

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1986-91

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, November 6, 1990

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

PRESENT

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

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

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Q.C., M.A., LL.B.

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

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.),
(Leader of the Opposition)

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

Hon. M. A. KING, Q.C., LL.B., (Attorney General,
Minister of Legal Affairs and Minister of Foreign 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. (Econ.)

Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH, (Parliamentary
Secretary, Ministry of Education and Culture)

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

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE, J.P., (Chairman of
Committees)

Mr. E. BOURNE Dr. E. A.

SIMMONS, M.D.

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

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

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER

Mr. R. P. BYER, LL.B.

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

Prayers were led by Rev. Father Ivan Harewood.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in session.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: Minutes of Meeting of Tuesday,
October 30th, 1990.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move
that those Minutes be taken as read and be confirmed.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no corrections and/or
observations, let those Minutes stand confirmed.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I draw to Your
Honour's attention, Sir, a Resolution which was circulated
to Members today. A Resolution to increase the cost of
living allowance at the rate of 3% for Government
pensioners and I beg to give notice of this Resolution with
the anticipation and hope that it will be included in the rest
of the Government's business today, Sir, if there is no
objection.

Mr. SPEAKER: Government business is the instant
order of the day.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to move that the following Standing Orders be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting: Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44.

Hon. M. A. KING: I beg to second the motion.

The question that those Standing Orders be suspended was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ORDER NO. 2 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) ORDER, 1990

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce this particular Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1990 and I would like at the start to indicate that there are also a number of other Resolutions relating to the general question of wages and salaries in the Public Service. Inasmuch as they are all related in some way or another, I propose to make one general introduction, Sir, so that when we come to deal with the other matters I may not have any substantial introduction to raise on those matters. Fortunately, Sir, I think the negotiation concerning the wages and salaries increases for 1990-91 and 1991-92 have been conducted in a spirit of mutual understanding, in the spirit also of a desire on both sides, both the Government as employer and the employees of Government and their representatives to reach an agreement within the context of the prevailing economic conditions within the context of seeking to maintain the standard of living of the workers involved and also, Sir, within the framework and in the spirit of ensuring that whatever growth and development there may be that the workers should share in that.

I think that it is against this background and against the desire to ensure that as far as possible maturity in the bargaining process, maturity which, I believe, Sir, would include the elements of knowledge and understanding of the issues involved, the economic circumstances and background as well as flexibility and the desire to reach an agreement and excluding, Sir, any tactics of bluff and trickery or any of those old-fashioned kinds of tactics that constituted part of the armoury of bargaining in distant times.

I think that this year's negotiations have exhibited a sense of maturity on both sides and this is most desirable within the context of our country. And, Sir, I think it is a tribute also to the philosophy of consensus government whereby, Sir, we seek, and the guiding theme of my Government, Sir, is to try to seek agreement through the discussion of the issues and through the reaching of common positions commonly arrived at in accordance with established procedures and processes.

We have long accepted the workers and their representatives as an integral part of the process of government and, on our side, Sir, we make no apologies for it that we seek to understand the positions advanced by the representatives of the workers and we seek to reconcile those concerns with the overall good and the overall interest of the country. *
12.25 p.m.

In the end it is the Government as employer and it is my responsibility as the Minister for the Civil Service to ensure that agreements are reached with which we can all live and which would be in the general public interest.

I would like to pay a tribute to the workers' representatives, the many unions and associations which have responded and participated in this bargaining process for the fact that I can come to this House today and announce that substantially agreement has been reached * among the principals in the matter of the salaries revision for the two-year period 1990 to 1992.

We have laid, Sir, in this Honourable Chamber a number of Orders and Resolutions relating to the revision of wages and salaries for public officers and other officials for the period April 1990 to March 1992. That legislation includes the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1990 and the accompanying Resolution relating to all public officers with the exception of teachers.

The legislation Sir, includes the following:-

- (1) the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1990 and the accompanying Resolution relating to the teaching staff of the public, primary and secondary schools.
- (2) An amending Resolution relating to public employees including casual and unestablished staff.
- (3) The Civil Establishment (Part-Time Officers) Order, 1990 and the accompanying Resolution.
- (4) The Ombudsman (Salary) (Amendment) Order, 1990 and related Resolution.
- (5) The Parliament Administration (Salary) Order, 1990 relating to the staff of Parliament.
- (6) A Resolution relating to the Personal Staff of the Prime Minister.
- (7) The Judges (Salaries) Order 1990 and related Resolution.
- (8) Resolution relating to the Governor-General.

I do not think I have omitted any that we intend to do at this time.

The negotiations on the new pay agreement for the period 1990-92, have been conducted between the various unions, associations and the Ministry of the Civil Service. Unanimity among the principals who have participated in these negotiations on the levels of increase to be granted, has been substantially reached.

We held some 15 meetings including meetings with the National Union of Public Workers, the Barbados Union of Teachers and the Barbados Secondary Teachers' Union - these were joint meetings - and the Barbados Workers' Union. There was also contact with the Association representing the Prison. There were no actual face to face meetings there but there was discussion through written correspondence of the matter and agreement had been expressed. There were two meetings with the Association representing the Fire Service. I will say something a little later about the Police.

The fact that we have been able to reach agreement, as I have indicated earlier, is a reflection of the maturity in our industrial relations in the public sector and a reflection also of an appreciation of the economic circumstances which are prevailing at this time in Barbados and on a wider scale.

Perhaps, I should say something about the discussions as far as the nurses are concerned because some concerns have been raised in that particular area. I would like to indicate that for this salaries revision, as indeed for the recent classification exercise, it was the National Union of Public Workers which was the accredited representative of nursing personnel as that Union has represented the nurses down through the years.

A claim from the Barbados Registered Nurses' Association either for exclusive or joint accreditation in respect of nursing personnel has been received and that is being processed in the usual manner in which such requests are dealt with. I should point out relevant information to facilitate fullest consideration of the matter was supplied by the Barbados Registered Nurses' Association to the Ministry of the Civil Service on October 10, 1990. That was too late for a decision to be taken in respect of this particular salaries revision. The matter of accreditation for that particular body is under active consideration. I do not think I should say anything more about that at this stage. That is the background to it.

I indicated that I would have said something a little later about the Police Force. I would like to make a few preliminary remarks in respect of the Force. I would wish to state that every police officer in the Force - I am using officer in a generic term including all ranks from constable

up - who was a member of that Force on or before April, 1988 has been a beneficiary from the recently concluded classification exercise. 12.35 p.m.

All of them have benefitted, Sir, and the Police is sharing to the extent of \$1.3 million a year in the overall cost of the \$11 million a year which was the price of the classification exercise.

I thought that I had to make that point, Sir, because there has been some misinformation put abroad that the classification only benefitted a small number of persons. I believe I should make that point at this stage. I will also get back to the beneficiaries in the overall Public Service a little later.

In relation to this present salaries revision, the Police unlike the other representative bodies did not respond early to the request for proposals and they did not submit any claims or proposals for negotiations early. After agreement had been reached with the other unions and associations, the Ministry of the Civil Service advised the Police Association by letter dated October 5, 1990 of the terms of the agreement and offered the same level of increase to the Force. A response to that offer was received from the Commissioner of Police on October 29, 1990, today is November 7, 1990, seeking levels of increases for the grades of Constable to Inspector which would be higher than the rates approved for other branches of the Public Service and would logically have the effect of increasing the salaries of those above the grade of Inspector as well. That submission will be given due consideration when we are able to study it and to discuss it. But in the meantime the provisions of the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No.2) Order, 1990 which is now before us, Sir, includes provisions for the Police Force in accordance with the general level of increases which would be applicable on a comparative base.

I would like to say a few words about the length of the agreement, Sir. The Government's position has been that we would have wished to see a 3-year agreement and we did put that particular proposal on the bargaining table. But agreement was not reached on that and in that spirit of flexibility to which I made reference earlier the proposal was not proceeded with as far as this present agreement is concerned.

I turn next, Mr. Speaker, to the level of increases and the distribution of cost. The level of increases agreed upon by the union averages 5 per cent in the first year, the spread being 7 per cent on the first 8 points of the Z Scale and in the categories 10 to 4 of the key scales graduating thereafter to 3.5 per cent on non-scale or salaries at S-9 to S-1. For the second year 1991 to 1992 the increases will be 3 per cent compounded on the 1990 to 1991 salaries applied across the board to all posts from top to bottom of the pay structure.

So we have increases ranging from 7 per cent to 3 per cent from the bottom to the top and then for the second year of the agreement there is a further 3 per cent across the board. The estimated cost of the salaries revision for 1990 to 1991 is \$25 million and for 1991 to 1992 an additional \$15 million. So we have \$25 million for the first year 1990 to 1991 and a further \$15 million for the second year, which would mean for the second year the amount paid would be actually \$40 million taking the first year and the second year into account.

The allocation of the cost among the various categories of officers, employees, and other officials is as follows, Sir: For 10 698 public officers on the established staff, it will cost \$12 928 846 in the first year and \$8 277 992 for the year 1991 to 1992. For the 1 000 holders of temporary offices, the cost will be \$1 277 493 for the year 1990 to 1991 and \$816 717 for the year 1991 to 1992. For the 1 931 permanent public employees and the 4 200 public employees who are casual employees, the sum will be \$5 409 873 in the year 1990/91 and \$2 502 362 for the year 1991/92. For the 572 non-teaching staff of secondary schools and tertiary institutions, it will be \$466 195 for the year 1990 to 1991 and \$300 968 for the year 1991 to 1992. 12.45 p.m.

For the 4,942 staff members of some 16 Statutory Boards which operate wholly or mainly on transfers, the sum will be \$4,293,678 for 1990-91 and \$2,093,064 for 1991-92. For other officials \$680,000 for the year 1990-91 and \$500,000 for the year 1991-92. That should bring the figure, Sir, approximately to the \$40 million to which I referred for the two years - approximately \$25 million for the 1990-91 year and another \$15 million approximately for the year 1991-92.

Perhaps I should say something about the establishment of temporary posts and the creation of new posts. In 1986 the Democratic Labour Party Government started a process for reducing the number of temporary posts in the Service by establishing such temporary posts on a permanent basis. Provision is being made in this Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order for 239 temporary posts to be established on this occasion. So simultaneous with this exercise, Sir, we will be putting on the permanent establishment another 239 temporary posts. Since 1986 we have been able to give permanent tenure in respect of some 942 posts. We have therefore placed 942 temporary posts on the permanent establishment, broken down as follows: For the year 1986-87, 202; 1988, 403; 1989, 46; 1990, 52, and now, Sir, if this particular proposal gets the approval of this Honourable Chamber, 239, which would bring the total to 942.

I think, Sir, sometimes it is not fully realised the amount of work that has been done by this Government, the Democratic Labour Party Government, in improving the lot of the Civil Servants and other Public Officers in this

country in our effort to provide a better standard of living and better conditions of work. I think we have all worked very hard in the interest of the Civil Servants of this country to ensure that their conditions of service, not only wages and salaries, but the fringe benefits as well....

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Don't they think so? You should look at the polls and see. The Civil Servants understand that we have been working very hard in order to bring about these improvements in the terms and conditions of their work. They would wish us to go a little farther faster, Sir, but I am saying that no Government in the history of Barbados has done as much for the Civil Servants in this country as the Democratic Labour Party Government.

Sir, I believe there will still be some 800 temporary posts remaining. It is my policy as a continuing policy to examine these and from time to time, sooner rather than later, seek to have these posts created on the permanent establishment in the interest of a more efficient-running of the Civil Service.

Perhaps, Sir, I should return to the question of the provision of permanent posts in relation to some of the uniformed services. I refer to the Police Service, the Fire Service and the Prison Service.

The provision of 25 constables, 10 telephone operators and 11 clerical officers for the Police Force is the second phase in the reorganisation of the staffing of the Force. It is aimed at relieving trained policemen of routine duties of a clerical nature for reassignment to full time policing. In August of this year 25 additional posts of constable were previously provided, so what we had was 25 in August which were provided and now we are making an additional provision of a further 25, together with 10 telephone operators and 11 clerical officers. I state again that my Ministry of the Civil Service, along with the Ministry of Legal Affairs, which falls under the Minister of Legal Affairs, will be working closely together to look at a third phase for additional resources for the Royal Barbados Police Force.

I make it clear that these efforts to respond to the call for additional resources are done within the context of the overall provision and the needs as we perceive them, and it - must be done within the context of the deployment of existing resources and the utilisation in the best, most efficient and efficient way possible of existing resources, but this will be a continuing exercise. I again wish to stress the point that we are responding to the perceived needs and the needs as determined in order to ensure that the Royal Barbados Police Force is able to carry out the mission which by law it has been set up to carry out. 12.55 p.m.

Again, no Government has been as solicitous for the concerns of the members of the Royal Barbados Police Force as the Democratic Labour Party Government. Provision, Sir, is also being made to establish the clerical and instructional staff of the Regional Police Training Centre as a unit of the Police Force.

As far as the Fire Service is concerned, 14 posts are being provided at 4 different levels and this is part of a programme aimed at reducing the duty hours of firemen and improving the manning of the fire stations and the fire tenders and also to provide an improved corps at the officer level. The aim of all of this is that the Fire Service should be enabled to devote more resources to the duties of fire prevention and fire protection and we are thereby seeking to place at the disposal of the service additional resources in this particular regard. Again, there will be continuing concerns. There will be continuing consideration of the needs of the Fire Service in this particular regard.

In respect of the Prison, the establishment on a permanent basis of 15 posts at the Prison Department recognizes the growing need for additional staff in that Department and so we are providing these fifteen posts on a permanent basis.

Sir, the Civil Service continues to be the greatest charge on the public purse and the salaries and wages, including the elements of transfers to Statutory Boards which can be properly attributed to personal emoluments constitute some 50% of annual expenditure. Some 50% of annual expenditure goes towards the salaries and wages of the Civil Service. Added to this, is the outlay for the cost of National Insurance Contributions of approximately \$27 million and of pensions and allowances for retired public officers and employees which is another approximately \$60 million, Sir, and these costs can be expected to increase if the programme for liberalizing the application of pensions continues. New pension legislation will soon be laid in Parliament to provide pensionable status for 3,300 persons who are employed in a number of Statutory Boards such as the National Cultural Foundation, the National Sports Council, the Barbados Board of Tourism and five other Boards for whom no pension scheme has ever been previously devised.

It is proposed that the staff... I don't think that the Member for St. Thomas quite understood what I said. I said that new pension legislation will soon be laid in Parliament to provide pensionable status for those persons in the Statutory Boards who have no pension scheme before and don't let there be any misunderstanding. You are bringing it in January? You expect to be my Personal Assistant at that time? I think that is the only way.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, what we are proposing is that the staff of these bodies will be brought within the provisions of the Statutory Boards' pensions legislation just as the Sanitation Services Authority and the Child Care Board are within that particular ambit, Sir.

I would like to refer again, Sir, to the reclassification exercise. The record of the Democratic Labour Party Government in catering' to the Public Service, Sir, is unparalleled.

In the other areas outside of pensions, salary revision and the establishment of temporary posts, the most outstanding achievement and one which has not really passed unnoticed, is the recent reclassification exercise which brought additional benefits to over 6000 holders of public office at an average of \$11 million a year. That reclassification corrected the many imbalances in grading relativities that had been created through piece-meal tinkering with the grades in the past.

I believe, Sir, in 1981, there was some reclassification which affected only approximately 300 posts and I believe there was another one, Sir, in 1984 which affected 900 posts and that one, Sir, I don't remember, I believe it was done in St. Peter. I believe, Sir, the Barbados Labour Party had set up Headquarters somewhere at a hotel in Road View....

Asides.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sandridge. Sir, there had some kind of operation nearby.... somewhere in St. Peter, I believe. It was a one-man reclassification carried out in 1984. That is the point I am making, Sir, a one-man reclassification exercise carried out in 1984 and which I think was the marvel even of the Member for St. Peter. I believe he even marvelled at the way that particular exercise was carried out in which one man, Sir... The one man, Sir, he was the Prune Minister of the day determining who should be included in this reclassification. He - he, not he - she, not she... And that is how these particular things were done at that particular time.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: At that time, Sir, we did not have any kind of criticism of the way that was done from any of the accredited unions who are so quick now to raise any issue, as indeed, they are entitled to under our consensus government. They can speak freely and they can make their comments.

Aside.

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: They spoke freely in 1986 when they went to the polls and delivered the people of this country from the hands of the Barbados Labour Party. May 28, 1986 was deliverance day. They spoke very freely at that particular time. 1.05 p.m.

What I am saying, Sir, if we take the 300 posts which were reclassified in 1981 and we add to that the 900 posts that were reclassified in 1984, giving a total of 1 200 posts and compare that with the 6 000 persons who, benefitted under the reclassification under this Democratic Labour Party, I think the civil servants in this country will realise which is the Government and which is the party that has been looking after their interests and will continue to look after their interests after whatever date the Honourable Member for St. Thomas chooses to set or to revise for election day.

The importance of the Public Service for the achievement of national goals and for the implementation of the policies of the Government cannot be underestimated. The sector represents some 25% of the labour force but I believe that their spending power and their contribution to the circulation of resources in the country far exceeds that particular 25%.

The fact that they are normally guaranteed employment adds to the stability of life in this country and the stability of our social and economic conditions. We expect the highest level of productivity in this sector because the Public Service, if we go beyond the Civil Service, represent a collection of talents and abilities that is unsurpassed in this country. I believe the Civil Service can make an even greater contribution to the growth and development of Barbados and that is what we will be seeking to achieve as time goes by. I call upon the Public Service to further commit and recommit itself to the highest ideals and practice of self-discipline and hard work so that our nation can continue to enhance its good name and its reputation for stability and good management.

Sir, as far as pensioners are concerned, it is normal to grant an increase to government pensioners on the occasion of a salaries revision. This practice will prevail on this particular occasion as well. I believe notice has been given of a resolution the effect of which will be to ensure that from April 1990 a cost of living allowance of 3% increase on the cumulative pension and the cost of living allowance, will be granted to each government pensioner.

Let me put it this way again, Sir. Effective from April 1990, a cost of living allowance of 3% increase on the cumulative pension and cost of living allowances will be granted to each government pensioner, that is, former public employees or public officers. They will get a 3% increase cost of living. No-one will get less than \$20 a month. It will be 3% increase but subject to a minimum of

\$20 per month so the lowest amount paid would be \$20 a month. For every pensioner who retired prior to April 1, 1976 an additional allowance of \$5 a month will be granted from the same effective date, April 1990. Those who retired before April 1, 1976 will get an additional \$5 as well. The percentage rate of increase to pensioners approximates to one half of the average percentage rate of increase which is being considered for the civil servants over- the period 1990-1992. The total number of pensioners who would have retired prior to April 1, 1976 is 3 500 out of a roll of 5 579. It is these 3 500 pensioners who would get an additional \$5 a month because that is the number who would have retired prior to April 1, 1976.

Very few pensioners are not eligible, generally speaking, for the National Insurance and Social Security Contributory Old Age Pension. They do not benefit from that particular provision. Their basic pensions would have been computed on a much lower salary level than their most recently retired counterparts.

Sir, I hear what they tell me from time to time. I listen to them whenever I meet them. They say "that their particular status should be improved somewhat. On this occasion, I think it is only fair and equitable that those public officers who have given so much towards the public administration of this country should benefit in a better way from the resources of the country hence this particular provision. We are a very caring Government and we look after the needs of those who are in need. The estimated cost of these provisions is about \$1.8 million a year.

As far as the pensions payable from the National Insurance Scheme is concerned, the rates of increase will be \$5 a week for the old age non-contributory pensions and \$6 a week for the old age contributory pensions. There are two categories, Sir, those who make payments towards their pensions, those will go up by \$6 a week and the non-contributory pension, the category we call old age pensioners these will be increased by \$5 a week. 1.15p.m.

These will take effect from December 3, 1990. The cheques for the current series have already been issued. I believe they go out in three or four weekly packets. In order to facilitate the administration of the payments, the increases for the old age pensioners and those who receive contributory pensions will go up from December 3, 1990. So this should mean I believe, Sir, that the non-contributory pensioners will now receive an increase of \$5.00 a week. That will bring them to I believe \$63.00 a week, Sir. In respect to the contributory pensions for those who have paid towards their pensions, that will be a minimum of \$76.00 a week. It is estimated that these measures will cost an additional \$8 million a year.

I think, Sir, I have given enough information to cover all of these areas. Perhaps I should answer that it is not

generally realized the contribution that has been made in terms of seeking to place and to retain the salaries of civil servants and other public officers at a reasonable level taking into account cost of living growth in the economy, and other conditions and fringe benefits and so on. We have made a very great effort to ensure that the salaries we pay to our public officers and civil servants that these are at reasonable levels. In 1986, Sir, there was a salaries revision which was ranging between 9 per cent and 1.25 per cent and that was at a cost of \$18.6 million. In 1987 to 1988 on top of that, Sir, there was a 2 per cent increase across the board and estimated to cost some \$7.5 million. In 1988 to 1989, the salaries revision ranged from 8 per cent to 5 per cent and the cost was estimated at \$30 million and for the year 1988 to 1989, 2 per cent which was a further \$10 million. In 1990 to 1991, this particular salaries revision, Sir, will be in the range as I said from 7 per cent to 3.5 per cent and will be costing some \$25 million with a 3 per cent across the board for 1991 to 1992 of a further \$15 million and those costs add up to about \$106.1 million. I should add to that the \$11 million for the reclassification of 1988. When all of these are taken together, Sir, and compounded when you get an increase for one year and there is an across the board or other kind of increase for the second year, the second year has to take into account the first year's increase and it is compounded over the period.

I estimate, Sir, that over the 6 year period from 1986-87 to 1991-92 some \$408 million additional costs would have been provided for the public officers of this country. That is a very great effort, Sir, that has been made and I believe that the people of Barbados will expect that the Civil Service and other public officers will rededicate themselves and recommit to increased productivity and to increased service to the people of Barbados.

I think, Sir, I have said enough on these measures. If there is additional information which Honourable Members may wish to have, I will be happy to provide that information if it is available. But I will commend this particular Resolution to this Honourable Chamber, Sir, in the hope that what we do here today will be for the further growth, development, and improvement of our country and will make for that social, administrative, and economic efficiency which combine, Sir, is so very vital for our continued growth in this country. Our country, as a small country, has done tremendously well over the years and we continue to be a marvel to other countries as to how such a small country with so very limited resources can achieve the levels of growth and development that we have been able to achieve in this country. I am glad, Sir, that this Democratic Labour Party has made so outstanding a contribution to the further growth and development of our country. We are very privileged, Sir - that is how we approach it - because we are the servants of the people and we continue to search for and to implement other ways for the improvement of our country. We rededicate ourselves to the service of this country.

I thank you very much, Sir.

Applause.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, quite evidently the election circus has come to town. The only problem is that the public purse will be financing the activities of the circus. 1.25p.m.

We listened, Sir, to the Prime Minister, and indeed members of his party, who seem only to take delight when they are spending money or talking about expenditures, and they never seek to reflect where the money comes from or what impact the consequences of their actions would have on the society as a whole. I can almost say for sure that there is not one Public Servant who would find himself financially better off after this exercise today, and I say it for this reason. Almost everyone will be saddled with heavy debts, they will all be deprived of access to credit, and every cent they get will almost certainly go to the satisfaction of past debts, so that by tomorrow they will be back to square one but facing enormous increases in the price levels in Barbados.

I think it is important to recognise that nothing that has happened here would even in any small measure compensate the public servants for the impact of taxation and the impact of prices on their pockets over the past two or three years. So we find ourselves, as I said, in the circus where you create conditions in the country which push the price levels up considerably, you proceed to impose all kinds of levels of taxation, then you come back and give modest increases in salaries and the conditions of the public servants continue to worsen year after year.

That particular aspect of the Public Service I will address later, but I believe it is time that some kind of firm decision be taken as to the reasons for the extremely low morale which exists in the Public Service of Barbados. There is no point talking of productivity when you have a Public Service which is living in a state of constant fear. They never know when the political axe will come down against them, and indeed I think that some kind of fundamental changes need to be made in relation to the Public Service of Barbados. We in the NDP believe firmly that the time has come when we have to seek to reverse the harmful decisions taken in the 1970s as to the role of politicians in respect of appointments to the Public Service.

What has happened since 1974, Sir, is that politicians have gone wild in terms of the influence which they were given the authority to wield in respect of the Public Service. They have appointed whom they felt like appointing, they have transferred whom they felt like transferring, they have

promoted whom they felt like promoting and they have fired whom they felt like firing. The net effect is that today we have a Public Service whose morale has been systematically undermined over a period of some 15 years, plus there have been certain structural changes in the Public Service which, as I say, would take 25 years to reverse after the NDP's policies have been put in place.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most revealing things is this. I have made a point over the past few years, and indeed it first occurred to me when a senior member of the Public Service in 1986 told me that he hoped that none of his children would ever join the Public Service. I have asked over the past four or five years maybe 20 senior people in the Public Service, who would have joined the Public Service in the 50s and the 60s, and not one of them indicated to me that they considered a career in the Public Service as one which they wish for their children. That speaks a lot, Sir. What has happened is that the confidence of the Public Service has been undermined by political intervention, by victimisation and by abuse of the public servants down the years by the political process.

I believe, Sir, that we will never be able to achieve the kind of Public Service which this country deserves until we restore the pre-eminence of the Public Service Commission in Barbados in respect of all appointments to the Public Service, in respect of matters of promotions, transfers and discipline in the Public Service, save for the few appointments which under the Constitution and for one or two other reasons are subject to political influence. That is clearly understood.

It has also had a very significant impact on the pattern of Government's expenditure over the years. The result is that from day to day nobody knows who is being taken on in the Public Service. Those responsible for the financial management of the country would not even know, for example, how many people are taken on and would be paid out of statutory expenditure, because you do not have to „ come to Parliament for that in between times. Many Ministers, for example, do not even know who is taken on on the Statutory Boards, what kind of expenditures are being incurred on a day to day basis, and that is why when people come in here and boast about the escalation of expenditure in respect of personal emoluments they do not seem to recognise that you have to relate that to questions of efficiency, questions of productivity and the like.

I was shocked today, Sir - because this reveals the large number of straightforward lies that a whole lot of people have been telling about the state of Barbados' external position, big lies by big people who should know better - I was shocked when I took up just now the October edition of the Economic and Financial Statistics of the Central Bank to note that on page 65 the foreign reserves of

Barbados stood at \$233 million, the lowest level since December 1984 when it was \$243 million, at a time when there were statements from several people to the public of Barbados saying that that was not true. And the same figures showed that the Central Bank of Barbados was in the red on August 31 as far as foreign exchange is concerned, on 31st August, 1985, and that when you look and add in the \$140 million owed under the Caribbean Multilateral Clearing Facility that is not money, it is a debt but occurs as an asset and that is included in the \$233 million plus another \$72 million which is the short term liability of the Central Bank. They don't have one cent in foreign exchange to buy one potato in Barbados. In other words, it is not only a question, Sir, of the Central Bank of Barbados being in a negative position but the reserves of Barbados being in a negative position. You can't spend the Sinking Fund for a domestic debt. You can't spend the net balances of the commercial banks. The only other money in there you can spend is to break the law and take out the \$18 million that you have in the Sinking Fund for foreign debt and to do that, you will have to break the law and breach several Acts in Barbados. 1.35p.m.

That is the kind of nonsense. The story is all there on that bottom line on page 65. It is absolutely clear, but, Sir, these things do come to light. All it means is that they could not get access to foreign exchange on the 30th August to effect a cover up for 31st August.

Now, Sir, the point I am making is that you have a situation where the country has not got the foreign exchange to support... I haven't seen September yet. Let's look at August.

Sir, we haven't had the foreign exchange to support additional expenditures in Barbados. The Government hasn't got a red cent. The Government has come inside here to raise the ceiling for local borrowing by \$100 million.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: This is the Debate. How are you going to pay this and what is it going to do? Because for the first time in Barbados, the Government finds itself in a situation where it hasn't got a red cent to pay the public servants and comes inside here boasting and all I am saying is that you will have to be printing money to pay the salaries. There is no way that you will have money to pay one cent unless you resort to Central Bank accommodation to pay the salaries and with this foreign exchange position, then it will be a disaster. And I want to go further and say this, Sir, that the Government having tried for several months in the Eurodollar market to raise money and has not succeeded in raising one cent and having now tried recently in appointing, I think, Barclays Bank giving them a mandate to try to raise some money a few weeks ago in the

Eurodollar market, that if that does not materialize and this country has to go to the IMF, then God help the public servants in this country, because this is the first Bill they are going to be looking at.

Anything we do here, everything done here today would have to be reversed, if we go to the IMF. Let's get the record straight, because there is no way that under any IMF programme they are going to allow salaries and wages to be anything like 50% or over the expenditure. There is no standby programme of the IMF that has ever permitted any kind of arrangement of that nature.

So that what we are seeing is a situation where Barbados, the people of Barbados, as a result of gross political mismanagement now find themselves coming to Parliament to approve increases for its public servants when we know that what we vote for today can only be met out of the printing of money. There is no other way. Already, Sir, we have a situation where there are several months of arrears in terms of travel allowances for several categories of public servants. They have not been paid for several months. Our citizens - the Government owes them vast sums of money and they are making no effort to pay them.

We have a situation where not only are there arrears in respect of the payment of our citizens that have provided goods and services to the Government but we also have another interesting situation where the Government has not only failed to satisfy those debts but now comes inside here pretending that they could be so good and so generous to all before an election. What a circus, Sir, what a circus! This is an appalling situation in which we have found ourselves. I have been in here for twelve and a half years and I have never known a situation where this kind of thing existed. Even if the Treasury was low in funds at a time, then our domestic and our external position and an environment existed in those two areas where Government could borrow profitably in order to meet its bills. Today it can't. They have no foreign reserves so they pay out the money with printed money and we are indebted further and that is the appalling situation in which we find ourselves today.

I urge the Government, there is no point in talking about the improvement in the morale within the public service when you couldn't pay the debts that you owe the public servants. That's the first thing you have to do. Go and pay the people their travel allowances.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I never owed anybody a cent yet. Go and pay. You don't have a cent to pay....

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Honourable Member does not understand a single thing because if Government in the past owed money....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the Chamber. From time immemorial the Government of Barbados has had problems where travelling allowances were outstanding. When the Honourable Minister was Minister of Finance he had the same problem only it was worst. Now he is coming in here and trying to give the impression that something new has happened.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I am saying there has never been a situation in Barbados where a government has been in arrears with its payments to public servants and finds itself today without one cent in foreign exchange and is unable to borrow except by printing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Honourable Member understands and if he understands he is being just wicked.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Point of order, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: If I may continue, Sir, in this kind of dangerous behaviour... Today we are faced with a major problem in respect to the law and order in Barbados and one would have thought that the Government would have made every effort to go some distance in trying to meet the requirements of the Royal Barbados Police Force. We are satisfied that the request for 1500 police officers is a legitimate request.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The point is, I am satisfied, Sir, that the Force needs 1500 police officers in order to meet the needs of law and order in this society and we in the NDP do so pledge. We believe that it is important that the whole area of law and order be dealt with. 1.45p.m.

I do not think that it is a matter of tinkering and bringing on 20, 25 or 30 here. I think it is important that a firm decision be taken as to what the needs of the Police Force is, set up a crash training programme and try and bring the Force up to the required standard.

The other area where there has been a lot of double talk as to what happened to the \$58 million which will be paid out this year, \$33 million in respect of the regrading and \$25 million in respect of this increase. I am saying that if you do not have any money and if you have to fight the unions and do all sorts of things, then you have a duty to concentrate on those at the bottom. Of that \$58 million I do

not think that more than \$10 million would go to the many many thousands at the bottom.

It is a fact that the \$33 million in the regrading exercise went predominantly, if not almost exclusively, to those at the top. It does not make sense to come in here and try to mislead the public by saying that all categories of police officers got a little piece as a result of the regrading because even if that were true, they would represent a very small percentage of those at the bottom. What happened to all the many thousands that did not get one penny and one or two got less.

The point is that the regrading was heavily biased and slanted towards those at the top. Those at the bottom should know that when those at the top are getting 3% they are getting 3% on top of \$33 million they got only a few weeks ago. Let it be clear that this DLP Government has succeeded this year in reversing what has been a consistent trend in Barbados over the past 40 years, that is, to try to keep narrowing the gap between the bottom and the top in the Public Service. This year is the first time that an administration would have taken that dastardly backward step as to come to this Parliament....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member should withdraw "dastardly".

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure the Honourable Member understands the point of order the Honourable Member has made.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I withdraw the word "dastardly", Sir. I would say that backward step, reversing trends which this Parliament unanimously has endorsed since the 1940's and 1950's to try to close the gap between the bottom and the top in the Public Service. I am saying that 1990 is a black year in the history of wages negotiations in Barbados.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member said that for the last 40 years this House has unanimously endorsed a principle. I draw to Your Honour's attention, Sir, that when the Honourable Member was in Opposition and the then Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Tom Adams, brought down a Bill in here to impose a settlement, that the Honourable Member was in the forefront. We voted against the entire package.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I remember speaking against the principle of bringing down legislation before reaching a negotiated settlement. I have never opposed the principle of wage increases being so structured as to progressively narrow the gap between the bottom and the top. What I am saying is that when you take the combined impact of the regrading plus this wages settlement, that this year in 1990 we have taken a major backward step.

I will say, as I have already said, it is a black year. Even when this Parliament was dominated by white persons this has never happened before. It is a fact. It is going to be very interesting, Sir. I think the last statistic that I saw was that the ratio was 7:1, somewhere in that region. It had arrived at that because of a conscious effort to make sure that the gap is closed. This year it has been reversed. Those same principles do not underlie what has gone on before. ^

The poor police officers - look who they pick on! They come in here, they do not legislate for anybody else but they come in here and legislate for the police officers. They do not have the right to strike. Their right to invite whomsoever they like to address them at their association is being challenged, Sir. Now, those people who have to protect us by day and night, the people who come first to your consciousness as fear strikes you in the middle of the night as you hear unusual noises around you, as your dog barks and you are afraid, you begin to think of the friendly » police officer. They are using the big stick of parliamentary legislation to grind their noses in the dust. That is what they are doing today.

Sir, I believe that a little more sympathy, a little more understanding of the problems that face our police officers would have led the Government to take a more sympathetic attitude towards them. I believe, Sir, that they deserve to get what they are asking for. I want it to be known that I am ^ going to scream today on the Floor of this House and let it be known in every home in this country that we in the NDP support the police officers in their demands for better conditions. You cannot want more protection from the police, you cannot want a reduction in the level of crime, you cannot want improvements in law and order and, at the same time, you do not address the many problems facing the police officers in Barbados.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I will not be confining myself to numbers in this debate. This is a second reading speech. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Rules of the House say you must address principles.

Further, let me say this. When we look and see the problems we hear of all these wondrous things that the Government says it has done for the Public Service. Every day you hear of a threat of a strike. You hear of confusion among all groups in the Public Service. Our mothers and our sisters, the nurses of this country find themselves under severe pressure brought on by the present administration and my friendly Minister here would do nothing to relieve it.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order. How come the Honourable Member has discovered the nurses? For all the years he did not even know they existed and suddenly, today, he has discovered the nurses.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I do not know in what context the Honourable Member speaks. 1.55p.m.

I have always maintained an honourable and dignified relationship towards the nurses of this country, Sir. There are others who believe that evidence of a good and sound relationship should be characterized by other areas of activities. However, Sir, I have always chosen the path.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I would just like to find out if the Honourable Member will be finishing his speech in the next 10 minutes.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, there is no way that the 25 000 Barbadians with their livelihoods being put at risk by that "wicked Administration" that I will stop in 10 minutes time, Sir.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: In the circumstances, Sir, I ask him to withdraw "wicked" Administration first.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, the Honourable Member does not like the word "wicked". I will say an Administration that does not function in the interest of the people of Barbados. I have withdrawn.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I beg to move that Your Honour do now suspend this sitting until 3 p.m. this day Sir.

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

The question that the sitting be now suspended until 3 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 2.00 p.m.

RESUMPTION Mr.

SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Now, Mr. Speaker, at the suspension I was addressing the question of certain groups in our society and the impact that this measure is having on their welfare. I believe, Sir, that the Government should pay far greater attention to the problems facing the nursing profession of Barbados. Nurses, Sir, by tradition are not persons who expose themselves too much to the limelight and they are invariably persons of very significant dedication. I want to say something. There are one or two Members on the other side who keep referring to my relationship with the nursing profession. Now let me tell

you something. There is no one in Barbados who has done more for the nursing profession than I have done in a personal capacity. I, Sir, for 10 years and continuing still for those who prefer my professional services have looked after the nurses at the hospital. I was the one who for 10 years was responsible for the training of nurses at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Anyhow, I will not go into that any further.

I go further, Sir, and I say this. I think that we have made some serious errors in the past in relation to the structuring of the nursing profession in Barbados and the structure of training for the nursing profession. I say this, Sir, that in a situation where you have so many unemployed young girls in Barbados who are willing and able to pursue a nursing career nevertheless we find ourselves in a situation where we have a shortage of nurses. It is quite wrong. I believe, Sir, that this is the result of certain decisions which have been taken down the years. As we all know, many occasions at night there is only one staff nurse looking after two wards and sometimes no staff nurse looking at two wards. Sir, this is a situation that never obtained at the QEH in the past. I think that it is the result of trying to mimic what obtains in North America rather than looking at the peculiar circumstances of a developing country.

In the past, we had a situation where nurses joined the hospital, where there was a training programme at the hospital, where nurses went through a 3-year programme, and they got good academic training at the hospital whilst at the same time they were paid and contributed to the service of the hospital. At the end of that time, Sir, those nurses were well equipped academically and at the same time they were very skilled persons with a very thorough understanding of what goes on in an institution. This whole idea of taking nursing training out of the hospital by and large and pulling it in an academic institution with the nurses paying periodic visits to the hospital as part of a training exercise has removed a very essential ingredient in the training on the one hand and at the same time has deprived the hospital of effective manpower during those training years.

I certainly conceive of a doctor being trained other than on the job. The doctor has to work in the hospital. He may go to the university but he has....

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No, no, not in the same way. It is a very different exercise that is going on. In North America, I know that has been the practice for many years. But you are dealing with a different situation. The British system, which we had here in Barbados in the past, I think was the system that was best suited for Barbados. A lot of our girls that have passed through that training in the fifties and sixties have reached the top throughout the world. Sir, some

of the best nurses throughout Southern England today, particularly those girls who went from the Modern High School who went into the Hospital Training Programme and emerged from there and went abroad, are now the top people because they have the academic input and they had the basic skills and familiarity with the functioning of institutions and the professional approach drilled into them right from the very beginning. I think that we really have to review the whole system of training of nurses in the interest of producing a better qualified nurse based on their qualifications and experience, and providing additional service for the hospital during the training period. We have all of the resources here available to us. I think it is really sad, Sir, where we were a nation exporting nurses in the past that we now have a shortage of nurses or we have to import nurses. Something is fundamentally wrong. I think that one of the strengths, Sir, of this country is its human resource development. Right here in the Public Service we can see something that has gone very fundamentally wrong and I think it is because of the wrong approach to the training of nurses.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The doctors thing is different. The doctors have to spend a lot of time in the hospital. As a matter of fact, the doctors' training has taken a complete reverse. In recent times doctors are being required to spend more of their time in the hospital than in the days when I qualified, whereas the nursing thing has gone the other way. It is good for PAHO and so on to make all kinds of recommendations, but they make those recommendations against the background of experiences elsewhere. 3.05 p.m.

I am calling on the Minister to do a historical review and see what has been the most appropriate system of training of nurses for Barbados, because I believe that if what we have in Barbados was reversed you would probably find that you would get in a very short period of time jobs for three or four hundred people, and in four or five years' time you will find you have no shortages of nurses in Barbados. These things have to be looked at and we have to look and see where we are spending money and not getting the kind of returns, and not getting the best kind of product at the end of the day.

I am also concerned, Sir, whilst we talk a lot about the salaries of public servants, we have to pay more attention to the conditions under which our public servants work. I am disturbed again and again when I see public servants having to go on a sick-out or see photographs of public servants standing on the sidewalks because of the conditions in the buildings in which they work.

This is another major problem we have had in Barbados. Whereas we commit more and more public expenditure for building all sorts of expensive new

structures, those structures that can be repaired, extended, enhanced at minimal cost generating work for a large number of small people particularly, contractors and so on, all that is neglected. I believe it is time that we pause and maybe for a five year period examine the conditions under which public servants work, using that term in its broadest sense, whether they be the Police, the Fire Service, the General Service, and let us focus upon that as our five year Capital programme. We should examine the physical environment in which the 25,000 public servants work. Do not be afraid to tell the international agencies we do not want one cent for this and that project they may want to foist upon us. Tell them it is a project the people of Barbados want and it is what we want financing for. If they cannot give financing for it, then they can keep their money. Do not commit us to any more debt on other kinds of projects.

I believe that could be a major step taken, because you cannot talk of productivity when people have to work in an environment where there is inadequate lighting, inadequate air conditioning, where the roofs are leaking and where all these kinds of problems exist. We have to face the reality that they do exist. The Government has done very little in this regard.

There is a substantial number of public servants in Barbados working in buildings which have asbestos roofs. It has been shown throughout the world that asbestos in buildings is dangerous to the health of people. I have heard all kinds of quacks trying to put forward the view that that is not the case. The reality is, Sir, that whilst it is true that if someone is working in an asbestos mine where you get the fine dust in large volumes, he is more likely to contract the disease at an earlier stage, nevertheless it is a fact that if you have asbestos in roofs sooner or later it disintegrates, and if you have 30 or 40 people working in that office for any length of time, then one or other will be affected at some point in time.

In North America if anyone discovers anything related to asbestos everybody is vacated the same day and that roof is attended to immediately, because in that society they know the legal consequences that would flow if those steps were not taken. I think it is important where you have thousands of people working in the Public Service under those conditions, then something has to be done. Only recently, Sir, in the State of Florida a law was passed requiring every school authority to get rid of all asbestos from roofing in schools.

No matter what anybody says, the fine asbestos fibre is a cause of health problems and you are only speaking of degree whether you relate it to mining or to a degenerating roof. There is nobody on God's earth who can tell me that if an asbestos fibre in a mine is dangerous to your health, that one in a roof is not dangerous to your health, because the critical thing is the size of the fibre and the extent to which

it goes down into the small areas of your lungs. The whole point behind it is that the fibre sets up a particular reaction. It is a fibre that cannot be degraded by biological processes and it stimulates a cancerous process in the lung. That is a fact, it is reality and there is no cock-eyed kind of view that can get me.

I smoke cigarettes, Sir, which is quite wrong, and it is just a question of whether you smoke lights or heavies. All you are doing is reducing the incidence, but the basic facts are there. The same thing applies to the conditions of our teachers and I would urge the Government, when it is boasting about the few cents they are giving the teachers and at the same time leaving teachers to work in the most appalling conditions, then in fact you are really doing nothing substantial to help the teachers.

I had indicated that at some point during my presentation I would also look at the net that persons in the Public Service would be getting. 3.15p.m.

I am not prepared to go through a large number of categories of workers and work out that they are getting three or four hundred dollars a year or \$1,000 a year or \$1,500 a year. To do that, would just hold up the business of the House. But what I am saying, is this, that this Government has done more to erode the living standards of public servants than any other Government in the past. And I am going to set about to prove it now.

Even to restore the conditions which the public servants enjoyed in 1986, they will have to come a lot better than they have come today. In 1986, Sir, yours truly, the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, increased the disposable income of public servants. We reduced the cost of their mortgages and all the monies that they owed in Barbados by reducing interest rates. We ensured that adequate credit was available to them and that they should not be deprived of credit. There are very few public servants in Barbados, Sir, who borrow money for anything other than for housing or for personal reasons and I am saying that there are 25,000 people in Barbados today, one group of people against whom the monetary measures of the Government will militate more than anybody else. There is not a single category of permitted credit that is of any value to those 25,000. That's a fact. Civil servants earn a salary and they borrow, they save and their entire life operates around that area. They try to acquire a home, they try to acquire a motor car and they try to make satisfactory conditions for their children. Everything the Government has done has militated against them one hundred percent.

There are other professional groups in Barbados and business people who can find ways and means of getting around the bends but the public servants of Barbados have no alternative but to bear the full brunt of that monetary recklessness that the Government has introduced in

Barbados. They are the hardest hit. I do not like to go through all the benefits that I brought on - the \$15,000 was particularly geared to help the public servants of Barbados but what did this uncaring administration do? This Administration that came in here today talking about caring for public servants? The first thing they did was: they slapped a surcharge tax on their income and on top of that they murdered them with unprecedented consumption taxes. That, Sir, has eroded anything they have done today and the poor people at the bottom have had to conserve. Only recently, imagine a public servant worked....

I would say St. Philip South probably has the largest percentage of public servants in Barbados. What will happen to his income as a result of an increase of gasoline to their coming to town once a day, 5 days a week? Do you know, Sir, what will happen when they have to buy bottled gas at present prices? The few cents they are getting today... I'm saying that what happened two weeks ago has eroded everything that they have done today. Just take gasoline, just take bottled gas not to mention increases in electricity coming this month in fuel adjustment charges. Not to mention when they have had increases in their water bills. Yes, as much as \$40 or more.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to make this a document of the House to embarrass my good friend from St. Michael East. Somebody must have given him misinformation about increases of the water rates. The account number is still on so I will not read directly from it and therefore I will not have to make it a document of the House but will show it to the Minister. It is only right that I should do so.

I am not reading from it. I am not going to make anything available to anyone who will seek to deprive the youth of Silver Hill of the opportunity to have lights to play at night. When private citizens go out and make a special effort to put up lights that the Government would not put up and then the Sports Council send a letter to the Electrical Department ordering them not to inspect the lights. Can you imagine that, Sir? The Sports Council did that. Go to Silver Hill and see the lights, they were to be inspected yesterday. The Government Electrical Inspection Department did not go and inspect the lights because Harold Russel and a few private citizens put up the lights.

If I may continue, Sir.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Go and take them down and you will see what will happen. The point I am making, Sir, is that several letters have gone out to several people and several people are having their water rates substantially increased and many of these people, Sir, live in St. Philip. I am saying, Sir, that a public servant living in St. Philip, if he gets \$2,000 a year more as a result of these things that are taking place in Barbados in recent times, he is no better

off. So I would ask the Honourable Prime Minister to indicate to me what has he done for the public servants of Barbados to come in here and make a long speech about 3% here and 7% here and not relating that to all the other things that have been done to the same people and not even recognizing that this cannot compensate them for the damage which the Honourable Minister of Finance has done to the public servants.

I feel very strongly because we have a duty to seek at all times in this House to improve the conditions of our fellowmen and in fact we are not achieving any improvement in the conditions of public servants by these measures today and I want the word to go forth that it is totally incorrect to suggest that any category of public servant will be any better off as a result of these measures here today because... You know, Sir, it is a funny thing. I remember, Sir, years ago, the philosophy was espoused on the floor of this House that you cannot get Barbadians to understand what is really happening to them unless this thing is expressed in cash. What Government is trying to do today is to give the people a few dollars more so that when they get their pay cheque they will see a few more dollars on it but then it is taken away in little bits at the supermarkets, at the gas pumps, right around. 3.25 p.m.

They feel that our people are not sufficiently mature as to be able to recognise that their net position is worse off. This is the kind of thing that has happened in this country for a long time and it is about time that it stops. I believe that if the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister wishes to give a balanced statement to the House he would have come in here and confessed that the things that he did to the public servants would have diminished the real value of their wages by X%. He is seeking to make up a little for what he has taken away. I believe that the people of Barbados would be happier. I feel that the public servants would have far more confidence in the Government because this is another big area, that crisis of confidence in the Public Service in relation to Ministers.

I know that there are several accounting officers who are deeply concerned about daily pressures being put on them right now by certain Ministers of Government to burst the vote and keep spending although no Resolution has come to Parliament for further allocation. There have been complaints within the Government.

I believe that it is wrong to permit that kind of pressure to be put on accounting officers in Government. Sooner or later we are going to have to understand in this country that public servants have a responsibility to respect the provisions of the Financial Administration and Audit Act that under that very Act that they can be charged.

I am calling on the accounting officers of this country to look very carefully at the provisions of the law and

anyone who puts pressure on them to burst any vote, tell them to go and burst the vote themselves. They cannot get fired. They would be perfectly within the four corners of the law.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: They are not wild statements. I » know what is going on. I do not even want to deal with the pressure being put on the Accountant General's office. I am not going to deal with that. I know what is going on there as well. I must congratulate the Accountant General of Barbados and his staff for resisting the kinds of pressures which are being brought on that office. I urge them to continue to function within the four walls of the law. I will say no more for the time being. I am sure there are many people who clearly understand what I am talking about.

One of the interesting things that always happens ** when Third World countries are headed for the rocks, a familiar term of the Prime Minister, that you see within Government expenditure system certain creatures emerging.

In Jamaica we had the phenomenon of public expenditure, totally, politically determined among certain groups of workers. Eventually that triggered riots in the society. As part of a political peace settlement ratios were established as to which political party should get how much * when they are in power and who should get so many jobs when they are out of power in order to establish some peace.

In Trinidad, you may recall, Sir, the Dewd Project. We saw the expansion of Dewd. Again, people stuck in jobs for political reasons, usually before elections and it mushrooms. Then after a while it becomes a major embarrassment to Government and to the whole society.

The NCC in Barbados is taking on those proportions. I *• guarantee you that it is going to go the same way as what happened in Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago in respect of that pattern of expenditure. Sir, this is public money and if there is one thing that I deeply and profoundly believe in is that every citizen in this country, every one who resides in this land, is called upon to pay taxes in one form or another. I believe that on the other side of the equation any expenditure incurred, that all its citizens should have equal opportunity in relation to benefitting from that expenditure unless by an Act of Parliament it is clearly spelled out that — such a departure is being taken. I believe that may require a constitutional majority to do that.

I am saying that kind of expenditure where politicians are picking people and saying, "you go down there and get a job" or you call up a chairman and say "you go here" that m frustrates what Parliament is about. All that happens is that when the money is spent, then a memo goes to Cabinet from the Ministry and talks about inescapable expenditure

for salaries. The Ministry of Finance looks and sees it is a matter of paying people's wages and so has no choice. It goes to Cabinet, Cabinet approves it, it comes down to the House here and we all have to approve it to make sure that people get their money. That is what happens.

It is dangerous. It is developing here in this society. It is undermining the entire Public Service. Make no mistake about it. There is not a senior public servant who has had experience of the proper way to run a Public Service, the proper way to organise appointments, promotions and discipline who would be happy with what is going on. They are silent. They allow it to go on and you undermine their authority progressively.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think that the Honourable Member who has just spoken would recall that he was Minister of Finance when the NCC people were taken on. I do not want him now to give the impression that he was not there. He must have known about the expenditure. That is my point of order. I do not want him to go on as if they were taken on after he left the office. He was Minister of Finance when the numbers were taken on. I would go further to say that he said they should be increased to 600.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the Honourable Member is talking about. He is noted for his terminological inexactitudes where he gets up and appears to be very pious indeed. I want him to deny on the Floor of this House that he has been handpicking people himself and he has even been getting people who are not in Parliament to send people to him to get jobs. Worse than that, Sir. He has been threatening people who got jobs in NCC that if they do not support the Democratic Labour Party they will lose their jobs. There are persons whom he has given a lift to and when he threatened the person, the person got out at the next stop and walked out of the car. I challenge you to deny that.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, everybody knows the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. I would not do that. But he is misleading the House. Everybody knows him. 3.35 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Anyhow, you see what they do not understand is that it is the very people who get the jobs who do not understand the nature of the infelicitous conduct that has taken place that resulted in the job. It is the same people who walk around and tell everybody in the district how they got the job. They do not realize that.

If I may continue, Sir. The Honourable Minister said that I said that I am no employment agency. I say, Sir, that that was a complete and total lie. What I said is that there

could be no circumstances in which I would send home someone because I thought that that person is a Barbados Labour Party supporter and put somebody else in their job. I went on to say that I would hate when I am a grandfather to hear that my grandson lost his job because somebody else said that he is the grandson of Richie Haynes who served as a Member of Parliament.

Sir, there was a rascal who joined the SL Michael South Central Democratic Labour Party band wagon who came with a proposal with 36 names of previous Democratic Labour Party supporters in St. Michael South Central and demanded that they should be fired and I said no way. Mr. Speaker, there is no way that my hands will ever be guilty of ever causing someone to lose their job on political grounds. Ask Reggie Hunte, Public Relations Officer of the Democratic Labour Party. There is no way that I would fire anybody.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have always made the Rule clear that names mentioned in debate in Parliament should be submitted to me before.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I said names in general.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: To set the record straight as leader of this particular party, I want to say that there can be no circumstance under which I will cause anyone to lose their job or in any way disadvantage anyone because they belong to another political party. Sir, I think we ought to get this out of our system of administration altogether because in my experience very often it is people who belong to another political party who give you the most loyal service. Very often that is the case. What we have to inculcate in people -is loyalty to the Public Service rather than the loyalty to the political party.

Having said that, Sir, I believe that there is still a substantial residue of that kind of loyalty in the Public Service of Barbados. Fortunate for us, Sir, some have been placed in political appointments, but nevertheless they have been able to absorb the culture of the Service and have not allowed themselves to be manipulated politically. I would really invite all political parties in this House to commit themselves to this major change. It is only right and just for the Public Service. The Public Service will never improve unless we revert to that kind of situation of impartiality. We need to ensure discipline and no Minister has any authority to influence the Public Service Commission. These things I feel strongly about, Sir. I have spoken about them for many years. Oh yes, I practice it! Do not talk about victimization. I do not want to know anything about it. I think it is the worst thing that you can do.

I, Sir, indicated that I would only speak for a half hour and I would like to wind up fairly soon to say this. As my

final contribution, I am not satisfied on several scores and they are:

- (1) That the public servants will benefit significantly in any way from these modest increases on the one hand.
- (2) I am very disturbed at the state of Barbados and the situations in which these increases are being sought, because I know that unless the Government gets a foreign loan very soon then we will have a problem.

It is sad to stand in this House today and look at the state of liquidity in the banking system and recognize that the only way in which the country can accommodate this kind of expenditure without any additional difficulty is if we finance it by a foreign loan. If you borrow locally from the local market, there will be more and more problems for the local economy. If you cannot raise it on the local market, then the Central Bank is going to be faced with a very awkward position as to whether it should bounce the Government cheques or not. That is the bottom line. The Central Bank is going to be faced with whether it should bounce the Government cheques. When the Central Bank honours those cheques, they are going to be honouring them in the full knowledge that it is the printing of the money and the fundamental damage that it is going to do to the foreign exchange position of Barbados. That is the bind in which we find ourselves. It is a most unusual situation. Never has it happened before. However, I believe there is a chance that the Government will raise money externally. I believe that it has now given the mandate to a respectable institution and even if the Government's image is such that it could not raise the money, that institution who has always been a good friend of Barbados will probably put together some money for us. In those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, we will certainly not vote against the Resolution. 3.45 p.m.

Sir, the Honourable Attorney General wants me to vote against the Resolution. He does not want the public servants to get even the modest increases which are being offered here.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Honourable Member cannot do that. I have not spoken in this debate as yet and he certainly cannot put words in my mouth. If that is what the Honourable Member feels, let him express his own feelings.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, we will not vote against this Resolution. Thank you very much.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Government on the conclusion of the salaries negotiations and recognise the fact that by law the

Government has to come to this Chamber in order to give effect to the conclusion of those negotiations through legal measures.

I am trying to follow the thought of the Leader of the Opposition in terms of the settlement that was agreed on, because it seems to me that he is impugning the entire negotiation process and in fact he sets out to give the impression that Government has reached agreement by itself on the level of increases. He gives the impression that in fact after the conclusion of the negotiations the Civil Servants are worse off, and therefore he is castigating all of those persons involved in these negotiations. He is saying that the National Union of Public Workers, the Barbados Workers' Union, the Barbados Secondary Teachers' Union, BUT, et cetera, to use a popular Barbadian phrase, must have sold out in these negotiations.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I never said that anybody sold out to anybody and the Honourable Member should withdraw a remark like that. It is really unparliamentary, Sir.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition is giving the impression to this Honourable Chamber and to the people of Barbados by the Press that in fact at the end of these negotiations, and after they had been settled by legislation, that the workers are worse off than they were before, by the simple logical system of induction he is saying that they were not well served by those persons who represented them.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. If the Honourable Member wants to attack the NUPW and start an internecine warfare between the Unions, let him do it himself. I never mentioned the word "Union" in my entire speech.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, I am establishing that the Government did not by itself conclude these negotiations. The settlement that is being legislated today is the final point in a process that starts with unions going to members and asking them for positions to put forward to Government, researching the information, sitting down at the bargaining table and negotiating, reaching a level, going back to the same workers to approve the settlement levels before reaching this Assembly. The levels that went through that process emerged as 7% in the first year at the bottom, graduating to 3% at the top in the first year and 3% in the second year after going through all that process. All of these people reached agreement, not NUPW alone. NUPW, BSTU, BUT, etc.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: No, Parliament is not rubber stamping anything, because you could, if you want to, make a proposal that is over and above. If you think it is not

enough, then you would have to be able to marshal this Parliament and get a majority in this Parliament to say that 7% in the first year and 3% in the second year is not good enough for the public servants of Barbados, and then you can come and propose something that you think would be reasonable for the people of Barbados to pay these public servants. Or you could go the other way and say that the state of the economy you were talking about is so bad they should not get any increases at all. You could do that too, because it might be even more logical, following your line of thought as to how bad the economy is, that you might want to propose that they get nothing at all, that in fact the Government is again engaging in squandermania by giving them 7% in the first year and 3% in the second year. That would be a very logical position, moving from your argument.

The point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that I think the Leader of the Opposition is carrying out a scurrilous attack on the trade unions in this country.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. During my speech I have deliberately not dealt with any aspects of negotiations. I dealt with the Public Service and I dealt with the impact of this Resolution on public servants. For the Honourable Member to get up and say that I carried out a scurrilous attack on the trade unions in this country I think is really outrageous. I honestly believe that the Honourable Member is misleading the House and should be asked to withdraw the remarks.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, we are all intelligent people here. If the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is saying that there have been all sorts of increases in the cost of living in the period leading up to this settlement, and that the unions agreed to a settlement that does nothing at all to take that into consideration and as a result the workers are worse off, by implication he is impugning the work of the trade unions in this country.

As far as I understand the way how trade unions operate, they have to look at factors relating to things like cost of living, and the increases that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition talked about would have been factored into the cost of living by the Government Statistical Department. One would have been looking at that data in terms of the sort of levels that are proposed and the settlement levels one would reach. I want to make the point again. Why is the Honourable Leader of the Opposition keeping more noise than the civil servants themselves? The civil servants have all kinds of avenues through which they can voice their concerns about the settlement levels, but the premier avenue they have is the trade union.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: So again you are impugning the trade union movement.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Most of the civil servants in this country are members of organised trade unions.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: You are saying it about the Government and you are saying it about the trade union leaders too. I am very concerned about that, because if you are telling me that trade unionists, that large body of people, feel so strongly about the levels of settlement and they are afraid to speak out because they would be victimised ... a body that has distinguished leaders like the General Secretary of the National Union of Public Workers, you are saying some very serious things about that man's leadership and the leadership of the rest of that body. Of course you are not going to enjoin the leader of the Barbados Workers' Union in that, because I can tell you categorically that we will speak out about any kind of victimisation to which you refer. 3.55 p.m.

We don't have any case of it. In fact, we don't know about any cases of anybody being victimized for coming to the Barbados Workers' Union and proposing the level of settlement they should get.

Asides.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: You bring any instance that you know about of anybody represented by the Barbados Workers' Union being victimized for speaking out on salary issues and not being represented. Bring the issues.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not permit this kind of cross-talk.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that for considered cheap political gain we can sometimes try to trivialize matters of important national consideration. We have a settlement that is a popular settlement, that is historic in this country. Can you imagine the Barbados Union of Teachers agreeing to a settlement up front? They never did it with the Barbados Labour Party, a Party that has had an opportunity to govern this country. They never did it before with the Democratic Labour Party and they have done it now. The Barbados Secondary School Teachers' Union agreed. The National Union of Public Workers agreed. Barbados Workers' Union agreed. All of the registered trade unions in Barbados and I make the point Sir, all of the registered trade unions in Barbados. I want to distinguish that the Police Association cannot be a trade union. Let us make it very clear because of the Laws of Barbados. And all of you who want to tell them that they are a trade union should know better than that because there

are ways of destabilizing a country by giving guidance to groups in such a way that is inconsistent with the laws and mores of a country; so that when these people behave a certain way it is because of the example and the urging that they are getting from certain sectors.

The Police Association has always been accorded the privilege and the opportunity to represent their members at the bargaining table and as far as I am aware, that happened again on this occasion. The process for negotiation is one that allows in our particular case two groups that have divergent interests, that is, the Government representing all the taxpayers of this country and in the case of the Police Association, a body that represents law enforcement agencies - they have divergent interests in terms of what they consider to be levels of remuneration. They have divergent interests as far as we are concerned in terms of conditions of employment and the process of negotiation that these two bodies, using the time-honoured process of discussion and looking at facts and figures try to narrow those differences and try to reach some kind of agreement. It is a process that we all respect.

As far as I know, Government has not used any form of coercion or otherwise to try to stop anyone of these bodies from putting a position and as far as I know on this occasion none of the bodies tried to use coercion either. But strangely enough, outside of this body... Outside of the people who are at first level who are discussing these matters, negotiating these matters there has been an atmosphere created outside by others to create turmoil in a situation where none exists. Now, that to me is extremely disturbing. When the principals are sitting down in a civilized way discussing these issues, persons who should know better are out there trying to create all kinds of impressions about what the police should or should not do. The Police are at the table - they are not outside and anybody talking to them - they are at the table using the only process that can work in the situation, negotiation, bargaining to get what they want. Any bargaining process, any negotiation process you know that there are some things you will get and some things that you won't. The other disturbing thing about it is an attempt to give an impression that every negotiation period is an end in itself. We cannot look at this negotiation settlement without reference to what happened two years ago and two years before that, etc. and what is likely to happen two years from now. When a level of increase is given, it is a level of increase that goes on to an already earned salary. You are not creating new salaries and giving the impression that the level of increase that goes on will affect everybody in the same way. This is again a nonsensical approach to take. To give the impression that all the things that happen in Barbados... according to the Leader of the Opposition, increases in water rates, increases in this thing and the next thing, will pauperize Barbadians. People are worse off than

ever before. What kind of exaggeration can that be? It is so unrealistic. It is so strange to the truth to give that impression.

The Barbadian people out there know that they are living through credit from the banks, they are getting it from the credit unions and Barbadians will continue to save. They continue to enjoy a standard of living that they can be proud of in comparison to anybody else. Certainly the public servants among the group of people in Barbados - I don't think the public servants in Barbados are unfamiliar... And we are fortunate that we have always insisted that in order to come into the public service you have to have basic qualifications.

It is completely different when you are talking to people who get into what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was talking about, the Statutory Corporations, the people who are working at NCC and so on. The people, who can't back up with three and five O levels and some A levels and so on. The Public Servants in Barbados are qualified persons. They are sensible people. They are able to evaluate what is happening in this country, sometimes with better facility than the Leader of the Opposition. I want him to understand that he is not talking to people who will be easily swayed by his emotion. He is looking for votes, they are not looking for votes. They are not looking for power. They are looking to live from day to day. They are not going to be concerned by his emotion. He should understand that.

The Civil Servants, the public servants of our country are not concerned in the same way that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is concerned to make points about public administration. There is always an accountant somewhere who tells him something or who knows something or some other person inside somewhere else. Of course, what he is always giving you is the impression that somebody always brings out news from inside the Civil Service and gives him. He is trying to give you the impression in here that the Civil Service is full of sieves, that they are managing this administration but they are always coming and telling him everything. That is the impression he is giving of the Civil Service of this country. He is telling the public that the Civil Servants are unreliable. This is the man who is telling us all, the Leader of the Opposition, is telling us that he would like to see a civil service where people are so professional that when they are dealing with Ministers that they can be advising Ministers from a pure consideration, no politics. But he is telling us at the same time that he is getting news from civil servants, that some of them come and tell him because otherwise how could he be reporting to us what accountants tell him and everybody else tell him in the Civil Service. He is giving the impression that the Civil Service is full of leaks. That is what he is telling us. That is by implication again what he is telling us. He doesn't have to tell us these facts. We can all understand and read between the lines.

Asides.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: That is the impression he is trying to give us that you cannot rely on the civil servants because they are serving one administration but leaking information to another one.

Asides.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, I find that the Leader of the Opposition and in fact the Opposition Parties seem to find in Statutory Corporations a political football each time around. They can always look at each one of these Corporations, NCC etc. to find some fault with them in terms of administration, in terms of financing them and so on. They seem to have this fixation about how these Corporations work. It seems to me to be good politics for them always to be criticizing these statutory corporations and the Ministers involved and each government in turn about the administration of these Corporations. If they want to come out point blank and tell the public of Barbados to stop spending money on the NCC and similar Statutory Corporations they should say so. In fact, some of them have gone so far as to suggest that it is money that is not well spent.

I want to make the point, Mr. Speaker, that there is a body of Barbadians unskilled, untrained and not a negligible body either, that left to open-market situations wouldn't get a job easily anywhere in this country. I want to be very clear about this. I know them. I speak to them often in my constituency and they come to each one of you. There is a body of untrained, unskilled Bajans that can't walk into any private sector organization in this country and get a job. You better believe it. I have no difficulty whatsoever in Statutory Corporations making jobs for these people and if they come to me and I have any facility whatsoever to refer them to any Minister to get a job for them I will be doing that because I consider that part of the process of representation. 4.05 p.m.

I will get a job and my children will get jobs as will the Leader of the Opposition's children. His grandchildren will not have to be going asking for any jobs at NCC. He will not be hearing about any grandchild of his not getting a job because of any political considerations. They likely would end up as professionals once they learn and behave themselves. They would not be begging anybody for jobs. I know that there are several people in my constituency, all through Lodge Road, Wotton and Kingsland who have no qualifications, will not get any, who have no skills, no training and they want to work at NCC and MTW. If I can beg for a job for them, I will do that. I will also say that I will not ask them when they come to me whether they are a DLP, NDP or BLP.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I never said that anybody should not get a job. I set out very clearly what I understand to be the constitutional requirements and the implications of the Financial Administration Rules and the moral principles relating to equality of opportunities in respect of participating in Government expenditure. I do not think that politicians should be in a position to be giving one person preference over another person because of political affiliation. I feel very strongly about that. That is what I said.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, I have no difficulty with that philosophical position. I am making my point. It is not necessarily in contradiction. I am saying that when people walk into my office - I believe this is true of anyone of the DLP parliamentarians - we do not ask them to which party they subscribe. As a matter of fact, any person with political sagacity would know that is a question you should not ask anybody. Any person with any political experience would know that is a question you cannot ask.

The second point is, anybody with any political wisdom would know that anybody can tell you they vote for any party anyhow. You would only be a fool if you are a parliamentarian and you believe that everybody who comes and tells you that they will vote for NDP will really vote for the NDP. I am sure you are hearing that all through Kingsland, "yes, I am voting for the NDP". I am sure you are hearing that in Christ Church South Central, "yes, I am voting for the NDP."

Barbadians are polite. They have a way of telling three parties, "yes, I am voting for you." Then they would tell the one they are really voting for what they told the others too. All of us know that. For a parliamentarian to be granting somebody a job based on what they perceive to be somebody's political affiliation could be stepping in quick silver or in quicksand. We all recognise that. To try to establish that the Democratic Labour Party is the party of patronage other than the Barbados Labour Party or the National Democratic Party, that the NDP will not be a party of patronage, if Dr. Haynes says that tomorrow he loses the little support that he had. If he ever makes a public statement here that his party will not be a party of patronage....

Mr. SPEAKER: You are not making reference to any person in this Chamber.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I am sorry. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. If the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is brave enough to get up in here today and say that his party will not go in for political patronage, I challenge him to get up in this Assembly and say so. Tell the people of Barbados that in here today.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. I would invite the Honourable Member - I am going to send him a

copy of our foundation ceremony document where we repudiated totally the kind *ai* yardfowlism that the DLP....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member cannot now make a speech.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, again I challenge the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to get up in this House and say to the people out there that support for the NDP will not give anybody any preferential treatment with him when it comes to jobs or any other kind of patronage. I challenge him to tell that to the country of Barbados now. Get up and say so.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot hear the Honourable Member. Will Honourable Members keep quiet. I have only allowed one member to speak. The Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central is speaking. I can only entertain the Honourable Member to whom I gave the right to speak. If other Members need to make an intervention, there is a proper way in the Standing Orders to do so. Continue.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, we have certain conventions in this Parliament. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition does not respond to challenges from back benchers on the other side.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would even add that Members should not challenge each other either in Parliament.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, I have been put in my place by the Leader of the Opposition. I am a mere Member of Parliament, a back bencher. He has dismissed Christ Church East Central like nothing at all. The only problem is that I have the same status as a whole lot of people on this side and on that side. I did not come in here in a box cart as the Honourable Member for St. Lucy is saying. By implication and by deduction I assume that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is not in a position to make that statement. He cannot say that he would not, and his party would not support political patronage. That is the implication of his refusal to make that statement.

He is no different from anybody else. I want to make that very clear. I do not think the people of Barbados would want to be any different either. I believe that it is only fair and right, quite frankly, that when people give you support that you owe them support also. Do not let us be hypocritical about these things. Giving them support does not mean you have to be unfair to anybody else. That is a principle, I think, we accept in the entire Chamber.

I feel that it is about time that we come off this whole issue of finding jobs for poor black Bajans in places like the NCC and MTW. Those of us who have been privileged to have gone to a secondary school in Barbados and higher

who can get and maintain jobs, sometimes the same job for all of our lives, must recognise that we are privileged persons. Those persons who go into the public sector from the time they are relatively young and can maintain a job until they leave, must recognise that they are privileged persons also.

There are lots of Barbadians out there who cannot maintain jobs for any length of time. Sometimes people go through six and seven jobs in a lifetime. Sometimes they have tremendous breaks in periods between jobs. Those are the persons that we can find jobs for in places like NCC and MTW. When we get in here castigating Government for spending money on that kind of person, I am ashamed sometimes to hear it. We must have a social responsibility for those persons. 4.15p.m.

You cannot erode their profits by giving what they call padding the employment of their business in order to let somebody get a job and look good, so we have to find room for them. Those people who criticise the State, know very well that the State has a responsibility to its citizens that goes beyond the narrow considerations of the private sector which has a responsibility to its shareholders, not even so much to its customers and consumers, a very narrow consideration, and there are not many people in Barbados who are shareholders of private sector concerns. The State has a responsibility to each and every one of its citizens and we have to be very careful when we talk about public expenditure in this country. We have to look after our citizenry and it is because of the spending power of that same private sector to which we are giving these increases that it will be able to maintain itself. They are all shaping up like now, with all types of advertisements, to get that money. If you depress those increases the entire country suffers. Let us understand that. If the public servants do not get that money, then the whole circulation of the economy is going to fall.

Barbados is so small an economy, so small a society, so small a polity, we are all wrapped up so much, I always make the case that there is no private sector without the public sector. The 25,000 people working for the kinds of salaries the public sector work for are the mainstay of the private sector. When we try to make these artificial distinctions sometimes, we really are not clear what we are talking about. There are some private sector concerns that depend almost totally on the public sector, and the public sector must depend very heavily....

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: There are some people I do not respond to. I do not respond to Nigel and I will not respond to "Biz/.y" either. We leave "Bizzy" to you.

One other area I would like to address, Mr. Speaker, relates to accommodation for public sector workers. I think this administration shares the concern of the public sector workers in terms of the accommodation that they enjoy. I think it would be true to say that we have done more in our time in the last four years to improve the conditions under which the public servants now work than the Barbados Labour Party did for the ten years they were in office. We have done a tremendous amount of work in terms of rehabilitating schools, Government buildings and offices, police stations, et cetera. That is a fact.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: The work is not complete. I remember charges were brought against the Barbados Labour Party in terms of the quantum of work that they did, and if I recall, it is the Leader of the Minority Opposition who came in some time ago with this statement, or the Member for St. Thomas, showing the amount of work that had been done. I remember a detailed statement was brought about the work that was done under the Barbados Labour Party administration, so we have on record that both administrations have done some work in terms of maintenance, rehabilitation and expansion of the physical facilities. I am not giving the impression that one administration did nothing and the other did all, but I am saying that work has been done in this respect.

You are getting now an administration that never had the fortune to hold office, and will never hold office, giving the impression that they can clear up, clean up and satisfy all conditions under which civil servants work for all time. That is unfortunate. This kind of hyperbolic talk is sending some very bad signals out there to the country, that all of a sudden everything can be done right away, yet still at the same time you are saying that expenditures are too high.

With those comments, Mr. Speaker, I would like to support this Resolution. I would also like to enjoin with those others who have spoken before in encouraging the public servants, as they customarily do anyhow, to put the income that is coming to them to productive use and to encourage them to put some in the Credit Union Movement, because it is out of the Credit Union Movement that we have to start building towards the industrial co-operatives and the other co-operatives that will provide an avenue for business involvement by people like ourselves, using your expertise, your knowledge, your training, some of your deferred income, your savings as civil servants for future investment. That is the road we have to go in the future.

I thank you very much, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is obvious that the Government is in a narcissus mood, absolutely and totally self-congratulatory about nothing whatsoever. I expect that between now and whenever the Government

makes up its mind to call the election we will hear more self-praise in this House heaped on themselves than you have ever heard in the 350 years of this Parliament.

What are they boasting about? Let us face it. At no time during the ten years of the Barbados Labour Party Government have we given civil servants so little as they are giving now and fussing about it. The lowest wage increase that we gave in 1982 was \$108 across the board. If you allow and upgrade that for the fall in the value of the dollar since then, we are talking about something like \$155.52, what it would be worth now.

Today the Prime Minister got up and said that it is amounting to about \$74 across the board, but I want to look at the categories. I am going to take the lowest economic category that has been negotiated for by the unions, the watchmen, that category of persons who at the moment have been quarrelling and walking around making a noise to be noticed. I am going to take them because in my view it is the person at the lowest rung of the economic ladder in this society that we have to be most concerned about. The majority of them are black people, small people, and they are defenseless in many instances.

When I hear the Government in here congratulating itself about how it has reached an agreement with the unions, and how, according to the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central, it is a historic occasion, that even the Barbados Union of Teachers has agreed, I ask myself: has this agreement, when you look at the people at the lowest rung of the ladder, conferred this great benefit on these persons? The total increase for them is something like \$68 per month. That is what it is, Sir, when you look at it. I think it is Category X we are talking about, Sir. 4.25 p.m.

I think it is category X, the people whom they are talking about. The general worker, the labourer on night duty, the cleaner, the caretaker, the scrubber, the washer, the attendant and the parking attendant and the watchman. The watchman's wages, Sir, is only moving from \$233.78 a week to \$250.15 a week - \$68 a month, a total of \$68 a month. And when you compare with the very cost of living the factor that the Honourable Member says should be a factor should be factored in. You will see that he has not been compensated for the increase in the cost of living in the two-year period.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: We will give the Honourable Member in a minute, Sir. So, really he is the person like the old age pensioners at the Geriatric Hospital that the Prime Minister expects will cut and contrive. He is in the same category of persons and that is the same approach to them.

So, when we look at the position, the settlement, although talking about 7% at the bottom graduating to 3% at the top has not been that beneficial to the people in this society who are in most need of assistance at this time. It is a fact, Sir, that the unions were not able to persuade this Government to take the 7% higher up to cover those persons in categories 1 and 1A. That is a fact. It can't be denied, Sir. And the union itself in its negotiating stand recognized that those persons were in need of a higher increase. I am talking about all the people like the mason helpers and porters and the gardeners and the rodent control people, the pumping attendants - I am talking about them. The unions themselves recognised that they hadn't... The Honourable Member will agree. He knows. Some of them live in my constituency and I talk to them, Sir. The Honourable Member will know that the union agrees with my view that this settlement when it is stripped of all the Narcissus approach which we hear in here from the Prime Minister today that this settlement has not done much for those people to compensate them for the effect of the increase of the cost of living on them in the two years and the effect of Government's taxation policies on them.

That is what has happened, Sir. If the union had come in here and told me that they got the Government to do the sliding scale as we used to do it to benefit those at the bottom in a more significant manner, then the Government will not have some of the criticism that it is getting from this side about these negotiations.

To say this doesn't mean that anybody is launching a scurrilous attack on the unions as the Honourable Member is saying. We are saying that you didn't negotiate in the manner that you intended to win the battle. But, I will tell you why now this is so. This is a fact. The Government must accept the fact that it has gone through a reclassification exercise that in retrospect has widened the gap between the top and the bottom in this society and was so intended. I am going to illustrate this, Sir, by two categories. The people at the top at the S2 levels, I think they call themselves, and SI and those persons like the school meal workers. I am going to give you the figures, Sir. In April 1988 persons at S2 level - I am not going to the Special Permanent Secretaries - were getting \$64,390 as against the school meal workers - the Honourable Minister of Education should be interested in this - who were getting \$11,892 a year. In April 1989, the people at the top went to \$65,688 as against their \$12,132. The regrading exercise, Sir, moved the persons at the top to \$68,436 retroactive to April and \$69,816 from April 1989. The school meal worker went to \$13,044. Now with an increase that has taken place the people at the top will get by 1991 \$74,424, the school meal worker will get \$14,376 and I am going to put it in relation to the figures. During those two-year periods, and this is the negotiation. That's why the regrading exercise really will have to be looked at again very carefully and we have committed ourselves to it. What has happened is that the people who negotiated the

regrading exercise were interested in certain categories of persons and widening the gap and did not look at....

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: A point of order, Sir. The Honourable Leader of the Minority Opposition is attempting to mislead the House. The reclassification exercise is one that is based on job analysis and looking at the nature of a particular position to see if it has changed over time and to evaluate it therefore. One can therefore only upgrade a position, that is a job, that has changed in its nature. It is not a matter of rewarding everybody or every position. Thank you very much, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am very well aware of what a regrading exercise is and I am also well aware of the anomalies which it throws up, Sir. But it has been a fundamental principle followed, certainly under us and before to some extent under the Democratic Labour Party to try to narrow the gap between those at the top and those at the bottom. We did it by a series. That is why I began, not from the regrading exercise. I began from dealing with the fact that on this occasion you could not get the 7% extended further to include categories of workers who ought to have been included. That is where I began. What I am saying here, is that when you look at the figures I have given you, those at the top in dollar terms got an increase within the same period of \$7,872 as against the school meals worker at the bottom who during the period got \$2,664.

Hon. C. V. WALKER: The Honourable Member continues to refer to the position of the school meals worker. I would like to assure the Honourable Member of this House that the school meals worker, when we took over office, was not even in the category that he is now referring. He has been placed in that category and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition knows that as well.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member is probably still at the Conference at Dover, Sir, looking at the sea. I don't think he is really. He is out at sea. The point that I am making Sir. Seven Thousand Eight Hundred and Seventy-two dollars has been the benefit to the fellows at the top over the two-year period and to those persons at the bottom Two Thousand and Sixty-four. Now, Sir, this must be looked at against a background of a shift in the form of taxation in this country where taxation has moved from impacting by way of direct taxes on salaries in this way to impacting on your take-home packet by indirect taxes. I will spell it out in simple language because I think we have to bring all the economic terms down to the level of persons - clear, simple language that people could understand what we are talking about. When any Honourable Member of this House goes to the supermarket to buy a packet of biscuits, to buy soap-suds, to buy corned beef they take in the same dollar as the school meal worker, as the watchman takes and they face the same price. When we have increased, as we have done in this country, the level of indirect taxes so that today the Government which came in on this great

promise of tax reform is taking from the pockets, from every dollar of this same school meal worker, taking nowadays 37 cents from the watchman - the Minister of Education would be happy with the watchman - taking 37 cents whereas in 1986 they were taking 25 cents. 4.35 p.m.

They are taking more from him, Sir. He has less to deal with in the supermarket, the minimart, and down in Cheapside or Fairchild Street markets. That is where it is impacted.

When we look at the salaries, therefore, we regret very much that despite the negotiating skills of the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central, he was not able to achieve his objective. He might have fought but he was unable to achieve his objective. He must admit that. His objective is the same as mine. A clear objective here was to ensure that those at the lower end of the ladder in this time of contriving and cutting, would be able to at least find that the belt is not being drawn too tightly around their tummies.

I regret to say that I really cannot congratulate the Government as the Honourable Prime Minister would wish the House to do, or as the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central would want us to believe on these negotiations which, in our view, did not achieve the objective of helping the persons who are most in need at this time. Anybody who reads the newspaper or listens to the news in this country would see that there continues to be dissatisfaction among public workers in this country about their conditions of service and not merely conditions of service relating to accommodation.

The Prime has today come and told us that 6 000 Public Service workers were regraded and reclassified, the highest number, he said, that has ever happened. He has to acknowledge that at no time that I have been in public life in this country have I heard so much confusion and so much dissatisfaction about the regrading and reclassification exercise, not even since Pusinelli looked at the exercise. There has been a good deal of dissatisfaction about. It is the source of continuing....

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am going to tell the Prime Minister where he went wrong, Sir, although I do not know that at this time I should tell him anything about where he went wrong at all. I should do as the former Rt. Honourable Member for St. John used to do. He would come in, say nothing, sit down then he goes and says "well, you make your mistakes" and wait his turn.

The point remains that this regrading exercise has not been satisfactory. Now, let us deal with one of the areas of dissatisfaction in addition to the general mass of the civil servants who feel that they have not had a fair evaluation of

their position. We have U]e particular problems of the police. We must not likely dismiss the police in a welter of verbal exchange between the Leader of the Opposition and the Government side, or indeed between the Deputy Prime Minister and the Association, the female member who spoke so well. We must not dismiss it in that way.

I have known the position where back in the 1960's the Police Service had serious grouses feeling the same way, not only about physical conditions of work, but about their salary and where they are seen in the ladder in this country's perspective as workers. They were then working something like 88 hours per week.

The Date Commission was appointed. I appeared on behalf of the police, Sir. We came out of the situation where a special categorisation was given to the police to take into account the conditions under which policemen work and the dangers with which they faced. That was based on a study not only done here but also based on a study done in England at the time. We went a little further with the police after. In 1976 we recognised that if you were not watching the figures problems would continue to occur. We gave them a special duty allowance to take care of some of the conditions and started, of course, to reduce the hours of work for them.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member obviously has not had the benefit of reading the files. In 1977 you will find that a special duty allowance was given to the police. I negotiated it with the Ministry. It is there. My files are there. My notes are there written in my clear hand, strong and firm. My stamp remains up there in, that Ministry never to be blotted out, excellent performance, friend of the police, always known as that. I worked for them for free. Do not mind all the foolishness people get around and talk about me. Go back, look and see that I gave them years in the Association working for them as their lawyer without charging a cent right through the time. When I talk about the police I know what I am talking about. Those had those special provisions.

The police now feel that the reclassification and the regrading exercise has not taken into account the sort of circumstances under which they labour. The Leader of the Opposition talked about the dangers which they face. That is why when you are regrading and reclassifying the civil servants have to bear this in mind.

One of the difficulties I have always had with Civil Service wage negotiations, it applies as much to special categories of workers like policemen and nurses as it applies to the technical people, is that everybody begun by looking at the Permanent Secretary. There was an exercise to keep you within that grade, not to recognise that jobs had special conditions.

The Barbados Labour Party feels very strongly that the regrading and rectification exercise in so far as it affects the police and the general service has not been properly done.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, you see how well I am abiding, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am also abiding as well too. I am going to ask Honourable Members once again not to make asides loud enough to interrupt the Honourable Members. 4.45 p.m.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: It must be very obvious to you, Sir, that my point has stirred the Government from its lethargic approach to the people's business, that they now at least shout and hoot in order to shut me up in this House, but I will not be silenced in here or outside. I will not be silenced either place. The point is that this exercise has affected a large number of public servants who have not benefited at all, particularly the categories I have singled out.

I want to deal also with another cause of dissatisfaction that exists. It is the way in which the committee that was supposed to look at anomalies dealt with the position. Normally, Sir, if you go back to Pusinelli and before, you would find that an anomalies committee is usually set up independent of those persons who were necessarily acting on behalf of the Government, and in which the civil servants themselves are represented, to look at what invariably happen with any regrading and rectification exercise. You will have anomalies.

In this case the civil servants feel that the anomalies which have occurred have not been properly addressed. They feel that this is the first time, even going back to the colonial period, when they have had to deal with a situation as has occurred out of the regrading exercise and which has been to their detriment. Therefore, Sir, I am not surprised when you hear on a daily basis, whether it be the watchmen, the nurses, the policemen, various categories of civil servants, even at times defying their unions and taking matters into their hands, feeling that there is an absence of fairness which has confronted them. Although the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central said that the negotiations were accepted by the unions - he gave the names of the unions and their members - I am not surprised when the union, not the Barbados Workers' Union, could only muster 54 people at a meeting that approved the salary negotiations we are now dealing with here.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member says they do not turn up, but I think we ought to make the position quite clear. Do not come in and give us a rosy picture, giving the impression that the public workers went running up to their various union headquarters to vote AYE, AYE and give approval. That is not how the exercise went at all. What I do know is that the Government's negotiating stance was one of asking them "What do you want to do? Cause a devaluation?" That was the Government's negotiating stance.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I know the unions well, I know their stance, Sir. No doubt these gentlemen might have felt that they would go ahead and counter by saying "We have agreed. If any devaluation comes and we are told by the IMF or anyone else that we have to have structural adjustments and hold strain, we are in a position to show you that we did not cause the situation." So like Pilate they have washed their hands of these things. They have put their position quite clearly to the Government. I want, therefore, to put this agreement that we are legislating in its right context and in a realistic assessment of what this House is dealing with.

When you look at the increases and compare them with the rate of inflation, it is obvious to everyone that the rate of inflation and the rise in the cost of living over the period of time, when coupled with the rate of taxation, particularly indirect taxation, had not been properly compensated for in these negotiations. They have not been and they are impacting, as I said earlier, particularly hard at the lower end of the ladder. It is because of that that we will pass these various Orders, but we would be less than proper representatives if we did not tell the Prime Minister that the Orders really have not been as generous and beneficial as he is trying to make them out to be. We have a duty to point out to the public, and to the public servants, particularly those lower down in the public service, where they must not be fooled by Father Christmas who comes to town just before the bell rings to say that all is looking to a white Christmas and a happy day. They must not be fooled by that.

Now, Sir, I have dealt with the quantum of the increases. I want to look at the position of the nurses, before *** I deal with the pensioners. I will surprise the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, who says I am asking for information, but I will make some statements about them.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think it is fair that I remind the Honourable Member that each Member has half an hour. In •"» the light of what you have said, I just want to remind you that you probably have eight to ten minutes more. 4.55p.m.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Now, Sir, there is no doubt that there is dissatisfaction among the nurses about their position and I wonder what is the state of the negotiations for treating the Barbados Registered Nurses Association as an accredited body. I recognise, Sir, that there is a certain overlapping in the membership between the NUPW and the BRNA as indeed there is overlapping in representation at times between the BWU and the NUPW. But I recall, Sir, when I was in the Cabinet....

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of elucidation. When I introduced this measure I did indicate that there was a claim from the Barbados Registered Nurses Association for representation. They had registered as a trade union, and I don't think, I actually said that in my introduction but there was a claim from the Barbados Registered Nurses Association. Information was requested and that information was supplied to the Ministry of the Civil Service on 10th October after the negotiations were virtually substantially concluded and that the NUPW which had been the representative of the nurses all along was the accredited representative for them on this occasion and that the claim of the BRNA for accreditation as the representative of the nurses is being processed in the usual way....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am indebted to the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister for repeating the statement which he made earlier. I was in my place at the time. But I wanted to say this, Sir, I would hope that now the information is to hand that the claim for accreditation will be dealt with speedily. I say this for this reason, Sir, I recall that the policy which has been established about the accreditation of negotiating representatives was established as long ago as 1965 and once they can prove that they have a reasonable number of persons representing them, of the persons whom they claim to represent as members, then they are entitled to share representation with the other unions.

If one union, whether it be the NUPW or what not, have a substantial amount and I seem to recall that the Attorney General in the past was asked to give advice on this, that is why I recall the position, then that union gets sole representation. But, I would hope that the other claims that they have for conditions of service, even if it is not about salary, would be taken into account and their voice will be heard in the negotiating councils of the Government.

When it comes to women, Sir, the mass of them are women. There are a few male nurses but not as many as women. I am concerned that, because they may be female trade unionists, they are not being ignored and therefore I am going to sound a voice on their behalf, just in case that they will be ignored.

Sir, I want to deal finally with the few pensioners. You know, Sir, when I said that the Honourable Member comes in like Father Christmas, the Honourable Members

from that side *sotto voce* say, "Nah, he is not saying so and so..." You know, it has taken this Government four years and one-half to come at the last moment of the dying days of the Government in order to say that they are giving the old age pensioners five dollars. And not only that, Sir, to say that they are going to give the retired pensioners \$20 or 3 percent. The point I made earlier about the persons at the lower end of the ladder applies even more strongly to these persons. They, too, have had the impact of inflation, cost of living and taxation. And, I say, without fear of contradiction that the increases being given to the pensioners, whether the Government pensioners, non-contributory pensioners or contributory pensioners does not make up for what has happened with their standard of living during the last two years. We cannot feel happy about that.

I am not surprised that when the Prime Minister spoke not even his side applauded. The Honourable Member would know how much their prayers took them from when they left government and what we did for them.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: My time has expired, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: Two more minutes, Sir. I was just asking members to be quiet. That's all I am doing.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am saying, Sir, that the pensioners should have been treated much better and much earlier. The Honourable Member knows that. He can't feel too happy that it is only now at the last moment....

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I wouldn't even call this a Christmas gift to the pensioners, Sir. I would call it the Right Honourable Member's last swan song.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: A point of order, Sir. Obviously what the Member for Christ Church West is concerned about is that according to a recent poll a majority of the people in his constituency prefer me to lead Barbados than himself. That is what he is concerned about, making that kind of statement, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I really don't like to get into these kinds of moods....

Mr. SPEAKER: Can we have some order, please. I didn't consider the intervention a genuine point of order.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: But, Sir, the point I am making is that since the Democratic Labour Party came to office in 1986 in each year that there has been a salaries revision, there has been incremental increases for old age

pensioners. When that Member for St. Michael South Central was there, there was, I think, a two-dollar increase. There was an increase each year, so it is really misleading the House to say that something is being done at the last moment. That's distorting the record.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I will reply, Sir. I want to issue a challenge to the Honourable Member from the Front Bench. If he really believes the poll, dissolve the House tonight and see how Christ Church West will deal with him as well as St. Michael South.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I don't want, as the former Honourable Member for South Central, Sir Frederick Smith used to say. I don't want to blow my bugle but let me tell them, Sir, the only member in this House of the three leaders, who has a certainty of coming back up here after the elections, is me. Let me tell him so early, Sir. The only body who has a certainty. The Honourable Member must be struggling against Mr. Vernon Smith and Mr. Ian Bishop, Sir.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member is misleading this House. When the Honourable Member makes a statement like that, Sir, he is misleading this House. There are at least two other Honourable Members....

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, I told the Honourable Prime Minister last week to watch the Honourable Member for St. Michael West because he has been saying that only he and the Honourable Member for St. John defend the Party, so he has sufficient ambition, Sir, but he will have to wait a little bit longer. You really have to watch him, Sir. 5.05 p.m.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, the Honourable Member should know also that my constituency, like the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Thomas, returned the highest percentage of people who thought that he was performing very poorly. I agree with them. I would invite him to come for a canvass next Saturday. I am going to take him to the old age pensioners and he will hear how they would condemn them for how badly he was really treating them during his time in office. He has put the tax on them when they go to Mr. Edwards' supermarket, or when they go to the corner shop - he knows the shop, Sir - when they have to buy the bottled gas, those from King's Village - they will not give him a vote in King's Village because of the manner in which he has dealt with the pensioners and the cost of living in this country.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members who have spoken on behalf of the Opposition seem to be almost annoyed, so to speak, that a settlement on wages has been reached.

Mr. SPEAKER: Can we have some order? I have given Members a bit of latitude. I must ask Members to remember that the Chamber is still a dignified Chamber and Members are still Honourable Members. They should know better.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, I was making the point that the tenor of the statements of the Honourable Members on the other side seems to indicate that they are a little upset that the wage negotiations in respect of Public Service salaries have not dragged on and that the matter has been settled amicably.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please address the Chair. I think you need to address the Chair.

Hon. M. A. KING: I repeat. They are annoyed that the matter has been settled amicably. To that extent the fulminations which might otherwise have taken place in this Honourable House have been pre-empted. One finds that the opportunity has been taken during the course of this debate to talk about the police in terms where, obviously, the Opposition wants to make a political issue out of the police.

The point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the Police Force, the institution of the police is not one which should be the subject of political division. If we seek to make a political issue out of institutions like the Police Force, the Defence Force, even the Public Service, we are not doing the country any good.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not heard the aside. I have not heard what the Honourable Member has said. It cannot be printed in Hansard neither can it be reported in the Press. It is not allowed. Will the Honourable Member please continue his speech.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Christ Church West was making the point in relation to the police about what the Barbados Labour Party did for the Police Force. He talked about a Commission of Enquiry into salaries and conditions in which he participated, the Date Commission. One would believe from the tenor of the statement made by the Honourable Member for Christ Church West that in the Labour Party regime that all was well with the Police Force. The change of Government was in 1976.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have very much difficulty in asking Members to observe the Rules of the House. It is not difficult to deal with these situations in relation to what Standing Orders we have. It is a matter of tolerance. I would ask the Honourable Member to be a bit more tolerant in this debate.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Peter was giving....

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not heard him. He has not spoken. I would request that you continue the debate.

Hon. M. A. KING: I know you have not heard him, Sir. You would not want to hear him. He has not recovered entirely from last week yet.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is very difficult to control a debate when sometimes you give a little latitude and then that goes beyond what you expect it to go to. Honourable Members should know very well that there are only certain ways in which you can interrupt another Member in the Chamber. I am asking you just to abide by those Rules during the course of this debate. I do not want to suspend the Chamber neither do I want to suspend any Member. If I give you that assurance, give me your co-operation that the debate will go on.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, let me get to the crunch of the matter. All the problems which the police are raising now about salaries, conditions of employment, physical conditions of the Force are a result of 10 years of Labour Party neglect of the police between 1976....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading this House. I will refer you to the Debate in this House in March, 1987 in Hansard at page 975 where I made it absolutely clear then that the problems which I found when I became Attorney General....

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member says I cannot read it. I said words to the effect that I found when we took over in 1976 policemen in the CID working for 86 hours and without beds to sleep on - that Barclays Bank had to come to their rescue and give us money at the time to buy beds for them - and the dilapidated conditions of the Police Station. All those are recorded as part of the history of this country. I inherited them and started to put them right, Sir.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, I was saying that we should not make a political issue of this. In 1961 when the

Democratic Labour Party Government came into office, let the police tell you about the cots with the chinks on which they were sleeping when they came in so let us not go down that road.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: That is a subservient statement made by you. Let us not get into any political argument about that. All I am saying is this that all the pressures which the police are facing are a result....

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Pat Springer will deal with you. He has a way of dealing with people like you.

Mr. SPEAKER: Address the Chair, please.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, if I can get this point made. The police would tell you that a number of the advantages which they had in relation to other public servant salaries were whittled away during the Labour Party administration between 1976 and 1986. Those are part of the problems which the police are asking more or less for a review of the position in relation to their salaries and terms of conditions of employment. 5.15p.m.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: I am not dealing with political issues, I am not seeking to curry favour in situations of these kinds and I think I have to tell the truth in relation to them all. You are telling me about the physical conditions under which they have to work. Do you have the nerve to talk about that? You know that you left their buildings in a terrible state and that we had to go through a whole process of maintenance and try to restore the police buildings which now exist. Do you think District B deteriorated overnight? Do you think all the police stations in the condition in which they are now deteriorated overnight? Do you think District D deteriorated overnight?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. District D has deteriorated in four and a half years. Check the files and you will see that between 1985 and 1986 I authorised the spending of \$23,000 on District D, to repair the whole of downstairs and repaint the station. Check it! You have not spent a cent since then, far less give them a vehicle.

Hon. M. A. KING: If you remember, Mr. Speaker, a former Barbados Labour Party Attorney General, not one in here, went into Central Police Station and had a row with the police. He said "Not one cent! I am not doing one single thing for you." Do you not know who did that?

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Tull. Who else? Do you know the confrontation which went on between the last Labour Party administration and the police? Do you remember Bree StJohn, Tom Adams?

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Are you making sport? When you had a run-in with the police? You cursed the police on the Floor of this House.

Asides.

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

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

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member has risen on a point of order.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member is misleading this House about confrontation, Sir. Would the Honourable Member clarify for the House then why he is the only Attorney General that they accused of a miscarriage?

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Hon. M. A. KING: The Honourable Member....

Mr. SPEAKER: It is no point of order, so there is no response.

Hon. M. A. KING: I will ignore....

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not in the records of the House. It is no point of order.

Hon. M. A. KING: The Honourable Member was on his feet, he spoke, he talked about a miscarriage. You see, when you talk about lawlessness in this country you wonder where it comes from. You talk about lawlessness, you talk about lack of respect for authority and you wonder where it comes from.

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: Yes. So he will support....

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: What racist statement are you talking about?

Mr. SPEAKER: It seems to me as if I will have to reverse my tolerance in asking Members not to interrupt the Member speaking. It is a good thing if I can reduce the numbers of the House at some point. I think the time is coming very soon. I will again appeal to Honourable Members not to make their Asides loud enough to distract the other Members.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, there have been bitter attacks on the police by the last Barbados Labour Party administration in this House of Assembly. Mr. StJohn on the Floor of this House said that he was willing to take on the Commissioner of Police. He said that if he wanted to be a politician he should come out in the hustings and let them deal with him and take him on there.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: The Honourable Member for Christ Church West and the Honourable Member for St. Thomas have called for the resignation of the Commissioner of Police. Let us not forget that. You hear all this talk about the Police Association and the positions it takes. The people are talking. The Police Association could not have a single meeting in their time. The Association was not functioning. The Association only came to life again....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Again the Honourable Member is misleading the House.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, I am on my feet.

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

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member is misleading the House because he is riled. I addressed the Police Association, as the records in his office will show, every year that I was Attorney General.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: From 1976 to 1981. The Honourable Member will find that I addressed the Association every year....

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Asides are too loud. Continue.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member continue his speech?

Hon. M. A. KING: The Honourable Member spoke

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has not said anything for there to be a point of order.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes. He said it is a lie.

Hon. M. A. KING: Are you objecting to that?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am on a point of order. On 5th December, 1985 I addressed the Police Association at Weymouth, in my capacity as Minister of Legal Affairs, and there presented to them the finished architectural plans for the new headquarters for the Police Band. It has not been finished yet.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, members of the Police Association hardly attended any meetings, because when they attended those meetings they dared not speak their minds fully because of the fear of victimisation. That is what we are talking about.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Victimisation by the Barbados Labour Party administration. That is how it ran throughout the length and breadth of the Public Service of this country in the time of the Barbados Labour Party. Those honourable gentlemen will come into this House and make us believe that they are the champions of the Police Force. Let me say this to the police, Mr. Speaker, and the police had better understand this, that their best chance in this country is with the Democratic Labour Party. I think they know it.

The Honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition, is willing to pander to the police now. He talks about giving his commitment to them, I am sure he said, 1500 more policemen.

Aside.

5.25 p.m.

Hon. M. A. KING: Oh, you are saying now bring it up to 1500. The Establishment until a little while ago was 1200. One hundred and twenty-five were added by this Parliament, another 25 has recently been added. We are in the process of civilianisation, taking out some policemen who are doing non-police duties and putting civilians in those positions, so we are quite near to the 1500 of which you speak. So the Honourable Member for St. Michael South, the Prime Minister, has made the point that he is continuing to review the request of the Police. The Prime Minister has made the point today, Mr. Speaker, that the whole question of the request of the Police in relation to the

increase in numbers and the increase in other facilities for them is constantly under review and as the finances of the country permit, and after discussions with the Commissioner and taking into account the considerations about the effective deployment of the Force and all of that a sensible decision in terms of numbers for the Force will be arrived at. Fifteen hundred may be the number. It may be less. It may be more. But the thing is, one has to take into account the effective deployment of the Police Force in the context of what the country requires, so that I appeal to Honourable Members, if an appeal can be made, that this is not the kind of issue on which there needs to be political division, because, you know, whoever is the Government of this country, you are talking about money, you are talking about readjusting substantial levels of salary in relation to a lot of people. On the Opposition you continually complain that the country can afford this and can't afford that, cannot afford this expenditure, can't afford the other. You talk very glibly about increasing the level of salaries and meeting the demands of the policemen. Give them what they want, that is the word from the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. I have been trying to help my good friend, the Honourable Attorney General.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule simply says that you make your point and sit down. That's what the rule says.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I haven't quite finished yet, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, begin.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you, Sir. The point is this, Sir, that when you think of Government expenditure always bear in mind and make the point to your Cabinet colleagues that one of the first responsibilities of Government is the maintenance of law and order in the society. Always remember that.

Hon. M. A. KING: That's not a point. The largest part of public expenditure is in relation to salaries and wages and don't forget this. We can't be naive - you talk about law and order as being ... you say law and order is important. Of course law and order is an important element in any free society but you will understand that the practical realities of any situation are that when you....

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I'm beginning to feel it is Christmas time.

Hon. M. A. KING: When you create, Mr. Speaker, a special regime for the Police Force the argument of the police is that they are in a very important area of work, which is true, that it is hazardous, again which is true but you see, when you begin dealing with issues separately like

that you tend to get all kinds of reactions setting in from other vested interests in the public service.

Now, you say that the police are special and they should be treated specially. The nurses will tell you that they are special and they would be justified in saying that because they perform a special function and the teachers will tell you that they are special because after all they have a responsibility for the children from the time they come to school and it is a very honourable profession. So, the point I am making is that you cannot deal with one area of service in isolation like that, you have to look at the repercussions which whatever you do is likely to have on the general body politic. You have to look at the potential snowballing effect which dealing with salaries and wages in one sector is likely to have on the other sectors. You talk about controlling public expenditure? You talk about the squandermania which this Government is embarking on, bearing in mind that most of the money that Government spends is in relation to salaries and wages? You see, you are talking out of both sides of your mouth because it is convenient. We are in the political season so it is convenient because of the political season which we are into to try to exploit every single situation without recognizing that in seeking to exploit all and several situations you can be doing damage to the very interest which you are seeking to protect. As politicians we have a responsibility to act responsibly. We ought to act responsibly at all times. And, we should not use, I repeat, should not use and I address this especially to the Honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition, we should not use the Police Force as an area to make political capital out of issues. You have a terrible responsibility as Leader of the Opposition to act responsibly.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Point of order. I believe the Honourable Member is suggesting that I have been using the Police Force as a political tool or something like that. Sir, there is nothing further from the truth. I would like to inform the Honourable Member that when I was invited to address the Association and certain attempts were made to stop me, including threatening the Police with the fact, one,* that they would not get leave to come to the meeting and secondly, they would have to hold the meeting off public premises. Those were the first two threats that were made. Now, I had nothing to do with that. All I received was a letter of invitation. I don't know who made the threats or whether the Attorney General knew about it.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition talked about threats being made to the Police. I think the Honourable Member should be very specific because if the Honourable Member is saying that I had anything to do with threatening the police in relation to anything he said or did, the Honourable Member is guilty of what he would call a terminological inexactitude. So, I think he ought to be very clear. 5.35 p.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I was wondering whether or not the Honourable Attorney General knew who issued the threat. I wish to make the point that the threat was made before I even replied....

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot make a speech like that. That is going into a speech again.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, let me assure this House that I know nothing about any threat about which the Honourable Member speaks. I do not know if any threat in fact did take place. I say that we are in the political season so we have to be careful about this statement To talk about threats to the police is a good emotive way of dealing with an issue. It is not a fact. I doubt it is a fact.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has two more minutes.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, with all the interruptions I need a little more time. Let me just make these essential points in relation to the overall salary structures which have been agreed by the unions..

The fact is; that the unions have agreed with the Government on the level of salaries for the public servants. In reaching a conclusion on these negotiations clearly all parties would have taken into account the capacity of the Government to meet the demands and taken into account what is reasonable for the public workers at this time. Really to be continually coughing about the salaries not being adequate for the public workers and the increases meaning nothing to them is to do them a disservice and to discredit them and their negotiators.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, only within the last week, might be within the past day or two in the City of New York itself there was a freeze on the City of New York workers' wages. Considerable numbers of persons have been retrenched in New York, about 30 000 to 40 000 I think. There has been considerable pressure to meet Public Service salaries and commitments in the State of New York. We are behaving as if Barbados is so great that none of the problems which affect cities and countries all over the world can have any impact upon us. What I am saying is that we should accept and we ought to accept the agreement which has been reached in good grace and do not get upset because you are not able to make political capital about what has, in fact, taken place.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, let me make it clear at the beginning. I am not at all upset about anything that is taking place today. In fact, I am very pleased with what has been coming out in the last weekend. I am greatly buoyed because if the poll is right for the 3% of the public which wants this Government changed, that is

a very heartening statistic, nothing to upset any Member of the Opposition. We will come to that later on. We have a number of Resolutions to deal with it.

If I may focus on the Resolution before the House and take us back to 12.30 today, Sir. The Prime Minister in introducing this Resolution said that the negotiations were conducted in a spirit of mutual understanding on both sides. Agreement was reached within the context of prevailing economic conditions. Strangely, the Prime Minister did not spell out for the benefit of Honourable Members what precisely were these prevailing economic conditions.

The result of the exercise has been effectively to give the public officers \$68 a month more. They have to bring it down to what it really is in dollar terms. This Prime Minister has been known ever since he has become Prime Minister, except for the one occasion when the present Leader of the Opposition accused him of aborting the policies of the 1986 Manifesto, he has been loathed to tell the country precisely how bad conditions are.

On that occasion in 1988 he warned the country that he had rescued us from going on the rocks. Since then he has been careful to accuse Members of the Opposition of being prophets of doom and gloom. It has only been since the week following the Barbados Labour Party's Annual Conference that the Prime Minister has had the courage - I am not saying that he is a coward, do not misunderstand me. Let me withdraw it, Sir, less the wrong connotation be drawn. The Prime Minister has been able to concede that the economy is not in the best of shape.

I say it was the week after the Barbados Labour Party's Annual Conference because the Honourable Member for Christ Church West in his address on that Sunday foreshadowed a number of indicators of the state of the economy and said that later on that week, I think the Wednesday or the Thursday, the Central Bank Governor would have been obliged to report A, B, C and D. The Central Bank Governor did honour the prophesy that was made from the....

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It is P-R-O-F-I-T. The Central Bank Governor did make it very clear to the country as a whole that we are cast upon very difficult times. Would that the Prime Minister had vouchsafed that information before or even today because if the Prime Minister would interpret for the benefit of the citi/cnry of this country what appears on Table G3 of the Economic and Financial Statistics, nobody would then be able to accuse him of trying to set us down gently when, in fact, the situation is dire.

In August 1990 as compared with August 1989 the overall revenue was down \$10.5 million. That is a lot of

bread. Import duties were \$1.6 million less than 1989. Stamp duties were \$1.4 million less than 1989. Consumption taxes were \$2 million less. Hotel and restaurant sales tax \$600 000 less. Levies were \$2 million less. That has implication for unemployment. Income Tax was \$600 000 less.

Now, we are in a very parlous state as far as Government's fiscal position is concerned and, indeed, the economy. I make a distinction between Government's financial position and the larger economy. 5.45 p.m.

In this state the Prime Minister is still contriving to beat his chest and say how wonderfully we are doing and what a wonderful settlement he has achieved for the public workers of Barbados. They seemed convinced that because there has been no demonstration, that the country and the public workers are happy and satisfied. Well, the 43%, according to the poll, who are not saying anything and who do not know, who are uncommitted voters, are the ones that are showing their displeasure, apart from the 22% for the Barbados Labour Party and the 6% for the National Democratic Party and so on.

At the same time as a message is being sent to the Government in the sternest possible tones, a message "Do what you like, we are waiting for the day to mark the X" is all that is happening in this country. Believe it. Look at the trend to the polls. The people have made up their minds already, the Government is to go, and the sooner the better, although you can make up your mind and say on the other hand, "if we are to go in any event, let us hold on, go one lime next April," but I know it will be sooner than that.

Now, Sir, between 1980 and 1982 the increase in prices has been of the order of 44%. I think the Member for Christ Church West made the point. Even when the economy was caught in the grips of the worst international recession that there has been in the 70s and 80s, the lowest amount we paid civil servants was \$108 a month. This Government, which until recently was telling the country there is nothing to worry about, things are going well, can now only find \$68 to give them, when that \$108 that we paid in 1982 would now be worth \$155.52.

The great dissatisfaction among the public workers lies in the way the reclassification and regrading exercise panned out, the way it came up. The Prime Minister said there were 6,000 of 25,000 public officers who were reclassified. That still leaves 19,000 dissatisfied and discontented people; 75%, I am told. That is what he has to address. The public officers will always remember, their unionists would have the records, the 10th March, 1987 the then Prime Minister, the late Errol Barrow, came in here and said - they were paying the increases then for the previous two years - "these proposals were considered and our response was firstly, immediately after the salaries

revision action will be taken to delete the point Z.39, and secondly, an exercise in reclassification of posts would commence not later than April 1987 and be finalised by March 1988." It was on the basis of that promise to reclassify and regrade that the public workers accepted the wage settlement that was then offered early in 1987, on an understanding that a year later, as Mr. Barrow said not later than March 1988 the reclassification exercise would have been settled and people would have picked back up while they held strain. Read it at page 699.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You challenged him to be President of the DLP, you know, and Cammie Tudor carried some votes upstairs in some rice and stew and you got licked up. That is true. He told me that himself.

The public workers held strain on an expectation of a reclassification and regrading. When the next salaries increase came around, they were told that the exercise had been incomplete and that they should hold some more strain. They were given what they call a "nay nay" thing. In fact, the Honourable Minister of Health called it a mere technical adjustment, so infinitesimal....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. Just for the record, the Honourable Member is misleading the House, perhaps inadvertently. The question of the technical adjustment was the 2½% that was given to the Ministers at that time in the face of the 5% cut and the fact that the Permanent Secretaries had galloped ahead. I was merely explaining to the House that the 2½ was what was called for to maintain some semblance of parity. It was a mere technical adjustment. I got my blows for it already, do not give me any more.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, when an Honourable Member begs,....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir. You know how it is in the silly season. On a point of order, Sir. I am not begging. Your Honour knows that from way back down the road, but I am asking especially that Honourable Member, feel free.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, whatever it was, I know the Honourable Minister of Health was speaking in terms of the relativity between parliamentarians' salaries and the Permanent Secretaries. I forget how much exactly was the increase that the public officers got at the time, but it was in single digits and it did not beat 6%. It was very, very small. 5.55 p.m.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation. I did give those statistics when I introduced this Resolution, the percentage increases for the benefit of the Honourable Member. I don't recall whether he was in here. I had to correct the Honourable Member for Christ

Church West already, but he was definitely not in his chair, but what I did say was 1986-87 increases ranging from 1% at the top, ranging to 9% at the bottom with a 2% increase across the board for the following year 1987-88. That for 1988-89, the increases ranged from 8% at the bottom to 5% at the top with a further 2% increase for the following year 1989-90.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am obliged to the Honourable Prime Minister, Sir. Perhaps, I should put it another way. Effectively, those percentages worked out in dollar terms at \$75 per month. That's what they worked out at. So, while it was working out at \$74 and there was another \$74 before that, in 1986-87. The one I spoke of when Mr. Barrow introduced the Order. Seventy-four and seventy-four and now sixty-eight. On no occasion did they come close to the \$108 which was our lowest in 1982.

What I am more concerned to say, is that

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: There are no ladies over this side. Sir, while people were waiting for their regrading, while they were being asked to hold strain, draw your belt, take seventy-four dollars at the same time inflation was continuing, I will not say galloping because it was reasonably well moderated - five and six percent - and the workers were always behind the rate of inflation. They could not catch up. Now you had the regrading exercise and it is the feeling and the experience throughout the service that the real beneficiaries have been those at the top who in any event, were best able to cope with the economic difficulties during the year. Those at the top got the best rewards - fifteen, eighteen, thousand dollars, some of them carried home but there are policemen who got fifty-four dollars and after tax seven and six dollars now those are the ones that cannot be satisfied. That is the area of discontent. The first time in the history of public service negotiations in Barbados that a government gave the lion share to the ones at the top who were best able. The first time that happened and that is what they have to reckon with. That is what is contributing to the low morale in the Public Service. And it won't change. There is no time to change it. You can't change it in a month. They are going to revolt massively.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The Honourable Member for Christ Church West has spoken about the pensions and I want to declare an interest because my wife is a public servant and my two parents are retired government pensioners. But, I did make a pica in here during the Budget Debate this year for these government pensioners to be helped, Sir. But having declared my interest I am not goin-J*¹ to go any further in the matter. I don't think it is proper for me to make a case for people who are connected. I will make a case for all government pensioners but there is a

relationship and I don't think that it is seemly to deal with it today. I am glad that the Honourable Leader of the Labour Party has in fact dealt with it.

Now, when you give public workers sixty dollars a month they still have to cope at the bottom. I am only concerned with the people at the bottom. I say the ones at the top are well able to look after themselves. They have their houses, they have their mortgages, they have their two cars and the ones at the bottom want a chance now to get a berry to get a house to buy a little car, fix up nicely where they live and so on and they are not getting any assistance. Now, Sir, this sixty-eight dollars that they are getting will be completely extinguished by the impact of indirect taxes and increased energy prices.

I am not going to be unreasonable in my criticism except to say that I have the greatest sympathy with the Government for the situation they have got themselves into. They wouldn't listen and they have landed themselves between a rock and a hard place.

We have few foreign reserves. We have a credit squeeze on for a year and an election coming up in a month's time. We are going into an election with a credit squeeze on. The only person who will be able to get credit is the Government of Barbados. They have drawn about \$150 million and the average man in the street has had the greatest difficulty in getting access to credit, especially people like small mini-mart operators and so. On top of the credit squeeze, you have consumption taxes and the cost of living is bound to go up comparatively as a result of the recent increase in energy prices. So, if anybody can be satisfied with the \$68 and feel that it is enough to enable them to cope, well that person has no understanding of how to manage and run a proper household budget. I am not going to get involved in the matters of who did what for the police. There is another bit of legislation we have to deal with today - the acquisition, I could deal with it then.

The Police would know the work of the Barbados Labour Party throughout the years and all I would say is, that if you are going to talk about physical structures and physical development, in 15 years the Democratic Labour Party didn't build one police station in this country. We started with Hastings in 1955 and ended with Oistins, which I opened sometime in 1985, I think it was, or early '86. In the meantime, we had upgraded stations. Who built the new wing for the CID department in one year? Who redid District A? I'm not talking about Oistins, that's a new thing. We had a plan, the Honourable Attorney General spoke in here a long time about it. Plans drawn by Athelston King long before he died for a new complex at the Glebe and a crusher of the premises at Boarded Hall. 6.05 p.m.

This Government felt they had a different priority. That is their prerogative. I am not quarrelling about that.

They figured the north wanted attention so they would go to Holetown. They abandoned the Athelston King Plan. He had been paid by the Ministry and they moved to Holetown. It has not even got off the ground yet. They have just recently decided to move into some private headquarters somewhere in the Sunset Crest area. They abandoned something that was ready and it took them four years to decide to go somewhere else. They have not even broken ground. That, you tell me, is competence, efficiency and good planning?

At the Police Band headquarters, as I mentioned, the same thing happened. Cecil Stuart Associates were paid for the plans. They had been left there. It had been planned to start that in September 1986. It did not get off the ground until long after that. That, at least, is, I believe, nearing completion.

The Airport station that they opened, plans were left by me in my Ministry that were drawn by - I am not speaking pejoratively - Mr. John Barrow, the architect at the Airport. I believe that the Government is aware of the concerns of the police. I am not going to seek publicly to try and politicise the Police Force. I only want the record to show what has been done.

Sir, there is one other matter that concerns me. The public health officers have not been the happiest group of persons within the last year. I am a little disappointed that I wrote letters to the Government expressing the concerns of these officers in the summer. I have not even had the courtesy of a reply. I would only urge the Minister responsible for Health - I am not going to condescend upon particulars because it is touchy - to look into the problems and the unhappiness in that department as a matter of urgency because again in that department the morale has been severely compromised.

There are a group of public officers who are very unhappy and I must say it because I have had representations made to me. The postmen and postwomen of this country have special needs. I do not have time to develop this this afternoon. I ask the Minister responsible to try and find out what are the concerns because there is unhappiness.

I want to tell the Attorney General too that the court process officers are another group who are very unhappy and whose morale is low. It is not only the numbers because I know an attempt is being made to create 4 or 5 additional jobs. It is not that. It is their conditions of service and the fact that their travelling allowances are being paid in a very lardy manner. They would not, perhaps, understand that the problem is that the Government does not have the money. Come out and tell them. There is, I tell you, a seething problem in those departments that I have identified. I do not want to be accused of gelling into the political silly season

or destabilising. That is why I am not going into the details. I am only telling the Minister to look into the matters as matters of urgency.

Now, the Government cannot feel satisfied with its performance notwithstanding the platitudinous statements attributed to the Prime Minister in response to the poll on Monday. They really cannot, deep down be satisfied. I think that Barbados in 1990 will respect and respond to frank talking at the highest levels. Come out and level with the public. Tell them what is the situation. Do not use jargon like "prevailing economic conditions". Come and let us know how bad it is. Then you can make an appeal to Barbadians to rally around you. If the situation were not as bad as it is and as we in here know it from the information that is available to us, no way would the unions have been settling for 7% given the history of settlements under the Democratic Labour Party since 1986, no way.

I have the list here. Let me show you. The groundsmen, the steel benders, the head gardeners, the electrical assistants, the supervisors, and so on - I do not understand these things. I think the time has come when we have to be more mature in our attitude to Government and to the dissemination of public information. We are custodians of the public trust. We have information and we can cleverly, by the use of language manipulate our information. When the public sometimes act on realising what is happening, a level of cynicism is engendered that causes a loss of respect for people in public office. I feel that as we are getting to the end of the year and the start of a new year, it would not be a bad pledge if all of us who have the information, particularly on the Government side, pledge that in the new year we would be more free, open and honest with information.

Now, Sir, we have to explain to the people in category 5, for example, the meter repairer, the driver supervisor how things are going so well and yet his money will move from \$6.99 an hour to \$7.48 an hour, an increase of 49 cents.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Forty-nine cents an hour. Two Honourable Ministers on that side say it is a lot of money. It cannot even buy a coke or a pack of biscuits. What can you buy with 49 cents in Barbados? This is only \$15 a week. This is what you all send out to the people. This is not my document. This is their document that is law to all the Government departments speaking in terms of hours. 6.15p.m.

The people in Category VI, Senior Groundsmen, Entomological Assistants, move from \$6.69 an hour to \$7.16; 47 cents. I had the shock of my life a few weeks ago, Sir. My petrol gauge was showing me....

Mr. SPEAKER: Make it quickly, within one minute.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, Sir. The Honourable Member for Christ Church West has already said in here and in his statement at Annual Conference that the Barbados Labour Party is committed to a review of the reclassification and regrading exercise that was recently gone into under this Government. We give the country and the public workers that assurance. We are not satisfied with it, nor are they satisfied. The least we can do is to review it with a view to ironing out the anomalies which have shown themselves.

Sir, I will have a chance later on, because we will be here all day and all night, when I get back to this debate.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, sometimes when we are discussing salaries in Barbados it is very difficult to understand where logic ends, or indeed where it begins, depending on who is speaking and what position they are taking as they perceive the public wishes them to take. Anyone listening to the Honourable Member who just sat down discussing the sadness of \$68 or the wickedness of \$74, would believe that the country has a cadre of workers who have tremendous difficulty eating their daily bread and this wicked Government descended upon them with money a-plenty and barely gave them \$68, \$74. You could almost hear the blood flowing as he cried tears of blood for these poor people, and then he picks on someone who is getting an increase of 49 cents an hour and that person cannot even buy a coke.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe that we are talking in the same context as the Honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition, and the Leader of the Minority Opposition and the Member who just sat down himself, who started off, each one of them, pointing out that the Government does not have a cent, there is not a cent at all in the Treasury.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I made my statement in the context of the Prime Minister's assurance all along that all was well, and I took the figures from the Central Bank to show that it could not be well and implored him to level with the country. That is all I did.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Even if what he said was true, even if the Prime Minister had ever said that, which is not true, then he could not have said that on the one hand and then quarrel about \$68 and \$74 on the other hand, and expect reasonable people to accept what in other places we describe as rubbish.

Mr. Speaker, let us take one category of workers between 1986 and 1990-91. A school meals worker in 1986 was getting \$666 per month. As of now that same worker

will be getting \$1030 a month, a 54% increase between 1986 and 1991. That is what it will be. Why can they not be honest enough when they are discussing these matters and deal with them in the broad sense so that the population will understand what they are talking about?

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: That is your problem. You have been behaving like a Prime Minister for too long. You behave like a Prime Minister all the time and now you are telling me I must start behaving like a Prime Minister. There is no way you behave like a Prime Minister, it happens to you. I keep trying to instruct you in these matters. You cannot behave like a Prime Minister, you either look like one or you feel like one. Take it easy. You have time.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am a very young man, you know, and very healthy too.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: You are not in this category, you are always a bridesmaid, you are not going to make this thing.

Mr. Speaker, this 54% for a school meals worker is an indication of what has happened in the society between 1986 and now, and it is important for us when we hear them on the one hand telling the population how we are running down the Treasury, spending so much money, indulging in squandermania, and now they come in here to quarrel with the trade unions. That is really what the argument will have to be. They are quarrelling that we should have beaten the trade unions and tell them they could not agree to \$68, or \$74, let me beat you and make you agree to \$100 or more. That is what they seem to be saying.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member must not mislead this Honourable House. The fact is that I am reliably informed that the trade unions really wanted 15% at the bottom and you forced and bullied them to accommodate you.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: We broke Goddard's hand and made him take it. The Cabinet Ministers beat Goddard with a bull pistol and made him take it. That is what I do not understand with the Honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition. One expects that the Leader of the Opposition is going to bring a level of intellectual honesty to the debate because he has spent the last five years saying that what this country needs is intellectual integrity and intellectual

honesty, among other things. For the first time we have one union that never agreed at all ever until now, but we have been calling on the unions to be responsible. The unions have determined that they wish to participate in the national development in a particular way. We have had no recriminations, we have had discussions, we have had agreement and now we have the Opposition parties coming in bemoaning the fact that the people at the bottom are being taken advantage of.

If I was getting \$666 in 1986 and I now get \$1 030,1 defy anybody to say that they are taking advantage of me. When he talks about \$68 and \$74, when I went to work at Cable and Wireless, Mr. Speaker, my salary was \$54 a month, so do not talk about \$74 and give the children in this country the impression that \$74 is not money.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Yes, it is a lot of money. That is part of the problem in this country. That is why people feel that they should grab and steal and go into people's houses. Seventy four dollars is not a single amount of money, thousands of people in Barbados are getting thousands of 74s and we all have to pay for it. I think it is dishonest, Sir, to try to....

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Would I accuse you of dishonesty? I know dishonest people and I would not accuse you of being one of them. I would go further with you, Sir. But, Mr. Speaker, I am saying that it is dishonest for anyone to try to give the impression now that \$68 or \$74 - and this is \$68 or \$74 on top of what in Barbados, in the Caribbean, anywhere in the world, is a decent salary. That sum of money that people get in Barbados whether you talk about the ones at the top - and when you hear them talking about the ones at the top, I have heard the Honourable Members over there joining with the former Governor of the Central Bank. But pound for pound, dollar for dollar, we get paid better than some people in Britain and some people in the United States. I state that categorically, Sir. Dollar for dollar and pound for pound, what we get in terms of quality is better for a lot of people in the same categories in developed countries but I can make that argument elsewhere some time to come. But, Sir, I have heard argument coming from the Labour Party sources when the former Governor of the Central Bank used to be making the argument that one of the reasons why we are not getting quality performance in the public sector was because the managers were not getting enough money, that they were being moved away and the buck was coming too close to the top, that you could not get quality people they were all moving to the private sector and the gap between the private sector and the public sector was too wide and the Honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition has

articulated that position on more than one occasion in my hearing, Sir. 6.25 p.m.

I am saying, Sir, that we cannot approbate and reprobate at the same time.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: They tried to drag the nurses into; their argument When the late Tom Adams single-handedly regraded in this country, and I state that he single-handedly regraded on the basis of favour and whim and fancy a non-scientific regrading that was done around the table in which he identified individuals in the Public Service that could not be moved up; in which he took out the civil list and drew up the names of the police officers who should or should not be promoted; in which he terrorized single-handedly senior officers in the Public Service. They think that in four years they can come back in here and talk about morale. There was no morale in the Public Service in 1986. The Labour Party did not discuss morale, the question did not arise so we can't come into this House now and play holier than thou and give the impression that milk and honey and dewdrops are flowing out of the mouths of the three who bit over there and the rest of the Labour Party. The Labour Party is part of the body politic and we are familiar with them.

Let me give you an example of the way they speak on some occasions and on other occasions. I am coming back to the nurses, Sir. Let me just take the police. If you heard the Honourable Member for St. Thomas as he talks about what they have done for the police, you could not believe that this same Honourable Member in this House in 1986 just before the election spoke at page 3652 on the following:

"From a security point of view, District D, Rock Hall is totally unsuitable to be a police station. If you block the entrance to District D Police Station, you could maroon all the police in there. They cannot get out. Put a few petrol tankers across the road, light them, and you have taken control of that police station...."

And hear them now, Sir, on crime and violence and I continue to quote:

"We are living in a world of increasing disorder, a world of rowdiness, hooliganism, terrorism and one does not know to what extent terrorists' activities will develop over time and so the societal responses must take account of the potentiality for damage and destruction to our country and so I want to move the police station from Rock Hall."

The Honourable Member, D. A. C. Simmons. This is on the Estimate for 1986. He was the Attorney General. I

am going on further. On the following page, hear him Sir. "If the police do not have batteries, that is not my fault." I am going on further, Sir, the Honourable Member. "I do not know, Sir, about Hall. You see, Sir, they are asking me operational matters and they well know and the Honourable Member for St. Michael West (meaning me) must know that constitutionally, I cannot interfere with the day to day operations of the Police." Yet, they are calling on him. They are calling on the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central, the Attorney General, to go and do exactly the same thing. I go further, Sir. The Honourable Member for St. Thomas is still speaking on page 3654. Hear him: "I am not hiding anything. Some of the conditions at Bridge and Harbour, for example, are awful. Some of the living conditions down at Central in the barracks are not reflecting 1986 standards. We have to provide the men with proper facilities".

I quote him further on the following page, page 3655. Honourable D. A. C. Simmons is speaking. I quote: "in the barracks in town, they have a problem down there. That is a great haven for the rats from Tudor Street, around the canteen and so on and so we are going to do rodent control down there to try as far as possible to ward off leptospirosis." Mr. Speaker, they come in here today, Sir, and they forget that some of us have been in the House for a long time. We didn't put any rats in the police station in Tudor Street. We have been removing the rats from the police station. But, he wants to give the impression and the Honourable Member, the former Attorney General who left and ran away and came back - from the Cabinet....

Hon. H. dcB. FORDE: The Honourable Member - as we get near to the elections, will talk nonsense. I never ran from the Cabinet. I have very frequently in this House said that I served my five years as a Minister and also with distinction and with great performance and also returned to the Cabinet in 1983 in order to take on a special assignment and did the special assignment and have returned to the front bench and the Opposition will lead the Cabinet after the next election.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, the distinction went like this. You will recall because Your Honour was on the Floor. The distinction went like this: when the Government used to be on that side and the then Prime Minister said "who wants to resign, can resign". That is a distinction. He said "resign now". That would have been distinct.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am not going into that now. I am going to leave that for the political platform when I discuss what Tom Adams said about you in here. I have to do it because when we are discussing the matters for the politics all of them think that we forget, but we are going to quote Tom Adams, chapter and verse, and we are going to discuss it in the context of race, too.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAUT: I don't mind what Barrow said about me. It is a free country and Barrow was free to say anything about me. All you have to do, let me go to Eagle Hall. You go to Eagle Hall and tell the people what Barrow said about me and let me go to Christ Church and tell them what Tom said about you. I am going to bet you that Barrow never said that I am not black. Never said it, couldn't say it. There is nobody living who could say it.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: He said you didn't know what you were.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: That may be so, but he knew I was black. He never had any difficulty with that. But we are not ready for that yet, Sir.

I don't want to be diverted from this debate. We will get to that, you and I, Sir, we will discuss the Mutual, the whole thing. But Sir, I want to talk about the nurses because the Honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition who didn't speak to nurses until recently..... When he was in the Hospital he did not used to speak to the nurses.
6.35 p.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I object to the statement. If he wants to keep it in the record let him keep it in the record. I want to say that it is not true.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Let us say that all the nurses who say so have not been telling the truth. I am not even going to touch that. I want to make this point, however. When the Democratic Labour Party came into office, we had a situation where nurses, among other public officers, felt downtrodden, felt as though they had no way to go and no way to turn.

I have to remind Your Honour, Sir, that they could not get leave, that they were working in conditions that were not acceptable to them, that they had seen their position vis-a-vis the police and other sectors eroded. We had a situation where the shortage of nurses was so acute that there was consideration to closing certain wards. We moved from having 369 nurses when I became Minister to a position where we had in excess of 440 nurses on the staff of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. We have also had an inlake in other areas of nursing in this country.

I state categorically that the Democratic Labour Party Administration has done more for nurses in four years than had been done in the previous 40. I am saying that, Sir, because we can examine in the context of the day. We restarted the mental nursing programme. We have continued it. One hundred and three persons over a three year period will become registered mental nurses. They are

going to get the dignity of being qualified staff nurses. We have completely reworked the system of training for nursing assistants. We have made sure that all nursing assistants who can go on to be trained become qualified.

The Honourable Member, the leader of the Minority Opposition, went to another place and made a categorical statement that we have been taking persons from institutions in Barbados to send them to St. Joseph Hospital in order to get St. Joseph Hospital open for political purposes. I state categorically that it is not true. Three nurses in the entire system have applied for St. Joseph Hospital.

Furthermore, the Honourable Member who was an Attorney General had to know that if a person is working in the Public Service that you cannot direct them to go and work in a statutory board which St. Joseph Hospital is. When he said that, since he ought to have known, you cannot second them without their approval. When the Honourable Member said that - first I said they were only three people who have applied. I categorically denied that we have sent anybody. I am saying that he had to know that you cannot do it so. Therefore he went to mislead the people.

Sir, we have reserved a place for him at the Mental Hospital so he can go and observe, because I believe that is what he needs to do, to be able to go down to the Mental Hospital and observe the system.

Certain remarks made by Hon. B. M. TAITT were ordered expunged from the records by Mr. SPEAKER.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of elucidation. The Honourable Member must know that when I spoke it was about the bad conditions that have existed under him at the Psychiatric Hospital where the poor people cannot even get their food warm. He knows that.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I was coming to that. Now he has said it I am saying that what he said is untrue. He said there was leaking and I am saying that it is untrue.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: People are writing in the papers what! The roof on the pay ward was fixed at a cost of \$228 000 two years ago. The Honourable Member should remember that when the now Member for St. Michael East was Minister of Health how he went to the same Psychiatric Hospital and showed the inhuman conditions that existed.

I state in here, Sir, that there is no place where the morale is higher than in the same Psychiatric Hospital. The morale of the nurses in the Psychiatric is the highest it has ever been in this country except for the one person who reports to you.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, on a point of order. Is the Honourable Member saying that his party has succeeded in creating a situation where the morale in the Mental Hospital is the highest in the Public Service?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Even if he wishes to say that. The morale among the nurses in the Mental Hospital is so high that you can even say that. It is higher than it has ever been in this country. I say so, Sir.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir. He might be an out-patient that we do not know about. We have 1 400 out-patients and I try to keep it confidential so I do not know if the Honourable Member is one.

The fact is that within the entire nursing system because of their capacity to get leave - right now there are over 65 nurses on the staff of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital who are out somewhere on training. In all of what has been going on we have been able to send 65 persons out for training. Under the Barbados Labour Party for two years there was no training at all. They cannot have the temerity to come and talk about the training.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: You do not have to read the files. I am stating as a Minister that it is a fact. In 1984 and 1985 there was no training at all when Billie Miller was Minister and when O'Brien Trotman was Minister. Do not ask me about the files. I am saying that there was none.

Furthermore, Sir, since this Government introduced the concept of a stipend we now have an over-subscription of applications to become nurses at the Community College. This stipend was stopped by the Barbados Labour Party Government for no apparent reason other than whim and fancy. I think it was Billie Miller who was Minister at the time.

The Honourable Member has a short memory and he needs to be reminded. We have now 60 persons in training. We had 60 persons last year and 60 persons again this year. When we get enough tutors we will extend it because it is my contention that we should be training 100 persons as nurses per year. We have started an additional programme within the context of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital which will allow for nursing assistants to be trained because there is no reason why this country cannot be a net exporter of skills such as nursing.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member is *sot to voce* saying it always was when it was properly organised. He could not even remember what happened when he was

chairman of the medical staff. I am not going to remind him. I promise you, Sir. I will not touch on it. He has a short memory.

The Honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition must not come in here trying to give the impression that there is something happening to the nurses.

«(*)»

I want to deal with the statement made by the President of the Barbados Registered Nurses Association. The statement suggested that somehow the Government had trampled on the rights of the Association.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: You are the only person I curse and the Lord knows he has sent me as a messenger to curse you. I beg your pardon, Sir.

*

Mr. SPEAKER: When you forget you are addressing the Chair, then you curse the Chair.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I must ignore him Sir. My Ministry is to deal with him. The fact is that the President of the Registered Nurses Association had made a statement which has been carried in the Press. 6.45 p.m.

M

I think the Prime Minister has explained that the Association made a submission in October, negotiations had been continuing with the National Union of Public Workers and agreement was reached, but there is a point to be made.

If a union submits names of public officers, especially names of officers like nurses, that union has every right to expect that the matter would be checked thoroughly, because it is not unusual for persons in professions like nursing to belong to more than one union. It is the >* responsibility of the Establishments Division to double check when names are submitted whether those names can be found on the NUPW's list, a comparative analysis has to be done and they have to be certain that the information is sufficiently accurate.

I have no doubt that, given the integrity of the Division (now the Ministry of the Civil Service), in due course they will report to the President of the BRNA what the factors are and what they have found.

M
-•

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: They have no vested interest. What can be the vested interest? I am not saying anything that you have not heard, I am saying that the information ^ which went in has to be checked, and the mere fact that names have been submitted does not mean that those names submitted are to be accepted without more.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member knows better than anybody else that there are nurses who belong to both organisations. I am absolutely certain about it and therefore it is not fair to leave the public with the impression that somehow the Ministry of the Civil Service has done the Barbados Registered Nurses' Association some harm. It is my feeling, Sir, that the matter will be dealt with in due course and all of the other matters which are being raised by the Association will be dealt with in the normal course of time.

Let me say that one of the things which this Government has set out to do, and I think successfully, is to prepare an environment within which those who work in the nursing profession will have a sense of belonging and a feeling that this is a noble profession again. That is why, Sir, if my colleagues do not mind my saying so, I led the fight to have nurses among the large numbers of persons appointed by this Government. It is my contention that a professional person should not have to be left dangling for six, seven and eight years in a temporary position, when it is obvious that that position is needed. Therefore, persons who have been working for approximately two years have all been appointed. There was a time when there was no one at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital left to be appointed. All of the persons working in the Hospital, not only the nurses, we have appointed maids, cooks, general workers, wherever it is possible for us to appoint someone, that person has been appointed in the provision of health services.

We have seen too that persons get promotion and I submit to this Honourable House that there is no one who can point to the promotions policy of this Government and accuse it of promoting people on the basis of their political affiliation. Those who work in the health profession in this country have had nothing but a clear and direct course of personal development, a clear and direct path toward promotion to the health services.

When saying that I must allude to the small question of some public health assistants who were not paid for some time in the Service. This is a technical problem which has been dogging the Service and which the Ministry of the Civil Service is seeking to solve. It is a problem which has to do with a person not being able to receive payment until the post which he or she is acting in is approved. There is not an Honourable Member who has been a Minister over there who is not familiar with the system, which is a very simple one. There are 16 persons who are public health inspectors, 14 public health assistants and 2 public health inspector trainees, who were given leave to go to the Community College for three years to do their public health training as public health inspectors.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The only mosquitoes I know are in the NDP, the only ones I cannot eradicate with an ordinary spray. The mosquitoes from the NDP are being dealt with by the people. They moved them from seven to six and are moving them down fast. We leave you to them.

Sir, these 16 persons who came in to act for them are 16 persons who were continuing to act before, but the approval for the 16 who got the training leave did not come through until recently and as a result the 16 were not paid. It is a normal problem in the Public Service, and when I read about people are going to strike, the people who are in these posts are not in a position to strike and the ones who are going to come out in aid of them could only have been doing so in the newspapers, because that is pure propaganda. It is not a question of anybody coming out on strike, I think it is unconscionable for anybody to work for three months and not get paid. I have made that position with my colleagues and my colleagues accept that, but we cannot interfere in the Civil Service workings, as you know - the Honourable Members know that - and from time to time the system clogs up.

Mr. SPEAKER: You have about two minutes more.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Sir. The point we are making is that we cannot pretend that the system does not clog up sometimes. Even though it is efficient it is like any public institution, the Civil Service is the largest public institution and sometimes it clogs.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: It has nothing to do with money not being there. The Prime Minister has already spoken on this and the Honourable Member knows it has nothing to do with money not being there. Unless you are going to act illegally, you cannot pay the persons until an authorisation is received. The authorisation sometimes takes time and the Ministry of the Civil Service is going through systematically and trying to find a system where that is eliminated. We want to give the people who work in temporary posts the assurance that this matter is being dealt with at the highest level and we expect that in due course it will be eliminated.

On the question of persons not getting their travel allowance, that, as I said earlier in an *Aside*, is a standard problem which has dogged the Civil Service from time immemorial, and especially when the Leader of the Opposition was Minister of Finance. If he checks the record he will see that it was especially during his time that people had difficulty getting money for their travel.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading this House. When I was

Minister of Finance I never heard a single complaint of anybody not receiving their travel allowance.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, that is true, because he never used to listen to anything. Honourable colleagues on this side will remember that the Honourable Member, when he was the Minister of Finance, would come and tell us, he would not hide his mouth, Sir, "you will have to roll it over a little bit" Sir, the conventions require that I not do any thing like that, so I am going to stop at this point. The conventions do not allow me to discuss matters in these terms, and we will leave them here, Sir.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I have not accused him of hearing, Sir. I will never accuse him of hearing anything like that. I am saying that the complaints were made, and if you check the record you will find that the longest period and the largest number who went without having their travelling paid would have been during the time when he was the Minister of Finance.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Honourable Member is not only misleading this House, he is lying. There was never a problem....

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot accuse a Member of lying. The Honourable Member knows that very well.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, I withdraw the word "lying", but it is not true. That was not a problem.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, it has been a problem every single year since we had a Civil Service, so it was a problem for all the years before him and since. Let us take him out, Sir, because as usual with him, the sun rose and set with him, the rain falls on the just and the unjust but not on him, and so it never happened. I am saying that it happened across the board, it is not a new problem and we will bring the details in due course so the Honourable Member could see that I was not lying on him deliberately.

I am grateful to Your Honour.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it being a couple minutes before 7.00, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 8 o'clock.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 6.55 p.m.

RESUMPTION Mr.

SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Mr. Speaker, I want to make a couple of observations on the matter before us at the moment and in doing so I would like to begin with addressing some remarks made by the Honourable Member <«* for Christ Church East Central and also the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central insofar as that Honourable Member dealt with matters relating to the police and the whole question of the politicization of the Police Force. Sir, the Member for Christ Church East Central dealt with the process of negotiation at the very outset of his speech and he explained how that process works in some detail and I gather that the point, without doing any violence to what he was saying, was that the Leader of the Opposition was in some way scurrilously attacking the trade unions of this country by trying to •*» suggest by implication that the workers in the Public Service had not disagreed or were in support of the salaries as negotiated by the unions. I think that is a fair assessment of what the Honourable Member was saying.

Sir, the fact that a trade union or trade unions might agree on behalf of workers as to pay increases does not mean that the members of that union or those trade unions all fully agree with the settlement that has been arrived at, « or for that matter that a majority of the members had agreed. Because of certain arguments put by 'the representatives of the workers, the workers might be persuaded into accepting the wages as negotiated but that does not mean a majority acceptance of the position as put by them. One could say that the workers might agree in a spirit of compromise. The workers might be persuaded that the economy could not afford any large increase at the moment but acceptance at that level does not mean that they are satisfied with the wages as negotiated, because the percentage increases might not in any way meet the day to * day requirements.

We have heard how the Member for St. Thomas had argued this question and how the Member for St. Michael West has dealt with it in rebuttal. The point I want to make in response to what the Honourable Member says is that acceptance of a package of wages settlement does not in any way mean that the workers of a particular organization accept that package fully. They might be persuaded into — holding strain at the moment, but it does not mean a full- --fledged acceptance of the package.

On the whole, Sir, I see nothing wrong in criticising a trade union. The Member for Christ Church East Central seems to be saying that trade unions might very well be above criticism. I do not accept that, Sir. If a trade union is wrong I believe that that trade union can be criticised. If it is not representing the interests of the workers....

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: If the Honourable Member for St. George South will give way to a point of elucidation. Sir, the question of agreement and acceptance of a negotiated position - normally the trade union puts in an increase that they would want and the other side will start off at zero percent. That is a negotiation stance and generally it is understood that both sides will give. To say that when we reached an agreement at 7% that it means that the workers are not satisfied because they would have wanted 15% would be in a way to simplify the negotiation procedure, because you don't put in what you really expect to get, you put in something to negotiate. I am sure he is aware of that. I think you need to recognize that if workers are not satisfied with an agreement they have so many ways of showing it. They would be on the streets and so on. But we have not seen that in these negotiations. We have not seen any mass protests. We have not heard of any groups breaking away from the main unions and saying they disagree. That is on the basis on which I see it as a popular settlement, generally speaking.

Mr. R. P. BYER: I did not express it in terms of percentages, Sir. The point I was making was that the workers might not resort to large scale protest but I am saying they might be dissatisfied with the settlement but at the same time they might be persuaded to accept it at certain levels within a context of a weak economy. I don't think that I am begging the question when I so put it.

One has got to look at the whole salaries negotiations within the context of the regrading exercise that took place recently. I had a chance to look and examine the percentages and have studied in some detail the document that was put out on the regrading exercise and I am sorry, Sir, that I forgot the material that I wanted to rely on today. From looking at the levels of increases and the way how the whole idea of regrading took place the criticism that the regrading exercise looked after the people at the top of the scale of the Civil Establishment Order is not a criticism that can be swept under the carpet. I think it is a justifiable criticism. The whole approach as explained by the Member for Christ Church East Central on a point of order was that the character of jobs has changed over the years and therefore the regrading exercise took part within that context. I do not believe that this should be an approach or this ought to be the approach adopted in these matters. As a country we are trying to narrow the gap between the haves and the have-nots and if in the Service we apply this approach what we are saying and what has resulted is that there is a widening of the gap between those at the top and those at the bottom.

I do not believe that it is right for 25% of the Service, assuming that 6,000 people were regraded in a service of 25,000 workers, that the regrading exercise should have benefited just 6,000 people to the extent that they....

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Again the Honourable Member for St. George South is misleading the House. If the suggestion is being made that the 6,000 positions that were being regraded came from the Government, that would not be correct. Proposals for regrading would come from the trade unions. It would be the NUPWi the BWU etc. who would have put in proposals from their membership for regrading and they would have to rationalise the regrading. It is not that Government says we want positions regraded. It was the civil service unions that put forward the proposals so the suggestion should not go forth that Government identified 6,000 jobs and regraded them. It was the unions who said that these are the positions we want regraded.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Yes, Sir, as I was saying. As far as I understand, Sir, the recommendations as put forward were considered by a Committee and the Committee after meeting accepted whatever recommendations that were made. If the Government accepted the recommendations of the Committee even though those recommendations were put forward by trade unions, the approach was still wrong. If the Government accepted the recommendations as put forward, I am saying it is still wrong because in the whole exercise the Government, obviously, Sir, would be the arbiter of last resort. 8.10p.m.

The Government would determine how the regrading exercise would take part in the final analysis. I am still saying that to allow the regrading to benefit those people at the top the way it does, to my mind, sets the stage for the disaffection and dissatisfaction that is so rampant in the service at the moment for the whole regrading exercise. Any salary increases have to be looked at in that context.

Civil servants might not necessarily be satisfied with the salary increases they have received but they would be dissatisfied with salary increases within the context of the regrading exercise that has taken place. What has happened, as far as I am able to understand, Sir, is that a number of people at the top have benefitted twice, as it were, from the regrading exercise and now they are benefitting from the salary increases that we are examining here today. I think that any dissatisfaction or disaffection in the Service must be traced back to that situation.

One other thing that the Honourable Member addressed and he challenged the Leader of the Opposition on the Floor of the House to look at was the whole question of political patronage. The position of this party is very clear on that. At the foundation ceremony of the National Democratic Party which took place on Sunday, February 26, 1989 - I would make this a document of the House - page 8 of this document, it is stated here in his address to

the party on that day. The political leader of that party, now Leader of the Opposition had this to say:

"The National Democratic Party represents an expression of commitment to truth, integrity and morality and it is my fervent desire that it shall always remain such.' I, therefore, rejoice in the proclamation which we, the founding members of the National Democratic Party, have made to adhere to the highest ethical standards at all times.

I need not remind you that, in making this commitment, the National Democratic Party has resolved to set its face against that mode of unsavoury and unprincipled party oriented behaviour which Barbadians so aptly describe as 'yardfowlism', a cancerous condition which has paralysed other political parties and has rendered them unable to put the national interest before personal and partisan considerations.

Nor should it be necessary for me to point out that commitment to the highest ethical standards will preclude a National Democratic Party Government from ostracizing and penalising persons who may have chosen neither to support nor identify with the National Democratic Party.

The National Democratic Party must at all times show appreciation and give encouragement to its members and supporters, but it must do so in ways which will not be unreasonable, unfair or discriminatory against others. We must always be mindful of the fact that the obverse side of undue favouritism towards some is victimization of others.

Our decision to eschew unjust political favouritism sets us apart from the other political parties in Parliament. However, it is my hope that the other parties will eventually do likewise, and I exhort them to free themselves from the shackles of yardfowlism and factiousness and join us in our philosophical stance on matters pertaining to political conduct.

There is no belter contribution a political party can make to the quality of social relationships in • Barbados, at this time."

Sir, that is our policy position in relation to the matter as raised by the Honourable Member for Christ Church East in relation to patronage.

Now, in relation to some matters that were raised by the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central which had to do with the police, he began by saying that Members On this side seem to be annoyed that the matters of the wage settlement have been settled amicably. Sir, no-

one on this side is annoyed with anything that has to do with the settlement of wages amicably.

I think it is in the interest of good industrial relations and, at this moment, a settled climate in industrial relations and otherwise social as well, that matters of this kind could be settled as quickly as possible. Frankly, I was very heartened that we were able to get the matter sorted out as •*" quickly as it was sorted out and that we were able to eschew any factiousness or anything like that. It is quite wrong for the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central to suggest that we on this side are annoyed that the matter of the wages settlement had been settled as quickly as it did.

While at the same time making that point when he talked about the police he was asking us to avoid making the Police Force a political issue but, at the same time, he was making the point that the Police Force had the best chance with the Democratic Labour Party. Now, Sir, that is open to question. The best chance to do what? To go where?

One cannot deny that we live in a country that is highly political and that most matters are brought into the domain of politics. That is something that we cannot avoid. But to say that we should not make a political issue out of the Police Force, I am wondering if the Attorney General was suggesting to us that if the Government should be "*" criticised in relation to its handling of matters pertaining to the Force it ought not to be so criticised.

I do not know where the Attorney General would want to draw the line. If he could help me I would be very glad. I know he would not be able to speak but I can give way on a matter of elucidation if he wants to do that. Where should we draw the line between politics and being critical of the Ministry responsible for the Attorney General and the Government where it has to do with matters pertaining to the Police Force?

I would venture to suggest, Sir, that the line is a very thin one. Any person in any subjective way could determine that a matter is political when it is merely a matter that has to do with the administration of the Force. Now, I can understand, Sir, that the Attorney General might still be smarting under the blows that he got from the police organisation earlier this year or last year. He might very well want to make a point about that. I can understand the _ "*" Attorney General being upset about these matters but he should not allow the ruffling of the feathers that he got recently to annoy him.

I was particularly surprised that he could be so easily side-tracked there. It was unusual that the Attorney General could be so side-tracked as he was earlier in the debate at very small things. At one time I thought he was Buster Douglas in the second fight. He could not get his act

together at all. But later on in the afternoon he did manage to get in a speech as we went along.

Sir, nobody here is trying to make political capital out of the Police Force. There are matters in the Police Force that have to be addressed. The whole question of law and order in this community is one that has to be addressed. If the Ministry of the Attorney General and the Government appear to be lethargic in its approach to addressing these problems, some things have to be said because, after all, a lot of money is spent in equipment, machinery and men in the Police Force in an effort to have a decent system of law and order in this community. We have to be critical of the Government when it is necessary to be critical of the Government in relation to matters of the Police Force.

I am surprised that up to now those problems that could be easily solved have not been solved, problems with equipment, machinery and so on. Even now they have brought in some cars recently, I think they are Subaru brand motorcars. I personally do not think that they are sturdy enough to endure the amount of work that they have to do over the next couple of years. 8.20 p.m.

Personally, I would have preferred another type of vehicle. I believe that they are not very good vehicles for the kind of work the police have to do over the next couple of years. I believe that they are a little thin, I do not think that they are sturdy enough to deal with the work that they have to do. I am surprised that matters like proper facilities in the barracks and so on have not yet been sorted out, but if we are to alleviate the social discontent in this community we have to pay some attention to the amount of money, the amount of equipment and men we invest in the Police Force.

The Opposition is not, as described by the Prime Minister, a rag tag band of prophets of gloom and doom, we are a very serious Opposition. We are not an Opposition that is bent on destruction of Barbados. If we were, I would not be part of that anyhow. I think that we, like Members on the Government side, like Barbados very much, so to suggest that we are bent on destruction is foolishness. It is nonsense, as far as I am concerned. If things are wrong in this society, they have to be spoken about and Honourable Members will speak about them from a position which they deem to be fair. If the Democratic Labour Party was over here in Opposition, they would be saying the same things we are saying at the moment.

I have read some of the past debates and I am alarmed at how Members in previous Sessions of this House could be arguing one thing today in Opposition and tomorrow defending the very thing they were arguing against. I do not know how they got it done, Sir, but they did. We like Barbados like anybody else and I think that if things are wrong we need to say they are wrong.

Thank you, Sir.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a small contribution to this debate. After listening carefully to the several contributions, I would like to add my voice at this time, first on behalf of the nurses, later on the teachers, then I would like to say something on the Police Force, and finally, if time permits, on the lowly paid workers in this country.

I would like to know, Sir, why is it that nurses who are qualified are being overlooked for promotion although they spent several years at the institutions in which they worked. Many of these nurses who have given of their best are usually passed over for outsiders, and I think it makes good for worker morale to promote from within rather than promote from without.

Another thing is that nurses who have served 15 years do not enjoy the same benefits as teachers when it comes to long leave. They get three months, one month at full pay and two months at half pay. I think they should be entitled to the same three months as the teachers. I would hope that the Minister of Health and the Minister of Finance would give this their most urgent attention.

In the regrading exercise, Sir, the teachers who graduated in 1988 got nine months' back pay, those in 1989 got 16 months and all the others got 26 months. This too is making for bad morale in the Teaching Service. I think that this should be addressed.

Some of the working conditions for teachers are appalling. Some schools are in dire need of repair, there is a lack of proper and adequate furniture, and also the external surroundings at the schools are a disgrace. I can name a few in my constituency. I think that these buildings should be properly repaired and that there should be a regular maintenance programme to rid these schools of the bush and debris which more or less surround them. At St. Christopher's Girls' School, which is just 100 yards away from me, there is a daily battle with the students and teachers against the stegomyia mosquito. These mosquitoes, after they breed in the water, make their home in grass and bushes, and I think it is high time that these schools are kept in a half decent condition if you are to get the best out of these institutions. There is no point saying that the teachers are not performing and that the students are not making use of the education which is given to them. You can only perform satisfactorily if the conditions are right for such performance.

Several speakers have spoken about the police. They talk about law and order, the poor morale in the Police Force, the disparity of wages in the Police Force as regards the regrading, but from my goings around I have noticed that there are several police stations which should be demolished completely. They are not only health hazards,

but some of them are death traps. For instance, District D comes to mind. I had the occasion to go to District D on some business and I almost fell through the floor. I do not see why policemen or anybody should be subjected to work in these conditions. In fact, Sir, if I were a policeman at that station I would find it very difficult to report for duty. 8.30p.m.

Dealing with the Police and the equipment, I think it is high time that we purchase proper police vehicles, which could withstand the hard work which will be placed upon them. You need a vehicle with good and strong suspensions, special gear boxes and a competent maintenance team. There is no point putting a policeman in a little Subaru to chase somebody who has a car or any vehicle that will outdo him, like the big V8 Chrysler. It is a waste of time. The police must be in a position to compete with the criminal. He must have equipment at all times better than, not equal to, the criminal.

It is not necessary for an Astor-Martin. I have seen the police in North America using the same Chrysler and the same Ford and the same General Motors Chevrolet. They don't go above a Chevrolet and the Chryslers that they use is usually a Dodge. But when you are ordering equipment you must specify to the manufacturer or distributor what type of equipment you require.

If you look at any of our police vehicles on the street, you see a little blue light on the roof which is more or less useless. Those vehicles should be fitted with proper sirens and Strobe lights because when the police chase someone in a car, the driver in the car which is being chased does not recognize the police is chasing him until the police is actually on him. With a proper Strobe light the driver would know from quite early that he is being chased by the police. These are the things that are necessary.

Again, Sir, the number of vehicles are inadequate. The police should have no less than fifty cars. The highway we have now should be well patrolled and you can only do this with a certain number of cars capable of overtaking the offenders.

Also the fines that we have are just kindergarten fines. In this day and age, a fellow can go on the street and abuse somebody and he is still paying ten dollars. A traffic offense is just a slap on the wrist - \$25 or \$50. What is \$50 or \$100? I'll pay it and do it again. I think that today we should bring the fines in line with the cost of living. This is what we should be doing and then you would find that this would act as a deterrent.

Day after day, X numbers of cars crash on the highway. The guys crash the cars, the police go out there, nobody is charged and they go on and on. In the end, we pay. All of us must pay for these things. It is a great burden on our foreign exchange. We have to buy parts at very high

prices. I am saying that you can get any make of car - you can have a Chrysler or the same Subaru but it must be made specially for the police. You have to specify the type of suspension you want. You have to specify the type of engine you want, the type of transmission you need. The Dodge that the police use in North America is not the same Dodge that I would go to a show-room and buy. It's just a name. It is just as though the Honourable Member for the city builds a house and the house cost \$100,000. I want a house built looking like the house he built, the same design, but my house might cost \$250,000. It depends on what you want. So this is the reason the police vehicles do not stand up to the hard work they have to endure.

Asides.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Another thing I have noticed, Sir, is that we get too many unnecessary accidents with some of the police cars. I have on several occasions to survey several of them and some of the accidents are unnecessary. You have to get the police trained properly so that they can be safe drivers.

Looking at the Fire Service, I have heard everybody talk about all kinds of people and nobody yet has spoken about the firemen. I remember when we first came to this House, I think it was late '86, we had discussed the Fire Service and there was lots of talk about the long hours the firemen have to work. I think that the firemen should be working 40 hours a week. If it is necessary to hire more firemen, we should hire more firemen, because an overworked man is no use to you when he is called out to duty. He is a dead man and these are the things we should be addressing. I understand at one time Worthing's Fire Station was not functioning because of lack of personnel because of overwork. These things should never have happened and I would like, Sir....

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am not aware that there was an occasion when Worthing's Fire Station was not functioning. I think that is not a true statement. There have been complaints of shortage of personnel but don't say that the fire station was not functioning. It is not true.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Mr. Speaker, when you have a shortage of personnel you can't function. How are you going to function? There were calls put through to Worthing's and the calls had to be referred to Bridgetown because the personnel were inadequate to answer the calls, would you call that functioning? If you went out a morning, Sir, and you tried to start your car and it didn't start, although the battery is in, oil is in, water is in, would you say it is functioning? Well, that was the problem with Worthing's.

Asides.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Now, Sir, when I look at what the pensioners are getting and the civil servants are getting and all the government workers as increases, I think that the high increase of electric bills, bottled gas, diesel fuel and regular gasoline would have eroded all that they have got. All that they have received... This is no joke. 8.40 p.m.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: You ask if we would give them more? Of course. A man must live. You cannot live on manna. Manna fell once. I am not in the Ministry of Finance. After a man has worked he should be compensated in such a way that he could live comfortably. That has always been my contention. My contention is that anyone who has worked should be compensated adequately. All this talk about this increase and that increase, it is a waste of time.

Many people have not studied the impact of the fuel increases because I can see that many people will have to go back to burning manchineel berries to cook because today in Barbados, with this high unemployment rate, what would you expect?

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: I know. Then the people down by you will suffer because there is no manchineel for them to get berries. There are no ends of cassava because agriculture has been killed. We do not see cassava. The poor people in this country will be in real trouble. You cannot get mahogany seeds because the air pollution is destroying the mahogany trees. Look around you. It is the first time I have seen in Barbados mahogany trees dying off. There was a time when you would go around this country and you would see mahogany trees just falling down and young mahogany trees growing all over the place. When last have you seen this?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Honourable Attorney General, he lives in Christ Church, and in his area of his childhood there used to be many mahogany trees and many mahogany seeds. When last have you seen these large numbers of mahogany seeds? Sir, this is no laughing matter. This is serious business. All I am saying is that these people should receive adequate remuneration otherwise we will find ourselves with more gangs. When a man is hungry he would be tempted to do anything and there is where the gangs will start.

As regards the postmen and postwomen, nothing much has been said about them, nothing much has been done for them. Those people do a very important service for this country. I think that their conditions of work should be

much improved. I know that in another few weeks or another few months the Members on the Other Side most of them would not be around.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Mr. Speaker, I am saying that to fine a guy \$100 for breaking the traffic laws, speeding and such things, is not a deterrent. He will do it again. It is much too low.

Hon. M. A. KING: On a point of order. I would just draw to the Honourable Member's attention that the fines in road traffic have been substantially increased in 1984.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Oh! It is a criticism against the courts? I thought you were saying that the level of the fines were too low. The fines vary. There was a time when \$48 was the maximum fine but in cases, for instance, for reckless or dangerous driving the fine for that is \$1 000 or imprisonment for 12 months, or both. In the case of a second or subsequent conviction there is a fine of \$2 500 or imprisonment for a term of 2 years, or both. A person convicted of driving without due care and attention, which is one of the normal offences, is liable on summary conviction to a fine of \$500 or to imprisonment of six months. For exceeding the speed limit it is \$1 000 or 12 months and liable to have the license suspended. The point I am making is the fines have been substantially increased.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: I am drawing it to his attention. He was saying that the fines were too low so that the criticism cannot be against the state of the law but it has to do with the administration of it.

Thank you.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Mr. Speaker, what I would like to say is that it is all well and good to have these things written in law. What is necessary is that these \$1 000 and \$2 000 fines should be mandatory. I lived in a country for several years where for committing such an offence the fine was so much....

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: No. You do not have to build a number of jails. They will pay the fine. Nobody would want to go into jail. Do not mind they are talking about going in jail. All of them cry when the doors are slammed behind them. A parking offence was so much and if you did not pay it in a certain time, it was doubled.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Yes, mandatory fines. It worked in Canada. I do not see why it cannot work here. You copy many things from Canada, England and the United States, why cannot you copy these things that would benefit the country? This is the reason why we have so many accidents today. I am certain tomorrow I will have five or six rear end accidents. That is careless driving, Sir. Nothing is being done. The guys just walk away. We need anything that will serve as a deterrent because we cannot afford the foreign exchange in buying these parts. They are expensive. This is all I am saying. Whether it is \$2 000 or \$1 000 we should have fines which will act as deterrents and they should be mandatory.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have said enough. I would hope that the several Ministries would kindly consider what I have said this evening.

I thank you.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, there is no question at all....

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I know once I speak you have to say something. You know he will have to canvas for me next time to make sure I get back in here or else he will never say anything. If I do not get up Thompson cannot talk. I will give you a speech now. Listen carefully.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. You know I hear things you do not hear. They like to trivialise very serious things. There is a way that the Democratic Labour Party operates. As soon as things start to bother you, as soon as you realise that your foot is firmly planted in your mouth, you start trying to laugh it back out but that is not going to work. I would prefer if he went back to sleep.

The low morale that you are encountering now in the Civil Service is evident for everyone to see. The fact that[^] most of those persons at the lower end who have only gotten a meagre or very little increase in their disposable income as a result of the fumbling that went on, the fact that they recognise that this Democratic Labour Party Administration is not really, when you put them to the test, working in their best interest, that would become evident whenever the Honourable Prime Minister decides to name that date and they speak with their "X's". 8.50p.m.

It will become very evident and the laughter will subside, because most of you who are laughing over there now will not be here to laugh, so we do not have any problem with that.

Sir, when you juxtapose the meagre increases in that disposable income with the high increase in the cost of

goods because of the level of taxation, duties and levies that are imposed by this same Government, then I believe what we will observe is that the problem is worse than what one observes at first glance.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I do not know, Sir, if * Honourable Members on that side have a problem with Philip Goddard, I do not have any problem. I really do not know much about it.

There has been a significant rise in the cost of goods in this country over the past two years, particularly in the cost of foodstuff, and I might add, Sir, in a lot of cases, basic foods. When you look at the fact that after this same Government imposed these high costs on people, because of the taxes and levies of which I spoke earlier, and at the same time will not provide a take home pay that would*** allow the people at the lower end to maintain at least the standard of living they had before, far from being able to improve on it... The persons at that lower end, those low income earners, have tightened their belts, have cut and contrived, they have held strain to the point of getting a hernia, but there is no relief in sight, and one Honourable Member over there would like to get up today and tell us that the only hope for anybody is with the DLP? Hope for what? Hope for an early grave? It is burdensome.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: You keep shouting about all this caring and sharing, but it sounds very empty. The question you will have to answer very soon is who you are really caring for. I do not mean the Honourable Member for St. John personally, I know he cares a lot for me, because he made sure that things were made easy for me in the City. You know that too, Sir, so I know he cares for me, but I am US talking generally for the people of Barbados.

My feeling is that the Government seems to have addressed this whole question of the salaries in a vacuum. When you look at the cost and you look at what people are earning, you then wonder what went into the thinking at this time. I would like to ask the Honourable Prime Minister if he still goes shopping, as I used to see him do in 1988. I used to see him in the supermarket pretty often. V

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: The Honourable Member for St. John is over there saying *sotto voce* that he is too busy struggling for his seat. I did not know that was so, I thought the polls said he was doing well, but he knows differently, obviously. If he goes shopping still, as I used to see him do * in 1988 - he looked a little odd to me pushing around a trolley in a supermarket, because it was not something I was accustomed to see him doing - but when he was doing

that I wonder if he saw the prices. I wonder if he understands what it must be like for these pensioners to make ends meet with the few shekels that they have. If he understands it, I wonder how he could believe that the kinds of increases he talks about are something so significant. They certainly are not appreciated by us on this side as being anything significant. The Honourable Member for St. Thomas made it quite clear today that basically what you are talking about is as much money as would probably buy a ham cutter and a coke. I believe that is what he said.

Let me move on. Several Members spoke today about members of the Cabinet picking their friends for jobs, practising some favouritism for people who they believe - because as the Honourable Member for St. Philip South said, they do not know who is supporting whom - are supporting the Dems. One Member over there tried to defend it, but worse than that, there is one particular Minister over there who is always threatening some sort of victimisation for persons whom he believe are not supporting the Democratic Labour Party.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Now, -Sir, the Honourable Member has been a parliamentarian long enough to know that to say one of the Ministers over there threatens victimisation is unparliamentary. He has to either produce or withdraw, Sir. Identify the Minister and put the facts.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: As I said, Sir, there is one Minister....

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

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: If the Honourable Member would stop getting up on points of order and wait to hear what I am going to say... He does not know what I am going to say and he is up on a point of order again. The Minister is not in his place right now, so it is not you.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure the Honourable Member knows the rule that governs that kind of language.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, what would you like me to withdraw?

Mr. SPEAKER: "Victimise".

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I said the threat of victimisation, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think you had better withdraw it.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: All right, I will withdraw it if it is causing pain to anybody over there. 9.00 p.m.

You have a situation now, for instance, where, I believe, that at NHC, you have about 10 people to a desk all of a sudden when elections are around the corner.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Point of order, Sir. I am for the time being the Minister responsible for the National Housing Corporation. There are not any 10 people to any desk at the National Housing Corporation. Within the last two or three months the only persons who have come to work at NHC to work at any desk at all are people who came on to relieve people who are going on holiday as happens throughout the Government Service. Thank you, Sir.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: As far as I gather, Sir, the only qualification you need in a case like that, is to either know the Minister or some high-placed Dem. That is what I was told. Alright, you want to tell us about how the VIP Lounge is run at the airport? You want to tell us about the two special persons, how they were selected and the fact that they are being paid better than the regular civil servants who do the real donkey work and do all the grave-yard shifts? Civil servants who have been working there for a long time and doing an adequate job prior to the hiring of these two individuals? If you don't know I don't think you should deal with it. It is a fact. I am not here making any fun about it. You see, if we go on this side of the House, Sir, to try to explain to the Government all the time, when we say things about low morale and things like this, just as when we were telling them about the squandermania, we had to spell it out for them. We had to tell them about all the things they were squandering the taxpayers money on. Now we talk about the low morale in the Civil Service, we try to tell them where some of this is coming from, they want to make fun of it on the one hand and then the Honourable Member for St. Michael West will now want to say *souo voce* that we don't seem to know what we are talking about. This is a fact. The Member for St. George has all the information.

Tell us about how the Minister behaves, the Minister responsible for the NAB and the NCC? What is his behaviour to persons who he believes are supporters of the NDP? He doesn't even know. Some of the threats are not so subtle.

Asides.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the average person working in the Government Service is fully aware of these kinds - I have to be very careful of how I choose my words - of unspoken threats. This is why in the same poll that the Honourable Member for St. Michael West keeps waving around, there are so many "don't knows" and "won't says". Those are the ones who are worried and concerned about victimisation. But they will let you know in the fullness of time what they think about your behaviour.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member mentioned St. Michael West and that is me, Sir, and I was not waving around a poll, but so that the record be clear - In St. James South 39 people were polled, there were three for the BLP, 20 for the DLP and 1 for the NDP.

Asides.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I don't understand what the Honourable Member got up for, because I said and I repeat that the number of people who did not say and won't say, that category... I don't know what he read out all of those for. Read the City. Read any constituency you want. No problem. What they will find is that a large part of those people are the very civil servants who are disillusioned and disgusted with the way they are treated by this so-called sharing and caring government.

Just, Sir, like the Honourable Members come in and say we will not politicize any debate regarding the Police Force and then they immediately proceed to do just that I always find that a very interesting way of debating. One group over there starts saying the other group over here didn't fix the police stations, and then the Honourable Attorney General says B did some and they say he didn't fix it and it went back and forth, apportioning blame and trying to take credit, but the point is that conditions at most police stations are deplorable. It does not matter how much Honourable Members in here try to apportion blame or credit because when you were in Opposition you used to lambast the Barbados Labour Party for the conditions at the Police stations.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is in his remarks tending to mislead the House. He talked about the parties throwing blame. We have never denied. We used to comment on the state of police stations in opposition, in Government we have never denied that the police stations are in a terrible state, but what we say is that it takes time and a programme to rehabilitate the stations and it takes a lot of money as well and we have indicated from time to time the programme which we have embarked upon and that in relations to those stations which are so horrible that we relocate, like the St. Thomas one, which we propose to relocate at Welchman Hall. So, it is not that we are just in the process of apportioning blame and not admitting that the conditions of stations are bad and the condition needs to be addressed within the context of what the country can afford and as a matter of urgency.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, you see the Honourable Member who just spoke said that it takes a long time and all those words to get this thing corrected, he also seems to have forgotten that when he was speaking today he went all the way back to 1961 prompted by the Honourable Member for St. Philip South to point out that

there were chinks and something else in the cots and that the conditions were so horrible under a previous BLP administration and then he went on to tell you what his Party did for the fifteen years which the other side pointed out was virtually nothing and then we have got up to today where he is now saying after four and a half years it is going to take a long time before we get things fixed up.

On page 21 of the manifesto which they have now thrown away and which I still have a copy here, they said in part, Section 4 under Law and Order: "Strengthen the Police establishment whenever appropriate by means of additional trained specialists manpower, modern crime detection equipment" - I gather they bought another sniffing dog; I don't know if that is the extent of modern crime detection equipment. They said then that there would also be an early and thorough examination of the working conditions of policemen. Now, you are talking about precisely what? You are talking about "an early and thorough", meaning four and a half years? Nobody is expecting all of anything to be done in 4 years. The question I have to ask is, how many you did? None. I listened and I heard none. I see none. I move on. You talk about a little patching up here and there. You call that a refurbishing job? And all the time you are patching and painting the police station, you are building Sherbourne.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is again misleading the House. A whole complex was completed for the police at the airport. That is one. The band headquarters, St. Cecilia, is being rebuilt. Work is being done, so don't distort and say that things aren't being done. The plans have just been organised for the Hometown Complex and the contracts have been awarded and provision is being made for establishing Hometown as the headquarters for the northern division. So don't mislead the House and say that nothing has been done.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: As I said, Sir, still not enough has been done and I bring that down to nothing. Talking nothing, saying nothing, doing nothing. When the Government was in Opposition, they even criticised the then Government for not having batteries for walkie-talkies. 9.10p.m.

Even now they are quarrelling about batteries for walkie-talkies to show the extent to which they went to being very critical of equipment not being provided for the Police Force and that the morale was so low in 1986. You recall that? I am sure the Honourable Attorney General recalls that because he was one of the people on the platforms saying that too. Now, the shoe is on the other foot and nothing significant has happened.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I believe they have some batteries, rechargeable ones too. Not only do they have batteries in their walkie-talkies but I believe they have a few in their cars too because I believe that was the problem.

I am not going to get into the fine details of what kind of cars you should buy for people. I do not know enough about that. What I do know and would suggest is - I know a lot about cars but I do not know enough about what type of cars the Police need. I know a Stellar would be a good car because they seem very strong. I believe the Attorney General would bear me out on that.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I do not know. I have already pleaded ignorance to these things.

A suggestion I would like to make though is that as we move forward and as we develop, the services have to be put in place to deal with the type of development. If you are going to have highways where people are going to be tempted to speed, you would need equipment to deal with those people.

I think the time has come, certainly with the Highway 2A project at the stage at which it is and seemingly almost finished, and the fact that it, is going to be linked up to the ABC Highway which runs all the way to the Airport, you are talking about stretches of road that will encourage some of the younger among us, like the Honourable Member for St. John, to put the foot down a bit. I would suggest that you may need to look at a special group of - call them chase cars, speed cars, call them what you like - to deal with that because it is a problem. I believe all of us travel on that highway and we agree that there is a problem.

Now, Sir, one of the Honourable Members on that side, I believe it was the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central, was making the point that the Opposition, I believe he meant this side of the Opposition, were very critical of the unions. I do not agree with him that is so but as the Honourable Member for St. George South said, even if one had to criticise the union, the union is not so sacrosanct that you cannot criticise it if you have to.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: No. If I had to criticise the General Secretary of any union I would criticise him or her. I do not pretend when it comes to these things. He would be a bigger man for it if he understood the position was constructive unlike the Honourable Member for St. John who always sees everything in terms of cursing.

Far from criticising the unions, what I am saying, Sir, is that we have to give credit to those unions for recognising the serious problems in the economy. The fact that they have been able to come to terms and recognise these problems when, in fact, the Honourable Prime Minister was giving us all the impression that these problems did not exist, fortunately these people in the interest of Barbados, putting Barbados first and recognising these problems, have been able to settle the way they did.

I believe the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central would have to agree with that because basically part of what he was saying today was just that. What he did not go on to say was that the Honourable Prime Minister did not take the step and take all of us Barbadians into his confidence and admit to us that he is having serious problems with the economy. He did not admit that to us. He did not take the citizens of this country into his confidence. He did not ask us to be partners with him in trying to bring things back on an even keel.

All we saw was the Prime Minister in a newspaper recently steering some ship. Now, unlike 1987 when he made the famous statement that the ship was heading for the rocks, we are now firmly on the rocks. I believe that bearing that in mind one has to applaud the civil servants and the unions for the position they have taken.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

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

ORDER NO. 3 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE OMBUDSMAN (SALARY) ORDER, 1990

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, as indicated, I have made the substantial introduction on the Resolution which this House has just passed.

/ therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

ORDER NO. 4 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (PART-TIME OFFICERS) ORDER, 1990

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

ORDER NO. 5 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE
CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (TEACHERS)
(AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1990

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1990 do now pass.

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

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

ORDER NO. 6 - RESOLUTION TO GIVE EFFECT TO
THE DECISION TO INCREASE THE WAGES OF
PUBLIC EMPLOYEES AND CASUAL EMPLOYEES
OF THE GOVERNMENT WITH EFFECT
FROM APRIL 1, 1990

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

ORDER NO. 8 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE
AMENDMENT TO THE SCHEDULE OF THE
GOVERNOR-GENERAL (CONDITIONS OF
SERVICE) ACT, CAP. 6 BY INCREASING
THE SALARY PAYABLE TO THE
GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

ORDER NO. 12 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE
PAYMENT OF INCREASED COST OF LIVING
ALLOWANCES TO GOVERNMENT PENSIONERS
WITH EFFECT FROM APRIL 1, 1990

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

ORDER NO. 7 - RESOLUTION TO REVISE THE
SALARIES OF THE PRIME MINISTER'S
PERSONAL STAFF WITH EFFECT
FROM APRIL 1, 1990

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, 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. 9.20 p.m.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, we have some comments to make on this Resolution. In the first place, Sir, no one is going to deny the Prime Minister the principle of having persons assist him in the proper discharge of the responsibilities of his office, but I am going to limit my contribution to the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister.

According to the Schedule, the Prime Minister is entitled to have a Personal Assistant, a Press Secretary, a Press Officer and an Executive Personal Secretary. I am not concerned with the Executive Personal Secretary, but I do wish to know about the difference in the role and function between the Press Secretary and the Press Officer. I know that they may be his advisers, and certainly one of them is one of his close advisers who is advising on elections next month.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I was thinking of a singer who used to write the speeches and make the responses, who is advising on the elections next month.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Well, if we are talking about one person, I have nothing to say that is negative about that person at all. We have not heard how he is progressing, I hope he is making satisfactory progress since his recent illness.

In relation to the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister, he is being given a salary of \$55,315, an entertainment allowance of \$2,340 and a travelling allowance of \$500 a month; \$63,605. It is my view, Sir, that this is a salary that is properly payable to someone who is performing in that role on a full time basis. I think it is unfair, and it amounts to taking the public purse for a ride, for a person who is getting a salary of that magnitude to be also using the time that should be applied full time to the performance of the duties connected with his job to engage in personal business activities such as managing a

plantation, being an active director of companies, one company in particular which contracts with the Government in relation to Queen's College.

At times during the day, as early as 2 o'clock in the afternoon, at the Farm Plantation in St. George, the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister has been seen and photographed - call the election next month and let us show the public - in Wellingtons directing agricultural workers.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Just as CBC went down last night to the Bussa Committee's meeting and heard a prediction that white people may have to run out of Barbados, and a prediction that unless the people who have assets learn to share them, and the way the young people are behaving a prediction was made that there will be violence in the election. Just as CBC was photographing the action down there last night, agents may have seen the gentlemen in his Wellingtons directing the labourers.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You all can make as much fuss as you like, it is not far now from the time when all these things will be demonstrated and dramatised. We do not make these charges lightly, Sir, and for as nice a person as the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister is, a very personable young man and so on, I think that the Prime Minister must interpose the strength of his office on the activities of his Personal Assistant.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. -SIMMONS: I do not understand the attitude of the Government to a matter which I am raising with some diffidence, but also with the greatest sincerity, to the effect that if somebody is being paid a handsome salary' to perform duties on a full time basis, it is inappropriate for that person also - and I am talking about days of the week, not weekends and off time, working time - it is wrong for that person to be seen operating another business during the lime that he should be giving his energies to the office for which he is being paid a full time salary. 9.30p.m.

There have been many instances of conflicts of interest in this administration. We have complained about those conflicts of interest and nothing is done. I cannot believe that the Prime Minister, it is true he is not a lawyer, but I am sure that he understands the principle of conflict of interest and public duty and I think he has to be firm about this matter if there is any time left to be firm.

Sir, it is a matter - I am not talking about twenty-four hours. I am talking about two o'clock during a Monday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday. It is a matter that we are

very concerned about, Sir. But, you see the problem is compounded by reason of the fact that the Prime Minister's Personal Assistant is also a candidate in an election - campaign. Teachers can be candidates. There is nothing to stop them. I have one running against me. According to the polls, he is going to get 300 votes.

I am not saying that a person cannot be in a position like a teacher and also be involved in politics. What I am saying is that if you are a personal assistant to a prime minister and also a candidate, clearly, especially when you are getting close to election as we are you can't really have the time to devote to this \$65,000 a year job. You have to be out there beating a canvass. We may understand that as politicians and that is understandable for a period of time in the canvass. But we are not talking about canvassing, we are talking about engaging in other gainful employment during the time when one should be committed to the substantive job, working for the Prime Minister. Unless you are saying it may be that the Prime Minister doesn't have any work for him to do. That may be so. Thank you.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Nobody says he has to work eight to four because by nature of the Prime Minister's office the hours are flexible. The Prime Minister doesn't work 8-4 because there are duties he has to perform at night and he never gets home until twelve. The Personal Assistant might have to be with him up to then.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No. I am waiting until the thirteenth. I have had to revise my dates. I am waiting until the 13th December to photograph. You are going to be caught in the same position as the late Errol Barrow on 2nd of September 1976, propping on a box, biting your fingernail and saying how did it get away. What happened? You have to come by the 13th December.

He has read the poll. He knows that the poll said that the Labour Party has held on to 90% of its support and the Democratic Labour Party has held only 58% of its support. It is there to be interpreted.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is putting misinformation. The Honourable Member cannot, Sir, mislead the House by making a statement which cannot be substantiated by the poll we have seen which is supposed to be the same poll he has seen. Don't mind the July poll, we are talking about the one that came out that said the DLP would win an election now if it were held. You keep calling for an election but neither one of the two of you want an election.

Mr. Speaker asked that certain remarks made by Hon. B. M. Taitt and Mr. D. A. C. Simmons be struck from the record.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, we are making a serious point in relation to the allocation of functions of Personal Assistant and if the duties, responsibilities and parameters of the office have not been clearly delineated in the past, I think that when we are paying, using taxpayers' money to give a salary of this magnitude to a person to perform responsibilities then we have to set out the terms and conditions very clearly. I do not believe that they exist anywhere. I am not going to be over hard on the gentleman for that reason, because I think the arrangement is a loose arrangement but we are approaching a \$70,000 a year job and I do not believe that the taxpayers can be satisfied to pay \$65,000 a year to a person who is going to let his own private business take over and dominate the vast proportion of the time that he ought to be giving to this office. How he functions, is a matter for him and the Prime Minister. The Opposition can deal with that in due course, because the performance of the Prime Minister is to some extent a reflection of the quality of support given to the Prime Minister by his Personal Assistant and in due course, these things can be dealt with on a platform. I am saying, Sir, that in regard to the present incumbent, taxpayers are being shortchanged. That's all I have to say on this matter.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sir, the matter under consideration, is in some measure a bit disappointing to me, the matter that the Member for St. Thomas spoke about. If you will recall on another occasion we raised certain matters in relation to this post in relation to the person that is currently in this position. 9.40p.m.

On the last occasion that anything to do with the Prime Minister's Personal Aide was raised in Parliament, it was the fact that he was occupying a house which was the "property" of the Agricultural Development Corporation. He was a board member of this Corporation. I said property in inverted commas because there might have been some question as to whether the house that we are talking about at Wildey, St. Michael, was really the property of the Government of Barbados as distinct from the Agricultural Development Corporation.

It appeared to me from that time that the Prime Minister's Personal Aide was not very sensitive to these matters and the Prime Minister had promised a full explanation in relation to the use and occupation of that dwelling. That has not come about as yet but, as far as I know, the Prime Minister's Aide is no longer there. I do not know what arrangements have been made to settle the matters that were raised on that occasion.

Sir, the whole question of conflict of interest situation has once again arisen. As I said, the Prime Minister's Aide

does not appear to be sensitive to these matters. Now, the gentleman is not an idiot but he seems to be falling into the same error all the time. I have no quarrel against anybody in this world trying to progress and making good of the time that they have walking on the face of the earth. I have no quarrel with that at all. At the same time, if you are paid to do a job as important as being the Personal Aide to the Prime Minister of this country, I believe that job ought to be * done in a way that it does not appear as though you are shortchanging the taxpayers of this country. Granted the job of Personal Aide might be a job with flexible hours, it might be according to how the Prime Minister works -sometimes he might be away from the Island and there might not be anything to do.

I do not know if his job has anything to do with meeting and interviewing people that would otherwise have to be met by the Prime Minister. That is why I think it is important that we have integrity legislation in Barbados to *» deal with these matters because it is important that there does not appear to be a conflict of interest between your job as the Prime Minister's Personal Aide and your own personal matters.

Now, this gentleman owns -I do not know, I have not been able to determine that - but certainly he has a leasehold arrangement in relation to the Farm Plantation in St. George. The Farm Plantation is not a mile from where I •** live. It is very close. This is a job in the Civil Service as far as I am concerned.

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: It is not? Anyhow, what I am saying is that this job ought not to be the kind of job to allow anybody in this position to be managing a plantation or overseeing a plantation at the time when they ought to be working for you. This is not an extension of the Prime Minister's business, or the office of the Prime Minister. It * has nothing to do with the Prime Minister even though the Prime Minister is a farmer of some repute. To be seen at the Farm Plantation every day directing, or supervising your employees is not desirable.

Sk, I do not think he is even getting anything grown there. There is a lot of bush all over the place and a couple of holes of cane. He cannot get one yam or one potato grow. It is a waste of time going up there and a waste of ^ money. He is doing but to no avail. We might be joking -*« about this but I think it is a serious matter. I believe that if there are no terms or conditions attached to the office, as political as it is, I still believe that the time has come when we must determine what these terms and conditions are. I think the first person who ever held this office was one Nigel Barrow.

**

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member has been discussing work all the time.

He would be misleading the House now if he calls that name and then continues to discuss work. He cannot mislead the House. Nigel Barrow and work are not in any company at all. Do not start with that.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sir, I do not know why the Honourable Member is accusing me of misleading the House. I was not misleading the House. I said I thought there was a person called Nigel Barrow who held this office. I never said anything to do with work.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I thought there was a rule that you could not discuss names of persons freely in this House without your leave. I am hearing the name bandied about and very subjective value judgements are being made.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will be consistent in my ruling. That consistency will remain with the ruling I give in respect of calling people's names.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sorry, Sir. I am in your hands in relation to that.

Sir, this is not part-time employment. This is a full-time job. To compound the whole thing not only is the person who currently holds the position, the manager of a plantation called the Farm Plantation, but he is also manager of several other businesses. As I was saying, I think we have to determine the terms and conditions of this office to avoid anything like this occurring. The person who hold the office does not appear to be sensitive about these matters. It would be a good thing if he was because then his behaviour would not have to be called into question time and time again on what appears to be similar abuses of the office that he holds. It is an affront to the office that he holds to do things of this nature. The time and the opportunity will come when this matter would be more fully addressed. 9.50p.m.

I believe that the Prime Minister's Personal Aide ought to be more discreet in the way he is doing his business. I have nothing more to say about it at this moment, but I believe that the Prime Minister, given the first occasion we had to speak about these matters in here, I do not know if he had anything to say to him about it, but he should have spoken to him in a very stern manner, because it is an embarrassment to his office as Prime Minister.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I never thought we would have this kind of debate, certainly at this time or on this particular subject, but the two Members who have spoken obviously feel very deeply about the matters which they have raised. They have felt sufficiently deeply about them to draw it to my attention on the Floor of the House.

I am hearing talk about the conflict of interest. I am not sure that the particular term or the nature of the conflict of interest has been argued closely enough to establish a case of conflict of interest, but I take very seriously the allegations that have been made and I think they are some issues we will have to explore in this particular matter.

I am told that the salary is something like \$64,000 when grossed up. That is what the Members of the Opposition have said. I note that when grossed up Members in this House who are either back benchers or on the Opposition benches, apart from the Leader of the Opposition, ordinary Members, may get under \$45,000 a year. I have never heard it argued that Members of this House who, as I said, when grossed up get approximately \$44,000 a year cannot engage in activities other than those activities for which they are paid as Members of Parliament, because it is recognised that these are political positions.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am saying, Sir, that I have not heard the case argued that a Member of Parliament who holds a political office....

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: They are elected and are paid for the representation of people. I have not heard that they can only perform as Members of Parliament and that they should not hold other positions. It is known that some Members in here are farmers, some are manufacturers and industrialists, some are attorneys-at-law....

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. To help the Prime Minister clarify his mind, and to help the House clarify its mind, those of us who are in here for the most part held professional appointments before coming in here, or had them running side by side our positions in the House. In other words, I was at the Bar before I came into the House. This gentleman never had a plantation before he became Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister, there is the appearance of a conflict, because since he became Personal Assistant, where he is being paid a full time salary, he is still to be seen engaged in this activity, when the public expects him to be working for the Prime Minister.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: As I said, the deeper we get into this the argument seems to lack the kind of precision and cogency to establish this conflict of interest that I am hearing about.

As regards agriculture, I am not sure that we would want to take a position that someone, whatever their position may be, should not be engaged in agricultural activities. It is something we wish to promote. The Member for St. Thomas himself is a gentleman farmer, among other

things. He is omniscient, Sir. He owned something called Tan Tan. That in itself is a commitment, that took up more time and oats than anything else, Sir.

I have listened carefully to the arguments and I will certainly examine them further, but I do not think that at this stage a case of conflict of interest has been established. I know the Member for St. George South has a particular problem, and I believe that opportunity is being taken to raise this particular matter. I really do not know why at this time this matter is being raised.

I think I have said enough on this, Sir, I do not think there is anything more to say. I have heard what has been said and I think I will leave it at that.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 10.00 p.m.

ORDER NO. 9 - A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE
COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF A PARCEL OF
LAND AT THE JUNCTION OF WHITE PARK
ROAD AND COUNTRY ROAD IN THE
PARISH OF ST. MICHAEL FOR THE
PURPOSE OF THE CONSTRUCTION
OF THE JUDICIAL CENTRE

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Government is proposing to acquire just over 7000 square metres of land at the junction of White Park and Country Road, St. Michael from the Barbados Hardware Holdings Ltd. for constructing the Judicial Centre. The lands adjoin about 4000 sq. metres owned by the Crown which is currently owned by the YWCA and this entire land has been identified for location of this Judicial Centre. We haven't agreed on a price yet, we were trying to do it by private treaty but that has taken a bit long because the negotiations have been going on and therefore the quickest way to get it is by compulsorily acquiring it and then we can continue discussions.

The site for the construction of this complex as proposed will provide accommodation for the Supreme Court, the Judges' Chambers, the Supreme Court Registry including the Court Process Office, Community Legal Services Commission, Corporate Affairs and Intellectual Property Office and the Probation Departments. So it will entail the whole gambit of the legal fraternity. The Chief Town Planner recommends the site as highly acceptable for such a development. It is highly accessible and well located and near to all the activities in Bridgetown and therefore this Resolution seeks parliamentary approval for the acquisition of this 7250 sq. metres of land owned by the Barbados Hardware Holdings Limited at the junction of Whitepark and Country Road, St. Michael, With those remarks I beg that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I want to say a lot in a very short time about this. There is no doubt that we need some substantial modernization of the physical structure of the judicial system in Barbados, indeed, the whole justice system, but I am afraid I have to question the decision to proceed with this acquisition and the development of a court complex at Whitepark. Now, I believe a plan has been in circulation and I heard, at the Bar Association Meeting a couple of Saturdays ago, that the architects provided some drawings. One of the things included in these drawings are four criminal courts. What for is anybody's guess. Why you would need to have four criminal courts in this structure is beyond me. I think that when Government comes to look at this, if they haven't just said go ahead, that they would apply some analysis to it, that perhaps it is an unnecessary waste of space.

The time has come when we have to move to a different system, where we should not be having assizes in January, April, July and October but it would make far greater sense, it would not impinge in the same way as it presently does on judicial time if we had a continuous flow of what are now called assize cases throughout the year. You have a judge come for a month or something and he will do them and as soon as you are finished doing a preliminary enquiry rather than have the accused wait long periods like this poor man - I can't comment on that, in the papers today - Keep it rolling. You probably only need two courts. I understand also that in the plan the Barbados Court of Appeal is a smaller structure than the Court of Appeal that is being envisaged for the Caribbean Court of Appeal. Again, why that should be so, I don't know.

We have to worry only to the extent that when Government is analysing these projects you have to ask yourself what are we paying for? How much per square foot are we paying and do we need all of this square footage until we cut back? I found myself doing that on the project for the police band because when I first saw the project, when I became Attorney General, it was a lovely looking thing but it would cost the earth and it would break you and I had to apply that kind of system to it, send it back to Planning and Priorities and then we scaled it down and no doubt, the present Government has again revised what I left there to give a basic satisfactory structure without trying to burst the budget.

Why I dislike the site and I think that people are coming around to this view in the profession, is that I think we have to look at the whole thing, as I said, the criminal justice system globally. The Central Police Station is not the most secure site for Police Headquarters. I think we need to move the Police Headquarters elsewhere. There had been a plan to take it to Wilkey. I believe the site that had been originally earmarked is still available and in days when we have to be security conscious - Trinidad's experience earlier this year should help to inform continually our decisions in this area. A police headquarters

ought to be sited in fairly close proximity to your systems of communication for obvious reasons and that was one of the things that we took into account in the Wildey site, having regard to CBC, BET and so on. If we took a decision to set up a new headquarters for the Police it doesn't have to be as elaborate as what we have in town and you can go up rather than milling out, and in that scheme for the Pine/Wildey there was also space allocated for the Regional Training Complex. I am not too concerned about that at the moment I am more concerned, with what Barbados needs.

The buildings in Coleridge Street where the police are are run down and in need of great refurbishment. We might be spinning top in mud, if we try to do too much there with a view to developing that site for the Police. I am submitting that we could build them a new structure more sensitive to security needs. You will still have those buildings in town which could be refurbished and used as a Bridgetown post. You wouldn't need to keep the bridge and harbour. In one section, you have enough space there in my view to use for offices connected to the Court system. We could build the court complex on the present site. Now, it would mean knocking down the existing courts because I don't think the foundations are the most secure but we could rebuild on the present site where we have the courts. There would be temporary dislocation and you will have to move the courts somewhere else to provide the accommodation for the courts while that site is being rebuilt. All you need is to stick a plaque on it for the National Trust purposes. You will have to retain it in the same shape. It would have an advantage of preventing too much dislocation within the profession. 10.10p.m.

Unhappily we -have had to carry the Land Titles Registry up to the Garrison. That has added to the cost in the profession because you have to send a clerk to file a document in the Supreme Court Registry for court purposes. Then he may have to go up and lodge these up in the Garrison. He has to get from Coleridge Street up to the Garrison. Some of them are now buying scooters. My messenger has a car. I think he takes around a couple of clerks from time to time with him.

Now, if we retain the buildings that are presently the Police Headquarters, perhaps, we could use and renovate some of them to form the Land Titles Registry so you would have the Supreme Court Registry with some extension, you would have the Land Titles Registry and you would rebuild your Supreme Court on the present site. I think there is enough space in the Police Complex because there is a lot of yardage to the north-west where you could develop, provided, of course - I must say this is a proviso - you move the Police Headquarters to a new site. Free up those buildings now and you could still have a police presence, perhaps, in the area where we now have the

telecommunications and the charge office. You could have a police presence there as a Bridgetown post, if you like, but the headquarters would be out of town.

I really wish Government to pay attention to the security aspect of headquarters office. You could be in James Street and you look straight into the police headquarters. You could just as easily throw a bomb from James Street Church in there. I do not want to develop that at all. I hope it gets no publicity but I just say it so that Members understand the problems with the security of the police headquarters.

I think Government is partly committed to this. I do not know if they are irrevocably committed to the development of a centre on this site. This site may well provide a facility for other Government offices. If we redevelop the Coleridge Street site I think we would be adding to public convenience more substantially than, perhaps, we will be if we develop this present site at Whitepark Road because I can envisage problems in terms of accessibility to the general public getting there. It is not so easy to get to Whitepark Road as it is to get to Coleridge Street. You might think it is an extension of one street but do not forget there are "one ways" in there. It is becoming complicated now when the Supreme Court is sitting.

I do not know when Government hopes to start the project. Perhaps, since the Attorney General is back in his place he might be able to give us an indication. As I said, if it is not irrevocably committed, and there is any merit in anything I have said, then, perhaps, there could be a rethink of this matter along the lines I suggested.

I am much obliged to you.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I shall not be long on this. I think, however, that almost any Honourable Member can rise and make suggestions which would be in terms of the planning and organisation of the Judicial Centre and the police in the context in which the Honourable Member has just spoken. This matter is a matter which we have been looking at, as the Honourable Member said, for some considerable time.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Judges are not going to be forever. Neither the Judges nor us will be forever and I do not really want to get into a discussion of what the Judges like. The Judges have to judge and we have to administer. The Judges cannot administer and judge at the same time. When the Judges become the Government they will make the decisions of the Government. The fact that the Judges do not like it is not sufficient by itself for us to accept that.

One of the things that happens in this country constantly is that we have to cater to certain tastes all the

time. All we are saying is that a decision has been made, that we will acquire this for the Judicial Centre. If you give an architect a concept he will go off and do anything. The idea of sending it around for persons who have a vested interest to look at it is to allow for the kinds of faults which came from the Honourable Member to come from all and sundry but that one sector does not like it is not sufficient.

We may not like it in all of its entirety either. There are a number of things we do not like but the country has a position where it has to do things that it can afford not only in terms of economic resources but in terms of the totality of the community.

Now, the Honourable Member raised questions about the location in terms of accessibility. Obviously it cannot be merely the question of establishing a building. It has to be the whole question of planning the entire area surrounding the Judicial Centre. There was a call for Country Road to be straightened as part of another project altogether. The whole question of how traffic will flow is a matter that will have to be looked at as part of the Complex.

The Honourable Member would remember that at some point he as Attorney General, that is, the leader of the Minority Opposition, had plans to put a court further at the end of Country Road where the Welfare Office is now. The Honourable Member had plans to put a family court in the whole massive complex.

There was a time when the Louis Lynch Building, the old Modern High School was not envisaged as ICB. It has turned out to be a magnificent decision. Clearly the Transport Board when it is moved from Roebuck Street will allow for redevelopment. The whole area of Roebuck Street and the surrounding area going back to Tudor Street is crying out for development. The development has to go over a very long time. It is not something that must happen or that will happen in our regime, or the next. The planning should include the modernisation of the entire area.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Hall of Justice. Across where the car park is now was supposed to be the Hall of Justice. It is a question of the thinking, the planning, what happens and how we do it. This particular Judicial Centre should be the subject of much examination and, perhaps, much debate. We are talking about spending a substantial sum of money but at the end of the day it should serve the total purposes for which a Judicial Centre is designed.

The Honourable Member raised a question, for example, of a very small area for the Barbados Court of Appeal and a much larger area for a potential West Indian Court of Appeal. These are matters that need to be discussed. These are matters which require us to ensure that if there is a West Indian Court of Appeal that it does not by

virtue of its structure be seen to be something entirely and completely engulfing a Barbados Court of Appeal. A Justice of Appeal whether he is working for the West Indies Court of Appeal or the Barbados Court of Appeal will need a certain ambience and environment in which to perform his or her duties.

A judge by nature requires a certain amount of space and environment in order to function properly. This business about which judge is in which particular division is only a function of how long a person has been a judge or what is the particular disposition at a particular time. It really does not make that much difference which judge is in which Chambers. What is important is that the Chambers should be sufficient for the judge to perform his or her work in an efficacious way hence to allow for justice to flow in a reasonable time.

So far as the area is concerned, I know it fairly well because a part of it falls in my constituency. Where it is currently located at four cross roads obviously the construction, whatever it is that is envisaged by the architect, would have to preclude any four cross roads occurring at that point. But one could picture a situation where Whitepark Road is going to be changed in its character. Passage Road is going to be changed in its character to the extent that the Hall of Justice or the Judicial Centre, as it is called, will be the most imposing structure in the entire suite from the Public Library right up to Passage Road. 10.20 p.m.

I envision that the Foundry will move from there, that the old building that is now Barbados Hardware will move from there. It may move long after we have gone, but I am envisioning that the character will change. I would not think that this is a matter in which there is going to be controversy, I would think it is a matter in which there would be difference of opinion and that some of us will find something which we do not like, but at the end of the day I would hope that we can have something which we all can be proud of.

I would like to say, before I sit down, that what the Honourable Member said about the Assizes would find favour with me as an individual. This business of having four Assizes because that is how it was in the British system from time immemorial, the English legal system was designed for the English countryside and the circumstances of the English weather. There is no necessity for us to have to follow blindly and continually a system which may not necessarily work for us in terms of our development. Therefore, any innovation which allows for a reasonable period for the Judges to have a respite away from their work, and for people to prepare their cases in a decent way, but which will speed up the administration of justice, I think is something which we will have to pay some attention to. I certainly would find, as an individual,

no difficulty with that kind of concept and I hope there will be some other innovations which would come necessarily with this.

I thought I would speak to this matter, not to preclude the Attorney General, but he was not in his seat when the debate started and I thought I would put it in perspective.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Mr. Speaker, I know it is pretty late but I would still like to add my voice to the debate that is going on at this moment.

I am pleased that we are now into the stage where we are about to acquire property for the construction of a judicial centre. I have listened to the comments of both Members and I find the comments made by the Member for St. Thomas to be pretty attractive, bearing in mind what I know that is being said in the profession about the proposed site. I have not seen the plans to see how the area will be developed, so I cannot bring any particularly incisive arguments to bear on the situation.

The Member for St. Thomas made some very good points about the development of the judicial centre in its relation to the present Judiciary, the present buildings, the fact that the police station is not all that secure and he would want to see another one built.

Sir, we are at the point in our development where we must accept that money spent on the administration of justice is money well spent, and any investment that is made at this moment will be an investment that would have to be a long lasting one. Therefore, great thought and care must be put into any decision that we make at this moment. Any decision we make about the construction of a centre must be one that is very well thought out and a decision that must be taken bearing in mind all of the things that were said before by both Honourable Members. Perhaps other Members who speak tonight would also bring some other things to bear, but we must remember that any money spent at this stage must be a long lasting investment.

The buildings we have out there at the moment are no longer adequate. A lot of money has been put into keeping them up to a standard that would allow for the proper functioning of justice in this country, at least at that level, but I think that those buildings have outlived their usefulness and the time has come when we have come this far and we must make this decision as to where we want to go from here.

Personally, Sir, I do not have any particular preference for where the site of the centre should be. I feel that as long as we have a centre, as long as it is one that is built with certain things in mind in terms of the commodiousness for the Judges and the people who are going to work in the

centre, as long as there are good facilities, then I think that the centre would serve the uses for which it would be established. For example, if we build a centre where it is proposed to be built, I cannot see it possible, as the Member for St. Michael West said, that we can retain the present road configuration or formation. I believe that other properties might have to be acquired, like the open space on the left of Country Road. The building which presently houses Brinks might have to go as well. The bond at the corner of Passage Road might probably have to go as well. Who knows? Any redevelopment might even impinge on lands on which the Barbados 'O' Level Institute currently stands. So I do not see it being a building that would be confined to that one space. I could not see it being like that and still have a congenial or tasty appearance.

It does not matter to me, Sir, I do not really think it makes any difference. I take the point of the Member for St. Thomas that the present police station is not adequate and secure and that we must look at building another police station. A lot of money over the next couple of years has got to be spent in the administration of justice in this country. I believe our capital projects over the next couple of years ought to be in the area of the administration of justice.

Soon from now we must consider even building a minimum security prison. I think that there are people who are given prison sentences who should not be at Glendairy. I was privileged to be in court one day last week waiting for a matter to be called and three young men, between 18 and 19 years of age, were sentenced to five, seven and six years respectively in gaol. They were, if we might borrow a French expression, convicted or they pleaded guilty to crimes of passion. I do not believe that they are hardened criminals, even though one was convicted and two pleaded guilty to manslaughter, and even for that serious offence I do not think they ought to be sent to Glendairy, because they do not have the appearance of being hardened criminals. It was their first offence.

I think we have to look at the building of the minimum security prison in addition to new headquarters for the police and a judicial centre, so that over the next couple of years those works ought to be our capital projects. For me it does not matter where the centre is built, as long as one is built and as long as it is done properly. It ought to be built in Bridgetown, but certainly as long as it measures up to what we consider to be comfortable, then I am in support of this Resolution.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to delay the House, because most of the points I wanted to make have already been made so well by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas and some of the subsidiary points have also been made by the Honourable Member for St. George South.

Let me begin by saying, Sir, that it is a fact that in the last 40 years or so we have not spent adequately on law and order in Barbados in relation to our economic development. 10.30 p.m.

The reason for this is that the planners have never really seen Law and Order as part of our economic development. Hansard is replete with statements to this effect which I have 'made before'; so I am not saying anything new. Events have now caught up with Barbados. We have now come to recognise that money spent on Law and Order, on the judiciary and the Police Force and on other protective services is money well invested on the future economic and social development of Barbados. When we are planning now, having now come to that realisation in this country at long last, we have to plan very seriously and take a long-term view, seeing Law and Order as an investment. We must also coordinate the activities of the various aspects of Law and Order.

One of the reasons why we have been slow in getting off the ground with the new Law Courts has been the fact that at times the Judiciary themselves were not clear as to where exactly they would wish the physical structure to be placed. But it was always envisaged that the Law Courts would be developed in such a way that there would be a physical relationship between the Courts and the Police Force. Physically, this is necessary.

In my view, it is a good idea from a security point of view to have a police station near to your main judicial centre. The fact is that several studies were done on this aspect of the matter. I think that the Ministry of the Attorney General would find that advice was had from as far afield as Australia, the United Kingdom itself and from Canada, when we were exploring these matters. In fact, Mrs. Thatcher made available to us at one stage one of the main architectural planners who had been advising the British Government for years on security aspects of police stations and judicial buildings, etc. So, I am not speaking, without some knowledge of how we were developing the concepts. Now, Sir, the physical site at Coleridge Street lends itself to and in fact, cries out for proper redevelopment and I believe that successive governments saw that area as capable of accommodating the Public Library which is of historical significance, and the judicial complex. It was also envisaged that we may have had to relocate some of the people at the back of the library at Lightfoot Lane; in fact the removal would begin at Mahogany Lane. The opportunity would have been taken to give them more commodious surroundings and physical space, because at present, they are cheek by jowl in that area. We would also have upgraded their facilities. By such relocation, the Law Courts would be expanded right over to the Tudor Street area. That was envisaged, Sir. Indeed, I still believe that that is the best of the concepts for the development of the whole of that area.

The Honourable Member for St. Thomas is right. The present arrangement for your Central Police Station where it is... Sometimes I don't like to speak on some of these matters because people draw the wrong conclusions, but we have to run a country. Whatever the political divide between the Parties, we also have a responsibility to recognise that whoever is the government of the day has to maintain law and order and run Barbados. But I would say, 'without going too deeply in the whole aspect of it, the present location of the Central Police Command Centre is security wise no longer feasible in the Barbados of today. We should move that command centre to a much more critical area, the area which the Honourable Member for St. Thomas has spoken about. That is one of the areas. We need to have a command post there. Just as we keep the Defence Force right next to the Light & Power Company, just as we are keeping it there for various security reasons, there are reasons why some police security presence should be located near to the main communication centres in this country.'

The events which occurred in Trinidad and elsewhere have convinced me more than ever that that type of planning is crucial. I also believe, Sir, that psychologically, it is good to have a Law Court looking the police in their face, because as much as I welcome strengthening the forces of law enforcement in this country, I must recognise as a strong believer in human rights that the judiciary in the¹ last resort is really the true bastion of human rights and of freedom in our country. The Judiciary has to adjudicate between the ordinary citizen and the state, between the military and civil powers. It must therefore have an imposing presence. It must also be given adequate provision to, and operate, in the privileges that we give to them, the aids we provide for them, must be such as to enable the public themselves to recognise and understand the symbol and the meaning of real Law and Order. That is my view about the matter. I have said it many times, speaking on this subject. It is not a new view that I hold but* it is one that I hold very dearly. I believe, Sir, that the Government owns the old Waterworks. This site also lends itself to proper development, not necessarily for the Supreme Court. We decided to keep the Synagogue on its existing site and as a result that site proved to be not a big enough area for moving the Law Courts there. But, the existing site, if it is redeveloped and the police located, would prove to be adequate, not necessarily for the High Court, or a Court of Appeal, but for an upgraded" Magistrates' Court. The Honourable Member for St. John has spoken quite rightly on the significance of the magistrates in the administration of justice in this country. So, when we are planning a judicial centre, we have to plan in mind as well for upgrading facilities at the level of the magistrates. And such facilities should be as imposing as the facilities being provided for the High Court of Justice. **

It seems to me that the site at Country Road doesn't lend itself to this type of development and it hasn't got the

features. It could be used by government for many other purposes. I am not against its acquisition, because more and more I believe that Government will find that it would need in the development of the greater Bridgetown to take into account keeping areas, whether they are for open greenery or what not, but we need to keep some of these areas. So I am not against its acquisition for public purposes, but I am saying, that the site does not seem to me the correct location at the moment for the Government to consider for the Judicial Centre. I don't believe that the Judicial Centre is going to be constructed or that construction on it is going to start in this financial year. In the Estimates we have provided some money for it, but that, I think, will be spent getting the experts who are doing the planning and probably also for spending on other related matters.

I also do not believe that we should run headlong into saying that we have established a Court of Appeal before we have the physical and other necessary adjuncts and services. I know that it is worrying the profession very much. It is worrying the judiciary very much that we are going headlong without proper registry facilities, proper support staff, proper physical space. We are also planning to commit ourselves to a West Indian Court of Appeal for which, once again I believe the proper planning is not being made. 10.40 p.m.

I know people have criticised the Government of Trinidad and Tobago for the large amount of money it has spent on its Hall of Justice. I have visited it. In fact, I have appeared in the Hall of Justice in Trinidad and Tobago. Frankly, when you go into it and you work in it, somehow it impresses on your mind that you have a special responsibility to try and preserve Law and Order.

I have had the privilege of visiting the Hall of Justice as well in the Province of Ontario, their new development, to see the arrangements they have made for prisoners, witnesses, etc. What an improvement they have made there, Sir! I think no Members on either side will deny the fact that the development of the Magistrates' Court in Oistins (with one exception and that is where the air-condition is located) showed a new trend in the facilities that should be provided for the Judiciary. It is not as ideal as I would have liked: Yet the police got upgraded facilities. I believe with sensible planning and without being extravagant we can provide structures and surroundings which can last for generations or centuries, whether as works of art or as telling monuments to show our respect for law, order and fundamental rights.

I am going to urge the Government to consult widely with the people who are most experienced in these matters - a group of people who like politicians are always under public scrutiny and are always being attacked. I refer to "the lawyers". There is no profession which is more maligned than the profession of the lawyers. I do not know why

people like to take a turn at us. Perhaps, those of us in here who practise both professions, law and politics, have chosen professions that make us easy targets to hit. But we are still necessary for the maintenance of law and order in this country.

I believe that the Bar Association will give an objective view on these matters. I also believe that you should talk as well to the other people who are not lawyers or the judges but who come to the courts and render service there - I refer to the probation officers, the staff in the Registry and all of those persons who are necessary. I would expect we can effect a tremendous saving on library facilities. We should make the new technological aids now available in many countries to help us improve the quality of justice which we must deliver to the people of this country.

I do not think that we are in a position to start the actual construction of the Law Courts between now and the end of March. I would have hoped that the architect would have held a session consulting on the plans with the profession. I understand that the consultation with the Judiciary has been perfunctory and not as deep as it should be.

As a matter of fact, I do not know whether the architects has ever had a proper brief as to what is required. I would expect they probably went around developing the brief as they went along. I am not sure they have taken into account the needs of the magistracy. I would believe that in the long run we would save money if we took a little while - it might delay you by three or four months - to consider the whole thing comprehensively.

We will need temporary quarters for the courts whilst we are redeveloping the site of the existing Law Courts. That building is of historical significance. In any event, Sir, I believe that there is a strong case for preserving our historic sites which are of great architectural significance.

I was pleased to see the work that has been done on the restoration of the Synagogue Building. I believe that there are other buildings in Bridgetown and elsewhere in the country that should be restored and preserved. We have made mistakes in getting rid of some of these buildings. I believe that the Law Courts and that whole existing complex can be restored, preserved and really be made into a thing of beauty again which in the words of the great poet "will be a joy forever".

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, there comes a time in life where one has to make decisions and move ahead with the decisions which have been taken. For several years, in fact, from the time I started to practise law in this country which was about 30 years ago, I have heard talk about building a new Supreme Court. We have been talking about

this thing for 30 years now that I know about, yet we have got nowhere with it. Yet we want to continue and talk, and talk about it and do nothing about it.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: I am not misunderstanding any argument. Whenever a decision is taken to do anything there is always a million and one reasons why you should not pursue that decision.

The question of the location of a site for the court is a matter of opinion and of judgement. You have the existing Supreme Court in the place where it is now. They are a bunch of old buildings. Obviously, if that site is to be developed to any meaningful extent, you would have to find somewhere temporarily to house the existing structure.

There is a lot of confusion creeping into the argument. You talk about having a police station near to the courts. You talk about the existing location of the police command post being a security risk. It should be moved to Wildey. So you move that to Wildey and proceed to do the construction of the court in the site where it is now. What are the security arrangements? What kind of police station you are going to put right there?

The site at Country Road is an uncluttered site, relatively free from building, a clean site on which you can construct a new building. We do not propose, Mr. Speaker, to construct any old building to house the Judicial Centre. We want to have a modern practical, useful, impressive structure as the Judicial Centre in this country, a Centre which will command the dignity and respect which needs to be given to an institution so important as the Judiciary.

It seems to me that once proper planning, proper architectural design and proper construction is done in the place where the new Judicial Centre is proposed that all the requirements for the type of facility for a proper judicial complex would be well met.

The place where we propose to put the Judicial Centre... It is not planned that the Magistrates' Courts will be sited there as well. It is proposed that it will be the site for the Supreme Court, the Court of Appeal and ancillary facilities like the Registry and so forth. It is proposed to develop the existing site where the courts are now for the Magistrates' Court because, after all, the Magistracy is an important area of the administration of justice as well. 10.50p.m.

We know that perhaps 90% of the work of the courts is probably done in the Magistrates' Courts and the

majority of the profession practises in the Magistrates' Courts, so that the existing site where the courts are will continue to be a very important centre for the administration of justice. The idea that Country Road is so far from town as to make it difficult is not a credible argument.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Well, I have heard that argument, that it is going to be difficult for litigants and lawyers. I do not buy that kind of argument in the kind of society we have.

In the new Judicial Centre which we are proposing adequate arrangements are going to be made for the security of the court, the Judges and so forth. The plans are being discussed now. I do not understand the Honourable Member's comment that the consultation with the Judges is perfunctory. I do not understand that and why that should be so, because the architects have got a commission, they have been told to consult with the Judges with a view to ensuring that the structure which is being designed meets with the requirements of all that is necessary and that the Judges, the Registrars, all those people who have to function and whose consultation would be useful would be available. I do not understand why consultation should be perfunctory, and perhaps those who need to consult and be consulted ought to understand that the best way of getting things done is to speak frankly about issues. We should not take fixed positions, like we do not want the court in this place and therefore we are not going to contribute in the way in which contribution can be helpful and worthwhile. We tend to set up our backs against development, against change. You have vested interest not only in politics, you have vested interest all over the place, and a variety of people who for one reason or another may want a particular decision to be taken and we tend to thereby inhibit progress and development.

We have set up the plans, we expect the widest consultation possible. The plans have not yet been finalised and completed but we will certainly ensure that a centre is developed which will do credit to our country as far as the administration of justice is concerned. I believe that the Ministry of Transport and Works in the process of its development of the Bridgetown area will certainly do so--realignment of the roads in that area. I believe that is part of the plan of the Ministry of Transport and Works and I have every confidence, Mr. Speaker, that the final result when the court is proceeded with will be one which will do credit to this country and to the administration of justice.

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

ORDER NO. 11 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF
LAND AT BISHOP'S COURT HILL,
ST. MICHAEL FOR THE PURPOSE
OF ROAD IMPROVEMENT

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, this is land which has already been used. In 1989, 19 parcels of land on the Pine, Culloden Road, Collymore Rock and River Road were vested in the Crown for the purpose of the road improvement in that area.

This parcel is one on Bishop's Court Hill, 1105 square feet. We had a little problem with the acquisition where we were not sure who was the owner. That problem has now been resolved and this Resolution is seeking the approval of Parliament to acquire this 1105 square feet of land at Bishop's Court Hill for road improvement. As I said, it has already been used.

With those remarks, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. M. A. KING: I beg to second that, Mr. Speaker, and reserve my right to speak.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply. In so doing, I would just indicate that we have had the assistance of the Reporters who indicate that they would be willing to see us through this one.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: I beg to second that.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1990-91, NO. 8 -
\$2,629,111 HEAD 84 - MINISTRY
OF TRANSPORT AND WORKS

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, this is a request for a supplementary in the sum of \$2,629,111 with

respect to Item 23 under Head 84 and \$100,000 for Item 26 under the same Head. This, I hope, Sir, will be the final payment made to Sintra, the contractor for the Airport/West Coast Road now named the ABC, Adams/Barrow/Cummins Highways. Under Item 23, Structures, the amount of money requested consists of two parts, (1) interests with respect to late payment and payment for foreign currency conversion. Under the contract entered into between Sintra and the Government of Barbados, there is a requirement that payment upon each of the engineer's certificate should be made within 21 days of presentation of the certificate and failure to do this results in incurring an interest penalty. The interest being sought in this Resolution is \$922,551 and under the same contract the Government of Barbados agrees to ensure that a sum not exceeding 70% of the total payment due to the contractor be converted to foreign currency. The rate of the exchange used by the contractor for currency conversion at the time of bidding was the governing selling rates published by the Central Bank of Barbados on the first working day of the month preceding the month in which the bids were submitted. The exchange rates used in bid preparation applied for the duration of the contract. The selling rate published by the Central Bank of Barbados for Canadian dollars was \$1.4865 Bds to \$1 Can. and the amount of \$1,607,560 was intended to cover the loss in foreign currency resulting from the transfer of interest and compensation payments to Sintra's head office. 11.00p.m.

Under Item 26, the sum of money requested is for professional services. The Government of Barbados appointed Proctor Redfern International, a Canadian company as consultants and the outstanding amount for additional work is approximately \$200,000, \$100,000 of which was provided under this item under the current estimates and this House is asked to provide the balance of \$100,000.

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

The question that Head 84 stand part was put and agreed to.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I move that your Honour do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee, Sir.

The question that the passing of one Resolution in Committee be reported was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the motion of Hon. B. M. TAITT, seconded by Hon. M.A. KING, the Resolution was read a first time, a second time and was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. B. M. TAITT: That brings us to the end of Government business and before I invite Your Honour to move the adjournment, I would like to express thanks to the reporters who graciously agreed to go beyond the stipulated period to allow us to finish the day's work.

I now beg to move that this House be adjourned until Tuesday, November 13, 1990 at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The question that this House be adjourned until Tuesday, November 13, 1990 at 12 o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 11.10p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Confirmation of Minutes of Meeting of Tuesday,

30th October, 1990 5985

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. B. M. TAITT 5985

Resolution to increase the cost of living allowance at the rate of 3% for Government pensioners.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS 5986

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) ORDER, 1990..... 5986

Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 5986; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 5991; Mr. R. L. Morris, 6000, 6025; Hon. H. deB. Forde, 6005; Hon. M. A. King, 6010; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 6014; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 6018; Mr. R. P. Byer, 6024; Mr. E. Bourne, 6027; Mr. P. J. M. Miller, 6030.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE OMBUDSMAN (SALARY) ORDER, 1990..... 6033

Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 6033.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (PART-TIME OFFICERS) ORDER, 1990 6033

Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 6033.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (TEACHERS) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1990..... 6034

Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 6034.

RESOLUTION TO GIVE EFFECT TO THE DECISION TO INCREASE THE WAGES OF PUBLIC AND CASUAL EMPLOYEES OF THE GOVERNMENT WITH EFFECT FROM APRIL 1, 1990 6034

Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 6034.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE SCHEDULE OF THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL (CONDITIONS OF SERVICE) ACT CAP. 6 BY INCREASING THE SALARY PAYABLE TO THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL 6034

Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 6034.

*

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE PAYMENT OF INCREASED COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCES TO GOVERNMENT PENSIONERS WITH EFFECT FROM APRIL 1, 1990 6034

Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 6034.

RESOLUTION TO REVISE THE SALARIES OF THE PRIME MINISTER'S PERSONAL STAFF WITH EFFECT FROM APRIL 1, 1990..... 6034

Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 6034, 6037; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 6034; Mr. R. P. Byer, 6036.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF A PARCEL OF LAND AT THE JUNCTION OF WHITE PARK ROAD AND COUNTRY ROAD, ST. MICHAEL FOR THE PURPOSE OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE JUDICIAL CENTRE 6038

Hon. H. A. Blackman, 6038; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 6038; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 6039; Mr. R. P. Byer, 6041; Hon. H. deB. Fordc, 6041; Hon.

M. A. King, 6043.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COM
PULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
BISHOP'S COURT HILL, ST. MICHAEL
FOR THE PURPOSE OF ROAD IMPROVE
MENT 6045

Hon. H. A. Blackman, 6045.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1990-91 - No. 8
- \$2,629,111 6045

Hon. Dr. D. G. Blackman, 6045.

SUSPENSIONS 5995,6024

ADJOURNMENT.....6046

Hon. B. M. Tait, 6046.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

BLACKMAN, Hon. Dr. D. G. (St. Michael East)

BLACKMAN, Hon. tl. A. (St. Philip South)

BOURNE, Mr. E. (Christ Church East) BYER,

Mr. R. P. (St. George South) FORDE, Hon. H.

deB. (Christ Church West) HAYNES, Dr. R. C.

(St. Michael South Central) KING, Hon. M. A.

(Christ Church West Central) MILLER, Mr. P. J.

M. (City of Bridgetown) MORRIS, Mr. R. L.

(Christ Church East Central) SANDIFORD, Rt.

Hon. L. E. (St. Michael South) SIMMONS, Mr. D.

A. C. (St. Thomas) TAITT, Hon. B. M. (St.

Michael West) WALKER, Hon. C. V. (St. George

North)