THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1986-91

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday. February 7,1989.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 p.m. o'clock, on Tuesday, February 7,1989.

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. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M., (Minister of Trade, Industry and Commerce)
Dr. R. C. HAYNES, M.B., Ch.B., F.R.C.P., (Edin.)
Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, B.A., M.A., (Minister of Transport and Works)
Hon. M. A. KING, Q.C., LL.B., (Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs)
Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, A.I.C., M.I.A.S., J.P., (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries)
Hon. N. K. SIMMONS, (Minister of 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., (Epon.)
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. P. J. M. MILLER
Mr. R. P. BYER, LL.B., L.E.C.
Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON, LL.B.

Prayers were led by Father Ivan Harewood.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The House is in session.

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minutes of Tuesday, January 31,1989.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker/before I move the confirmation of the Minutes, I should like to draw attention to 2 matters which, in my opinion; Sir, need correction. As far as I can recall, Sir, Your Honour the Deputy Speaker presided over the full session at the last meeting of the House on January 31st. That being the case, Sir, as far as I can recall, it will be necessary to amend Page 7 the line immediately following the word in caption "Resumption" to insert the word "Deputy" after thd word "Mr." and before the word "Speaker" so that that line would then read, Sir, "On Resumption, Mr. Deputy Speaker resumed the Chair" rather than Mr. Speaker.

There is also, Sir, a similar error on Page 10, Sir, in virtually the middle of the page of those Minutes where it is stated in the paragraph where the "Motion of Hon. P. M. Greaves, seconded by Hon. B. M. Taitt, the Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee" and it says "and Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair". It should read, Sir:

"and Mr. Deputy Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly."

With those amendments, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move that the Minutes be taken as read and be confirmed. *

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

The question that the Minutes be confirmed as amended was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am to announce the receipt of the Report of the Ombudsman for the year 1988.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1989.

Civil Establishment Teachers (Amendment) Order, 1989.

Civil Establishment Part-time Officers (Amendment) Order, 1989.

The Senate and House of Assembly (Remuneration and Allowances of Members) Order, 1989.

And the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances) Order, 1989.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George South.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to inform this Honourable House that I no longer support trie governing party, the Democratic Labour Party, which constitutes the majority membership of this Honourable House. I have resigned from the Democratic Labour Party. I am a Member of the National Democratic Party. I support the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central as the Leader of the National Democratic Party.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Christ Church East.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to inform this Honourable House that I no longer support the governing party, the Democratic Labour Party, which constitutes the majority membership of this Honourable House. I have resigned from the Democratic Labour Party and I am now a Member of the National Democratic Party. I support the Honourable T .fiber for St. Michael South Central as the Leader of the National Democratic Party.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for the City.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to inform this Honourable House that I no longer support the governing party, the Democratic Labour Party, which constitutes the majority membership of this Honourable House. I have resigned from the Democratic Labour Party and I am a Member of the National Democratic Party. I support the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central as the Leader of the National Democratic Party.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to inform this Honourable House that I no longer support the governing party, the Democratic Labour Party, which constitutes the majority membership of this Honourable House. I have resigned from the Democratic Labour Party and I have been elected Leader of the National Democratic Party by my colleagues, the Members for the City, Christ Church East, and St. George South. I command the support of these 3 Honourable Members and, in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution, I am able to state that I command the support in this Honourable House of the majority of those Members who do not support the Government.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise again to inform this Honourable House that I hereby tender my resignation as Chairman of Committees in this Honourable House. In doing so, I must say that if I were to continue as Chairman of Committees it would seriously compromise my position as a Member of the Opposition in this Honourable House. I will also add, Sir, that, for the time that I have conducted and sat in that honourable office, I would like to say that I enjoyed the support of the House as it was then constituted. I would also like to add that anyone who sits as Chairman of Committees will have my full support. Thank you, Sir. 12.30p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I wish to accept the resignation of the Honourable Member for St. George South from the office of Chairman of Committees in this Honourable Chamber and I would like also to declare the office of Chairman of Committees vacant.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in view of your ruling that a vacancy exists among the officers of Parliament, specifically that of Chairman of Committees, I now move, Sir, that the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East, who has had some experience in serving a little apprenticeship in that position, be appointed

Chairman of Committees in accordance with Standing Order No. 4 of the Standing Orders of this Honourable House of Assembly.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to second the nomination of the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East He is a man of tremendous experience in the ways of humans, he is a lay preacher in the Methodist Church and therefore his integrity and capacity are such as command the respect of his fellowmen, and the humility with which he has served so far as a representative of people in this House suggests that he will carry this great honour in the tradition of all those who have gone before him.

It is a pleasure for me to recommend this Honourable Gentleman to serve as an officer of this House, and so, Sir, I second the nomination that the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East be the Chairman of Committees of this Honourable Chamber.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is a nomination of th * Honourable Member for St. Michael North East. Are there any further nominations?

Pause.

There being no further nominations, I declare the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East elected to the office of Chairman of Committees in this Honourable Chamber.

Applause.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to move the suspension, which I now do, Sir, of the following Standing Orders - Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20,42(5), 43 and 44 - for the remainder of this day's sitting.

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

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

ORDER NO. 1 - COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. M. A. KING, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee of Supply.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1988 - 89, NO. 14 HE

AD 18-AUDIT

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of $344 940. In respect of that there are certain sums relating to Head 18 - Audit, Subhead 1 - Audit Department. These sums relate to Object No. 3, Object No. 5 and Object No. 9.

Object No. 3 deals with National Insurance contributions and a supplement of $8 700 is required for that particular Object No. to meet payment of National Insurance contributions, a sum of $160 under Object No. 5 to supplement the provision relating to the Transport Levy, and Object No. 9 in the sum of $1 200 in relation to Maintenance of Property. In this case the property being referred to is the photo copier which is in need of repairs.

I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that Head 18 for those sums indicated stand part.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.* 12.40p.m.

HEAD 19 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, under Head 19, the sums provided, have proved to be inadequate and small sums are required to supplement the provisions under a variety of object numbers. These include Other Personal Emoluments, National Insurance Contributions, Transport Levy, Travel, Supplies and Materials, Operating Expenses, Plant, Equipment and Furniture. These are the items to be supplemented under Subhead 1, Subhead 4 and Subhead 14, Supervision of the Insurance Industry where the sum of $102 is required to supplement Other Personal Emoluments under Object Number 02. The Addendum sets out the purposes for which the supplementary provision is required.

I beg to move that Head 19 - Ministry of Finance stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 20 - REVENUE COLLECTION

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, under Head 20 - Revenue Collection - a supplement of $155 235 is required for Object No. 12, Operating Expenses, in respect

of Subhead 02, Customs Department, Object 03, National Insurance Contributions, and under Object No. 11, Maintenance of Property, the supplement of $4 351 is required. In respect of Subhead 3 of the same head, and this is in respect of the Land Tax Department, supplementary provision in the sum of $2 400 for Supplies and Materials is required. These are to meet ongoing expenses of the Inland Revenue Department and the Addendum sets out the purposes for which the supplementary provision is required.

I beg to move that Head 20 - Revenue Collection stand part of the Schedule.

.Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER,1989

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the matter that we are dealing with reads as follows:

"Resolved that the Order entitled the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1989, made by the Minister responsible for Establishments on the 2nd day of February, 1989, under Section 2 of the Civil Establishments Act, be approved.

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

This House of Assembly, Sir, has been called upon from time to time to deal with such Resolutions and today there is nothing novel happening in respect of the Resolutions to provide for payments in terms of the salaries and wages of the civil servants and those who work in the Statutory Corporations or para-statal bodies as they are sometimes called.

This House has, from time to time, debated the issues relating to such provisions and it is necessary, from time to time, that when such matters are debated and discussed and approval ultimately given, due consideration is paid to the circumstances facing the country, the circumstances relating to the ability of the Government to meet the demands that may be placed upon it as employer, the impact that such provision may have, not only on the public finances, but also on the general economy and related matters.

There are a few issues, Sir, which I would wish to speak on, but first of all, I would wish to state that the legislation that we will be dealing with is as follows: Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1989, and the Resolution relating to that. We will also be dealing with other Resolutions and Orders in the course of this sitting, as is customary, and I expect that this pattern would be followed. The main debate or discussion on these matters may very well take place on this particular issue so that there would not be a great deal of repetition in the debate. 12.50p.m.

The comments that I may make in this presentation, would relate to the Resolution that we are dealing with and the related Order, that is^ the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1989 and a related Resolution, the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1989 and the other related Resolutions, the Resolution relating to the Casual and Unestablished Staff and the Civil Establishment (Part-Time Officers) (Amendment) Order, 1989, and then the Resolution, the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances) (Amendment) Order, 1989 and a related Resolution, the Senate and House of Assembly (Remuneration and Allowances of Members) (Amendment) Order, 1989 and the other related Resolutions, the Resolution relating to the Staff of Parliament and the Resolution relating to the Personal Staff of the Prime Minister, and finally, the Resolution relating to Government pensioners.

I hope, Sir, that with the indulgence of this Chamber, we will, also, be dealing, subject to such approval as may be given, with the Resolution relating to the Remuneration and Allowances for the Chief Justice and the other Judges as well. I expect that permission will be sought to deal with these during the course of this sitting as well.

What we are seeking to do, Sir, is to deal with the matter of the remuneration and allowances of all of the public officers, the civil servants, those in the civil departments of Government and the other departments of Government and those who work in the statutory bodies as well, to the extent that their salaries may be related to these provisions.

I would like to clear a few issues relating first of all to the popular phrase about the legislation of salaries. I see the

Honourable Member for St. Thomas with his hands up praying to high heaven.

Aside.

Hon. L. E. S ANDIFORD: According to the law of this country, Sir, it is necessary for all changes in the level of salaries and allowances for the civil servants of this country to be legislated because it comes under a piece of legislation.

Some of it is statutory and that is why during the Estimates, we do not actually vote upon the provision for them, because that is regulated by law and automatic. But when there are changes in the salaries, wages and allowances payable to public officers as well as to any, as I indicated, allowances these must, by law, come to this Chamber under an Order and appropriate Resolution which will provide for the funding of the particular changes. So it does not make much sense to speak in terms of the legislation of salaries, because all salaries of the public officers, the civil servants, have to be legislated.

The question is whether the amounts that are being legislated have been arrived at after complete and total agreement with all of the unions and associations involved in the negotiating process, whether agreement has been reached with some of those unions and bodies, or whether no agreement has been reached with those unions and bodies. So the question of legislation is not in doubt. It is the circumstances and the bases on which there is agreement, a settlement or a determination.

I have spoken on more than one occasion and I have stated that this Government believes in the processes of collective bargaining and that every effort should be made by the Government as employer, to provide opportunities for its workers to participate in that process and to seek to come to some agreement on the wages and salaries payable.

We have had down through the years, a variety of processes within that overall framework. Sometimes there has been a limited number of meetings. Sometimes there have been many meetings. On rare occasions, agreement is reached with all of the unions, but in the vast majority of cases, some unions and some associations may indicate that they have agreed to the terms and conditions offered and then other unions and other bodies have not agreed. But I thought we should understand that particular process quite clearly, so that the background against which this matter is debated, can be fully understood and appreciated.

I want to stress again that this Government believes in the processes of collective bargaining and I believe that we have gone into the negotiations with good faith and have modified our offers from time to time, depending on the cogency of the arguments advanced and depending x>n the soundness of the case advanced and depending also, on the ability of the country to meet those requests. But we have to take this thing in its entire perspective and in its historical perspective. .

Shice Independence in 1966, salaries and wages in the public service, have been conducted through that process of collective bargaining. 1.00p.m.

That process was put in place substantially through the efforts of the Democratic Labour Party in 1964, and related to the reform in the Trade Union Act which permitted civil servants to belong to the unions of their choice and freedom of association which was later entrenched in the provisions of the Constitution.

This ability to participate in activity relating to the terms and conditions of service was extended to members of those services which cannot by law, be members of a trade union, and we refer to members who serve in the Royal Barbados Police Force, the Barbados Fire Service and the Prisons Service. Their right to negotiate salaries and conditions of service, is guaranteed under their relevant staff associations and the legislation relating to them. I think the fact that we have conducted this system ever since the 1960s, is a tribute to the maturity of our regime of negotiations between Government and the unions and the Public Service Association.

There was a time, Sir, prior to the 1960s, when salaries were determined by salaries commissioners brought down from the United Kingdom. There would be some discussion and then the salaries were simply determined by the authorities with some representation from the body of employees.

This salaries revision, Sir, will be the ninth undertaken since Independence. In 1969, 1972-73 and in 1986, agreement was reached with all of the unions and associations on the level of salaries and wages to be paid. There was no agreement in 1976, a year which, we will all recall, was one in which some claims were advanced for salary increases over 100% in some instances. In 1978, as I recall it, agreement was reached with the unions with the exception of the Barbados Union of Teachers and the Police Association. In 1984, the National Union of Public Workers...

Aside.

Hon. L. E. S ANDIFORD: Eighty-four?

Aside.

Hon. L. E. S ANDIFORD: In 1984, the National Union of Public Workers...

Laughter.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: ...alone settled with the Government.

Laughter.

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I will deal with all of them. Have no fear. We are very thorough. We are dealing with all of them.

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: No. You have to deal with them...

Laughter.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: ...or they are dealing with you.

Laughter.

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I would like it to be understood, we can conduct our politics in this country in a mature manner and in a civilized manner. We are not sending any signals to the people of this country that politics is a war...

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: ... or that there will be a battle, a battle of any place. The Battle of Trafalgar was fought long ago. There need not...

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:.....We have to understand in this country that there will be views for and the views against on a number of issues. There does not have to be any enmity on a personal basis between Members of the Government and Members of the Opposition.

I have had very cordial relations with...

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: ... Government and Opposition and Oppositions. We have had a very good personal relationship, although in recent months I have been wondering...

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: He will be back later on.

Aside.

Laughter.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Have no fear. There is no doubt. I think you will do well.

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I think you will deal with them at the appropriate time. I believe so. A little later on.

Laughter.

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: That will happen.

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: But there is no...

Asides.

Laughter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Asides.

Laughter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let us have some order, please.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: The point I am trying to make, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that we are a mature democracy and we must demonstrate that, particularly in our 350th year of the existence of this Parliament, those of us who occupy these seats now must and should conduct our business not on the basis of personal animosity, nor on the basis of personal enmity but on the basis of what is in the best interests of the people of this country. I believe that as legislators we can have differences and express those differences without any excess of venom or bitterness or the kind of calumny that pervades the politics in other countries. In other words, what I am saying is that no signals should be sent to the populace of this country that

there is any kind of bitterness at the personal level in the conduct of our affairs.
1.10p.m.

And I have no problems. Those who have taken their positions, I have no problems with that. We on this side have no problems with that. We are discussing a particular issue here and we have to discuss it within the context of what is best for the people of this country.

As Prime Minister, I believe I have a responsibility not to permit the kinds of tenor to enter our debates that will engender dissension among the populace and set in trend the kinds of actions and reactions which are very difficult to reverse. I say that with a full consciousness of developments in other countries both in the Caribbean and beyond.

The Government is required to seek the approval of this Assembly for changes in the salaries and wages of its employees. That we are coming here, therefore, does not represent anything improper and does not represent anything that is unusual. These salaries and wages must be legislated and if I repeat this, Sir, with your indulgence, it is because there has been and continues to be some confusion in the minds of the public on this issue as the circumstance is not a new one in respect of such salaries and wages without agreement having been reached with all of the unions.

Between 1976 and 1984 there were at least 5 occasions, or approximately 5 occasions on which such agreement was not reached. This Government and all Governments have a responsibility to look after the interest of the people of the country and those entities which comprise the body politic or the body economic. The Government has an overall responsibility for managing the economy and at the same time seeking to do what is fair and just and equitable for its employees. If and after every reasonable avenue has been exhausted and explored, a Government has no option but to make a decision in the national interest while at the same time seeking to provide adequate remuneration and to meet the reasonable claims of its employees. But at some time a decision has to be taken and that time is now. These are the lessons which we have gleaned from 1976 and the lessons in 1978,1980,1982, and 1984. That is the tradition.

Since 1972, Sir, when the notion of annual increases was first instituted by the Government, there have been increases almost every year in the level of pay granted to Civil Servants as follows: in 1972, there was an interim pay of 25% to 10%, in 1973 - 30% to 20% including interim pay* in 1974, it was 5% of the preceding year, in 1975, 5% of the preceding year, in 1976, the settlement was 35% to 12V2%, in 1977, 15% to 7.5%, in 1978,20% to 10%.

I will be glad if the Members of the Official Opposition can correct me, but I have not been able to find the percentage increases for 1979. I believe it must have been nil - no increases I believe. But I stand to be corrected on that particular issue for 1979.

In 1980, it was 38.3% to 22.5%, and again for 1981 I have not been able to put my hand on the increases for that year. It was over the 2 years.

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: No, no - that was 1982. In 1982, I am advised that was $108 across the board for 2 years. In 1983, there was a 21/2%, interim pay and then in 1984 a 15% across the board, in 1985, 5% across the board, in 1986, 9% to 1.4%, and, in 1987, 2% across the board. I, therefore, think it is true to say, Sir, that successive Governments have sought within the framework of the resources available to them, the state of the public finances and the levels of activity in the general economy, all of which influence the ability of the Government to pay and ~also have an effect on the competitiveness of the economy, successive Governments have sought to make provision for the claims of the Civil Servants and the other workers in the Public Service broadly and that Public Service has been growing over the years.

Today it is estimated that there are some 25,000 persons in Civil Service and other public sector employment, 8,400 persons employed in the latter category, which will include the statutory corporations. There may be something like some 82 or so separate bodies or entities, statutory corporations and other bodies, for whom provision has to be made and some 16,900 directly employed in the Public Service. 1.20p.m.

It is Government then which employs almost a quarter of the work force, that has to be concerned as employer, with its ability to meet wages demands, to curb those demands which may be excessive and which would have a deleterious effect upon the state of the public finances, which may have a wrong impact upon the level of wages in the private sector and which may have a bearing, positive or negative, on the competitiveness of our country.

A Government that is interested in the overall welfare and well-being of its people, cannot take a hands off attitude on these matters, but at some point, when we are going beyond what is reasonable and just and appropriate in our circumstances, we must call a halt.

This particular increase that we are dealing with, I estimate, will cost something like $30 million for one year, and in the second year, there will be an additional $10 million approximately on this. So that in the first year, full year, it would be $30 million, which is the approximate estimate, and the second year some $40 million.

There has been some concern about the length of time that it takes to conduct these negotiations, and perhaps I

should point out that the negotiations will, of necessity, be lengthy in spite of wishes on both sides, as expressed on the Government side and on the side of the Unions, that negotiations might be concluded speedily.

There are some nine Associations or Unions which are accredited to speak on behalf of the various bodies of Civil Servants. There is not an overall umbrella organisation, as I understand it, a kind of Trades Union Congress, which negotiates jointly on behalf of the workers, and so that discussions should ideally take place with all of those bodies. Some of the bodies may take offence if the same proposals are not placed before each one of them. That kind of situation, therefore, leads to delays in the negotiating process.

I am not happy with the length of time it takes and I will be looking at this matter very closely to see whether the negotiations cannot start at a much earlier time, before the end of the negotiating period in order to see if, very early in the year, of the new wages and salaries regime, this could not be , in place. But to have salaries or the conclusions or determinations of the negotiations going from one financial year to another financial year, creates certain difficulties for those of us who have to make the necessary provision to meet the salary demands.

What we are therefore proposing in this particular determination is that the new salaries of the workers should be paid from the 1st April, 1988 - this is the period that will be covered - to the end of this financial year, the new salaries will be in respect of that period, and it is a determination for a two year period, to the 31st March, 1990.

The determination relates to increases of just over 8% at the bottom to 5% at the top, and we are seeking to ensure that that kind of settlement applies throughout the public service and the statutory bodies which are related in these exercises.

The proposals embodied in the legislation that is before us, have not met with the approval of all of the Unions and Bodies, and that is a source of regret to me and to my Government and to this governing party. We searched and we have been searching for an agreement that would embrace all of the nine Unions and Associations to which I made reference.

Broadly speaking, the proposals have had support from one of the major unions, the Barbados Workers Union, but the National Union of Public Workers has not found it possible to agree with the determination. I would like to read a letter which was received in the offices of the Civil Service on the 3rd February, 1989 and it is from the General Secretary of the National Union of Public Workers, to the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of the Civil Service. This letter was one in reply to a letter of January 26, 1989 from the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of the Civil Service and Head of the Civil Service, Mr. B. R. Collymore. 1.30p.m.

The letter to the General Secretary, National Union of Public Workers dated January 26,1989, reads as follows:-

"Dear Sir,

In accordance with the understanding reached at our meeting of 1989-01-24 that the Union would be prepared to recommend that its membership accept the Government's offer of salaries/wages increases at the level of 8.2 per cent to 5% for 1988-89 and 2 per cent across the board for 1989-90 if the status of servers in the school meals service is varied from part time to full time employment, I now confirm Government's acceptance of that proposal to take effect from 1st April, 1989. As of that date these workers will be paid at the Z.38 point of the revised salary structure, and they will be required to carry a full schedule as specified.

I await your confirmation of these arrangements, so that early steps may be taken to finalise the salary revision process for 1988-90."

That was the letter faithfully written or signed "Yours faithfully", let me put it that way, by the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of the Civil Service. The reply, as I said, was received in the Ministry of the Civil Service on 3rd February, 1989. It was dated 1st February and it reads as follows:

"The Permanent Secretary
Ministry of the Civil Service.

Dear Sir,

Revised Salaries and Wages and Improved Conditions of Employment

Your letter has been received."

There is reference number given, which I will not trouble the House to read out. But they say they received the letter.

"The National Union of Public Workers wishes to inform you that a special general meeting convened today, decided by Resolution to reject the Government's offer of 8.18 per cent Z.38 and 5 per cent S.I since its proposal of 9.7 per cent Z.38 and 5 per cent S.I is reasonable.

The special general meeting, however, in considering the proposal to place school meals/servers at Z.38 and give full time employment, decided that this aspect of the two point proposal, should be discussed since it holds

implications for other employees in the lower echelons of the Z sfcale.

The Union stands ready therefore, to engage in negotiations at the soonest opportunity, respecting the status and salary of school meals services and appropriate consequential adjustments, relative to points between Z.38 and Z.30 of the salary scale.

Yours faithfully,
Joseph E. Goddard."

Now that is the position in respect of the National Union of Public Workers.

After all the discussions and negotiations which have been taking place for most of the current financial year, we have not been able to reach agreement with the National Union of Public Workers. As I indicated before, we have searched, the Government's negotiating team have searched for a resolution of the differences over that period of time, but we have not been able to reach that particular resolution.

The Barbados Union of Teachers has not accepted the Government's offer and I read the letter from the Barbados Union of Teachers on this matter, which is to the Permanent Secretary, Establishments Division. This is dated 12th December, 1988, was received in the Establishments Division on 15th December, 1988 and reads as follows:

"Dear Sir,

The Executive of the Barbados Union of Teachers presented the Government's last offer to its membership'at a meeting held in Queens Park on Wednesday, December 7, 1988. The Union maintains that in light of its reasonable and just salary proposals, it has difficulty in accepting the Government's latest offer, particularly as it relates to points beginning at *Z.I* and declining to Z.36.

When one considers the impact of income tax, surcharge, levies, national insurance as well as widows and childrens' pension on the disposable income of the majority of teachers, the Union is unable to accept the latest offer.

Though the Union is interested in expediting a settlement, it cannot relinquish its fundamental responsibility to bargain for wages that are just and acceptable to all its members."

And that is signed by "Stephen M. Blanchard, General Secretary."

Sir, the proposals that are before us, therefore are proposals that have been studied. They have been discussed. Modifications have been made by, the Government from time to time, and we have come to the end of the road in that particular process. No one can accuse the Government of not providing ample opportunity for those involved to reach an agreement, but it is clear that no agreement can be reached with some of the Unions.

We have held, according to the record, some 31 meetings. We have reached this stage after a process of some 31 meetings, not three or four or six or ten as in some cases, but 31 meetings, with the different Unions and Associations. Indeed some persons have been indicating that we have been too dilatory in this particular process, but in my management of the public affairs of this country and with my belief in the principles of collective bargaining, I believe that ample opportunity should be provided tor the representatives of the unions and the Associations and the Government negotiating team to seek to reach some agreement, some consensus. 1.40p.m.

But I am at pains to point out that that process cannot continue forever. The processes, in terms of the number of meetings and so on, have been the longest provided ibr the process to work itself out and for some conclusion to be arrived.

No one can accuse this Government of not providing ample opportunity for a settlement to be reached and when you take that within the context of the state of our public finances and the impact of any extravagant settlement on the economy generally, I believe that the determination that we arrived at is the farthest that we can go on this occasion.

We had something like 2.8% growth in our economy during 1988, approximately, and I have made it clear on more than one occasion and, certainly, in my financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals of 1988, that where there is growth, where productivity and production have increased, the workers should share in that increase. But there is a fundamental lesson that we have to take into account.

We all agree that labour, whether in the public or private sector, should share in the benefits of growth for we are a caring society and we are seeking to construct the just society. But if the economy is to continue to expand and provide all of the citizens with the quality of life that we have become accustomed to, and which is the just reward for the efforts exerted, we must be able to sell our goods and services to the rest of the world.

Wage increases that are far in excess of increases in productivity will -only serve to erode our competitive position in the international economy and reduce our standard of living. We have been warned about this on many occasions.

I believe the Honourable Member for St. Thomas himself had some advance information about the warnings that come from international bodies about matters relating to wages. I am not putting it any differently from that.

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, will you put him into a position where he will address you?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I thought you were encouraging an interruption.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I was here minding my business researching all the things he has said over the years.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The point of order is that he mentioned that I quoted from an IMF document. I am asking if he is now agreeing that my citation in here last year was correct and accurate. That is all I want to know.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Prime Minister may continue.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Thank you very much.

We have to be concerned about these matters and Government would be less than prudent if it agreed to salary increases which were way above what the economy can afford. We have to be prudent in these matters.

We had increases in productivity in the year 1988 and it is our feeling that some of that increase must be passed on to the workers. But already we have gone beyond the level of those increases so that we are providing not only at the level of what may be deemed to be appropriate in the circumstances, but we have gone somewhat beyond th$t. We believe we can go no further in this particular matter.

I believe that the Government has, therefore, been very fair and just in dealing with this matter. We have taken all of the issues that have been raised and we have either set machinery in place for dealing with them or we have come to a determination which is reasonable in all of the circumstances.

We undertook as a Government arising out of discussions with the unions to abolish the point on the scale which was Z.39. That has been done. We agreed that we would increase the level of training in the public service so that people could once again have study leave that has an impact on the general level of activity in the service as well as in the ability of some people to earn more when they get increased training and, certainly, to improve their opportunities and avenues for promotion. It is all part of the social cost of the operations of the public service. That has been done.

There has been the question of reclassification. I directed that machinery should be set up immediately for the problems relating to reclassification to be undertaken and there are some issues relating to the reclassification, that is to say, some matters raised by the Police and by other associations and bodies, which will be considered within that particular reclassification exercise.

We have taken almost every step in order to ensure that the civil servants of this country get an increase in relation to increases in productivity in the country. We cannot borrow to pay for our current account expenses, the largest item of which is expenditure on the salaries and wages and other payroll charges relating to the public service.

When we meet that wages and salaries bill, there is hardly enough left over to ensure that the surroundings, the environment, the buildings, the offices in which the civil servants work are comfortable, because if you spend the money in one direction, it is just not available to be spent in other directions. 1.50p.m.

We have got to understand that simple, basic'lesson, the more we bargain ourselves into higher salaries.

Let no one believe that they have to come to outdo somebody else in order to prove that they are a better trade union negotiator than anyone else. That is not demonstrated on this side. We have the experienced negotiators so we know what we are talking about. When I say "we", I mean there are people in our Party and on this side of the House who have experience in that particular way. When I look across there...

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take it that you are still addressing me though.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Oh yes, I am.

Laughter.

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: He is a good negotiator. He negotiated...

Laughter.

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, one does not have...

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: We must make the point on every occasion that we can, that if one has to try to out-bargain someone else in order to demonstrate that one is a better negotiator or to consolidate one's position, that can reach the point where it is very damaging to the state of industrial relations in the country and to the economy as a whole. So we have to be searching for a way of dealing with those problems and overcoming those problems.

In addition to the points that I have made, whether it is reclassification, enhanced training, abolition of the Z.39 point to the advantage of the workers at that particular level, there are the increments which are granted every year which is part of the total package.

I believe that when we take all of these things into account, one cannot but come to the conclusion that the Government has been fair and just and that it has been searching for a solution to these problems. We do not wish to become like other countries which, instead of offering a salaries increase, have to call upon the workers to give up the increases that they have obtained.

We have, with our limited resources, tried to manage our economy as best we can, and we have not done badly. We have to ensure that we are not borrowing in order to sustain our current account. We must seek out of what we produce, to balance our expenditure and our revenue on current account. We have to do that on the basis of sound financing.

For our capital works programme, we have got to ensure that our economy is in such a state that we are able to raise the funds for those capital projects on the international market or from the multinational institutions. But if our economy is not right, we will have difficulty in achieving those objectives.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that I have set out the background to these negotiations. I have said quite openly what our objective was. I have said quite openly what we aim to do. I have placed these negotiations and the determination within the context of the public finances and of the economy generally.

It will be noted, Sir, that I have introduced this matter without any rancour and without any venom. I cannot say that I can retain that equanimity if responses are in a different vein. But let me say this much, I have not dug into the past history of wages negotiations of the previous administration. I do not think that that is appropriate on this occasion.

What I have sought to do, Sir, is to demonstrate that we have searched very carefully and very diligently for a resolution of this problem, that we have given ample time for the processes and the principles in which we believe to work, and that in accordance with the needs of the public finances of this country, we must take that decision now, because I do not intend to allow this sizeable wages bill to go into the coming Financial Year and get caught up in the other fiscal arrangements for that particular year.

I appeal to this Honourable Chamber, i appeal to...

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: ...those in the general public and to those who are members and leaders of interested bodies, to accept this determination and to resolve with fairness, to search for a further resolution of those problems in the industrial arena which are outstanding and which may lead to an improvement in the industrial relations climate in this country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Applause.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I second this Resolution and reserve my right to speak. 2.00 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: It is at this point, Sir, that I move that this sitting be now suspended until 3 p.m. today, Sir.

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

The question that this sitting be now suspended until 3:00 p.m. today was put and resolved in the affirmative, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of privilege, I am told, Sir, that there are fumes which seem to be affecting this Honourable Chamber, and we are in an air conditioned.....

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: .... and I am told that they are spraying downstairs for pests. I take it, Sir, that Your Honour is fully seised of this matter and that we...

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You still are Minister of Health.

Laughs.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Since the matter was not drawn to my attention, Sir, I assume ...

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: We need to find out what the position is because if in fact they are using, it smells like kerosene we would need to suspend for a short period before...

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: No short period in this one.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think if they are carrying out any works which affect the proceedings here they may be required to stop for today. So perhaps the Leader of Government Business, if he knows of any works going which would affect us here, can probably issue the necessary instructions.

When we took the suspension, the Honourable Prime Minister had just concluded his speech. Are there any other Members who wish to speak on this Resolution?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, like the Prime Minister I have been in this House for some 17 years. I believe that he has been in the Senate for a period of time longer than that and during these 17 years I have had the opportunity to study the Prime Minister quite carefully. I came to the conclusion that he is a person who chooses his words very cautiously and deliberately. I can tell when he is batting a good hand and I can tell as well when he is perturbed about events.

But today one of the things which characterised his speech was that I gained the distinct impression that the Prime Minister was really more interested in occupying the crease right up to the luncheon adjournment than giving the House in a succinct and effective fashion the real reasons why the Government could not report to this House a complete agreement between the Government and the various public sector unions on the wage negotiations. The Prime Minister used the opportunity to trace the historical development of collective bargaining negotiations between the public workers and the Government, its employer, including the statutory boards. He used the opportunity to adopt not only the words but some of the ideas and the analyses previously proffered in this House by the Barbados Labour Party which I represent. He used the opportunity to show quite clearly that there is a vast difference in the Democratic Labour Party when it sits in Opposition from when it sits in Government and how it then conducts itself. What he did not use the opportunity to tell us at the end of the day is what really were the areas that divided the Government from the main public sector unions in these negotiations. During the process of time, he appealed for light and the sound in his voice making .....

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Could the Honourable Member just pause for a moment? We are getting a lot of disturbing movements in, about, and around the House. Okay, you may continue. Sorry to interrupt.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE:... Sir, making some statements that, when I reflect on the expressions of certain Members of the Democratic Labour Party before it was divided really, is in great contradiction of the stand taken by former leading lights of the Democratic Labour Party. I am going to be specific, Sir, not to waste the time of this House.

We have always contended that all salaries at the end of the day have to be legislated given the legislative framework under which Civil Servants are paid. However, the Barbados Labour Party has on several occasions been at the receiving end of the stick from the Democratic Labour Party when it has had to explain in the simplest of terms what is a legal truism. In the debate which took place in this House on October 16th, I think it was 1980, as well as in the debate which took place in this House in 1984, particularly September 4th, the then Right Honourable Member for St. Thomas, then Prime Minister J. M. G. M Adams, was at pains to trace in succinct and clear language the history of public sector negotiations. He made the point then, a point which the Prime Minister has adopted, and I hope it is an official DLP policy that what is quite clear is that successive Governments have had to legislate because of the nature of the legal requirements of the legislation.

Today, I hear the Prime Minister coming to the conclusion that, according to the law of this country, it is necessary that all salaries should be negotiated.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: All right, Sir, I have got an indication from my colleague, the Honourable Member for St. Thomas, of a conversation with the Leader of the House, so I will give way.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are all labouring under some little problem here of fumes which are causing considerable discomfort to us all, Sir. It has become in a way intolerable, Sir. For this reason, Sir, I am going to move the suspension of this House for 15 minutes so the windows can be opened during that time and hopefully that we will be able to get rid of the fumes that are affecting us by that time.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I therefore, Sir, move that this sitting be suspended until 3:30 p.m. today, Sir.

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

The question that this sitting be suspended until 3:30 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended accordingly. 3:15 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The sitting is resumed. When we took the break the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was addressing the House. He may continue.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the point I was making is that the Prime Minister in his presentation has now adopted, for the purpose of justifying the legislating at this time of the salaries of the public workers, some of the arguments which we in the past have said were considerations that had to be borne in mind, but what he has not told us is that in adopting those arguments the Government has moved from its own pristine position, the impression which it gave to the public of Barbados that under no circumstances would the Government ever come to the House to legislate salaries before the whole collective bargaining process has been exhausted.

Now, Sir, I want to contrast the position - because sometimes you have to reflect in this country to remind people - now with the position which obtained in 1986. Prime Minister St. John tried as early as possible to meet with the Unions to set out certain parameters which in his mind would affect Government's position. He tried very clearly to encourage the Unions to move to a position of negotiations as soon as possible showing not only the *bona fides* of the then Government, but the seriousness with which it had intended to approach the negotiations.

Within a couple of months of that situation we had the Unions, not all the Unions, leading main demonstrations against the Government. I recall very vividly the position of the Democratic Labour Party then. It was represented by statements made by some of its leading spokesmen that the Government had the capacity to pay and they should pay. There were several of the leading Government people participating in the demonstration then against the Government of Mr. St. John, and the considerations which today the Prime Minister has used to appeal for reason and for fairness and for justness were considerations that one must say were thrown through the window at that time.

You have to ask yourself what has changed and you have to ask yourself why has it changed, that today the now Government who at that time took a hard attitude against the Barbados Labour Party should be appealing for light. One has to ask oneself that question. What is- the unspoken factor? What is the hidden factor that has occurred at this time? In asking oneself that question, Sir, there is a series of questions that arise out of this. How far apart in December 1988, and even today, were these parties from a collective agreement?

At the end of the Prime Minister's speech there is nobody in this House who could in money terms spell out for me what the differences in his case between the Government's last negotiating position as is now being legislated and the negotiating position of the National Union of Public Workers. When the Prime Minister has finished his summation in this Hose we are still at a loss in money terms as to what would have been the additional cost involved in sitting down and negotiating a settlement that was acceptable to the National Union of Public Workers, the Barbados Union of Teachers, the Police Association and, I believe, the Prisons Association.

At the end of the Prime Minister's speech I believe we are still at a loss to ask where exactly were the points of division. They were not at the top. All parties, including all Unions as I understand it, had agreed with the 5% at the top. What was not agreed was exactly where at the bottom you would draw the difference between the 9.1% situation of the NUPW and the Government's 8.18%. I am saying that the Government has come in here to legislate the salaries without fully taking into account the claims of the poorest sectors of the Public Service, that the people whom they are legislating against are not us parliamentarians, in fact the Government is anxious today to legislate the salaries for parliamentarians and Ministers. It was not in that area that there was any difference, Let us get rid of all of the wool. It is at the level of the lowest paid workers in the Public Service as represented by the NUPW. That is where we are today.

What is the dollar account? The Government has noi given us, but I am going to give you. When the negotiations concluded, my information is that the difference from the NUPW position was a mere $236 000.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member will hear the figures a little later. That is the NUPW's position on it. What is the difference in relation to the Police? The police position was that they would agree - the Government knows this - on the proposals, provided that they were given two increments from the rank of Constable up to Assistant Superintendent. I have not heard the Prime Minister explain to this House what is the cost of that and the Government's inability to pay.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: There are 1200 policemen involved in the whole of the Service, if the Honourable Member wants to know. 3.40p.m.

The cost to the Government of these proposals from the Police at the most would have been about $1.2 million to $1.3 million to answer the needs of the Police Force. The police had occasion to put their position bluntly in the presence of the Honourable Member for St. Michael North. They feel dissatisfied and let down by this Government, that in the situation where the Government at the end of the year is already projecting a surplus, they are not taking into account what they consider to be the legitimate case that the Police have. The Government has not even said to the Police we will meet you half way on this one.

The Prime Minister sat down. He has read out letters passing between the National Union of Public Workers and the Head of the Civil Service, passing between the NUPW and the BUT and the Head of the Civil Service without any reference to them - that we are going to debate on this side - what is the Government's position towards the legitimate claims of the Police? I am saying that $1.3 million was no significant amount and that the needs of the Police Service should have been taken into account adequately in these negotiations.

Now, Sir, I said when the negotiations concluded with the NUPW.....

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I do not want to indicate that the Honourable Member is misleading the House, but the police, as I understand it, said that they would accept what everybody else accepted; so to say that the police has not accepted is incorrect. Do not try to mislead the House.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Now, Sir, I want to look at the overall position of the NUPW's last stand, if the NUPW's level was taken for all workers including the workers represented by the other unions. As I understand it, the NUPW was asking for 9.75 per cent graduating to 5 per cent at the top in the first year and for 2 per cent in year 2. The 2 per cent has been agreed in year 2, The 5 per cent at the top has been agreed in year 1. The distinction comes out within grades that are lowest on the salary scale. Now the Government's offer is 8.18 per cent graduating to 5 per cent. Let us take the overall position and average. Roughly the Government is about 6.6 per cent over the period of time.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of elucidation, the Leader of the Opposition has been asking for some information. He said I did not give the House certain information and he wants that information, He obviously wished my presentation to be a little lengthier than it was.

In respect of the police, the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of the Civil Service wrote to the President of the Police Association by letter dated 4th January, 1989 as follows:

"Dear Sir,

> Following the conclusion of salary negotiations* with some Unions, I am authorised to make an offer to your association on the basis of an increase of 8.3 per cent at P.35 graduating to 5 per cent at P.I for the first year plus an additional 2 per cent across the board for the second year.
>
> I trust that this offer will be acceptable to you. An early reply would be appreciated."

A reply dated 13th January, 1989 to the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of the Civil Service from the Police Association reads as follows:

"Dear Sir,

> We the gazetted officers and the Police Association of the Royal Barbados Police Force write in response to your letter" - this is from the President of the Police Association, and I am omitting the details about reference number and so on - "The gazetted officers of the Association have considered the offer made in your letter with regard to salary increases and have arrived at a common position. We are prepared to accept Government's offer of 8.3 per cent at the bottom and graduating to 5 per cent at the top with a two per cent increase across the board in the second year, provided that in addition to this offer Government agrees to our request for an upward adjustment in the salaries of two increments for each post from the rank of Constable to Assistant Superintendent.
>
> In this regard your attention is referred to paragraph 21 of the Minutes of the meeting between a joint delegation of gazetted officers and the Police Association with the Establishments Division on 17th November, 1988.
>
> We are hopeful that our position as outlined herein will be accommodated by Government, thus leading to what we consider a just settlement."
>
> That is signed for the gazetted officers and President of the Police Association. There was a reply to that reply dated 23rd January, 1989, to the Commissioner of Police.

> "I refer to your letter 2389/1/388 dated 16th January, 1989, submitting the Police Association's and Gazetted Officers' position on the 1988-90 salaries revision.
>
> I have been directed to inform you that the proposal for the granting of two increments to the grades of constable to Assistant Superintendent is not feasible in the context of a salary revision because it would destroy the existing relativities in the P Scales and create anomalies. The proposal will therefore be referred to the Classifications Committee for due consideration.
>
> You will note from my letter 6222/T.l dated 1988-12-15 that any adjustments resulting from a classification exercise will take effect from 88-04-01."

You have asked for the information and I have given the information, and that is the Police position.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take it this is information which you requested.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I have set out the position of the Police and the Prime Minister has not differed from anything I have said, that agreement has not been reached, except that I have gone a little further and said that the cost of these proposals could have been accommodated by the Government. 3.50p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. Order, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I will come back to the Police in my final summary on this.

If Government took the whole of the NUPW's position over the whole of the service, not only from the categories they represent where there was disagreement, but over the whole of the service, the total cost to the Government, the difference in the cost would be just $3 million.

Now, Sir, we are talking about a wage bill here of roughly $385 million, $386 million. We are talking about a $3 million difference. If you take all of their proposals over the whole of the service and let us assume that the average of their proposal was applied over all categories of the service, represented by them or not represented by them, the differences between the parties was approximately $3 million.

The Government has, according to the Prime Minister, to look at this, in the context of the capacity to pay, in the context of the rise in the cost of living, in the context of taxation and in the context of inflation.

The Prime Minister has sat down and we have not heard that the Government has not got the capacity to meet that additional $3 million. We are saying in this House, that the Government on its taxation policies is not only able to meet the expenditure which we have voted in this House, but the supplementary votes that came down, the additional wage bill that the Government is now voting without any additional taxation and, in addition, to come out with a surplus. We are saying that, in the context of what has occurred, the $3 million which the public service was asking for, particularly at the level of the society and of the workers whom it was asking for, was not an unreasonable demand. We are saying that Government's argument that it does not have the capacity to pay does not hold water.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: It is not a question of whether things are so good as the Honourable Member for St. Michael North shouts. The position is that Government has extracted enough taxes and overtaxed the people and altered the basis on which the unions accepted their position back in 1986 and that, therefore, the levy of the surcharge, the increase in inflation that has occurred and the increase in prices generally, in particular the consumption tax prices, have meant that the workers, particularly those at the lower rung of the ladder, have felt the sting of the taxation policy fully and have a legitimate claim to ask the public of Barbados from the extra money that is being taken in to meet that extra $3 million.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: It is a miniscule difference in the context of what we are talking about here and I am going to go through the various categories to show how miniscule these differences happen to be.

In some cases - let us take the position of the Government's latest proposals, particularly in the Z scale, Z.38 upwards - in some instances, it is at Z.31 and the difference is $2.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: At Z.31 the difference is $2 between the Government and the union. At Z.32 the difference is $4. At Z.33 the difference is $6. At Z.35 the difference is $8. At Z.36 the difference is $10. At Z.37 the difference is $12 and at Z.38 the difference is $15. If you even go up to the scale to Z.18, higher up in the scale, and Z.19, the difference is a mere $6 and $2. Z.16 is $10.

Aside.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is this a private conversation?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If you take the teachers scale the difference as well is negligible. The average difference right over the whole scale is less than $18 between these parties and we are saying it is a very simple point.

If the Government is coming out of the year and not showing a surplus, the Government, because of the very surplus it is getting, because it is getting it from the people, and from the bulk of the Public Service, the Government is in a position, given that situation, to meet the bill and the Barbados Labour Party Opposition will not b$ voting for the Resolution. We are not satisfied by anything.....

Aside.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are getting too many voices in the Chamber.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: ..... The Prime Minister has said that the difference warranted the Government in coming down here today to legislate the salaries in the way that they are doing.

Aside.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am just going to ask you, bt fore I have myself to exercise my own rights in this House and I am subject to you, to ask Honourable Members to obey the Rules of this House.

Now, Sir, what is the hidden factor? The hidden factor is locked up in the process of negotiations.

The Prime Minister spoke about 31 meetings taking place, and I am sure that he has given the impression that there were a whole series of exhaustive meetings. There are 9 unions. There are 2 points that must be made on these.

In the first place, the number of meetings that he claimed took place, if it was spread over the unions is not a lot of meetings. The Prime Minister knows that.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: He might shout that they are more than we held.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do not respond.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: But they are not a lot of meetings that have taken place. That is the first point.

The second is the method of negotiation. I charge the Government with deliberately pitting union against union with these negotiations. The Government found itself tied to a situation that it had given its word and agreed with one of the unions, a large union in the context of Barbados, but a small union in the context of public sector unions and for political reasons, the Government did not want to do anything that would show that it was not going along with that position. 4.00 p.m.

Now, Sir, the Prime Minister said four unions agreed. Let him tell us of the 25 000 workers that are represented, 17 000 directly in the Public Service, that agreement has only been reached with 2 000 of those 17 000 directly in the Public Service. The bulk of the workers in the Public Service are represented by the NUPW and the Barbados Union of Teachers, neither of whom has accepted the conclusions. So you have a situation, regardless of what they say, where agreement has not been reached with the bulk of the union members represented in these negotiations and this was in the context where the Government had committed itself and had no reasonable excuse to give the National Union of Public Workers why it could not have continued the negotiations.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: It had not exhausted...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: ...all of the avenues 'for a settlement that was available to it.

I am saying that the sad state that has occurred today is a state of which we warned. If you are going to put your friends before the overall position of the whole of the public sector, we will always have to come in here and legislate on this matter, when only $3 million is involved.

I am not, for one moment, going to change one word of that in the context of these negotiations that have taken place and in the context of Government's financial position. The Government is collecting over $100 million more this year than it had bargained for when it introduced the Budgetary and other measures into this House. It is able to pay the public sector increase of what I estimate to be $30 million. It is able to take up Supplementaries of close to that amount. And it is going to show a surplus on top of it. When you are dealing with people at the lowest rung of the ladder for whom $5.00 a week make a lot of difference, the Government is going to tell us it cannot pay them any more. That is the position of this Government.

I ask Honourable Members, some of the Honourable Members over there who were the first very often to criticize the Opposition, why is it today that you are prepared to accept that situation, having gone around the country giving the impression that the Democratic Labour Party was so wedded to the collective bargaining process

that it would never come in here and legislate salaries? That is what we are asking you and what the people want to know.

You have completely, gone back on many of the things you have said and stood for in this case. I am not surprised that the NUPW and the BUT now find themselves in problems.

A couple of Sundays ago I told them not to waste their time, you had started the legislation.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: You had started the legislation process.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am not surprised that the unions have created problems for themselves. Some of them were playing along too much and could not understand that they had to adopt a proper and correct industrial stand when they were dealing with the Barbados Labour Party in 1986. Some of them who had been promised that they would have been given various jobs tonight find they do not have the jobs and they have lost their credibility within the very union structure.

Aside.

Laughter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: They were more interested then in bringing down the Barbados Labour Party than they were in the collective bargaining process. In those days it suited the Democratic Labour Party to give the impression that we did not have the position of the workers at heart.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: That is what suited them. Ask those. Ask them tonight what is their position. I am not surprised when the Prime Minister reads out the letter from the NUPW...

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: ...and the Permanent Secretary. I said that the rank and file of the union were going to be out of step with their union leaders and negotiators if they do not understand that when it comes to industrial relations in Barbados that they have to be independent, and they cannot wear their political cap more than they wear their industrial cap.

Asides.

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

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: What is happening is that the political cap is now becoming the ruling position not only in the Democratic Labour Party but in the Government's stance towards the public sector unions.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: That is what the Honourable Member must understand.

Asides.

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, any objective analysis of industrial relations in the last two years, last three years in Barbados must agree that, when it suits the Democratic Labour Party, it is prepared to use the unions for their purposes. When it comes to the crunch and it is in power, it will find itself, as it has found itself today, having to choose at some stage because the rank and file is no longer prepared to put up with the political posturings and decisions being taken and machinations by some of their members and their leaders.

I got a good deal of criticism...

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: ...when I spoke in this very House earlier and issued the warning that I gave then and I am giving now. I am saying that we can still return to a system of industrial relations in which fairness and objectivity will apply. 4.10p.m.

But it must be understood, regardless of which government is in power, that the principal consideration is not whether you are part of a Government, whether there is a liaison, whether there are jobs being promised to you. That is not what is important. The important thing is that you have to take a consistent and objective position on these matters.

Obviously, we too cannot be satisfied with the manner in which union negotiations are structured. When I say in here that the NUPW rank and file feel that they are being sacrificed on the altar of political expediency, I am reflecting the mood of the vast majority of the members of the National Union of Public Workers and the BWU.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am reflecting the mood of a vast number of them. They are losing confidence themselves in the collective bargaining process. They have found themselves, Sir, in the situation that they are losing confidence in some of them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: They have themselves found that when it comes to a choice between the Barbados Workers Union and themselves that the major public sector unions are out in the cold. It should not surprise the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central who is listening very carefully. I am mirroring the statements that have been written to me and expressed to me by persons and, therefore, they have got to be answered and have also to be articulated on the floor of this House. Many members of the National Union of Public Workers and the Barbados Union of Teachers consider that the Government in this set of negotiations is more concerned with making sure that the Barbados Workers Union does not lose its credibility than looking after their own interest.

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Now, Sir, one of the points they made is that, although they represent the major sector of the Public Service, the structuring of the meetings was loaded against them. They make that point, that they were treated as though they were the junior partners in the negotiations rather than the senior representing the majority of people. The Government, even before it had concluded negotiations with the NUPW, made it known and the BWU made it known that it had reached agreement, so that every other union could well have packed up and gone home.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Look, the Honourable Member is good at planting things including planting his foot in his mouth all of the time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: So the Honourable Member must know that it would be planted in the Press in order to upstage the National Union of Public Workers in their negotiations. He must know that, and the Barbados Union of Teachers. If the Honourable Member does not understand that that is the sentiment of the rank and file out there, then he has completely lost his feelings and any bearings that he has.

I could not agree more that we need to change the structure of the negotiations. We said so when we were in Government. We said that the process of negotiations must be done swiftly and in such a way that the positions of both parties are fairly put and fairly exhausted.

Now, Sir, I want to deal with his capacity to pay. The Prime Minister is justifying the refusal to pay the extra $3 million on the basis that there has only been a 2.8% growth in the economy. That is what he is justifying it on. The Government cannot say that there is not a precedent, even when there was no growth in the economy, to make a proper settlement with the various sectors of the Public Service. The Barbados Labour Party, in the years when there was no growth in 1982, still found it possible to arrive at a settlement of $108 across the board. In 1984, when there was no growth, we gave 15% in the first year, based on 1982/83 wages and 5% in the second year across the board. There was no growth and the lowest figure that we have ever given is $108 dollars per month. That is the lowest that we have ever given.

The economy is now growing. The Government is boasting of growth even in the year that growth should have been attributed to the Barbados Labour Party's actions and the Government finds it possible to give a mere $75.00. The Government finds it possible only to give a mere $75.00! The Barbados Labour Party, when there was no growth at all and when were mismanaging this so called economy....

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: ...When we were mismanaging according to them, we found it possible to give more than the Government gave today. If you compare us with them, you will find that this label that they have tried to put on the Barbados Labour Party as being anti-worker, cannot be justified. The Prime Minister himself today had to admit, he said "successive Governments", that was his statement "successive Governments have sought within the state of the resources available to pay" - and he had to read out because the facts are there for everyone to see that consistently when it was in power, the Barbados Labour Party, with growth or without growth, made it possible to give more every year. As a matter of fact, I believe it was 1980 that you got the highest raise ever given to the public sector in Barbados, something like 38.3% at the bottom graduating to 22.5% at the top. 4.20p.m.

We have never reneged on our commitment to ensuring that the workers in Barbados benefitted annually from the fruits of their labour within or without the public sector. I go further and say that it was during our administration that the gap between those at the top and those at the bottom was lessened. You look at the figures. I have previously in this House made the statement that Barbados stands out within the Caribbean and even against the Communist world in showing in relative terms that there is less difference between those at the top and those at the bottom than anywhere else in the world. That statement

cannot be gainsaid. Both in the private sector and in the public "sector that is true. I have made that statement all the time and it cannot be gainsaid. In fact we even had the position where the Government's chief negotiator complained, I think it was. last year, that the relativities had been reduced to the point that the Government now could not get top managers and you would have to do something at the top more so than at the bottom.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: That is what he had said, so wherever possible and we had to make the choice, we made the choice in ensuring that we were bringing up the lowest paid workers to a position since they had, in our view, the greatest needs in that respect so that they were better off, so we are not talking in here about large sums. Do you mean you are telling me that this Government that is so pro-worker cannot find it in its heart to give the janitors, to give the maids, the clerks, the clerical officers an additional... all they are asking for is an additional $5 a month here, an additional $7 a month here and an additional $10 a month the*c, in a position where the Government is boasting that it can show a surplus, in a position where the Prime Minister had to admit that he has to remove the surcharge?

Aside.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to refer Members to the rules governing debate in this Chamber and in particular Order 28 Rule 13.1 am going to read it. It says "A Member who desires to speak must rise in his place and if he is called upon by the Chair address the Speaker or Chairman." I am sure that all Honourable Members are familiar with these rules and will be guided accordingly.

You may proceed.

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

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are two Honourable Members on their feet.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: One of them is on a point of order.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member is misleading the House, Sir. The Honourable Member by the phrase that the Prime Minister "has to remove" is misleading this House because a law was passed in this House, Sir, a law which mandated the Prime Minister to terminate the surcharge on a specific date. If the Honourable Member, who is familiar with that law, then uses that phrase, he seeks to mislead this House, Sir. I so submit.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You may continue.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, when we debated the surcharge in here we pointed out to the Government that it would be collecting more money than it needed. My information is that it has collected $10 million more than it had estimated it would have collected by the very surcharge itself.

The cost of the additional amount asked for by the large majority of the public sector Unions is less than one-third of that amount. The cost, I am saying, of the amount being asked for by the public sector Unions in order to reach total agreement is less than one-third of the excess amount that the Government is getting from the surcharge this year that it had not bargained for.

Let us put it in the context in which we are dealing with the position, so that if the Government has the interest ^of the workers that it so often claims it has at heart, why cannot it give them the extra $3 million they are asking for? What is so unreasonable about that? I said there must be some reason that the Prime Minister has not disclosed to this House what has inspired the Government's action? There must be some reason that that has not been disclosed to this House.

The Prime Minister said that we have to look at the effect which this will have on productivity, on other wages in the private sector and how it could affect Government's fiscal position. Once again you see the DLP doing their leaps. The main advisers to the Democratic Labour Party on their economic policies, including a senior lecturer, or the senior lecturer, at Cave Hill who is now...

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am talking of the one that you appointed to the Central Bank and to head the National Insurance Board. Again, Sir, you know, coming up to the last elections...

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: He is the senior lecturer of the Department of Economics of the University of the West Indies. He addressed the 40th annual conference of the National Union of Public Workers, and I really want to stress where the address was given, at the National Union of Public Workers in early November 1985. His whole thesis then was that there is no effect on the economy from having an open ended system of wage negotiations, wage settlements. His thesis was that in the context of Barbados and an open economy such as ours it did not matter, you did not need to have wage restraint, that you could go on and have anything, because it had no effect on the fiscal position of Government.

Now, Sir, he was talking at the NUPW. I am not surprised that he was in there misleading and using his position - not using his position really as a lecturer - using his political cap as a member of the Democratic Labour Party in those days in order to give the impression that the Barbados Labour Party was anti-worker.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member says leave him out. I cannot leave him out, Sir. I am-not going to leave him out. Like me he is a Christ Church man. 4.30p.m.

I am not going to leave him out. He is a main participator in every election in Christ Church. He is a leading member of the Democratic Labour Party. He is now writing all of the articles all of a sudden again, having chosen which side of the DLP he is on, whether on the side of the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central or the Honourable Member for St. Michael South. Having now chosen which side of the DLP he is on, he is now of course changing his tune. I am not surprised that the NUPW is now beginning to see that it cannot play the role of an objective negotiator if it is going to be misled by the politicians whom it encourages within its midst like that Honourable Member at the time. So the Prime Minister today comes in and he accepts that when the Barbados Labour Party in its negotiations in the past has had to set out the factors and criteria which had to be taken into account, that it was speaking properly, it was speaking objectively, it was speaking with the interest of the country as a whole at heart, and that it was not being anti-worker as they sought to label us.

Now, Sir, I said that I would revert to the position of the Police, but before I do so I want to put for the purpose of the record, the difference between the Government and the Barbados Union of Teachers. If the Government had come in here and said that it had a significant and wide margin between its position and that of all the Unions, one could understand that. Even taking the last position of the teachers, the BUT, they asked for 11 per cent at the bottom graduating to 5 per cent at the top, and 3 per cent I think across the board in the second year. The Government has agreed to the 5 per cent, and the difference between the two parties, assuming that the BUT situation was put across the whole spectrum of the service, assuming that the BUT position was accepted for every category of worker, the difference was about $8.5 million to $8.7 million. Even that is less than the excess amount which the Prime Minister is collecting from the surcharge.

So when we examine the position, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have to conclude that the Government's reasons advanced in here do not bear examination. They cannot stand up. We have to conclude that the Government's argument that it has not got the capacity to pay is groundless and without any merit. We have to conclude that the Government has not justified its contention in this House that it had exhausted all of the avenues for settlement. As a matter of fact, when the negotiations broke off the National Union of Public Workers were prepared to accept the position of the school meals .workers and had indicated that if the Government would negotiate a limited number of the Z scales, there was a good chance of reaching agreement.

Sir, the Government has never gone back to talk to the NUPW about that. In fact, they themselves knew of the Government intending to legislate salaries in this House from reading like any other member of the public in the newspapers. The Honourable Member wants to know how I know that. Talk to the NUPW members and they will tell you that if you want to know. So with whom has the Government really reached agreement? One of the Unions with which it has reached agreement is the Barbados Workers' Union. My information is that they represent about 1 200 of the people, not in the Statutory Boards, I am talking about the public service proper.

It has reached agreement with the Fire Service, less than 250 persons, with the Barbados Secondary Teachers' Union and with BAMP, but with the biggest Union no agreement of any nature whatsoever has been reached. I think the Unions are justified in protesting the manner in which they have been treated in these negotiations, particularly as the facts at their disposal and at the disposal of the Opposition show, quite clearly that the Government has the capacity to meet an additional bill of certainly $3 million. Even if we put it at the highest expected by the Barbados Union of Teachers, some $8.5 million or $8.7 million, they had the capacity to meet that as well. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we cannot support the Resolution which the Prime Minister has brought down to this House of Assembly.

I would wish that the whole framework under which salary negotiations are conducted, as the Prime Minister has promised, is looked at and looked at speedily. There is a need to cut out the tremendous delay. There is no need to leave the negotiations with other unions feeling that they have been unfairly treated. That feeling has not evolved from these negotiations. There is a need to remove the suspicion that the Government favours some friends over other friends, and there is no need for us to restate that, if collectiv3 bargaining is to be properly conducted in Barbados, then political considerations must not be a guiding principle in the negotiations.

I had hoped, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Prime Minister would have brought, after all his silence on this issue for many a month, something new to tell us. I had hoped after the calumny that some of the Democratic Labour Party people were heaping on me when I spoke up and said that in my view the Prime Minister has a duty to speak in these negotiations to which it is a party ... the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central gave an

example of the then Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central, Mr. Bernard St. John, taking a proper stance in the manner in which at the opening of negotiations he set out the basis as he saw them which would inspire the Government's series of negotiations. I see nothing improper in that, and I want to go further, Sir. I believe that we have to have a system of collective bargaining whether in the private sector or the public sector where all of the facts are known to both parties. It is the surest way of removing suspicion. I do not believe that the Government has any private and personal business when it comes to giving the state of the economy to the Unions with whom it is negotiating all of the figures. 4.40 p.m.

I consider that, if the out-turn figures are such that the unions feel that they are not getting a true picture, they are entitled to hear it whether they hear it from us on the floor of the House or from the Government side and, until we can get those parameters clearly set out, we will always remain in a situation in which the doubt, in which the suspicion, in which the feeling of let down which has permeated these negotiations become very strident forces in industrial relations in Barbados.

For these reasons the Opposition feel it cannot give the Government the support it is asking on this measure or any of the measures that it is bringing before the House today on salary negotiations.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Two Honourable Members are on their feet.

I recognise the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have been a Member of this Honourable House since 1978. I stand today as Leader of the National Democratic Party and I want to give this House an assurance that in this matter my views shall be the same on this matter as they were in 1978 and as they always will be because this new political party, recognizing the tremendous demand among the electorate for a commitment to honour and integrity, a commitment to honouring the positions that we have taken over the years, shall always remain loyal to those high virtues in our political existence.

Today, Sir, I find myself in a position where I have always found myself, standing in defence of the poor in this community, and despite those who walk around saying that we are supported by wealthy merchants, the same merchants that have supported them, I presume, over the years, the same merchants they have been calling up saying do not give us any money if we come to them - we have not gone to any - we will take the same position that we have taken on behalf of the working people of this country.

There have been all sorts of situations which have occurred in this House in respect of legislation of salaries. I am not going to get into the area of argument that all salaries must be legislated. Of course, all salaries must be legislated.,The issue is whether they should be legislated before there is a proper agreement or whether or not the collective bargaining processes have been exhausted. So to get into that kind of argument does not make any sense to me.

What is peculiar is, and I think this is the only occasion that salaries have been legislated in this House where the only people who would bear the brunt of that legislation are, in fact, the lowest paid workers in the public service - we have had several occasions where there have been differences at the top, at the middle and at the bottom, we have had occasions where there have been differences in the middle and at the bottom - this is the first occasion where salaries are being legislated in this Parliament where the difference is at the very bottom of the scale. I have been in here for every single negotiation and I have studied these matters in detail and no one can tell me that this is not the case. It is the very first occasion that this has ever happened in the Parliament of Barbados and I am saying this, that several matters will flow as a result of this.

When the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party was being constructed, the original draft did, in fact, say that under no circumstances would a Democratic Labour Party Government legislate salaries without an agreement. That was deliberately changed to use various words and the final word chosen was the word "strive" and the reason why the word "strive" was used was because it indicated that we would use every single effort before coming to the House to legislate salaries. That is a fact.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not the Leader for the Opposition. Anyone interrupting me will get a good piece of my tongue. I sat down here. I did not interrupt anybody. If anyone wants to interrupt it is a different ball game.

Aside.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Just one moment before you proceed. I just want persons in this Chamber, those in the public gallery, to recognize that they are not permitted to participate in the debate or to interrupt or interfere with the debate.

I also want to say that I will be here to see that nobody interrupts your speech and you have no need to fear in that regard. You may proceed.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can assure you that I do not know the sensation of fear. Secondly, I did hear the Honourable Member for St. James South wonder if

I have a tongue. I would like to assure him that the whole of, Barbados is wondering whether he has a brain.

I would like to say this, Sir. This legislation here before us is going to have several effects. First of all, the social costs, and make no mistake about this. There will be a social cost in terms of the morale of the public service.

There will be an economic cost in terms of productivity and when you have a breakdown in morale and productivity in the public service, it means that the entire society will suffer and, indeed, it is going to widen the gap between the haves and the have-nots in this society.

You only have to look and see what 5% means to somebody earning $85 000 a year and what 8.1% means to somebody earning $10 000 or $15 000 a year. Make no mistake. The bottom line is the cash in your pocket and there will be a tremendous difference in that regard. 4:50 p.m.

And I go further and say this, that when you look at the small sum that stood between the National Union of Public Workers and the Government, some $286,000, that could easily have been obtained by shaving at the top. Indeed, my understanding is that it was not the unions who were pressing for a 5% at the top, it was the very negotiators who decided that they are soon going home and wanted 5% for thel* pensions. The sacrifice had to come at the bottom of the scale. That is a fact. That is what was said at the negotiating table.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I said that was said at the negotiating table. I repeat it here on the Floor of the House.

Here you have a small difference between the Government and the public workers of this country, and we are down here today being asked to legislate. Legislate for what, when there is such a small difference? What are we legislating for? Go back to the bargaining table. The unions have not said we are not going to negotiate any further. The bargaining process was still open. What is the reason to be here? Why are we legislating these salaries on this occasion?

There have been occasions where there have been substantial differences between the union and the Government involving millions of dollars. Here you have a difference involving a few thousand dollars and you are here legislating this.

I say that it is wrong and I say that it is doubly wrong when the people who are going to suffer as a result of this legislation today must be the poor people at the bottom. I have the scales here. There can be no question about it... When you look at the differences on here, you start at Z.31 to Z.38 and that is where the difference is. What is the point cheupsing and what not? That is a fact. That is a fact. That is a fact that is right here before us. It is the very bottom of the scale that this legislation is being brought to oppress.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Are they saying that I am not telling the truth?

What person defending the workers of this country is going to get up and say that it is not a fact that the legislation is primarily, predominantly and almost entirely covering from Z.31 to Z.38 and that is where the lowest category of workers is? They are the scales for the lowest category of workers.

How can we in all conscience come in here as representatives of constituencies, the majority of whom are populated by people, the public workers in all our constituencies are people who are paid in this scale, and support this piece of legislation and then go back to them and ask them for a vote? >

I will tell you this, the National Democratic Party will not be supporting this.

Laughter.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The National Democratic Party will not be supporting this.

Laughter.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is the political cost that one will have to pay. The political cost is this, that all of us who sat here from 1978 until now, all of us without exception on the Opposition benches addressed this issue of legislating salaries without exhausting the process of negotiation. All of us. Any one of us who sat in that Parliament during that period and gets up here and takes a contrary position, cannot be speaking according to his conscience now or then. One has to be wrong.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I said all of us took that stand. Every single one of us took that stand in Opposition. We spoke of it. We were very forceful on that particular issue. We held public meetings up and down the country, and I think that we were right then. I think our position was the correct position to take then. I am taking the same position now that I took then. I will not change.

Now it is important in public life, when you are dealing with the livelihood of people, particularly poor people, people who live a marginal existence, people who

are hardly earning enough to meet their basic needs, that we should not play games with their lives.

I have marched with the Barbados Workers' Union in this country, because they took a position of principle on matters like this. I have taken the same position as the Barbados Workers' Union in this Parliament, because they have articulated the same ideals that I am articulating here on the Floor of this House today. What has happened that I should not change? I am not accusing the Barbados Workers' Union of anything.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not dealing with the Barbados Workers' Union on this matter. I said I am dealing with the Barbados Workers' Union's position which I have supported and which I am sure every trade unionist in this House would get up and support.

Aside.

Laughter.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am absolutely sure about that.

Aside,

Laughter.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am absolutely sure. We have always been at one in this particular area.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: But you see, what can readily happen is that you can find yourself in a bind very easily.

Some time ago, I said in this House that there will be a political and a social cost to reduction of the incomes of people through surcharges and at the same time, increasing Consumption Taxes by some 50% at one and the same time in a given year. Therefore, it is very, very difficult to see how any trade unionist who is defending the interest of the people whom he represents would not recognize that once he factors into these things, the cost of taxation, the increase in prices, the inflation rates, there is a floor below which he cannot agree, unless he is going to agree to a diminution in the standard of living of the persons whom he represents.

What one is going to find is that there is going to be a continuing impact of that surcharge on Government's expenditure pattern in terms upon our personal emoluments, long after the surcharge has been taken off. Taxation is not something that you could put on today and take off tomorrow, and believe that what you did today ceases tomorrow. There are a whole lot of intervening things that happen. I am sure that if Government were negotiating against a background of a further 10 months of increased disposable incomes in the hands of the workers then you would not find yourself in a situation where you have to come in here and legislate salaries. Let us face it.

The people of Barbados, they know, they understand. We have told them often enough when we were in Opposition what our position would be on legislating salaries. There is no form of words that one can find at this stage to explain any turnaround on that. You can only fool yourselves with words either on the Floor of this House or words in the press. But the people know and they follow this. They have listened to us and they have accepted what we have told them, that legislation of salaries is something that should not take place, except in the most dire circumstances. 5.00 p.m.

They cannot be said to exist where the difference is entirely at the lower end of the scale and affecting only the poor people in the Public Service. What sort of consciences would we have? What sort of consciences would we have as legislators if we find ourselves passing legislation on this basis?

I have opposed legislating salaries on the floor of this House when the differences were far more substantial, the differences between Government and the unions. What grounds can you have now? What reasonable grounds can you have for supporting it when the differences are so small? I would like to hear this. What could be the reason? What could be the logic behind it? It just simply does not make sense to me.

Now Sir, all sorts of things would have happened. You see, I looked recently, Sir, at the settlement among the sugar workers of this country working in an industry where the profitability is exceedingly low at the moment or where there is no profit, or where there are losses. The workers in the sugar industry have had to accept increases in the order of 3% and 2% which means, Sir, taking into consideration the hike in consumption taxes and the surcharges, that they are absolutely and relatively worse off in relation to other workers in the community.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Yes, absolutely. Of course, he would not, the higher ones in the crop..... The higher paid ones yes. But the consumption taxes apply to everybody.

The point I am trying to make is that one understands and I am quite sure that the union would have done well even to get a 3% or a 2% in that kind of situation. I am not arguing about that settlement. But what I am saying is that in that kind of situation, where an industry is facing bankruptcy, one can accept and see why that is done. The same does not apply in this particular situation. There is no one who can tell me that the Government could not spare

less than half a million dollars more in order to come to some kind of negotiated settlement with the National Union of Public Workers. I cannot see the reason for it. No reason has been put forward and I do not understand the reason for it.

I am not going to get into micro-economic factors as to the impact of wages on the Balance of Payments or on the Fiscal Deficit and all of this kind of thing like that. Because, as someone said, there are certain persons who take one position now another position now. I know how you can find out which position that person will take. You just look at the moon and the moon will tell you how he is going to operate next day.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: When you look at the entire scenario, you will see that what we are paying for here is the price of the fiscal disarrangements of 1988. You will see that the Government has virtually created the conditions precedent for the levels of demand of the workers and that the Government, by pursuing a different position, knowing pretty well that they would have had to have negotiations in this year, could have easily handled the matter differently.

You know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I look around and 1 see the groups in this society who have found themselves responding to the industrial pressure that has been brought on them by the given economic situation and by the attitude of Government to negotiating, when I see the Police, and make no mistake about it, when I see the Police reacting in a way in which they reacted, when there is a Democratic Labour Party Government in office, I say something is wrong. I want the Police Force to know that the National Democratic Party is on their side.

Laughs.

Dr. R. C HAYNES: I want them to know that we will stand by the same position that we took prior to 1986 and we will always stand faithfully by that.

When I look at the nurses and I see them expressing their concerns, I am sure that the Honourable Member for St. Michael West will share my concerns in this particular area as well. I want them, too, to know that the National Democratic Party is with them as well in this matter.

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: When I see the teachers of this country being forced to walk the streets, when I see them being forced to march, I know something is fundamentally wrong and I want the teachers to know that the National Democratic Party is with them too.

I have only selected these 3.1 have already adverted to the bottom scales of the Public Service who are being done a tremendous disservice by this piece of legislation today and I want those people to know that the National Democratic Party is with them as well.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is not by chance that I have selected a few groups like this. I selected those groups for a particular reason because they were among the many groups in this .society that gave their support to the Democratic Labour Party in 1986. They were the people who felt that they were going to get a better deal under a Democratic Labour Party Government. They were the people who were impressed by what we said in terms of how industrial relations in the future will be handled. Am I am not telling the truth? Who will challenge me and say that I am not telling the truth on the Floor of this House? We addressed the problems relating to each one of these groups and now today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are being asked to come and do the exact opposite. I would understand it and I would probably support the Government if the difference were $20 million or $30 million or something like that. I would support the Government if it was a question of the Government offering a *5%* at the top and people demanding 15% at the top or something like that. I would have no difficulty. I would not come in here and take a position not based on reason. But when it is the \ lowest group in the Public Service and when the difference is so small, when you are talking differences between $2.00 and $14.00 then something must be wrong. Ask yourselves - why did you bring the legislation?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has 2 minutes.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I will ask myself and I would doubt very much Members on that side were truly seized of the nature of these differences, I have grave doubts whether the majority of wise men of average intelligence, if they were fully seised of the area of difference and the small sum involved, whether or not they would have come down to Parliament with this kind of legislation. These are the facts, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They are there for all to see. They are inescapable. They have been clearly set out there. You can go through Hansard and I hope that my colleagues in the National Democratic Party would read out the words of what [f]hey have been saying over the years on this matter of legislating salaries. 5.10p.m.

These are the facts, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They are there for all to see. They are inescapable. They have been clearly set out there. You can go through Hansard, and I hope that my colleagues in the National Democratic Party would read out the words they have been saying over the years on this matter of legislating salaries. I would hope they would do it, because this is a major turn around. It is a

turn around for a few hundred thousand dollars and I cannot understand why it has been done.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have been Minister of Finance in this country and if there was a major difference between the Government and the National Union of Public Workers involving a large sum of money, I would not come in here and be irresponsible, I would not do it, but I cannot see the reason for taking this position.

I want to wind up, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by making it abundantly clear that we intend, in the National Democratic Party, to bring a new dimension of loyalty to the electorate. We intend at all times to stick by what we tell them that we will do, and I am quite sure that after one has demonstrated beyond a shadow of doubt what has taken place in debates in this Parliament, then I know there is only one level at which one can respond after such an exposition has been made.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please wind up.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: In winding up, Sir, let me say this once again. Let me urge on the Government now to withdraw this piece of legislation. It is unnecessary. The difference is too small, it is affecting only the workers in the lowest category in the Public Service. It is unfair legislation and it does not befit us as legislators even to be considering this kind of legislation.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: time.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I must admit to a certain disappointment at the level of debate that has occurred so far. Quite frankly, Sir, I think this is a matter of great importance and should be treated in that way.

I am concerned that the two speakers before me have been looking only at one aspect of industrial relations, that is, the Government's ability to pay, and saying that that should be the cardinal matter in determining what the workers should get. I would say that that is a fairly simplistic, but also at the same time dangerous position to adopt both in public as well as in private sector negotiations. Because if your position is that the Government can pay every time there is a difference, or that the employer can pay in the private sector every time there is a difference with the Union, he can clearly be creating a path to turmoil.

Nobody wants to prevent workers from getting money. Let that be very clear. I will get into those issues later on, but understand what you are saying basically. You are saying that your position in this matter is that Government can pay, and you are using some - fairly economistic arguments, a kind of, more or less, argument. If it is 3, yes; if it is 4, yes; if it is 5, yes. When are you going to put a cut off point about when you cannot pay? You really should not get into these kinds of arguments if you are talking about industrial relations at this kind of level. It is really very simplistic, because as industrial relations practitioners, we use a range of things to look at when we are reaching a settlement. Ability to pay. Quite frankly in the public sector, internationally that is not an overriding consideration. Who discusses Government's position to pay anywhere in the world? Government can pay and Government will go and tax, so it is never really an important consideration in negotiations in the public sector for anybody who understands industrial relations.

The other factors. You look at what is the going rate of settlement out there in the country? There are about 25 000 workers in the public sector, there are over 80 or 90 thousand in the private sector and you have to look at the ~ relativities between private and public. You cannot be giving one set a kind of settlement that would put the entire economy in disarray, because if you lift levels in certain areas too high, you are going to get a lot of dissatisfaction in the private sector and everybody will want to work in Government, and you already have that problem that everybody who wants employment wants to go in Government. Nobody wants to work in the hotel industry or anywhere else, so if you create this nice, cushy level all the time of pushing up public sector salaries, not only are you burdening the economy of the country - that is entirely a possibility, I am not saying we are at a stage where we are in any collapse, but that is a possibility you have to look at - that at the same time you are setting up a certain disequilibrium in the entire economy, so I just want to look at this point about ability to pay.

Really, anybody who understands public sector negotiations knows that that is not a major thing here, the United States of America, England, anywhere, you do not talk about Government's ability to pay, because Government can pay in most cases. Even when they are in the IMF's hands, they would still pay, because Governments might be conditioned by politics and not by economics sometimes. So let us understand that is really not a big argument. When we reach agreement in the Barbados Workers' Union, we would have been looking at ability to pay, we would be looking at the settlements, we would be looking at the differentials in the sector and we would be looking at cost of living. There are certain fixed criteria. I do not know how these Johnny-come-lately negotiators...

Asides.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I am not talking about people inside here. These are not negotiators, these are politicians. I am talking about people who are now using criteria that were never on the board for negotiation before. When you are sitting down to negotiate, there are certain things that

are known to be negotiable items, and unless the system changes, there are certain things that are not in. We do not negotiate bonuses, it never was a matter for discussion. When we are sitting down and discussing with the employers, we do not negotiate Government taxation. How does that become a part of a package for negotiation? Have you ever heard about that anywhere in the world? Can you negotiate Government's surcharge or any other taxation? That is not part and parcel of proper negotiations, and we negotiate based on a two year back historical position. Therefore when we were negotiating, the surcharge would not have been a matter for discussion. Two years from now, we would be discussing the surcharge as it affected the workers in that historical period, but I will have to get back to that later because these are really details. I want to move on to a broader plain because we are not negotiating salaries in here, we are discussing different things. We negotiate in the right place.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us look at this whole problem that we are faced with here, and it is a problem for all of us, this question of legislating salaries before there is agreement. We have to look at that.

I am indebted to the Leader of the National Democratic Party* for reminding us that the Manifesto, which he claims to be part architect of, had said that under no conditions you would legislate, and in wisdom that was moved to...

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: You would strive, and I think you would recognise that there was wisdom in that, because I believe there is a difficulty in the system. Let us understand that. The Leader of the Opposition spoke about the system wanting change, but he did not address that really, because I think he was concerned by making the ability to pay a point and score a few political points about how we can pay the $365 000 or $3 million more or whatever. That is not really an argument. 5.20 p.m.

Let us understand that is not enough to engage the attention of people of this intelligence. That is a fickle point. I am not saying that $3 million in workers' pockets is nothing, but when that is dispersed to the individual worker it is not going to be the same thing. We talk sometimes about $10 and $12 more, we don't do the real mathematics of these things, we only call figures.

I want to look at the importance of industrial relations and, in particular, public sector industrial relations. Those of us who are practitioners do not look at 1989 negotiations. We look across the world and see what is happening in terms of unions, the wages between unions and Governments, and the whole system of industrial relations which is never static but changes all the time. We know what is happening in Britain. We know what is happening between the Conservative Government and unions that were the strongest unions in the world. We know that because of sticking to an old outdated model, the conflict model based entirely on antagonism, that unions have been put under tremendous pressure by that Government in such a way that even the Labour Party now is reassessing its position, and cannot go back to its old pattern of relationship with the unions, because once. Mrs. Thatcher has put her stamp there it is going to be very difficult to go back to an original position.

If you look recently in Spain where President Gonzales, a leading trade unionist, is the leader of that Government, there was a general strike in Spain. The industrial relations climate is becoming extremely difficult everywhere. Don't talk about the United States of America where only 12 million people are in the trade union movement these days. Tremendous pressure is being put against them, and you know how President Reagan was able to disband a lot of public sector unions. The same is true of Thatcher in England too. In fact those who know the public sector would know that it is only recently that the ILO has been able to get a convention on negotiations in the public sector, Convention 151 which has not been ratified by very many countries. All the countries in the world are not able to have public sector negotiations the way we have them in Barbados. Let us understand that.

If you look in the region, if you look at the labour movement in Guyana, there are tremendous fractures there, and people who think that a TUC will solve the problem here don't understand what is going on in the world. The TUC in Guyana has now split into two factions. If you look at Trinidad there are now two TUC's. One is a Congress of what they call progressive trade unions, and the other one is the trades union congress, two with different philosophies, so they can never come together at all in this world. The progressives tell you, when you hear that, that you are talking communism. I distinguish between communism and socialism, because I am a democratic socialist, I am no communist. I am a committed democratic socialist, I am not a capitalist and I am no communist either. I know where I stand, I know what it means. But those two unions cannot get together. If you go to Jamaica there are all kinds of trouble up there in terms of the trade union movement which has been emasculated, and we don't understand what we have in Barbados. That is the first thing I want to make out, that a lot of us do not understand the industrial relations climate that we enjoy in Barbados.

Governments have a big impact on public policy and can express it in many different ways. The Barbados Labour Party used to express it by calling for wage restraint every minute. That was one way of public policy impacting on industrial relations. Another way is introducing legislation and creating what we call essential services. That was the road the BLP was going into along with the Emergencies Powers Bill and so on.

Social policy can impact on trade unions through your social welfare legislation and through your fiscal measures. That is why in 1986, in the give back or give way or whatever it was, the Government of the day was able to reach a certain understanding with the trade unions in terms of the levels of settlement ranging I think from 1.4 per cent at the top to 9 per cent at the bottom because there was a component in the fiscal measures that would have buoyed that, but remember the actual settlement in terms of money that Government paid out was 1.4 per cent at the top ranging to 9 per cent at the bottom, but that was only possible because of the fiscal policy that allowed that. Outside of a fiscal policy the settlement would have to have been different. That is why when Mr. St John spoke to the unions, and that is true, he sat down with the unions and he came with a policy that he wanted to articulate, but the difficulty, of course, was that he did not have enough time to negotiate. Elections were in May. So really he did not have any time to negotiate. One does not know how that...

Asides.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Not the Barbados Workers' Union. I don't speak for others. I can't speak for others quite frankly. I am no hypocrite you see. I am not one of those who try to lump all unions together and try to harm those that are good because of the bad that the bad are doing, and there are a lot of decent people in Barbados who should speak out and say there are differences. Don't try to lump us all together. I will not be lumped quite frankly. I am not saying anything about anybody else yet. I am talking about me and my union's position.

There are ways in which public policy will affect industrial relations-, and I am saying that if you look at the Democratic Labour Party's policy towards industrial relations, you will see a progressive policy. I will give you examples. In areas of what I would call recognition of the importance of the union, the DLP put back May Day where we asked that it should be. The workers called for May Day and we got it back. They recognised Charles Duncan O'Neal who was the founder of the trade union movement in this country, and they have recognised the work of over *40* years of the Barbados Workers' Union going onto 50 in recognising Sir Frank Walcott because that title was not for him really. It was for the workers that he represents.

There have had a policy of promotions and appointments in the public sector and that is important in terms of social wage costs. In the area of training, they have increased training and study leave. That is for people going outside or going to the University and there is more internal training in various Departments than ever before. They are now in an advanced stage of setting up a Chair in Industrial Relations at the Cave Hill Campus and that will mean a significant contribution to our understanding of industrial relations in this country once that Chair is going. You cannot go anywhere in the Caribbean and train to, be an industrial relations expert. That is one of the problems that we have in this country, that a lot of the actors in the system are not trained. If you can find deficiency in the system and deficiency in the actors you are heading for problems basically.

If you look again at what the Democratic Labour Party has done in terms of industrial relations, they have brought improvement to the civil establishment sector. Anybody who is objective will tell you that when Mr. CoUyrnofe was made head of that section again that that brought tremendous benefits to an understanding of what industrial relations are all about, because he is an experienced person. He has been there for a,very long time, and he has experienced persons. We are not satisfied, quite frankly, that all is being done to make sure that the personnel in there are up to the level that you need, because industrial relations are too important not to people those departments with experts, people who are well trained and in sufficient , numbers. I have no doubt about that at all. You need to beef up that system, both in terms of handling public sector negotiations and advice in general through the Labour Department to the private sector. These are things that have to be done. But I will look at changes in the system later on.

I would say also-that the Democratic Labour Party has engaged in good faith bargaining in 1986 and again in 1988, and by good faith bargaining I mean that they have always shown an intention to bargain from start to end. They never stop bargaining, but we will come to a position about when you have to stop sometimes. That is something you have to look at, because you can be frustrated, unless you are willing at the end to say well take everything now, that is what you want, so that we can agree. If I am not convinced that somebody is engaging in good faith bargaining I would say so, but that is at that level. Then on the macro level there is no doubt that this Government has ensured growth in the economy and financial stability, because without that, whatever else you do, your industrial relations system cannot function. It has stopped the haemorrhaging of companies closing down. That has not been happening in Barbados and it is keeping the inflation rate at an acceptable level in spite of the negative predictions that were made. It has been creating jobs in this country also. I am saying, therefore, that at the macro level this Government has been supporting the industrial relations system that has been in place and that it has nurtured.

I want to move now more particularly and have a look at the micro look, at the industrial relations system in the public sector. The major trade unions - because let us be frank, a lot of the associations, the Police and so on are forbidden by law to negotiate, let us understand that they are forbidden by law to negotiate - but the trade unions that can negotiate, the Barbados Workers' Union, the NUPW...

Asides.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: We have no difference. All the Police are saying is, give me some more increments, and an expert says you cannot do that because you are changing relativity, send it to reclassification. That is the kind of answer I would expect from an expert, not that when you want it to give it to you and then cause all the trouble as the BLP has done all the time. The BLP used to make changes without looking at the domino effect. An expert says "No, we can't do it that way. We will put it to experts and then we will come back and talk." 5,30 p.m.

I understand expertise and I support it because you cannot really exist in a country without that kind of integrity and expertise in your own particular areas. You know doctors give good advice. Lawyers give good advice. I expect an industrial relations expert to give good advice in his field and not to say: "Give them what they want but let us look at it."

I think the problem is in the system, the public sector system in Barbados, let us understand. We have a dual system in the country. The private sector is based on voluntarism and we have always maintained, let us keep any kind of legislation out of it but the public sector cannot be based on voluntarism. It is a legal system so you have to legislate and that is where the crux of the matter comes. You cannot escape it.

But you also know...

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Listen to the point that I am making. I take your point Anybody who sets out to frustrate the system, therefore, can do it. Any person who purposefully sets out to frustrate the system can do it under that situation, If you know you have to legislate you get to a position, well, let them legislate. I am not going to agr^e under any circumstances. That can be done.

I am not suggesting anybody did .that but that is one of the weaknesses in the system that it can be so easily frustrated by actors. But listen. I want to make a point now. I am looking now at the actors in the system.

The Barbados Workers Union... Mr.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: ...These are points of fact. The Barbados Workers Union has a Research Department that has 4 graduates in it from the University of the West Indies in Economics and Accounts. One of them just came back from Howard University with a Masters in Business Administration. They are the ones who write papers and advise.

Tell me how many research people are in the NUPW and tell me how many research people are in the BUT. That is the first thing I am going to ask. I am talking about the actors in the system, now.

The Barbados Workers Union negotiators negotiate important settlements every week. They are trained with Masters in Industrial Relations and so. Tell me about the same now. All of them have gone through formal training in collective bargaining, in industrial relations. Tell me if that is true or whether we have some amateur negotiators in some of the other unions. I am not trying to pull down any union. Let me be very clear on this but I am looking at the actors and we are looking at the system that would lead to complications. Let me be very clear about that.

You do not see the Barbados Workers' Union marching at the same time that we are negotiating with anybody. When we sit down and talk, we are sitting down and talking but that so called mode that went out in the 1940s and 1950s, a concertina mode, antagonistic to a mode that was used to containment. That is passe',

Most unions are at the stage now of constructive cooperation and let us understand. When we settled we did not settle and then look over our shoulders to see who was coming next. We do not operate that kind of way because when we got recognition rights in the public service it was not for a sector of workers. Do not play any numbers game with me about the Barbados Workers' Union representing so many thousand, the NUPW so many thousand. That is a numbers game for children.

When we got recognition it was for the whole service. When they got recognition rights it was for the whole service and when we settled first in 1986 you did not keep any noise about who settled first and who looked back. So we settled first this time again because we were settling months after the effective date, way down in the year and the level of settlement is so good ... You all talking about a sell out? Some of them are talking about a sell-out, but our settlement was so good that they are only $3 million from it and $1.5 million and $1/2 million and ours is a sell-out or ours is politically motivated.

If ours was a sell out, it would be $20, $30 or $40 million down the road, or if it was politically motivated it was a give away. But anybody who could say that 8% in the first year and 2% in the second year is not a good settlement under any other conditions when they are 9% and 5%, they would have to be jokers. What is the difference between the two of those? That one is politically motivated but that is different. How they get down there then?

What I do understand is negotiation is not by one side. It is by two sides and it is not our agreement. If a Government is negotiating with 4 unions - we sent in 4 different packages - are they going to have 4 different settlement levels? Which employer is going to have 4 different settlement levels? This one for the NUPW, this

one for the BUT, this one for BWU. There is one and we move to* the one but we are moving from where we were to that settlement and the Government is moving from 0 to that settlement.

When we reach that settlement there is no one person's settlement, one organisation settlement. Let us understand that. That is the basis of collective bargaining, that both sides start with a position that is only a presented position but then you have a target. Now, our target is not set by the people who sit down and negotiate. It is sent by our membership and our membership wanted to send in more than we sent in and that is a fact. The workers sat down at Solidarity House when we were looking at proposals and took a particular position on what we would be sending in.

I do not know whether my workers are B or D because I do not question those things. I believe they must be both. The other party was not there yet so I had no way of knowing whether they were but at that time the workers who sat down in front of me, as far as I am concerned, did not have any political labels attached to them. I have one label clear for anybody to see. Theirs is not my business but they said that we should send in more than we sent in for and when we came to ratify the settlement we had no problems.

Now, let me make it very clear. Let us understand what is happening in Barbados then.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Well, I do not know but, anyhow, that will be tested elsewhere.

But let me tell you what is really happening. Let us really study this matter. The workers at the lowest level that we represent say that they can take 8.1%. The teachers who are at a significantly different, a higher level, and who enjoy conditions of employment that are far superior to those workers, they are saying we cannot take it.

Now, to tell the truth. Why are you all not criticising where that criticism is necessary? Let us be honest. Do not let us be hypocritical. If the workers at the lowest level - we represent the ones in the Barbados Workers' Union - are willing to take an 8% which is what their brothers out there in the private sector are taking, but the teachers in this country who start off at a different level altogether are asking for 11% and 3%, who are you really criticising in this country? Not only are the teachers at a higher level and all of that, but they are getting more leave to study etc. I will tell you what happens.

A fellow who goes to Erdiston and graduates will get a salary increase that is tremendous because of that qualification and if he goes on to university he gets another salary increase.

Aside.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Listen, I operate at a different level. The Press can carry what they want I operate at a different level and I do not look over my shoulders about anything. I speak at a different level. I do not come in here and talk economistic talk about $3 million more and whatever. I am really not concerned about that. What I am saying is this, that there must be levels of responsibility in our country. You can put it how you like.

What I am saying is this. You are quarrelling on the Opposition, but I know the Opposition has to oppose. If you multiply them out there, more and more opposition again! But the position is this, that we are really not addressing fundamental problems in this system.

The system of negotiating in the public sector might be improved by a TUC but I am saying that there is no certainty about that because you know what happened to the TUCs in Trinidad and in Guyana. They are fractured so it might not help but I will tell you something.

We tried to get a TUC in Barbados for those who do now know and when we were forming the TUC, the NUPW were of the view that BIGWU and all the other WUs should be part of it and we took a position of philosophical importance "No". We will not sit down in an organisation where we have differences in ideology because the aims and objectives must be different. You cannot have a TUC made up of all kinds of people with different views in a fundamental thing like industrial relations. That came to naught. It is going to be very, very difficult to form it.

So the question is, what can you do really? What can you do with public sector negotiations in our country because of the difficulty in the system, and the difficulty with the actors involved in the system?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Two minutes.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Two minutes? Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

What can we do? I would say that the Honourable Member for St. Michael East has spoken about the need to restructure the system on a previous occasion and I believe there is need for a serious look at the entire system in terms of manning the system. We need more people in Civil Establishments who are trained in Industrial Relations. I think that the system of some unions needs to be examined. Now it seems to me there is a problem in some union

structure where there is a one on one relationship between the President and the General Secretary. And that one over one relationship seems to me to be problematic. You cannot have the President negotiating and the General Secretary negotiating too. It cannot happen in the Barbados Workers' Union. You cannot have the President of the Executive Committee putting somebody on suspension and then the membership coming and saying: No. And then the Executive Committee still maintains itself. 5.40 p.m.

I am saying that there is need for systemic change in trade union administration in areas where they are weak. This is not meant to be negative criticism of the organization, because when any one of these organizations suffers, ours suffers too. But it seems to me that where you have a one over one system, where there are two people, two Executives and both of them are at logger heads, something is wrong with the system and it would be exploited by anybody, especially anybody who is malicious. That is a system that can be exploited.

It sterns to me also, as I got the impression in the letter that the Prime Minister read between the Permanent Secretary in Establishments and the NUPW, that where the leaders, and I mean here now the negotiators, can agree or come to an understanding with a Government negotiator and then go and get turned back by the membership, something is wrong with the leadership there. Because all of us understand what democracy is. All of us understand democracy. If you can go with something you are satisfied with to your leadership and your leadership should be telling you go back, something is wrong in that kind of democracy.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please wind up.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Something is very, very wrong in that kind of democracy.

All I am saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that we h^ve to address the problem that we are facing today, the problem of having to legislate these salaries, I think it is distasteful to all of us on both sides, before agreement.

We have to look at it in terms of the system and the actors and we need to give it very careful and considered thought. Clearly, I am convinced that the Government tried all that was possible and that it really indulged in good faith bargaining.

My union, the Barbados Workers' Union, reached an agreement on these levels, after considered thought, after enough research that we could do and looking at the various criteria that we have used in all negotiations. We have agreed with the Barbados Labour Party up front and first, and the NUPW and the teachers were still out there. We have done that because we try to operate on principle and on scientific approaches down the line.

It is unfortunate that you have to legislate again here before agreement. But let us understand that the actors in the scene, once the system is problematic, the actors in the system can keep you out there strung out for a very long time. But still, eventually, the public interest must be important. When do you stop? That becomes vitally important.

Those who are serious people here know that that is vitally important. I am not batting a hand for any side because I can get serious conflicts between Party and trade union, because I represent workers daily, not only in the public sector but in the private sector. All of us face these kinds of problems. But you cannot alter the entire system because, remember...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Time.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: ...the citizens are involved here too, the citizens of this country are involved here too.

I thank you very much, Sir.

Applause.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I recognize the Honourable Member for St. Thomas.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am just bringing over my hand, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you having problems with your shoulder?

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, this debate has not come down to ground yet. We have to deal with the issues.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please do not take it into the gutter though.

Laughter.

Mr. D. A, C. SIMMONS: Into the gutter? No, no, no, no, no No, Sir.

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I will stay above the gutter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will expect that.

Asides.

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: That is a sweet piece of repartee on your part, Sir, and you know that I have an appreciation for these things.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I know that.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: This debate is not about die shadow boxing that we had from the Prime Minister who made a speech that was thoroughly empty, that failed to come to grips with the issues, that failed to put before the House the proper statistical basis so that the public could come to an informed decision as to whether what Government is doing today is really and truly in the best interest of the public workers of this country or not.

The Honourable Member who just sat down would wish us to believe that there is more to all these negotiations than would easily meet the eye. He says, for example, that the workers must take into account that the Government, this Government, the parent Party over there, not the child that was chastized just now, the parent party over there, has given back the workers May Day, that they now have 50 years of the Barbados Workers' Union, that the contribution of Charles Duncan O'Neal has been acknowledged. The workers, we are asked by the Honourable Member, my friend from Christ Church East Central, must take these things into account when they are negotiating. But not one of them can be carried to JB's Master Mart to buy the sardines at $1.35 that have gone from 99 cents. That is the issue.

Asides.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Two Members...

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: ...on a point of elucidation. A Charles Duncan O'Neal is a $10 bill.

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: And you know what this debate is about, Sir, the fact that NUPW at Z.36 was only asking for a Charles Duncan O'Neal, a $10 bill. Look at it here. This Government, this wicked Government...

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: ...has refused to take into account the interest of the several public workers of this country. I learnt those words, Sir, sitting on that side, when the Honourable Member for St. Lucy was on this side. I learnt from him, Sir.

These are the critical issues that we have to address, Sir. Can what the Government purports to offer really make any difference to the man in the street and the worker in the Public Service?

The Barbados Labour Party, when in power, was criticized and pilloried for giving increases of $108 a month. This Government, since 1986, has not really bettered $74 a month. it is about $75, $76. The last Today one was everybody the Civil Service from top to through bottom $74 a month . And then, to compound that, increase you haa an increase you had some new levies... in levies,

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: When? When there were 4 and 20 mockingbirds, before 4 left the parent Party. You had new levies, increased levies...

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: ...bearing all...

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: ...heavily on the people of this country, Sir.

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Now, Sir, let us face it. The Prime Minister himself last week, was forced to say that the Barbados Labour Party is a great Party. He cannot now say any different.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Now, Sir. Tom is everybody's friend now. Everybody's friend.

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, this Debate is about matters of political credibility, of political principle. It is about whether a party, when in Opposition, should give the public the impression that it would not legislate salaries, but when in Government, it does the precise reverse. 5.50 p.m.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Page 2111 - I am going to pass it for you .... "Let me hasten to say that the principle of legislating salaries in a community such as ours is a principle that is unacceptable".....

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS:...you say at that time, you do not even have any shame... "and it does not matter that anyone will point to the fact that it has been done by A or B. The fact is it is an unacceptable principle." That is what he said. There was not anything else of any substance.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Now, Sir....

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, I have to quote from this extensively. I have to deal with this, Sir, because it shows that the Democratic Labour Party has no consistent policy on the question of legislation of salaries. Let us go back to 1976. In the summer of 1976 when Errol Walton Barrow was alive and heading the Government, he came in here and legislated salaries, and to the credit then of the Honourable Member for St. Lucy and Mr. Frank Walcott now Sir Frank, when they did not support their party at that time, I find it very incongruous that 13 years later that same Member for St. Lucy, who voted against his own party, then sitting on the back bench where the money was less, now today sitting on the front bench where the money is more, is part of a Cabinet that comes in here and legislates salaries to give the people of this country who work in the Public Service $75.00 a month more. That is a matter for conscience. That is one of the questions at issue today.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Before I go to what the Prime Minister when in Opposition said...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Could you please give me the date of that debate?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: September 28, 1982, Sir, Page 2111.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: At Page 2110 the same Minister of Health put the issue very nicely then as the issue is today and said this, Sir: "There are 2 basic principles at stake in any analysis of this situation. The first one is whether the Government having taken a position of principle in the past and now having done a complete U-turn, whether the Government's credibility is capable of acceptance by rational beings in this society."

That, he said, was the first issue. Those are your words in 1982. "The second issue, Sir, is whether the Government has the moral right to return the community in Barbados to a situation which in spite of gains made in the area of industrial and social conditions in the sixties and seventies is more reminiscent of the early 1940's and 1950's." I do not understand what that was.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: You would not.

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He was trying to say that we had gone back to a pre-1940 situation in Barbados by legislating. So where are we now? Because that is the issue as I understand the second issue that he raised and I was sorry that he had drawn me out on it because you are now hoist on your own petard. If it was wrong to do it then, surely it must be wrong to do it now as a matter of principle.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is quoting selectively from a speech. The Honourable Member is then going on to draw inferences from his quotations and the Honourable Member is then drawing conclusions which seek to put this Honourable Member, as he put it, on his own petard. I wish to submit that, unless the Honourable Member is going to give the context in which the statement was made, which I propose to do when I speak, that the Honourable Member would in fact be misleading the House. The position I took then is the position I take now. The question was: What was the Barbados Labour Party doing and what has this Government done? You just cannot take the words and then use them and quote them. We will discuss that, Your Honour, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You may continue.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You cannot convince anybody. I have not taken myself out of context. I have read it straight as it comes, and I would not seek to take the present Prime Minister out of context either.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Deal with him .... yes, I am going to deal with him. At Page 2106 of the same debate, Sir, he was then Mr. L. E. Sandiford, Member of the Opposition. This is what he said, Sir:

> "The question now is whether the Government really has the kind of integrity to stand up and tell the people of this country that they have really exhausted all of the possible avenues of negotiations."

Let them get up and say so. Keep quiet Rambo. I will challenge each one of them on this particular question. I know you are a man of courage. I am talking about this issue. I know you got it on the word "integrity". I am talking about this particular issue. Then he says:

> "Now Mr. Speaker, most persons will admit that $25 a week is really minuscule. It is a very small addition to the wages, and salaries of public workers of this country."

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Let me read it again.

Asides. \

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The person who is now holding the office of the Prime Minister of Barbados said:

> "Most persons will admit that $25 a week is really minuscule. It is a very small addition to the wages and salaries of public workers of this country."

Twenty-five dollars a week was criticised bitterly in 1982. Less than $20 a week today he is offering the workers of this country and would want us to believe that he should not incur the wrath and the criticism of the Opposition, not at all, offering $74/$75 a week, seven years later when everybody knows that the value of money has dropped in the intervening years. I am not talking about the consumption taxes that the 2 Ministers of Finance of the Democratic Labour Party put on after 1986 that affected the cost of living from the highest in this society, the richest in this community to the poorest.....

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am not talking about that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am not talking about the levies. I have hinted at those already. What I am saying is that in 6 - 7 years, 7 years Sir -'1983 to 1989, prices have risen. All kinds of impositions are now facing the poor and $25 a week was criticised as being minuscule then and now we are asked to accept less than $20 by the same person who was so critical then but now has the control as the only Minister of Finance of the Ministry of Finance, Sir. So that when one looks at what leading spokesmen of the Democratic Labour Party were willing to tell the people of this country 7 years ago as against what they are telling them now, I say that the issue resolves itself into one of political credibility and political integrity. 6.00p.m.

If you have changed from those lofty principles and precepts of seven years ago, I can understand why you now have a wayward child. I can understand it, because you set no proper example as the parent

Mr. R. P. BYER: On a point of order, Sir. I would believe that both comments, the one made by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas and the comment made by the Honourable Member for St. Lucy, were terms of endearment

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, I am grateful for the intervention of the Honourable Member for St George South, if only because he so accurately read and interpreted what I was saying.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I did not understand you to be referring to anyone in this Chamber, or else.I would have stopped you.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you are on your top form today and that is what adds some colour to the debate. Perhaps I should not have used the word "wayward", Sir. What I was trying to say is that now, after today, the public of Barbados has yet another reason, not only the fiscal policies and the fiscal tosses and twists and turns and reversals, but they have another reason, the abandonment of industrial principle to justify the formation of the National Democratic Party.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I have it all here in your words and the words of the now Prime Minister.

Sir, there are a number of questions that the public 'workers and the public at large are asking, and which heightened the concerns of the public workers. How is it, they ask, that for the second time since this Government has been in power it has been able to settle with the Barbados Workers' Union in advance of the other public sector Unions?

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: How many times?

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The Members on the other side will have their chance to reply, Sir. They are telling me that it happened when we were in power, but for the second time...

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You are possessed of the information, so you must know the facts.

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Order, please.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Let us even accept it is a fact. I am being told by the Unionists on the other side thai it is a fact. This is the second time within two years that, while the other Unions who have a disagreement are purporting to negotiate with the Government on one side, the BWU goes and settles with Government, tying the hands of the NUPW, the BUT and all the others, and it does not look good.

Certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas were ordered by the DEPUTY SPEAKER to be expunged from the record at this stage. 6.10p.m.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, Sir. The words having been expunged from the minds of the people of Barbados the perception is that they are not getting the best deal as workers in the public sector by reason of the fact that there are three members of the Union sitting on the Government benches who are members of the Democratic Labour Party, one of whom is a Cabinet Minister, and who appear consistently since 1986 not to be serving the best interest of the workers.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let me just also mention that you have two minutes, but I will give you three minutes.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I appreciate that. It is like the difference between $36 million and $36.4 million.

Sir, it appears to the members of the general public that the Barbados Workers' Union agreed with the Government negotiators on the figures, the $75, the quantum of money. The question is, do they agree with the methodology that was used? Because the complaint of the NUPW is that they were close to the Government and the Government refused to give them enough time to sort out the little difference that existed between what they wanted and what Government wanted to do for the school meals servers. That was the problem. But you see, it would have embarrassed the Government greatly to have agreed at all with the NUPW for something different from what they had agreed with the BWU. So the Government has come in here today and said they are imposing this on all public workers because they had settled already with the BWU a long time ago. If that is not what the people out there are thinking, then I am an okra.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please! Please wind up.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: But you see, it only takes a short time, as the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was trying to point out, to lose a whole constituency. You have lost a constituency of public workers by your actions today which can, in my submission, having regard to the passages I read of the Prime Minister in 1982 and the Honourable Minister of Health, only be fairly described as unprincipled. I am obliged to you, Sir.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Honourable Member who has just sat down said a lot of things. The impression was given, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by the last speaker who just sat down that the three Members on this side are giving the public the impression that they are not serving the public's wish. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to say this. The Barbados Workers' Union settled with the Barbados Government up front first, I think it was in 1982. Were they members then of the Barbados Labour Party Government when they settled up front, or is it now that, because they settled with the Democratic Labour Party, that the reason they have settled up front is because they are members of the Democratic Labour Party? You have to be consistent in things like this.

The Honourable Member for St. Thomas made a statement today that the Honourable Prime Minister back in 1982 said that $25 a week was too small. I am not a Government or a Union negotiator, but I"have sat and listened to the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central who is a professional negotiator. He said that when you are negotiating, or when a Union that is versed in these matters is negotiating, it looks at certain matters, and he said that among the things that the Union looks at are (1) the settlements that are being made in the private sector and (2) the cost of living. I am only quoting two of the reasons or two of the elements of the things that are taken into account when you are negotiating, and one of them is the cost of living. For any Honourable Member to extract from any speech at all what was said in 1981 or 1982 or any other time without mentioning what the cost of living was at that time and to say that because the Prime Minister said that $25 was too small and he is only giving $20 is dishonest. How can you say...

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I never said the Prime Minister is dishonest. If you are saying that, it is a matter for you. I never used the word "dishonest" in here today at all.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Philip South may continue.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: I am continuing. Do you agree that you should take the rate of inflation into account when you are coming to agreement?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, any person who believes that collective bargaining means or implies that negotiations must be endless and interminable does not understand what they are talking about. If you are negotiating with persons you do not legislate salaries because of the difference between what your position is and what that of the Union is. There comes a time in the negotiations when they have gone on for a very long time and one has to take a decision. In fact in 1976, if you recall, the then Prime Minister, Mr. E. W. Barrow had to legislate salaries, not because of the difference between the figure that was being put forward by the DLP and the figure being put forward by the Unions, but because of the number of meetings he had held with the Unions and the length of time that negotiations were going on. Are you telling me that you should negotiate for five years? Is that what you are trying to tell me? Legislation has nothing to do with the difference between what you are putting up and what the other fellows are asking for. It is the length of time during which you have been r ^gotiating.
6.20 p.m.

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: So you should go on forever! You should go on negotiating all the time without stopping.

The point I am saying is this. The problems why the unions did not come to agreement had nothing at all to do with whether the Government's offer was too small or too great. It has to be said in here and it was said at the BUT meeting last week at Merry Hill, or whatever up there is called, that there is too much politics at the head of the union where one person had to resign because of the politics in the union.

It also has to do with the NUPW General Secretary being told every night after midnight not to agree with the Government's proposals and that he will be a candidate for the new party in St. Philip North so he would never agree to any Government negotiations. That is a fact. Do not tell me. It has nothing at all to do with anything that the Government is putting up.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order.

Did the Honourable Minister say that somebody would be a candidate in St. Philip North?

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Oh! I thought he was worried about competition. You may get it from a different source.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I believe that the veracity of the statement should- be seen against the background that the National Democratic Party...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is this a point of order?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Yes... This was announced only last Wednesday.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. You may continue.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the truth has to be told in here at all times. The trouble in NUPW had nothing to do with the salaries, had nothing to do with what the Government put up or what the union was asking for. It had to do with what was being told to the General Secretary and it appears to me that that office of General Secretary of the NUPW seems to be an office where people like to prostitute themselves politically because it happened back in 1976 where the holder of the office in 1976 was a politician as well. That is how it appears to me.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: One moment, please.,

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, on a point of order.

The Honourable Minister is attributing the worst possible motive to a person who holds a public position in Barbados.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: But he has identified the officer in the NUPW. I do not want to make it any worse. He said the General Secretary of the NUPW is prostituting.

Aside.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: One moment, please. There is too much noise in the Chamber. I want to hear the Honourable Member for St. Thomas.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I just say that that is imputing the worst and the basest possible motive and the words should be withdrawn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I took the Member to be speaking generally and not about any specific person.

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the truth has to be told at some time. I am saying that that office peculiarly seems to attract persons who are politically motivated and even if they were not politically motivated when they started in the office, with the passage of the years they become politically motivated and they are being manipulated by people. It has to be said and I am going on. I will deal with that gentleman at the appropriate time.

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Nobody ever called Horatio Cooke...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Now, I get to the speech of the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. In his speech he said that there will be some problems caused by our legislating of the salaries and he said the problems would be in the form of economic cost and social cost.

I am glad that the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central mentioned that this Government has improved training. It is doing a regrading of the Civil Service. It is repairing and refurbishing many of the buildings which were allowed by the past administration to go into a dilapidated state and have been causing all of the

people to go on strike and sicking out, buildings that you all never repaired in the past 10 years.

We are repairing them now and refurbishing them now. All of that goes to make the work of the civil servants more palatable. It costs a lot of money so I am saying that these things... Not only that. It is a matter of fact that this Government in the past 3 or 4 months has appointed many, many persons in the Civil Service who have been acting for the past 10,15,17 years. That is security of tenure.

You are not bringing all of these things —a settlement is not only money - and more is coming. There are 23 lerical officers just appointed at the National Housing Corporation, 23 out of 30. Two hundred and twenty nurses were just appointed. All of these things you have to bring in when you are talking about legislation. It is not only salaries. It is tho entire system of working and I am going to come to the point mentioned by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central in his argument about it affecting poor people.

I find it strange that today in here the Honourable Member ke'eps speaking about how the poor people will be affected and every time he or his good friend at the University speaks about expenditure they say that we should not have spent money on Parks and Beaches, the workers who are at the very bottom, the poorest people.

Only last -weeI-;, I think it is, the same lecturer at the university got on "Tell It Like It Is" and said, "you can imagine that Government is spending more money on Parks and Beaches than they spent at the University". Those are the poor people we are talking about.

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: He said it on "Tell It Like It Is". I heard it

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that I have gone on record on several occasions, both when I was Minister of Finance of this country and when I was on the Opposition benches.,.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is this a point of order or a speech?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: All that has happened is that the Honourable Member is keeping so much noise that when I speak at a normal rate you cannot hear me. It is a question of how the ears are tuned.

The point that I have always made, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that expenditure in the area of Parks and Beaches should have some capital and permanent component. That is the point I have made so if he does not understand that, that is his problem. But I have always said that.

One further point whilst I am on a point of order.

6.30 p.m.

I do not share the view that because a Member has a profession as a trade unionist, whether it be BWU 'or whethet it be NUPW, and he participates in public life that he will have to prostitute himself. I think it is a very dangerous line of argument.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am saying what I heard. The lecturer at the University said when he was speaking about runaway expenditure, as he said; he called it runaway expenditure ...

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: I do not want to call the lecturer's name because I did not tell the Speaker I was going to call any names. But you know who I mean.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Proceed.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: He said when he was speaking about runaway expenditure on that programme, can you imagine that they are spending more money on Parks and Beaches than they are spending at the University? It had a familiar ring because I heard the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central mentioning more than once that we should not havq spent that money on Parks and Beaches. Do not tell me any nonsense that you talk about productivity. You might have talked about productivity now and then. But I am telling you that when I heard, you did not talk anything about productivity.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Again I said ...

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: You said we should not spend the money on Parks and Beaches.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Two Honourable Members are on their feet. Before you proceed, just indicate the reason why you rise.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Good. Thanks.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Honourable Member is misleading this Honourable House.

I have said in this Honourable House and in other areas of Government that the expenditure on Parks and Beaches should be allocated in an area of capital expenditure as well so that some permanent feature ultimately having some productive component should be involved in the expenditure. That is my position on that then and now.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am only talking about giving poor people work because today we heard a lot about the poor people who are going to be victimised and who are going to be squeezed by this legislation. Now we...

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I never said anything about poor people being victimised. I would be stupid to say that. I said poor people would be disadvantaged because it is at the lower group that the legislation impacts.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the poor people will be oppressed by this legislation. These are the same poor people whom we decided to employ because they do not have any certificates. They do not have any degrees and they did not have any jobs. We put them to work. We had to buy implements and tools for them. That is where the money was spent to get those people working. You pass by the corners, pass by the roundabouts, pass by the housing developments, pass by the parks and you seek the work these people do. Pass by the beaches and you see the people working on them.

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: A lecturer at the University will get on a radio programme and say you can imagine they are spending that money on Parks and Beaches, more money on the Parks and Beaches than on the University? That is the mentality he has.

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Anyhow, there will be a lot said in due course.

Asides.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Now, I should like to ask, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how could giving anybody 10% increase over two years be oppressive? How can it be oppressive, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with an inflation rate that has not gone over 5% I believe for the past three or four years? How can it be?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, let us turn to the letter or oral agreement of NUPW with the Government negotiators. The NUPW by the letter read by the Prime Minister seem to have agreed that they would have accepted the salary increase provided the Government or the negotiating team had agreed to appoint those School Meals workers. The negotiators agreed that they would appoint the School Meals workers and then NUPW, having got that agreement from the Government that it would appoint the School Meals workers, went back to their body and the body, by a resolution said: "We cannot agree."

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what does this say? As pointed out by the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central, it shows that there is something wrong with the leadership of the union. T will say here agaiij that the negotiations were going very, very well with the National Union of Public Workers until a certain gentleman was reinstated. These things have to be said. The Agreement was almost signed ...

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN:... until he was reinstated.

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: So do not let anybody bury their head in the sand that the problem is that the difference was only $200 000 or $100 000. That was not the problem. The problem is that the man who was carrying on the negotiations for the union is a politician. That is the ^problem.

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: He is a politician.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: If you look at BUT you would see a similar situation. I will go back and read some of the things said about BUT by the Honourable R. L. Cheltenham in 1984. He said the Teachers' Union, BUT, do not agree with anybody, not even themselves. He went on; "So what is the Government to do?" The Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams in 1984 as well said - this is after there was almost general agreement on salaries and he is speaking about the BUT, - "They have never agreed to anything for any Government at any time vis-a-vis money."

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Adams said it. They never agreed with anything at any time with any Government once it comes to money. He went on: "Their salaries always have to be legislated." Mr. Adams went on: "They do not conduct themselves as a union which wishes to reach agreement on teachers' pay." That is what was said about BUT. They do not agree at any time about anything with any Government when it comes to money.

Laughter.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: That is what Mr. Adams said here.

So I have explained to you the reason why you could not come to agreement with BUT ...

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN ... I have explained to you the reason why you could not get any agreement with NUPW. I believe that, although all of us believe, all of us in this Democratic Labour Party believe, that the legislation of salaries, the Honourable Member for St. Michael West said it, that the legislation of salaries is unacceptable. That is true.

Aside.

lion. H. A. BLACKMAN: It is still out position. But there comes a time when you have negotiated for a length of time almost six, eight, nine, ten months, eleven months, there comes a time when you have to cry, "halt!"

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: It is not acceptable but it is something you have to do. It is like putting taxes on you. They might not be acceptable but it is something you have to do.

I have explained, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I am winding up now because I do not want to take up much of your time. I have explained why the Government could not come to an agreement with the BUT, because of the politics in the hierarchy. I have explained why it could not come to agreement with NUPW, because the gentleman is a political candidate or he has been quoted as one and he...

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Pardon?

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: We never said anything is wrong with it. We just said that that is the reason why we could not come to any agreement. There is nothing wrong. Anybody can run for any person.

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: He was getting instructions not to agree.

Asides.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: You would have to tell me that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: I have explained why we could not come to an agreement with NUPW...

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: .Iwe have agreed with the other unions. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think the time had come to legislate and let the people who agree get their money. That is what it is.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Applause.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Mr. Deputy Speaker.:.

Aside.

Laughter.

Aside.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please address the Chair.
6.40 p.m.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, at the very outset, I want to more or less build a model within which I would like to make some remarks and comments on the whole principle of legislating salaries before or after agreement. I would want especially to deal with the whole idea of Governmental intervention in the collective bargaining process and more particularly the settlement of wage negotiation in an atmosphere of industrial dispute.

We are all agreed that salaries from time to time, have to be legislated. I do not think that we ought to go down the road arguing about whether or not salaries should be legislated. But before I go any further, I would want to look a the 3 distinct models within which the collective bargaining process can function. Earlier on, the Member for Christ Church East Central did allude to the principle of voluntarism in the context of negotiations in the private sector in Barbados. I believe we can say that this is one of the principles that we follow in Barbados in negotiations in private sector matters.

Now what does voluntarism mean? It is a situation where there is minimal legislative intrusion and in this area, the state intervenes to the extent of providing auxiliary services and machinery to aid and assist parties in the collective bargaining process. As I said, we use this system in Barbados. One of the drawbacks of this system, is that collective bargaining agreements carry no legal force and it is also a truism that in this system, the employer can discriminate against an employee with impunity, because he might be engaging in collective bargaining or trade union activities.

There is also the model of polarisation or legislative compulsion which is followed in countries like Australia and New Zealand. In these jurisdictions strikes and lock-outs, for example, are made illegal and there is also the whole idea pf compulsory arbitration of trade disputes.

Then you have a hybrid system where you might have a partly voluntary and a partly compulsory system. The best 2 examples that I can think about, are the systems that

operate in the United States of America and Canada. In relation to America, you would find that the system bears greater towards the pole of voluntarism than in the latter case of Canada, where there is a more varying to the pole of polarisation or the operation and atmosphere of legislative compulsion.

It is within that whole framework that I would want to look at the exercise we are engaged in here today. It is my opinion, given the small differences that existed between the Government on the one hand and the unions on the other, excluding the Barbados Workers Union because they had already come to an agreement, that Government should have sought, in keeping with its principle as enunciated in the Manifesto, should have tried to reach an agreement.

The Manifesto at Page 24, under the caption "Public Service" at No. 5 says that, as part and parcel of the Democratic Labour Party's policy agenda, it will strive at all times to reach negotiated settlements on wages for public servants. It also said that it would try to minimize grievances within the public service by attending promptly to all legitimate grievances. I am of opinion, Sir, that it leads to divisiveness in the Public Service. It creates an atmosphere of uncertainty within the Public Service. It can lead sometimes to members within the public service coming to the opinion that Government sometimes goes with indecent haste in legislating salaries. That is my opinion, whenever Governments move to legislate before reaching agreement with the majority union or the majority unions in the process, and in the context of these negotiations, without being offensive in any way, I think that we have got to accept that the Barbados Workers' Union is the minority union. Yet Government found it necessary to come to an agreement with the Barbados Workers' Union, an agreement which we are now here debating today. Earlier on the Prime Minister called it a determination. That might be just a play with words. But I think we can say that Government is here today giving legislative effect to an agreement reached with the Barbados Workers' Union which will impact on the Public Service as a whole.

My own view is that legislating salaries in this atmosphere is against the spirit of collective bargaining. I would also add that it would render the collective bargaining process nugatory if Governments continue to operate like this. We have been having this exercise since 1976,1 believe, I speak under correction in this area, and it has been continually going on and on. It was to me a bit surprising to come here today to see the Democratic Labour .Party engaging in a similar exercise that they have repeatedly criticised throughout the years, an exercise that was engaged in by the Barbados Labour Party. I would also make another point and it is that this is a clear case of the Democratic Labour Party reneging on its promise to allow the collective bargaining process to take its course. That is my own view about it.

We can recall that on an earlier occasion the Honourable Prime Minister of this country ,was asked to intervene in the process. He said that he wanted the process to work and that he did not think it necessary to intervene to bring it to an end. I believe that, in that case - and I am not trying to tell the Prime Minister of this country what he should do or should not do, this is just my humble opinion, I am not being apologetic about it either - the conditions were right at that time for the Prime Minister to intervene not to bring the process, or I should say to impose his iron hand or iron fist on the process, and say: "look, this thing has to come to an end, but to assist in bringing the process to an end, while at the same time holding fast to the principles that the Democratic Labour Party over the years has promoted, that Government should not legislate before an agreement."

When you operate in a situation like this and come to a conclusion of a collective bargaining process in this manner, my own view, and it is another opinion which I ~hold dearly, is that you are giving respectability to a collective bargaining agreement which is reached with a minority union. I earlier on alluded to this. I believe that when...

Asides.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Yes, I said that. I said giving respectability to collective bargaining agreements. If we are operating and you accept the principle tliat in these negotiations when you are negotiating with more than one union including unions constituting a majority that you never ever as far as I know and as far as I am concerned...

Asides.

6.50 p.m.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Let me talk man, you just keep quiet and let me make my point.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Address the Chair, please.

Mr. R. P. BYER: I am talking about the system which we operate in Barbados. It is a voluntary system in terms of the private sector. The only difference between voluntarism and then you are operating with the Government is that you have to come in here and give legislative effect to the agreements that you reach. That is the only difference, but we agreed on that earlier when you made the point.

Asides.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Of course you have to deal with sides. What I am saying is that when you are negotiating with several Unions you should always give effect to the agreement reached with the majority Union, and I am saying here...

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: That is a principle on which you operate.

Aside.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We have to maintain order, please.

Mr. R. P. BYER: That is a principle of collective bargaining agreements.

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Let me continue, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central wants to keep it up, when another matter comes up he can respond to that.

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: I am not rewriting any books. I would like you to know...

Aside.

Mr. R. P: BYER: You see, the principle in these matters is that agreement with the majority Union is always very powerful. In the context of negotiations with the Civil Service, as I said before , the Barbados Workers' Union is the minority Union. Therefore, the agreement reached with the Barbados Workers' Union, in my opinion, should not have formed the basis of the Resolution now being debated. Government should have sought to conclude negotiations with the other majority Unions in the process, and I am certain that this could have been achieved, given the relative size of the difference in the scales Z.31 to 38. That is my view about it.

The Member for Christ Church East Central gave out a long list of achievements of the Democratic Labour Party in terms of the Public Service. It would seem to me that they are sacrificing all of this on the altar of a few pennies. That is my view about it.

Government by its attitude is promoting divisiveness in the Trade Union Movement and the society. These differences are so small that it was not worth it. We live in a society already where there are significant differences between groups of people and so on. There is a lot of divisiveness in the society, politically that is, and this could have provided the framework for the healing process to begin. The effect should be to minimise conflict and this could have been achieved in a number of ways. One of the ways is that the collective bargaining process should have been allowed to run its natural course. x

In terms of divisiveness, this is a matter that the Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central when he was a Senator made mention of in 1982, in the Senate Debates 1982 in the volume 27th January to 15th December, second paragraph of the second column of page 679. Senator Hall, as he then was, said, referring to the fact that legislating salaries in this manner always leads to divisiveness and bitterness in a community: -

> "....even though we boast a proud record in industrial relations, even though strikes have been few and far between in this country, I think that we must get away from the residue of bitterness that prevails whenever there are such things as legislating salaries."

The choice of words used was excellent and succinctly put and I adopt those words in trying to make the point I am making. I agree with the opinion.

Conflict can be minimised in a number of ways. I adverted to one such way for social and economic development, and it all has to do with the context in which the negotiations are taking place.

Earlier on the Member for Christ Church East Central also adverted to this point when he said that, in 1986, agreement was reached so quickly because of the prevailing economic circumstances in terms of the fiscal rearrangements put into place by the then Minister of Finance, now Leader of the National Democratic Party - if I might add - and soon to be Leader of the Opposition. If these negotiations had been conducted in the context of the 1986 fiscal policies, we would not have been shouting at each other in here at all. The negotiations would have been completed a long time ago. Because of the socio-economic environment at this stage, I am saying that we have to come here today to engage in what we are engaging in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Prime Minister earlier on today said that he did not want to go down through history in dealing with this matter. He might not have wanted to take that road because history might not have been very kind to him in relation to this whole matter of legislating salaries before agreement. I would want to refer to some passages from a speech he made in the debates of 1984 when a similar matter was being considered. At page 1235 of those debates the Civil Establishments Order was being considered. I am reading from the middle of the first paragraph. The Honourable Prime Minister, then and still the Member for St. Michael South, but then without the appellation of Prime Minister, said:

> " ...As I understand it, on such occasions - I believe there have been three occasions now - the process of collective bargaining, which should be the hallmark of industrial relations in a democratic country such as Barbados and which should be given every opportunity to be explored to the fullest, was cut

short. The Government now has almost a 100 per cent redord in prematurely bringing to an end the processes of collective bargaining in which the industrial relations in this country should be based." 7.00 p.m.

The Honourable Member continued:

"I dwell on this question of collective bargaining because this is at the heart of the present matter, and indeed at the heart of the fundamental question of . whether Barbados will continue as a country based on free institutions, and its industrial relations based on the practised procedures and the processes of free institutions, using the spirit of voluntarism, sitting down around a table, bargaining in good faith and arriving at some kind of compromise at the end of a reasonable period of negotiation. I do not think that anybody in their wildest dreams could advocate the view that, in these present circumstances, the processes of collective bargaining have been exhausted or have been pursued in good faith."

He also continued on page 1236:

"Now there were other unions still to be involved in the whole process of negotiation. They were not brought into it at all. As I understand it, the Barbados Union of Teachers, and then a letter was sent after two meetings indicating the settlement, take it or leave it! I understand that they were given the opportunity to concur, not to negotiate. That is my understanding of the words that were used."

Earlier today the Prime Minister said there were 31 meetings. As I understand it, there are nine Unions involved. I do not know what the break down was in terms of the Barbados Union of Teachers, the National Union of Public Workers, the Barbados Workers' Union and so on. But I think at some stage one or other Honourable Member said there might have been four meetings with the National Union of Public Workers. I am not so sure I heard correctly, but I think I heard that. It would seem to me that, even if the negotiations were spread over eleven months, you still have to look at the number of meetings that were held in reaching agreement. If my understanding is correct, it would seem to me that four meetings with any Union at all would not have been enough to come to some agreement in this matter. You see you also have...

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: On a point of order, I do not want the Honourable Member to mislead this Chamber. I do not think the Prime Minister in his deliberations this morning indicated the number of meetings which were held with any of the Unions. It is a fact that more than four meetings were held. If the Honourable Member wants to find out how many meetings were held with each Union, he can get that, but he should not try to mislead this House by giving the impression that only four meetings were held with the National Union of Public Workers.

Mr. R. P. BYER: If I may respond to that, I never made any attempt to mislead this House. I was most careful and correct in what I said. I said that if I was wrong, I could be corrected. I said I believe I heard some Honourable Member say there were four meetings held. So you do not try to mislead the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just one moment, please.

Mr. R. P. BYER: You do not try to throw me off what I want to say.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. We were proceeding quite nicely. There is no need to get excited.

Mr. R. P. BYER: I am not getting excited. No Honourable Member will try to make me look like a feel on the floor of the House. If I am wrong, I will say I am wrong.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will not permit that to happen. You can be assured of that. What I would suggest, is that you conclude your speech without listening to the asides by the other side".

Mr. R. P. BYER: How much more time do I have?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You should finish by a quarter past seven. I would say that is six minutes more that you have if you need it.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Under the Civil Establishments Act, salaries must be legislated before civil servants are paid, and this is acceptable. Now my own view, Sir, is that when you come to legislate salaries in this manner, it amounts to an indecent use of Parliament. That is my view about it. My opinion is that we have got to put our heads together and come to some agreement in terms of the principles upon which public sector negotiations have got to be conducted. It would be a waste of Parliament's time to come in here year after year to argue the same differences and take up positions that one might have been opposed to previously. I do not know why we have got to continue to do this all the time. I think that if we have skilled negotiators, as is being said, we can work out some framework within which negotiations can be conducted and within which we can come to agreement in relation to salaries for public sector organisations.

I am of the opinion that what we have here today amounts to an attack on the poor and underprivileged who come within the Z.30 to Z.38 scale. The other portions of the Civil Service were satisfied. The perception has gone abroad that the Government was taking advantage of that

scale Z.30 to Z.38. The differences are very small. You had some cases where the dollar difference between the Government and the National Union of Public Workers was a $2 difference, a $4 difference and in some cases, it ranged from $2 to $14. It seems to me to be wrong to come here today to legislate in such a way that only a small category of workers is now being affected. I think we have got to devote some time to providing the framework within which we can operate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am hearing too many voices within the Chamber. Can you please keep your voices down a bit?

Mr. R. P. BYER: Now, Sir, as to the question of the principle that should be used in determining the exhaustion of the process of collective bargaining, how do we know that the process has been exhausted? How do we know when to intervene as a Government and how can the Government determine when it should intervene? These are things we have got to look at. It is not enough to say that it should be left to the whims and fancies of the Government to determine whether or not they should intervene. These are matters, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I will implore the Government to address and try to provide some framework within which we should operate. I thank you.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Honourable Members seem not to want you to vacate the Chamber for a few minutes.

I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 8p.m.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 7.10p.m.

RESUMPTION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed. When we broke, the Honourable Member for St. George South, had just concluded his speech. We will now have the Honourable Member for St. Lucy.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I propose to be fairly short in this intervention. In doing so, Sir, I would like to start with the year 1976, when this whole question of the principle of collective bargaining between unions and Governments was introduced into the debate in this Honourable Chamber. It was introduced by me.

As the Honourable Member for St. Thomas rightly said, on that occasion, I took the opportunity to draw to the attention of the then DLP administration that I considered that the procedure and, indeed, the fact that enough meetings and discussions had not taken place between the negotiators on the Government side and the Government was an~ abrogation of the conventions and the general acceptance of the procedures which were understood in industrial relations.

I held that view in light of the circumstances which obtained in 1976.1 still maintain that kind of position, but when one looks at what obtained in these negotiations here in 1988 and 1989, one would see that this Democratic Labour Party Administration has made every conceivable effort to get a conclusion in the negotiations. The doors were open to the unions to have discussions and to get a conclusion out of this.

I can recall, Sir, and my Cabinet colleagues can bear me out on this, I believe it must have been on 2 occasions, when those persons who were negotiating on behalf of the Government, indicated in a report to Cabinet that they had, for practical purposes, reached the end and they did not believe that they could get any further with the negotiations, iii its wisdom, directed the negotiators to go back and try again to get an agreement. This was the position of the Democratic Labour Party.

We were sticking to the principles which we wrote down in our Manifesto as quoted by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, even quoted to the point where he quoted what was to be put in originally into the Manifesto but which was altered because obviously, wiser heads prevailed in the writing of the Manifesto.

Then we have here on page 24, item 5 under the Public Service that we would strive at all times, to reach negotiated settlements on wages for public servants. This was a sincere commitment. It is a sincere commitment. All the actions of this Adminsitration in these negotiations and in any negotiations conducted by or with the public servants, have been done in sincerity and in an attempt to fulfill this particular statement which has been included here.

I think that one has to understand, as the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central has pointed out, that bargaining in the public sector is not easy. It is not easy because the same kinds of regulations and the same kind of rancour do not apply that would normally apply in the private sector.

There is a history of negotiations in the public sector. It would be interesting if one were to look at what has happened since 1974 in negotiations in the public sector.

Sir, would you believe that the first time that all unions who were negotiating with the Government agreed to the proposals from the Government were the negotiations in 1986? That was the only time since 1974 that all the unions agreed.

In 1976-1978, in those famous negotiations, there was no agreement by any of the unions. In 1978-1980, there was no agreement with the BUT or with the Police. BUT is a recurring decimal in these non-agreements. In 1980-1982 there was no agreement by any of the unions. In 1982-1984 there was no agreement by any of the unions. In 1984-1986 the BUT did not agree, the BSTU rejected, the BWU was not in favour of the across the board offer, but promised to consider if the key scales were rejected. The Fire Service rejected.

The point is that there was only one occasion on which there was complete agreement, so it is against that kind of background that we were negotiating.

It is interesting that all of the Honourable Members on Jie other side who have spoken so far have made reference to the BWU alone agreeing with the Government on the proposals for 8.1% at the bottom, 5% at the top and 2% in year 2, but no mention has been made of the fact that the Barbados Secondary Teachers Union, in their wisdom, also agreed with these proposals. Nobody has mentioned that up to now.

Sir, I refer to the letter which the Prime Minister read from the Head of the Civil Service who was conducting the negotiations on the part of the Government. It is clear to me, as no doubt it would be clear to all Honourable Members, that there was an agreement between the leaders of the NUPW and the Head of the Civil Service on these negotiations.

There was a clear understanding and agreement where he said:

> "In accordance with the understanding reached at our meeting, that the union would be prepared to recommend that the membership accepts the Government's offer if the status of the servers in the Schools Meals Service is varied from part-time to full-time I now confirm the Government's acceptance of that proposal to take effect from April, 1989.

We have to understand the language in which letters are written. This is very clear to me, that the leadership of the NUPW agreed to the proposals from the Government under the chairmanship of the Chief Establishments Officer. It just happened that, unfortunately, after having made that agreement...and here we have to question this whole question of leadership!

What is the position with a leader who will tome and sit down and discuss a matter with you on behalf of a group of people, agree with you and then when he gets back to the crowd and the crowd tells him "No" that he will come back and say, "what I agree with you is not an agreement."? It leads only to chaos. We cannot have that kind of situation obtaining. It is clear to me that, having gotten the Government to move, and it is a fact that the Government was negotiating as it raised its offer on many occasions and even conceded the point which NUPW was making about the Servers in the School Meals Department, but having got the Government to agree with them to improve the conditions and the salaries of the School Meals Servers the NUPW having achieved that, decided: "We have that under our belt now, let us go for something else." 8.10p.m.

Each time there was a point where there could have been agreement the NUPW changed its position, shifted its position. Having got the School Meals workers out of the way, look at what they are now saying. If you were to read - I can make this a document of the Chamber, Sir - the Advocate, Tuesday February 7 on page 3 where the General Secretary of the Union is making the point: "Yes, we agree to what the Government offered for the School Meals workers." But they are saying that, if this is so, then the Government would now have to come and discuss with them the position relating to the cooks, the general labourers, the watchmen, the gardeners, the groundsmen, the porters, rodent control assistants and several other workers who are regarded as doing only arduous or dangerous work", who are regarded as doing, so they say, "only", well this does not make sense, but anyhow, what he is saying...

Asides.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: What he says now really does not make sense in any case. I mean, I find it difficult to understand what he is saying. But he is being quoted here.

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: ... "Who are regarded as doing only arduous or dangerous work than the servers, probably more."

So you see, having done all of that, having accepted what they said that they wanted the Government conceded. We gave you what you want. They come with something else now. So there would be no end to what it is that they would have wanted.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What document is that?

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: The Advocate newspaper. I would make it a document of the House, Sir, page 3 of the Advocate newspaper, Tuesday, February 7,1989.

So, Sir, you see the kinds of problems which we have.

Now I heard the Honourable Member for St. George South. It is instructive that not one of them is in here tonight.

Laughter.

Aside.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please continue;.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: They say that they are representing poor people, but they are nowhere in here. You are not going to find them you know. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I bet you that they are not going to come back in here because...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do you want to bet me?

Laughter.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: No, Sir. I would not. I know you are not a betting man, Sir.

Laughter. *

Hon. E. E: GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I really would not...

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please continue. Continue your speech, please.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I think it is the height of irresponsibility in the Party Leader who the Deputy Leader said just now talking out of turn would be Leader of the Opposition in a short while. The same thing I would say to the Honourable Member for Christ Church West, that today is his last. The Deputy Leader of the , what do you call it?

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Even the Leader is getting confused, the National Democratic Labour Party.

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: He does not even know the name...

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: ...of his own Party. But the point is that we were subjected this afternoon to a weak position taken by them on this issue.

What I am saying is that this administration has bent over backwards in these negotiations. I want to repeat that on two occasions the negotiators had thrown up their hands when they were at the negotiating table, because they recognised the conditions under which they were negotiating. They were able to determine the stance of the unions which were negotiating on behalf of the workers in the public sector. They recognised that it- was almost impossible to come to an agreement with some of those.

Cabinet in its wisdom instructed them that they should go back, make more efforts in order to try to get an agreement. We were consistent with the position in our Manifesto. We strove at all times to get an agreement. But, Sir, at some point an end has to be brought to this otherwise we will be negotiating further. Particularly when we are negotiating in a situation where, at each point you concede, the NUPW goes a step further. One cannot negotiate in that kind of climate. There must be some principle to negotiations. This is very important, you know, some principle and some good faith.

The Government put its position up front indicating that we could not go beyond a certain point. I believe the negotiators even exceeded the point which the Government offered in an effort to try to get it to reach an agreement. But particularly the NUPW was shifting its position from time to time and made it very difficult.

I have no difficulty, having enunciated the principles which should direct collective bargaining and negotiations in the public sector. One has to recognise that there will be certain difficulties which are involved in this whole process.

I do not want to take up much more time. I am sure that the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central and the Member for Christ Church East Central can defend the Barbados Workers' Union with the kind of force with which that organisation is usually represented.

I should just like to make the point, and I have to repeat it, that, in 1982, I believe 1982, 1984 when the Barbados Workers' Union went out front, ahead of all the other unions and agreed with the Government, Sir, do you know which Party was in office then? It was the Barbados Labour Party.

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: On that occasion the Barbados Labour Party described the Barbados Workers' Union as a mature union, a union which took into consideration the national interest, a union which possessed the leadership which this country required, a union which could make a decision in difficult circumstances. The Barbados Labour Party described the Barbados Workers' Union like that.

Asides.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: It is not the first time that the Barbados Workers' Union has taken a position up based on principle, based on what is going on in the society, and not misleading people into believing that...

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: ...the Government's coffers do not have a bottom, that we can get into a bottomless pit where there is money flowing out.

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I mean, all of these are things which one has to understand.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order.

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I do understand the point being made by the Honourable Minister, Sir. What he does not say is that in 1980 when the settlement was 37 and 22 his very responsible union, as he describes it, Sir, was the one that did not agree. It was the NUPW that agreed that time. Is that not correct?

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: But the point I am making, and I started out by saying, I traced a history of agreements and disagreements in the negotiations in the Government sector, is that the only time that all the unions agreed was in 1986. The only time was in 1986. At some time the NUPW agreed, at some time the BWU agreed, at some times nobody agreed, but this is the nature of it.

So they described the BWU as a most responsible union on that occasion.

Aside.

One has to understand the circumstances surrounding those negotiations. I do not think that we need to make any more heavy weather of this. I think the point has been made very clear from the Government side. The position has been made very clear from the Government side. I am sure that the Opposition, I am talking about the Barbados Labour Party Opposition because one has to make the distinction between the BLP and the NDP.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is only one Opposition here though.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Well, it would be a Party.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes. Right.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Oh, oh, I see. The two opposition Parties. I think it is very clear. They understand the position. We understand that they...

Aside.

Laughter.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I agree that it is improvement because they will soon be moving down to the end.

Laughter.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: But, quite seriously, Sir, I should like to commend this. We should accept in good faith the arguments which have been advanced from this side. It was also painful for us, but we had, at some point, to come to an end. Given the circumstances, we consider that * we did the best. We have, therefore, had to come to the conclusion that we had to put an end to the discussions on this. The Government has committed itself to the reclassification exercise which is supposed to be done this year, in 6 months time. A Reclassification Committee, I believe, has been established and is working on the reclassification of the Service. I think these are important considerations. The unions asked for reclassification of a number of areas and we agreed to that. 8.20 p.m.

On the question of the Police and the position which was put by the Police that they would agree to the Government's proposals provided the Government give 2 increments from the Constable to Assistant Superintendent, Sir, that in itself is a reclassification and this was told to them. What in truth and in fact they are saying to us is they want a reclassification. They agree with the proposals from the Government, but they also want built into those proposals 2 increments and then on top of all of that then the reclassification exercise. What has been said to them is they will be looked at when the reclassification exercise takes place. The Police and everybody will be looked at.

It does not mean that everybody is going to get reclassified. The point is that the Government has committed itself to the reclassification exercise among a number of other conditions which have been outlined by the various speakers from this side.

Sir, it is my considered view that the arguments which have been advanced from this side are arguments which are sound and clearly demonstrate the good faith of this administration in the collective bargaining process. I thank you.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Peter.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the legislation of wages really in many respects embodies an economic policy by Government. I intervene in this debate after a long day of hard debating in order to speak to the economic aspects of this particular matter. I would want, Sir, at the outset and before I deal with some of the debating points which have been raised merely to advance the simple position, Sir, that the character of this settlement, taken into conjunction with the other economic policies of the Democratic Labour Party, very unfortunately conveys the distinct perception that Government expects that the burden of economic adjustments in this country is a burden that is to be carried disproportionately by the lower income groups in the society.

In many respects the character of this legislated wage settlement, Sir, conveys that very distinct perception to me, separate and distinct, Sir, from all the other considerations that have been raised pertaining to the implications of this legislated settlement for the collective bargaining process in Barbados or the breach of faith by the Democratic Labour Party or the departure from principle. I really do not believe, Sir, that we should miss this opportunity to address the question as to how are we going to share in Barbados the burden of making economic adjustments that are required in this Society, whether those adjustments are adjustments made mandatory by our need to make this country more competitive, whether those adjustments, Sir, are adjustments made mandatory by our need to maintain fiscal stability or a sound Balance of Payments position.

I am advancing the case, Sir, that my reading of the situation is that, when we see this agreement in its totality, we are dealing with a situation where the Government is, I think, forcing too much of the burden of economic .adjustment on the lower income groups of the Barbadian society. That is my basic point to which I will come.

This debate, Sir, has, to use the words of the Member for St. Michael East in a previous debate, raised from the brilliant to the bizarre. We have had the very brilliant contribution from the Member for St. Thomas, Sir, and the absolutely brilliant contribution from the Member for Christ Church West. Unfortunately, Sir, the Member for St. Philip South, I thought, introduced some elements in this debate which were truly unfortunate. It really has to be unfortunate for a member of the Democratic Labour Party to advance the view that for a person holding a position of General Secretary in a union to seek a political office is really to prostitute himself.

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Because it raises immediately the question, Mr. Deputy Speaker...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Make your point of order.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: On a point of elucidation, I never said I was opposed to anyone in any union running for office in any Government or in any administration. In fact, I actually said in the debate more than once that that position in that particular union seems to attract persons who tend to prostitute themselves politically and be manipulated by parties. I am not against anybody joining any party.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the facile explanation of the Member for St. Philip South still raises the implication by what right can General Secretaries of other unions participate in the political process without running the danger of being called political prostitutes when such a right cannot be afforded...

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR:...but that is precisely why the Honourable Member, Sir, should not castigate another person other than Sir. Frank Walcott or the Members on the other side merely because they combine trade union interests with politics* The history of Caribbean development, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is a history in which there has been a marriage between trade union activities and politics. If we are to believe, Sir, it is right for some people and wrong for others and I am not here this evening, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to argue a case on Mr. Joe Goddard, that is not my purpose here this evening Sir,...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please let us avoid calling names.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR:...! am not here, Sir, to argue the case on behalf of the General Secretary of the NUPW, but we must not fly in the face of history. My party, Sir, was founded by a person who had the vision to combine politics and trade unionism. It is a reactionary step for any person in this House, Sir, in the year 1989 to attach any element of prostitution to the relationship between politics and trade unionism. Sir, I want to make that categorical statement because it is worth saying. If the Member, Sir, has a political grievance with the General Secretary of the NUPW, he can express it, but the connotations I found very distastefully, reactionary, Sir, and unworthy of a party which understands history far better, Sir, than the Honourable Member.

He also, Mr. Deputy Speaker, really sought to compare $25.00 in 1982 to $20.00 in 1989 by means of a technique which is, I think, on reflection one that will cause him to be a little embarrassed. It is as if he was, to draw an analogy, Sir, to say that $25.00 in 1900 is the same as $25.00 in 1989, he seems not to recognise that inflation is cumulative and as a result of inflation being cumulative the value of money decreases as the rate of prices increases from year to year. Therefore, Sir, I want to put to the House, in order to correct the misconceptions that might

have ^arisen from the arguments advanced by the Member for St. Philip South, that in fact there is much validity in the position taken by my colleague in his build-up and explanation to this Chamber, Sir. 8.30 p.m.

It is unprincipled for the Prime Minister to have spoken so sharply about a minuscule increase of $25 a week in 1982 and then want this House to commend a less than $20 increase in 1989. It is unprincipled, Sir, and that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is one of the issues that this debate is about.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I can go forward, these salaries are in my view being legislated in the circumstances where, in my view as well, negotiations were not undertaken in good faith, and I say that for a number of reasons. The important consideration in this matter is not just the number of meetings that have taken place. The important consideration is that, at many times during the process of that long protracted series of negotiations, Government had virtually to be forced back to the bargaining table through public pressure. I contrast that attitude with the attitude, for example, of the former Prime Minister of this country, Mr. Bernard St. John, who, in 1986, called the Unions early and tried to set a framework within which principled negotiations could take place in good faith.

I want to make the point, $ir, that we have to look at this thing as a continuum. This present legislation of salaries takes place as the second wage settlement where there have been protracted negotiations between Government and the Unions, punctuated by what appears certainly to me as a disinclination on the part of Government to want to arrive at any settlement at all.

I must remind the Members on the other side that the last negotiations with the Unions of this country took so long that the payments arising out of the negotiations which were not legislated had to be carried over into a new financial year. I want to link the whole question of negotiating in good faith with financial management.

It seems to me that some sensible framework has to be evolved whereby negotiations can be settled in such a timely period that we will not have to be confronted with the spectacle in this country of having to bunch together wage settlements with potential risks and dangers to the state of public finances. These things happen to some extent, and this is part of my argument this evening as well, Sir, in relation to the lack of negotiating in good faith. To some extent the Democratic Labour Party seems to believe that it has the Trade Unions of this country, if not under their control, Sir, under some sort of influence. That can only explain, as far as I am concerned, why there seemed to be a lack of urgency surrounding the desire of Government and the Trade Unions to reach a settlement in a timely basis such as we have become accustomed to in this country. I want to make that charge very explicit, that it is highly unsatisfactory for negotiations to be undertaken in a lack of good faith.

The Prime Minister's credibility as well, as far as I am concerned, is to some extent somewhat on the line. He took a very direct public position in these matters that he was not going to intervene, and the question arising, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is whether we are now in a position to take the Prime Minister directly at his word. I would like to live in a country where that is a matter of course, but when the Prime Minister makes a position as clear as that, as categorical as that and as uncompromising as that, and then in short order comes and reverses himself on a matter that is apparently sacred to the Democratic Labour Party, we have seriously to begin to question what might be the other things on which he will reverse himself. I am really therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, put in the position of having to say that the manner in which this particular round of negotiations has been resolved puts the credibility of the Prime Minister of this country on the line, in my view.

It also puts the credibility of the Barbados Workers' Union on the line as well, because I am advised, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I stand to be corrected, that the Barbados Workers' Union has recently settled for as much as 10% with a section of the private sector. That is my information, Sir. I stand to be corrected. There was a time when we used to believe that the level of settlements agreed to between the Unions and the Government set the stage for settlements in the society as a whole. We are hearing this argument about how we expect the private sector of this country to lead and how Barbados' competitive position can be undermined by excessively large wage settlements. The question arises by what logic can we rationalise that the same Union which uses public sector settlements as a bench mark, agrees with the Government for an increase that is lower than the settlement that is agreed to with the private sector.

There is a special difficulty, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Let us deal with the raw politics of this. We are living in a situation of multi-Union negotiations in Barbados. The political reality is simply this - and my colleague tried to bring it down to earth - that a Democratic Labour Party Government of Barbados is not going to settle with the Barbados Workers' Union to pay wages of $74 a week negotiated on their behalf by the Barbados Workers' Union, and thereafter go and agree with some other Union not affiliated with the Democratic Labour Party for a higher wage increase.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Honourable Member is trying to mislead this House. The Democratic Labour Party does not have an affiliate named the Barbados Workers' Union. There is no affiliation of the Barbados Workers' Union with the Democratic Labour Party.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the legal nicety that the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central has introduced would almost cause me to want to believe that he is now about to relinquish his relationship with the Democratic Labour Party and join some- other party. I want to put it as a matter of fact that the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central is a member of the Democratic Labour Party and an employee of the Barbados Workers' Union.

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, a lot has been spoken in this debate. I believe that when we put this matter in a political context,in the context of multi-Union competition in Barbados, a situation will never arise where a Democratic Labour Party Government is going to settle for $74 a month and thereafter agree with another Union to pay a higher monthly increase than agreed to by the Barbados Workers' Union. For the last two years therefore, Sir, there has been an element of charade, I want to put that point, Sir, there has been an element of charade in some respects in what appear to be negotiations taking place when once an agreement has been arrived at with the Barbados Workers' Union. In many respects therefore, Sir, it is a charade. 8.40 p.m.

As you will recognise, Sir, fortunately, on the last occasion the other unions eventually agreed to accept what was negotiated by the Barbados Workers' Union. They had to go through the motion of saying that it was not enough but they accepted. In this particular case, Sir, they have not accepted and we are going to face a crisis in this country, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as regards the further development of the union movement if we cannot evolve a system of .minimising practices like these. People understand the practical realities. It was the burden of the contribution of my colleague from St. Thomas that the perception by the general public of Barbados of what the Government is doing is far different from. what the Government is convincing itself is the reality.

We are not in this House allowed to speak in terms of collusion. We impute proper motives. I want, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to say on the floor of this House that there is a general perception in this society that there is collusion between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Government of Barbados to arrive at wage settlements which put the minimum pressure on the Government of the day.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: On a point of elucidation, when you use terms and give impressions, perhaps the last speaker may need some education on industrial relations in the world. The British Labour Party has a close association with the Trades Union Congress. In fact the TUC in Britain funds Members of Parliament and they negotiate salaries with the British Government. The same is true in Sweden, Norway, Denmark. In those countries who would talk about collusion? Why do we get on as though this is some strange and unusual circumstance because it happens in Barbados?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are having too many noises. *I* want to hear one Honourable Member at a time, please. The Honourable Member for St. Peter may continue.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I can put the case, there is a perception in Barbados that the hands of the other unions are tied. So long as the Barbados Workers' Union has agreed with Government, no matter how reasonable the case may be, the hands of the other unions are tied, and that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, allows me to set the stage against which I wish to explore the point that I have been making and want to have as the chief point in this particular debate. There is but one Barbados. There is one economy. The issues of competitiveness, fiscal stability and protection of balance of payments have been with us for a number of years.

I remember the difficult days of 1982 when the economy was not growing. There was a recession. If you were to link wage increases and productivity as the Prime Minister tells us that we must do, then there would be an attitude on the part of the Union that would have been seeking wage settlements far less exacting than those which were sought in 1982. That is the essential point, the economic point that we must drive home. At a time when this country was not experiencing any increase in productivity and when it could not have been said that it experienced six years of economic growth and when it was in the throes of serious recession, having problems of international competitiveness of which the Prime Minister speaks, having problems of protecting the balance of payments, unions were asking for 39 per cent at the bottom and 25 per cent at the top. There was no consideration then on the part of the Barbados Workers' Union or any of the other unions about protection of the one and only economy we have. The Barbados Labour Party in those difficult days, despite the lack of six years of successive growth, made a settlement for the persons at the bottom, some thirty per cent higher than that which the Government of the day has ever arrived at. The maid, living in the throes of recession under the Barbados Labour Party in 1982, found that she was getting a $108 a month increase compared with a $74 increase in 1988, despite the fact that the Government in 1988 will now tell us that they have had six years of solid economic growth, that there is no problem now with the preservation of a stable financial position. We have had this pattern, Mr. Deputy Speaker, not only in 1982 but in 1984.

I remember 1984 very well because it was a year when the Barbadian economy was just emerging out of recession and the Prime Minister of the country offered 15 per cent, we do not hear of these terms again, and 5 per cent in the second year. If you will remember, Sir, the Unions

were inclined to accept. We had to come back to the House to legislate in the context of a situation where we were granting 15 per cent in difficult economic circumstances. The Union leadership would have accepted but they did not have the strength to impress upon their members that the Government was doing all they could in the circumstances to come to an agreement that was fair and reasonable. What if we had had six then! They had six years of economic growth and I must remind the House that in the 1986 settlement there was a $74 increase at the bottom. Compare that with what the Barbados Labour Party in all the years between 1976 and 1986 granted despite the difficulties that we have had to face from time to time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in relation to this particular wage adjustment, I must make the point...

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not like to interrupt the Honourable Member but in the course of his presentation he is making statements that are not factual which are misleading the public. In 1977 the settlement was 5 per cent across the board. We have the facts here too, you know.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: The Honourable Member should know that the 1977 adjustment was what he would call a technical adjustment. A substantial adjustment had been made in 1976, and despite the adjustment that had been made in 1976, the late Prime Minister in the goodness of his heart and under no pressure ...

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let us hear one speaker at a time, please.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: ...and in money terms, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and if you are going to talk about legislating salaries, in 1982 Tom Adams legislated $108 for himself and $108 for the maid as compared with what we are doing today.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir, that is when Tom Adams grossed up. Do not come in here and mislead anybody. That was after grossing up. How can you come in here and say that, when you know that in 1981 you had Tom Adams misleading the whole country first.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, let them understand the point. In money terms the lower income people in this country have now been made accustomed by this administration to increases that amount to no more than $75 a month compared to what would have obtained in the past and this $75 a month takes place in the context of a situation where their real purchasing power has been ravaged by the extent of the indirect taxes which the Democratic Labour Party has chosen as its way of making adjustment. 8.50p.m.

I want to stress the point because it is the point of economic principle that is involved here, Sir, where you combine wage restraint as an economic adjustment strategy with a heavy dependence on indirect taxes then, essentially, you tell people at the bottom to hold strain and reduce the amount of wage increases you get in monetary terms and then on the other side you switch your fiscal system in favour of an increasingly heavier dependence on indirect taxes.

There are the people at the lower end of the income ladder who will have to carry the strain.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: The Members are saying "strain what?" I must remind the members of the Democratic Labour Party, if they must be reminded, Sir, that the increase in the consumption tax of $70 million is to be carried to a large extent by persons at the lower end of the income ladder. That is one of the dangers of carrying the economic systems like ours increasingly in the direction of dependence on indirect taxes because it is the poor who carry the strain.

Mr. Deputy speaker, if we were to talk in terms of linking to productivity,...

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: On a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Am I really understanding the Honourable Member to talk about the impact of the indirect taxation on the people of this country? I understand that the NDP promises to abolish income tax and, of course....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This is another point of order?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The National Democratic Party has not enunciated any such policy but I would like to remind the Honourable Member of the question by the late End Walton Barrow in 1986: "Do you think that Barbados would collapse if income tax was abolished?"

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member Tor St. Peter has 2 minutes more to wind up his speech.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the issues therefore, raised by this particular action the House is being invited to take today are very simple.

We have come to a stage in the development of collective bargaining in this country where bargaining of a

serious nature will continue only so long as there are outstanding issues between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Goverment of Barbados whenever there is a multi-union competition involved.

The pattern of the last 2 years leads to that incontestable conclusion, that collective bargaining of a serious nature can only now continue in the context of multi-union competition so long as there are outstanding issues between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Government. That is a matter we have to address.

There has to be a framework which will allow multi-union negotiations to appear to be less than a charade such as we have had over the last 2 years. I really do believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that what we have seen in terms of protracted negotiations does no credit to the unions. It does no credit to the Government. It is a development that we should stop because it has within it the potential of serious financial instability and division.

But above all, as I close, I want to state that my basic concern, my fundamental concern in essence, is that if we are to make adjustments in the interest of Barbados' stability, if we are to make adjustments in the interest of increasing the competitive position of Barbados, if we are going to make adjustments in the interest of financial stability of the public accounts, it is unreasonable, as far as I am concerned, for such a large proportion of that adjustment to be forced on the shoulders of the genuinely poor people of this country, as has been embodied, manifested and reflected in the 2 negotiations which this House has been called upon to approve.

I am much obliged to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Applause.

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are some things which, in this debate, have caused a certain degree of humour but there, are some other areas where there has been a cause for some degree of concern because, as we know, Sir, in this Honourable House, one is always honest. In this Honourable House all Honourable Members are supposed to be honest and to know that the Member for St. Peter can be so dishonest as he was is a source of some concern. I would only hope that it is not a position in a degree of honesty followed by everyone else.

I am concerned, Sir, that in his distinguished view, there is the impression of a charade in the terms of the collective bargaining exercise and I wish to draw a few matters of pertinent interest to his attention.

In 1976 the National Union of Public Workers submitted a proposal - I am referring to the bottom the scale only - for 100% increase. The Barbados Union of Teachers and the Barbados Secondary Teachers Union submitted a proposal for 88% increase. The Barbados Workers' Union submission was 62% increase.

In 1978 the NUPW submitted a proposal for 60.6% increase, still at the bottom, the BUT 44%, the BWU 35%.

In 1980, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the NUPW submitted a proposal of 50% increase. The BUT did not submit a proposal. The BWU submitted a proposal at the bottom for 45%.

In 1982 the pattern continued - 39.4% by the NUPW, 40% by the BUT, 25% by the BWU.

In 1984 the NUPW submitted at the bottom 26%, the BUT 35%, the BWU submitted 22% proposal.

In 1986 the NUPW submitted a proposal for 25% increase. The BUT submitted a proposal for 27% increase. The BWU submitted a proposal at the time when the Barbados Labour Party was still the administration, and we were not clairvoyant, for. 18% increase.

The point I am being very careful to make, Sir, if those people who wish to stretch honesty, of course, none in this Honourable House, if it were examined, one would recognize that throughout the period when the Barbados Labour Party was the Government of this country, the Barbados Workers' Union was consistent in submitting a proposal that was lower than the proposals of the other major unions.

Now, one has to ask oneself what was at the back of that submission? What prompted the proposal? Was there then an appearance of collusion between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Barbados Labour Party? 9.00p.m.

Aside.

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: When in the eyes of many people the Barbados Workers' Union seemed to have taken the Barbados Labour Party under its wing when there were many people clamouring for strikes and the Barbados Workers' Union said we would not strike, was there a suggestion of collusion?

Why then in this time because some people are of the view that impressions are better than facts, as I am satisfied the Member for St. Peter is of that view, why then do we have, Sir, to have this suggestion of collusion?

The hard, cold facts of the matter are that when the Barbados Workers' Union negotiates a contract, it submits a proposal from a position of careful research, a position which it feels it can defend before the public, in this Honourable Chamber or anywhere else, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

We will not submit a proposal purely because we may have wanted in 1976 to see some changes take place. We would not have then in a position where there was an increase in the cost of living of 50%, advise anybody to submit a proposal of 100% increase. We endeavour to put a position which any employer, be he private sector or public sector, would recognize as being fair and reasonable. I want to start from that position. I am only sorry that the Member who just spoke may not be able to take the lesson from a little lecture which I hope would get across to him. I would wish to save him from himself in the future.

One important suggestion which he wanted to make a big "to-do" about has to do with the size of the increase which there was at certain times in the past, during the regime, for example, of the Barbados Labour Party.

I wish to submit to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the size of an increase in wages and salaries is a function of the movement in the cost of living over the period that is being historically reviewed. If there is a period that is being reviewed where there is no cost of living movement at all then I submit to you that when a salaries review is being conducted, the level of increase in wages and salaries is likely to be much smaller than it would have been in a situation where there was a great increase.

Consequently, we have been able to find that, in 1986, because there was not a major increase in cost of living, there was at the bottom a 9% increase in wages and salaries, whereas in 1976 there was a 35% increase in wages and salaries at the very bottom. It was because of the size of the cost of living movement. I am sure, Sir, that anybody who has come into the slightest contact with economic principles would accept that as a fact that is irrefutable and beyond discussion.

In the negotiations we are currently reviewing, the 1986-88 period, the movement of the cost of living for that period was 5.3%. Again that is known to all and to sundry. There is no point anybody trying to make that information anything but what it is, a movement in the cost of living of 5.3%.

The negotiations on this occasion, as well as the negotiations in 1986, were being conducted in circumstances where the union, meaning the Barbados Workers' Union, I dare not speak for any other, where the Barbados Workers' Union and, I daresay, the Government of the day had to recognise that there had been a climate of feeling in this country led by some governors that there was an intellectual body that should so establish itself that the increases which should be given to people should be inversed. That is to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that at the level of a Governor of a Central Bank, purely for example, an increase may be 30% but at the level of a maid, the said increase for the said period should be 10%. It was that kind of climate, led by the Barbados Labour Party ,.that had taken over this country.

Aside. .

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: Led by some members of the Barbados Labour Party. I correct myself, Sir.

Asides.

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am hearing *sotto voce,* and I do not always hear *sotto voce* comments that is not true. I have corrected it to the extent that I am saying some members of the Barbados Labour Party. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition may not have been of that ilk but that has been the position which we had to sit down and hear coming from the leadership of the Barbados Labour Party when we met at the highest levels. I make no apology for saying that, even though the current Leader of the Barbados Labour Party may feel some sense of injury.

Now given that position, Sir, one has to understand that negotiations were never going to be easy, either in 1986 or in 1988. I have gone on record, Sir, as complimenting Prime Minister St. John when he was Prime Minister for the approach he took in the matter of negotiations. It is now a matter of record. I have always gone on record, Sir, as being dissatisfied with the protractedness of these negotiations and the preceding ones. I will also take the view that it is absolutely necessary that negotiations are so conducted on any future occasion that we endeavour to obviate this problem of protractedness. That can easily be done if the machinery is put in place so that we set ourselves a target that, by end of May, or the beginning of June, we ought to be able to reach agreement provided that people approach negotiations in a meaningful manner that suggests that negotiations can be resolved, which of course, Mr. Deputy Speaker, raises the question.

What is it that governs collective bargaining? Secondly, what determines a resolution in those collective bargaining exercises? Thirdly, who can settle in the public sector? I suggest to you, Sir, that collective bargaining is governed first of all, and foremost, by respect of the parties for each other, and respect of the parties for themselves. If an organisation is notable to exercise a sufficient control itself and a sufficient image to make somebody else respect it, I suggest to you, Sir, that the exercise will not be collective bargaining. I would not wish to pursue this in the current forum any .further because I would not wish to give the impression of not being an admirer of all trade unions in this country.

Aside.

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: Secondly, Sir, there must be respect by the parties for information that is given. The information that is given has got to be information that is honest and is respected and respectable and is beyond the suggestion of being incorrect or otherwise unsatisfactory.

Thirdly, Sir, there has got to be a position of good faith. There has to be an understanding that when a position is given the word of the speaker is the bond of the speaker. I shall have to come back to that later on, Sir.

Then the question is, well what determines a resolution? 9.10p.m.

I am suggesting to you that there are several factors which determines a resolution. Time will not permit me to treat them all. But two important considerations I want to leave with you, Sir. One has to do with the movement in the cost of living. Another one has to do with the direction of the membership. I would suggest to you, Sir, that, in the circumstances in which we are speaking, these are going to be important considerations, especially when one looks at those considerations against the third question, the question of who can settle.

I am suggesting to you that, in the context of Barbados, any of the major trade unions can settle. The underlying consideration, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is not the number of members, but whether there is effectiveness of the members. You can have a work force of 500 people. You could have 400 of those people unionised and yet they may not effectively be able to exercise a sufficient power relationship with that employer so as to cause that employer to want to meet with them and to treat with them.

I go beyond that to say, Sir, that...

Asides.

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: I am coming back to it some more .....that the Barbados Union of Teachers with 1,600 members could easily have reached agreement, the National Union of Public Workers could have easily reach agreement with 7,000 claimed and the Barbados Workers Union with some 6,500 and not 800, Sir, we are giving 500 to them, with that number of claimed members, we could easily reach an agreement as well. But one has to go beyond that to understand the significance of Barbados Workers' Union involvement in Public Service negotiations.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, public sector negotiations influence or, are in turn influenced by what happens in the wider community. Anyone who does not understand that does not understand Barbados. When there is a settlement in the public sector negotiations, the very next day employees at all levels are going to point to that agreement and say this is what there is. It works the other way as well. When one goes to meet the Government negotiators, they for their part will say this is what is happening in the private sector. Why would you want to demand more from us?

The Barbados Workers' Union, in addition to having 6,500 public sector workers including statutory boards - and as the 25,000 members in the Public Service includes statutory boards and the statutory boards are "going to get the same level, there is no point isolating Central Government from statutory boards as that would be an exercise which would not be honest and everybody in this Honourable Chamber, Sir, is very honest - in addition to that, the Barbados Workers' Union has as its membership claims another 23,500 people for a total membership of 30,000. The Barbados Workers' Union, in short, is by far the most far reaching influential negotiating organisation in this country. Can this organisation be in a position where it accepts the suggestion that it must not be central in any collective bargaining exercise in this country? Well, if there is anybody who wants to believe that and who hopes to put this organisation in that position, that person would have another thought coming.

The Barbados Workers' Union in short, Sir, has more than a passing interest in all negotiations in Barbados - private sector, public sector, whatever sector it is, Sir. In good times that organisation and any other trade union that understands the exercise will try to get levels in salaries and wages higher than the going levels and will try to set new platforms. In difficult times it may be necessary for this organisation and, indeed, for any others to try to get the employer, in this case the Government, to a level no less favourable than the general levels. That was the basis for the negotiations by the BWU and so far as we understand for other organisations. The argument that the Barbados Workers' Union took is that the workers in Barbados are looking towards increases at a time that is difficult and in these difficult times the organisation was concerned with making sure that the levels were levels which were no less favourable.

The Honourable Member for St. Peter wanted to make the point that the Barbados Workers' Union, whereas it was prepared to get higher increases in the private sector, was prepared to throw in the sponge early and accept lesser increases in the public sector. With your kind permission, Sir, I wish to give you an indication of the levels of settlement in 1988.1 will not call all the settlements. There are more than 50 of them, Sir. So my organisers and my colleagues know what collective bargaining is all about. What we have forgotten some people have not learnt yet.

The Transport Board was 8% and 2%. Even the Minister of Transport and Works will accept that those were very rough negotiations and that there was no quarter asked and none given. But there is a suggestion of collusion.

The Barbados Telephone Company, a very prosperous company. That no one can deny, a 3 year contract in the first 2 years 7*/2% plus 3%. There was an extra 4% in the third year, but I mentioned a 2 year level so we can make comparisons.

BET, Sir, nobody questions the wealth and prosperity of the BET-7% and 3%.

British Airways - 7% and 3%, Sir. The CBC was a statutory board and still is - 7% and 2%. C. O. Williams -1 would think that that is a company we can use, 8% and 3% for 2 years.

The Lumber group of companies - 8% and 3%. The Shell Antilles Gas people, Sir, 8% and 2% in the second year. The Barbados Light and Power Company - they were very pleased with the give-aways in 1986 - 8% and 4% plus 4% for 3 years. That is 16% over 3 years, average a 5 Vs%, 8 plus 4 plus 4. BWIA - a 3 year agreement of 6% as a lump sum payment but really carrying 7% and 3% over the 3 year period. Berger Paints, doing well but 7 *1/2%* and 2 V2% and that, Sir, is the general level. There are some which are not so good. There are some 2 or 3 that are better. The Cigarette people got 9% and the Oil people got 9% as part of a 3 year agreement effective from April 1988.

That is the level of settlement we were talking about, an average, Sir, of 8% to some and in many cases the 8% and 2% gives you an average of 9. The Barbados Workers' Union's position was that there should be a settlement no less favourable than the going level and the membership, the workers who matter, are the people who dictate. There are a number of people who would speak to how the Barbados Workers' Union functions. 9:20 p.m.

I want to say that we should make the point, although we do not know the declared membership yet, but if we hear from the Leader of the NDP they are having some members, I believe that at this stage we can say that we have within the rank and file of the Barbados Workers' Union members of the Barbados Labour Party, members of the National Democratic Party, members of the Workers Party of Barbados, members of the Democratic Labour Party, members from the PPM Party, members of the Party in power. In short, Sir, the Barbados Workers' Union has members from all about, and at the level of Executive Council those members, except for the last two, in my estimation represent -1 believe that the NDP might even be represented at this level - within that pluralism a unity of purpose that where it comes to the needs of the workers they do not see party lines.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition and his predecessors in that office will know that, when we have dealt with the Barbados Port, most of the leadership within that part of the Union had been very strong Barbados Labour Party people, yet when they have come to deal with matters of the Port they have never seen party, they have always seen their Trade Union. We have a very serious position to understand, and it is that the workers' rights are always made paramount and predominant and that where Trade Union means the Barbados Workers' Union, the Barbados Workers' Union has no apology to make for it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Two minutes.

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: It was not the Barbados Workers' Union that had drinks up in Bay Street celebrating any victory last week, so if the General Secretary of any other Union had drinks and then could not consummate that marriage, do not blame the Barbados Workers' Union.

Aside.

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: At Government Headquarters for that agreement. When one comes to understand why that is so - perhaps we will understand very shortly, because in the fullness of time all these things will come out, Sir.

Anybody at all is able to talk, but when it comes to reaching a settlement a lot of people do not know how to reach a settlement, and that is a fundamental problem in the collective bargaining exercise. Any Union has to understand that in the event of its wanting to reach a settlement it has one or two things it can use. It can use the labour power it has to press for the demands that it wants, or by an exercise of industrial maturity it can enter into concessionary bargaining.

When the NUPW reached agreement with the previous administration the Barbados Workers' Union was mature enough, while not agreeing to anything inauspicious with the Prime Minister of the day, to enter into an agreement which gave a settlement without causing confusion in Barbados. Out of that the Barbados Workers' Union got the Tom Adams administration to agree to a reclassiflcation of the artisans of Barbados. It was because of that maturity. So in essence I am saying to you, Sir, that collective bargaining is not the only part of the wages settlement. There are other elements of collective bargaining to be studied, and anybody who wants to bargain collectively has to understand that the bargain is bigger than the wage.

I would suggest humbly that, in the circumstances we are looking at, we have the unfortunate problem that the drinks were too many and they came too soon.

Applause.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are debating what I think is a question dealing more with principle and integrity than getting into all the mechanics of processes that have to be gone through, because as an

Honourable Member on that side indicated to me earlier, he thinks the process is wrong anyhow. I do not know a lot about the processes and I am not going to spend any, time dealing with them as such. Certainly persons who know a lot more about it, like the Honourable Member who just took his seat for whom I have a lot of respect in these matters, have explained over and over how it works, whether it is working right or not. I do not really want to get into that.

He explained how it works, and certainly the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central did a good job in an area in which he obviously would be well versed, but the question I would rather deal with would be a few of the areas I think can be dealt with under the broad heading of principle and integrity. I hear a few Honourable Members sucking their teeth.

I am saying, Sir, that we are talking here on one hand we hear the Democratic Labour Party continuing to talk about these kinds of things, they continue to talk about dealing with and representing persons at the lowest level in the society. They continue to talk a lot of things about the masses of working class people whom they claim to defend, and then, as they have done in other areas, comes the normal reversal.

I have heard Honourable Members on that side speak of the kind of funding that is necessary to take care of those persons in the Z.31 to Z.38 bracket as being negligible. If, Sir, that is so, and I made it clear that I am not going to get into the whole area of how that affects other things, I have not heard enough argument to satisfy me that that is what we are dealing with at all. I do not believe money is the problem. If that is so negligible, why are we here questioning and arguing about, or debating, some money for people like general workers, cooks, watchmen, maids and road menders? If this Democratic Labour Party speaks of defending these kinds of people and assisting these kinds of people, then why is it a problem to settle at that level? It did not seem to be a problem higher up.

I also heard the Honourable Prime Minister say in his contribution to the debate that the decision was made in the national interest. I am not satisfied that he has explained that, at least not in my mind, satisfactorily, because if a decision is made in the national interest and it only affects adversely those people at the lower end, I am still at a loss as to what is the national interest

I believe we are dealing with a question of what is reasonable and what is just. That is why I do not see it necessary for me to stand up and speak of all the things that all the other Members have already covered, but rather to speak of what I see gave birth to the National Democratic Party, this constant reversal.

Laughter.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I heard some Members laugh, but as I said before integrity, principle and things of that nature are strange to those people.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You do not mean Members of this House.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: No, I mean certain members of the Democratic Labour Party.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Oh, you do not mean Members of this House.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: No, Sir.

Asides.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I was born and raised in integrity, so that is no problem. One of the things the Prime Minister also said in his speech and I hope that unlike some of the things that have been reversed by the Democratic Labour Party lie would keep his word on this one, is that he will start the process early next time around. 9.30p.m.

I think one of the problems was that the time lapse between when the Government was advised and when the actual process started was a bit long, and could be part of the genesis of the problem.

Sir, I am a little concerned, to put it mildly, when we come into this Honourable Chamber and seek to make certain insinuations sometimes by what we say. I believe that it is very important to this country, to the social development of Barbados and certainly to the political development of this country to remember that the trade union movement has played a significant role, continues to play a significant role, and I believe will continue to play a significant role in the social and political development of Barbados. It is no secret that both of the two political parties, that is, the Barbados Labour Party and the Democratic Labour Party were founded by people who were heavily involved in the trade union movement, and I find it rather strange and rather upsetting, Sir, that an Honourable Member on that side, the Honourable Member for St. Philip South, would want to insinuate that, when a senior member of a trade union organisation seeks political office, he would want to term that person as a political prostitute, because when he does that, Sir, he is including a number of rather distinguished honourable persons.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, the Honourable Member is misleading the House. The Honourable Member I believe must have been in his place when the Honourable Member to whom he is attributing these remarks denied making that statement. The Honourable Member is not in his place and that is the reason I am rising and not for any other reason. As Leader of the House I think I have the right to speak on this

particular matter. The Honourable Member must have been in his*place when the Honourable Member for St. Peter attempted to so construe the remarks of the Honourable Member for St. Philip South and he said there and then that was not what he said and that is not what he meant. I believe the Honourable Member for the City was in his place when that was said on a point of elucidation. So if the Honourable Member for the City is now coming to say the same thing all over again, he is misleading the House. That is my submission.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, I was sitting here when the Honourable Member for St. Philip South spoke and that is what he said.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Philip South said he did not say so and subsequent to that he said what he meant. I do not think the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was in his place at that particular time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We had the matter clarified on a subsequent occasion and I think we should not try to belabour the point. The Honourable Member for the City would no doubt want to clarify or withdraw those remarks.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is my opinion that the Honourable Member for St. Philip South seems to have serious difficulty with anyone holding high office in a trade union movement offering himself for political office.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: On a point of order, that is not what the Honourable Member for St. Philip South said. He cannot decide what he should say or what he meant to have said. He has to quote him.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let us not stress the point. Let the Honourable Member continue, please.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Philip South in his usual bull in the china shop tradition went on to talk about persons seeking office. I know he was trying to identify an individual. He said the General Secretary of the NUPW. I understood him to be referring to the office of General Secretary.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: On a point of order, I particularly said that the office of General Secretary of a particular union seems to attract persons who like to . prostitute themselves politically. I never called any person's name. I said that the office seems to attract such persons.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Honourable Member has just said carefully what he said.

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please! I would like to have one Honourable Member address the Chair at a time. The Honourable Member for the City may continue.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, just now the Honourable Member for St. Philip South got up and admitted wnat I said was true. He said the person holding the office as General Secretary of that union. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you will go back and check his speech, you will see he was speaking of the NUPW at the time. When the Honourable Member for St. Thomas called him Rambo, he seems to believe it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: He did not call him that when I was here.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sure that he did not call him so when you were there, but he did so on previous occasions.

We are not here, Sir, as the Honourable Member was trying to indicate to me to score any runs. That is not my job in here. I do not see it as that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the Honourable Member proceeds, I would just like Honourable Members to give the Honourable Member for the City an opportunity to make his contribution. I think he has something to say and perhaps we should give him an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I made it clear when I started to make a few remarks that I am not getting into the mechanics of this area, but I wanted to make a few points really on what I felt was a sad lack of principle and integrity, as I said before. The Honourable Member who is just making an aside was nor in his seat, but obviously that was part of the reason fcr the birth of the NDP. He would understand that one. 9.40 p.m.

My difficulty then, just to sum up, Sir, was that when the Honourable Member for St. Philip South makes these kinds of statements, it is something that bothers me and should bother most thinking Barbadians. Apart from the fact that great and honourable Barbadians, present and past, persons like the President of the Senate, Sir, the 3 Honourable Members in this Chamber sought and even gained political office, I then could see nothing wrong with anyone else, be he the General Secretary of the NUPW or any union, seeking political office in Barbados.

My real fear is that if we continue on a path like this, especially when you are the governing party, and if the governing party w.ould continue on a path like this, we would probably undo a lot of the hard work that was done by those who went before the present trade union leaders, hard work in terms of social development and political development in Barbados.

What I am saying is ihat if that path is continued on, there is going to be a kind of divisiveness which has already started, which I believe can only do serious harm and damage to this country of ours.

So, Sir, my contribution, which is short, is to appeal really to those Honourable Members on that side to avoid getting carried away in terms of what they say about various groups who are not small groups and who make a serious contribution.

I do not only caution them because they can run the risk of losing a greater number of members than they are already losing as a party, but because they will run the risk of further dividing this country of ours which they accused the Barbados Labour Party when in Government of having done. It is sad to see that they will take now the same path which they accused the Barbados Labour Party of taking in the 1970s.

At this point, Sir, I am much obliged to you.

Hon, C. V. WALKER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will probably first like to say that, as I look, I am the only one on this front bench who has never had the opportunity to make a contribution to salaries debates. However, I realise that our time may be short, Sir, I have taken several notes and most of the things that I wanted to say probably might have been said before but there are 3 specific areas that I would like to address.

Now, we have heard, starting this morning from other Members on the other side, that the unions are not satisfied with the results of the negotiations but yet, at the same time, we are told that they were the longest negotiations ever held.

We are also told, and we heard read into the records of this Honourable Chamber, Mr. Deputy Speaker, letters going back and forth between the negotiating team for the Government as well as the negotiator for the NUPW. One specific area as it indirectly or directly relates to the Ministry for which I have responsibility, had to do with the question of the School Meals Servers, now operating as part-time workers, and with a clear understanding that they would be given the right to be full-time employees effective April 1,1989.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, not only was it a clear understanding between the Government and the union that this was going to come about, but, indeed, to the School Meals Servers themselves who had made representation because they were concerned as to the changes within their daily activities whether or not they would have to be changing their own lifestyles, if you will. So it was clear and it is, indeed clear to the School Meals Servers that this is part of a deal. I put it to this Honourable House that not only was it part of a deal but in the Ministry of Education we intend to implement that as part of the policy in April next, 1989.

We are talking of about 325 people. A few of us might have thought that we are talking of pure appointments. That is not the real case. There are 275 established and 51 who are uitestablished so we are not talking about appointments. They are working. We are talking about a change of status and that has to be very clear. They are being moved effectively from part-time to full-time-people moving to the Z.38 scale.

While I am on that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in terms of movement, earlier today I have had the occasion to be speaking to a Member from the other side. One would think that Honourable Members are totally *au fait* with what is really happening in the society.

There seems to be dialogue going along about who is making what, in the level of individual who is representing whom, but there has to be some clear understanding. I can say I feel free to speak because this is the first time I am speaking on this issue. There has to be the clear understanding that there are unusual circumstances, inadequacies and when we heard earlier that there would have to be some adjustment, there are areas which have to be adjusted throughout the Government Service.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us talk a little about another area where I have some responsibility, the area of teachers. We are told that the teachers have never settled.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if this is a fact and, indeed, from all records it seems to be a fact, the teachers, the BUT, we have clearly to understand that if this is so we cannot then, in the same breath, place the teachers at the same level as we are placing a maid because the salary levels are completely different.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, a teacher with "O" levels starting in 1989 will earn between $13 044 and $18 864 a year and a graduate teacher who comes into the system will earn $24 132 up to scales of $34 548. If we were to go back to the teacher entering with "O" levels, who having moved through the system and become a qualified teacher, that qualified teacher will earn some $19 992 a year to $28 152. 9.50p.m.

If that qualified teacher moves on to the next level to become a Senior Teacher, that teacher will move from $28 152 to $29 760.

Now why did I raise that, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I raised it to point out this. I do not support, and I heard a comment made by an Honourable Member on the other side, I do not support the fact, the public comment if you will, that teachers only work 39 weeks out of a year. Teachers do not get vacation and we have to accept that.

Teachers really do not get vacation. The children get vacation. Teachers are called upon during the vacation period to attend courses, to attend classes for additional training. I am speaking from personal experience. I cannot state that I agree with the public that the teachers have that special privilege because they only work 39 weeks. However, I will say that public opinion may very well work against them because it is conceived that they only work for 39 weeks. Indeed when that is further compounded by the frequent meetings which are viewed by the public again as work stoppages, that may work against them. I will defend them to the point that they do not work only 39 weeks a year.

Aside.

Hon. C. V. WALKER: Now, I would not even address that I have not even heard that, because you will have to deal with .... I heard someone being sued for that. But that is another point.

Laughter.

Aside.

Hon. C. V. WALKER: No, far from it. We are told, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the increase for this year 1988-89 will be some $30 million. We are also told Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the increase for 1989-90 will be another $40 million.

Aside.

Hon. C. V. WALKER: It will be $40 million in 1989-90. In terms of our operation, since we operate within a Financial Year, it is $30 million for this year and then it is $40 million for next year. So it has to be another $40 million. It is not going to be the same $30 million. Thirty million dollars plus forty million dollars equals seventy million dollars. That means that if we do not pay the $30 million in this year 1988-89, we will have to look for $70 million in the Financial Year 1989-1990. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if we have to look for the extra $30 million in 1989-90 we will have to find that money because it is a statutory payment. We will either have to find some way of raising revenue, current revenue to pay that extra $30 million. It is important therefore then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, despite the comments we heard about coming to settle this issue, notwithstanding the fact that there were numerous negotiations, it is important therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we settle this in 1988-89 so that we will not have to impose any kind of taxes or what have you to raise the revenue for that $30 million and also $40 million in 1989-90.

That is all I have to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Thank you. I am obliged to you, Sir.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Stir, on a point of order, the Minister of Education is not educating me. I do not understand what he is saying, Sir. '

Laughter.

Aside.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think it is because you have difficulty in understanding.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Understanding him.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Oh, I see. The question is -Sorry.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have had a very long Debate on this matter, on this particular Resolution that is before us and I do not propose to detain the House much longer on it. But there are just •one or two issues which I should like to clarify.

There are Rules in this Chamber which refer to the kinds of imputations which one should make about Members. Some comments have steered quite close although the Rules themselves have not been infringed. If they had been infringed, I know, Sir, that you would have dealt with those matters. But there have been comments which seemed to suggest, or suggested, comments which stated openly that the Prime Minister must have been unprincipled and that his credibility is on the line and comments to that effect.

I should just like to clarify that position for purposes of the record. There is no credibility on the line here. I stated a principle that the process of collective bargaining for me and for my Government is one in which we believe. I have been urged from time to time to intervene in the process of negotiations and particularly during the month of December. I indicated that in my judgment, I did not believe in that course and I did not intend to intervene in that particular process but that I would give the process some further time to work itself out. We gave further opportunity for the negotiating process to take place.

At this particular time we have come to the judgment as the Democratic Labour Party Government that the time had come for the negotiations to come to an end because there was no hope of these negotiations coming to an end, in our judgment, in a reasonable time within the current Financial Year.

If, as the Barbados Labour Party Opposition has been arguing, there is a small difference, why has there been all of this holding out, from June last year right through until this particular time? Then at this last moment when unions and associations, certain unions and associations had indicated some general agreement, some more specific,

with the offer from the Government you still have other unions taking positions that they are not agreeing.

We had to come to the conclusion that the divisions and other interests were getting in the way of the settlement. I have heard a lot of protest against statements made from Members over here and a lot of protest about statements made by the Member for St. Philip South. I think they doth protest too much. When there is all of this defence, it means to me -1 certainly come to the conclusion - that the statements made by the Member for St. Philip South are touching the bone, and therefore the protest and the defence are specific and directly related to some particular association the fruition of which no doubt we will see in due course.

But let me say this much, that this particular Resolution before us now is after a process, a long process of negotiation and discussion between the negotiating team of the Government and the negotiators of the various unions. We have agreement among some of the unions and associations but not all of them. It is not unique in this country. It is not novel. The Barbados Labour Party Government had to deal with such situations and the Democratic Labour Party Government is now dealing with that particular situation. We have to exercise our judgment. 10.00 p.m.

Now at one time we had all kinds of projections and prognostications as to what would result from the way that the public finances of this country were being conducted, all kinds of dire consequences about what would happen, and now that those proposals have worked and are on target up to this particular time, bearing in mind that I said that no provision has been made for the salary increases, I am saying that the predictions which I made in the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals are to this date on track. Instead of getting up and saying that the Minister of Finance has been sound in his analysis of the economy and in his projections for the economy and that they are working to date, they say now that we have a lot of money when their predictions were that we would have no money.

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Why did you not get up and say that the economy is working? I do not pay any kind of attention to any talk about over-taxing in an economy in which we have started out with a deficit on Current Account and we have to borrow for the Capital Account. How can you over-tax in that particular way when we are not making any provision for that? But I am not getting into that. I will deal with that particular argument at another time. What I am saying is this.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Let us hear one Honourable Member at a time please.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: This is the point that I am making. I am making this particular point that you get the Leader of the Opposition getting up - Leader of the Opposition *pro tern* - that we can pay the money because of a surcharge, and at the same time saying that the surcharge has to come off in March. If the surcharge has to come off in March and you are saying that we can pay because of the surcharge, I wonder what kind of argument you are really advancing. It does not make sense because if the basis for the payment is a surcharge and that is coming to an end on March 31st, as I said in my Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals, it is false to construct an argument that we can pay. It is not any small amount of money that we are talking about. This settlement, this particular determination, the cost of the payments for wages and salaries and the other payroll costs, amount to some $450 million that we have to provide in one financial year. This $450 million is the amount of money that is provided by this country on the wages and salaries and related costs.

We, therefore, have as a result of these measures to find an additional $30 million for the year 1988-89 and the year 1989-90 it will be $40 million estimated. Now we can get up and say you can look for an additional $3 million or an additional $4 million. The Opposition can have the luxury of saying that. As a Government and as a responsible Government we have to make sure that the amount of money that we have to find to meet those costs is within the capabilities of the country and that undue burdens are not imposed upon the country. We have to ensure also that the other areas of the public finances and of the economy can be stimulated in order to give the necessary production for a buoyant economy to take place.

I am satisfied, Sir, that after having heard the arguments on both sides of this Chamber I have appealed for support for the measures. The Opposition has said that they are not going to support the measures. We are going to make the provisions for the public servants of this country. We are going to take up in good faith all of the issues flowing out of this determination and the other matters that might be outstanding in the industrial relations climate as far as the Public Service is concerned.

We have started already on the reclassification. We fulfilled our promise in respect of the removal of the Z39 Scale and we have implemented our proposals in respect of training for the public servants of this country. Our record in respect of the Public Service is an outstanding record and it is a cheap political argument to try to give the impression that this is a Government that is against the lower paid workers in the Public Service. That is a cheap political argument of no validity whatsoever and our actions as a party and as a Government from the time that we were given the mandate to run this country in 1986 when those earning in the lower brackets up to $15,000 were removed from the payment of Income Tax itself wouM demonstrate that we are pro-workers in this country and pro the lower

paid workers in this country. How you can stand the argument on its head is really an amazing thing. 10.10p.m.

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Do you know who murdered the country with consumption taxes? It was your friend.

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Not me.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Was that a private conversation?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, Sir. I am asking the Honourable Prime Minister if he did not impose $70 million in consumption taxes. You are offended with me for

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: You check Tom Adams.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Tom? Tom is up there lying down.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: That is why I tell you go and check him.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take it that you are still addressing the Chair.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am sorry, Sir. He wants to say that you are up there sitting down, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My name is not Tom. Hon.

L. E. SANDIFORD: He is *trying* to name you, Sir.

Laughter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please continue.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Anyhow, Sir, I have made the point. This is a Government whose actions are taken in the interest of the public workers of this country. It is a Government whose actions are taken in favour of those persons who may be disadvantaged and under-privileged. We do not have to protest and advance arguments in that particular regard. Our record from the 1960's onwards is full testimony of that and I am happy, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to commend this Resolution to this Honourable Chamber.

The question that the Resolution do now pass[1] was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon. L. E. Sandiford, Hon. P. M. Greaves, Hon. B. M. Taitt, Hon. M. A. King, Hon. E. E. Greaves, Hon. W. O. Franklin, Hon. H. A. Blackman, Hon. N. K. Simmons, Hon. W. W. Hall, Hon. Dr. D. G. Blackman, Hon. C. V. Walker, Mr. L. L. Brathwaite, Mr. C. LeR. Trotman, Mr. R. L. Morris, Dr. E. A. Simmons, Mr. C. A. Neblett, Mrs. M. Barker-Welch and Mr. D. J. H. Thompson - 18

Noes: Hon. H. deB. Forde, Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, Mr. O. S. Arthur, Dr. R. C. Haynes, Mr. R. P. Byer, Mr. P. J. M. Miller and Mr. E. Bourne - 7

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I recommit Government Notices.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are two Notices of which I should like to give notice relating to the same matters we have been discussing.

A resolution to increase the salary of the Governor-General with effect from 1st April, 1988 and 1st April, 1989, and the duty allowance with effect from 1st April, 1988.

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

It is the intention, Sir, with leave to do these two matters in all their stages during this sitting.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move that the Bill to amend the Judges Remuneration and Pensions Act be now read the first time.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is a matter to be tidied up in Committee of Supply. For that reason I move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair

and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee of Supply. 10.20 p.m.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, you will recall that the House in Committee of Supply passed a Resolution for the sum of $344 940 but you were not requested to report the passing of that one Resolution in Committee of Supply. It is important, Sir, that this matter be concluded and I am now moving that Your Honour report the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have been meeting for a long time. There are a number of matters yet to be done and concluded, and I do not think that we can get any further today. I therefore move that this sitting be suspended until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, Wednesday, 8th February, 1989.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 10.24 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION Mr. SPEAKER: This

sitting is resumed. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Government Business.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (TEACHERS) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1989

Order No. 3 was called - to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1989.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, the general principles which we have applied to persons in the Civil Service generally apply also to those in the special categories of teachers who fall to be paid either through grants to the statutory bodies or who may be paid- on account of their work with the Ministry of Education and Culture. I do not think that we wish to go through the protracted arguments again. Inasmuch as we had a full debate on the principles relating to the salaries revision, I would only wish to stress that the Government has been negotiating in very good faith on these matters, but successive Governments have found it very difficult to come to any conclusion with the Barbados Union of Teachers. Such agreement has come in all of the history of these negotiations during the 1970s and 1980s on only one occasion as far as the Barbados Union of Teachers is concerned. So in terms of trying to reach an agreement, I think the judgment would have to be on the side of those who conclude that it would have been impossible to reach a settlement with the Barbados Union of Teachers on these matters.

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

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

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is one of several Resolutions we have, to deal with today following upon the general Resolution yesterday, but I think that an opportunity is provided for us to make some comments in relation, specifically, to the problem in the negotiations with the teachers and, as well, to look perhaps at the larger difficulties that have been thrown up in these negotiations.

If I understand it, the Barbados Workers' Union was able to agree with the Government a few weeks or a few months ago. The NUPW has not been able to agree and they represent a considerable body of public workers in the country. The Barbados Union of Teachers has not been able to agree and that Union also represents a vast number of the total number of teachers. But the BSTU, like the minority that the Barbados Workers' Union was in all of that, has been able to agree and the Headteachers and so on.

What concerns me is the question of the future of trade unionism in Barbados, having regard to certain questions that were raised yesterday. I am not going to retrace those steps or rehash those arguments about perceptions of conflicts of interest and so on. Those were dealt with yesterday from this side and responded to particularly by the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central.

We in the Barbados Labour Party, not only a party but a movement of 50 years must be concerned about the state of trade unionism in Barbados, well recognising that it was the founder leaders of this movement who had the courage

and the foresight in the rough days of the late thirties to give birth to trade unionism in Barbados, so that there could be an organisation to work actively on behalf of the working class in this country. So well recognising our pivotal role and the close association and links between the Barbados Labour Party and the Barbados Workers' Union, we cannot, either in principle or political expediency be anti-worker or anti-union. I think it behoves us from time to time, indeed even though the relationship with the BWU may not be as close now as it was prior to the departure of Sir Frank Walcott, when he left the Barbados Labour Party, it is incumbent upon us as a party and a movement that was born out of an interest for the working class to ensure that trade unionism in Barbados thrives rather than falters. We are concerned when we hear members of the general public questioning the commitment of members of the Union to the cause of the workers. 12.10p.m.

I am concerned that the leadership of the NUPW and the BUT, at a sensitive time of negotiations, can appear to the public to be in a state of disarray. They cannot say that about the BWU. They really cannot say that. Their experience and the quality of their leadership has ensured that they have maintained a course of reasonableness.

During the time that we were in Government, 1976-1986,1 believe, looking at the matter objectively - I know you have little political angles to push from time to time - as Barbadians, not now as politicians, standing back and looking at the role of the Barbados Workers' Union from 1937 and their operation in the public domain promoting the public interest of workers, I think we would have to concede that they have played a role of agitation on behalf of the workers, militating to attain that fine balance that allowed the agitation to be reasonable and responsible. I believe, that when looked at objectively and I say dispassionately, employers in the private sector and the Government as employers in the public sector would have to say that the Barbados Workers' Union has been consistent.

I say it is distressing that there appear to be fractures in the leadership of the NUPW and the BUT. The Romans used to speak of divide and rule but it would be easy to try and create fractures of self interest. I do not believe anybody has deliberately been promoting these fractures in the leadership of these two unions.

There are, of course, admittedly problems in terms of political allegiance both in the NUPW and the BUT. The leaders of these unions, I think, must understand and appreciate that their own personal, political sympathies and interests must be subsumed to the largest interest, that is, representation of the general membership. I am going to come down to be specific but I am talking at the moment of the broad parameters of the unions.

Leaders of unions will have to see themselves first as leaders of unions representing a membership Uiat supports a cross-section of political opinion of this country. If they see themselves as only representating and promoting the interest of a particular political party, then from time to time, as political parties change from here to there and assume the roles of Government and Opposition, the credibility of those unions is going to be called into question to the point where the membership of the unions is going to become cynical.

I do not believe that we need any more cynicism in our public affairs. There is cynicism about politicians among the general public. If we have this now in each organisation that represents thousands of persons, what is going to happen to the cohesiveness that we are looking for in our society? These are groups that all form part and parcel of the total society and the leadership of these groups and societies must, therefore, be guided by principles more lofty than the mere promotion of partisan political interest.

In the heat of negotiations and at a point where the BUT is saying that it was in a position of reasonableness in the negotiations with Government and what they were putting up was generous, all of a sudden the president of that union resigns or ducks out of the leadership amidst accusations of his political alignment with the Minister of Education.

Hon. C. V. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I said amidst accusations of his alignment. What are you going to jump up to? Is he a campaign manager to you? I was very careful how I chose my words in case of any.....

Hon. C. V. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

The Honourable Member is still trying to read into the records that the President was a campaign manager for me. I say to this Honourable House that he is misleading the House and the gentleman referred to was never my campaign manager.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: We now have that on the record. The Minister of Education rose like what was bait to a mullet fish. But, anyhow, I said that I am glad for his denial that there was no close political affiliation or alignment such as campaign manager. I am glad for that denial. 12.20 p.m.

But there has been talk in the public domain. The membership of the union, I am advised, felt very deserted

and let down when suddenly, a former President of the BUT resigned and left the total membership in the lurch.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Shop Hill? I know Shop Hill very well, Sir. But now we have an interim President...

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes..... threatening, according to this morning's report, that after today's debate further action will be taken.

I understand, Sir, that there is great polarization in that union. The only point I am concerned to make is that if the leadership of the Barbados Union of Teachers is seen to be in disarray, then no leadership is being offered to the membership. We have to be careful, even though we have just gone out of carnival time, that the place does not turn Ole Mas. In the NUPW, to me, everybody can do what they like. If unions are not in control, you know the point that has to be made, Sir, is that we will see a proliferation of wild-cat strikes that can only cause instability in the industrial climate of Barbados. None of us wants that for our country. There may be some short-term political advantage from time to time, because of that kind of instability, but if we are patriotic, and we have the larger interest of Barbados at heart - everything is in order now - none of us can wish for an unstable industrial climate.

The NUPW have had their problems too at the level of leadership, problems of which all of us have been aware, problems at the level of personality clashes and disputes which became public, thus undermining their effectiveness. I say that, Sir, without any reservation. That split in the leadership of the NUPW must have contributed to the effectiveness of that union as a negotiating body on behalf of the fourteen or whatever thousand in that union.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Seven thousand? I am obliged. Seven thousand workers the union represents.

Ultimately, who is to suffer but the general membership, the public workers at large who are represented by these associations?

The point I am concerned to make in principle, is that after the dust settles from these debates and the public workers and the teachers and everybody get their little pittance, it is not more than a pittance, $75 a month...

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Seventy-five dollars a month is what the Honourable Prime Minister is offering.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am nothing to do with Trinidad! I am something to do with Barbados, where on the 28th September, 1982, the Honourable Prime Minister, then as a member of the Opposition, said that the Barbados Labour Party's offer of $108 from Prime Minister to a maid was minuscule - page 2106 of the Debate of the 28th September, 1982. I was only saying that in parenthesis. They are now offering -1 do not know if Your Honour has had a chance to really look at the quantum of what is being offered by the Government in this legislated settlement, for those at the bottom - it is not more than $25 a month. I am saying, Sir, that the Honourable Prime Minister had argued in 1982 that $25 a week, as he put it, for similar categories of worker was in his words, "minuscule". It is not minuscule now. It is not minuscule after seven years, taking into account inflation and the drop in the value of money. That is a matter for the conscience of the members on that side.

I fear, I am speaking, Sir, on behalf of the Barbados Labour Party which has discussed this problem in its offices, the future of trade unionism in Barbados, given the matters which I drew to the House's attention earlier. The perception of conflicts of interest between members in here who represent the BWU and the factual situation, is no longer of perceptions, the perception of factual situation is that there are open public splits in the leadership.of, for example, the BUT and the NUPW, Sir.

After the dust has settled, Sir, the first thing that the unions must address is the question of their leadership and their public image. They have now got to sit down and do...

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I hear the doctor in the NDP says that he has a prescription.

Laughter.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I do not know about snatching. You see we have to be careful how we start now as political groups snatching...

Mr. SPEAKER: And I hope that you would not snatch anything from the other side that is not in the Resolution as well.

Laughter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I notice you are responding to am aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Alright. I am obliged to Your Honour and I would be even more obliged if Your

Honour would remind Honourable Members on that side that when a member is speaking, they must remain silent.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thought you had given me some advice on that before.

Aside.

12.30 p.m.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wanted to speak in a reflective way because I think that we must look at what is happening in the society in various ways and various sectors of the society and the whole problem of trade unionism and the posturing; and the image of unions is a matter that we should all, as public officials and parliamentarians be concerned about.

Now, Sir, on the other hand the Prime Minister has been concerned to make the point in the last 24 hours that the Government was negotiating in good faith with the unions. I am concerned to question that value judgment. It could only be a value judgment. I am constrained to question that, Sir, if only for this reason, that on the day of the last set of negotiations with the NUPW, after they got up from the table the Government had circulars and correspondence in Government Departments advising the Personnel Officers in various Departments how to calculate the arrears and the increase based on what we are now legislating today. I challenge the Minister of Health to deny that in the QEH, as one such department, that happened.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. Having seen the circular, Sir, the Honourable Member would be misleading the House if he does not add that the first line says, "Subject to parliamentary approval". You cannot catch the civil servants. You cannot catch the civil servants like that - "subject to parliamentary approval." You should know better than that.

At this point certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, I could not believe my ears. That is the point I was making that the day of the negotiations, and the Minister of Health now admits that while the negotiations had not been concluded with NUPW or BUT...

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is definitely misleading the House. I said that I saw a circular this morning. That is what I saw this morning - "subject to parliamentary approval". I saw it on my desk this morning. I do not know anything about what wa& happening in the negotiations. I saw that this morning, Sir.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I did not say that it went to the Minister's desk. I said, Sir, that the circulars went to the Personnel Officers in the various Government Departments, including the Personnel Department of the QEH, advising them about the computation arising out of these negotiations. What I am submitting, Sir, is that the negotiations, sp far as the public of Barbados was aware, had not yet been concluded, because NUPW was saying: "we have not agreed" and BUT was saying "we have not agreed". They sent out a circular using the language of the Honourable Minister - "subject to parliamentary approval" showing every intent to legislate ... subject to parliamentary approval. Yes, that intent showed every reason to legislate those salaries. We know that at a very technical level...

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member, if he is discussing the circular which went out, the Nation Newspaper had it on Sunday because the parliamentary papers were distributed and the Honourable Member knows that. The parliamentary papers were distributed to the Civil Service and the Press and published on Sunday. The papers an always distributed to the Press and throughout the Service and the Government has the responsibility and the Civil Service has the responsibility to be efficient. So if they do not tell them how to calculate, how are you going to pay them in time?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You were telling them how to calculate only because the BWU and the Government had agreed and the BSTU and whatever is the other one had agreed. I am saying that a large section of public workers and teachers represented by NUPW and BUT had not agreed but Government had determined, no, Sir, had predetermined to legislate at a time when they were negotiating, causing the NUPW and BUT to believe that they were still negotiating. They were sending behind their backs...

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: On a point of elucidation. I do not want the Honourable Member to continue to mislead this House. The circular about which he is talking is dated February 6th. He is trying to give the impression...

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Not true.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: I will make it a document of the House. Let him bring his and put it on the table and then we will see which is right.

Mr. SPEAKER: Make it a document of the House. He can see it.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, I am not talking about any document that they put out on Monday. I was not talking about that. I said weeks ago when your Government last met NUPW. That is what I am talking about.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am saying that weeks ago the Personnel Department in QEH had a circular advising them how to compute...

Hon. B. M. TAITT: As the Minister responsible*..

Mr. SPEAKER: What have you risen on?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I submit that the Honourable Member is misleading the House. I submit that the Honourable Member cannot supply a circular from the Government Department sent to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital weeks ago telling them how to calculate circulars based on this. I submit, Sir, that he is misleading the House or any Department. I challenge the Honourable Member to produce...

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that you can challenge a Member.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg your pardon, Sir.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am grateful for your protection, Sir. I do not mind the challenge. I will try and see when we resume after lunch if I can get the circular down here by then, Sir, because we are going to go on all day. That is what I said, Sir. There is a question about the *bona fides* of the Government in these negotiations. I would like, for example, the members of the BWU to say whether it was a fact that, at their meeting where the decision was taken to accept Government's offer, the number of persons present did not beat 40 and that there were about 19 who voted in favour of accepting Government's offer because it has implications. I just want to know the facts. 12.40 p.m.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Since I have been challenged to join the Union, my facts have come from one of the members who was at the meeting, and it is factual information.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: That raises a very serious matter that in fact if it was 19, if it was 26, if it was 27-1 am told 19...

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: That two people could bind, by their acceptance of Government's offer, 25 000? That is what it means, because you settled first on the basis of what your membership instructed you to do, quite properly, but if that membership was only 19, then I am saying that here we have a situation where 19 people were in a position to bind all these 25 000. I only ask for the information, I am told that I am wrong. If I am wrong, I stand to be corrected.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the Honourable Member is misleading, or attempting to mislead, this House. On a strictly technical point the Barbados Workers' Union has representative bargaining rights in the public sector for all categories of workers, and so does each Union in terms of wider representation. When we go" there, we do not go to negotiate for a particular category, we have not been given those kinds of limited rights. Whatever our membership is, when we represent we represent public, sector workers.

Unless you can prove anything to the contrary, then you are trying to mislead this House.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, I am obliged to the Honourable Member for explaining so lucidly the fact that his Union negotiates on behalf of public workers. That was never in doubt, even when I started this morning.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You see, Sir, he skillfully avoided on his point of order answering the guts of my question, and that was'whether 19 people at the BWU decided to accept Government's offer of 8.18% and if you acted on that decision and bound the 25 000.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, he is exposing his ignorance all the time. The agreement is not between 19 people and the Government, it is between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Government. Get on with the debate, man.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, nobody is putting the case as the Honourable Member who just sat down has been trying to put it. What we are saying is, they have delegates, they have representatives and so on. What we are asking, Sir, is it a fact or is it not that 19 people who turned up at a meeting gave a vote and a mandate to the leadership of the Union to go and settle with Government on behalf of so many public workers, 2 000 or whatever? That is all we are asking, Sir, and if the answer to that is: Yes, then we want to know if that is really a representative sample of the views of the people that you represent. I find it a limited sample, but I stand to be corrected. I do not believe I can be corrected, though.

Sir, while we are on teachers' salaries, I just want to issue a warning to the teachers. Government has been desirous of promoting the life and work and image of Errol Barrow. None of us denies his place in the history of Barbados. None of us will quarrel with suitable recognition, other than sandwiching him in the road, of course, for the outstanding service he gave to Barbados, but I am not going to sit down on this side and allow a situation of deification and indoctrination to develop in Barbados, such as Burnham fostered in Guyana...

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Wait until I finish. Can you ask them to keep quiet while I speak, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes. Rule 33. I need to remind members of Rule 33 and I. am going to read it because my decisions in this debate are going to be based very closely on this! "A Member while present in the House during a debate must maintain silence except when called by the Chair." Rule 32 allows a member to interrupt another member but only at my discretion, and, therefore, unnecessary interventions by members will be met very strongly by my disapproval. I want members to just pay attention to Rule 33 and continue as we have been carrying on.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Continue in the way I was carrying on, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: You have not broken any rules so far.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I want to be very clearly understood in what I am saying. We in the Barbados Labour Party recognise...

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Do you see how they break the rules? No sooner than...

Mr. SPEAKER: You are also breaking the rules, because I have not heard the aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: We have no quarrel, Sir, as I said, with suitable recognition for Mr. Barrow, but we are going to oppose, with all the gusto we own, any attempt to deify Errol Barrow in this country by using teachers and schools as instruments of indoctrination. I can tell you of schools where, not on Independence Day, not on the Friday before Errol Barrow Day, January 20, but consistently throughout the term children are being fed a diet of Barrowism that approaches - this is the only way I can put it, Sir - deification.

Do you know what they are saying in schools in Barbados? To the tune of "Michael row the boat ashore" they now have teachers in schools changing the words "Barrow row the boat ashore" and having young children sing that and repeat it like puppets.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: What does it prove? Why don't you deny that it is happening?

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Everything is for the first time. When we told you about the dope in here it was the first time you heard about it too.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, because he did not tell you all about it.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! Order! Order! I would just like to remind the Honourable Member he is going very close to the conduct and character of public officers. Inasmuch as no names have been called, you are going very close to that borderline.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I intend to speak within the framework of the rules, if necessary to go close but not over or in breach of the rules. Please understand that, Your Honour. Please understand that, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is why I quoted the Rule, because I understood it. 12.50p.m.

It is a dangerous sign that is developing. I do not want to say some of the other things that are being said. I am told that I might be coming close to reflecting. I am advising the Government to do their acts of honour to Mr. Barrow with moderation and a sense of propriety.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, is the Honourable Member suggesting that the Government as a conscious policy has instructed teachers to change the words of a song "Michael rowed the boat ashore" to "Barrow rowed the boat ashore"? Is that what he is saying?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am submitting, Sir, that it is happening within the Ministry of Education under the purview of the Minister of Education. He has responsibility for it and if anything is wrong with it he must accept that responsibility as part of his ministerial responsibility.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Would the Honourable Member identify the schools in which this is being done? If he is going to be honest to himself and to this House, would he care to identify the schools?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think you should say, if the Honourable Member is honest to himself. I think we all expect that all Honourable Members here are of that quality, and, therefore, I take the point that you are trying to get a reply. I do not think you need to put it in that kind of phrasing.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I will give him a note, Sir.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, I wish to submit that it is misleading to suggest that even changing the words of a ditty to "Barrow rowed the boat ashore" is

deification. I would like the Honourable Member to point out what is deifying about Barrow or anybody else rowing the boat ashore. When it was Michael row the boat ashore, John Michael Geoffrey Manningham, that means it was Michael?

Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit that it is trivial, he is trivialising the matter and it is therefore irrelevant. That is my second point, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I may take the point that it may be irrelevant.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Why doesn't the Leader of the House keep quiet?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the Honourable Member wants me to make the point, and I am going to make it, because we in here are dealing with a Resolution relating to the salaries of teachers. He is now bringing all kinds of irrelevancies, Mr. Speaker, relating to deification of a former Prime Minister. What is that to do with salaries for teachers? I am submitting, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member is out of order because he is irrelevant.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already indicated to the Honourable Member that irrelevancies may be considered by myself, but I understand the Honourable Member to be just developing a point for the purpose of making his speech much clearer. I do not expect it to be carried on.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You tell me when I can speak, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have read Rule 33 already. I have no hesitation in going to the other Rule which would permit me permanently to put that Rule in place. I want Honourable Members to take note of my rulings. I am going to rule according to the Rules of the House. I have read Rule 33 and if I need to read it again, I shall. Rule 33:

"A Member whilst present in the House during a debate must maintain silence except when called to speak by the Chair."

I also indicated that Rule 32 permits Members to interrupt other Members within reason. If those two Rules are not adhered ^o, I will then move to the other Rule which gives me permission to allow a Member to speak in silence.

In conclusion, I believe that the Honourable Member for St. Thomas recognises that I would normally give him enough room to develop his arguments, but, also, I will not allow irrelevancies of any nature to continue if it is not the interest of this debate.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am obliged to you, Mr. Speaker, because it must be within the parameters of this debate for me to question the purpose for which we are voting the money for these teachers, and it must be relevant whether teachers for whom public funds are being voted are carrying out their duties purely as teachers or for some collateral purpose. I was only concerned to make the point that^I shall not sit idly by and see any collateral purpose such as a deification of one man take root in Barbados. That is all. Honour and recognition, yes, deification no. He had, plenty, plenty faults.

Now, Sir, I was not concerned to lambaste anybody as they are saying. I am only making a point in the interest of Barbados because I think our history as a people has shown that we have been able to forge our ways and fashion our development guided by standards and precepts of reasonableness, moderate behaviour. We have not been given to excesses as a people. Just as the Prime Minister appealed yesterday for restraint, moderation and reasonableness and understanding, so I am appealing today for those same principles to guide the decisions of his Government.

Now, Sir, we cannot on this side -1 have been the first to speak for this side, for the three Members of the Barbados Labour Party - support this Resolution because we are not convinced

(1) that Government, notwithstanding its protes tations, was indeed negotiating in good faitl) with the teachers and the NUPW. That is our value judgment. You say you were negotiating in good faith, we say not and we told you early why we don't believe you were negotiating in good faith, so we cannot support it for that reason.

(2) We believe that the parties in these negotiations were so close and the amount that was being asked for was so small, given the totality of the Government's expenditure and the claims being made by the Minister of Finance about how well Government's finances have done, that Government could have paid more or taken more time to negotiate and bring negotiations to a successful conclusion.

1.00p.m.

(3) We cannot support the Resolution as a matter of principle because, having regard to the stances adopted by the Democratic Labour Party when in Opposition, purporting not to legislate salaries, trying to assure the public that the legislation of wage settlements was something special, novel and wicked introduced by the Barbados Labour Party, though they introduced it in 1976, we now see a reversal in the stances and the postures explained only in this way. You cannot keep negotiating forever and ever.

There were 31 meetings with 9 different unions. There were not 31 meetings with 3 unions, but 31 spread among 9 and we feel, Sir, that...

Aside.

«

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: This is a point of genuine difference of party principle.

The Prime Minister earlier on said he would not get involved or intervene personally by sitting with the unions. He is entitled to that view.

Our view is - I am not quarrelling with him for it because I think he sincerely believes that it is part of the role of management, part of the function of the employer or the senior representative of the employer, to meet from time to time with the employees or the agents of the employees - we do not believe that it would have breached any principle of management, any principle of industrial practice if, let us say, last week or week before the last the Prime Minister could have sat with the unions and personally heard from them what were the areas of difference and represent to them from the position of Minister of Finance, Prime Minister and Head of the Government what was the position of Government and the capability of the Government and, indeed, the country, to afford or not afford the request of these unions. For all those reasons we cannot find it possible, in the Barbados Labour Party, to support the Civil Establishment (Teachers) Order.

Indeed, we believe that they deserve more than the $75 a month. We have to question - I do not want to steal the show and talk until 2 o'clock or anything like that so, perhaps, I will leave some of what else I have to say for another debate and give other members a chance. I have spoken for an hour. I will leave the other points for another debate.

I am obliged to you, Sir, and for your protection this morning from them.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Thomas started on what I considered a very good vein. I thought he was doing well to advise the teachers on proper collective bargaining principles. I am sad to say that, going off at a tangent as he did, he really lowered the standard he is accustomed to in debating in this House.

If one were to carry his argument about the Barrow situation to its logical conclusion, is he saying to me that I must take Grantley Adams' book off my shelf so that my youngster cannot read it? The fact of the matter is this.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir.

The Honourable Member was yesterday characterized by the leader of the National Democratic Party as not having a brain.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope you are not now repeating that.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not see the relevance in that point of order.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: What I was concerned to say was that, perhaps, something is wrong with his ears because he did not hear what I was saying. He obviously did not hear what I was saying. There seemed to be no connection between here and here, Sir.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: You have to ignore some people. It is pointless because they do not talk unless they talk foolishness, anyhow.

The point I am trying to say in this. No intelligent person - if you are intelligent - could assume that you can talk about a hero unless you relate it to other persons. Any person who goes into a school or comes in here and tries to give the impression that an intelligent person refers to Mr. Barrow unless you talk about Mr. Adams, Dr. O'Neal and Mr. Wickham is, obviously, not *au fait* with history and is only deliberately trying to mislead the populace of this country.

Is he saying, therefore, that Mr. Hoyos' book on Sir Grantley Adams should be taken out of the schools? Let us face it. That is the type of nonsensical argument that he has brought to this House. I am sorry that he has gone that way because there are some Barbadians who having heard it from somebody in Parliament, would assume that that is a good argument. That is the type of thing we do not want in this country. Then to come and accuse teachers because, what he is saying about teachers, I do not know what he has for teachers!

He comes in here to give the impression that teachers who have been trained and are intelligent people, who have the lives of all youngsters in their hands would go and tell children to ignore everybody else except one man. Whai is he saying about our teachers? But then the same person is asking them to be professional. He is accusing them of being unprofessional. You cannot blow hot and cold at the same time.

Aside.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: As Minister of Labour I wanted to make some comments yesterday of the collective bargaining process. My understanding of it...

Aside.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Your leader calls your party the National Democratic Labour Party so I do not know what it is.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the Honourable Member to desist from those asides.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: My understanding of the collective bargaining process is that, when negotiations are in progress, any method of withholding labour should not apply. I make mention of this because I think it is important that some unions try to understand the basic principles of collective bargaining. To withhold your labour when you are negotiating is, indeed, a case of bad faith and it violates the basic tenets of collective bargaining. As far as I understand it, withholding of labour is a last resort when everything else has failed. 1.10p:m.

By whatever other means you might call it, the sick-out, holding a meeting at 9.00 o'clock when the teachers should be in school, and holding it for a whole day on the pretence that it is a meeting is only the same thing in a different colour. It is contrary to the basic principles of collective bargaining.

I should like to remind unions in this country that there are laws on our Statute Book, for example, the Trade Disputes Arbitration and Enquiry Act, Cap. 360 where parlies can apply to the Governor-General either for him to appoint an arbitrator or recommend an arbitrator to have certain matters adjudicated. I think it is Section 2 to be precise of that legislation.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, enlightened Government, industrial relations practice demands two other elements, the first fundamental which seems to be violated in this country is that when the parties are negotiating they should not ventilate their differences in the public domain. Time and time again, during the last negotiations, we would see that unions were going to the public by way of the press and airing their views.

Secondly, I should like to state that every collective agreement should spell out 'an avoidance of disputes procedure which, if well thought out and adhered to, would remove many of the misgivings in the industrial relations scene.

I should like to add, too, that in the Ministry of Employment, Labour Relations and Community Development and, more specifically, in the Labour Department, there are procedures to deal with reconciliation. You know where, and I believe the Honourable Member for St. Thomas alluded to it, there is an untidy industrial relations climate some countries or Governments in the Caribbean have experimented with the setting up of industrial courts. Of course, the results of these courts have not been entirely encouraging. From my own recollection they tend to act to the detriment of the worker. The process is no quicker than when the parties are negotiating. Very often, when these agencies are set up, one finds that something else has to happen, some other agencies set up to deal with something which they cannot deal with. So the negotiations are protracted and never seem to come to an end.

In_ some countries, where arbitration is the normal route for settling disputes, the unions have lost many members and stand not to benefit as a result of these arbitrations.

4Mb

I want to place on record my high regard for the industrial relations practices employed by the Barbados Workers' Union during the last forty years or so. I know that they have resisted going to arbitration and wherever possible, have tried to reach an amicable settlement. Of course, the Barbados Workers Union is highly professionalized. There is no doubt in the minds of the employers or the Government, when it comes to the Barbados Workers' Union, that they are tops. I hope that ** other unions would take advantage of the opportunities which have been made available to them when a Chair in industrial relations is set up at the University. There are some people who believe.that is too narrow and it should be called the Faculty of Labour. That is only a detail for discucsions.

It is important that people understand that, to negotiate on behalf of a union, one has to be properly trained. I hasten ^ to add that, on our side in Government, we are not particularly happy that, our people are not sufficiently trained either and therefore we will have to do something to upgrade the standard of professionalism within the Government service.

I read somewhere today that the Acting President of the BUT says that the Government should act more responsibly. I wonder if he considers how responsible they are when, at 9.00 o'clock, on a normal school day they withhold their labour. They leave the children of this country exposed to all dangers. They are the same people who are asking the Government to supply security guards for them. Yet they do not see it fit to provide some form of security by way of their own presence at the schools.

I now turn to the question of the current negotiations with the teachers because that is what we are talking about. Yesterday we spoke about negotiations with the public servants and today we speak about the teachers. I have to repeat some of what was said yesterday for emphasis because it is sometimes necessary to repeat certain important matters.

The first thing I want to remind the teachers of is that Government is the largest single employer of labour. Whatever Government does in the settlement of its negotiations will have an impact on the wider labour market. I believe it is true that all Governments would desire to assist each worker to achieve the highest quality of

life attainable within available resources. That is important. The question is what is available. This goal cannot be achieved by striking wage settlements which put the country into crippling fiscal deficit, perpetual foreign reserve losses, never ending currency devaluations and destruction of the aspirations of our people. 1.20p.m.

We only have to look 200 miles off the shores of Barbados to see what is going on and ask ourselves why these things happen. It is not very far from us. But, you see, there are some people who have always been accused of impressions. Impressions are more important than truth and reality. We have got to look after the interests of the poor and disadvantaged in this country. That is paramount and we cannot allow any recklessness to interfere with the proper running of this country.

Yesterday it was mentioned that Government's Current Expenditure was estimated $801 million. Of that 54.4% is spent in paying the wages bill, in other words some $432 million or thereabouts. The Honourable Member for St. Thomas mentioned that the difference between the Government and the BUT was very small. Well, 3% might appear to be very small. But my calculations indicate to me that it is $13 million difference. If that is small, well, everything is relative.

Asides.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Thirteen million dollars - if that is small, well, so let it be. But the question is: Who would pay the bill if that were included?

Asides.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Well, they would do anything to get a vote at this time.

So that one has got to understand that one is not just looking at $75 or $15.1 heard yesterday that it was 1%. But when you calculate 1% it is $3 million. You see it is all right for a fellow to sit down and talk about $5 or $10. It has to be multiplied by the number of persons and then you will try to understand what you are trying to achieve.

As I was saying, one cannot look at the Government pay packet in isolation. One has got to say what that will do with other negotiations in the private sector. At the present moment, Mr. Speaker, persons who want to set up business here - and I guess the Member for the City might be able to help us with this and he knows what he pays his people! He would know that if we settle here too high what pressure he would have to bear. There is nobody in Barbados paying a maid more than $200 a week, nobody. If the average pay for a maid is $150, it is a lot for a maid. Maids in the Government Service get $220.00 a week. Their functions are no more, I think will be less than when they work in a private house. These are the facts we have to deal with. I do not understand how intelligent people reading jthe economic situation in Barbados and looking at Third World countries and seeing the problems they are facing could say to any Government pay them, pay them what they want. That is the height of irresponsibility.

A country not too far from us built a medical centre for $600 million plus and could not buy the equipment to put into it, because money was no problem. .

Asides.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: At that time.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Money was no problem. That is what they are trying to say to us, because the Honourable Prime Minister says that he hopes to come in with about $2 million or so - pay them, settle, and do not think about .tomorrow. Tomorrow will never come. Barbadians have been very cautious people and that is what has stood us in good stead over the years. That is important and I think that we have got to ring this message through to those who are thinking.

The Honourable Member of St. Thomas talked about 19 people attending the meeting. The people who decided for some of these unions were only 1% who attended the meeting too. Am I to say that if 1% attended and decided that they are not going to take action that 99%.... where are you going? Those are foolish arguments. We have to look at the facts. We have to look at the situation. We have to look at the circumstances and decide where best to come down.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Government has found it impossible, as Governments in previous Administrations found it impossible, to settle with the teachers. They have never settled and the only oiher alternative, if the parties are so wide apart, is to do what is inevitable. That is that we have come to Parliament to legislate the salaries. With those remarks, 1 want to support this measure. I thank you.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, my intervention will not be very long this morning. Yesterday, I enunciated the principles which would guide the National Democratic Party in addressing the matters before this House in the question of the legislation of salaries before agreement is reached. In this instance, our position remains the same, that having for 10 years consistently told the people of Barbados and having taken that position on the Floor of this House that we would not be party to the legislation of salaries before an agreement is reached, one cannot see the circumstances where one can vary from that with honour

unless the gap was so wide between the Government and the parties concerned that it will represent a matter of overriding national interest. In those situations I think one could make some variation and explain it in detail to the people of Barbados. 1.30p.m.

It is patently nonsensical, Sir, to state that, where the difference is in the area of $2 a month and $14 a month and so on among a small category of workers, that could amount to $13 million. That kind of argument could be dismissed.

Another point, Sir, I think it is important to make, I hear all sons of figures like $454 million and so on being bandied around. What is not being taken into consideration is that, following the passage of the Education Act and the appropriate amendments, I think, to the Constitution, there was a consequential change in the presentation of Government finances whereby as of 1986 one would note in the Central Government accounts a dramatic rise in personal emoluments. That was largely due to an accounting' procedure whereby the payment of various categories of teachers suddenly shifted into that area consequential on that amendment.

Our position on this is no different from what it was yesterday. I have looked very carefully to see the quantum involved and the area of difference. It is not that great. The areas are relatively small. I am not talking about what the Union originally asked. I am talking of the point they had reached prior to this legislation.

I believe yesterday, and someone like the Honourable Member for St. James South who cannot think for himself just repeated a statement that was made yesterday that if . you make this settlement in the public sector then the private sector is going to behave in this way. That is a generalisation, but in respect of the current negotiations, when you take the total average picture in relation to the totality of the positions reached just prior to this legislation, it is about the same as the average for settlements in the private sector in Barbados in this year, that is, under 10%. That is a fact, so it is an irrelevance to try to signal to the people of Barbados that,df negotiations had continued or a settlement had been reached anywhere near where the Unions had reached, that would create a catastrophe for Barbados either in terms of its competitiveness or in terms of driving up wages in the private sector. In point of fact, when I listened to the figures very carefully put out by the member for St. Michael Central yesterday, I made a very careful note here that the average position reached by all the Unions in the public sector was very similar to the under 10% situation in the private sector.

It is most important that people should not come in here when they hold ministerial responsibilities and try to propagandise and drive fear into the workers of this country to suggest that a reasonable...

Mr. SPEAKER: I would caution the Honourable Member not to suggest that another member is driving fear into somebody. I do not think that kind of phraseology is within the fair interpretation of the rules. The member can rephrase it if he cares to.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I thank you for your ruling, Sir. May I rephrase it this way, for a Minister of-the Crown to use language which might happen to drive fear into the workers of this country by trying to suggest that modest increases in their wages, like $2, $8, $10, $14, can precipitate a balance of payments crisis or a devaluation in Barbados of today...

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: ..... as I said last night, I said on the floor of this House if the difference between the Unions' position and the Government's position was in the region of say $30 million, even $15 million, $10 million perhaps, I would come in here and support the Government, because there would be a substantial difference which could lead you to question that particular principle.

Aside.

Certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central were ordered by Mr. SPEAKER to be expunged from the record at this stage.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: If I may continue, Sir. I want to spell out very clearly what the National Democratic Party's position is in relation to the participation...

Asides.

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

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the Honourable Member for St. George South to be quiet, and all other members as well. I will read to you rule 40.1 have no hesitation with rule 40. Continue.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to state the position of the National Democratic Party on the question of the involvement of Trade Unionists in the political life of this country. I do not for one moment believe that, because a Trade Unionist is involved in politics, he cannot offer service either to his Union or to the country as a whole in a professional manner. Let me get that clear. So much so, Mr. Speaker, that, as someone who has supported the Barbados Workers' Union for my entire life, as someone who has marched with the Barbados Workers' Union on more than one occasion, when others were telling me that I was bringing disgrace upon the Democratic Labour Party to do so - that is a fact - I will say this, that I would welcome among the ranks of the

supporters and members of the NDP members of any Union in Barbados at any level, because I think it is insulting to assume up front that because a member is involved in the political life of the country that he must act in an unprofessional manner. I do not hold that view and I do not think that, given the parameters of the Constitution of Barbados, people can be excluded from political life because they are doing a particular job. I say so, Sir, as a professional who would clearly understand the difference between political involvement and when one has to be involved in one's professional activity.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, having a very good friend in the Barbados Workers' Union. I saw him the night before I was to head a negotiating team on behalf of a company with which I was associated as one of the early manufacturers in Barbados in the 1960's. We had a drink the night before. When we came into the room the following day I smiled and the member did not smile. Indeed I was most amazed at the very adversarial position taken for the period of the discussions. Then when we left the room he smiled again as he had smiled the night before. 1.40p.m.

So I have no difficulty whatsoever with that particular matter. Our position will always be one of dealing with each case on merit. My view is that we have always supported the trade union movement in Barbados. We will continue to support such activities in this country. We would like, and strive to ensure, that we maintain the closest possible linkages with the trade unions in Barbados at all levels.

Now, Sir, one or two other points have been raised. I can only speak for a few minutes or so because I have another appointment shortly. I want to say that I hope we will never again be faced with a situation where we are called upon to legislate salaries where there is such a small difference between the Government and the workers. I believe that it is still not too late for this Resolution to be withdrawn and for negotiations to continue. I believe that the teachers of this country feel a genuine sense of hurt I do not believe that they were grand-standing when they inarched during negotiations as was said earlier. I do not believe that what I am hearing from the teachers represents a politicisation of their position in relation to these negotiations.

I believe that there are genuine complaints. I say this for this reason, that these are the same teachers who came out in their numbers and voted for the Democratic Labour Party not so long ago. I believe that it is important that we look and see where are the areas of complaint, where are the areas of difficulty and try to find some means of having a calmer industrial position in Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say this. I do not believe that the leadership of any union in Barbados can take their members in a political direction where they do not wish to go. It has not been the history of Barbados. When you see the rank and file coming out like that, they come out usually on matters of an industrial nature, not of a political natqre. Do you think any member of the Barbados Workers' Union could stop me from enjoying the wide support that I enjoy among the membership of the union? They would not even try it.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is an industrial problem in this country. What we have seen is a manifestation of people's realisation that there has been a major breach of the social contract which they thought they signed in 1986. That is my belief. I believe that they are reacting to a situation where they feel a sense of betrayal. It is interesting to note that people have been walking out in the public sector. Whereas there have been settlements at much lower levels in the private sector, there has not been the same kind of reaction from the workers in the private sector.

I have said before, and I prefaced my remarks by saying, that I did not think the majority of the Barbados Workers' Union members care two hoots whether their leaders are DLP, BLP, NDP or whatever. They have to persuade them of a genuine industrial case if they want them to march. Otherwise do you think a trade unionist, Mr. Speaker, can win a seat in Parliament based on his support in the trade union? The chances are that he wouldn't win a seat. That has been the history of this country, there is no question about it, but they must have wider support. So I reject that kind of argumentation totally. I believe that we must go much beyond this business as to who is "B' and who is "D". As a matter of fact, I think the people now have found the answer. The answer is who is "N". The people themselves are putting an end to that kind of argumentation rooted in sterility over many years. For the first time now, Mr. Speaker, they are seeing a real hope at the end of the tunnel. At the two ends, "Bs* and "Ds", at the end where the hope lies they see an "N".

So, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude prematurely. I am enjoying this presentation tremendously, but I shall conclude and urge, and I really do urge that we abandon this belief that the industrial unrest among individuals in this country is motivated or stirred up by trades union leaders. I do not think that this is the case. People, when they are fed up with trades union leaders, leave those unions and go to other trades unions. It never expresses itself in political terms. It is not part of the history. You should recognise that there is a problem. The problem translates on the one hand to dollars and cents, on another hand, in relation to impositions that have led to increases in prices. On the other hand I think there is a new breeze, a new wind blowing through this country, a wind where people will follow those committed to integrity and morality.

I think there is a new hope blowing through this country. There is a wind of change and it is carrying along with it hope, morality and integrity, and caught up in that wind is the NDP. Thank you very much.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I know only too well that it is never very easy to convince and persuade people when tempers are flaring, expectations are high and men have lost their reason. I think that the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central probably would have wished that he had made that speech yesterday. I think he is now accustomed to his position and he would probably have wished to make that speech with a little more gusto or so.

I have to reflect on the fact that yesterday you would have thought that the gondola had arrived again. You would have thought that the Concorde had come to Barbados for the first time as thousands came down to see what was happening. 1.50p.m.

Perhaps, the rousing welcome given to the Prime Minister and the members of the Democratic Labour Party must have unnerved the Opposition, Sir, and hence I can say that was the reason for the replies I heard to the Prime Minister's address. In fact, it was said that the Prime Minister's address was empty. What emptiness? I thought that it was about a 2*/2 hour speech that was clear and full of information and, what is more, Sir, it gave the reason why he took the decision he took.

Today, I hear about Barrow rowing the boat ashore and things like that. I hope the Prime Minister will continue to row the economic boat into very safe waters. That is all I will say. If you are going to talk about rowing a boat, let us talk about what is happening now, not what happened before, somebody rowed a boat before.

They are always talking about famous people. I can speak with authority on that. Famous people are sometimes very lonely people and do not hanker for all of this old talk that we hear about, a day, and days, and what we are doing to make sure that they are remembered. Famous people will always be remembered, regardless of what you do in terms of a statue, in terms of a school, an airport, a road or what have you. They are known by their deeds and, unless you completely burn all the history books, you are not going to forget them.

Sir, all that I heard yesterday had little to do with the trade unionism concept. It was mostly political aspects that I heard. When one considers it, this issue is a burning one and not particularly a nebulous issue. It is one which, to my mind, involves all Barbadians whether you are on this political side of the fence or any other.

We have heard from the experts and we listen to them with rapt attention. But, we have also heard some neophytes in the field of industrial relations and labour issues.

I think that we may just let everyone know that neither the Democratic Labour Party, the Prime Minister and indeed, no members on this side get any joy from coming in here to say that we are going to legislate salaries. I can speak for myself.

It was alluded to yesterday that I said there is a residue of bitterness engendered. I would say to that - I said everything and voted in 1972 and in 1982 and I will deal with that in the process of time - today - I feel, Mr. Speaker, that for us to understand why you would wish to legislate salaries at this time, one would have to have an overview, a helicopter view of the situation and if you were to hang a picture of the scenario in your minds, you will understand what is going on.

I think that you would have to understand, first of all, what negotiations are all about. Negotiation, as the Oxford Concise Dictionary puts it, is a hassle of give and take. That is what it is. It requires skill. It requires a lot of research. I feel that one must understand that you have most times in negotiating to bridge that negotiable gap. I may warn that one does not bridge the negotiable gap if you sit there and say that you are not moving.

If there is movement and there is the *quid pro quo*, you understand that you have to be in search of that all the time, and you have to show you are skilled in negotiating. I think you have to understand these things first of all before you can decide in your minds whether anybody in the Government can negotiate.

The ultimate aim is to reach an agreement. Sometimes in negotiations you have to agree to disagree. Sometimes you have to go to arbitration and things like that, but most times, Sir, I think all times, one strives to get an agreement.

Now, to agree, Sir, is not really an elusive quality hanging continually out of one's reach. I think it can be achievable but to get an agreement in the negotiating room there are certain things you would have to do.

You would also have to have some mutual respect and trust. You have to learn to negotiate in good faith. That is the position, Sir, and you need to do that, as I said, ever searching for the *quid pro quo.* You have to do that if you are going to negotiate properly. I feel that any negotiator with a modicum of commonsense must understand that, in looking at a union he has, first of all, to look at the structure. He has to look at the strength and he has to look at the weakness.

It would be a good thing if you looked at the finances of that union because, if the union is financially weak, it is

obvious that it cannot withstand strikes. You have to pay the workers when they go on strike so you have to look and see whether all of those things are right. One has to look and see whether the union leaders speak as one. Is there fragmentation among the ranks? If there is, then you know what is going to happen.

I think those are the areas. I have to bring this to bear because I will tell you why I took decisions in 1976 and 1982 and why I am taking one now. You have to have a good research team. If you have a good research team the submissions would be realistic. These are things I have looked at all my life.

I am telling you, Sir. I am not going to get involved in the economic talk today. I am not going to delve in the realms of the unknown, as far as I am concerned. As far as industrial relations and labour issues are concerned, whenever the intelligentsia sit down, believe me, Sir, I am not going to take any back seat so they will have to listen while I teach them a few things about industrial relations.

I am saying to you that, in the final analysis and I heard so much talk yesterday, it is not the wage bill alone that is important.

Aside.

Hon. W, W. HALL: Sir, do not worry. They will never really deter me. What I have to say is an education.! am illuminating the dark corners of their minds. They do not seem to understand that.

The wage bill is not the only thing you have to look at. It is not the end all of everything. You have to look at the total package. In looking at the total package, you have to look sometimes at the conditions of service. You have to look and see what cost factor that will be. Sometimes these cost factors are more or less dictated to you by the ILO. It is like this. Sometimes the union will say to you that the room is too hot. The workers cannot work in those hot conditions and they have said to me so many times, It is too cold. Sometimes you do not have enough toilets. There are so many things that are involved in this whole thing. The question of leave is a cost factor. Training is an unending process and that, also, is a cost factor. Rectification, a matter of grades. That, too, is a cost factor. 2.00p.m.

Increments, Sir, are a cost factor. While you are at it, Sir, you should make sure that you have a look at the history of the unions. I heard yesterday that the late Prime Minister said that the BUT - I only heard in this Honourable Chamber - do not agree to anything and the comment was attributed to the late Prime Minister, Mr. Tom Adams. I do not know, Sir. I heard that it was not challenged. So, Sir, I can only conclude that it is true. Since they do not agree to anything and you are having agreements with other unions, I think all of these are factors that one has to bear in mind.

I want to say, Sir, that it is delusional to expect - it is, Sir - a Government to pay more than it can afford. You would not understand that word. You corne from St...I would not tell you.

Laughter.

Hon. W. W. HALL: I wish to conclude, Sir, that a Government can pay almost anything. A government...

Aside.

Laughter.

Hon. W. W. HALL: I said delusional. That is what I said. Do you want me to say delusionary?

Laughter.

Hon. W. W. HALL: It is delusional. That is what I said. Do you want me to say delusionary?

Laughter.

Hon. W. W. HALL: It is a delusion then.

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Yes. It is delusive, if you want me to tell you the various forms that it can take that a Government can pay more than it can afford, Sir.

I have heard it said that a Government can pay anything. That is true. We can give the workers a 100%, I suppose, but then we must look at the ramifications. Do we not have things like Budgets and taxes and things like that, Sir? Government would pay what it can afford. That is the end of the matter.

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Well, if the NDP is going to abolish income tax...

Asides.

Hon. W. W. HALL: The Leader did not know the name yesterday. The Leader of the Party did not know the name. He called it the National Democratic Labour Party. So I would say...

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

Hon. W. W. HALL: Sir, I merely wish to say that any attempt to settle beyond your means will lead to wholescale social suffering. I refer to things like redundancies, Sir, not that the people are not producing, not that they have deviant behavioural tendencies, not that they are indisciplined, Sir, but the fact is you cannot afford to pay them. What happens, Sir? They go home. That is all I am saying, Sir. I have heard all sorts of arguments. I heard that the difference at the bottom is too small. Well, if I were negotiating for a union and I felt that the difference at the bottom was too small and the employers had told me that they could not go beyond a certain figure, I would have to think that, instead of agreeing at the top, Sir, instead of agreeing 5% at the top, I would have to think, Sir, that I would have to shave that off a little bit more and put a bit more at the bottom. I heard the Barbados Workers' Union say that the workers at the bottom were convinced and said that 8.2% was something they could live with. Consequently, they went through the negotiations and they settled the 5% at the top.

I am saying that, if the argument is that the difference at the bottom is too small, I wonder why settle at the top at 5%? That is my argument. I heard, Sir, that there is some $10 million in the surcharge and that money could be used. All of these are arguments I have heard. I prefer to roll in with the opinion of the Prime Minister who is Minister of Finance in this matter when he said he could not afford it and he had reluctantly to come to the conclusion that today we will legislate salaries.

The Honourable Member said that we should have second thoughts.

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: I am not the Prime Minister, I am not the Minister of Finance, but there are no second thoughts today.

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: That is for the researchers.

I think, Sir, that, if you are going to think about not having enough money at the bottom and you settle at the top, in my view, Sir, that is myopic.

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Some Members, Sir, alluded to the settlements in the private sector and the cost of living. We have heard the pros and we have heard the cons. We have also heard about credibility. Since I voted against it in 1976 and 1982...

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: - they could talk about my credibility - ... I am saying this now, Sir, I am making it abundantly clear, eminently clear, that there is no one in this Chamber, that there is no one in this Chamber or no one anywhere on this planet that can question -my credibility, integrity or otherwise. These hands are pure, p-u-r-e. Poor, too, but pure.

I am saying, Sir, that when I say that I am supporting this, you can believe me that I have compelling reasons, using my industrial relations expertise to make a decision as I see it, Sir.

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Sir, the Honourable Member for St. George South alluded to the fact that I said there was a residue of bitterness in people when Governments legislate. I said that, Sir. He said that. He was being kind to me, Sir. He was mentioning it in a Debate. I do not have any acrimony. I am saying that you were very kind because you just wished to point out that one Member on the front bench...

Mr. SPEAKER: Could the Honourable Member clearly identify the member? I am not clear if you are speaking of someone in the Chamber or someone out of the Chamber.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Sir, I said that the Honourable Member for St. George South, he said yesterday, you were not here, Sir, I am sorry, Sir, that you were not here, but he said yesterday that I said, in 1982, that there is a residue of bitterness engendered when you legislate. I said that, Sir... What he could have gone on to say is that I voted against legislation of salaries in 1976 when the Democratic Labour Party...

Asides.

Hon. W. W. HALL: I hear a lot of voices.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out to this Honourable House that the quote, when I was quoting the Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central I was making a point that there is always a residue of bitterness, I was using his exact words, meaning...

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: - Just let me make my point please - ...when Government intervenes at this level in salaries negotiations. That is the only reason why I quoted the Honourable Member's speech, and for no other reason. I was not referring to it for any other reason other than that.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Mr. Speaker, that is what I said. In fact, Sir, I said he was very kind.

Aside.
2.10p.m.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Mr. Speaker, let me repeat, Sir. I said that the Honourable Member for St. George South alluded to the fact that I mentioned in 1982 that there is a residue of bitterness engendered when you legislate salaries and I said that it is true, Sir. I said that he was kind to me because, if he had read on further, he would have seen the "Senator W. W. Hall-No". That is how I voted. You could have said that I voted "No" in 1976,1 voted "No" in 1982. How am I going to vote now? You could have said that. I' said you were kind to me. So I am putting it now, Sir. I am telling you why, Sir. That is all I am saying, Sir.

Asides.

Hon. W. W. HALL: I am saying, Sir, that in 1976 under the Democratic Labour Party led by the Right Honourable Errol W. Barrow, I voted "No" to legislation of their salaries. I am shedding no tears, Sir. I said that, under the ILO Convention 127 and indeed 138,1 felt that enough negotiation had not been done. They had not met as often as I would like and I was not going to go for it. It is not the first time that I did not vote for it. I voted against the Constitution Amendments too. So I have no fear about voting. When my conscience is there, I vote how I know I should vote. My conscience dictates how I vote. I am making the point that in 1982 I also said "No". By the way, Sir, the Honourable Bernard St. John in 1976 voted "No" with me and in 1982 he voted "Yes" with his party. I did not accuse him of not having any credibility. Circumstances alter cases. Circumstances bring about change and when the circumstances are altered, Sir, when they are different, I have the right to state my views as I see it, as the case or cases may be. That is how I feel, Sir. That is my position.

I am now saying, Sir, that the Honourable Member for St. George South said yesterday that the Democratic Labour Party or indeed the Government was not allowing the collective bargaining process to take its course. I hope that I am quoting him properly. Good heavens, Mr. President, what course is he talking about?

Asides.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: He is the Speaker.

Laughs.

Certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central were asked to be expunged by Mr.. SPEAKER from the record.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Good heavens, Mr. Speaker, I want to know what process. I just would like to say that the problem really in the public sector is that negotiations begin in one room and end in one room. It is the beginning and the end. It goes there, unless you come in here really is the only recourse if you legislate. That is what I am saying. It is the beginning and the end, the Alpha and the Omega. Sir, there is no process at all in this respect because it begins and ends there.

In the private sector there is a difference. In the private sector, Mr. Speaker, you have the domestic level. If you break down, you can go to the Labour Office. You will not see the Chief Labour Officer no doubt in the first 2 cases. If there is no agreement, the Chief Labour Officer will come in. The Minister of Labour can be contacted. The Prime Minister can be contacted. Your last resort is the law. But, Sir, I am saying in the public sector I do not understand the business of the negotiations, Sir. There is a theory - I do not even remember the name of the gentleman, Sir, a theory that you know people were talking about. Perhaps my colleagues can tell me the name of the gentleman they have been reading...

Asides.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Mr. Henry, the Henry Theory. First year student, Sir. First year students in Industrial Relations would know. So, Sir, I am only giving the reason why I said "No" in 1976 and 1982. Before anybody jump up and say that is what I did. I said "No".

Let me tell you about 1988 now. We heard about a letter. It was made a document of this House. The letter said, Sir, and you have to listen to the language of the experts in Industrial Relations: "According to the understanding reached".....Let me put it clear to you, Mr. Speaker, when you are negotiating with a union, at the end of each day's proceedings, you tend to recap and see what has been reached, what has been arrived at. At the end of the agreement you will tell them that day what has been done and then you would write them a letter. I believe, Sir, it is the quintessence of ignorance, Sir for anybody in here to suggest that a public officer of the calibre of Mr. Branston Collymore would write a letter like that if he did not think that he had come to an agreement, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would prefer you...

Hon. W. W. HALL: I am sorry if I called names. I should not call names - right? I am saying, Sir, that when you settle an agreement you usually have a few drinks in celebration. I am telling you, Sir, that was done too.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two minutes more.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Two minutes. They had, the NUPW and the Head of the Civil Service, and all of them, had drinks celebrating the end of the agreement. Hence, Sir, when you write a letter to them, you would not expect them to come back and tell you that they are not interested in you and that the package with the civil servants is something

that they will live with but they are not going to accept the settlement as going in, Sir. That is where the bad faith is, Sir. That is where the bad faith is that I alluded to.-1 am talking about negotiations, Sir, and I am telling you that when it comes to negotiations I know that I am on the right track.

Asides.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Sir, yet I am operating in a situation where you had sick-outs. You had marching, Sir. The only method that I did not see, Sir oh Lord....Two minutes are not included in that, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is happening with the Lord?

Hon. W. W. HALL: The only method, Sir, that they did not use is a downright strike and a bog-in. They did not use a bog-in, Sir. Mr. Speaker, do you know what a bog-in is, Sir?

Asides.

Hon. W. W. HALL: I cannot do that. Well, Sir, I wonder if the Opposition knows what a bog-in is, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I know that your time is fast running out.

Hon. W. W. HALL: A bog-in Sir, is when all of the workers decide that they will go to the toilet at the same time. There is no doctor in the world that can say that they cannot do that, and that is the only method they did not use. Sir, it is because of these acts that I believe that I am correct. I believe so. I believe that with every drop of rain that falls. I believe, Sir, that the Prime Minister is right in legislating these salaries, Sir. I have little difficulty, in fact, I do not have any at all, in agreeing that these salaries should be legislated and the Prime Minister is absolutely right That is my contribution, Sir. I am sorry that I did not have at least another 2 hours to elucidate and, therefore, let the Members know exactly what is the position with industrial relations and labour issues. Thank you Sir.

Applause.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that this sitting be now suspended until 3.20 p.m. today, Sir.

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

The question that the sitting be now suspended until 3.20 p.m. today was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 2.20p.m.

On Resumption

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

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

ORDER NO. 4 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (PART-TIME OFFICERS) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1989

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that that Resolution do now pass.

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

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

ORDER NO. 5 - RESOLUTION TO GIVE EFFECT TO INCREASED WAGES OF PUBLIC EMPLOYERS AND CASUAL EMPLOYERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I move, Sir, that the Resolution do now pass.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: I beg to second that.

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

ORDER NO. 6 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE PAYMENT OF INCREASED COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE TO GOVERNMENT PENSIONERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I move that Order No. 6 do now pass.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: I beg to second that.

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

ORDER NO. 8 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE MINISTERS AND PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES (REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES) ORDER, 1989

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Resolution do now pass.

Hon. W. O..FRANKLIN: I beg to second that.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, there will be no way that the Opposition could support the attempt by Government to increase parliamentary salaries this way, Sir.

This question of parliamentary salaries has always been a kind of political football. The Democratic Labour Party, when in Opposition, took the opportunity on several occasions to criticise the methodology used by the Barbados Labour Party for paying parliamentarians salaries. There is no argument anymore that parliamentarians in Barbados should not be remunerated for the work which we do as parliamentarians on behalf of the people, but we have persisted in an attitude, fostered principally by the Democratic Labour Party, that every time there was a salaries increase it was a matter that should evoke and provoke the greatest possible partisan attitude.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It does not matter if this speech has been made in the past or not. We have a right to speak. That was claimed, Mr. Speaker, before he came in here. That is the problem. That right to free speech was claimed at the first sitting after May 28,1986. You claimed it on our behalf. The Honourable Member for St. John came in here after all that had been done, so he does not know the struggle we had with you to claim those ancient and honourable privileges.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The impression should not go out that I wish to deny the Honourable Member the right of free speech. The impression should go out that I believe he should not be entitled to bore us with the same speech time and time again.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The Democratic Labour Party used to bore us every two years on these matters. The late Honourable Prime Minister Barrow, true to form and trying to give the impression that he was so altruistic, every time ministers and parliamentarians salaries came up for debate used to slip out of the House or slip out of the debate so that he would not be present to participate by vote in the debate, and I have heard him say in Miami in 1979 that you could never catch him in that. I said, but you used to draw the money though. He said: Yes. His attitude was: If somebody has something to give me in terms of money, why should I refuse it?

But that was because politics involves a certain amount of posturing, a certain amount of acting, a certain amount of histrionics. I hope this group of us does not do that, Sir. He used to find himself bound to appear not to be in favour of salary increases.

The Honourable Prime Minister has just come in and I would say for him that his principle has always been consistent. I think I am right in saying that, certainly since 1976, when I was in Parliament with him, he has always taken the position that we are really and truly running a charade in here every two years when we pretend that we do not want the little increase, or that we should not be paid whatever it is we are paid, to create an impression for the public outside.

Aside. ,

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: We have responsibilities as Members of Parliament now to stop the charade and tell the public quite frankly, do you believe we should be paid for this work? Do you believe we work on your behalf?. If the answers are yes, then we ought to be paid. How much we are paid depends on a number of relative and comparable factors. If we are managers, if Ministers can be seen and cast in the role as quasi-directors, if you like the political directors, then there is nothing wrong with comparing...

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The Deputy Prime Minister is in this debate, he cannot run. There is nothing wrong with using the comparable salaries or tables that are used in the private sector as a standard against which we measure the levels of remuneration payable to the political directorate. We have to stop making a fuss about it and tell the country quite frankly what is our position, and I say the Honourable Prime Minister, as a member of the Democratic Labour Party, has, I believe, been the one and only and single member of that party who has been consistent in speaking his mind frankly on these matters. I think it was healthy. 3.30 p.m.

Some vote with their heels, like the late great Prime Minister Barrow. He used to vote with his heels, and they all used to take the money. So I am not saying that we are intellectually dishonest when we come in here and argue that it is too much and all this kind of thing, but we are coming close to that. We may indeed be prostituting our intellects. We are sending the wrong signals to the public and devaluing our responsibilities and our roles, and if you like, our positions as representatives of the people. So let us cut out this foolishness. We are doing a job that has perhaps more liabilities and has the potential for the greatest personal disruption. We incur abuse and all kinds of things. I said that already in here, so let us stop it. We are doing a job that is fraught with a lot of hazards. Anybody can be paid for the job and we have to be paid for this one. So let us cut out the monkey business. I believe Don is glad enough for this piece of bread. The Sunday Sun published the figures with the disparities between the Ministers and the ordinary ones that are here and on the back bench. It is stark when you look at it.

Mr. Speaker, I got a cheque last week for $2 573.12. What is so grand about that other than to mess up my personal tax? What is grand about it? We have to speak frankly about these things. If you all do not want to talk about them, we will have to talk about them.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wonder if the Deputy Prime Minister has crossed somewhere else. He is not sitting in his seat.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No. He is attempting to vote with his heels, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: A stranger in the Gallery.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The principle has been established that so long as public workers get their increase every two years, the Parliamentarians automatically will get an increase relative to the increase granted to the public workers. So this measure today does not come as a surprise. This is consequential on the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order that we dealt with yesterday. All I am asking is that, whereas I had to be critical of the Prime Minister yesterday and this morning on grounds of credibility and shifting in principle in relation to the principle of legislation of salaries, on this one, Sir, I have to concede his consistency. I admire him for that. That can go down in record.

I admire the Prime Minister for the stance he has always taken. He has shown leadership in this regard to us and to the public. Now I do not at all endorse or admire the stance of his party because they have been less than consistent. On this I give him proper marks. I believe that we have, as Parliamentarians, to express more of this candour and more of this frankness in some of these matters and to give proper leadership to the community rather than seeking to confuse them. He has always taken one position and his party has taken another position. His party got upset with him for taking that position, but he thought that it was a position of principle and I feel, having set the pace, in time his position will be accepted by the supporters of his party.

I think now, Sir, that this is the time when we can say that, in so far as the principle of payment for work done[x] as Parliamentarians is concerned, we all accept that principle. In so far as the methodology of granting these increases is concerned, I think for the time being we have to accept the principle that it is tied to increases for public workers. Whether that is the best method for arriving at a determination of the salaries or not is another matter open to another debate. There is a view that they should be done after some independent tribunal has investigated and pronounced, but we are not going with Nicholls again. He can stay with the CDB because nobody is going to pay me or anyone of us as an MP according to a punch clock system, unless you are going to talk about every time somebody phones you and you have to get up and run and see about a street light that is down, take off the number and write to the Light and Power giving the number of the pole and all these kinds of things. That kind of foolishness that Nicholls wrote is finished. Neither one of us is going back to that, I am satisfied with that, but all I am saying is that there are ways of looking at how best...

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Every time a house burns down", the telephone rings and you have to be there in a hurry, because can I say "God help you", Sir? God help you if you have an opponent and he gets a phone call too and he gets there before you. You might be in the toilet and he on ^ the road. Somebody tells him about the fire and he goes quickly and is on the scene. By the time you bathe and get there he has been there half an hour before you, and the people feel you are not interested. We have to take all of this foolishness out of it.

What we wish to get across in this particular debate is that we understand the justification of the Government for paying the 5 per cent at the top. Therefore the 5 per cent will affect most of us if not all of us. But, in 1982 when salaries were legislated, and Parliamentarians' salaries were consequentially legislated, there was $108 for everybody, from the Prime Minister to the watchman, the maid, whatever, and the only issue that I see in this debate is whether we should have been getting an increase of $75 right from the very top to the bottom, or whether those at the top would get the same increase as those at the bottom . in the public service have got. That could be the only issue. I think we are agreed on all the other things I talked about ** in here.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition from time to time has called for a bi-partisan approach on these matters. I believe that the climate is right. 3.40 p.m.

In due season, Sir, I would still like to see...

Aside. **

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS:...tripartite... bipartisan now,...as presently constituted bi-partisan, according to the Prime Minister. I do not know what will happen next week so I have to tow myself, tripartite.

I hope that some accommodation will be made in light of the changed circumstances, having regard to the Prime Minister's promise to develop the concept of democracy, I think they are going to have an institute jf democracy. I think I see that in the Development Pla[T]i. I am not tying that. I am just saying that consistently, with all of that, since there are now three parties in here, in the event that positions are changed...

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I do not know. I would not presume. I cannot advise tfo Governor-General. He has to

act in his deliberate discretion but in the event that the circumstances are changed, it would mean that the BLP Opposition would have to give up the rooms in the West Wing to which we have had access for the last two or three years.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: That will follow as a consequence of any changed constitutional circumstances. It would be of assistance and I am saying it now in advance of Estimates, in case my appeal is going to be received with any favourable consideration, that we feel that we would like to be accommodated with space in the precincts of Parliament. It would assist in the proper functioning of the work of the Opposition.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Well, Sir, that is not really true. The Prime Minister has a room there. There is another room there.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: But you mean to put our filing cabinets and so in there, Sir? You would allow that, Mr. Speaker? No, Sir.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: That is what I mean. What we are asking for is physical space where we can put some of our necessary tools and where, for example, there is a break or something we can resort to, go and discuss among ourselves. The present office downstairs, we understand, would have to be primarily for the use of the official Opposition if the Honourable Members become the official Opposition so I am only asking for some consideration in that regard, Sir.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He has no funds to dispense. That is the Minister of Finance. I am sure the leader of the NDP has the charitable intent. He would like to accommodate us but we are two different parties.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Become one? Initially, Sir, it would not be feasible. From time to time, obviously, we will have to get together as Members of the Opposition. What we are talking about is separate accommodation for the parties within Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish to make this point to the House. I hope after today there is no longer any hypocrisy about parliamentarian's salaries. I say without reservation that in 1986 as a sop to the public, as part almost of an act of deception, suddenly, after the Election, to try and make the public believe that something was happening and that savings were going to be effected, you heard about a 5% cut back in nmisterial salaries and then, in a matter of months, there was an increase which virtually nullified the cutback. That was called a technical adjustment. All we were doing as parliamentarians was really playing games with the mentality of the people of Barbados and they would see through it. It would promote cynicism so let us decide that from today we are finished with that.

While we understand the principle of tying parliamentarians' salaries to the public service increases, the fact that the Government has chosen to legislate this whole package, legislate the public workers' salaries to which all of these others that we are dealing with are tied and upon which they are consequential. We will have difficulty, having opposed the principle of the legislation of salaries in so far as and for all the reasons that I gave earlier today, so I am not repeating them.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No. I am explaining why we will vote against it.. It is tied to the General Amendment Order that we dealt with yesterday and we explained why we voted against that Order and the Teachers Order today.

It is not that we do not want the public workers to get money. It is not that we do not want parliamentarians to get the couple of dollars more, but we have to be consistent to the principle and we felt that the legislation of tnese salaries has been precipitated, has been a betrayal of principles, indeed, has been a reversal of principles previously espoused by the Democratic Labour Party, vehemently opposed by the Democratic Labour Party, and as a matter of principle we shall have to vote against this, all tied to the same string. 3.50p.m.

I said I was not speaking long on this, Sir. I believe other Members would wish to make a contribution. As we say the arguments have been hackneyed several times and gone over several times in here, Sir. I think they are well known.

Much obliged to you, Sir.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, I would just want to respond to the closing comments of the Honourable Member for St. Thomas because the matter of legislating the salaries is still apparently a difficulty for some Members in the House.

I just want to make the point that in the case of the Barbados Union of Teachers they have not reached

agreement and Government has legislated consequentially. It might help the former speaker to look at the matter more objectively if we look at the grounds on which the teachers maintained the position that they were negotiating.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: He was just talking about it. I am just trying to help him out.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Just a point of explanation to him. In fact, the teachers are holding out and refusing to settle on scales for whom they can claim basically no representation, if you want to go to that kind of extent. There is no teacher in the bands from Z32 down to Z38. Let us be very clear on this.

If you all are saying that you do not agree with legislation because the teachers want to continue to negotiate, the Barbados Workers' Union reached a settlement and they represent those bands. The teachers cannot reach a settlement and they do not represent those bands. Let us be very clear on what is happening in Barbados. I am not pulling any punches.

The truth is that the teachers are holding out for people that they do not represent.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was waiting to see what... Mr.

R. L. MORRIS: Therefore the policy that...

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the point the Honourable Member is trying to develop? I am trying to follow the point you are developing in relation to the Resolution before the House.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I was just saying, Sir, the last speaker said that he could not vote because of the principle that these salaries are tied to the other salaries. We are talking about the legislating of the salaries. I just wanted to clear that. That was my take off point. He could not vote for this increase for Parliamentarians because it is tied to those areas.

I am just saying that it might ease his mind if he understands that the teachers do not represent the people in the categories that they still have been negotiating for. Therefore they could have settled. Because in fact, their membership has already been negotiated for. It is really very difficult for me to see how they could be out there striking for bands that they do not represent, and they have agreed for bands that they represent. So I think that would ease his mind and other minds, if they are saying they cannot settle because that particular group has not been able to complete negotiations.

Thank you very much, Sir. Mr.

SPEAKER: The question...

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I should like to respond to a comment made by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas where he alluded to the position taken by the Government in relation to reducing certain salaries in 1986 and then making subsequent technical adjustments and now further increases.

«

I am sorry that the Honourable Member for St. Michael West is not in his seat because then he might save a speech since I could speak for the two of us, having just read Hansard at the time when he was President of the Democratic Labour Party and participated in similar Debates in this House. I am sure he would not object to it, if I represented him on this particular matter.

That 5% reduction was not intended to be a gimmick. It was a signal to Barbadians that there were people in this country who were prepared to make a continuing sacrifice in order that the social contract anticipated through the reduction in taxation and an anticipated consequential reduction in demands would take place. It was an act of leadership. It was an act whereby you did not lead from behind making an adjustment at a percentage made by public servants, but recognized that as politicians you have a role far beyond that of a senior civil servant, a creative * role in the society, a role of leadership. I wish to make it clear to this Honourable House that it was not a gimmick and that I supported it because I felt that it was a step in the right direction.

I know that there were many Members of the ruling Party who felt as embarrassed as I was over the minor technical adjustment because they understood the significance of that particular reduction. It was not just a gimmick. Indeed in the wider sense, I have no doubt that it ** has had an impact on the demands of workers throughout the society in terms of the extent to which they would wish to moderate their claims.

I do not believe in this business that, as Ministers, you have to tie your salary to the salary that the Permanent Secretary gets and then you get 5% more. This is an argument we have had. There has always been a division of opinion in the Democratic Labour Party on this matter. The ** reason why I said I could speak, I think, for the Honourable Member for St. Michael West is because I think he shared my view over the years on that point.

I do not think it matters whether a Minister gets paid or not. If he were not paid a cent, that should not diminish from his authority. And unless you proceed...

Laughter.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am serious, Sir. A Minister's authority is established in the Laws of this country.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not saying that.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order please.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I know the Honourable Member for St. Lucy. He does not have to be encouraged to make mischief... It is a natural tendency on his part...

Laughter.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: ... to make mischief at all times. An," indeed....

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Laughter.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: The Honourable Member knows better. I would not even draw it to your attention that the Honourable Member should withdraw that remark because no Honourable Member in here makes mischief.

Laughter.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: And least of all, the Honourable Member for St. Lucy.

Laughter.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am sure, Sir, that the Honourable Member understands that the word mischief used in his case is a term, not a pejorative term but it is a complimentary term in this particular situation.

Laughter.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: A term of endearment, a complimentary term with regard to the Honourable Member.

But the point I wish to make, Sir...

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: ...I think, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that we cannot conceive ourselves as civil servants. The Civil Service has a role to play in the society, the political directorate has a role to play. Whereas I accept that in this day and age Ministers have to be adequately rewarded, I have never agreed to this idea of tying Ministers' salaries to the salaries of public servants. 4.00 p.m.

There may come a time when a Cabinet may have to take a decision and say as a signal to the rest of the community - we are prepared to accept a cut back for a given time or something of that nature. So I am not committed to that principle. I never was and now as Leader of the NDP I wish to make it clear that I am not committed to that kind of thinking in relation to these matters.

Now Sir, the problem that I must nave and I think that I will try to make with your permission, Sir, because I think it has generally been the case in debates in this House where when we deal with parliamentary and related matters, excluding matters in relation to the staff, we try in order to be conservative of the time of the House to deal with the thing on a Second Reading so you do not have to repeat the same speech all along. I find it difficult, and my colleagues in the NDP find it very difficult, to support these Resolutions coming as part of this package whereby we have had a legislative imposition on the poorer sectors of the wider Public Service community, in matters relating to $2, $4, $8, $10, and $14. We find it very difficult to support this kind and this category of increase which will vary from $75,1 believe, and in some instances at the top of the scale - 1 hope there is no objection if I refer to the highest salary, the salary of the Leader of the Government could be substantially higher than that. I will not go into the details because it is the principle I am addressing. It is not the amount that I am addressing. I think all men of good conscience, all men committed to fair play, all men recognize that the available cake must at all times be so distributed that no one is disadvantaged beyond any particular point, whatever, principle you apply. I do not see how one in conscience does these things and, therefore, we in the NDP do now declare that we will be consistent in our voting. We will vote against this measure and the related measures. It is a matter of principle. I think it is one of the most unfortunate packages of legislation that ever came before this Honourable House where there is such a clear gap in the legislative and the treatment by negotiated settlement in relation to those at the top as compared with those at the bottom. I believe that this point has been made before, Mr. Speaker, and if you were here yesterday, you might perhaps rule me out of order for repetition but you cannot do so because you were not here yesterday.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: But the point I am trying to make, Sir, this is the crux of the matter, is that, it imposes

on us serious matters of conscience. I will challenge... Sir, I withdraw that word. I know it is a word which you do not like. I will invite men of conscience in this Honourable House to get up and say whether they are in fact happy with a package of measures that came to the House in this form. I am sure the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central - I know when he is happy and when he is not happy. I do not see happiness on his face, I know the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central. He is more difficult to read. But I understand that we share the same reservations. We do understand. You have to say that you share the same reservations. It is unfortunate and I hope that this will never happen again in the life of this Parliament. I think that all Members of the House will recognise that this is a wrong kind of signal that has been sent to the workers of this country. It is a wrong kind of signal.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Honourable Member for St. Michael West does not have to speak. Anyhow, the point is this. This whole package has sent the wrong kind of signals to this country. Let us resolve, Mr. Speaker, that this sort of differential and discriminatory approach in relation to legislation and negotiations which impact at the point of legislation on the poor workers in the community, let us resolve now that this does not happen again.

I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, if I were to summarize the position of the Members of the Official Opposition and now - not the N's, the B's if you prefer it that way.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The Leader of the N's has said that they are the "N's". He did not spell it for us but that is politics. If I were to summarize the position of the Opposition and I believe now it extends to the entire Opposition on this matter, I believe, Sir, it could be summarized in this way based on the comments of the Honourable Member for St. Thomas, that the Opposition will only agree to increases in salaries for Parliamentarians so long as the Government has agreed to a wage settlement with the unions...

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: No, no. The only way they will agree with an increase for Parliamentarians is if Government has reached agreement with the unions and salaries therefore are not as they would suggest, prematurely legislated.

Now Sir, last time we debated parliamentary salaries I made my position very clear. I said, and perhaps it was a prediction, that there will be no time in the history of this House of Assembly that we are going to achieve any bi-partisan position on parliamentary salaries. People will always^see it as being necessary for them to state some either high or middle principle or slightly different principle or moderated principle or adjusted principle so that they do not have to come out in the wash with everybody else. Therefore, Sir, we can perhaps reliably and safely say that every time the matter of parliamentary salaries comes up in here there will be some debate...so that the early part of the speech by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas, which is a speech he has made in here before, is a position he has had from the days of the Nicholls Commission as far as I know. I read that speech, I remember, last time it was being debated and it was the same, that we should not be quarrelling about it, but I am saying it is perfectly legitimate. If people feel that they do not wish an increase of 15%, somebody could very well come in here and say they want a 20% increase. If that is their feeling they are entitled to say that. 4.10p.m.

The Americans thought that they had a formula and now public pressure is such that, apparently, my latest report is, that they did not pass, or they voted against, the increase that automatically would have come into effect. So you can expect that kind of adjustment.

My position is neither here nor there, except to say this. Parliamentarians on the backbenches and in the Opposition to a large extent receive salaries which basically go to provide or fund support services that I believe the Government should be providing. I believe that the Government should establish in constituencies a permanent branch office, not my branch office, a branch office for the sitting member of Parliament, whoever he or she may be at a given point in time, where his Parliamentary Assistant can work on a daily basis and would be required to work 8.00 to 4.00 like any other worker in this country, where a telephone would be provided.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Yes, the present Parliamentary Assistants we are provided. If it were not for the beneficence of my branch and my own disposition, my branch Assistant would not have anywhere to go on a day. She would be floating. Fortunately I have an office, but for somebody who is employed, let us say, in a private office they cannot bring her in there, he or she, to sit next to them, and if they do not have a branch office and their branch is not in a position to provide it, then they have difficulty, and it should be mandatory for each and every one of us to have a branch office or a central place where people can report their concerns.

It is a tremendous strain on those of us, even in private practice, who in the end have to bring in the Assistant to work from the office, because most of your calls come there anyway, but I believe there should be a more systematic approach to these things. The salary goes in welfare assistance and so on, so it is neither here nor there whether I get it or do not get it. I have said so already. It makes little or no difference, because persons even in private practice, or whatever, still have to operate at their own welfare level too in relation to the kind of work they do. If you are a lawyer, there is a percentage of work that you have to do gratis anyway. That is, I suppose, the nature of the thing. It is a reality. It might be against the ethics of the profession or whatever, but that is how it goes.

There are people who come to you destitute who need assistance or help, and there is a thin line between acting as a professional and acting as a politician. That perhaps brings me to another point that was made in here today which I must address. It is a signal failing of the maturity of us as politicians, that we find it necessary, and I am not singling out anybody because it comes from this side and from that, that we have to single out members of the Trade Union Movement time and time again. I have heard the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I have heard the Deputy...

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: *Pro tern*, right, and I have heard my colleague from St. Michael South Central today, and I am worried about it. I have heard people on this side too saying that Trade Unionists have to wear two hats, as though...

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order. I believe that the Honourable Member might have been asleep when I spoke. I spoke for almost ten minutes and I never talked about wearing two hats, Sir.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: As politicians it is possible for them perhaps to adopt one position, and when they are at the bargaining table to adopt another. That is wearing two hats, in my view, and that because they are members of a political party and members of a Trade Union that they have to have two kinds of personalities, as though the members of the Union within the confines of their own party do not from time to time object. In other words, it is not as though Trade Unionists go along with everything a Government finally decides to do. On the way through the process they may have strong objections, they may have to be persuaded by their colleagues or they may have to adjust their positions, but it does not make them any less of a man or a professional or a person of integrity, and I think the regularity with which people have to come in here and pontificate about the manliness of Trade Unionists when they act in this dual role is an affront to the Trade Unionists. That is my view, because what is said in here is not what is said on the platforms. You create the image out there in the public forum and then you come in here and act as though it is the people who have that perception. It is common fare for the Honourable Member for St. Thomas to say it is the members of the public that have that perception, as though he did nothing to contribute to that perception, and I am saying that the Barbados Labour Party contributed.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. I made it clear yesterday - you were not here, Sir, - and I do not apologise for it. I am a representative of people. One of my responsibilities is to articulate their concerns. Surely I cannot be denied that, and if I articulate their perception and draw it to the members' attention, all I am saying is this is what the people are telling us, this is what we are hearing. Listen to it and deal with it as you please. That is all I am saying.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The Barbados Labour Party, Sir, carries the message out on the highways and the byways that the public and the workers are being sold short and that they are not receiving effective representation because the likes of the Honourable Members for Christ Church East Central and St. Michael Central are members of the Democratic Labour Party. That is their message on the platforms, but when they come in here and have to face the music they then adopt what they consider statesmanlike positions and start to say their former Leader was a member of the Union too and he did not have that difficulty, and that their association with the Workers' Union lasted tor 50 years and all of that kind of thing.

I am saying that I do not think it is mature. There are policies that this Government brings to fruition in here that I am not always in full agreement with, and to the extent that I am not I say so sometimes in here and express reservations, but once I am assured that the intent and the interest of the people are the essence of it, I am going to support it. So when I get in my parliamentary group meetings I say what I have to say, and the Trade Unionists say what they have to say, but at the end of the day they are committed to the final outcome and no matter what our grievances are I take them inside George Street. That is me, and there are no Ministers on this front bench, or for that matter His Honour, who from time to time has not either heard me or been at the receiving end of my view, whether I am right or wrong, and I may be persuaded at the end of the day.

But to give this impression that these people have no personality and it can be split up into pieces, and that they can adopt all these different kinds of positions is unreasonable. It is immature. It is as unreasonable, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would say, as the comments that he passed legislation in here and then went into the courts and had it struck down. There is only one member for Christ Church West, but he came under

criticism and now he is trying through the Labour Party to use the same tactic on the Trade Unionists. 4.20 p.m.

It is a lack of maturity; but even if we look at the entire debate, and strip it of the positions that have been taken, the several positions that can be gleaned from the Labour Party's contribution to salaries being legislated in here over the years, would make fine reading. They have taken all kinds of different positions. But if you strip that criticism to the bare bone, Sir, the Barbados Labour Party's position is this: the Barbados Labour Party gave increases when there was no growth; that's what the Honourable Member for Christ Church West said and the Honourable Member for St. Peter. That is the first point they made, as if that is a principle by which economists or Government should be guided. It was handed down to us in here as though it was a high principle of the Labour Party's pro-worker position, that even when there is no growth in the economy, we gave you an increase. But at no point were they able to be honest to say that very often when they gave that increase it was as a result of one meeting with the unions or two or perhaps not even more than three, and that * they came in here and legislated salaries and some of the same Honourable Members sat down in silence while they were being done and voted for it. They sat down in silence and did not say anything.

The second point that the Barbados Labour Party makes is that it is not an anti-worker party because it consistently gave salary increases, as if that in itself demonstrates you are not anti-worker; as if there are not other considerations that a political party or people that are interested in the development of working class people of working conditions would not look at other areas such as pension schemes, promotions, appointments, institution of fair practices within the public service. Those are pro-worker policies, not just salary increases, because you could not give a salary reduction; you could only give an increase, so you cannot hold out an increase to the public or the fact that the Labour Party has given increases consistently as some high principle to demonstrate that the Barbados Labour Party is pro-worker and feel that that is enough to convince unsuspecting persons that all of a sudden the Labour Party is interested in the public servants of this country. So it is an absence of those other kinds of things that made the Labour Party an anti-worker party; the removal of study leave and all kinds of other attitudes, the extension or increasing use of acting appointments, keeping people under your thumb all the time; those were anti-worker practices; so the fact that you gave salary increases should not be held up by the Honourable Member for Christ Church West as being the Labour Party's standard for determining who is pro-worker or anti-worker.

Now, Sir, we had the policies of the National Democratic Party, the wind of change party, and they, Sir, took the position that there was a social cost, and I take the position from their leader that there was a social cost and that cost would be demonstrated in the morale of the public servants. The Government had to take a position at the end of the day. This Government had taken a position cognisant that the majority of public workers are in favour of its decision, and we have no fear that there will be any loss of morale'in the public service. But I am still going to go on to make the point that we cannot send out a message to the public servants of this country or to any other^ group, that simply because on this occasion they did not get everything they wanted that it means that all of a sudden they can adopt practices that may not be in the best interest of the people. So I do not think that that is a factor that should bear any considerable weight in this particular debate.

The second point he made, Sir, was the question of the economic cost of the proposals. He said, Sir, that productivity would decline. Now, Sir, I believe that that is putting the cart before the horse. The point that should be stressed and has to be made is that productivity must come before salary increases, not after. I do not think that people would necessarily respond in terms of productivity on the basis of the kind of increase that they receive as a result of Government legislation of salaries.

The final position they took is that the NDP will not legislate salaries before agreement unless the gap is too wide. Sir, whenever you strip all of these various positions that have been put by the two Opposition parties, they add up basically in my view, Sir, to one position and that is that whatever final determination they make on how to support or not to support a measure will be based on the exigencies of the situation. The facts as they exist, and may have no bearing to any broad or high principle of labour law, labour economics or anything like that. In other words, Sir, their position will be based on the facts. When they are presented with the facts by a Minister or by the Honourable Prime Minister, they will respond accordingly, and that is the nature of the Opposition's position on the increase for Parliamentarians. The mere fact that Government did not reach a negotiated settlement or full negotiated settlement, means that they will not agree, but if we had reached it they would have agreed and there would not be any debate in here at all. But then again, one is never sure, because there may be some other reason whey they may not agree. So at the end of the day, Sir, I am unable to sift from all that has been said anything of substance from which to gauge the direction of the country in relation to these matters.

The Honourable Member for St. Thomas said basically what is the future of trade unionism, and then he did not answer the question. The Honourable Member for St. George South asked during his discourse on collective bargaining or bargaining with trade unions, came to the conclusion that the Prime Minister should have intervened at an earlier stage, but at what point do we determine whether the Prime Minister should intervene or if he should intervene at all? That, Sir, is the basic problem that we have. A lot of questions, and as a former Member of this

Chamber would say, Shibboleth, a lot of statements, whither trade unionism, whither the NUPW, the BWU this and a lot of statements that really have no meaning at the end of the day in my view.

Obviously there is something wrong with the process perhaps and that needs examining. Perhaps we have to determine at what point there should be a cut off and the Prime Minister should intervene or at what point Parliament should intervene. These are things you can determine before hand so long as the unions are in agreement with it.

Then, Sir, we have the argument that it is not a considerable amount that is involved in this particular settlement. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition said he felt it was neither here nor there, and the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central said he felt that since it was such a small amount his party could not go along with it; it was only if the gap was too wide; but at what point do we determine when the amount is too considerable or too little. That is perhaps the greatest difficulty with the debate, and at me end of the day if I am confused, it is because perhaps people have not used the opportunity to put forward those kinds of suggestions, and they would lead one and the publie at the end of the day to come to some conclusion as to whether these positions they have taken are positions that are reasonable in the circumstances, or whether there is some kind of overhaul that is necessary or whether indeed and in fact there is some kind of alternative that we should look at. At the end of the day I believe we are going to learn the hard way. We will learn the hard way as perhaps we have learnt in the past that in this country it is quite possible for a Prime Minister to convene one meeting with the unions and then come to Parliament two days later and legislate salaries and say that he stuck to the principle of collective bargaining but legislate, which was the policy of the Labour Party, or we can have thirty-one meetings, not three or two, and then you come in here and you legislate which you have to do at the end of the day anyway. But I do not believe that there has been anything that has been said that has demonstrated to me that there is any high ground. 430p.m.

The Honourable Member for St. Peter would, perhaps, say that there is some kind of high ground you should take and this is his high ground that a large proportion of the burden of the economic adjustment in Barbados is being carried by those in the low income categories.

But then he went on to say that the $3 million is neither here nor there so how can you use this particular exercise to substantiate your point that the larger proportion of the economic adjustment lands on the heads or the shoulders of the poor in this country. On what basis can you say that if you say $3 million is neither here nor there.

What basically you would have been saying is that if they had got what they wanted it would not m^ke much difference so where is this burden. Tell us about the burden. If this is the high ground tell us about that. Use the opportunity to dq that but I really do not think that at the end of the day that I have been able to come to any conclusion as to any solid position from the Barbados Labour Party or any yet solid position from the National Democratic Party with which to carry home and discuss with the young people of this country, the young people that everybody is now scrambling to get. Everybody is saying I am for the young.

The Honourable Member for St. George South and I are young. The Honourable Member for St. Peter also. There is one youngster in every parish. Everybody is scrambling but what kind of messages are we sending to them at the end of the day. There is nothing to it because nothing has been said.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: No, I am not adding nothing to nothing. I made my position clear at the beginning.

But my position in this matter is that if all we are going to do every time salaries are legislated is come in here and say well the sum is not too much so I am not supporting it or the gap is too wide so, perhaps, I am going to support the Government, or as the Labour Party would do, simply state for the record that they have given salary increases even when the economy does not grow, we would have reached no further.

We would never have got to the real root of, perhaps, the deficiencies in the negotiating process. We would never have had the economic discussion about the ability of the country to pay nor any of the other issues that, perhaps, are important and that young people should, perhaps, come into this House of Assembly and hear and carry back and discuss in their homes or in their various organizations.

That is my position on this matter and I, Sir, crave the support of the Prime Minister, the Cabinet, for my recommendations regarding the support facility for parliamentarians. It is critical.

I think that even if they abolish salaries for backbenchers and they gave us the proper tools by which to operate in our constituencies that we would all be better off but that is only me speaking and I am not making people go back on any bipartisan positions that may have developed over the years.

Obviously, we are agreed that parliamentarians should be paid but, at the same time, I think that we need the resources with which to carry out our work. We come in here and Parliament is deficient.

The Opposition office that somebody is offering to the new Opposition is not worth offering. The conditions in there have been deplorable for decades. I worked in there and I know, terrible, so it is nothing to offer.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: It has been fixed up recently? Oh, that is wonderful, I have not been in there and I hope not to have to go in there for a long time but there are other kinds of facilities that we need in here.

There is a lot that we need to do in relation to Parliament and this is our 350th Anniversary of Parliament and, perhaps, these things should be looked at in this year particularly those kinds of support services which would make our task a lot easier as parliamentarians in discharging our duties in the community.

With that, Sir, I can say that I support this Resolution. Thank you.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this Resolution and I am going to be relatively short. I just want to make some observations about some of the discussions that have gone on.

It has been fashionable from the Opposition side to hear the words, of credibility, morality, loyalty, sending signals, etc. going out during this debate and one would think that the only way as politicians or responsible people in this country that we can send signals is during a Budget debate. I think that we as citizens, as responsible citizens, must understand that we have a much bigger role to play.

It was also fashionable in this debate to hear about concern for the poor and the dispossessed but concern for the poor does not start on Tuesdays when we come here at 12 o'clock and finish when we leave this Honourable Chamber. Concern for the poor is an ongoing process which we carry through our lives.

In terms of our discussion and the sending out of signals with respect to Government servants, I notice yesterday when I arrived here that the Public Building yard was full of civil servants, Government Servants, who had come not only to hear the debate on what would be taking place on what we call the legislation of salaries, but were also, obviously, very critical of some of the proceedings that were taking place as we arrived in this Chamber and I, myself, was a little bit taken back by some of the flag carrying people I saw in the yard and I wondered how those of us on this side who are loyal to the great Errol Walton Barrow must have felt if he somehow could have been present to look at that spectacle. I wonder if we for a moment thought about how he would have felt by that experience which I myself experienced yesterday.

But, you know, those of us who have spent some time in Religious Knowledge as we used to call it, would remember the experience of Paul, when at the end of what is referred to as his First Missionary Journey he and Barnabas had their differences and they separated and Paul took with him Silas and went on the Second Missionary Journey and Barnabas took with him John Mark and there is always a time of parting when philosophies, etc. do no! come hand in hand.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have to say something about this whole thing about credibility and I was a little concerned when I heard members of the Opposition accusing the Honourable Prime Minister of this country saying that his credibility would be in doubt and I recall not so long ago, I think it was in late December, I was in a neighbouring country and I tuned into a radio station in Barbados and I heard the very people who are questioning the credibility of the Prime Minister of this country on a radio station saying that they believe in the philosophy of the Democratic Labour Party. That was in December last year, less than two months ago. I am hearing the very people saying now in this Honourable Chamber that the Democratic Labour Party has no credibility. 4.40 p.m.

I want to know what happened in this country with the Democratic Labour Party between December last year and the beginning of February this year, how those same people who were so loyal to the philosophy and the policies of the Democratic Labour Party have, all of a sudden, overnight, discovered that, because they are sitting on the other side, this Party no longer has credibility. I do not think the people of this country, the civil servants, the workers, the teachers et cetera will miss these points because these are signals and these are impressions that can do more damage to a country than the $10 or the $15 that we are talking about.

Aside.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: I am saying that, as responsible people of this country, we must send positive signals and signals are not always measured in dollars and cents terms. There are sometimes even more important signals that we must send.

But I want to spend a few moments, Mr. Speaker, with the attitude of the Barbados Labour Party towards trade unions in this country. The Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central yesterday made reference to a piece of legislation which frightened trades unions in this country. I think I am correct in saying that when this legislation was drafted the Honourable Member for Christ Church West was probably then the Attorney-General. I can be corrected if I am wrong. Mr. Speaker, I am talking about a Bill that was debated in this House on the 18th and 25th May, 1982 *> called the Emergency Powers Bill.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member is obviously misleading the House. I was not the Attorney-General on 25th May, 1982.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have not said that the Honourable Member was the Attorney-General then. I said he was probably Attorney-General when the law was drafted. We know that it takes time.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member has obviously never served in the Cabinet of Barbados. Any legislation which is drafted and has the approval of the Cabinet is by virtue of collective responsibility. I have never shirked any responsibility in this House or as a Parliamentary Representative.

The Honourable Member should know, if he wants to know without breaching the Official Secrets Act, when I went into the Government as a Member of the Government I found the Emergency Powers legislation that was there drafted and Essential Services legislation left by the Democratic Labour Party which has always been kept in Governme^. If they would check the offices now, they would still find it there.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is that the Barbados Labour Party which is now trying to create the impression that they are all pro union, in 1982 brought to this Honourable Chamber the Emergency Powers Bill. I should just like to quote some of the passages from this because yesterday there was a lot of.....

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. I feel very hard done by....

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I was kept in a straight jacket this morning. What is all of this to do with what we are debating, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have always said to Members, if they introduce substance into a debate I will allow others to respond to it.

My understanding is that the Honourable Member is responding to some comments made by the Leader of the NDP. That is my understanding.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member spoke about...,

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not Emergency Powers. He spoke about credibility and morality. And I understood the Honourable Member to be responding to that.

Aside.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Honourable Member for St. George South in a contribution in this House said that the bringing of this Resolution before Parliament put the credibility of the Prime Minister of this country on the line.

Mr. R. P. BYER: On a point of order.

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: That is not so, Sir. I never said that.

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: I do not think that the Honourable Member should misrepresent me. I have kept quiet for the whole day. I have not said anything. So leave me alone!

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has made his point.

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: I am not talking with you either!

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I apologise if I attributed it to the wrong speaker.

Asides.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: I was under the impression....

Asides.

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

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the Honourable Member finished his speech?

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: No, I have not.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has been given permission by the Chair to make a speech in this Honourable Chamber. The Honourable Member for St. Peter, I am asking you to keep your asides within limits.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I apologise if I said it was the Honourable Member for St. George South and not for St. Peter. When I read the Debate in this House, I will find out if I were wrong, anyhow.

But there is no way I am going to sit here and allow anybody over there to level those kinds of attacks on the Prime Minister of this Country and the Leader of this Party without responding. I am not going to do it. It is my respon-

sibility. I will take on the challenge. I am not going to let anybody over there think that with their training they could put fear in my mind, because I too am trained in the medical profession. I know the kind of level to which some people want to go. And I am prepared to challenge, them.

But I will go on. In 1982 in this Honourable Chamber the Barbados Labour Party brought the Emergency Powers Bill. The Honourable Member for Christ Church West....

Aside.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS:..... was a sitting Member in this Parliament when that happened. He was privy to it and my recollection is that he did not oppose it.

Aside,

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: The Emergency Powers Bill on page 2 said:

> "If during a period of public emergency the Minister is satisfied with respect to any person that with a view to preventing that person from acting in a manner that is likely to endanger the public safety it is necessary to provide his preventive detention and the Minister may make an Order referred to as a Detention Order."

It goes on to say:

> [11]A person in respect of whom a Detention Order is imposed may be arrested without a warrant by a member of the Police Force and may be detained in such a place and under such conditions as the Minister directs."

It goes on, Mr. Speaker....

Asides.

Dr. E, A. SIMMONS: The point I am making is that the very people now who are talking about their love and their protection....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member does not know that, under existing Barbados legislation, all you have to do is ask the Governor-General to sign such an Order in emergency and you have the existing power.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: But, Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member for Christ Church West makes that point, why was it necessary then to bring this Bill before the Honourable Chamber?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member, if he wants information, Sir, and he will allow me, Sir, to give him since he is asking me - On a point of elucidation, Sir. The Honourable Member ought to know that every successive Government of Barbados has within the confines of the Government a series of Orders in order to deal with any eventuality which occurs.

I found it in the files of the Government when the Rt. Hon. Member for St. John now deceased was the Minister, it existed under Colonial times and before then and I am sure....

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think you need to make another speech.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: .....if you look now you will find that that is the position.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am going to make a ruling on this matter. I cannot see any good reason why we should continue with the question of the Emergency Powers Bill, as it seems to me not very relevant to the present debate and I will not allow any further discussion on the Emergency Powers Bill. 4.50 p.m.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the point I was making is that the Barbados Labour Party now pretend to be the saviours or the protectors of trades unions when during their term trade unionists in this country were under great pressure. The Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central pointed out a very pertinent fact that in England and the United States where there were right wing Governments the trade union movement dwindled under such pressure and it was because the Barbados Labour Party was a right wing Government that they introduced that kind of legislation to intimidate trade unions in this country.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: That is true.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: So I want to know how come now the philosophy of the Barbados Labour Party is so removed from that position which they took between 1976 and 1986? How all of a sudden the Barbados Labour Party finds itself the protector of trades unions? It is a fact that trade unions were afraid to function under the Barbados Labour Party. That is a fact you cannot deny and thai is written into the history of this country. So when you come and talk about bargaining with unions in this country, the Barbados Labour Party has no moral ground on which to talk about bargaining with the unions.

Asides.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: That is the point I want to make, that the Barbados Labour Party has no moral ground on which to stand when you start talking about trades unions. You do not suddenly become a party that talks about trade unions when you are in Opposition. It is when

you have the reins of the Government to run that you are in a position to cooperate with the trades unions and make sure that the workers out there get their benefit. That is the point I want to make, because I hear a lot about morality and credibility and about the poor. Yes, I am going to come back to the poor because that is very important. It is easy to get up and say that Ministers should not accept this. Well, it depends on the position from where you are speaking. If you are rich, you do not need to have any money. But there are some Ministers who are not rich. There are Ministers who only can live on their salaries. So let us be realistic about that.

I know the philosophy of the newly found party as well. Yes, because we used to hold one philosophy and as far as I know up to December last year you were still grounded in the same philosophy and I am waiting to hear the new philosophy expounded. But as I said, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to get these few things in their perspectives that when we talk about credibility, when we talk about sending signals, we must not talk about them purely in terms of money. There is a level to which we as leaders of this country as politicians must rise and we must always remember that the signals are not always monetary signals. There are other signals. I said that my intervention was going to be short and I intended it to be, and I will fully support my Government and the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance in this Resolution.

I thank you.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I really was not intending to speak in this debate. I really was not going to speak in this debate, Sir. I was intending all along to vote against the particular measure. I now have an additional good reason, Sir, for voting against the measure, Sir. Because when you hear a speech of that lack of quality in this House, Sir, it is purely arguing a case against any increase at all for a Government back-bencher, Mr. Speaker.

The Member speaks in terms of credibility and he has come to this House with a lecture about credibility. Why does he not tell us about the credibility issue where the Errol Barrow Memorial Park is concerned, how the people of this country, Mr. Speaker were made to believe that the Dark...

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: ...by him, in this House and out of this House - how that park was built as a community effort by community funds and we had eventually, Sir, to find out that it was built at the public's expense? How much did it cost? Your credibility is on the line, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: But the Honourable Member must recognize even I gave some latitude to establish a point, I have not given it the latitude to debate the point and, therefore, if you made the point I will accept the point. But to have it debated as a subject, I will not allow it.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: As regards the whole question of the Barbados Labour Party's attitudes to unions, I must remind the Member of the position taken by the late Right Honourable Errol Barrow in the Budget Debate of June 6, 1972 and I will read it for him, Sir: "There is a kind of superstition that the Public Service is automatically entitled to a 3 year upward revision of salaries. This is the main preoccupation from the Budget Debate," the Official Document - Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals the 6th June, 1972. Let us put it in perspective - Pages 8 and 9 of the document.

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: "There is a kind of a superstition that the Public Service is automatically entitled to a 3 year upward revision of salaries. This is the main preoccupation of the Civil Service Association which has now dispensed with a term civil and changed their name to the National Union of Public Workers and which registered as a trade union in 1964 and not at any time during the regime of the National Conservative and/or the Labour Party." And he goes on...."The militant and churlish opposition leadership of the Secondary Teachers Union has staked its own claims on the earnings of the taxpayers"....This is not the Barbados Labour Party, This is the Democratic Labour Party..... "still entrenched in the belief that they can go further than holding up the nation's children to ransom but that they can blackmail the whole community and even overthrow the Government." This is the position of the Democratic Labour Party in relation to trade unions....."I will therefore look at the emoluments of those less well off[1] and then he concluded, Sir..."Negotiations may take place provided that a sensible rather than the present insolent and truculent approach is adopted."

That, Sir, is not the words of anybody in the Barbados Labour Party, Sir. They are the words of the Right Honourable Errol Walton Barrow delivered June 6, 1972.

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: But the civil servants liked him to abuse them. So let us get this matter, Sir, in its entire perspective. When the Honourable Member for St. Michael South East rises, Sir, to deal with the question of credibility on the line no moral ground by this person and that person, picks out people on the Opposition for personal attack is perpetuating a style in this House which misses out only re-introducing the Pele case, calling reference to the Duffus Commission, calling reference to the Malone Commission, and I am disappointed in him this afternoon that we have not heard as well about the Pele case, the Duffus

Commission, Sir, or the Malone Commission or for that matter the Mahon Commission because I thought he had reached that stage. We are dealing, Sir,...

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not even think that what ypu are even saying is relevant to what we are discussing, neither Duffus or any other.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: All I am trying to caution the Member is that the debate must stay within the confines of the Resolution and, if I allow certain comments to be made, I will not allow them to be debated at length. Therefore, if you made a reference in passing, fair. But it will not be debated as part of this Resolution.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I submit that it is relevant from the point of view the question arises as to whether or not Members of Parliament deserve wage increases, Sir. I am saying that on the basis of performance and upon the basis of utterance this afternoon and on previous occasions in this House, Sir, that the Honourable Member for St. Michael South East is arguing an eloquent case not only against increases for parliamentarians, but he is arguing a case for parliamentarians to be paid no salaries at all, and that is my point.

Laughter.

5.00 p.m.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: In that context, Sir, it is relevant that discussion on the question of how much parliamentarians should be paid. I really believe, if I might come on to the more substantive issue, I was not intending to speak in this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am very glad that you recognise that as well, that.....

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I was dealing with insubstantial matters merely because I was reacting to an insubstantial former speaker. The matters raised by the former speaker were so light that they really did not require substantial discussion.

Our position on this side has clearly been put. The Barbados Labour Party has a policy in relation to the grant on increases to parliamentarians, but in this particular matter we find it impossible to separate the fact of wage increases from the method in which this business is being approached, and this Opposition will be voting against this particular measure.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, it really is very difficult to understand why this debate has degenerated to almost nothingness, when in fact the positions of all the Honourable Members have been put, in Opposition, in Government and in transition. I really wish to say that I do not have difficulty with my public utterances from time to time on any issue because I speak on those issues from how I feel and how I am informed by the facts and how those facts manifest themselves on my intellect.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, while making his contribution, made reference to the Member for St. Michael West, and to the best of my ability to ascertain what he said, since I was not here, I understand him to have cited me in Hansard as not ••* being in favour of attaching Ministers' and parliamentary salaries to those of the Civil Service. I have not changed my view on that, Sir. I do not believe that each time the Civil Service - and this is a position which I have stated from time immemorial and which I will state - I do not believe that each time the Civil Service gets 3% the Ministers are to get 3% or any variation thereof. That has nothing to do with whether one accepts that on this occasion the 5% being offered to parliamentarians and Ministers is reasonable. *

Mr. Speaker, on the last occasion we discussed salaries in this House I made the point that a 2%, which was a 2% across the board, as I recall it - and I used the phrase "technical adjustment" and the only body who did not curse me for saying that it was a technical adjustment was Your Honour, Sir, and my colleagues on this side - and the 2% was a technical adjustment because it was intended to keep the parity between the Ministers and the rest. That is what I thought, Sir. Had I known in fact that it was not doing that, ** as I discovered a couple days ago - couple days ago, Sir, I discovered that I took all that abuse for nothing - because the truth is that there are Permanent Secretaries who in the present circumstances are going to earn more money than the Ministers.

Now, Sir, if there is a Permanent Secretary who by virtue of his responsibility, by virtue of his expertise, by virtue of his methodology, has more responsibility and * performs his duty in such a way as to be exemplary in relation to all Ministers, then that Permanent Secretary on the basis of the meritocracy would deserve to be paid specially. But as a class across the board no Honourable Member in this House or anywhere can agree that he who has to direct the operations can in relation to the pensionable salary which he is going to get be in a subordinate position to he whom he has to direct.

I want to make this point. A lot is written about the *** amounts of money which Ministers get and I am not going to spend any time dealing with that, except to say this. I heard on that side of the House and I have seen in the public domain people discussing sacrifice to be made. No one has given anybody in the Democratic Labour Party Government the credit for putting their money where their mouths were when in 1986 the Prime Minister directed that the Cabinet should consider a reduction in the salaries paid to Ministers, and the Cabinet considered it and made a ^ decision that they would reduce the salaries of Ministers

and Parliamentary Secretaries by 5%. To demonstrate their *bona fides* they did not interfere with the Ministers who had served for four days in June in 1986. They left their salaries at the levels which they had found and all the Ministers of the Democratic Labour Party took a 5% cut, and those who are writing in pejorative manner about the Democratic Labour Party Ministers and their morality and their failure to sacrifice are refusing to recognise that the 5% cut has a multiplier effect that is continuing and continuous. So anybody who has recently found God or morality who wishes to discuss morality and integrity with me will find me ready, Sir.

I have no difficulty with my morality nor my integrity, nor with myself. I have made sacrifices which I do not wish to discuss, but I will say this. There are many people who go around giving the impression that when you work as a Minister in the Government and you cannot show some visible sign of having amassed great riches, that you are somehow penurious, at the mercies of all of those who wish to suborn you and your decisions, all of the moguls in Barbados, and that you cannot possibly have integrity because you do not have money. 5.10p.m.

There are rich and poor people in Barbados who believe that Ministers ought to be on the take, must be on the take, have to be on the take and that you have to get something from somebody. I challenge anybody anywhere in this country who has followed my political life to come forward and say otherwise from the time I was Minister of Trade, Industry and Commerce in this country, and when all kinds of people came and said to me what I should do to become rich in and out of season, when all kinds of people went to the late Errol Barrow and directed him how he was to deal with me. There is not a single solitary soul in Barbados who can say that he has ever given me anything which I have taken for me to make any decision for him or her. I may say in passing that I have been offered by him or her, but I challenge anybody to come and say, and Mr. Speaker, you, Sir, of all people in the world can speak with the knowledge that you have found me from the time I was about six years old unchanged and unchangeable, unbought and unbossed by anybody in this country forever; so let no one walk around saying "well you know how it is, poor Branford!" There are no poor Branfords, not in the sense of needing to maintain my position in the Democratic Labour Party on the front bench.

Sir, the Barbados Labour Party and Tom Adams sought to ensure that I would not eat in this country. I have never made this statement publicly except one night in this House which was not covered by the press. This one probably would not be. Mr. Speaker, under the Barbados Labour Party they sought to ensure that I would not be able to earn a living in this country while in Opposition. I survived for ten years and will survive for another hundred if the Lord allows me to live for that long; so don't let anybody believe I have to go back and forth on the question of 5 per cent on $62 000 a year when the Director of Finance and Planning is deemed to be able' to earn more money than me and any other Honourable Minister. I am using him specifically because he is big cheese in the public service, so anyone who wishes to say that I must not vote for this because I would be immoral to do so, feel free.

Now I understand the position of my colleagues over there. Were I in their position, Sir, I would take the same position. Politics require them to do that. I have no difficulty with that. As for my colleagues on that side of the House who will soon be on this side of the House, it is not your fault. You and the Senator who will soon not be a Senator has spent a lot of time spreading all kinds of rumours about this Honourable Member.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I can only go over as leader. Do you think I am you? If I go, Sir, I have to go as leader, so you can afford to tell anybody I said so. You can't have two leaders and he announced that he is the leader, so there is no room for me. You can come over here not even as leader, because you all are not consistent. Don't get into this business of coming over there. If I had anywhere to go, that would not be your business anyhow. And let me make it clear. The Honourable Member is telling me how to be like him now. Don't close my bridges. That is his phrase. He wants me to be like him. The Honourable Member Sinbad would be able to tell you.....I beg your pardon, Sir. That is a term of endearment to quote the Honourable Member.

Quite seriously though, Sir, the question of salaries excite us every time it comes up. The fact is that this 5 per cent is not enough to warrant the kind of excitement which is sought to be generated. I understand the Opposition voting against it if they feel bound to do so, but they must not discuss it in moral terms because there is no question of morality.

The Prime Minister said last time or the time before that whenever there is an adjustment in the salaries, there will be an adjustment across the board. If there was no adjustment, what would happen is precisely what is happening in the United States today where an independent objective body has found that the political necessity not to increase salaries by politicians for themselves has led to an incongruous situation where in order to, if you pardon the expression, correct pass imbalances, there has to be a 50 per cent increase.

Now no politician who is worth his salt if he wishes to be re-elected will vote for a 50 per cent increase. At the same time he is telling other people that they must contain the deficit. In the United States the biggest political issue and the greatest economic problem is containment of the deficit. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South

Central will know about containment of the deficit. Containment of the deficit is an economic situation which is required of most countries that are not so underdeveloped that it does not matter. It is required of the United States and it is required of Barbados to contain the deficit, and it will allow the country to calibrate its economy in such a way as to bring modest growth. There are no economies in the world that are going to have any massive growth over the next 15 years except perhaps Antigua, where you cannot judge their economic development in the same terms and with the same criteria as are other countries judged, but developed countries like the United States and yes Barbados, require proper economic management and it requires containment of the deficit. So in the United States they cannot vote a 50 per cent increase because they would not be able to stop every sector of the economy from running away. The wage demands that would be made in the United States if the Congress voted for a 50 per cent increase would be such as to heat up the economy in such a short time as to create chaos, and all the gains that have been made in the last eight years will tend to fall apart.

Sir, in Barbados we are not discussing a 50 per cent increase. As a matter of fact, I find it passing strange apart from political reasons that anybody would question the Barbados Workers' Union's acceptance of an agreement of 5 per cent at the top and 8.2 per cent at the bottom. I find it passing strange that anybody would question that because the nature of agreements in the last 15 years certainly since, certainly since Margaret Thatcher became director of the economy in the United kingdom and Ronald Reagan became President of the United States and therefore director of the United States economy, economic gain for workers has been in the vicinity of 3.2 per cent to 7.5 per cent. I challenge anybody anywhere in any economy that is functioning and that has functioned in the last ten years to show agreements far in excess of 7 per cent. I am talking about public and private sector settlements. 5.20 p.m.

There is a strange situation in Barbados where people believe that unless you get up every day and talk about the deficit, the economic conditions, unemployment, unless you do these things, they feel that you have no capacity or no understanding of what is going on. There are some of us who have done that for so many years that we get tired of it.

I remember when the late Tom Adams was declared an economist. The Member for South Central and I spent a substantial amount of time making the point that, until Glyne Murray had declared him an economist, nobody had heard of him as an economist. We spent a lot of time making that point. Suddenly...

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Do not put me in that. These are the declarations that I do not know anything about.

The point is, Sir, that there is a certain mystery that has attended upon the public which allows for a certain kind of discussion, so when the television people want somebody to discuss the economy they send for the same tired four or the newspapers will interview the next three and then you get a statement on the economy, and then it is repeated. Really, all you have to do is get the newspapers of the last year around the same time and you-will see the same things. I do not get involved in this much because I do not think it is useful and, besides, I am busy with the health of the nation at the moment.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The health of the nation is quite fine.

But quite seriously, Mr. Speaker, when we come to discuss these salaries, we can be consistent and take <•* different positions depending on the circumstances as the Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central so brilliantly displayed today.

When you are in Opposition you have a critical eye to certain matters and you are not privy to certain information. We were in Government and then we went into Opposition and we started behaving in a way that the Barbados Labour Party had not behaved and everybody said we were a timid Opposition but the fact was that we had been in "* Government and we had become aware of certain things but it took us about seven years before we started learning how to go for the jugular again.

The Honourable Member for St. Peter, now not in his place, has just barely begun to understand how when you are in Opposition you go for the jugular and that position now is going to be swiped from him. He is going to be replaced by the past master but these are matters which all # of us in this House understand.

What I would have hoped for is that by now would have emerged in this country analysts, journalists and people who can speak and educate the population as to how the nation, how the issues could be analysed before taking a position.

When one is in public life one has dreams and one of the dreams I have is that one day we are going to have "* discussion programmes and...

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member is now saying I am so good I should be over there but may I return the compliment that I know you miss being over here.

The truth is, Sir, that we really need to analyse the issues and I do not think that we should ever - I hope that

we never stop having programmes like "Guttaperk" and "Tell It* Like It Is". The people do not have to be right all the time. The fact is that they are discussing issues.

In certain other Caribbean countries they do not get to do that. Let them discuss the issues but when it comes to a certain other type of discussion we should move beyond: "Last year you said this: four years ago you said that:" unless when we say that we are able to make a salient point.

We in this House have a duty and a responsibility to lift the economic debate beyond where it was 25 years ago. I make the point that the salaries discussion in this House has a tendency to take on an image that is unworthy of all of us.

I am voting for the legislation of the salaries because I verily believe, if you would pardon the expression, that they have become political rather than matters of trade unionism.

i believe that the NUPW has taken on a political hue, not because somebody told me so, but because I have seen the ':ind of correspondence which emanates from that union to Permanent Secretaries, unnecessary, boisterous and offensive.

I have seen the NUPW raising the question of lights in St. Philip North. What is that to do with the National Union of Public Workers except that they are trying to relate it to the nurses at St. Philip Hospital.

Now, the nurses at St. Philip Hospital had been assured by the Ministry of Transport and Works that the lights were being put in and, indeed, while the NUPW was courting the "Nation" to get the story in the newspapers, the lights were being installed. They had heard the Minister of Transport and Works say what he had to say about the Barbados Light and Power. Yet, the National Union of Public Workers tried to give the impression that this was a negotiating point.

I want to say this. They have misled the nurses in this country. I can only speak for the nurses. I tell you that they had the nurses putting out in the newspapers that they want this and they want that when, in fact, those things were things they already had.

I have spoken, Mr. Speaker, at length about what we have done in Health during the last two years. I do not intend to try to do it now, Sir, in this debate but I am saying that when one comes to the conclusion, not the whole NUPW, but that those who should be guiding the NUPW may be misleading it then one has to take a different position.

Anyone on my side will tell you that I am an inveterate quarreller to the bitter end. Anyone on my side will tell you that I was one of the last to come in about legislation of salaries but, like everything else, when once I was in I was fully in.

I am not going to play games. We decided on legislating the salaries when it was clear that there were no further roads to travel. The honourable gentleman who was leading the negotiations for the Government is no child nor is he a frivolous person and all sides respect him and say so. Therefore, when he advises the Government, whether it is the Barbados Labour Party Government or the Democratic Labour Party Government, that advice has to be taken seriously and the Honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition will not resile from that kind of position. Therefore, it is fine to say, when one is discussing the rhetoric, that we are only a half dollar apart, or we are so close that we should have negotiated some more but I want to tell you something.

Public officers themselves come and tell us "legislate the salaries. Why are you keeping us back?" The Minister of Finance has pointed out that he does not wish to carry the matters over into the next year and there is good and sufficient economic reason for that.

In 1986 we had to give people the agreement one time and the money the next. There is nothing more dangerous than giving people an agreement today and the money some distinct time after.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: It is not a matter of putting blows. You have felt my blows and you know I share blows directly. I do not share any indirect blows. You, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition know that when I come to sharing blows I share them cleanly, clearly. I float like a butterfly and sting like a bee.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: No, No. When it comes to fighting I sting like a bee but I am not a stinging bee.
5.30p.m.

Aside.

Laughter.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: You see that now, he is rejecting me. He does not want me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stinging bees are not elected to this Chamber, as far as I know.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: They are not elected, Sir? There are three of them, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Sir, but you do not know them.

Laughter.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the fact is that from an economic point of view, it is desirable and necessary that we have these salaries that we pay the 5% to the Members of Parliament and to the Parliamentary Secretaries and to the Judges and to everybody. It is necessary to retain the balances in the country, if for no other reason than that it is necessary.

If the politicians in the BUT do not want to accept that, if the politicians in the NUPW do not wish to accept that, if the politicians on that Side do not wish to accept it - the politicians in the BWU have spoken for themselves; they do not need me to speak for them, but they have accepted - but if the politicians in the other places do not wish to accept it that is fair enough. Let us separate the politics from the economics.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am grateful to my colleague for reminding me that they negotiated a settlement. In that respect, let me say this. I have been very embarrassed, I use the word embarrassed, Sir, very embarrassed, Sir, to hear some of the arguments being made against acceptance of a settlement by the BWU.

First of all the Government has not put out any press release saying that we had reached agreement with the BWU. Nor to the best of my knowledge the BWU find it out. If the NATION is good enough to find out the information and publish it, we should praise them. If they discovered that we had reached agreement and they published it, we should praise them because that is the nature of their job. It is the nature of the newspapers to find out information. It is only our responsibility to see that it is accurate and hope that they will publish accurate information. In this case, they found out before I did. I read in the newspapers that the BWU and the Government had settled. I would tell you what I said, hallelujah. Because this country cannot afford....

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Now you see that. You see what you have gone and started. Now the Prime Minister wants me to sing Sandi row the boat ashore.

Laughter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like you to row ashore now.

Laughter.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Sir, I am very grateful, Sir. That is why Branford is going to steer his own canoe to shore, Sir.

Quite seriously, as I wind up, Mr. Speaker, I said hallelujah because this country cannot afford to have agitators from outside of Barbados who are jealous of the tranquillity which we have been able to maintain despite the little hickups which we have with one another. There are persons poised outside of Barbados who wish to destabalize this country. And they have varying and sundry ways of going about their business. There are many people who are jealous of the methodology which is used in Barbados.

Aside.

«

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am not talking about Sydney Alleyne. I am talking about serious people. The fact is, Sir, that those kinds of machinations and manoeuvres have to be resisted by those of us who are in public life. We must have our internal fights and battles, but at the end of the day, we must have one goal, it must be the advancement of this country. Some of us have to make sacrifices. That is why when Mr. Barrow caused us to reduce the salaries by 5% we went along with it. Just like the time before when I was a Minister when he gave no increases to the Ministers, I did not agree with him but I went along with it. This time it is 5% I agree with the Prime Minister and so, Mr. Speaker, I am going along with it.

Thank you very much, Sir.

Applause.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think this House has just heard one of the best speeches made in this Debate on these matters that are before us. Certainly a tour de force and certainly a ringing justification of the stand taken by this Government in these matters and a direct refutation of the criticism being raised by the Opposition.

I will be very brief in this intervention. I am speaking as an ordinary Member of Parliament. I have that right. I believe that when you come to discuss salaries and such matters, it is in the personal views of individual Members. There are no whips on anywhere on this side. So I express my own views on this. They will happen to coincide of course with those of the Government.

But let me make the position clear. We are talking about a sum of money amounting to $30 million approximately to meet these claims for the Salaries Revision. About $30 million in this current year, it will be $30 million plus $10 million in the second year which is $40 million. So that will give us the settlement over the two year period of $40 million which is among the largest, I believe. There are only two since 1972 which have exceeded the amount of money that we are called upon to

fincj for this wages settlement, a substantial sum of money that we are being called upon to finance these Salaries Revision. That must be taken into account.

Those who are urging us to go further, I ask them to have a conscience in relation to the public finances of this country. It is quite easy when you sit down in Opposition and advance these arguments that you could have had another meeting or that you could find just another $10, but it is the last straw, it is always the last straw that breaks the camel's back. From the comfort or discomfort of those positions over there, they may advance those arguments but when they advance them they are certainly not in the best interest of the economy of this country.

When we look back at what happened in previous times in the 1986 settlement, I believe that settlement was something like $18 million approximately. And former Ministers of the Crown walked away from that.

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: The Minister of Health can put it one way. I put it in my own way. It was not settled in that particular year. It was fed into the finances of the following year.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: We have devised the methods and the techniques in order to finance that which was a significant part of the deficit that we had to deal with. We had to find solutions to the problems including the imposition of a Surcharge to correct the imbalances in the public finances of this country.

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: It takes courage to lead a country.

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am saying that we had to find the solutions to the problems.

On this side in dealing with those problems, we are not looking for any cheap popularity, certainly as Leader of this Government and of this country. We have to take the decisions which are in the interest of the country even if it mean that those who for deliberate purposes or those who genuinely do not understand feel that we are not on the right track, we have the responsibility to take the decisions.

I should like to give this House and the country the assurance that whenever hard and tough decisions have to be taken, so long as those decisions are in the interest of the country, this Government, under my leadership, is going to take those decisions. Have no fear about that.

We have gone through this whole year in the face of opposition inside of the.House of Assembly, opposition, outside of the House of Assembly, opposition inside of my own Party.

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Hallelujah. Hallelujah.

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I believe we will now be able to talk you know. I believe so. He will now be able to talk. You watch it. When he sits over there and I sit over here, you are going to see how we are going to talk. He has to come behind that Chair to me now. 5.40 p.m.

Laughter.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: He passed my office as Minister of Finance. I do not think he went in there twice, but I must walk down to the Ministry of Finance. But that is the past now. That is in the past.

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: You have got tc sit down and listen or go out. You are seeking a constitution. Anyhow that is...

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure the Honourable Member is not taking it upon himself to put out anybody. I am sure the Honourable Member made that comment. Are you suggesting I am only asking if you are suggesting that you are putting somebody out of the Chamber?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: No, Sir. No, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: You would wish to withdraw that remark?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Oh, if you say, Sir, that I should withdraw the remarks, I will certainly withdraw them with alacrity, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking with the intent.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Oh, the intent Sir, Anyhow, Sir, if I may get back to the point after that particular point.

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: Dont't worry....don't worry. Take it easy. Cool down.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: The point I am making here, Sir, is that having taken those decisions and having

now brought the economy in terms of the predictions which I made to a point where I believe that we can now plan further for the implementation of our capital development programme and other works. Instead of saying that a good job has been done, they are now saying that we should have talked a little more and tried to make the situation worse through greater expenditures.

Now there has been a lot of talk about the Barbados Union of Teachers and seeking to reach agreement. We have no bitterness against any union in this country. I sat down and I had discussions of a general nature with the National Union of Public Workers I had discussions of a general nature with representatives of the Barbados Workers Union. I have had discussions with the private sector organisations and we intend to continue those kinds of consultations. Of course, I have never intervened in the discussions as relating to negotiations because I am not a negotiator. The Government has its own negotiators. I am not a negotiator and I said that I was not going to intervene unless it was a matter of last resort and that was in context. I believe that I said it on one occasion in the constituency of my Minister of Transport and Works and when I believe at a public harangue, a week before or so, leading Members of the Opposition were urging that I should intervene in the discussions. I made it clear that that is not my style. That is not my position. We decided to give as much leeway as possible, coincident with the coming of the end of the current financial year, for some kind of settlement to be arrived at. We reached general or specific understandings or agreements with certain unions and organisations and bodies. But there were 2 that held out. The Barbados Union of Teachers first of all said that there was not a question of salaries at all that they were particularly concerned about, that it was regrading, and immediately we set in motion the classification exercise. I am pointing out, Sir, that we have taken at every turn the steps necessary in the process in order to meet any legitimate questions that are raised, the regrading and the reclassification. We set that in motion and immediately they tacked back on to salaries again and started to argue about Z-39, as I understand, or Z-38 at which category they have no members down there. I believe they start at about Z-33 or Z-32 somewhere in that region. But they are arguing about Z-38 and you are asking me now to prolong that. Not you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I know you would not do that.

Hon. L. E. S ANDIFORD: It was being urged upon me that I should have more meetings with the Barbados Union of Teachers in the context in which since 1972 or 1974 when these current procedures were put in place. They have only come to an agreement once. But we are always ready to come to terms on these matters so long as there can be a meeting of minds.

As far as the National Union of Public Workers is concerned, we can talk about the difference between the top and the bottom. But sometimes you have to look at the real figures, not necessarily the gross figures, but the net figures. We can come out with what the difference would be. We have got to be realistic about these matters and we have got to do the examination. We had reason to believe that there was more than 60% chance that there would have been a settlement with the National Union of Public Workers. I heard my Minister of Trade speak about drinks, sorry, the Minister of Tourism and Sports....Where? I am advised that there were discussions and that there was some kind of an agreement, that they would put the case, and then, according to the information which I heard, the hospitality was extended. We are talking about salaries negotiations of which this present matter that we are discussing, is all part of the package. I did not say it yesterday. I said it long ago - part of a package. I said it long ago. There was no good reason for believing that we were nearing a conclusion on the matter. I can well understand why we have to rise to the defence of officers. That is as it should be from people. That is as it should be - to rise to their defence.

Now let me say that that particular person/official of a union is not anyone in here.

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I wait for an official list. I do not know. He had another meeting. He was not in the drinks. He had another meeting. So I am not saying that he was in any drinks. I am not saying that because he had another meeting and was not there. 5.50 p.m.

But let us understand, Mr. Speaker, that when we go for all the kinds of high flown language about social contract and so on, that is high flown talk. Thomas Hobbes spoke in the Leviathan about a state of nature and nasty, brutish and short. Then we had some philosophers - John Locke and Jean Jacques Rousseau - who spoke about *le contract sociale.* They talked about social contracts in their political contexts. That is political philosophy, and the next time you heard about a social contract was when there were problems in Britain during the 1970's - this is where the phrases are coming from - labour Government in Britain trying to reach some kind of agreement with the Unions, and they are talking about social contract.

What social contract in Barbados are we talking about? We are not talking about the start of civil society and we are not talking about anything of which the terms "an offer acceptance agreement" or anything like that for consideration have been placed before anybody, and we are talking about social contract? Let us not look for these kinds of philosophical underpinnings...

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Oh, political. I have not heard about that one yet. Because if you are talking about the philosophy of Manifestoes, not even that. No one has ever talked about any contract in relation to a political Manifesto of a political party, but we are going to lock horns on those issues. I am sorry my friend, the Leader of the Opposition ....I am going to look after you.

Laughter.

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think that we understand what it is, that the Government had to take a decision at some time before the end of this financial year, that we set everything in place, including reclassification. I have said that we are going to ensure that negotiations in the future start much earlier and that we try to find a conciliation procedure that can deal with these issues. I believe that we have enough persons of goodwill who can assist in the drawing up of the kinds of machinery that might improve this particular process, and that is the track we will be on.

Let the Member for St. John not worry. I went up to a constituency office in St. George South and St. John, and I have indicated more than once that I am looking at this particular problem of constituency offices, because when we say that the Members of Parliament must have their base from which they can do their constituency work, because they are public officials, we are going to take steps in that particular direction as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us rest assured. These measures are in the interest of this country. They give the public servants the increase that they have been hoping for and that they have expected for some time. When this debate ends shortly we will then continue with the public business and put in place the kinds of decisions which we have been mandated to do and which, with the grace of God, we will carry out.

I thank you.

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

Ayes: Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Hon. B. M. TAITT, Hon. M. A. KING, Hon. E. E. GREAVES, Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, Hon, H. A. BLACKMAN, Hon. N. K. SIMMONS, Hon. W. W. HALL, Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, Hon. C. V. WALKER, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. L. L. BRATHWAITE, Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN, Mr. J. J. PAYNE, Dr. E. A. SIMMONS, Mr. C. A. NEBLETT, Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH and Mr. D. J.H.THOMPSON-18.

Noes: Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. D/ A. C. SIMMONS, Mr. O. S. ARTHUR, Dr. R. C, HAYNES, Mr. R. P. B YER, Mr. P. J. M. MILLER and Mr. E. BOURNE - 7

ORDER NO. 7 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY (RE-MUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES) ORDER, 1989

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I move, Mr. Speaker, that the Resolution do now pass.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I came down here in a state of peace, I shall leave here in a state of peace. But having heard the callous and indifferent rejection of a fundamental notion that underpinned the manifesto which the Democratic Labour Party took to this country, the whole concept of a social contract rooted in cohesive development of this society, underpinned by a fiscal programme that called for the co-operation of every sector of this community in propelling this country into the 21st century, and to listen to a foul repudiation of that Manifesto, it just about boggles the mind. 6.00 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now the Honourable Member....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That about boggles the mind.

Mr. SPEAKER: But the Honouiable Member...

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I would like to continue, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: But I am not clear as to the language used at the present moment and how it is used. You said a foul repudiation.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not accusing anybody of being foul. I said the repudiation was foul, and it otems either from an ignorance of what that manifesto contained or alternatively from a deliberate attempt to try to destroy the very instrument which formed the foundation of the construction of a Democratic Labour Party Government in this country. No wonder the people of Barbados are in the mood they are in today, and this I can assure you would be propelled with greater acceleration as we approach the polls in 1991.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken a position on behalf of the National Democratic Labour Party that, at all times, not only in this House, but outside, we will make a clear departure from personal politics. We shall seek at all times to establish the truth. What is the truth about this business

of running away from pay settlements in any fiscal year? I am saying that it is a total untruth; I am saying that that settlement was made around the end of January 1987, at a time when the capital section of the budget for 1987/88 was not prepared substantially because of the illness of the late Prime Minister in December of that year. It was therefore determined by the Ministry of the Public Service that whilst they would be able to permit us to pay the statutory emoluments that they would not have been able to come up with details of payments on time to pay the non-statutory emoluments. They were the circumstances. There was no question of running away from any particular payment. It just could not be done. We were a new Government and we had a split situation. You had a Ministry of Economic Affairs and you had a Ministry of Finance. There was a capital side of the budget that had to be prepared, and the Minister responsible was not in a position to give us the figures to get the Estimates under preparation at that particular time. Therefore there was a matter of some 18 days that you had to prepare Estimates, lay Estimates in Parliament, and because it was the last two months in the financial year, nothing could be done because there was no money to pay people in the month of March. They are the facts relating to that and in any event what would one be running away from?

Sir, we had a current account deficit of $15 million. If you add another $18 million to that, you would have had a current account deficit of $33 million. Is .that something to run away from? But that kind of nasty sliminess is what is going to undermine any political party in this country. I am saying it is an untruth and it has nothing to do with the Ministry of Finance, and it is known that it has nothing to do with the Ministry of Finance, and several of my colleagues know that it had nothing to do with the Ministry of Finance, because the Ministry of Finance was not the main source of the preparation of the capital budget because of the division between the Ministry of Economic Affairs - don't get me wrong - nor was it the fault of the Ministry of Economic Affairs because it was a matter of illness and that was that.

I think that I want to get that clear, but anyone who wants to get into any argument with me oi> economic policy, let me tell you something, Mr. Speaker, I have never declared myself an economist. I am a trained physician, not a bad one. My interest in economics started in 1961 and the reason why I understand what is going on in this country and recognise nationally and internationally as someone with some reasonable competence, offered one of the principal posts .... since I have resigned as a Minister I was offered about three international posts, not one carrying less than $US 150 000 a year in economic matters. Let us get the records straight. When the Honourable Gentlemen came to my house at 5 Golf View Terrace, in the same room in which I announced the National Democratic Party last Wednesday, and begged me to take up the position of Shadow Minister of Finance of this country, where were the economists? They only asked me because they did not want the Honourable Member for St Michael West to do it, and that is why they came and asked me. They came on a Saturday afternoon about 1 o'clock and asked me to take it over. Where were the great economists that sat in the House for fifteen years and never spoke a word on the economy and come in here pointing a finger asking who declared me an economist?

Mr. Speaker, there are some kinds of creatures that crawl about this .universe that make one wonder. One of the * worst sins on this earth is ingratitude. I would never come before this House and seek to challenge the competence of anyone on an individual basis that sat in a Cabinet with me. What I would do, and I have done and will always do it if the circumstances dictate would be to challenge the direction of policy if I saw a change or a policy that I could not agree with. Let it be clearly understood that I have always conducted myself as a Minister of the Crown with the utmost honesty and integrity. Let it be clear that the «,. public officers in the Ministry of Finance can substantiate any statement that I make on the conduct of the affairs in the Ministry of Finance when I was there. How on earth could you ask public workers having heard of a claim, a settlement at the end of January in the Ministry of Finance, not having the capital budget completely prepared and had to be vetted elsewhere, to publish that, print it and have it available to conform with the Constitution of Barbados which demands that an Appropriation Act be brought before this House and passed before 31st March? How are ** you going to do it? What can be the structures by which you would do it within the system? It is one thing coming here today at the end of January and bringing this before Parliament in the first week of February because these numbers can be adjusted. In fact, once you knew what you were going to legislate you could have started two to three weeks ago preparing the Estimates.

Mr. Speaker, if this was a negotiated settlement that we were discussing here today, I doubt whether the Ministry of Finance would have the resources to pay this money out before the end of March. That is the big difference, and there was a negotiated settlement that was obtained in 1986.

I am saying that the Estimates in Barbados generally speaking have to be prepared and about to be printed by the last wee[1]: in January. If this was a negotiated settlement and not a settlement being legislated, and the officers had to come tomorrow and calculate these figures, over 1 000 heads in the Estimates and make changes for them, they could not get them ready and have these Estimates printed by the end of February. That is the bind in which we were caught in 1986 and you will know it, and you all know it is unjust, wicked and malicious for anyone to come in and talk about a Minister of the Crown running away from meeting his public obligations. What Minister of Finance in Barbados would ever do a thing like that? 6.10p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Honourable Member accusing members in Parliament as being malicious?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not accusing anybody of anything, Mr. Speaker.

What is worse, I can tell you this that by the time I left the Ministry of Finance every single cent in back pay was paid out. On July 31, public expenditure was projected at $760 million, not over $800 million after every single cent was paid out in back pay by the end of July and provision was made for it in the over $40 million that we raised in the Budget.

You want to go and spend as you like not understanding what is going on? What your responsibilities are, take you 18 months to learn, that is your problem but do not come in here and try and put the blame on me.

Let me tell you something, Mr. Speaker. I never intended to speak in this House in this vein but I think that it is fundamentally wrong and not one of you have heard, despite all the difficulties that I have had in the last 18 months, not one of you who is an elected member of this Chamber can say that except for the matter of policy direction of Government that I have come out publicly and said anything which would reflect on your administration one way or another, except on a matter of policy.

But I do not care if people do not want to respect that barrier. That is not a problem with me. It is a different matter when you seek to indulge in disinformation but the debate will be continuing across the Floor of this House and I promise you that if that is the line chosen it will be a bitter debate.

It will be bitter for several reasons. For the first reason because I feel a deep and profound sense of commitment to concepts of loyalty to the electorate of Barbados. Let no one ever underestimate the depth of my feeling in this matter. Let no one ever underestimate that.

For a second reason. I never ever asked the Democratic Labour Party to give me any portfolio, you came to me and said that since you came in the House over the past six months that I seemed to be the person most competent to do it. I went through the trauma of those years. That is a fact.

Now, at the end of 10 or 12 years involved in this thing some clown is going to come and suggest that you are incompetent, Mr. Speaker, and you expect anyone in this House to accept that. Having remained silent in this House when the Democratic Labour Party was being castigated for its economic policies over 15 years who stuck to their defence? The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central and the Honourable Member for St. Michael West. I am telling the truth. Everyone else was silent in this House and come parading with this kind of indifference?

Let me make it clear, not only finance, I had to speak on everything. But there will come a day offreckoning and so long as I have life in my body I will make sure that the injustices inflicted on the electorate of this country by a perversion of the pledges made which I was party to, I would like to see those injustices redressed and I shall make every effort so to do from morn till night, day in, day out, week in, week out, and make no mistake about it.

I am not at war with the Barbados Labour Party. I am not at war with the Democratic Labour Party. I am here to promote the interest of the National Democratic Party and it is this party that I feel and I am absolutely sure will be the party which will restore that social contract repudiated, which will restore that balance between practicality and realities which are so necessary and are still an essential ingredient of the social contract in this country.

I have troubled no one. All I have come here to do I have sought to carry out the policies and the positions of the National Democratic Party.

(Certain remarks made by Dr. R. C. HAYNES were ordered expunged from the records by Mr. SPEAKER).

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Persons with elephantine intellectuality and not nibleness of direction cannot dictate to the National Democratic Labour Party what its position should be.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: ...the National Democratic Party what its position should be.

Let it be clear that I would regard what I have said here tonight as a warning. It is not my chosen position but if I am forced to take it, I will take it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I wish to repeat for the benefit of those for whom I have either substantial or an element of residual respect that this is not my chosen position and I will allow it to remain here but I shall be vigilant and I shall wait and when it comes again, that contract of respectability, social contact or otherwise is through the window from here on.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Applause.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows: 6.20 p.m.

AYES: Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Hon. B. M. TAITT, Hon. M. A. KING, Hon. E. E. GREAVES, Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN, Hon. N. K. SIMMONS, Hon. W. W. HALL, Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, Hon. C. V. WALKER, Hon. L. L. BRATHWAITE, His Honour J. J. PAYNE, Dr. E. A. SIMMONS, Mr. C. A. NEBLETT, Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH and Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON - 16

NOES: Hon. H. deB, FORDE, Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Mr. O. S. ARTHUR, Dr. R. C. HAYNES, Mr. R. P. BYER, Mr. P. J. M. MILLER and Mr. E. BOURNE - 7

PAPERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded by the Cabinet on behalf of the Prime Minister to lay:

The Ombudsman (Salary) Order, 1989.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

A Resolution to grant the sum of $7 329 019 from the Consolidated Fund and 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. 17.

I give notice too, Sir, of:

A Resolution to grant the sum of $26 000 from the Consolidate^ Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1988-89 Part II Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1988-89, No. 18.

Finally, Sir, I give notice of a:

Resolution to approve the Order entitled the Ombudsman (Salary) Order, 1989.

If the House is so minded, Sir, I will seek permission or the leave of the House, Sir, if it is the will of the House, to do these Resolutions, the money Resolutions as well as the Resolution for the review of the salary of the Ombudsman, in all their stages at this sitting. Government Business, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business. Order No. 9.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE RATES OF SALARY APPLICABLE TO THE POSTS OF THE STAFF OF PARLIAMENT AND CERTAIN OTHER POSTS

Order No. 9 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to increase the salaries of the staff of Parliament other posts as appear in the Schedule of the Resolution.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, this particular Resolution is in keeping with the other Resolutions for the increase in Salaries Revision. The arguments have been advanced on both sides and I do not propose to repeat myself in this.

I beg to move that this do now pass.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put to the House and was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 10.

RESOLUTION TO REVISE THE SALARIES OF THE PRIME MINISTER'S PERSONAL STAFF

Order No. 20 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to revise the salaries of the Prime Minister's personal staff with effect from 1st April, 1988.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, again this Resolution is on the same basis as the previous Resolutions which we have been considering.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 13.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE ORDER ENTITLED THE OMBUDSMAN (SALARY) ORDER, 1989

Order No. 13 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled the Ombudsman (Salary) Order, 1989.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I move, Sir, that the Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 11.

RESOLUTION TO INCREASE THE SALARY OF THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL WITH EFFECT FROM 1ST APRIL, 1988 AND 1ST APRIL, 1989 AND THE DUTY ALLOWANCE WITH EFFECT FROM 1ST APRIL, 1988

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

But I wish to propose an amendment, Sir, that instead of the figure appearing for Entertainment Allowance of $24 000 the figure of $32 400 be substituted, being the same figure as for the Prime Minister. In other words, the Entertainment Allowance of the Governor-General is the same as that of the Prime Minister.

Subject to that amendment I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass, as amended.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I beg to second that, Sir, and reserve my right to speak.

The question that this Resolution as amended do now pass was put and was resolved in the affirmative without division. 6.30 p.m.

JUDGES REMUNERATION AND PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1989

Order No. 12 was called - To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Judges Remuneration and Pensions Act.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, again the arguments which have been applicable in cases of the other measures that we have been doing would be applicable in this case. I, therefore, beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I second that, Sir, and reserve my right to speak.

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

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on this Bill, Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE ' Mr.

CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee. *Clause*

1 was called. Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am having a little too much noise please. Thank you.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, the Bill was read a third time, past and the title read and agreed to.

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

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee of Supply.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1988-89 No. 15 HEAD 19 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of $19,805,000 and it is to supplement Head 19 Ministry of Finance and Subhead 13 Arrears of Salaries and Wages which is a new Head. The purpose of this, Sir, as the Addendum states, is to provide the amount of money required to meet the payment of arrears and new salaries as they were based on the existing salary and wage structure. This is in respect of those who receive pensions, Sir. They are to be paid - the Government pensioners - an allowance of $25.00 per month with effect from April 1, 1988. There is no authority for the payment of this in as much as the sums available cannot meet this particular outlay and, therefore, the Supplementary provision is required to meet the expenditures.

I beg to move that this Resolution stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I second that.

The question that Head 19 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 24 - PENSIONS $1,600,000

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, the sum of $1,600,000 is required as a supplement under Head 24 Pensions and I beg to move that this stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that Head 24 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 6.40 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 'l988-89, No. 16
HEAD 73 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sums of money indicated under Head 73 stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1988-89, NO. 17
HEAD 15 - CABINET OFFICE

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, the sum of $5 427 is required under Object No. 13 of Head 15, Subhead 5, for National Insurance Contributions, and I beg to move that that sum of money for Head 15 stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 36 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, as you can see this is an omnibus Resolution for a large number of institutions with small amounts for supplementary.

I beg to move that Head 36 stand part.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1988-89 No. 18
HEAD 78 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, this is to supplement the vote to allow for counterpart funds to be paid out for the south and west coasts and Greater Bridgetown sewerage project. These funds are refundable.

I beg to move that Head 78 stand part.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of four money Resolutions in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, we have had a long session and we have come to the end of Government Business for today. I therefore move that the House be adjourned till Tuesday, 14th February, 1989 at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 6.50 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Confirmation of Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday,

31st January, 1989... 3152

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 3152

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER.....3153

Receipt of the Report of the Ombudsman for the year 1988

PAPERS

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD 3153

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1989.

The Civil Establishment Teachers (Amendment) Order, 1989.

The Civil Establishment Part-time Officers (Amendment) Order, 1989.

The Senate and House of Assembly (Remuneration and Allowances of Members) Order, 1989.

The Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances) Order, 1989.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES.....3251

The Ombudsman (Salary) Order, 1989.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES..... 3210,3251

Resolution to increase the salary of the Governor-General with effqct from 1st April, 1988 and 1st April, 1989, and the duty allowances with effect from 1st April, 1988.

Bill to amend the Judges Remuneration and Pensions Act.

Resolution to grant the sum of $7,329,019 from the Consolidated Fund and 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. 17.

Resolution to grant the sum of $26,000 from the. Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1988-89 Part II Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1988-89, No. 18.

Resolution to approve the Order entitled The Ombudsman (Salary) Order, 1989.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES.....3210

Bill to amend the Judges Remuneration and Pensions Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

Mr. R. P, BYER.....3153
Mr. EDGAR BOURNE..... 3153
Mr. P. J.M. MILLER..... 3153
Dr. R. C. HAYNES 3153
Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER..... 3153

APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES..... 3153

Hon. B. M. TAITT 3154

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS..... 3154

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 3154

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1988-89,

No. 14 3154

HEAD 18-AUDIT

Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 3154.

HEAD 19 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE

Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 3154.

HEAD 20 - REVENUE COLLECTION

Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 3154.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1989 3155

Mr. O. S. Arthur, 3197; Hon. H. A. Blackman,

3185, 3197; Mr. R. P. Byer, 3189; Hon. H. deB.

Forde, 3163, 3164, 3166; Hon. E. E. Greaves, 3193; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 3172; Mr. P. J. M. Miller, 3204; Mr. R. L. Morris, 3176; Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 3155, 3165, 3208; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 3181; Mr. C. L. Trotman, 3201; Hon. C. V. Walker, 3207.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTAB LISHMENT (TEACHERS) (AMENDKffiNT) ORDER, 1989.....3211

Hon. W. W. Hall, 3223; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 3220; Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 3211; Mr. D. A. C. . Simmons, 3211; Hon. N. K. Simmons, 3218.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTAB LISHMENT (PART-TIME OFFICERS) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1989 3227

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 3227.

RESOLUTION TO GIVE EFFECT TO INCREASED WAGES OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES AND CASUAL EMPLOYEES OF THE GOVERNMENT 3227

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 3227.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE PAYMENT OF INCREASED COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE TO GOVERNMENT PENSIONERS 3227

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 3227.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE MINISTERS AND PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES (REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES) ORDER, 1989.....3227

Mr. O. S. Arthur, 3240; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 3231; Mr. R. L. Morris, 3230; Hon. L. E. Sandiford, , 3245; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 3227; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 3241; Mr. D. J. H. Thompson, 3233; Dr. E. A. Simmons, 3237.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY (REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES) Order, 1989.....3248

Dr. R. C. Haynes, 3248.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE RATES OF SALARY APPLICABLE TO THE POSTS OF THE STAFF OF PARLIAMENT AND CERTAIN OTHER POSTS.....3251

Hon. L.E. Sandiford, 3251.

RESOLUTION TO REVISE THE SALARIES OF THE PRIME MINISTER'S PERSONAL STAFF WITH EFFECT FROM 1ST APRIL, 1988.....3251

Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 3251.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE ORDER ENTITLED THE OMBUDSMAN (SALARY) ORDER, 1989 3251

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 3251

RESOLUTION TO INCREASE THE SALARY OF THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL WITH EFFECT FROM 1ST APRIL, 1988 AND 1ST APRIL, 1989 AND THE DUTY ALLOWANCE WITH EFFECT FROM 1ST APRIL, 1988..... ...3252

Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 3252.

JUDGES REMUNERATION AND PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1989 3252

Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 3252.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1988-89 CURRENT-NO. 15

HEAD 19 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE

$19,805,000..... 3252

Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 3252.

HEAD 24 - PENSIONS $1,600,000.....3253

Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 3253.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1988-89 CAPITAL NO. 16 3253

HEAD 73 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE

Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 3253.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1988-89 CURRENT-NO. 17 3253

HEAD 15 - CABINET OFFICE $5,427

Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 3253.

MINISTRY OF HEALTH - HEAD 36

Hon. B. M. Taitt, 3253.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1988-89 CAPITAL No. 18..... ,3253

HEAD 78 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH Hon. B. M. Taitt, 3253.

SUSPENSIONS 3162,3164,3193,3211,3227

ADJOURNMENT.....3253

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, Mr. O. S. (St. Peter) BARKER-WELCH, Mrs. M. (St. Joseph) BLACKMAN, Hon. H. A. (St. Philip South) BOURNE, Edgar (Christ Church East) BYER, Mr. R. P. (St. George South) FORDE, Hon. H. deB. (Christ Church West) GREAVES, Hon. E. E. (St. Lucy) GREAVES, Hon. P. M. (St. Michael North) HALL, Hon. W. W. (St. Michael West Central) HAYNES, Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central) MILLER, Mr. P. J. M. (City of Bridgetown) MORRIS, Mr. R. L. (Christ Church East Central) PAYNE, His Hon. J. J. (St. James Norih) SANDIFORD, Hon. L. E. (St. Michael South) SIMMONS, Mr. D. A. C. (St. Thomas) SIMMONS, Dr. E. A. (St. Michael East) **SIMMONS, Hon. N. K. (St. James South) TAITT, Hon. B. M. (St. Michael West) THOMPSON, Mr. D. J. H. (St. John) TROTMAN, Mr. C. L. (St. Michael Central) WALKER, Hon. C. V. (St. George North) WEEKES, His Hon. L. A. (St. Michael North** West)