reply to Parliamentary Question, No. 92 asked by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas is ready.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 93 asked by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas is now ready.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is the order of the day. Order No. 3.

Order No. 3 was called — Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition by the Crown of several parcels of land for the purpose of road improvement at River Road, Pine Road, Collymore Rock and Culloden Road.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, in June, 1985, Cabinet at that time decided that 38 parcels of land should be acquired for the improvement of the Pine Road/Culloden Road/Collymore Rock junction and the widening of the road at the junction of Jemmotts Lane, Collymore Road and River Road.

It was discovered afterwards that the 38 parcels of land were not really needed and necessary and, in fact, only 22 parcels of land were necessary for the improvement of these roads.

Two of the 22 parcels of land were donated to the Government, one parcel at Melrose, Collymore Rock and the other parcel at the Shrubbery. The two of those were donated to Government and the final position of one parcel of land has not been ascertained or decided upon. This Resolution seeks Parliamentary approval to acquire the other 19 parcels of land.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that all of this land that we are speaking about here has already been used for the roundabout and the widening of the road coming down on Collymore Rock so this is just regularizing the situation in order that the people can be compensated.

I must, on this question of acquisition, also state that it has been brought to my attention that someone from the Other Place had mentioned that we did a lot of acquisitions this year and that his information is that quite a few of the people whose land we had acquired this year have not been paid; and he mentioned that he knows of 11 parcels of land which we acquired this year and most of them have not been paid for. '

I would just like to say for the benefit of this Honourable House and the gentleman in the Other Place that the 11.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure the honourable member understands what I am trying to say now.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: For the benefit of the members of this House and other persons who may care to be interested in what the facts are, I would just like to say that the 11 parcels of land that were acquired this year, or that came to Parliament to legalise the acquisition of these lands, — 9 out of those 11 parcels of land, Tent Bay Fish Landing Site; Hall's Road; Proute's, St. Thomas; Lancaster, St. James; Pine Hill, St. Michael; Vauxhall, Christ Church; River Road, St. Michael; corner of Garrison Road and Highway 7 and Collymore Rock - all of these parcels of land had been acquired before this administration took office, by the previous administration. We are now regularising the situation in order that we can compensate these people.

The only two parcels of land in these 11 acquisitions that we have acquired this year were one at Cane Garden, St. Thomas and the owner has already been paid; and the other one at Rices, St. Philip and this is part of the low income project which the Ministry is moving fairly quickly on. The only reason that these have not been paid yet is because the lands are owned by sundry owners so I just thought that I would say that most of the acquisitions that we are coming to Parliament with now we are coming to regularise in order that we can pay the persons.

With those few words I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 12.30p.m.

RESOLUTION TO GRANT THE SUM OF FOUR
MILLION FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS FROM
THE CONSOLIDATED FUND AND TO PLACE
IT AT THE DISPOSAL OF THE GOVERN-
MENT FOR THE PURPOSES OF MAKING
ADVANCES OF SALARY OR WAGES ON THE
TERMS AND CONDITIONS SET OUT IN THE
SCHEDULE BELOW

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 5.

Order No. 5 was called - To move the passing of the Resolution to grant the sum of \$4 500 000 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government for the purpose of making advances of salary or wages.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is for the sum \$4 500 000 and it is by way of a grant from the Consolidated Fund and to be placed at the disposal of the Government in order to make advances of salaries or wages on the following terms and conditions. But before I set out those terms and conditions, Mr. Speaker, I wish to indicate that from the year 1962, I believe, until the year 1977, a practice was followed by the then Government, the Government of the Democratic Labour Party that advances in salaries at Christmas time would be made to public workers in order to assist those who desired to avail themselves of the opportunity of loans at Christmas time. It was in recognition that higher expenditures in our society are made at that time by households, individuals, families and that in order to defray some of those expenses and spread it over time, a loan would be made to certain categories of workers on terms and conditions that would be less onerous than if they had to make loans, assuming that they were able to obtain the loans from other sources. That practice ceased after the year 1977 and it was resumed in 1986 and payments were made also — the advances — in 1987 and it is the policy and the practice of my Government to make these annual advances.

So we are not really breaking any new ground here. This is in continuation of the practice and the policy of making these advances.

Now there are specific terms and conditions under which the advances are made. First of all, the advances are made to all members, or are available to all members of the unestablished staff, casual employees and monthly paid Government employees who would normally remain in Government employ up to and, no doubt, beyond the end of March, 1989 which is the end of the Financial Year. These persons would be eligible for advances on their wages and salaries at Christmas time in addition to the wages and salaries that they would

normally receive. So the workers get their normal salaries and on top of that, they get an advance and that advance in the case of unestablished and casual staff and other weekly paid employees is "equivalent" to twice the net weekly earnings during any average week in the period of eight (8) weeks immediately preceding the date of payment," and there is a maximum attached to it of \$400.00.

Secondly, the advance is also available to monthly paid employees and the amount does not exceed the maximum of \$400.00. We have used some officialese in order to describe this particular matter, but that is the nature of it - the sum does not exceed \$400.00.

Now in order to ensure that the money flows back into the Treasury, deductions are made from the salary and wage of each qualifying employee. Such deductions will be made in equal monthly or weekly instalments during the months January to March, 1989. It is purely voluntary operation. There is no compulsion on any worker to take the advance. There is no compulsion whatever. If an individual worker believes that the interest free loan would be of benefit to him or to her, that worker is free to apply for the loan. And if the worker qualifies on the terms and conditions set out, he automatically gets the loan. So there is no compulsion at all in this. Once the worker consents Upon taking the loan, or agreeing to take the loan, the worker consents that deductions from salaries and wages due to that worker would be made according to the schedule of repayments applicable.

There has been a very good record of repayments under this programme. I believe of the amount advanced, for Christmas, 1987, a sum I believe of about \$10,000 is still outstanding, and that is largely due to the fact that some persons leave the Public Service and there are some sums owing to the Treasury on the account. But it is a small amount when compared with the actual amount of advances made.

We believe, that it is of benefit to some of the workers, and they do make use of the provision and we are happy to make this proposal, and to make these advances available once again in accordance with established principle and practice. There is nothing more and nothing less to this, Mr. Speaker. 12.40 p.m.

It relates to an ongoing situation and, therefore, I am happy to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker. Sir, on the last occasion the Minister of Finance introduced a Resolution

dealing with loans and advances to the Public Service he was good enough, Sir, to indicate that in 1986 Government sought parliamentary approval for the appropriation of \$6.3 million to on lend to public servants in the form of loans and advances but that some \$2.8 million in the loans and advances had been taken up. In financial terms, Sir, one can be forgiven if we were to say the issue was under-subscribed and that even though this matter of loans and advances is a Democratic Labour Party pledge, obviously as far back Sir as 1986 there were no long lines waiting in the Public Service to take up the loans and advances which had been granted, Sir.

It is very significant, Mr. Speaker, that in 1986 less than half of the loans and advances that were voted for by Parliament were in fact taken. This brings me to my first question Sir. Last year the House was asked to approve, I think, a supplementary for \$4 million and this year we are being asked to approve a supplementary, Sir, for \$4.5 million. I therefore, Sir, have to inquire of the Minister of Finance if conditions of increased hardship in the Public Service of Barbados now require Government to have to vote increasing sums of money to assist public servants by way of loans and advances, given the track record, Sir, that in 1986 two short years ago, the public servants of this country were only prepared to take up less than \$3 million of a \$6.3 million facility that was granted.

The Prime Minister also mentioned that this was a practice that was in vogue between 1962 and 1976 and 1977. Indeed the reinstitution of this loans and advances scheme is as a result of a Manifesto pledge by the Democratic Labour Party and we understand it, Sir, in that context. The charge has been made from time to time that the stopping by the Barbados Labour Party of loans and advances to public servants was part of an anti-worker attitude on the part of this party, Sir.

But if we were to go back, Mr. Speaker, to the circumstances which required or which led to these advances being stopped, we can begin Sir to appreciate the extent of the fallacy that continues to inform the Democratic Labour Party as to the need for these advances, Sir. In 1978 when these advances were stopped it was a time when public servants had been granted substantial pay increase and they received their back pay in December.

It would have been, Mr. Speaker, a bit superfluous for Government to owe public servants in 1978 a wage increase, to pay them their wage increase together with the back pay, and then seek obviously, Sir, to allow them the facility of a loans and advances as well.

It took place, Sir, in the context of a situation where the Government of the day was committed to the notion of people helping themselves and building credit

institutions, Sir, that would enable them to meet their own financial needs. The most important point, Mr. Speaker, that I want to make is that this is a relic. This is a vestige of a paternalistic past. Those of us who grew up in the country would remember the days when Christmas cheer was a matter that exercised the paternalistic attention of the plantations. The needs of workers throughout the whole course of the year, Sir, did not matter fundamentally, but what you had at Christmas was a situation where a large number of pigs sometimes were killed and each worker was ordered to take 10 pounds and to repay the amounts, Mr. Speaker, out of their wages and salaries for the first 3 months of the year — a form of paternalism which viewed the needs of workers strictly as a matter of bringing a little cheer at Christmas.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, a paternalistic approach to the dealing of people's needs and in the context of a situation, Mr. Speaker, in which the Government is reluctant, Sir, to arrive at timely wage settlements with the unions of this country in the same manner as in 1988 prevails. In the context of this situation, Sir, I certainly find it very difficult to support a financing arrangement whereby Government undertakes to lend people money precisely at the same point in time, Sir, when it owes people money. That is why, Sir, I go back to 1978; because 1978, Sir, was a year in which clear and clean decisions were taken in relation to this particular matter. It was a year, Sir, in which the Barbados Labour Party showed itself committed to arriving at wage settlements, Sir, handsome wage settlements, which obviated the need for the Government to have to finance a little bit of Christmas cheer for the workers of this country. I am saying to the House, Sir, that if the Democratic Labour Party would only adopt the good practice of having settlements.....

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: The Democratic Labour Party has been noted to legislate settlements in the past. The late Prime Minister, Mr. Errol Barrow, legislated salaries in the past. So the Democratic Labour Party, Sir, has a tradition in relation to the legislation of salaries from which the present Prime Minister can draw.

Put the point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is simply that if we were to go back to the practice of timely settlements of wage agreements then the need for this House to have to exercise itself with providing loans and advances to the public servants at Christmas, Sir, can be obviated. In addition Sir, I am saying the very reason why less than half the loans were taken up in 1986 was precisely because the role that to some extent used to be carried by Government between 1962 and 1977 has now been taken by other institutions in Barbados. Be-

tween 1962 and 1967 the financial system of Barbados was one that was characterised by the under-development of consumer instalment credit. We now live in a country, Sir, where consumer instalment credit is a normal practice. Between that period, Sir, the coolie-man, for the people in the country, was one of the major sources of credit. But Sir, these times have changed. Consumer instalment credit has become a permanent feature for the financial system of this country as well as the credit unions have shown a capacity to finance the needs of people both in the public service and people in the wider society, Sir.

So that I say to the House, Sir, that my qualified support for this type of measure, Sir, remains. As in 1986, Sir, this is being brought to the House at a time when Government owes civil servants back pay. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, to be immoral for a Government to be seeking to lend at a time when it owes the civil servants, Sir. It would behove Government, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that in the future the practice which prevailed between 1978 and 1986 of having wage settlements agreed to insufficient time to obviate this particular need, Sir, - that if this practice were to prevail, Mr. Speaker, that the House would not have to find itself in this particular situation.

So that the comments that I made then, Sir, are pertinent again. This is a relic, a vestige of a paternalistic past. Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is a relic that is being imposed again by the Democratic Labour Party because there is still that conviction in the Democratic Labour Party that we have to create the impression in Barbados that the world stopped in 1976. 12.50p.m.

If something was in place in 1976 and it was stopped by the Barbados Labour Party, no matter how good the reason, it has to be reintroduced. Circumstances have changed and this system of loans and advances at Christmas, to my mind, is absolutely no substitute for proper increases to the public servants; and it is no substitute for timely settlements with the public servants.

On these grounds, Sir, I really must tell you that this year I cannot support these loans and advances.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, in supporting this Resolution, the Prime Minister said that the Democratic Labour Party instituted the system of making loans and advances to the working people in the public sector of this country, and that this was discontinued by the Barbados Labour Party administration in 1977.

I think you would note also that the modern system of collective bargaining in the public sector was also instituted by the Democratic Labour Party with the Barbados Workers' Union playing a significant part in this system, and that between the 1960s and 1976 this remained virtually a voluntary system until there were certain distortions between that period and 1986. So it was not just the change in terms of the loans and advances, but there were also significant changes in the collective bargaining practice.

The honourable Member for St. Peter, my friend, has isolated 1978 as a successful year and he made a generalisation that the Barbados Labour Party since then has continued to give some significant increases. I should like to set the record straight on the public sector negotiations in Barbados.

Between 1976 and the present date — I would say before 1976 — the voluntary system worked very well, and the Barbados Workers' Union attempted, through collective bargaining to reduce the enormous disparities that existed between top salaries and the lower wages in the public sector. In fact, in the early sixties it was in the range of about 16 to one, the salary of a Permanent Secretary as against that of a Maid. Today I am told it is something like a disparity of four to one because of the kind of bargaining that the Barbados Workers' Union has been part of. I think that is a significant change.

I should like to say that between 1976 and up to about 1987 there have been certain characteristics that put a serious flaw in public sector collective bargaining. First of all, intervention by the Prime Minister at that time, Mr. Adams was the person, in the process of collective bargaining. This used to be before negotiations, during negotiations, and then he would legislate salaries. He also used the Governor of the Central Bank copiously to come out there and interfere in the collective bargaining process. He also tried to use legislation to control Unions. I refer to the Emergency Powers Bill 1982, White Paper on Industrial Relations 1983, and the Prison Officers Bill which took away a right from Prison Officer to be members of a Union, so that they now enjoy the same status as Fire Officers, Police and so on. They resorted to massive lay-offs and dismissals in order to prejudice the level of negotiations, the settlements, and they made attacks on Trade Unionists. That was all in keeping with their style.

The period generated active Trade Union protests. People talk about disputes? I will tell them about some disputes under the Barbados Labour Party. There was a rapid turnover of Labour Ministers. You did not know who was Labour Minister one day from the next, and they did not seem to have any idea what labour was all

about at all. That is the kind of framework that developed between 1976 and 1986. I will try to be more specific and to look at some of these negotiations in cameo.

We all remember the 1976 negotiations, the cost of living running at 37.2%, the NUPW pushing for 80%. Eventually the settlement was 35% in the first year, 15% in the second year. We remember the turmoil when a particular person, who was the General Secretary of the NUPW, who later on became a Government Senator — but of course this could not be true, because the Barbados Labour Party says that the Trade Unions should not be involved in politics Nobody would believe that that would be possible. One of them who writes that, who is now the Personal Assistant, I think, to the Leader of the Opposition, who ran for St. Philip North, and who tried to break up the nurses and form a Trade Union, he walked for St. Philip North and he tried to form a Trade Union with nurses, trying to break up the NUPW; but he is writing that Trade Unions should not be involved in politics. I am not going to get into that. Let me go through the collective bargaining process.

In 1978 the Barbados Workers' Union and the National Union of Public Workers settled with Government. There was a negotiated settlement with those two Unions at a level of 10% at the highest, 20% at the lowest. At the time the cost of living was 16%. They talk about point to point, historical, two years back. Private sector settlements were at a range of 11% to 24%. Government settled at 10% to 20%, 10% at the top and 20% at the bottom. The cost of living was 16%; private sector settlements were 11% to 24%. The Barbados Workers' Union settled, because we have certain criteria in collective bargaining which I will enunciate as I go further.

The teachers and the police did not settle. Let us be very clear about that. In 1978 the teachers and the police did not settle. After the legislation of salaries the Government tried to introduce a four hour work week for MTW workers in order to cut back on the meaning of that settlement for those workers in the key scale. That was 1978. A four day work week to cut back on the real settlement by reducing the amount of time those persons worked, because those persons are paid by the period, by the hour and so on.

In 1980 the cost of living increase, point to point, was 34%. Private sector settlements were in the range of 22% to 30%. These negotiations in 1980 were preceded by Prime Minister Adams coming on the television and on the radio interfering in the collective bargaining process by giving statements about the impending negotiations, telling everybody they have to tighten their belts, and so on.

Our Union rejected this approach to collective bargaining, because we do not believe that Government should interfere. I do not see how the Head of the Government should be interfering before his chief negotiator, his public servant, sits down to negotiate with Trade Unions. That was an aberration of the collective bargaining process and we were against it. Government was able to agree with the National Union of Public Workers and other Unions and they went ahead and legislated; and there were differences between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Government. I will give the key scale, in each category.

Category I - The BWU was asking for \$118 a week, the Government legislated at \$116. Category II — We were asking for \$134 a week, the Government legislated at \$130. Category III - We were asking for \$142, the Government legislated at \$138, and I could go down the line. They were relatively small differences as people would say, but Government chose to legislate rather than negotiate. That was not in total agreement with all the Unions and nobody said that it was a political settlement. The Government went ahead, negotiated, got agreement with NUPW which did not represent the key scale, so they were satisfied with what they got. Our Union continued to represent the people at the lowest level and Government legislated over differences of \$2 and \$4 and so on.

The Barbados Workers' Union took a position. We were against the legislation and our Executive Council determined that there would be a work to rule, which is no sick out or anything like that. That was a Trade Union decision. We did not agree. Our Council called a work to rule and the postal officers instituted that industrial action and we showed our form of protest; and when we decided that we had shown our protest we then called off the work to rule. 1.00 p.m.

There was not a sick out, not a wild cat strike or anything like that, all within the confines of proper industrial relations, collective bargaining.

In 1982 Tom Adams again called all of the unions and associations together in order to prejudice industrial relations. At the time the cost of living was 24 per cent point to point. The levels of settlement were generally in the range of 25 per cent over two years, just trying to keep up with the cost of living or go a little ahead. Mr. Adams announced to a joint meeting of unions and associations on the 9th August 1982 that Government intended to legislate salaries at \$25 a week or \$108 a month. There had been three meetings with Establishments when Mr. Adams made this decision, and he said

he could not offer a settlement of more than \$25 million because it would jeopardise the public finances of this country.

He then later on came back and said he would put on a 2M> per cent on basic salaries; 12% per cent at a time when the cost of living was going at 24 per cent, 24.7 per cent if you want to take the point. What were the differences when the Barbados Workers' Union was still negotiating after three meetings? We were now negotiating for category I in the key scale and we were at \$277.50 a week, Government was at \$247. In category II we were at \$241.50, Government was at \$218.20, and again I do not need to go through all of this.

You will recall that 1982 is the year when the NUPW staged a one day stoppage because of that. The Barbados Union of Teachers staged a series of what they called rotary strikes to try to get the Government to come back to the bargaining table. You will recall that there were strikes by the Welfare Department, there were strikes by the non-nursing staff of the St. Michael District Hospital. You will remember at that time also that Government tried to reduce the uncertified sick days from 21 to six among the public servants, and that 1 200 picketed Government headquarters in 1982. After the negotiations, Government sent off workers from the National Housing Corporation, the Water Authority, the National Conservation Commission, the School Meals, ADC Tractor Extension, the Pine Hill Dairy, the teaching service. People were severed from teaching and in 1982 that same Government brought in the Emergency Powers Bill. This is the fair Barbados Labour Party we are talking about, how good they were in granting wages to the workers of this country.

In 1984 after one meeting with the Barbados Workers' Union, Mr. Adams met with the NUPW; the cost of living was 12.4 per cent, private sector increases ranged between 10.5 per cent and 18 per cent. And you will see a moderation in the kinds of levels of settlement that the Unions were agreeing to because they were looking at the economic conditions of this country. You can see that moderation, not any wildness, but the unions understanding economics and understanding the importance of keeping the country prosperous so that everybody could benefit. He legislated 15 per cent increase on 1983-84 salaries with a further 5 per cent on 1984-85 salaries. Following that there was a white paper on industrial relations. No unions in Barbados went on strike, sick out or anything else. That was in 1984.

In 1986 clearly you had an anomaly here, a situation where elections are going to be held in May and

public sector salaries are to be determined in April. You did not get off the ground in terms of negotiations. It was not a question of any unions coming together against any political party; nonsense. You have an election in May, salaries are due to be settled in April; you start your negotiations before. There was no real time for the Government to conclude any negotiations and Government did not have the spirit to do it. Negotiations were completed in 1987 and remember, another important factor that I have to mention here, the Barbados Labour Party administration did not like the kind of negotiations the unions did in trying to decrease the disparities bringing them from 16 to 1 to 4 to 1; so they started this whole process in the 1980s of across the board increases; because if they can settle at 15 per cent across the board, they used to give that to themselves as Parliamentarians too. So that was part of their whole principle, so that the people at the top were supposed to expand and move away from the kind of differential that had been established. That is vitally important and we have to remember that.

We resisted that right through to 1986 and eventually when we settled it was again another graduated settlement. At S.I. it was 1.4 per cent first year and 2 per cent second year, a graduation scale down through Z.I6 with 4.3 per cent first year, 2 per cent second year, and at the bottom in the key scales and so on it was 9 per cent first year and 2 per cent second year. At that time the cost of living was 8.2 per cent. Private sector settlements were between 10 per cent and 15 per cent. So you can see the principle in the Barbados Workers' Union. The public sector negotiations must relate to the cost of living and they must relate to what is happening in the private sector. That has been the principle throughout, and if you look at these figures you can see that it is based on logic and scientific analysis, not on any wild emotionalism. There is nothing about politics in that. They are basic principles that anybody can go and see. Whether the Barbados Labour Party is in office or the Democratic Labour Party we negotiate by the principles of collective bargaining and we will not vary from those principles. We don't strike when we are talking to people; it is bad, and we do not encourage people to go on strike when we are talking to people. We will not be that irresponsible. The Democratic Labour Party never called on any trade union in Barbados to strike against the Barbados Labour Party for political reasons. We have never done that. I will take another opportunity at another time to look at the level of disputes in that same period, because if we were a political union in the sense that some of them are saying, I would look at the high level of disputes during the time when they were in office. It was never so; it never happened. Irresponsible statements come from people who ought to know better, but they have their reasons for making the statements.

In 1987 was the first time that there was a concluded settlement by all of the unions sitting down and saying "we agree". It only used to happen before 1976 and not only were they getting that settlement but there were significant give backs in terms of fiscal concessions. So when the honourable Member for St. Peter is saying that people did not queue up to get money in December 1987, what were they going to queue up for? They had a lot of money given back to them already. You have to understand that. You have to look at all the factors now. The honourable Member for St. Peter is^N only trying to make excuses about the bad industrial relations policy of the Barbados Labour Party, an anti-union party, especially in its present formation; and there is no real difference between the leadership and the gadflies that write for them. The leadership cannot tell them anything because they are all of the same kind.

The Democratic Labour Party in 1988 established from the start that it was going to go in for industrial relations even after people like the honourable Member for St. Thomas came out early and said there was going to be a wage freeze, setting up the grounds for industrial conflict in this country. Then they went on the public platform and said "settle at no less than 10 per cent then." That is what they told the people in this country. The Government had got an agreement with ten per cent, but this was not anything that was got because of industrial relations — two of the -best in the country sitting down, one on one side and one on the other, with a background that we do not negotiate unless all , of our membership give up the guidelines where to go and how to settle. 1.10p.m.

The Government has got an agreement with 10% and this was not anything that was keeping us from industrial relations — two of the best in the country sitting down, one on one side and one on the other with a background that we do not negotiate unless all of our membership give us the guidelines where to go and how to settle. We do not negotiate and settle outside of our membership.

When we took the final position every sector that we represented voted "Yes".

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Your side likes to bring in all of these false things and parade them as facts. Give me the source of your facts. Do not call it here. We do not have any sou sou talkings - unanimous. Nobody dissented. Not one person dissented. You sent in your yard fowls and so on. Let them bring false news to you. Nobody dissented. All of the divisions of the Barbados Workers' Union in the public sector came to the meeting. Hartley Henry was there. No dissent, so do not give the impression that this was a settlement by any one individual.

We did not tell the "Nation" that they could not come in there and hear what was going on. We did not care whether they distorted what happened or not. He might be a member of the union for all we are concerned, because we have people at the "Advocate" and the "Nation" organized. Come here and say what you have to say.

This is an agreement between a responsible union, one of the best in the world and a Government, and we can stand by the principle that we negotiated on over the years — cost of living increase, when we are dealing with the Government; level of settlements in the private sector; Government's ability to pay, and the principles of industrial relations.

The Honourable Member for St. Peter is there giving me some kind of signal. He knows that his administration is weak on industrial relation matters. He knows that the principle adopted by the Leader of this Government is correct.

The Prime Minister is not interfering in these matters but, of course, if you are going to have the voluntary system it also presupposes that all of the persons involved will act responsibly too. Government has acted responsibly. Government has negotiated from stage 1 until now. They have never stopped negotiating. There was no breakdown. There was no impasse. There has never been and that is a fact.

Government negotiated right through and they are still negotiating, meeting people regularly, several meetings, and the Prime Minister said he is not going to intervene and now all of them are saying that that is a sign of weakness. Sticking to principles in this country is a sign of weakness for people who are immoral. Sticking to principles is a sign of weakness for those who are destructive, miscreants who want short-term political gains and they would not care if they destroy this country in seeking that.

Certain remarks made by Mr. R. L. MORRIS were ordered expunged from the records by Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: There are persons who are allowed to use the pages of a newspaper on a regular basis and to use those pages to put lies to say that I made a pledge somewhere that increases could not go past double figures. Why you do not come out and quote that somewhere?

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I mean the man who said so is a liar, a congenital one, a terrible one, and I have to

get protection against him. But he can go in the newspaper and write what he writes about me?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am wondering if the honourable member is addressing the Chair.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: No, Sir. I am not at all referring to the Chair. I am talking about.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Remember that you are addressing the Chair, any sentiments or otherwise.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the comments and just say that they were not intended at all as an address to the Chair. They were loud Asides, Sir. My apologies, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, industrial relations in Barbados at this time are alive and well. I was part of industrial relations in Barbados from the time I was 22 years old when I was on the executive of the Barbados Union of Teachers.

In 1979 I became the President of the Community Division in the Barbados Workers Union. We had in regrading proposals from 1980. This is 1988. The Government of the day treated them with scant respect and did not encourage any discussion on them.

The problem with regrading now is that we have so many regrading proposals that went forward to the Barbados Labour Party that used to treat them with scant respect and that is why people are getting on the way they are getting on now. Understand that. They knew where they stood, with the BLP and that was nowhere, from 1980; but what that administration would do would regrade to suit some of their friends.

They regraded the Teaching Service in order to make sure that certain people went out at a certain level and in doing that they created several distortions in the complete system and they have been doing that. It is a passion with them to do things on a personalised basis, not on a scientific basis. Regrade to suit the ones whom they can get an interest for — their friends. And they have distorted the system, a serious distortion in the system, so the Democratic Labour Party is faced up with a mop-up job, a clean-up job; but it believes in the principle of collective bargaining and it believes in fair play; but it is also an administration that knows that the bottom line always is what can a small open economy afford; not only that things have to be done but there must be a process and that there has to be a timetable for doing certain things and the people in Barbados understands this, too.

They are getting commitments from this administration that we will do in such a time — six months to regrade, a year to regrade; and people who understand regrading know this is an exercise that calls for time — people who are involved in industrial relations on a day-to-day basis. If I had to go through and show you the kinds of agreements we signed, 80 a year and that sort of thing. We do not sign one every two years. We conclude agreements on a basis sometimes one or two per week and we do regrading exercises as a regular process in the private sector with smaller groups of people, not 22 000 people, not 36 000 people, but small groups, and we know how timely it is and what an expert job it is, so we understand that there are wise and sensible people out there who know too.

The bottom line in this discussion is that industrial relations is vitally important in a country with 110 000 workers most of whom are wage and salary earners and industrial relations is at the heart of this economy.

Industrial relations is vitally important to the country. It is not something that people should be using to make scurrilous comments when they know better. It is too important, and I believe the practitioners should be given the respect and the trust that they deserve in making sure that the kind of settlement in this country is reached that will be for the benefit of all Barbadians.

As I said, the principles are set out — the cost of living increase, what is going on in the private sector, Government's ability to pay as well as the principles of collective bargaining, and we have never strayed from those principles. The Barbados Workers' Union has never strayed from those principles and the Democratic Labour Party has also adhered to those principles.

The distortion came between 1976 and 1986.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has one more minute.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: It was one of the reasons why that administration was tossed out ignominiously and now they are saying they are keeping a watch on Public Service negotiations. This is the big thing on their side now, they are keeping a watch. They have no credentials to keep a watch on it. They have no respect in that area and they are now quaking to see when the final settlement will come.

This is only the first shot in this war because they must not be allowed to get away in trying to fool the people of this country by their spurious and weak arguments and their propaganda: using all of the channels

.available to them and now wanting to privatise CBC to use that too by the same person. He will sell it to the company that he is associated with, I am sure, but I say no more, Sir.

Thank you very much.

(Applause).

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I understand the reason for the ire of the last member who spoke. There was an editorial in one of today's papers on him rinsing him out for nonsense that he wrote on Sunday attacking black people on the ground of shade.

(Aside).

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I have not written anything yet. That is the kind of behaviour you get from an Amin so that if he is a refined version of Idi Amin, we expect that from him. 1.20 p.m.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It is a sad day when a black person can get in here and use language like was used earlier today about another black person.

Certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas were ordered by Mr. SPEAKER to be expunged from the Record.

Mr. R. P. BYER: On a point of order, Sir. I believe, Sir, that the Shorthand Writers are at some loss, if I may be allowed to interject at this point, Sir, as to what the Honourable Member for St. Thomas ought to withdraw. And I think that in fairness to what ought to be taken.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I think they are clear as to what I mean. So I do not think I need to unless there is some difficulty with them.

Mr. R. P. BYER: She is not clear. She is not clear.

Asides.

Laughter.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, the withdrawal — I am serious about this particular aspect of the Debate. I think we need to have the Records properly recorded. If the Reporters have difficulty in recording - I understand it is quite all right. Will the Honourable Member continue his speech.

• Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I want to go further, Sir. For the period 1981-1982, the end of period as shown clearly in Table 11, Sir. It shows in that period 1981-82 a change of 7%.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Honourable Member giving way?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, if he is going to elucidate. Sure.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Each time when I mentioned cost of living increases, I was talking about point to point over a two-year period, where we are looking at the historical method

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: which relates to the period of agreement, a two-year period relating to the period of agreement. I believe that the Honourable Member for St. Thomas used to be part of a negotiating team at CBC and he knows the method and he would know that the period we are talking about is not annualized nor calendar years, but we are talking about the years of the agreement, two-year period going back historically.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Now you see, Mr. Speaker, when the flaws in the argument are shown up, you get an elucidation to say, I was riot taking about 1980-81 point to point, I was talking about a two-year period. That was never said in his original presentation. I was only going by what he said in his original presentation.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, I said historical negotiation that it was point to point on the two-year period. From the start I said that.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, it is just like when he accused the late Tom Adams of intervening in public sector negotiations before and it was such a reprehensible thing to do.

But on the 2nd December, 1986 in here, his colleague the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central praised Mr. St. John for intervening in the 1986 negotiations and you can see it at page 436. I cannot quote it, that is why I give you the page. I will give it to you when I am finished. I cannot quote it in here today because of current sitting.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Page 436. I do not like anybody to challenge me when I have documents in my hand you know.

"The Prime Minister was the Honourable Bernard St. John, and I believe that he alone of the persons within the Barbados Labour Party endeavoured to deal with page 20 of the BLP Manifesto of 1976 where he endeavoured, ...to meet the unions to give a commitment towards the principles of collective bargaining and to ensure that there was no undermining of the process. And therefore in 1986 the Prime Minister met — other unions — but he met the Barbados Workers' Union and he endeavoured to point out what were the problems that were facing the country."

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Now, Sir, the substance of the Debate today is to deal with the principle of advancing loans to the workers pursuant to this Resolution.

We are being pilloried for the position that we take as outlined by the Honourable Member for St. Peter that if you are in an industrial situation where the public workers are owed back pay because the wage agreement should have been settled a long time ago, that it cannot be right to come and offer them at Christmas time a loan, well knowing that they are entitled to more ultimately upon a settlement in terms of the arrears than would be the amount of the loan.

I have lived to see that a union representing more public workers than the BWU has advised its membership not to take up this loan.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Well you know they are going to take it. Right. I said they have advised them not to take it up. The question of their taking it up is an individual decision. But the union has given them instructions.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: One individual! One individual in the same union encouraged the nurses to sick out. 1.30 p.m.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: One individual! One individual in the same union encouraged the nurses to sick out. Why don't you deal with him? A different individual. Why don't you deal with him?

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Me - I am answering you all. I do not think it is right. No Sir, I am very angry today at the level of the attack that was levelled against a friend. He will say anything.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I was not going to get involved. But once you do it, you hurt a friend of mine I am going to defend him. I am not going to let him go down without being in a position to defend him. One of these days somebody will come in here and talk about embezzlement and the loss of funds. Right. I am not a school child. I am not sitting exams. You check out! Check out! I am no teacher. I do not pretend to be teaching. It is common for the Democratic Labour Party to pretend that they are on the side of workers and supporting principles of collective bargaining. In 1968 Barrow legislated the sugar industry wages. In 1968

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. Once Sir, the Honourable Member was speaking at Ruby and did the same thing and a lady had to tell him to put a

handle on it. The Honourable Member cannot refer to a previous Honourable Member of this House in those terms, Sir. Put a handle on it.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS; He wants me to say that a Member got in here today and said Tom Adams and nobody called for any handle to be attached to him. I called him Barrow. I do not have any exceptional respect for him. He was a Prime Minister who did a job for Barbados. I am not a sycophant.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order. He is misleading the House, Sir. The honourable Member is misleading the House. The honourable Member has demonstrated on more than one occasion that he had exceptional respect for the late honourable Member and that he had more respect for that honourable Member than he had for his own late leader Tom Adams.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: That is a foolish matter of his own opinion — stupidity. You see, I am not letting myself get carried away, because in 1976 these words were said about him. "People in the Democratic Labour Party want us to believe in obeah. Mr. Barrow and the people in the Democratic Labour Party are telling the intelligent people of this country that the complex problems facing this country can be solved by a single man with a big head."

Mr. SPEAKER: Now the Honourable Member is reading.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am reading yes, Sir, from the Nation of Sunday, September, 1976.

Mr. SPEAKER: Very clearly, very clearly you know that is a breach of the rule. You cannot use

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I bow to you, Sir. But if I can remember

Mr. SPEAKER: You will take it up.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, Sir. The person who was making the very profound observation also pointed out that other countries have a host of people to solve their difficulties. But the Dems wants us to believe, Sir, that because Barrow's head might be bigger than Tom Adams' head, he alone is fit to be Prime Minister of Barbados. Sir, that was called the big head obeah approach to leadership and the words which sprung from the present Minister of Transport and Works, Sir, at Webb Hill in St. Philip in 1976 I highly endorse. I do

not get carried away by this big head leadership. If he had the view of Mr. Barrow at that time, Sir

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Why don't you behave yourself? One does not go overboard at a certain level, Sir, and *be* sycophantic about people because they are leaders. Because all leaders have strengths and weaknesses and one has to be sufficiently critical to be able to make proper judgement.

In 1976 the Honourable Member who spoke before me used the year 1976 as a peg on which to hang the thesis of his argument today that industrial relations took a different turn in 1976. What he did not say was that prior to the dissolution of Parliament in 1976 the same Barrow, sitting over here, legislated, that is the word that is being used, the public workers salaries and incurred the wrath of Mr. Frank Walcott and the present Minister of Trade sitting here in 1976. I do not know what is meant by legislation of salaries. Let me just make that clear. I heard a religious person make the point Friday or Saturday.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Frank Walcott was in here and as Frank Walcott in 1976. Don't ask me to paint him up.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, I call him by his two names by which he was christened and baptised and whatever, Sir.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: On a point of elucidation, Sir. The Honourable Member wants to know — he is not sure what is meant by legislation of salaries, Sir. It was always clear to talk about legislation before agreement, because I am very clear about legislation of salaries for public sectors. But I also want to speak about legislation before agreement. The Right Honourable Errol Barrow before he died in addressing this Chamber talked about certain people submerging from

Asides.

Mi. R. L. MORRIS: What was that?

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, I said I don't understand what is meant by legislation of salaries. No public worker — civil servant can get an increase in salary unless the Civil Establishment Order is brought here. It is something that has developed I believe in the vernacular of the Press. What I understand is that where one union or other agrees to settle for a particular amount but the others do

not agree then the Government say "well, that is the end of the negotiations. I have so and so on my side and I am going down to the House with the Civil Establishment Order". That is done whether the agreement is reached as a result of the exhaustion of the collective bargaining process or otherwise. You still have to come in here.

»

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Don't interfere with me today otherwise you will get one from Ambrose.

Sir, the position of the Opposition is quite simple. < We feel, Sir, that the principle at this time of offering advances, well knowing that the people are legitimately entitled to an increase and back pay - that this is a sop. And I endorse the language of my colleague "born out of a paternalistic attitude" that does not really advance the social and economic being of the worker. It is a temporary thing. 1:40 p.m.

Nobody is going to get more than \$400. What we have also said is that having regard to the development of a number of systems and mechanisms within the financial community that would allow the individual worker access to funds, indeed more than \$400 in many cases and perhaps in all cases, that we should be encouraging our people (a) to be self-reliant and (b) to be making use of the other mechanisms.

This is not a gift. Government is only putting itself in the place of another lender. That is all. Government is not giving the workers any money; they are lending them and they have to pay it back or have it docked. And I must reiterate that we take exception with the distortions of the honourable member for Christ Church East Central who would seek to confuse the history, to distort the history of industrial negotiations in this country by pretending that the Democratic Labour Party never adopted the posture of having settled with a Union, then coming to Parliament with the Civil Establishment Order to tie the hands of the others.

Asides.

He never said it. When he said 1976 he did not say prior to September 2 or both, he left the impression that 1976 involved the Barbados Labour Party alone. What I am saying is that prior to the 2nd September, 1976 there was evidence of his own party doing what the Barbados Labour Party was accused of.

I am proud to say, Sir, on behalf of the Barbados Labour Party, which gave birth to the Barbados Workers' Union, that never have we - I use the word "legislate"

now advisedly within the context — legislated or negotiated an increase as low as the Democratic "Labour Party gave the workers of Barbados two years ago. Seventy four dollars a month more, after promising them the earth. The worst we could have done, Sir, was 1982 when it was \$108 across the board.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The tax that you cut and the taxes you have imposed and the surcharge? Sir, you were in here in April 1987 when there was an attempt even to tax vegetables, when \$16 million of indirect taxation went on. You were in here, Sir. They forget, and this year \$110 alone. The problem with consumption tax is that all of us of whatever rank or order are affected. We are buying virtually the same things, because they have consumption taxes on everything from shoe laces up to whisky, exercise books, but we are not going through that now. The worst we have ever done was \$108 as compared with \$74 under them.

In 1980 there were increases from 38.3% at the bottom to 22% at the top; so that we are waiting to see the conclusion of the wage negotiations. We are not making any detailed comment about the level of negotiation, or the details of the negotiation, we are not getting into that.

A side.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Not one of us has mentioned that now the negotiations are going on, Sir, on any platform.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I said before they started, long time in Independence Square. I said they should not take less than ten. You all settle very close, you know.

A sides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The more they interfere with me, Sir, the more I will throw some

Mr. SPEAKER: And the more time you will get.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Thank you, Sir. We want to stay clear of embroiling ourselves in the details of the current negotiations, but we just make the point of principle. If we really wanted to get involved, Sir, you would hear some things today.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member has one minute more.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, Sir. They do not even recognise when one is dealing with principles and not details. We are not commenting on who is right, who should move half percent or not. We are not doing that, what we are saying is you are lending people money now, well' knowing that you owe them money and it is better to settle quickly so that the workers will have their own money to spend however they like without having to think of repaying Government.

But I am glad that they are behaving like this. They do not even understand what they are doing to themselves as a party. They are not settling with the workers before Christmas, so the workers will have a rough time this Christmas. And not only them, all the businesses that depend on ...

(Aside)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, do you know why I am worried about it? Because in 1976 Sir Theodore Brancker, the former Speaker, after the elections

(Aside)

I am worried about the shops, yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Because your time has run out.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir? Sir Theodore Brancker said he could not find one person having a good thing to say in the supermarket field for the now Minister of Health when he was in charge of Trade and Industry.

Mrs. M. BARKER—WELCH: Mr. Speaker, I should like to compliment the Government on sticking to principles and allowing some persons this Christmas to have the facility of having some money which they can spend at this time of the year.

I am sure that I am speaking for a lot of women in this island who work for the Government and who are heads of households, and at this time of the year this concern of this Government in allowing people to have this money is going to be very much appreciated by those persons. The thing is that this has been a principle set down by the Democratic Labour Party and this Government, and it is nothing whatever to do with wages. I do not see how the honourable member for St. Thomas can tie in this Christmas loan with the wages. It is nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. The honourable member for Christ Church East Central started before me and he is the one who talked at length, for half an hour, about wages. Why don't you look to your left and see who started it?

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.
1:50 p.m.

Mr. Speaker ordered that certain remarks made by the Honourable Members for St. Thomas and St. Jcfseph be struck from the record.

Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH: I just wanted to say that from what has been happening in the past few weeks, the honourable Members on the other side have very little knowledge of the true nature of industrial relations, and show to my mind great immaturity in trying to upset the peace of this country by advising people to do this and to do that; and also at their meetings certain members are advising people not to pay this to this union and all sorts of things and trying to govern this country from that side, but we are governing, not you, and the Prime Minister of this country is quite right in allowing negotiations to go as they are going.

Contrary to reports in the newspapers, negotiations are going on in the manner that they should be going on except for a few persons who are allowing themselves to be infiltrated to disturb the peace of this country, and so, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to make a long speech. I just want to say that the majority of Barbadians are going to be happy with this, and when the negotiations have been concluded in a proper manner befitting industrial relations, it will be to the satisfaction of those people who have the good will of Barbados at heart and who do not want to see anarchy and the sort of situation that arises in other countries, when people who should be helping to keep law and order are fomenting the situation.

I would finally like to implore — of course I do not think they have such good ears — but I would like to implore the media of this country to be more responsible to its citizens in reporting certain events, to be more responsible in reporting things to the citizens of this country. The Democratic Labour Party has shown over the years that it cares about people and especially about the workers of this country, and I am telling you that there are a lot of people out there who read the newspapers and understand very well what is happening. They understand that they want to undermine the strength of this Democratic Labour Party, and I can tell you that the majority of people out there understand more than the Honourable Members over there think they understand, and they understand where we are coming from, especially the women of this country. I can tell you that we are more than 51 per cent of the population, and the women of this country are in sympathy. They understand and they know that this Government is going to do things in their interest, because when we do things for the majority we are helping all the women in the country. We do not have to go out and raise flags at every minute saying what we

are doing, but we are going to be systematically doing things that will benefit every man, woman and child in this country.

So, Mr. Speaker, I compliment the Government on its stand, I make my point and I take my seat. I thank you.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, just a short intervention on this matter. I really want to understand the position of Honourable Members of the Opposition, unless it is a side show, because I have not heard the Leader of the Opposition yet on this subject ifrid therefore, maybe, his position differs substantially from theirs. Is the Opposition saying that because it is perceived by them that the Government owes the public workers money that you can't give a Christmas advance? That is a foolish concept for the simple reason that you do not operate at the level in terms of execution of policy on the basis of fact that existed at a particular or given time. We have said that we will be giving Christmas advances and we are giving them irrespective of whatever other kinds of factors may come into play; so I do not really understand how last year there was not a word from the Honourable Member for St. Peter. He did not say anything, not a word. It was the Honourable Member for St. Thomas who spoke last year and he wanted a minor correction to the manner in which it was worded. He did not object; they did not vote against it simply because, according to them, we did not owe the public workers money; but now we owe the public workers money, there is a big hue and cry. What does that say about the policy of the Barbados Labour Party? Do you have a policy? That is why I want to hear the Leader of the Opposition, because he is the one who had said on the last occasion when we were debating the Estimates in here that the Barbados Labour Party is committed to members and officers of unions running as candidates and that he sees no reason why people should be attacking trade unions in this way. He committed the Barbados Labour Party to that. If you read last year's Estimates, he said very clearly how he felt about it. I have it here. The Honourable Member for Christ Church West said that. But in Villa Road he allowed one of the big businessmen in the Barbados Labour Party to get up and say that members, not officers, of the trade unions, in other words, working class people it can simply be translated, should not offer themselves as candidates because they cannot serve two masters.

Mr. SPEAKER ordered that certain remarks made by the Honourable Member be struck from the record.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: A former Cabinet Minister, a big business man or front man for bigger business-

men said words to the effect that members of the trade unions, I read it carefully, should not offer themselves as candidates because they cannot serve two masters. It is at complete variance with what the Leader of the Opposition said in here during the Estimates debate, and yet today they can get on as though they are on the workers' side. All of a sudden they have found the workers of Barbados; all of a sudden the Honourable Member for St. Thomas can get up and say that the Barbados Labour Party started the Barbados Workers' Union. Well go and tell that particular member of your party that and disassociate yourself from that kind of wickedness and that assault on the working people of this country because what in essence it is an assault on, and I have no fear in saying, black people, because you all do not like to hear that kind of thing. It is an assault on black, working-class people. It affects me because I represent them. Go up in St. John. That is who I represent. 2.00 p.m.

The Honourable Member for Christ Church West understands that. He comes from St. John but I represent black people.

(Aside).

Mr. D. H. J. THOMPSON: I am not going to fall into that trap. We have had a long lecture in here on the concept of legislation of salaries and whether it is the right word. All of that is irrelevant. It cannot be relevant. We all understand what we are talking about when we say "the legislation of salaries."

We had a little talk about what a loan is and he tells the workers they have to pay it back. We all know we have to pay back loans. That is nothing for you to be getting up having to tell us in here. We understand the principle on which this money is being advanced.

I only have one thing to say with respect to this concept of sycophants. I want to say to this House what I consider a sycophant to be regardless of who is offended in here. When a Prime Minister refuses to conduct negotiations or refuses to allow the unions to put their positions over a period of time so that a final

decision can be arrived at and comes in this Chamber and legislates salaries and its own members sit down and support it, they are sycophants too. That is my view, Sir; so that all of those who cannot get up and disassociate themselves from those kinds of positions can only be sycophants.

Mr. SPEAKER: The time is now 2.00 o'clock. The Honourable Leader of the House.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Yes, Sir. It being the hour of 2.00 o'clock, I move that further consideration of this matter be postponed.

I move that the House be suspended until 2.45 p.m.

The question that the House be suspended until 2.45 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the House accordingly.

RESUMPTION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed. If the Honourable Member for St. John .

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: The Standing Orders were not suspended. It is Question Time.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: Question Time. Question No. 85, the Honourable Member for St. James North.

Question No. 93, the honourable Member for St. Thomas.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: To ask the Prime Minister:

Will the Prime Minister please state:

1. Whether the Government is preparing a Development Plan?
2. If the answer is in the affirmative, what is the period to be covered in and by the said Plan?
3. What is the likely date of publication of the said plan, if any?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: The reply to Parliamentary Question No. 93, Mr. Speaker, is as follows:-

"The Government is preparing a Development Plan for the period April 1, 1988 to March, 31 1993. That Development Plan is now in the final stages of preparation and it is proposed to lay it in the House of Assembly during the month of December, 1988.

The following information should be noted in respect of the two previous Development Plans:

- (a) the 1979-1983 Development Plan period commenced on April 1, 1979 and ended on March 31, 1983, but the Development Plan document was not laid in the House of Assembly until December 18, 1979;
- (b) the 1983-1988 Development Plan period commenced on April 1, 1983 and ended on March 31, 1988, but the Development Plan document was not laid in the House of Assembly until February 14, 1984."

Mr. SPEAKER: Supplementary?

No. 85 - the Honourable Member for St. James North.

Mr. J. J. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, to ask the Minister of Housing and Lands:

Will the Minister state whether Government has initiated legal procedures for the purchase of a parcel of land at Hoytes Village, St. James to the East of the St. John The Baptist Church for providing playing facilities for the residents of the area?

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the answer to Parliamentary Question No. 85 is as follows:-

"Yes. The Resolution for the compulsory acquisition of this property will be submitted to Parliament shortly."

Mr. SPEAKER: Supplementaries?

Mr. J. J. PAYNE: Just a very brief one. Could the Minister state whether anyone is now in possession of the land?

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the owner is still in possession of the land.

Mr. J. J. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, that satisfies me.

Mr. SPEAKER. Question No. 92 - the Honourable Member for St. Thomas.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: To ask the Minister of Tourism and Sports:

1. Is the Minister aware of the resignation in 1987, of the Manager of the New York Office of the Board of Tourism?
2. If the Minister is so aware, will the Minister please state whether he and/or the Board of Tourism has yet appointed a Manager of the said Board's offices in New York?
3. If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister please state the name of the appointee and the date of his/her appointment?

Hon. W. W. HALL. Mr Speaker, the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 92 is as follows:

"1. Yes, Sir.

2. The post has been advertised and the Board of Tourism is considering the applications which were received."

Mr. SPEAKER: End of Question Time.
2.55 p.m.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION URGING GOVERNMENT TO DECLARE A NATIONAL HEROES DAY IN HONOUR OF THE LATE RT. HON. E. W. BARROW, Q. C., M. P. AND OTHER PERSONS DECLARED TO BE NATIONAL HEROES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it gives me great pleasure as the Representative of St. John and the successor to the former Representative to move this particular Resolution.

The Resolution, Sir, speaks for itself and I believe it has been circulated to Honourable Members but. Sir, I will try to paraphrase basically what the Resolution seeks to do. This Resolution is that:

"WHEREAS the late Right Honourable Errol Walton Barrow, Q. C., was a member of this Honourable House for the constituency of Saint George

from 1951 to 1956 and of Saint John from 1958 until his death on 1st June, 1987.

AND WHEREAS he also served Barbados successively as Premier and first Prime Minister from 1961 to 1976 and again as Prime Minister from 29th May, 1986, until his death.

AND WHEREAS as Premier and Prime Minister of Barbados he presided over governments which introduced important social, political and economic measures for the upliftment of Barbadians and the transformation of Barbadian society, including the establishment of free secondary or tertiary education for all Barbadians.

AND WHEREAS he was committed to regional institutions and integration in the Caribbean and was a founder and original signatory of the Agreement establishing the Caribbean Free Trade Area (CARIFTA), 1967, and of its successor, the Treaty establishing the Caribbean Community (CARICOM). and served this country and the Caribbean region selflessly and with distinction.

AND WHEREAS it is appropriate that our country should honour the lives and work of our most outstanding citizens as National Heroes.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT this Honourable House urge Government to commemorate the life and work of the Right Honourable Errol Walton Barrow by acclaiming him as our first National hero and by establishing his birthday, January 21st, as National Heroes Day a Public Holiday in each year in tribute to him and to every other person declared a National Hero of Barbados."

Sir. I should like to begin in moving this Resolution by perhaps dealing with some of the conceptual difficulties that the Resolution may pose to a person who is not discerning. Sir, it is not to say that in declaring Errol Barrow as the Resolution says as the first National Hero that that either means he is pre-eminent or that he will have that designation our first National Hero capital F.

So it is just that I believe, as all Barbadians I think believe that the contribution of Errol Barrow to our national life is so substantial that he stands to us and to our memory as a National Hero.

Also, Sir, another point that I think is very important in moving this Resolution is to point out that it is not an attempt by me or by Parliament in my view to make heroes by decree, nor is it an attempt by Parlia-

ment to create heroes by decree. It is a response, Sir, essentially to a number of factors which have come into place since the death of that distinguished gentleman. First, the desire of my own constituents in the constituency of St. John whom he represented for "a very considerable time and for whom his memory is a source of inspiration and which they hold in great affection. And this really has been the most important factor that has influenced my moving this particular Resolution in this Honourable House.

But, Sir, the second point which is just as important and it has been stressed time and time again in this Chamber, and that is why I believe that this particular Resolution will find support in this Chamber, is that we need to highlight and promote the life and work of Errol Barrow and other National Heroes in this country and especially those who have contributed in political life who very often stand not to be counted at the end of the day.

In addition to that, Sir, I believe that there is a need to put in place some suitable memorial to Errol Barrow and this was one of the things that had been called for during the speeches made in this Honourable House on the Resolution expressing sympathy on his death.

There are no two ways about it, Sir, we have had time. And the people of Barbados - the media, the church, all of the institutions in this country, have had time to assess the contribution made by Errol Barrow to our national development. They did not start to assess it from the date of his death. Even after the Democratic Labour Party lost office in 1976, assessments were made of Errol Barrow's tremendous contribution. And even during the period that he was in Opposition he was held in high regard for his commitment to regional institutions and for the work that he did on behalf of the people of Barbados and this country, both here and overseas.

Now, Sir, I want to make this point up front because I believe that it should be said, not that it is the pre-eminent factor in what this Resolution is about. Sir, in any kind of analysis of somebody's contribution to our political life or social life or religious life, there is no need, contrary to this drumming in our ears all the time, there is no need for us to be objective in the sense, Sir, that I do not believe that it is necessary for us to take this attitude that because somebody is a member of an opposing party or even of another church, that we have to support a Resolution that promotes their cause. I am not saying that that is required. But I believe that in any event, the contribution that Errol Barrow has made to this country stands up in relation to both of the political parties and in relation to all of the national institutions

in this country as a sterling contribution that should be honoured and suitably memorialised. So that I do not want to place the premium on objectivity. He was one of us in the Democratic Labour Party. He was part of us. He was part of our lives of the people of St. John. And that is what motivates this particular Resolution that I am moving here today.

In that sense, Sir, I believe that the Resolution may be viewed by some, perhaps in the public forum, to be subjective coming from the Democratic Labour Party. But I believe that we have to lead the way. It has been said in here on several occasions in tribute to various politicians that suitable memorials and suitable edifices or national honours should be bestowed upon them and that in that way, perhaps it will assist in promoting good relations between the political parties, and it will provide for our young people, role models that can be emulated.

So that bi-partisan support for this Resolution, Sir, would be a most desirable thing and in that regard I have had cause to look at the speeches which have been made by the Honourable Members for the Opposition, both who are present with us, who themselves said that they believe that suitable memorials should be established for the life and work of politicians in Barbados during the presentations in the Resolution of sympathy after Mr. Barrow's death. We cannot therefore in that sense be all things to all men. But we can single out individuals who have made that contribution and we can commit ourselves to, not only following their effort and keeping it alive in the minds of our people, but we can establish suitable memorials to these people in one form or another. Those, Sir, are what I consider the conceptual matters.

And I wish, therefore, to turn, Sir, to the wider considerations that each of our political Leaders has passed on and there have been various remarks in the public forum by leaders in the society, by politicians, about their work and contribution to this country, and there have been several calls, none of which has really ever been answered, for the establishment of suitable memorials of other kinds or means of honouring the life and work of these people, and ensuring that their names live with us for perpetuity. 3.05 p.m.

Callers on local radio programmes have made the call. We have made it in this House of Assembly as recently as during a speech on the establishment of some memorial to Charles Duncan O'Neal. The Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central pointed out the need to establish suitable memorials to those persons who gave their lives during the 1937 disturbances, and also pointed out the need for the lives and works of

politicians in our country who have contributed to be memorialised. We are living today, but tomorrow there will be young people who, unless we do something about it, will never know about the work and the tremendous sacrifice that politicians may have made, both in their individual capacity and in working with any particular party for the advancement of the people of this country. I think it is important, Sir, that in that regard we take a step now to do one of the things that we should do.

Sir, it cannot be enough to have biographies which when reduced and stripped of the anecdotes or personal experiences mean nothing. Sir, I have read several of them. I have recently read one which I thought was disappointing in that it says nothing about the work of the person. It says nothing about their contribution. It in no way tries to develop a theme about the person's life. All it is, is a collection of statements about the individual, or a collection of obscure events in the life of that individual, about personal reflections of people, but it never really gets to the root of establishing the individual as an outstanding political figure if he is that. If he is that then the biographer should seek to do that because today there is not a lot of that is being written, either, out of the university. Well, I should not say written. A lot may be written but very little is being published. There are- courses at the University of the West Indies, for example, Caribbean Studies and others, where the Manifesto of our political parties are analyzed, where the lives and works of politicians are analyzed and they end up going on a file index in the library. None of us ever see them and basically they are not for public consumption. Yet a biography, which I say, says little about an individual's political contribution and says more about the views of people around him who may very well be sycophantic. We do not know. Those kinds of biographies really do not lend any assistance to young people who are searching for truth and who are searching for the background to the development of this country over time. I think that in that regard, Sir, we have to have tangible expressions which speak to the achievement of people who made the difference in Barbados, like Errol Barrow and others who I presume over time we will seek to memorialize and pay tribute to. A suggestion has been made in the Other Place that the Government commission a biography of Errol Barrow. Well, that suggestion as far as I am concerned stands for many of the other persons, too, who have made a contribution in this Honourable House who very shortly may pass away and whom we may never have any idea of what their personal views are, or their political views of the development of Barbados today and going into the 21st century. So it is okay for us to live now and to say "Oh, yes we should

honour these people," but yet it seems as though so little is being done and «ven what is being done is so token. If for example, Sir, I can draw a reference.

I do not really know the history of it but a bust was done of the late Sir Grantley Adams. When one drives down Bay Street, Sir, it is a tiny thing. You can pass it without even noticing it. That is not, Sir, in my view the way to memorialise a politician whom a political party may promote as one of those persons who has made a contribution. Okay, naming an airport after him is one thing. But when you are travelling on a plane a tourist has never asked me who Grantley Adams was. They do not ask you who V. C. Bird is. People do not ask those questions. You just come up hearing Grantley Adams Airport. Some people do not even ask their parents who was Grantley Adams. So that I believe that there must be more meaningful ways to promote the lives and works of these individuals, and I believe that one of the ways in which we can do it, Sir, is by establishing in this place an Errol Barrow Day for the life and work of Errol Barrow in this country. So that in 20, 30 years time hopefully, the Errol Barrow Day will be something of significance in our national life not only to be reflecting on Errol Barrow, but to be reflecting in a national way on the development of Barbados and to do some other things which I shall shortly speak of.

Sir, what historians and other people, even politicians, call the post-Independence era will come to an end. You will not forever be walking around and talking about post-Independence. In fact, in 30 years time Independence will be a joke to people. In other words, young people will not see independence as a significant event. We see it as a significant event. The 1937 riots have passed and today people do not see it as a significant event. But back then those persons who were oppressed and those persons who suffered prior to the development of a mass political party, trade unions, and so on saw that as a significant event, and then Independence came and that was a significant event. Therefore, the disturbances went into the background and all that we have done is say that it is a day of national significance. Independence Day exists as a bank holiday. Eventually the time will pass and people will wonder why we are celebrating Independence Day and there will be some other kind of national development which perhaps will assume even greater significance than Independence does.

So I believe that it is our duty today to promote and cherish those things that mean something to us. They will not forever mean something to Barbadians in the way

that they mean something to us today. But we have a duty to ensure that we have put in place the mechanisms by which the particular individuals and events can be memorialised, and by which young people can use the opportunity presented by us to reflect on our national development and the persons who contributed substantially to that development.

Sir, I envisage the Errol Barrow Day being a public holiday and I believe, Sir, that the occasion should be used as a national occasion for the development of community activities, cultural, sporting and educational activities whether it is quizzes and debates, sporting competitions like those that we hold at Independence and cultural activities, small community shows and so on.

There are some people who have been saying recently that Barbados has too many public holidays or if you add another public holiday it is too costly. Sir, the point about it is that many of the great nations have substantially more public holidays than us. But let us not even draw that analogy. The persons in my view who benefit most from public holidays are the small vendors, people who go out to the public parks to sell, the people who make handicraft, the persons who operate small businesses, whether it is discotheques, whether it is dance halls, the people who operate minibuses who carry out people on excursions, persons who cater for functions - all of those people see public holidays as significant events for them. People go into Bridgetown and buy clothes for years. People have been going into Bridgetown before public holidays and excursions and buy their excursion material and a lot of small people benefit from that kind of thing. It is only the persons who employ 400 people or 200 people who complain as soon as you give a public holiday and they have to pay. 3.15 p.m.

There are a lot of small people in this community who benefit substantially when we have public holidays. I am not saying we should have public holidays twice a month or three times a month, but I am just answering that argument by saying that it is not altogether uneconomic or undesirable for public holidays, particularly those of national significance, to be placed on our calendar and to be celebrated in a positive way.

Sir, I believe that an Errol Barrow Day should also be an occasion to highlight some of the other people in the community who have contributed substantially; the people for whom Errol Barrow made his greatest commitment, the persons who are involved in teaching our children — the civil servants, policemen, the firemen

- in other words the individuals in the community who have made a difference, the people who are Justices of the Peace and who would welcome people to their home at any time of day or night and have served them selflessly for no reward. Those are the kinds of people whom I believe, Sir, we should spend some time honouring while they are also still alive and we should use the occasion of the Errol Barrow Day to do so.

I believe one of the most pleasing developments that has occurred in recent times is the growing awareness and positive response of people to public discussion ^ on all kinds of issues. For example, the emancipation lectures where sometimes you cannot even get a seat in Queen's Park Steel Shed, and all kinds of other public participation programmes that have developed and grown up over the years; and I believe that the establishment of Errol Barrow Day could in each community encourage people to promote public lectures, public education programmes with an emphasis on building Barbados through ** education.

Sir, I believe that especially at this time when we are engaged in a tremendously important discussion on questions of race in Barbados that it becomes important for us to promote positive images of our people. That can be interpreted in whatever way anybody „ wishes to interpret it.

There is too much ascendancy of the view in this country that black people are not united, that we strive against one another, that we are deceitful. I have read in recent times articles in the Sunday Sun where people said they were sitting down and having a conversation and all they could do is point out to each other all of the bad things about black people.

I read during the Independence Supplement in the newspaper people saying, all of a sudden, that we are all Barbadians and there should be no discussion about black people, because we are all striving against each other and we do not promote our own people, et cetera. And there is too much ascendancy of that view, because in this country, unlike other countries in the world, we still have important institutions like the family, and people cannot compete easily against Barbadians and other black West Indians, for the fact that they still maintain very close and important family ties.

There are other races that cannot compete with black people, whether in the West Indies or elsewhere, who have gone overseas and have sent remittances to their families on a weekly or monthly basis to ensure that they survive and that they enjoy a better standard of living. That is something positive that we never talk about.

Sir, we never talk or promote pride in our own work, the things that we do better than other people, so that all that is littered in the newspapers and all that is coming out in the public forum is that black Barbados is disunited and that we are not in any way interested in pursuing anything for the betterment of ourselves. That view, as far as I am concerned, is nonsense and I believe that occasions, as I said, like the Errol Barrow Day should be used to promote positive images of ourselves, positive images of Barbadians who have contributed, who have made the difference and who can be looked at and viewed in a positive light for our young people.

But even more important than that, Sir, is our responsibility as politicians to try to close the gap that exists between those who are governed and those who are governing. In other words, to use the opportunity of an occasion like Errol Barrow Day ~ and there could be no better an occasion — to demonstrate our own commitment to hearing the views of people, to contributing in public discussion and debates, to listening, to advising and to developing a form of community and constituency awareness between, as I say, the governed and those who govern, which is important for our success in the future.

Sir, I do not have a great deal more to say on this matter as I know my time is limited, but I believe that it is a matter that should receive full public support, both from my colleagues here who I know are looking forward to the establishment of the Errol Barrow Day as an important aspect of our national calendar, but I believe that in view of what I have read representing the views of the Opposition, that they too will eagerly support such a Resolution, and certainly they would support such a Resolution that promotes the life and work of Errol Barrow and support the aspect of it that sets up a suitable memorial to his life and work.

This is not an occasion for me to go into a long dissertation on his contribution, it is merely, as far as I am concerned, to seal all that has been said by persons from all walks of life in our community about Errol Barrow and to use this opportunity now to honour a man that we know about and that we know made a tremendous difference in Barbados, and to also start the impetus for us to use opportunities like this to honour other distinguished Barbadians in this country.

With that, Sir, I look forward to the support of other members in this matter.

Thank you.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second this Resolution and to make a few comments. I remember when we debated the Resolution calling for a befitting memorial for Charles Duncan O'Neal, the Opposition

joined with us and we were at one on the wisdom of that particular decision.

This is a similar Resolution, but I believe there must be some differences and I believe that there is going to be some debate in this country on the matter, first of all, of why a particular politician is being singled out for a day when in fact there must be several who might have certain potential to be categorised as a hero. That must be an issue.

Secondly, I believe there will be an issue about a holiday being created, and I think both areas are legitimate areas to be addressed.

I think there will be few persons who will doubt that the request here is a genuine one and one that is worthy of consideration. In fact, I believe the whole of Barbados will support the view that a day should be named after this renowned leader who rose from among us.

I have basically two concerns. One is the procedure in implementing any decision that we arrive at. I believe firmly that it is an issue which we want the entire country to be united on and therefore views other than those in this Chamber are necessary at this point in time. I believe it is vitally important that we try to reach out to institutions on an issue such as naming a Heroes Day, because as the Resolution says it is not just one hero they are trying to name, but a number of them. That is one of my concerns.

The second one is that there are many of us who have been pushing the concept of July 26 as a special day for heroes also because of certain reasons, and I don't think there is anybody who wants to desist from that particular effort. I am aware that the Opposition, when they were the Government of the day, had signified that July 26 would have been a day of special importance. 3.25 p.m.

Good measure that that was, I think that the follow-through has not been as significant as we would want and after it was named for one year or so and some special events put on, I think it just faded away and that was not continued, but the intention was there.

The principle of isolating that day as a significant day was recognised by the Government of the day, but we are going a step further than that and asking for a holiday, and I believe that that needs to be weighed; and I believe that institutional opinion should be sought on the matter. Let me say that I support it, but I think there is need for institutional opinion on it.

On the question of looking at our heroes, I would like to see a non-partisan approach on this, quite frankly, would like to see a Committee established for the purpose of looking at that list of heroes, and that should then come to Parliament for discussion and acceptance. I believe that these matters principally, really, are paramount, because what we are doing is not for present consumption but for the future. So, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I fully support the call by the Honourable Member for St. John, but I believe that these two things are important - that, firstly, there should be some national debate beyond the Chambers of this House of Assembly, and I believe that you should try to reach out to the Unions, the Employers' Confederation and other institutions in this country who certainly would have something to say about a bank holiday in terms of what a bank holiday means within our country, and in terms of moving to decide on a list of heroes, and I think it is vitally important, that we get some input from some non-partisan Committee established to look at it which we can then put to scrutiny. Once there is consensus on our heroes we should go ahead then to honour them, whether we will be honouring them on the same day that we will honour Errol Barrow or on July 26, because clearly we are not talking about multiplying days. If we are saying that there will be two days, then we will have to look and see which one will be the Errol Barrow day and the other one the national heroes day, but I think it is vitally important that we make these kinds of determinations.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite correct that when the Resolution relating to a suitable memorial for the late Dr. O'Neal came before this House, the Opposition indicated quite clearly that it was a matter that had the support of the Opposition, and this is not strange because an earlier Resolution about the honouring of Dr. Charles Duncan O'Neal was brought before this House during the time that the Opposition was the Government of the country, and the Resolution obtained the support of the present Government.

Unfortunately the procedures for the following up of this Resolution were not fully laid down and as the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central said, at the time it was not followed up. When I spoke in that debate, Mr. Speaker, I made it quite clear that I thought that these matters should not be done on an ad hoc basis. I believe that at that time I invited the Government to give consideration to a broad based Committee which would look at the whole issue of national heroes and remove from the realm of, perhaps, partisan politics the honouring or memorialising of persons who have made an outstanding contribution to the country's affairs. We have not apparently yet reached that stage, but I wish to repeat that I think that the time is long overdue when we should have established the procedure for looking at the recognition of persons, who

through the years have made significant contributions to our country in such a way that they receive not only the usual annual honours, but in such a way that those who have even made a higher contribution will receive an honour of a more permanent nature, and even the ultimate honour of being declared a national hero.....

There is enough precedent within the Caribbean and beyond for the procedures which ought to be established to ensure that when a person is designated a national hero that it meets with the approval of the broad masses of the population, and that the criteria which are used in reaching that decision are criteria that are acceptable to all of us. It is usually difficult soon after the death of a person to determine fully whether or not that person is deserving of being recognised. That is a general statement; it is not true in each case. Sometimes one has to wait until the passions of partisan politics have been removed. We must not fool ourselves that during the life time of any politician it is unlikely that you would not have rubbed some people in a way that they themselves would not want to remember. You can have feelings, Mr. Speaker, sometimes not based on other than subjective criteria or views in looking at the designation of such a person as a national hero.

I share the concerns expressed by the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central in that I think we have to clarify and set out clearly the procedures which we will use to implement decisions taken on this issue, and as part of those procedures I believe that we ought to seek the views of a non-partisan and broad based Committee, non-partisan in the sense that the major political parties in this country will be represented on such a Committee, and broad based in the sense that the Committee should go beyond the major political parties in the country and have included on the Committee persons who I think will provide and bring that same objectivity of which I spoke earlier and to which the Honourable Member for St. John made reference.

I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that we do have an advisory Committee which advises the Prime Minister and through him the Governor-General on the question of award of national honours, and that Committee is to some extent broad based, the Government and the Opposition having representation on the Committee, and there are other citizens who are neither drawn from the Government or the Opposition who sit on that Committee, and despite the fact that this Committee meets some of the criteria of which I speak, I still consider that in this case there is a case for a different Committee, probably a Committee that will have on it some of the very members of our national awards advisory Committee. But I think a Committee to look at the whole issue of national heroes, the most suitable way of honouring them, looking back in the past beyond the immediate persons who have gone in the last 20 years or so to other heroes who at the time that they

struggled in this country and made contributions would have gone unrecognised for various reasons, and those who went even years ago who might not have been honoured in any way, but who themselves deserve a honour even posthumously. 3.35 p.m.

I, also, share the second concern about how does one designate that particular day - the reasons for designating that particular day as National Heroes Day.

Mr. Speaker, July 26 was stated to be and designated to be a day of special significance. I remember the late Reginald Pierrepont campaigning almost single-handedly for many years and canvassing strongly the successive Governments to give not only that, but a higher recognition to that special day and, indeed, among my papers I have a letter from him in which he was very pleased that it had been recognized as a day of special significance after it was so recognized by the then BLP Government. He went on to express the view that he personally hoped that one day it will become more than a day of special significance. I share his view myself.

I remember when I was Minister of External Affairs he lobbied me and through me lobbied the then Permanent Representative to the U.N., the Honourable Minister of Transport and Works, — myself through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. We ensured that a Cabinet Paper was brought before the Cabinet on the matter, and a decision was taken by Cabinet to declare that day a special day. So whether the day is July 26, January 21 or some other day, it is my view that we need to have that sort of matter as well considered and all of the alternatives looked at as to whether it should be a public holiday as well.

I consider, perhaps, July 26 a very special day in this country's history and one that could encompass and could reflect the work of outstanding persons such as Grantley Adams and Errol Barrow and I see no reason why it would not be possible taking that day into account to recognize most of our national heroes.

I want to use the opportunity as well to say that one of the issues that such a committee should be asked to consider is whether posthumously, again, having had enough time to look back 50 years on events which occurred on that July, whether we should not, without rewriting history, use the opportunity to ask that the prerogative of mercy or pardons should be exercised in such a way as to pardon those persons who did nothing other, in my view, than fight for the political enfranchisement and freedom of the masses of the people in this country.

I think there is also a wider issue here, not only the recognition of the day, but the recognition of the persons who blazed a trail that most of us who have come afterwards have had to follow, and they did blaze a trail.

I do not think that is a controversy between the political parties in this country and they blazed the trail for, when I say the majority of people, I mean particularly the black majority.

It has become part of the current pejorative language in the country to think that only persons of a certain political persuasion understand what are the racial characteristics or where they stand. That has become current now, Sir, unfortunately, but, I think, that we ought to look back on those who remain unrecognized in many ways.

I think there are not a lot of Barbadians who even remember either the names of the persons and there are certainly some who do not recall the struggle that they had. I think we ought to look back on that occasion to also give them the honour that they deserve.

In many ways Jamaica has forged ahead of us in this respect. Despite the deep political divide that there is in Jamaica — and the political divide between the political parties in Jamaica is sometimes more violent in language, and in action, than I have ever seen it here - yet, I think that when it comes to issues such as this, we can learn a lesson from the manner in which Jamaica, proud as it is of the contribution which its peoples have made, has been able to grapple with this problem, deal with it and establish its national heroes, its national Heroes Square, establish its national day and, I think, has obtained a great deal of acceptability among both political parties on this issue.

We sometimes, unfortunately, Sir, as politicians, are a bit hesitant to say how difficult it is to follow the profession, or calling, or whatever you like, of being a politician. It is not easy and if we follow the adversary system of politics which we have here, it even becomes less easy to do so because the nature of the bipartisan system has within it the fact that from time to time you are going to have to disagree with persons who normally may be even your relatives, far less being your very good friends.

(Aside)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Prime Minister wants to know if I am following him in explaining my position now, Sir. No, Sir. I am sensible enough to recognize that that is the nature of politics.

I think that at the end of the day what we have to say is that those of us who have the guts to come into public life and take the calumny that sometimes come from it and to live through it all and have made contributions, no matter how big or how small our contribution, that we should be big enough to say that we have made contributions in this way.

I have no problems at all, Sir, and the Opposition has no problem. We have already expressed it here on our

side, of saying about the contribution which the late Errol Barrow made to the public life of this country.

The records are there clear and careful. We may not have always agreed with everything he said, or, in fact, did, and I am sure on his own side there were some who did not at all times agree with everything he said and did, but we have been on record as recognizing his contribution in this country, and beyond, and that, therefore, I think, it would be but fitting that whatever committee we established should give consideration to a suitable manner in which the late Mr. Barrow should be suitably honoured in this country.

I think that when we ourselves were in Government we were a little bit hesitant in the way we went about paying tribute and honour to Sir Grantley Adams who was obviously in my mind, and I think in the minds of most right-thinking people, and outstanding national hero of Barbados. I think so. 3:45 p.m.

The Honourable Member for St. John spoke of the fact that the bust of Sir Grantley which stands outside of Government Headquarters is hardly to be seen. Once again that was raised by the donation of private persons. I do not think that there was any governmental contribution financially to it. But I suppose it was a tentative beginning. I knew that later on we had made provision in the Estimates for a suitable bust of him, statue of him, to be established, and I believe that the first carvings for sculpture of that work were actually done and it has not been pursued.

I should like to think that that sort of issue again goes to a Committee which would be empowered to make the right representation and that whatever Government is in power, whether it be the late Grantley Adams, the late Errol Barrow, whatever Government is in power will only have the task of bringing to Parliament the appropriate Resolution to provide the funds for such a Committee to carry out its work.

So it is in that spirit, Sir, that I make a small contribution to this PRIVATE MEMBERS' Resolution and trust that the Mover and Seconder of the Resolution will see it necessary in fact the mover of the Resolution will accept the qualifications raised by the Honourable Member for East Central, the qualifications with which I join, not in any way at all to take away from the contribution which the late Errol Barrow has made to the public life of Barbados and the Caribbean, but to emphasize the necessity to use this occasion as one on which we can once and for all establish proper procedures of honouring people like him who have made a contribution to the life of this country. I trust that in that sense the Resolution will be seen as a non-partisan one.

The Honourable Member for East Central expressed a view that there may be a difference now between the political parties to the extent that there is need for honouring National Heroes and honouring them in a set and a proper form; I think there could be no division between the political parties. And I think that we ought to do everything to ensure that this type of Resolution which is a worthy Resolution does not cause division between the political parties in this country. And I agree with the Honourable Member. We want, on issues like these, to set a lead to the country at large whatever the day to day differences that from time to time surface between our respective political parties.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, just let me point out my position on this.

When Mr. Barrow died we spoke

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: - Do not interfere with me now - in here and paid tribute to his life and work, Sir. I believe one of the last things I said in that Debate was that he will go down as a National Hero. And that is where I stand on it, Sir.

But before we can determine a day in his honour or to his memory, having regard to how this Resolution is worded, I think it is necessary, Sir, to do things in order. Since the Resolution speaks of National Heroes in the plural, we have to get a committee to determine who are worthy National Heroes. Secondly, to have an acceptance of the recommendations of the committee. And thirdly, to determine in what manner we will honour those National Heroes, whether as Members have said by a day, a bank holiday, just a day? of significance, whether we will have a square named heroes square and erect busts and so on, whether we are going to put statues at various roundabouts in the country, whether we are going to name roads after them. I had said in here many years ago that some of the housing areas could well be designated and roads and housing areas could bear the names of Parliamentarians who served and made significant contributions. Things like Uiat, Sir. Those are all the ideas that can go in the melting pot.

So that I do not know what would happen at the end of this Resolution. The Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central seemed to have been suggesting that perhaps we may be a little premature now in determining all that the Resolution calls for. What he is suggesting or at least is my interpretation of what he is suggesting, and if so, I agree with him, is that until we have all these other preconditions and arrangements in place, we ought not to be too quick to finally vote on this matter.

Everybody will agree in principle I think that Mr. Barrow is a National Hero and should be honoured and recognized in some way. The question now remains as to the implementation of the mechanics and whether he should be singled out or whether we should do all National Heroes at one time up to this point in time, after due consultation, where the views of various opinion makers and people who have ideas and so on can be taken into account.

That is my opinion, Sir.

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I would wish to support this Resolution based on the fact that national heroes in my view must mean something to the future development of our country, by way of its impact on the young people of our country. Unlike the Honourable Member for St. Thomas, I have no difficulty in determining that a decision can be made on what is the criteria, and I mean without any difficulty, by which you would name and honour the name of Mr. Barrow as a national hero, if only because he stands out as a person who significantly means a lot to the people of this country. After all, he is the father of Independent Barbados. The development of Barbados as it relates to our young people, if it has to do with giving them a priue in their nationhood must have some beginning. And I can see no more fitting place to begin but with the memorial to the late Errol Walton Barrow.

What has been said here so far today, if a report were written on it, it would seem to me that someone could conclude that it would relate primarily to politicians. I am not saying that that is what has been said. But I would wish to make the point, Sir, that there are many aspects of national development. And I should like to think that persons in many disciplines of life have made significant contributions to the development of this country and will continue to do so.

And I should like in this short discourse, Sir, to make the point that while at this particular point, we are looking at the contribution of the late Errol Barrow and other persons who have made significant political contributions, Sir, that we give some scope to embrace those persons who have given, and sacrificially so, to the development of their nation. 3.55 p.m.

Some may have don? it, Sir, in the field of sport or the field of literature, not counting the cost that they have given in the service of their country. I believe, Sir, the country as a whole must be in a position to recognise and to honour them befittingly.

I am saying, Sir, that we have a good opportunity in the person of Mr. Barrow and honouring the work that he has done for this country and for the citizens of this

country. We have a good beginning in formalising the award of the status of national hero and I -would think. Sir, that we should waste no time in making a decisior in this particular instance on this particular person. Because I think it means a lot to the young people and people in general of this country and to the future development of our country.

I thank you, Sir.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I believe that this honourable Chamber should be grateful to the Member for St. John for bringing this Resolution before the Chamber, for highlighting the issues involved through the terms of the Resolution and for focusing national attention on the desirability in some form or fashion to pay tribute and respect to persons who have made an outstanding contribution to the development and the growth of this country.

I have listened very carefully to the speeches that "have been made and, while there have been differences in approaches, in nuances and in tendencies and expectations, I have not detected one speech where there is fundamental opposition to the recognition of the principle that in some way or another those persons who have made the kinds of contributions to which I have referred should be honoured in some way.

I, therefore, believe that this Chamber should, after listening to the various speeches, be in a position to approve this Resolution as it stands and that the implementation can then be left for the kinds of consultations and discussions that have been raised on both sides of the Chamber. But I believe that we would be sending i the wrong signals if we postpone a decision on this 1 particular matter simply because there_jriay ____ become difference— in— viewpoint as to wh^t specific day should be_set_ aside _fQjLiIMJonal_sjgnificanfe__or_ jlays _of_ importance or what is called here Heroes

I myself have some reservations and I will make it quite clear. Lam nnt a. believer in anv.-natiQnal heroes day. I will _say__that a£such. "Some talk__of Alexander, an3~some~of Hercules," " Of Hector and Lysander, and such great names as these ", but the composer of that patriotic ditty then bypassed all of those heroes and \ talked about the British grenadiers. I believe that it is perhaps not the right psychological stance for this young nation to become wrapped up and emmeshed in ideas about national heroes ano heroes square and such kinds of adulation. I do not believe in that, Sir.

There have been nations in this world which have Lbecome very wrapped up in this concept of the hero. [Those who have pursued certain aspects of literature will Jrecall the works of one Thomas Carlise in a book 1 Obelieve it is called "Past and Present" and in other works

in which he spoke in almost spiritual terms of the hero and the place of the hero in the nation and it all tended; towards the kind of sycophantic adulation. Note I did not say "sy-cophants" or "sy-cophantic". My pronunciation is the purest.

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: The only trouble is that we have the authority behind us.

(Laughs.)

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: And what we get from that is that a nation, and I do not have to call names, carried this thing to such an extent that there was this sycophantic adulation behind the Leader and it ended up in one of the most heinous dictatorships that the world has ever known. So you will forgive me, Mr. Speaker, if I do not approach this subject with the same kind of full endorsement as far as the aspect of a National Heroes Day is concerned.

I believe that there are ways and means of recognising those who have made significant contribution without going down that particular road. I believe that one of the best ways in which we can emphasize the contribution -that leaders have made- in this country, significant contribution, is to pay respect to them when they are alive and when they are dead. I believe so. 4:05 p.m.

¹ We have a particular responsibility in this Chamber to give a lead and to set standards. And if we even by accident, Mr. Speaker, show the kind of disrespect for those whom we ourselves have called, in previous speeches and on important occasions, national heroes, and then by our own words come afterwards and try to diminish the efforts that we made previously, then we are sending the wrong signals.

There is no honourable member in here who should/ be getting up on the floor of this House at this stage am talk about "Barrow." I don't believe so. That is my view. And not in that broad, brawling enunciation either. This adds insult to injury, you see. I think that is the way can send the wrong signals to the people of this country.

I would say, Sir, in respect of the contribution of Sir Grantley Adams, every day when I go to my office I see this monument hidden among some shrubs on Bay Street. I don't think that is proper and appropriate, whether it was done by donation or not. I do not think that it gives proper recognition to the role and place of Sir Grantley Adams in the history of this country. I will only say this much, that these are things which will have to be corrected in due course. In due course these things will have to be fixed.

I believe, sir, that in respect of the implementation of this Resolution, the Cabinet now has before it a proposal that January 21, which is the birthday of the Right Honourable Errol Walton Barrow, be declared a public holiday in recognition of his outstanding contribution to the growth and development of this country. I do not think there can be any party divide that would negate or gainsay that contribution.

I do not think that the Americans had any quarrel with declaring Washington's birthday as a national holiday. In our own country we can give recognition where recognition is due. It is not unlikely, if I may seek to anticipate the thinking of the Cabinet - I would not do it as far as Parliament is concerned — but I know the thinking of my colleagues, and I believe that this particular proposal will be accepted very shortly. Thereafter the kinds of concerns raised on this side of the House and on that side of the House about recognition for other persons who would be considered as heroes can go through the winnowing process which has been indicated;

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support this Resolution and I urge this Honourable Chamber and all members to support the Resolution as well.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: In closing, Sir, in my own instinct and I must say, the original position of my branch, and other people who I spoke to in St. John, was to establish an Errol Barrow Day, but we live in times where I believe that to avoid the partisan position on some issues, one is always prompted to give some leeway to others, and perhaps that is how the concept to the National Heroes Day came in.

I would like to say this. I do not wish to be uncharitable or contentious in this matter at all. When the question as to the naming of the newly built Airport to West Coast Highway came up, nobody said set up any committee. All of a sudden we talk about objectivity, and that is why I spoke about it at the beginning. I do not place any premium on it. Historians like to talk about objectivity, but they can only be jokers. You cannot come to knowledge objectively. You have to be subjective, in the sense that you do not go in a bookshop and pick up every book and read. You know where your interests lie and you try to further your knowledge in particular areas.

This idea of objectivity where, for example, you hear prominent people, one in the Other Place — an educator and others — talking about "we must be objective" on issues. Errol Barrow was with us; we understand him as a man. Those who don't understand him, that is their problem. I do not have to be objective about that. I am interested in establishing an Errol Barrow Day and honouring the life and work of Errol Barrow.

The Labour Party has said it wants the highway named after Tom Adams. There is nothing objective about that. You don't have to be objective, you will have your opportunity to do that if you want to do it, so all I am saying is, as much as people try to talk around issues by saying that they want objectivity and bipartisan support, it is not really necessary. It is nice, it sounds very good, but at the end of the day you do not come to knowledge by saying you are going to be objective.

If we continued with this concept of being objective about the choice of national heroes, we would never be able to narrow it down to anybody, it would never be narrowed down. All of us would be sitting down and saying these are the reasons why X should be honoured and these are the reasons why not. Next week we will try to come and close the gap, and we come in here and a civil servant may say Mr. Barrow cursed the civil servants in 1975, he should be honoured. Somebody else will come and say he did this, he should be honoured. That does not answer the question as far as I am concerned. 4.15 p.m.

Years ago, Sir, the history that was taught to us was the history of other people, so objectivity had to be the case. You can only be objective when you are learning about other people, but today we are learning about ourselves, and if we cannot be subjective about that, then we are idiots. What I am trying to say is that those of us who hear the story of Bussa and talk about objectivity can only be idiots. If we are not moved by it, something is wrong with us. If we are not moved by the story of black people struggling in the cane fields, something is wrong with us. If we are not moved by Errol Barrow's contribution, something is wrong with us. This is not a day in which we are learning about Winston Churchill and we objectively say that great writers have said that he was a great man. We are now saying to the rest of the Caribbean, to the world, to our people that we feel subjectively as Barbadians that Errol Barrow was a great man and we are putting fitting memorials in place to memorialise this great man.

You know, it hurts me to think that I pass by the Bussa statue at night - I know the Minister is going to correct it immediately - and there is nowhere else in the world where a monument is unlit. Do you know that when you go by the Bussa statue at night you cannot see it? You go down there. The lights are not working?

The other day an amazing thing happened. I passed the Bussa statue and heard a group of youngsters around it. They were not playing reggae and calypso; they were playing disco and rock, and it was an interesting thing to see that juxtaposition. This is the age in which we live. The point is that many others will go to Bussa and see it perhaps as a shrine, but all I am trying to say is, let us not place a

premium on this concept of objectivity. Historians who talk about objectivity write down facts that somebody else has researched or they go and research facts and write them down; they do not seek to put an interpretation on them, they do not seek to solve questions or to develop themes. I know that.

Mr. Speaker, all the years in first form I learnt about other people, Boadicea, - I can't remember all of them - the Vikings and so on, King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table. When I reached the sixth I started to learn about the period after slavery, and you cannot be objective about that. People do not sit down and say "well you read Dr. Drescher and you read Eric Williams." These were the two who were taking different positions. The honourable Member for Christ Church East Central I believe would know that Drescher had one theory and Eric Williams another. If you read both, you have to conclude. You cannot answer the question by saying that Dr. Drescher said this and Eric Williams said that. You take a position, and that is the whole concept of learning.

We are taking a position on Errol Barrow. In due course you can take a position on Tom Adams. Seek to educate the people. I am not saying it is going to be easy.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: If I am around or other people, because I have to be subjective. You cannot expect me to be more objective than you about it. You will bring it and I may seek to say something about it. That is my prerogative as a thinking person. We are not dummies, so that is all I am trying to say. Let us not place this premium on talking about setting up Committees and objectivity. Errol Barrow is what he was to me, he is what he is to the honourable Member for St. Peter, he is what he is to the honourable Member for St. Michael West, all meaning different things, but at the end of the day we must take a position, and I feel we should take a position on him.

I agree with the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central that we should reach out to others in discussing the concept of a public holiday. I agree on many of the other things that are said. I cannot tell you I am going to be involved in them because I am not sure if one can set up Committees with objective criteria. I do not know. Maybe you can. I cannot promise you that I will go into that Committee with any semblance of objectivity unless they are people I do not know, but the people I know I will have something to say about, and that is a normal human reaction.

Sir, recently the American Government had taken a position and signed a Bill which gave effect to the establishment of a Martin Luther King day. That is not because they have looked at it in an objective way; people have lobbied for it, people have taken positions on behalf of

Martin Luther King, and as a result of that their view prevailed, and there is absolutely nothing wrong with that. So I do not think we should go around with this attitude that there is something wrong with singling out Errol Barrow as an individual worthy of note, if, indeed, it is agreed among the majority of people, or even if it is not in some cases, that he is a person of note. That is all that I am saying. If for example, it is necessary to amend the Resolution in some way, I would accommodate it and I would accommodate it to the extent that it establishes an Errol Barrow Day on January 21 in each and every year, and it is in commemoration of his life and work, and if therefore we find that it is a bit difficult to deal with the heroes day part for now and people want to incorporate other views, I have no problem at all. I can only say that I put in that part to accommodate other individuals who may wish on that occasion to be honoured or who may wish to be involved on that occasion. I am therefore not going to be opposed to that position at all.

Mr. Speaker, the interest of the constituents I represent is in establishing an Errol Barrow day and it is in developing these activities that I listed earlier community activity, honouring people in the community who have served the community, public lectures, and public entertainment, education programme, the promotion of positive images of our people and an opportunity to close the gap. I think it is important that we stress this point about closing the gap between those who govern and the governed, as they say, especially as we move into the anniversary of Parliament or the celebrations of an anniversary of Parliament next year, and we should perhaps use that particular occasion in declaring the Errol Barrow Day to highlight the contribution, or lack of it depending on your perspective, and then again that is perfectly legitimate, of Parliament to our political development. In other words, you should have people on the Errol Barrow Day speaking about the form of Government we have, whether there are other forms that are more useful or progressive, what kind of changes we would like to see in future in terms of the development of our country, the role of Parliamentarians and whether they are serving the interests of the people - these kinds of things. That really is my assessment of what is desirable on January 21, and as I said, particularly as we begin to celebrate an anniversary of the establishment of Parliament.

In that regard, Sir, and having due regard of all of the comments that have been made, I should like to move the following amendment in respect of the last paragraph to read as follows:

"BE IT RESOLVED that this Honourable House urge Government to commemorate the life and work of Right Honourable Errol Walton Barrow by establishing his birthday, January 21, as a public holiday in each year in tribute to him, and to

establishing an appropriate Committee to determine how other persons may accordingly be declared national heroes of Barbados."

I believe that that amendment should meet with the approval of both sides of the House and tries to accommodate most of the things that have been said in this debate. I should like to thank you very much for showing interest in the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will someone then second that amendment?

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection, I will put the question that the Resolution as amended do now pass.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the end of Private Members' Business. We shall now revert to Government Business.

The Honourable Member for St. George South.
4.25 p.m.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sir, in view of all that has transpired this...

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order. At the time when the luncheon break was taken - I assume, Sir, that you are resuming consideration of the Resolution for the \$4 million?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is what is intended but I think 'the Honourable Member for St. George South wants to raise a question in respect of Private Members' Business.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Yes, Sir. I am saying that in view of all that has transpired this afternoon, I would beg that the Resolution standing in my name be retained on the Order Paper, Sir..

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no objections then that item should remain on the Order Paper and I so declare.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Order No. 5 was being discussed and the Honourable Member for St. John ... Does he want to continue his speech?

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I was really in the middle of a point that I was making when we took the luncheon break which I wanted to complete, so all I was saying at

that point in time was that we had a lot of discussion about sycophantic and I am now making another amendment and that is to the pronunciation of the word - sycophantic behaviour.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope we do not go down the road ...

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am not going to pursue it, Sir, to the extent that I am only going to say that I believe that where the unions are conducting their negotiations with the Government with respect to the salary increases, that it is our duty, not only the duty of the Prime Minister, but it is the duty of all of us who are committed to harmony and are committed to the resolution of conflicts, not by might but by discussion, however long it may take on some occasions - that those of us who are interested in that, should demonstrate our commitment by resisting and not supporting any attempts to pre-empt whatever negotiations are taking place whatever the immorality of the behaviour of workers will be.

In other words, there are some people who may hold the view that if some people use the sick-out as a back door means of striking that the Government should retaliate by legislation of salaries, but two wrongs do not make a right and it does not make sense threatening people that way.

One of these days, perhaps, the persons who take whatever course of action they think is right now will sit down and think about it and about the effect it is having on the moral fabric of the society, and those who are principled will stand out in the end. So that I do not think that the comments that have been made in here today by the Barbados Labour Party on this point can stand up to public scrutiny.

They really have no case whatsoever for any of the statements that they have made with respect to the Christmas advances. It is the most specious and nonsensical argument that I have heard in here for a long time and I have heard some before from time to time. For example, last Christmas the Opposition did not even want to support the expenditure of \$10 million on the NCC. They wanted to send home the NCC workers.

The Opposition took a position against the Government spending additional sums of money so that over 2 000 could continue in their employment. Today, now, they are saying that some of my constituents who may be finishing the plumbing in their houses or whatever at Christmas time, should not get the little \$400; because, you see, it is all right for us to adopt these positions and think ;,,out middle-class civil servants, but there are some other civil servants down there who depend on that \$400. It makes all the difference to their Christmas.

The Opposition views it from, perhaps, civil servants in the middle rung but there are a lot of my constituents who may be workers at the Ministry of Transport and

Works who may be casual workers, or whatever, who depend on that little advance at Christmas time, who are the mothers of 8 or 9 children, and for whom, without that, Christmas would be no different to any other day in the year; and those are the things that you have to think about.

Let us not adopt this attitude of the nineteen forty and something and the paternalism and so on. It is not a hand-out. You have already said it is a loan and it must be paid back, so it does not stand on all fours with largesse being distributed by a plantation owner at Christmas or by the Vestry or by whatever system of Government was in operation then, so none of those arguments can stand up.

When the Honourable Member for St. Peter makes that criticism he is basically saying that those large numbers of workers at the bottom levels of the scale should not receive Christmas advances and, therefore, Christmas for them should be the same. That is what basically the Barbados Labour Party is saying.

I really do not think that we can accept their argument as being genuinely based on any policy. It is just as usual getting up and opposing for the sake of opposing and pursuing the same old story that they have pursued in the past and I would myself say that I am very much in support of the Christmas advances.

I do not know what will happen at the end of the day but I am quite certain that the majority of persons who are entitled to them and for whom it makes a difference will take them as usual and that their Christmas will be brighter, and, at the same time, at the end of the day, whenever the negotiations are finished they would not only have received the Christmas advances, but they will receive back pay and increased salaries and they are getting it, therefore, always. It is nothing for the Opposition to complain about.

Thank you, Sir.

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: Mr. Speaker, I was hopeful that I would not speak in this matter, especially since I have been in communion with the Great Master upstairs and I did not wish to lose my calm in what has been a series of invectives against the organisation that I represent, and, I detect, against myself as well; but, I believe, that I should rise to clarify a few issues since I have been a primary person involved in the recent exercises for the Barbados Workers' Union which has been engaged in negotiations in the public sector.

I would wish to commence any comment in that regard by saying that I share the view, although I do not know that it may have been intended in the way that I am sharing it, by saying that I would accept any position that says that the timely resolution of wages negotiations is a necessary prerequisite for the harmonious relations between employer and employee at the level of the private

enterprise, or at the level of the public system where the Government is the employer.

I think it must be a statement that is irrefutable and it is my position. I have stated publicly before and I wish to repeat now that Government has, and in the future, all Governments will have to move with greater speed and alacrity to conclude negotiations and, perhaps, what would be desirable is for the unions to ensure that proposals are submitted before the end of the preceding year where the April 1 becomes the effective date and where Government, because it has the machinery at hand in terms of the officers in its Research Department and in its Establishments Division, it has the officers who are going to be able to conduct the same kinds of exercises of analysing that the trade unions are conducting. 4.35p.m.

They will be able to advise the Minister responsible and thereby the Cabinet regarding what might be the kind of ball park figure where reasonable negotiations might be brought to a head. I would think that that is a position which we would have to move towards, and I would certainly be in favour of, and I believe that the Barbados Workers' Union would look forward to the day when by April 1st in an Agreement year we would be able to say that an Agreement has been negotiated.

For one thing it would prevent the uninformed and the mischievous from being able to introduce extraneous factors into a period of negotiations. I think most people who want to be honest and forthright would recognize that we negotiate historically. That is to say that we reach a level of agreement and then after the passage of a period of time, we endeavour to renegotiate an Agreement taking into account those factors considered by the relevant negotiating parties as being appropriate to, and important, for the period that has elapsed.

When too great a period has gone beyond the effective date, it is quite possible that one party or the other might wish to introduce factors that have come after that effective date and so complicate the issue, even beyond the stage that is reasonable or acceptable. And I believe that this may very well be one of the factors which are causing difficulties at the present time. When once however, Mr. Chairman, one recognizes that point, one has got to be able to move oneself away from any sophistry which may endeavour to upset issues and to get put at cross purposes against this particular issue.

One of the first things that we have to recognize is that a number of persons who may benefit from this particular advance of wages and/or salaries are not even being negotiated for at this time. For example, by extension of this exercise, the Transport Board workers will be expected to have a similar arrangement for themselves. And I do not think that anybody who has spoken before or who has

sought to speak would wish to suggest that there is in fact a collective agreement which is being negotiated for those workers at this time.

Additionally, one needs to make the point that this is a standard arrangement which is made possible because of a commitment that was made and that it is voluntary. And in that same spirit in which it is voluntary, it may be received or it may be rejected. I would certainly wish to respect the position of the National Union of Public Workers through the voice of the General Secretary of that organization. He has taken a position that one has got to understand is in keeping with accepted practice, and one needs to understand that he has a fundamental right to advise his workers in the way that he perceives to be proper in a given set of circumstances. And if after his deliberate judgment he is of the view that his cause could be better served by advising in the way that he has done, we should allow him to do so without allowing ourselves to interfere in what really is the business of two parties to an industrial relations issue which cannot and should not have the unfortunate and regrettable intervention by senior and otherwise supposedly intelligent and responsible members of our community.

When therefore one hears comments being made, and I have seen no refutation of them, that Government should give workers whatever they are asking for, and when that statement is reputedly made by senior members of a political party, when furthermore the statement is reportedly made by a person who would be the Prime Minister of the country, if by some accident or the other there were some change in dispensation, one is led to become very concerned because, Mr. Speaker, such a statement does not suggest the deliberate and careful thought and judgement that we are talking about. And it is the kind of statement which will later on come back to haunt anybody who is so irresponsible as to say so.

Many years from now, Mr. Speaker, I hope that I shall still be a member of the Barbados Workers' Union and hopefully still negotiating in the public sector. I hope with some luck, that the people of St. Michael Central may still repose their confidence in me to be in this place. But it may be possible that there may be a change of Administration and those people who now would try to intervene in the collective bargaining machinery and in the collective bargaining exercise will expect the organization which I have the honour to represent to bring to bear to the negotiations if they form the Government, the same maturity and objectivity that we bring to bear today. And I would suggest to them therefore that the slurs they make, the invectives which they presume to perpetrate on the platforms, that these would be things which should not be part of their armoury. Not because the Barbados Workers' Union, as one Member on the other side is purported to have said, perceives itself to be a holy cow. We are open to negotiations, we are open to discussions, we are open to public criticism. What we are saying is that people who have responsible positions must recognize that if a

responsible person from either side of the House, Mr. Speaker, a person whose office puts that person in a position of trust, if such a person is heard to dilate on a matter which is before the community in which we live, then we know from experience, sometimes from bitter experience that a great number of the members of that community are going to accept as being gospel, the words which come from those leaders. And if you make irresponsible statements, then you are going to speak to an issue which should be left to the normal industrial relations procedures of negotiations and discussions and collective bargaining.

And I think that a sad, very sad day it was when public figures chose to pronounce on an issue which their public experience and their public life should have led them to understand was a matter which was bigger than the pettiness of narrow political gain of any political party, but concerned the entire country as a whole. 4.45 p.m.

In that respect, Sir, I wish, just because there seems to be a certain misunderstanding in some quarters, to have it known and understood, Sir, that when the Barbados Workers Union submitted proposals to the Chief Establishments Officer, it was not on the say so of the leadership of the organisation. Our organisation does not accept membership on the basis of their political affiliation; and, indeed, in the councils where we sat to make deliberation on this issue there are several people who are known to have several political views across the entire spectrum of all of the political views that there are in this country; and, notwithstanding their political views, I would think that it is important in this forum that we recognise the tremendous maturity that they exercise in advising the leadership of the Barbados Workers Union in the levels of submissions which should be made in their behalf.

Those submissions which they directed that should be made took into consideration the perceived movement in the cost of living at the time, because the period had not yet passed. It is necessary that the point be made again, Sir, that when my colleague and esteemed friend from Christ Church East Central was speaking and, when we speak on these issues, we do not speak about cost of living increases for any 12 months period. We refer to cost of living movements within a period of an agreement and in that regard the figures that were put forward were absolutely correct. It was perceived at the time that the cost of living would have risen by just over 5% as our Research Department had worked out and as it was subsequently realised the movement in the cost of living for the period under review was 5.3%. Honourable Members were very aware of that. We were aware of the imperatives and the dynamics within that imperative which should sustain any submission which you should make for an increase.

We realised from early that there would be certain constraints which led us to put up a very strong argument

for what we call the social equalization process 'in the collective bargaining exercise. I am sorry that some persons might not be able to be here presently because I would like to use the occasion to give them a slight understanding of those kinds of issues so that it might help them in any future public meetings which they may hold.

But as it stands, Sir, all that attempts to say is that there are brothers and sisters working some of them in the private sector and some in the public sector *and*, that however stringent Government economics might be, Government had to realise that brothers and sisters working together starting from the same position would have to be able to have their position no less advantageous to themselves than what the private sector was able to offer. Mature minds have come around to recognise the validity in the position which we have adopted. I think we must always accept and understand that individual unions have a right, indeed they have a responsibility, so to pursue the aims and aspirations of their membership that they are at the end of the day able to reflect what is the general view of their membership. If at this time other trade unions are having a difficulty, we have to be able to understand and to respect their position and I certainly do so. I have no difficulty whatsoever in understanding their position and respecting it.

I wish, Sir, to make a few comments regarding what seems to be the order of the day whenever one comes to look at money and the issue of money for working class people and generally for the question of representation of working class people. It seems more and more that we are arriving at the situation where professionalism is seen and understood only if one is a lawyer or a businessman. It matters not the extent of the reputableness of either one or the other. They can be professionals but nobody else apparently can be. I have the greatest respect for anybody, Sir, regardless of the work that that person does because I am of the view that one can bring a professional air to bear in any kind of work that one does provided that one understands that all work is honourable and that there is dignity in all work; and the man who uses a broom to sweep the street must be understood to have a professionalism that he can bring to his job. But if political parties in this country begin to put out the idea that you can only be professional, meaning by that that you can only surround yourself with a mystique of holiness and better than thouness if you are a businessman or a lawyer, then they are to use the words of the Prime Minister sending out the wrong signals to our community and to our young people.

We have a lot of people who are never going to find the money to be lawyers, and, indeed, I have heard word that there is a bit of a problem of supply being greater than demand in that particular regard. So the question might very well be if they all go and study in that particular discipline, what will they do except perhaps turn to politics and cheap politics? We have to understand, Sir, that this is a

democracy made up primarily of a wage earning community and whatever you would hear those pseudo-intellectuals say, Mr. Speaker, the best people that one can think of to represent a wage earning community are people who themselves are wage earners and of a wage-earning background. I am not suggesting now that we must get people who do not know how to read or spell or to speak on behalf of their colleagues to come forward and to be their representatives. Although I wish to make the point that because you have studied at the Inns of anywhere, it does not follow that you will become a good representative of the people.

We have had very good representatives of the people of this country who have only had 3 certificates, Sir, a birth certificate, a baptism certificate, and a marriage certificate; and some of them did not have their marriage certificate; and later on they got a fourth one when they get their death certificate. That did not mean that they could not become proper representatives of the people because representation of the people, Mr. Speaker, does not lie in the amount of letters that one has or how lettered one is. It has to do with what human considerations rise within the bosom of the representative and how we empathize with people and how we are able to represent that empathy in the terms of looking after the needs of those people whom we represent. I take a very dim view, Sir, to see the champions of the Barbados Labour Party on political platforms suggesting even after their Leader has spoken to the issue that persons who are in the labour movement - presumably because they are in the labour movement - cannot be representatives at the political level of the masses of the people of this country, a wage earning community. But they, themselves, employers in their own right, and let me hasten to say, employers with whom the Barbados Workers Union has had difficulty because we have had problems with the way that some of them have treated their membership of their work force, have a right, which we do not deny, to offer themselves to the people. And that is their right, a right that nobody can deny even though it may be a right offered to them. If that is so, Mr. Speaker, how much more must we recognise that this issue of where a person stands must not allow itself to be slurred purely because a person is in a job or is in a profession where masses of people are involved?

Surely we do not at this level or in this forum attempt to cast slurs or aspersions on how business persons conduct their business, or indeed how lawyers conduct their business, notwithstanding the fact that rumours might also be heard in that direction. I think, Sir, when it comes to the matter of the business of the people, that one has to be able to rise above the cheapness of slight and petty political points to see the dignity, the loftiness, and the national effort that is made by any worker in service regardless of the level at which that person serves.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, one has got to be very careful not to allow this issue that is before us to get side-tracked into narrow avenues and cul-de-sacs. 4.55 p.m.

All that one is attempting to see here is a situation where any organisation that is endeavouring to negotiate with an employer wants to have the employer adopt the same attitude towards any offer that he would normally make as he would do in the private sector.

If we were negotiating with any employer, Sir, and I will not call any because I do not want to be misunderstood, and that employer, as indeed some employers are doing even now, perceive that because of the season of the year that there was, and because there was a practice of giving a bonus or advance or otherwise, that employer would not normally take the position that he is not going to give the advance or make the loans available because he is entering into negotiations and they are not completed. What the employer may do is that he might say I do not wish to prejudice the negotiations which are ongoing, and therefore I leave the offer before you as it always was in the past and leave it to you only to determine for yourself whether you choose to accept or to reject what is the traditional offer.

In this context I understand that the Government is making an offer to the public servants. It does not have to be accepted, indeed there has been an advisory in some areas not to accept, an advisory that has to be respected, and I should not wish anybody to get the impression that because a person earns more than that person may not wish to use the benefit of this advantage.

We are traditionalists in Barbados and all of us, whatever the extent of our earnings may be, I mean all those of us who are relatively poor, like to believe that at Christmas time we can do a little bit more for our families than we would normally do throughout the year, but we understand that at some times our pocket limits the extent to which our wishes may run, and if somebody comes along and makes some money available to us, for which we do not have to pay interest, and where we do not have to stand before a bank manager and tell him about our - somebody said about our cow, our calf and all the rest of it - then obviously we would want to avail ourselves of such an opportunity, and I cannot see anything being terribly wrong with that.

Of course I can understand that one would wish to use the occasion to refer to the ongoing negotiations, and one might wish as was done earlier to make some kind of passing reference to the question of interference; and in that context, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make this observation - that the Honourable Member for St. Thomas correctly pointed to a comment I made earlier about Honourable Bernard St.

John when he called the Unions together and spoke to them before a series of negotiations. I want to make a distinction which I am sure he will accept, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure you will accept. When the Honourable Bernard St. John did that, he was holding ...

Mr. SPEAKER: You mean the then Honourable.

Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN: Oh, yes, the then Honourable with a capital H. He may still be honourable with a common h. Forgive me, though, for making him more honourable than you wanted to make him, Sir.

The difference between the position that was adopted by the then Honourable Bernard St. John and the position that was taken by the Leader of the Barbados Labour Party was that the Prime Minister of that day held discussions. His predecessor in office as Prime Minister interfered, that is to say, deliberately and maliciously and calculatedly entered into a discussion in such a way as to influence improperly. That is what I understand by interference in that context. The other person, Mr. St. John, invited the groups to meet him and explained to them the kinds of difficulties with which he as the leader of the country was faced and asked for certain levels of understanding, a position for which I respect the gentleman immensely. I am afraid I could not respect the position of his predecessor, and I am afraid I could not respect the position taken by his successor as leader of the party in saying whatever the Unions ask for...

Mr. SPEAKER: You have only two minutes more.

Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN: That is quite enough time, Sir ... that whatever people ask for they should get. Because even if you feel so, you have to be careful not to say so; because if you say so you are going adversely to influence the negotiations in such a way as to becloud the issues and as to prevent objectivity from becoming the order of the day.

I urge, Sir, that we should avoid in the future, however much mileage we might feel that we can gain, that we rise beyond the occasion and put Barbados first, and I am sure we all would want to see Barbados put before anything else, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that that should be the level at which we approach matters of this sort.

I thank you, Sir, and I urge that we agree to support this Resolution.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, had this debate stuck to the outlines set out in the Prime Minister's speech and the reply of the principal spokesman for the Opposition on Finance, I believe that the issues on the debate would have been very simple. The fact that it has not so stuck is not surprising.

It is obvious that the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central has for the past couple "of weeks been waiting for an opportunity to get a few things off his mind and obviously to make a couple of remarks, some of which I would like to say were personally cast.

That you, Mr. Speaker, had to make a ruling on some of those remarks does not surprise me. I have noticed that recently the Honourable Member, in and out of the Chamber, has probably determined that his best style, if there is the slightest criticism, is to depart from a standard of which I formerly thought that he was capable. But I am not going to use this opportunity to cross swords at a personal level. I wish to reply to some of the statements that he made concerning the period during which the Barbados Labour Party had the privilege and the honour to be in charge of the affairs of this country. 5.05 p.m.

Let me say, Sir, that during that period the disparities between those at the top in the public service in relation to their financial reward and those at the bottom were reduced at an astronomical rate. The Honourable Member now says that those disparities have been reduced from something like 16 to one in the case of the Permanent Secretaries vis-a-vis the maid to a ratio of something in the region of 4 to one.

Now, Sir, the fact that that is admitted tells my simple mind only this: that whatever the Honourable Member may say about any person who led the Barbados Labour Party, during the ten year period of the Barbados Labour Party rule we were able to reduce the disparity in public sector wages to a level below that which exists even in some communist countries.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Speaker. I also made it clear that it was the policy of the Barbados Labour Party to have across the board increases which could not have had the effect that I mentioned and to which the Honourable Leader of the Opposition referred. It was the negotiating skills of the Barbados Workers' Union and its sticking to principles that there would not be across the board increases that led to the kind of effect that I mentioned.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, there is only one occasion during that ten year period that an across the board settlement was made. During that period negotiations took place and in many instances took place over a long period of time. In instances arrangements and agreements were reached with one union and not necessarily with the others. In one case an agreement was reached with the Barbados Workers' Union and the NUPW did not agree. In another case agreement was reached with the NUPW and the Barbados Workers' Union did not agree; so during the period the Barbados Labour Party has never opposed the concept of collective bargaining. It is not true. Furthermore

the figures on the admission of the Honourable Member clearly show that during that period regard was paid to the process of social and financial equalisation in the public sector. If you would like to look at the statistics put up by the United Nations and other recognised organisations you will see that Barbados today has a better record than, let me pick a communist country, a country that they always said believed even more than us in democratic socialism, communist Cuba. That is a fact. So whatever the Honourable Members may say about the Barbados Labour Party Government, whenever we return to analyse the objective criteria, not the sentiment, not the pejorative language, it must be realised that we recognised the need that those at the bottom of the ladder in the public sector had to come closer to those at the top of the public sector and we achieved it.

Only I think earlier this year or last year the Head of the Civil Service in a speech which he made said that we had reached in Barbados, today, in his view - I do not think he was necessarily reflecting the view of the Government, but he was addressing a seminar - the stage where he thought that there must now be a greater disparity at the top, if the public service was to retain within its ranks and to recruit within its ranks the managerial expertise which it needs. That is not a statement coming from the Barbados Labour Party. I take it from that that if you are being objective you have to recognise that the process of negotiations during our period has resulted in that narrowing of the gap.

Now, Sir, the Honourable Member for St. Thomas as well as the Honourable Member for St. Peter and the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central have made the point that there is need for negotiations to commence and one would say to conclude in a much more timely fashion than exist in Barbados today. I could not agree more. I fully agree in that sentiment. Whether you are sitting in the role of Prime Minister of Barbados, in Government or in the role of Opposition, that is not a view that anybody would disagree with. Where, however, I have to take some measure of disagreement with Honourable Members who have spoken is on the issue as to whether during the period and an extended and unreasonable period of negotiations there must be no statement, no, what they like to characterise as, exercise of freedom of speech by any manner of man on any matter at all that affects the public interest, because the parties in the collective bargaining process, one or other of the parties, cannot or have not reached agreement. I am saying that the Democratic Labour Party's record on this does not in my view bear out the contention which Honourable Members are now making. It is not borne out. I myself have heard both on the floor of this House and in the public domain leading Members of the Democratic Labour Party during the time that we were in Government speak about the course of the negotiations and have said that the people deserve their money and should be paid.

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is I who spoke about that and I would wish to make this comment. I cannot speak for what happened when the Barbados Labour Party was in Government. I am saying that today it is wrong for a responsible person who is in a leadership position to pronounce on the negotiations in such a manner as unreasonably and adversely to colour the course of those negotiations. That is the point I am making. If it was wrong in 1976, 1978 and 1980, it is still wrong today, and if it was right then it is right now; but I am saying it was wrong then and it is wrong now.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Let us begin by accepting for the purpose of this argument the Honourable Member's statement that it is wrong now and it was wrong then. I have difficulty however with the Honourable Member's position now that he is now prepared to criticise that attitude but he was not prepared then, that is, being a member of the Democratic Labour Party and a professional trade union person to speak out about it, then.

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: Mr. Speaker, unless the Honourable Member can show when I did not speak and where I did not object where that took place, I would wish him to withdraw that with an appropriate apology.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: As a matter of fact I would like the Honourable Member to point out where he did object and where he did speak:

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: Mr. Speaker, he is supposed to be one of the great jurisprudence experts in this country and he knows that he is the man making the charge. Prove it or withdraw it.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I know of no instance. If the Honourable Member cannot tell me when he did speak out, where the Honourable Member spoke out ... That is my memory of the position, Sir. 5.15p.m.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the debate so far I have not even *sotto voce* made one comment. I have quietly sat down and listened to all sides of the House even when words and sentences were cast in a phraseology to get a reaction from me. Not a word I said, so I hope that Honourable Members will respect, as I am sure you will see, that they respect the rules of the House in this regard.

What I am saying, Sir, is that as recent as 1986 when, in my view, and I am expressing my personal view, negotiations had not got to that timely stage of which the Honourable Member spoke, what we had in Barbados was the union, in this case the National Union of Public Workers, who were prepared to use exactly some of the measures which are being used today, to march against the Government, after a limited period of negotiations, in April, an agreement that should have come into effect from April

1, in circumstances where the negotiations, as far as I recall, commenced somewhere in February, and were being conducted in good faith, against a background of what the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central now characterises as, not the interference, but the timely discussions of the then Prime Minister.

Now, Sir, I did not hear at that time the inference being drawn that those persons were being inspired by subversive elements, that they were persons who had been infiltrated. I did not hear any of that.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, it is only since 1986 that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition instructed his members that they should infiltrate all groups in this country and last Tuesday I heard the Honourable Member for St. Thomas say not only infiltrate but overthrow, in this Chamber. The advice was not given then.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order. If you check the record, and I will hold Your Honour to this, I never said standing on my feet in any debate in this House of Assembly anything about overthrow.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take the point in the order that it has been made.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Thank you, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The point I want to make is the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central may get up to elucidate. If he is speaking from his position of high principle, I would have expected him then, not as a member of the Democratic Labour Party, but as a professional trade unionist, at some stage, if he did not want to do it then, to have come out and characterized that as the type of behaviour he would not expect in the best standard of industrial relations.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Speaker.

I stressed in my address that the union to which I belong acts and by example, therefore, we indicate to others how they should act. When we had a difference with that administration we called a work to rule. The Executive Council did and by our action we were indicating to others how they should act. We do not set ourselves up to indicate to every union how they should behave then or now, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member says that the union acts. The union may act but the Honourable Member also speaks and the Honourable Member has a very lashing and violent tongue when he is ready, so the Honourable Member has to understand. He also must be able to speak and use his tongue in circumstances such as those and not now only when the Honourable Member wears two hats.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I wear one hat, always.

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to remind you that unless you state on what you have risen, the Honourable Member does not have to give way.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Now, today, Mr. Speaker, I am in some difficulty about the manner in which the names of persons can be introduced in debates in here but the Honourable Member...

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, I am sure your recollection would recall my ruling and on every instance I have asked for either a withdrawal, and not only withdraw the remarks but also have them struck from the records so I am sure the Honourable Member will recollect that that was my position in the particular matter.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: All I am saying, Sir, is I am in some difficulty as to how the names of persons can come into the debate. But the Honourable Member had a tongue lashing for various individuals either as you have ruled, wrongly by expressed name, or by inference, today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Sir, because a person takes a different point of view to the Honourable Member, that does not make him immoral. That does not make that person a congenital liar.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation. I said that that speaker had said something which I had never said in a public newspaper. I challenge that person to quote where I said what he said because that refers to my professional practice. It was a lie about my professional practice and the person has all the room in the world to go and find the quotation and publish it so that the world would then say that I am the liar.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: You see, Sir, when people have not got the right to respond - the Honourable Member has the right to speak...

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE:...in the newspaper. He has that right but there are persons who have not got the right, as we Honourable Members have, to reply for themselves on the floor of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the Honourable Member would also recall that when certain comments were made in a frame like that I asked the Honourable Member to withdraw them and those remarks were also struck from the records so I do not think that that forms parts of the debate at the moment because it is not in the records anymore. 5:25 p.m.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, why I carp on a problem like this...

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Why I carp on a problem like this - if the Honourable Member wants it - is because in my view recently, the Honourable Member in particular has started a course of debating which focuses on the person rather than on the principle.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation. Any attempt to separate person from philosophy is a false one! A false attempt. What comes out of a person's mouth can defile that person. Therefore you are taking a false position when you say that certain persons will write things in the newspaper and then when you attack them, you are personal, but not when they attack you.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has a major flaw in that he tries to defend the indefensible in his supporters and that has not been recommended for anybody who wants...

Mr. SPEAKER: You are going on to a speech.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member also has a major flaw in that he believes that only morality is on his side. You see, Sir, it reminds me of the fact that you could hear from the Honourable Members from time to time that the characterization of the Opposition as being anti worker, being immoral, being everything. You can hear that.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: There is a certain self-righteousness about that.

I have heard them in here, Sir, lash out at the Opposition as being mixed up with drugs.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I wish the Honourable Member, if the Opposition comes in here with information - or anywhere else - such as we have that, for instance, within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, recently, a couple of weeks ago, four pounds of cocaine came through in the diplomatic bag... The Honourable Member would want to say that the Opposition has no right to say it. The Honourable Member would want to say that we have no right to say that.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: But it is a fact. It is a fact. We are not supposed, in our discharge of our public duty, with the information which is available to us to make any criticism whatsoever of the Government. None whatsoever! We are not supposed to have a stand on anything at all!

That is the Honourable Member's position. Whenever we do that, the only way it can be characterized is because we are infiltrating, and we are subversive and we want to overthrow the Government.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The position is that there are times that an Opposition has a duty, and we exercise that duty, exercise it with care too, to speak out on public issues whether it is the fact that cocaine comes through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the diplomatic bag as has happened, four pounds of it, or on the fact as to whether negotiations are timely or not.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: And in my submission in this House, when we so speak, characterize others as subversive and what not, this is completely unwarranted.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Now, Sir, the Honourable Member talked about the fact of legislating salaries. I am not going to spend much time on that. The Honourable Member for St. Thomas, I think, replied to show that there is within Barbados, a precedent in both political parties for a time when a Government may have, I say "may have" advisedly, to determine whether or not the process of collective negotiation can continue ad infinitum.

As I understand it, Mr. Barrow so determined in 1976. And on two occasions I believe that determination was made by the Barbados Labour Party Government. But I believe on both occasions, in circumstances where agreement had been reached with at least one of the unions. I believe so. If not on both, certainly on one of those two occasions when negotiations had been reached with the union.

Nor do I believe, that because the Prime Minister may have, either before or during the course of negotiations, speak to the unions involved and to the public, that that constitutes interference in the collective bargaining process. It depends on how and when and where he does it. We can disagree on that.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member is shouting, Sir.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: You see, Barbados is not the only place in which events such as these take place. And the Barbados precedent is not the only one from which we have

to draw. And Honourable Members must know that in other countries where the industrial relations are just as good, and there are some precedents which are followed by the union, it is well known for Heads of Government, whoever is in charge, from time to time to talk to the parties.

Now the Honourable Member commends the former Member for Christ Church East Central, the then Prime Minister St. John. Of course I agree that he should be commended. But I am sure that despite the commendatory manner in which the then Honourable Member performed,, he received a thorough tongue lashing...

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: ...and the same lies of which they talk...

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: ...from members of the Democratic Labour Party.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I have not made any allegation.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: He' received the same tongue lashing. He was characterized as being anti-worker from the public platforms of the Democratic Labour Party.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member says *sotto voce* "He is." The Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central said so *sotto voce*. Probably he is speaking to his constituency interest there. He could not have any conviction about that. And I will tell you why he cannot have any conviction from that, Sir. Because the Honourable Member prior to becoming a Member of the Democratic Labour Party worked on one occasion for Mr. St. John's re-election.

Laughter.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, I did not think he would get to the same level...

Mr. SPEAKER: Not "he".

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: What to call him? That is a dastardly lie.

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot say that. You will have to withdraw it.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I have never, ever been associated with the Barbados Labour Party in Tmy life.

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot call the Honourable Member a liar so therefore you have to withdraw it.

Asides.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: He told a lie.

Mr. SPEAKER: But you have to withdraw it.

Asides.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, he uttered an untruth, then, a dastardly untruth.

Asides.

Laughter.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member wants the source of my information and if he wants to know the person with whom he campaigned, I would cite for instance, he can talk to Mr. Roachford from up in Silver Sands.

Mr. SPEAKER: But I would -1 think you...

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Now...

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Please. Sit please.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I draw Your Honour's attention...

Laughter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Sit please. Sit please. Now the Honourable Member complained not long ago how names can be drawn into a Debate.

Laughter.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I suggested, and I ruled not to entertain any calling of names and so I am going to ask the Honourable Member to withdraw that remark as well.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The name is withdrawn, Sir. But if I could give the names in here, Sir, I would give the names to the Honourable Member and he could talk to them and he could see who is telling the truth and who is not telling the truth.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: He would be in a position to see who is telling the truth and who is not.

Mr. SPEAKER: I may also say that we are bordering on irrelevancies of the present Debate. I am asking that we keep a little closer to the debate. We had some interruptions 5:35 p.m.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member, Sir, recognises that despite the role that Mr. St. John took that the unions chose at that time, and untimely in my view, a role which... The National Union of Public Workers was politically inspired and I say that it was politically inspired because of the infiltration which the Democratic Labour Party itself has made within unions in this country.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Honourable Members may say rubbish as much as they want. They are not the only people who can analyse political developments in this country. I thought I would never live to hear today when the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central will get in here to characterise the Barbados Labour Party as an anti-worker party. The history of the Barbados Labour Party is written large and in the minds of so many people that no misrepresentation by the Honourable Member or defacing of history will ever remove the contribution which it has made in this country to the working class movement, to the building up of the trade unions, and which it will make in the future and continue to make under the present and succeeding leadership. The Honourable Member must understand that. The Honourable Member believes that within their breast they have the only *bona fide* when it comes to representing working class people.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member believes that.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Both political parties have in employers and employees. Both of them have them in on both sides. Both of them probably have in members who hold points of view with which we may not always agree. But they are political parties that are free for anybody who subscribes to their principles to join. Everybody might not live up to those principles. But to hear the Honourable Member in this debate set out, and I say without any formal justification, to attack the Barbados Labour Party, saying that there is no difference between the leadership of the Labour Party and gadflies - those are the words that he is using -

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: ...gadflies that write for them. That is his position, Sir. You see the Honourable Member ^ may believe that he can be insulting as much as he wants to, but the reply to his insulting statement will be made in Wotton and not on the floor of the House from my position, when the time comes to deal with him. In Wotton. • And if necessary I will deal with him in Lodge Road and in St. Patricks too. The Honourable Member must know that.

Sir, I want to speak, however, in the one minute that is « remaining, to the issue.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please. Can I have some order?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The position of the Labour Party on the advances was put by the Honourable Member ** for St. Peter; and this is not the first time that he has put that case. We had a debate on this matter in December 1986. To be exact, I think it was December 2, 1986 and the views expressed then are not now views that have come up simply for the purpose of this debate. We expressed the views then. The DLP may not agree with the views. The next year after that there was no debate on the matter because there was no „ public sector negotiations. The views which were expressed then were expressed at the time there were negotiations going on and we said at the time there is much ado about nothing as far as we were concerned. That is why I said, Mr. Speaker, when I began my speech by making the statement that if the two Honourable spokesmen in this House on Finance had ended there, the debate would not have been as contentious, and I regret to say that it would "* not have been as variant as the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central sought to make it on this occasion.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have been too tied up for a long time to deal with other issues. But I feel constrained after listening to the noise pollution ^ of recent weeks as well as the disjointed effusions that appear in the Press on the question of negotiations. I waited in vain to hear a comment of substance that relates to issues of labour and that affects the working class people of this society, or comments that did not wreck of negative political opportunism. I waited in vain. I would have thought that the so-called new Barbados Labour Party under reconstructed and progressive leadership would have ""* moved away from the sterile position which the leading members of that party have habitually taken on these questions. I also thought that the leading members of that party under the new and progressive leadership would have sought to acquaint themselves with substantive issues of labour more so than there were when I operated within the Barbados Labour Party. I will say without fear of *

contradiction that that political organisation, when I was a member, was profoundly hostile to proposals that operated to promote the interest of the working class people of this country.

My position on this I stated boldly and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition can bear me out. He has heard me state it on more than one occasion within the 4 corners of that organisation and he has also heard the derisive laughter and comment that greeted such statements. My position is simply this: That for me in the productive process of this society labour is the most important factor. That view has been derided as old fashioned and even dismissed as communistic by individuals who interestingly enough are no longer Members of this House. I believe that all activity within any realm in any given society ought to be devoted to human ends since the term "labour" connotes a collectivity of human beings and, therefore, all activity should be aimed at achieving what Kant called a "kingdom of human ends". 5.45 p.m.

That position is unchangeable. I would therefore have thought that in the face of new and difficult situations within the industrial climate of Barbados that the opportunity presented itself for political aspirants, tired hacks, political dead horses or whatever metaphors were used to describe the strange collection of individuals that call themselves the Barbados Labour Party. One would have thought that this was an opportunity for that party to break new ground and for us to hear proposals, or at any rate ask pertinent and constructive questions about the issues that are clearly agitating the workers of this country.

One of these issues, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest that the Honourable Members of this House who identify themselves as members of the Barbados Labour Party, I would urge them to reflect upon some of these things, as I have urged the former Attorney General when he was a Cabinet Minister with me, to reflect upon some of the things I say in connection with labour, things that were normally pooh poohed.

The first question is this. Are we satisfied that it is possible to have an effective collective bargaining process within the public sector? That is the first and the most fundamental question. The answer to that, Mr. Speaker, in my view is no, and the answer to that is no because as presently constituted negotiations start and end within a particular Ministry and therefore, unlike the private sector where you have a conciliation procedure in these negotiations that start at domestic level and then move to the Labour Department, and then the Minister of Labour and the Prime Minister, you have a situation that begins and ends in the same place; so that if there is a deadlock any such appeal is of the nature of appealing from Caesar to Caesar, and that constitutes one of the serious problems which militate against effective collective bargaining within the public sector.

I urged it upon the Government of the Barbados Labour Party, and happily this Government is giving active consideration to it, of revamping and restructuring the Establishments Division in such a way that there are different levels of discussion so that we could have a system that approximates to an appellate system and thereby have a conciliation procedure similar to that which obtains within the private sector. It is my view that the different levels of conciliation that obtains within the private sector make for a situation where strikes are averted and the kind of acrimonious and rancorous debate that accompanies the discussion of public service negotiations could be averted.

The Opposition would do a great service, an invaluable service to the people of this country if they could set their not inconsiderable intellects to working out a system and proposing it in the public domain, or to the Honourable Prime Minister on the floor of this House, or however they choose, as to how this particular problem could be resolved.

I believe that the problem is essentially a structural one in which a procedure that is old fashioned and anachronistic exists, and therefore it is impossible to bring a fresh perspective at certain stages in discussions when talks become bogged down, giving rise to considerable irritation. It is not, in my view, clever or constructive to fish in troubled waters in such circumstances and make what are considered to be political points. There are no political points to be made in such circumstances. The country is being done a disservice by not approaching these issues in a constructive way.

There are other aspects of the negotiations which have led to the high levels of agitation and frustration which are manifested in irresponsible statements made by various Unions concerned. And again it goes to the structure of the Establishments Division where there is no existing service or mechanism available to deal with non-wage problems or non-wage issues that are contained in the collective agreement.

Many of the grievances, inappropriately, that public servants experience, are brought to the substantive Minister who presides for the time being over the Ministry in which that worker is employed, and this continues to happen with unsatisfactory results, precisely because Government has never set up a structure whereby collective bargaining agreements can be policed in a way that non-wage issues which are continuous between periods of negotiation can be effectively dealt with.

Even within the private sector where the Barbados Workers' Union has officials whose functions are exclusively those of servicing collective agreements, even in those cases frustrations well up and explode, and they explode because the ratio of workers to Union officials is too high. I think at one time it was one Union official who

was required to service non-wage grievances on a continuous basis of 8 000 workers. If this kind of situation is not checked by restructuring the Establishments Division and appointing staff to deal with these problems on a continuous basis, it will lead to a high level of unrest and instability in Barbados that would itself paradoxically spell the end of collective bargaining. j.55 p.m.

I believe the unions and the members basically want our voluntaristic system of collective bargaining to continue, but it will not continue if their grievances are such that they are impelled to conduct themselves in a manner to produce conditions of instability. There was a time when I was Minister of Labour, having regard to the large work load that the Ministry of Labour was forced to undertake in order to deal with the problems that arise out of the non-wage aspects of collective agreements, and I invited Sir Frank Walcott to my office and told him that I was thinking of putting to the Government of the day a solution which many countries had recourse to when the problem of dealing with non-wage problems out of wage negotiating season had arisen, and that was the establishment of an industrial relations tribunal constituted on a tripartite basis. Sir Frank objected to this in principle and I was sympathetic to his objections, because in countries where Government had been forced to regulate and thereby establish order within the industrial relations climate, it had led to a weakening of the unions. Union membership has haemorrhaged as a result of this because people then prefer to take their chances with a tribunal rather than stick with a functionary of the union, and that leads to a weakening of unions and the industrial relations process, and indeed makes tension between labour and capital much more acute than it originally was.

I had put the proposals with respect to the restructuring of the Establishments Division and re-staffing it to the Barbados Labour Party Government and it was laughed at and derided as communistic. What appears to me to be an eminently practical solution to problems which would obviate or preclude the unrest that we are experiencing now, was pooh-poohed and laughed out of court. That is why when I assert that when I was functioning within the Barbados Labour Party that it was dominated by anti-labour elements, I can demonstrate it empirically. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition is there; he was there during that period, he witnessed my travails; he was sympathetic most of the time, and that is why I would have expected from him, having listened to my educational arguments during that period, at this juncture to be making more profound statements on the question of labour, and not getting into picayune discussions about who legislated what and who did not legislate what, or arguing about percentage points. I expected better from him. I thought that he would have been better educated after listening to my discourses on labour policy over the years.

It is six o'clock now and I can go on on this thing for hours. This is really my first love, the question of labour, and I could go on at great length, but this House has been held up long enough, Sir. They say that I begged for the Ministry of Transport, but I just want to make it clear that I * am appealing for higher standards and more serious and substantial points in discussions of this kind, and one would expect that a party that would want the people of Barbados to believe that it is an alternative Government should convince them that they are ready rather than trotting out the same old tired empty and sterile positions of that organisation when it is alleged that it was under more reactionary leadership than it is now, I don't want to say, saddled with.

I do not want to go and deal with their attitude to strikes because I will be on it another hour. I do not want to talk about the Telephone Company, the mobilisation of the Defence Force to check a secondary strike in the Port. I do not want to go into these things. It is a long, long history of •»• anti-worker conspiracy that I personally experienced, and I believe that the present Barbados Labour Party should be concerned with purging itself of that recent inglorious anti-worker past, presided over and inspired by Tom Adams...Mr. Tom Adams. They say you must put a handle on the names of these persons.

So in conclusion, Mr. Speaker...

Mr. SPEAKER: You have about five minutes more.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: There are some other questions that are causing frustration within the public service unions and public workers that I feel constrained to put on the record of this House. Recently leaders of the ••** NUPW have been clamouring vociferously for inclusion into the policy making apparatus of Government. They say that they want for the public workers effective participation in Government. 6.05 p.m.

Now, this statement, taken by itself, is riddled with ambiguity because I do not quite know what they mean by Government.

Sometimes when we talk about Government we mean the political directorate. On another occasion you mean the administrative layer and, yet, on other occasions you mean everybody, the political directorate, the administrative layer and the messengers. You mean everybody. It is necessary for me to ask what they mean by "Government" when they say they want the workers to share in making policy with the Government.

I have been led to believe, Sir, that Permanent Secretaries, Deputy Permanent Secretaries, Technical Officers and the like are members of the Public Service and

as such, members of the union. I do not know of any politician who is capable of going into a Ministry and making policy without soliciting the assistance of these officers so it is not clear to me that this demand is even coherent.

I have asked certain union members in the leadership what they mean and the responses have been notably vague and general when the obvious fact that civil servants assist Ministers in policy-making was drawn to their attention. If it involves the workers at all levels, then one would have to examine it very carefully.

I remember in 1978 as Minister of Labour I undertook personally to introduce worker participation in the Ministry of Labour and called a meeting of all the staff from top to bottom, messengers, everybody, and told them "these are the proposals that I am working. Let me invite your views". There was no response. I could not even hear the people breathe and I told them "okay, you think about what I say. In two weeks I will convene another meeting." The same thing - I heard nothing but what I did hear through the grapevine was that one member whom I invited to participate in the cabal said "Tom Adams gave him the Ministry, if he does not know how to run it I do not know why he does not give it up. He is asking me what to do. He is asking for our opinions."

A second one said "You have to be careful with what he says. He is a communist," and a third one said "I do not believe he should be working in Marine House. He should be in a room in Jenkins." So when we talk about workers' participation and the democratisation of decision-making within the public sector, understand that what, in essence, we are talking about and what, I believe, the basic demand is on the part of the NUPW is union input into policy-making.

Now, I have some serious reservations about that with all due respect to my union friends here, for this reason: that in many societies that have undertaken an experiment of workers' participation, and the representation is not representation of workers who do the work, but union officials, then many critics have claimed that this kind of workers' participation has become deformed and distorted as a result of the fact that the interest becomes not the interest of the workers, but the interest of the union leaders.

Mr. SPEAKER: One minute more.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: I know we have democratic practice within the Barbados Workers' Union and, therefore, that could never be the charge laid at the door of the leadership of the Barbados Workers' Union. I feel that, in a sense, the detractors of the way in which the negotiations were conducted were saying that the union bureaucracy is at odds with the rank and file. Well, there has been no insurrection against the union leadership in the

way it is conducting its business and if there is no insurrection or criticism of the union leadership, then I am satisfied that democratic principles are being observed.

All of these are issues that I am saying that a party, a rump group posing as an alternative Government, have in its power to consider and convince a society hungry for information, convince a mass of workers who are looking for light, and enlighten them rather than endarken them, convince them that this is the way to go, these are the big issues of the day.

Instead of that, we are regaled with sophomoric rhetoric about what the DLP is doing, who should pay more. The issues are much bigger than this and let me say for the good of this country to the leaders of the Opposition that they have a responsibility to elevate the debate and give the country a lead if they can on these big issues.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Applause.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think we have had a very long debate on this particular issue and I am not sure whether this is surprising or not because it is a routine matter that we have been considering.

In my opening speech I indicated that this has been a principle and a practice established and honoured during the years 1962 to 1977; then there was an interruption and it was resumed with the change of Government in 1986 until the present and it is the intention of my Government to continue this practice of making advances.

With that long history, Sir, of actually making advances by the Government to the employees, it has come somewhat as a strange argument to hear that the making of advances by Government to its employees represents some kind of sop, a paternalistic sop, as a substitute for the timely payment of wages and salaries. 6.15 p.m.

Sir, that is an argument that cannot hold water or hold anything else for that matter. During all of my years in this Honourable Chamber and I am the father of this Parliament, I have never seen or heard the collective intellect of an Opposition strained to such an extent in order to find some kind of intellectual clothes for the nudity, the nakedness of an argument as I have heard today.

To say that advances at Christmas time which follows virtually the same pattern, 1986, 1987, again in 1988 and which is hallowed in practice from 1962 to 1977, to say that that is a sop - it really beggars all description. And to hear the Leader of the Opposition say that he supports that kind of intellectual aridity is certainly a disservice to the kind of

comment and penetrative argument that we expect to come on issues such as this. Let us dismiss it all, Sir.

Let us understand that there must be some principle other than the principle of political opportunism that should be employed when we are discussing public issues.

Before the negotiations actually started or in the beginning stage, Members of the Oppositions were out there saying "not less than 10%!"

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Not less than 10%. And then together with that, there was some ambiguous statement or statements to the effect that the Government was going to impose a wage freeze.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. There was no ambiguity in any statement. There was a clear statement in the IMF Report that Government had agreed and had a plan...

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I read it out in the Budget Debate.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Honourable Member make his point. Make your point.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, the point was made in the IMF Report which I referred to and quoted in extenso. Sir, I make the point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I will bring the Report next week, Sir.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, I am not really dealing with the powers of recall or the accuracy of the statements made. I am setting a certain background against which this whole matter has been discussed.

And what I am saying is that there was talk of arriving at a settlement not less than a certain amount and other kinds of statements whether quoted from some source or not, making references to wage freeze, wage restraint and whatever else, which was tending to set a kind of pattern which I call interventionist, which I dub as interventionist, even before the parties to the negotiations were sitting comfortably around the table, even before the serious negotiations were under way. Because those who study social developments, those who study negotiations know that they go through various stages.

But I have studiously followed the practice or followed - yes - the principles, Sir, that employers and employees in this country should sit down, they should place their positions on the table, they should seek to arrive at some compromise, taking into account the factors involved; and after negotiating in good faith and seeking to arrive at a conclusion, hopefully they might reach that particular port; but that ample time should be given for the process to work. That is a principle, Sir, which respects the rights of workers and it respects the rights of employees, it respects the rights of employers. I believe it is an honourable process and I have tried to follow that.

Let no one look to suggest to me what somebody else did or what is somebody else's style. I am committed to the principles and practice of the Democratic Labour Party. And when I make statements, even though where they are founded and how they are cemented may not be obvious at the time, it should be clear that I do not make statements and I do not take positions on the spur of the moment. I study matters very carefully.

And there is a document here called the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party. It is a winning document and it is the principal document on which this Party, and this Government, base its actions. And there are no serious charges that can be made against my Government that we have sought to depart in any fundamental way from the principles and the policy set out in this Manifesto. Persons have tried to establish it. But whenever they have come back here, they have found that it is rooted and based in the document here and therefore they have to find some other grounds on which to base their arguments.

So it is with the principle of non-intervention. And I will quote from this document, Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party which is already a document of the House. Under the section called, "THE PUBLIC SERVICE" on page 24, the document reads as follows in part:

"To this end we will:" and

I go to number 5:

"strive, at all times, to reach negotiated settlements on wages%for Public Servants."

I will repeat it, Sir:

"Strive at all times to reach negotiated settlements on wages for Public Servants." 6.25 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I am saying that as a Government we feel a high measure of commitment to the principles outlined in this document and wherever it is possible to follow those principles we will follow it. For those who have been urging upon me to legislate something...

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I have not said what you have urged upon me yet to legislate. Let me say this much. Everything has to be done by legislation in respect of the wages and salaries of workers. There are a whole series of Civil Establishments and other Orders that have to be brought in here and that is part of the legislative process. They all have to be legislated. But there are those who wish us to legislate without first seeking genuinely to allow the parties the time and the processes in order to reach some kind of settlement as opposed to those who would give the process some time to work itself out.

It is really ridiculous, Sir, to hear members now on that side saying that money is owed to the public workers and therefore we should not offer the advances. That argument as I have said before is an arid argument. It is an arid argument. And then to try to say that there are credit unions in Barbados and that there are banks in Barbados and that there are friends in Barbados - from those various sources loans may be obtained. To dub that as being paternalistic is some kind of argument that I can only attribute to those who are in the preparatory stages of the educational process. I cannot attribute it at any higher level than that. But it is my task as Father of this House ...

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: ...It is not an empty title. It carries responsibility and part of the responsibility is to teach them. I happily out of my own innate characteristics am willing to pass on the information, my knowledge, experience, and so on to Members of the Opposition.

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I have challenged them on any matter at all relating to the public affairs of this country to establish any instance in which the public affairs of this country have not been adequately and effectively managed since 1986 down to the present time within the framework of the resources of this country. We have sought on every occasion not to shirk any issues but to arrive at a decision and to implement those decisions with the kind of efficiency that befits this developing country.

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: That is a ridiculous argument.

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully and I studied....

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, let me make this position absolutely clear because I am not certain whether there is any, or what is the thrust of this talk about cocaine and what it proves.

It is a fact, Sir, that some substance came into the country. That is a fact. That is a fact, Sir. It is also a fact, Sir, that related to that particular find that a person has been charged before the courts and I say no more on that.

But when we come and use this as an argument using the skills of the rhetorician and say: "If I was such and such a person, I would say that cocaine came into this country." In so using those kinds of rhetorical techniques to disclose what you are in fact saying that you would not disclose if you were a different kind of person, I think that kind of argument again is most disappointing in the Leader of the Opposition.

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I think, Sir, we deserve to find a new method....

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: When someone said that he was a high leader of jurisprudence in this country, did you not see David's face?

Laughs.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I hear you - anyhow, sorry. I will stay off of that.

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: But Sir, I do not play fast and loose with the economy of this country or with matters of high public affairs. I believe we all have a sense of responsibility and we should seek even though we go about our political battles - we should seek at all times to make sure that in striving for political power we do not destroy that which is most precious to all of us and that is our good country and its reputation and its good name for stability. I think a dose of common sense in circumstances such as we have been discussing is the best antidote that I can think of for the kinds of inflammatory statements that have been made and that are being made from time to time. 6.35 p.m.

Sometimes what may be politically expedient at a particular time is not necessarily what is best for the country. And I would think that those members of the Opposition as they believe that the only way they can recapture the Government is by means of attacking the leader of this party, and in a subsidiary fashion the other

members of the party, let them think again. Think out that strategy. Let them think again, it will not work.

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: On November 30...

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: November 29? I had to deal with him and they have to deal with him too, because he has been up and down this country talking in a most uncharacteristic manner. I will give him that credit.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. How can the Prime Minister now deny the right of the Opposition to deal with him, the Prime Minister, if he is seen in the public eye as not doing what the public expects him to do? We have a role to articulate. He is saying that we should not do that.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: You have freedom of speech. All members over there have freedom of speech in this Chamber, subject to the overriding control of the Chair in accordance with the rules of this House. Democracy is alive and well in this country. You have the right to speak and we have the right to speak as well. I will just say, Mr. Speaker, when these statements - false, distorted or in similar vein - are made, I have said before and I repeat it, we will be replying to you. I want to congratulate the members over here for getting up this afternoon and really setting the record straight and replying to some of the false charges that have been made.

I will have a lot to say about the question of collective bargaining and about these negotiations. I have said that my memory of the proceedings in this Honourable Chamber is as good as and better than any Honourable Member's in here. I know when the Leader of the Opposition went to talk about Dougal Smith and all kinds of names like that, and I believe Honourable Members would not even know what we are referring to. We know all of that. I believe enough is enough.

I have given the root of the position that my Government and party operate from. It is on the basis of the statement in our Manifesto to which we are committed, "...strive at all times to reach negotiated settlements on wages for public servants...." and today I am hearing members of the Opposition saying pay the workers their back pay. What must we pay them when the amounts have not yet been finalised? What will you pay them, when the amounts have not been finalised?

I believe, Sir, that narrow political gains at certain points in the history of a country should take the second place.

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Every time you go out there we will choose our own time and place to reply. You heard the firing power from Independence Square? You got it there and you went - what did they say they had down at Deacons Road? - a cold pone meeting. Anyhow, Sir, the Opposition has said that they are going to 'give qualified support - at least one member said he was going to give qualified support - to this particular measure.

In 1987 some 7 500 persons received advances of salaries and wages. Over 7 000 persons in the public service availed themselves of the opportunity of these advances and now there has been some kind of Janus-like argument and posture taken by the Opposition as though this is something paternalistic, it is something out of the 19th century, because I do not know what paternalism in Government means. You are acting like a father towards the nation. Do you call it a relic? Over 7 000 persons availed themselves in 1987. I do not know how many will avail themselves in 1988. It is a voluntary system and if it is not taken up, it will remain in the Treasury, but it is for those workers who feel they can use an interest free loan by way of an advance at this particular time.

I am happy to commend this measure to the Chamber, Mr. Speaker.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, the Opposition abstaining. 6.45 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Order No. 1 was called - to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

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

Ho.i. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1988-89 No. 5

Head 84 - Ministry of Transport and Works - was called.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, this is a request of this Honourable House to supplement Head 84, subhead 23, Transport Board, to the tune of \$7 047 000.

The purpose of this request is to purchase buses for the fleet of the Transport Board. It is proposed, Sir, to purchase 50 buses from Mercedes Benz of Brazil. Ten of these buses will be a model known as 1315 and the purchase price of each bus would be US\$62 365. Another 30 buses would be the 1318 type costing US\$64 505 per unit. In both categories they represent completed units. Then there will be an additional ten chassis of the 1318 type together with the bodies which are to be assembled in Barbados at a price of US\$69 905.

As far back as 1975 when the concept of nationalising the entire public transport system was first mooted, the total of bus units operated or required by the three concessions at that time was 280. One concession of course was the public corporation, the Transport Board, and two other private concessions, the Rocklyn and Elite Bus Companies. The Transport Board at the time had 179 buses and the private bus companies had a total of 87 buses.

Now, Sir, at the commencement of the financial year 1987-88 the Transport Board had 323 buses on its books, and at the conclusion of a survey conducted during that year some 87 of these buses were deemed unserviceable. The majority of these buses have been sold or cannibalised, that is their parts are used or interchanged with other buses of the same type. At the present time therefore on the books of the Transport Board there are 236 buses that are considered functional. Now these buses include some vehicles that are over 30 years old. There is a 1957 Bedford valued at \$100 and a Seddon slightly older valued also at \$100. For these persons who have bought buses in the past for \$100 or a little over, there are good bargains now available at the Transport Board.

Aside.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: I believe that \$50 would bring you one. You can bargain. They are going by auction very shortly I have been advised.

The policy of the Transport Board is that the vehicles should be standardised at two types, that is, we should have Mercedes Benz and a second type. In normal circumstances these Mercedes Benz are all purpose units and will be able to deal with any peculiarities in the topography of Barbados, go up hills, down hills or otherwise. To standardise at one type is the ideal type of standardisation since it affords optimal use of available units in terms of interchanging of parts, but for the Transport Board to standardise at one type would be tantamount to putting all of its eggs in one basket.

The world of international capitalisation is a high risk environment and multinationals come and multinationals go, and even although today it appears that Mercedes Benz is a safe and secure multinational with an excellent product, in these days of leverage buy-outs and predatory take-overs by people with a lot of money but no business expertise, many a substantial and efficient firm has found itself denuded of its holdings and fallen on bad times. So having regard to the fluidity and uncertainty of the international environment, it would be wrong and imprudent for the Government to use one type of vehicle exclusively.

Now this argument would support the contention that Leyland buses should be purchased, and indeed this was an argument I urged very strongly upon the Board; but after a considerable period of time the Leyland Motors or British Leyland as it is now called - in fact I don't know what it is now called, its ownership has changed so frequently within recent years that I do not know whether it is British Leyland, Daft, Leyland Motors or whatever. They have not been able to come up with a proposal to provide a vehicle that in our experience can perform satisfactorily in local conditions.

Consequently we are considering very carefully substituting another type for Leyland. This is not an easy decision for the Ministry to make in spite of the overwhelming evidence that the Government should purchase another type, because Leyland has served us well for some 30 years, and I personally believe that in principle it is wrong to switch to new friends when old friends have proven themselves to be trustworthy. 6.55 p.m.

There are other companies making extremely attractive proposals such as Thomas in North Carolina. It has offered to supply the Transport Board to provide 10 buses. They are free of cost for demonstration use in Barbados to determine whether they can stand up to our conditions for a year.

Now, I have made the point many times in this Honourable House that when we are purchasing rolling stock for the Transport Board, it is not an act as simple as purchasing sugar cane as a predecessor in this Ministry had thought and, therefore, we always try, as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition knows, to negotiate other benefits with the purchase and we have succeeded in negotiating with Mercedes Benz of Brazil the same type of service that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition negotiated in 1982 when I entrusted him with this great public responsibility.

It is important to point out that the technical assistance which he negotiated and which is identical with the technical assistance negotiated now with the purchase of these buses was dismissed as foolishness in the Barbados

Labour Party. It was stated that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition went to Germany on a junket. Yes, those unkind statements were made. That was the kind of gratitude that he got for the work which he performed.

Aside.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: No. He did not negotiate those buses. Those buses were the buses that a man whom I had to have removed from the chairmanship of the Transport Board had, in his rashness visited Martinique, I think, and in his unthinking approach to things, purchased.

It is the Minister, not Mr. Yearwood who said "This bus is pretty. I like it," and bought it accompanied with a girlish giggle, like a young lady pointing out a gift to her fiancé. "I like it." The Leader of the Opposition knows when I am Minister of Transport how buses are bought.

The technical assistance involves, upon the arrival of the units in Barbados, that an instructor from the Service Department of Mercedes Benz of Brazil will carry out pre-delivery inspection, training of drivers, training of mechanics for preventive maintenance and small repairs and the suppliers have indicated that the services of the instructor will be available indefinitely.

We have also secured agreement for periodical visits of a service • coordinator for the Transport Board to investigate the needs of technical support.

You will hear more about this as time goes on. I am told that due to the constraints of time that it is best....Anyhow, an elaborate programme of technical assistance has been negotiated.

I beg to move that this Head do now stand part.

Hon. C. V. WALKER: I beg to second that.

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

On motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, the Chairman reported to His Honour The Speaker, the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: It seems to be the will of the House that we should do the last matter on the Order Paper that we proposed to do today, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The rules permit if you can finish in 10 minutes time, so be it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2.

Order No. 2 was called - Resolution to approve the Guarantee by the Government of the loan of \$13 000 000 (Bds) made by the Barbados National 'Bank to the Transport Board.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Sir, this is only a tidying up proposal. This loan was made in August 1987 in order to liquidate certain outstanding debts of the Transport Board. 7.05 p.m.

This was necessitated by the practice developed in 1984 by the then Minister of rolling over debts in order to conceal the magnitude of the deficit for any given.....

Aside.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Okay, I will deal with it another time.

This is a tidying up

Asides.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Reimbursements of this loan were in the past made from the Transport Levy Fund. But the Attorney-General in 1984 indicated that all such loans made and disbursed from Government funds should have a Parliamentary guarantee. And this is the formalization of this process.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. Hon.

C. V. WALKER: I beg to second that, Sir.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, this brings us to the end of business for the day, Sir, and I move that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, the 20th of December, 1988 at 12.00 o'clock noon, Sir.

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

The question that this sitting do now adjourn until the 20th of December, 1988 at 12.00 o'clock noon was put and was resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the sitting accordingly at 7.07p.m.

CONTENTS	SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1988-89-NO.'5 HEAD 84 MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT AND WORKS - \$7 047 000.
MINUTES	
Confirmation of the Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 6th December, 1988 2954	Hon. Dr. D. G. Blackman. .2998
GOVERNMENT NOTICES	
Hon. P. M. GREAVES..... 2954	RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE GUARANTEE BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE LOAN OF \$13 000 000 (BDS) MADE BY THE BARBADOS NATIONAL BANK TO THE TRANSPORT BOARD
1. Resolution to approve the grant of \$1 477 735 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1988-89, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1988-89, No. 6.	Hon. Dr. D. G. Blackman ..2999
2. Resolution to amend the Explanatory Note to Head 75, Ministry of Education and Culture, Subhead 17, Industrial School, Object No. 24.	QUESTION TIME
3. Resolution to amend the Explanatory Note to Head 28, Ministry of Legal Affairs, Subhead 2, Subscriptions and Contri butions.	QUESTION NO. 93 Hon. L. E. Sandiford . .2969
GOVERNMENT BUSINESS	QUESTION NO. 85 Hon. H. A. Blackman ,.2969
RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COM- PULSORY ACQUISITION BY THE CROWN OF SEVERAL PARCELS OF LAND FOR THE PURPOSE OF ROAD IMPROVE- MENT AT RIVER ROAD, PINE ROAD, COLLYMORE ROCK AND CULLODEN ROAD Hon. H. A. Blackman 2955	QUESTION NO. 92 Hon. W. W. Hall 2970
RESOLUTION TO GRANT THE SUM OF \$4 500 000.00 FROM THE CONSOLIDATED FUND AND TO PLACE IT AT THE DISPOSAL OF THE GOVERNMENT FOR THE PURPOSE OF MAKING ADVANCES OF SALARY OR WAGES ON THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS SET OUT IN THE SCHEDULE BELOW Hon. L. E. Sandiford 2956, 2994, 2996, 2997; Mr. O. S. Arthur 2956, 2957; Mr. R. L. Morris 2958, 2961, 2962; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons 2963, 2964, 2965, 2966, 2967; Mr. R. P. Byer 2963; Mrs. Maisie Barker-Welch 2967; Mr. D. J. H. Thompson 2968, 2981, 2982; Mr. C. LeR. Trotman 2982, 2986; Hon. H. deB. Forde 2986, 2987, 2988, 2989, 2990, 2991; Hon. Dr. D. G. Blackman 2991, 2993, 2994.	PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS RESOLUTION URGING GOVERNMENT TO DECLARE A NATIONAL HEROES DAY IN HONOUR OF THE LATE Rt. HON. E. W. BARROW, Q.C., M.P. AND OTHER PERSONS DECLARED TO BE NATIONAL HEROES. Mr. D. J. H. Thompson 2970, 2979, 2980; Mr. R. L. MORRIS 2974; Hon. H. deB. Fordc 2976; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons 2977; Mr. L. L. Brathwaite 2978; Hon. L. E. Sandiford 2978, 2979.
	SUSPENSION 2969
	ADJOURNMENT..... 2999
	SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE
	ARTHUR, Mr. O. S. (St. Peter) BLACKMAN, Hon. Dr. D. G. (St. Michael East) BLACKMAN, Hon. H. A. (St. Philip South) BARKER-WELCH, Mrs. M. (St. Joseph) BRATHWAITE, Mr. L. L. (St. Michael North East) BYER, Mr. R. P. (St. George South) FORDE, Hon. H. deB. (Christ Church West) GREAVES, Hon. P. M. (St. Michael North) MORRIS, Mr. R. L. (Christ Church East Central) SANDIFORD, Hon. L. E. (St. Michael South) SIMMONS, Mr. D. A. C. (St. Thomas) TAITT, Hon. B. M. (St. Michael West) THOMPSON, Mr. D. J. H. (St. John) TROTMAN, Mr. C. LeR. (St. Michael Central)