

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1991 - 96

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, October 5, 1993

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

PRESENT

His Honour L. A. WEEKES, G.G.M., J.P., (Speaker)
His Honour T. C. ESTWICK, B.Sc., LL.B., (Deputy Speaker)
Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A., (Econ.), J.P., (Prime Minister, Minister of Economic Affairs and Minister for the Civil Service)
Mr. H. deB. FORDE, Q.C., M.A., LL.B.
Hon. B. M. TAITT, B.A. (Hons.), M.P.A., LL.B. (Hons.), (Minister of Foreign Affairs & Deputy Leader of the House)
Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Q.C., B.A., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Home Affairs and Leader of the House)
Hon. M. A. KING, Q.C., LL.B., (Attorney General, Minister of Justice and Minister for CARICOM Affairs)
Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, A.I.C., M.I.A.S., J.P., (Minister of Trade, Industry and Commerce)
Hon. N. K. SIMMONS, (Minister of Education)
Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN, B.Sc. (Econ.)
Mr. O. S. ARTHUR, M.Sc. (Econ.), Leader of the Opposition
Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Q.C., LL.M.
Hon. C. V. WALKER, J.P., (Minister of Health)
Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees)
Hon. E. E. GREAVES, G.C.M., B.A., Ed.M., (Minister of Tourism, Culture & International Transport)
Hon. W. W. HALL, G.C.M., H.B.M., J.P., (Minister of Labour, Public Works, Community Development & Sports)

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON, LL.B. (Hons.), (Minister of Finance)
Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B.
Mr. L. R. TULL, Q.C., M.A.
Miss B. A. MILLER
Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, J.P.
Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, Q.C., M.A., M.Sc. (Econ.)
Mr. J. O. TUDOR, J.P.
Hon. D. W. BOWEN, (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries)
Mr. G. W. PAYNE
Mr. R. C. EASTMOND, B.A., LL.B.

Prayers were led by Mr. L. L. Brathwaite.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in session.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, August 24, 1993.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, the Minutes of the meeting of this House held on August 24, 1993 have been circulated. I move that they be taken as read and confirmed.

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY YOUR HONOUR

Mr. SPEAKER: I am to announce that I am in receipt of the Accounts and Statements for the months of May and June, 1993, prepared by the Accountant General.

PAPERS

Hon. C. V. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Annual Report of the Chief Medical Officer for the year 1990.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES seconded by Hon. B. M. TAUT the following Bills were read a first time:

1. Bill to validate acts done by certain persons purported to have been licensed as Land Surveyors under the Lands Surveyors' Act, Cap. 370.
2. Bill entitled the Public Service Suspension of Increments Bill, 1993.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

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

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

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

ORDER NO. 4 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE A LEASE TO SEAWELL AIR SERVICES LTD. OF LAND AT GIA FOR PASSENGER SERVICE FACILITIES FOR AIRCRAFT USING THE AIRPORT

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Resolution is to, grant a lease of approximately 6 431 square metres of land at the Grantley Adams International Airport to Seawell Air Services. Seawell Air Services is a company that performs ground handling services to many other of its customer clientele at the Airport which are, in fact, various airlines. It does cleaning of aircraft. It provides at best, customer services at the Airport.

From time to time Seawell Air Services has had to update its equipment because of the fact that as new aircraft come on stream and as they are brought into Barbados, sometimes the kind of equipment that the handling company has in its possession is not suitable for dealing with that new aircraft that has come into the country. So that it is in their interest to have this piece of equipment available and to have a sufficient parking area where they can rest these pieces of equipment because these are, in fact, addition to the equipment they already have. As the state of the art comes on stream they have to

keep abreast in order to be able to do a good job for their customers.

The conditions of the lease are set out in the Second Schedule to this Resolution. The lease is for a period of 6 years. The rental will be at the rate of 0.300 per square foot per annum subject to a review in 1994, that is, next year. The land shall be used for the provision of maintenance, storage repair and passenger service facilities for aircraft using the Grantley Adams International Airport.

The lessee shall be responsible for maintaining the premises in a good state of repair. The responsibility for paying all the taxes and outgoings must be borne by the lessee. The lessee will not be permitted to sublet or part with possession of the leased premises without the prior written consent of the lessor. All buildings on the land shall revert to the Crown for nil consideration on the expiry of the lease - as I said it is for 6 years - or if the lease shall sooner determine, on the determination thereof. So these conditions, Sir, have been worked out with the lessee and are agreeable. I therefore move that this resolution do now pass. 12.25 p.m.

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

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, Sir, from time to time these Resolutions seeking lease approvals, as it were, come before Parliament in relation to land at the Grantley Adams International Airport. You will recall that it was about a year ago that we last discussed one involving the lease of land to Simpsons Motors or some related agency. On that occasion we on this side took the opportunity to make some points which I regarded then and still regard as valid points with respect to airport management, airport policy and land policy. I think on this occasion that we must return to some of those issues in so far as the Government has not, in our view, seriously addressed them or given to the Parliament any satisfactory answers to the questions raised.

Before I get to them, Sir, I would want to begin by making some remarks about the Airport itself. The Airport is an important and impressive piece of investment in the Tourism and Air Transport Sector in this country. It is the first point of contact with the visitor and the last point of contact; and it is always within our interest that people who use the airport should arrive with good impressions of Barbados, resulting from the first point of contact, and leave with good impressions resulting from having to exit through the Airport.

My certain and reliable information is to the effect, Mr. Speaker, that the Airport roof is leaking at several points and that in this rainy season the airport

is unfortunately, even under cover, a wet area. The second point of complaint I wish to make, Sir, relates to the state of the toilets. They have been described by those who use them as absolutely filthy.

Now, there was a time when those who used those toilet facilities were proud to be able to do so. They were well maintained and they compared with the best maintained public facilities anywhere in the world. In recent times there has been a shortage of staff, in the first place resulting from the cutbacks, a failure to maintain consistently high standards and in addition to that, there may seem to be difficulty in the management of the maintenance unit whereby it has become a law unto itself at the airport and it is not subject to easy direction, management and control as some other departments are. The result is that the toilet facilities are not at all well maintained and it is tending to spoil the image of the airport as a place that one is happy to use. I think it is important enough for the Minister responsible to be involved in the matter in terms of trying to put it right.

The suggestion is being made that perhaps the time has come to lease out that service rather than have it managed and run by the Airport itself and that in so doing we are likely to be able to insist on higher standards and actually realise higher standards rather than have employees of the Government and of the Airport Department

It seems to me it is an important matter which can help to spoil the image of Barbados and that it ought to be addressed. I do not know myself how easy the roof problem is to be corrected. It is likely to be a very expensive job but some *pro tem* measures need to be taken because we cannot have a situation where the Airport roof is a porous one and whenever the rain falls up there it leaks as though there was indeed no roof at all.

I want now to turn to the lease itself and say that I have been attracted to the provision in the lease which says that the Lessee will not be able to sublet except with the permission of the Lessor. It is not widely known that Seawell Air Services which experienced a monopoly in the form of its operations for many years until the sister company of Caribbean Airways was recently created actually abused its lease over many years and, without the permission of the Government, sublet vast areas of land which it controlled for an exploitively high amount of rent. They actually made super profits out of subletting without the permission of Government. So that it is important that in any future lease arrangement it be made clear to them that they cannot sublet without the permission of the Lessor. But that is itself a commentary on the extent to which the management of lands at the Airport is not well organised and well done.

It is again not widely known, Mr. Speaker, that at present we have two Government bodies that are

responsible for management of lands at the Airport. You have for example, the Ministry of Lands that is responsible for the lease and the collection of rent from the gas station. On the other hand you have the Airport Management itself which is under a different Ministry that is responsible for the management of the leases and the collection of the rents from the commercial shops around the airport. The failure to concentrate the management of the property in one body at the Airport is itself a source of confusion and a problem and I would hope that the Minister who is now responsible would regard it as important enough for him to address as a matter of some priority.

On the whole we are concerned on this side with the *ad hoc* approach to the leasing of the land at the Airport. We have made the point repeatedly that the Airport land constitutes a prime resource and there ought to be a well thought out plan for land use at the Airport over the next 20 to 25 years, and that the land use plan needs to be public property. All those who are interested in investment, either immediately or in the likely future at the airport ought to know which lands have been earmarked for which activity and generally what is the land use plan for the Airport over the next 20 years or thereabout. We are living in a dynamic world and from time to time we may have to modify and amend but it ought to be public knowledge what are the projections with respect to land use at the Airport over the next 20 or 25 years.

In order to do that the first thing you need to do is to have a plan of the lands at the Airport and I was absolutely shattered to discover recently that nobody knows for certain what is the acreage of lands available to the Government of Barbados at the Airport. There has never been a survey. There are no clearly defined boundaries and no one can say for certain how much acreage of land is available at the Airport. It is absolutely unbelievable. So we on this side must make the point again, Mr. Speaker, that the Airport lands need to be managed by one authority and not by 2 or 3. There needs to be a plan, which is public property, with respect to the use of lands at the Airport over the next 20 years or thereabout. That this *ad hoc* approach, to the giving of leases and the use of the Airport land is not desirable or efficient. In fact, it is likely to be a very costly way of managing the land at the Airport.

Now, Seawell Air Services had the use of one lot in the past and they were always interested in 2 lots, so we are going to want to know whether this land under lease today represents 2 lots or one lot. I have just been handed this plan and I have had no time to study it, but it is mentioned here Lot 1 and Lot 2 and it does appear to be two lots. A related question which arises is whether the being at Seawell has already been earmarked for maintenance or whether it trespasses on land earmarked for else. The other thing is this: How do we

arrive at the 30 cents or 34 cents per square foot? Is that an economic rate? I note that the Resolution said that it is subject to review next year. But I think that we would still be interested to know whether it is an economic rate and how has it been arrived at. 12.35 p.m.

When the new Airport was constructed, Mr. Speaker, it was widely felt that in another ten years or so major expansion activity would need to take place at Grantley Adams International. I think it is almost ten years now since the new Airport has been opened and I would like to know from the Minister responsible whether we regard the existing facilities as adequate for the volume of traffic or whether we think there is need for expansion. If so, in what areas and what steps are being taken by way of feasibility studies and so on to ensure that the Airport continues to be kept up-to-date and that its facilities are in keeping with the demand for the services.

I see from time to time, as a user of the Airport, that in the departure area you always see additional shops being located within the Departure Lounge. It was never even at the outset a large area and, though it is consistent with what happens at other airports where users of the airports are being given every opportunity to shop with as wide a variety as possible, it seems to me that we are now trespassing on what is really sitting space. I am all for increased commercial activity at the Airport and for an increased number of shops. All that I am saying is that I am not sure* that we can continue to put additional shops in the departure area. It seems to me that that area is getting very crowded. Although I am making the case for a wide range of shops of every variety, I am saying that we may need to locate additional shops in a new area rather than in the departure area. I was there only recently, Mr. Speaker, and there was a situation obtaining where persons who wanted to sit found themselves having to stand because of the additional shops which seem to be trespassing on the area which should rightly be for those who want to sit in order to wait for their aircraft.

Mr. Speaker, on the whole, we have no resistance to the Resolution before Parliament. We like to give our support to these Resolutions. But I think that Government has not treated us to a full range of the information that should be made available to us. I think there is no evidence that the Government is taking the management of the land at the Airport and the future development of the Airport as seriously as they ought to be. I have visited an airport, Mr. Speaker, which has its own Authority rather than the situation currently obtaining where two Authorities are responsible for the management of the land, and where the airport becomes a sufficient source of income to the point where it does not have to be subsidized by the Treasury. It is a self financing agency and I think that is the target to which we should be moving with dispatch. I have no

evidence notwithstanding the comments which we make in here from time to time that the Government's thoughts are in that direction. What we are appealing to the Government to do is to try to manage the Airport in a modern and efficient way. It seems to me if that was the situation where the Airport had its own Authority, the situation currently obtaining where the Maintenance Division is not attending to the toilet facilities with any efficiency whatsoever could not obtain. That is the reason why I make the suggestion that as long as we have that situation obtaining we are going to have to consider the matter.

Aside.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: The Honourable Minister responsible is trying to put words in my mouth, Mr. Speaker. He will have the opportunity to make his mark and I hope that he will begin by improving the toilet facilities at the Airport. He will have the opportunity to make his mark, Mr. Speaker. If the present management arrangement does not lead to an improvement of the situation, we may very well have to consider at a soon date the leasing out of that particular service and put it in the hands of the private sector under very strict conditions whereby they are told what standards they have to maintain and with what frequency the units have to be cleaned and so on as to ensure that the standards which we had in the very early days at the Airport be realised again.

Aside.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Not that that is far from true, but the new Airport in the early was very carefully managed as far as those facilities are concerned. The situation has deteriorated very badly to the point that it is almost a scandal.

Mr. Speaker, I think that I have made the point that we on this side wish to make and I hope that the Honourable Minister responsible will take the opportunity to give the Opposition, Parliament and the country some assurances on the issues raised.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member has made a number of the points which could possibly be made in this debate. There are still one or two areas though, Sir, because of my familiarity with the original conception of the Airport which I would like to underscore. There is no question or doubt about it, Sir, that the Airport derives and earns sufficient revenue as to be able to maintain the Airport and make a significant contribution to its capital repayment. If the accounts of the Airport were separated and presented in a manner of capital investment, even using the historical price of the land and things of that kind, that could easily be seen. There were always plans in existence for keeping the Airport up-to-date in ' the sense of modernizing and reforming the

management structure at the Airport to ensure that it fulfills its object and the objectives set for it as being the best run airport in the whole of the Caribbean carrying the best and the most up-to-date equipment so that we would be able to compete with any other airport in the Caribbean for rights and the attraction of airplanes both for the carriage of passengers and for the carriage of cargo. That was the fundamental mission that has been given to everybody at the Airport. Grantley Adams International Airport was to be better than anything else in the Caribbean and that was always the objective. That means that some of the bureaucratic constraints that inevitably arise, once it operates as a Department of Government has to be periodically as a result of the initiative of the Minister in collaborating with his other Ministers, have to be relaxed. 12.45 p.m.

I think one of the great failings of those who have been responsible for airport administration, under this administration, has been that they have failed to recognise this point. There has been a serious cutback in the personnel available for the cleaning of the airport, and that started some time ago. That was wrong. Grantley Adams Airport had the reputation for being the cleanest anywhere in the Caribbean, but that was dependant upon the fact that you had people continuously working on cleaning the areas and on preventative maintenance. There was a cutback on the ground of savings, so we are in a position now where the revenue from the airport is not being used for some of the elementary purposes you need to use it for, but because of the strictures of the finances in Government it is being used, so to speak, to make a contribution to the running of the other services.

Now, Sir, what the Honourable Member for St. Joseph, the spokesman in this matter, has said is true. There is no question about it. There are some backup problems you always have at that airport with respect to sewage. There have always been backup problems. That used to be dealt with in an expeditious manner by the hiring of special vehicles at particular periods of time at night. My understanding of the situation is that because of financial stringency days are allowed to elapse before that remedial work is done. We all would know the consequences of that.

The second point I would like to underscore is that it was always envisaged that the airlines themselves and contractors, such as Seawell Air Services, would have a role to play in the providing out of their own capital, within the context of a lease or licensing arrangement with the Government as a land owner, a number of facilities there.

The time has come when there is need for mere airline counter space. If you go there on any day now you

will see, particularly the area where the Caribbean airlines operate, that is, the BWIA and the Caribbean aircraft handling, in that corner, already you have had to expand by way of a temporary relocation of some of the area there to allow BWIA more counter space. That is a fact. There was an area to the Seawell Plantation side, Spencers side, which was reserved for future expansion of counter space for airlines, and it needs just the provision of a cover for it to be done. That should be put out immediately. That is needed.

The Caribbean airlines should not quarrel, because they had the first pick of which space they wanted and they picked that corner. But there is definitely a need. If you go there on the days in the winter season, particularly at Christmas, you will see that there is need for more space, so a decision has to be taken on that.

As far as shopping is concerned at the airport, the Government now in its zeal to embrace the merchants in Bridgetown have decided in their minds that whether it is the sea port or the airport, or the whole of Barbados, whatever they want they can come and get. That is a fact. That is the current philosophy that is in vogue.

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: It is foolishness? I would not be surprised, Sir, because the Honourable Member knows very well how they operate. The point is that it is a fact, and everybody is discovering it, that the Government has embraced the doctrine that private enterprise can do things better than Government and therefore whatever facilities they want at any of the Government's locations they can get. I have no quarrel with that if that is your philosophy, but I want to know that when you are making these concessions and are giving out these tenders, that there are certain minimum criteria involved. For instance, I wish the Honourable Minister who said it was foolishness could tell us when the tender came out for anybody at all to competitively bid for the right to establish a cruise port at the Bridgetown Harbour. That is the kind of thing I want to know. I do not mind if that is your philosophy, but you tell me when did you advertise for tenders to provide a building at the airport to be used for Columbian Emeralds. I do not know these things. I repeatedly say I have no quarrel with a Government saying that it is its philosophy that if you at the present moment wish to make use of Government property you will be able to get the land from Government. I have no problem with that, but I want you to make that a transparent policy.

I want you to advertise each and every occasion when you contemplate that you need these services that you would have tenders, because I do not want any fast track approach. It is not good for this country for the impression to be given that there is a fast track inside approach.

That is all I am saying. I do not mind who you give it to, but at least let us go through the formalities of inviting competitive bids. You cannot quarrel with this, because you are the ones always talking about transparent policies. We must not be hypocritical in this exercise.

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: It is not nonsense, it is very good sense for Governments to say that if I want to have a terminal for the provision of duty free services that I will invite each and every group in Barbados to tender so that I can get the best. That is the way it should be done. Nobody can be against you if that is your philosophy, that you want it to be done not by a Government Department.

I want to say this. I do not subscribe to the view that all the good sense in Barbados resides only in the private sector. I have lived long enough and have been in politics long enough to know that you would never have had an airport if you had depended upon the private sector. You would never have had a sea port if you had depended upon the private sector. These are essential infrastructural developments for which the Government had to undertake the risk in the interest of Barbados' economy as a whole. That is a fact. Therefore, we must look at it. All of those who are coming with their current views as to how these things could be run must understand these facts.

Another problem we have, Sir, at the airport - and it was always a problem which was envisaged - is the question as to how you integrate Terminal No. 2 with Terminal No. 1 and the role in particular of Terminal 2 in respect of Caribbean passengers run by LI AT and the other small companies which do that. There was a viewpoint that the two would be linked in the future and that one would be an intra-Caribbean port of entry where you could relax some of your Customs in the interest of the integration movement. It is true that the integration movement and freedom of movement in this direction have not progressed as fast. It is also true that since that concept was first thought of we have the introduction of a new factor. We have the introduction of the Caribbean being used as a transshipment base in the drug trafficking, so therefore you have to look at these matters in the light of new developments.

We also have to look at the airport, in my opinion, in relation to one other important area. All around airports in the world, quite apart from the activities such as Seawell Air Services Limited, it is now quite current to have other enterprises taking place in the form of duty free manufacturing. It is around airports that you have the free zones. I know that a study was done years ago on the need for a free zone in Barbados at the air or the sea port. 12.55 p.m.

Now, that study may need updating in light of new developments in the world. I do not know. At that particular period of time the United National Industrial Organisation who did the study came to the conclusion that Barbados has, in effect, such a simple set of laws in relation to industrial manufacturers, duty-free raw materials and things of that kind, that the whole island of Barbados could be regarded as a free trade zone for manufacturing purposes.

We know, of course, that that has gone by the board. But there still may be, particularly now, a strong case for revising that study to ensure that in the light of the clear Government policy that is going to withdraw the concession of duty-free entry of raw materials for manufacturing in Barbados, that today we may have to say that there is an exception to that policy in a free trade zone ringed around by a fence at the Airport

Now, Sir, we have had some remarkable things that have happened at the Airport on the other side of the road. This is something that the Town Planner and others had objected to in our time and we had a policy in-relation to that. There is a rum shop on the other side of the Airport, and the Honourable Member for St. Philip North in particular is fully aware of this, that has been erected on Barbados Government land, either through its ownership the Ministry of Housing, or the Agriculture Development Corporation and nobody in this House of Assembly yet knows who gave permission for that rum shop to be erected. It invaded agricultural land. It is a positive fact. If you pass by the Airport obliquely opposite the bus shed you will see a new rum shop has been erected in a field that used to grow cotton. It is a fact.

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I do not know who erected it. I do not know who gave permission for it. I know that this House of Assembly has never given permission for that and I would like to know why is it that we have a Resolution today to move the passing of a Resolution to approve to Seawell Air Services Limited land at Grantley Adams International Airport, Christ Church, for passenger service facilities for aircraft using the Airport and we have never had a resolution in this House for Government to approve the erection of a rum shop at land at Grantley Adams International Airport. This is a very serious thing, Sir.

Why I say that it is so serious because my memory tells me that that field of land, it is about 8 or 10 acres, was identified most specifically as the area for the free zone. That is my memory of the master plan of the whole area. So you will put a rum shop in the middle of it now. Perhaps the former Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, not this one, he does not know a thing about that. They have so emasculated the Ministry now that

he would not know about these things so I would like to know what are the circumstances. I believe the Honourable Member for St. Philip North could help us in that direction. My understanding is that the Honourable Member for St. Philip North is able to enlighten the House on this issue. That is my understanding, Sir.

The last point I wish to make, Sir, is that my memory also informs me that we are past the time when another major study would be done on the Airport. I believe I have seen some evidence that a study is being commissioned. We are in a dynamic situation and everybody is proud of Grantley Adams International Airport. The Labour Party had the good sense, wisdom and foresight to have acquired the original land and make the international airport.

When I first became a Member of this House one of the greatest contributions I made, although I say so myself, was that a resolution came here for the acquisition of part only of Spencers and Fairy Valley Plantations. I remember in conjunction with the former Member for Christ Church South making speeches in here in which we said very clearly that we felt that the land of Spencers and Fairy Valley was so intimately tied up that you should never separate it. The Government should acquire all and if you go back into the records you will see that the then Minister of Civil Aviation....

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: No. There were 2 plantations. They came back and the Resolution was amended and the totality of Seawell Plantation, Fairy Valley Plantation and Spencers Plantation was acquired. That is the history of how the Government came to own the whole of that area. There would not have been a survey because in the those days the plantations were done by leaps and bounds and the watchman would tell you the boundaries so we are not arguing in any contentious area here about that. We must have an airport. We want to have it as the best all the time because this is a natural hub. Barbados is a natural hub in the Eastern Caribbean. Do not mind what they tell you in some other parts of the Caribbean. This is the natural hub. It is the most easterly of the Caribbean Islands. We have developed the expertise to run the Airport. We have the equipment. We have the radar. We make decisions relatively quickly. I want the integrity of our decision making to continue. We must not have anything slipping through the back door, whether it be contracts for the provision of services inside or outside the Terminal, inside the Airport or outside the Airport. We want to have it on fair competitive tender so that we will get the best.

They used to accuse the Labour Party Government of being so interested in money at the Airport that we used to gouge out the duty-free rum people by insisting that there be competitive tender and they used to put in wild bids.

That is a fact. The people used to bid very, very high but it is their business. If they are commercial people and they want to bid high, our only instruction was to ensure that they pay their rent and if they did not pay their rent, I did not care who they were, they were given reasonable opportunity to honour their obligations. If they broke that they were out. Some of us have incurred lasting enemies because we insisted on that policy but it does not make any difference to us. The point was they bid, they won, they fell behind in their payments, they were given full opportunity. I think they were given over a year to come back up to scratch. They got vex and they go. So that is the position, Sir. I hope that we continue with the competitive tendering in respect of duty-free matters at the Airport.

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: We have abandoned the seaport now. We have cast that aside to the new dispensation. We are finished with that. That, Sir, is my contribution.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I have called on the Government to supply a map before we enter this Chamber to debate certain resolutions. We have heard the Honourable Member for Christ Church South mention a case in which Government decided - he said it is alleged but I am going to state categorically that the Government entered into a Lease Agreement with someone to build or to operate a canteen near the Airport on Government lands and the lands that the canteen was built on by Government belongs to 2 sisters living abroad. I have a copy of the plan. The Government, recognising that they had built on the two ladies' land decided to correct it. What they did, they decided to go west of the same site and build another facility. A miraculous fire destroyed the original building built by Government. 1.05 p.m.

Aside.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: It was built during the Democratic Labour Party's time. It was built a couple years ago. We do not want to split hairs on this. What I am saying is that Government has to be very careful, Mr. Speaker, with the leases and make sure that the land they are leasing is Government's land. I do not know what sort of action the Government is liable to in this case because the owners wanted to dispose of the land and they could not do so because Government had the facility on it.

I also want to draw to the Government's attention, the Government built it and leased it out. It is now being destroyed by fire. A rum shop/canteen facility, operated by a Barrow.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: This is very serious. You all may laugh but I am saying the shop was built by the Government under the Democratic Labour Party's regime. I am going to say something. The Town Planner advised that there should be no entry to that building from the main road. I want to check that. This is a serious matter for the Minister of Public Works and yet the Town Planner stated that entry to that facility should be by way of Charnocks. But if you go there it is a very serious situation. The Town Planner knew why he made that stipulation. If you go there presently vehicles are going there to that facility, entering and departing from it and I am hoping the Government recognises that it is dangerous, it is in breach of the law, and make sure that they impose the regulations as set out by the Town and Country Planning.

This is serious and I will tell you something. When Government leases land in cases such as this they should make sure. And the Town Planner is responsible for laying certain regulations down. There should be some follow up to make sure that these conditions are held and observed. You have a very dangerous situation there because there is a bus stop on the other side and as I said it is impeding the flow of traffic.

I will also go as far as to say the relevant Minister should find out that the Town Planner also said that nothing should be build on that area to block the view. It should be landscaped. I would hope that in an effort to have this free zone area that we observe certain regulations otherwise we are going to be in for some serious problems and we know how the law will be seeking to contain certain people as far as traffic regulations go.

Now we cannot on the one hand have regulations laid down and then have them broken. I hope the Minister responsible would address this and make sure that everything is done in the future that when lands are leased or when he comes in here for lands to be leased that the person is advised that someone goes and points out the lands to be leased and do not allow this foolishness to be compounded when Government of itself sets out to build on lands that is not theirs. It is all right if someone else did the building but when Government builds I think it is a bit more serious. You will find when you check that what I am saying is absolutely correct because I am privy to all the facts surrounding in this matter. That is all I have to say at this moment.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to deal with one aspect of the discussions that have taken place on this Resolution. I am not familiar with any of the properties around the Airport nor the physical configuration of the Airport and therefore, Sir, I cannot speak to that specific matter. I would like to join with those who are in

support of the development of the duty free sector, whether that development is private sector led or Government led, but I wish to speak about the way in which this Government has opted to proceed in relation to developments relative to the expansion of the duty-free sector.

A lot of remarks have been made, as I understand it, on public platforms and elsewhere which seek to give the impression that we do not understand how to exercise discretion as Ministers; that we are people who are less than honourable in the way in which we grant tax concessions and that Ministers exercise their discretion with some kind of caprice and indifference and over brandy and tea with their friends. I want to make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that none of the procedures have changed. The Administrative Justice Act is in place. If anybody seems aggrieved by any concession that has been granted, if any Minister has used immaterial or irrelevant considerations in coming to a determination or review or makes any decision that anybody on that side sees is incompatible with the Constitution, the Laws of Barbados, or propriety, then they must make the specific allegations.

Now I know there is a firm belief on that side, Mr. Speaker, that the more they raise or glance at issues of corruption or impropriety by the most tenuous of evidence and the most tenuous connections and the most remote connections or associations with people, they feel this would stick like hard dry mud on Members on this side. One particular proponent, who knows more than anything else that unsubstantiated charges of corruption in Barbados do damage very quickly to political parties, and he has been in politics long enough, probably longer than any of his colleagues on that side, knows what I am talking about. I deprecate that.

The Government established a Foreign Exchange Committee. I want to give the history to this matter as I know it.

The Foreign Exchange Committee Task Force was established to look at the issue of duty free shopping in Barbados and the Task Force which comprised of members of the private sector and the public sector of Barbados looked at the duty-free sector as a whole and looked at the initiatives that could be taken both in the private and public sector to enhance the development of the duty-free sector in Barbados and they came up with recommendations. The private sector travelled as far as I recall at their own expense. And those from the Government, at the expense of the Government to two jurisdictions in the region to look at ways in which the procedures for duty free shopping and the way in which duty-free shopping is conducted and has been enhanced. The Honourable Member for Christ Church West came in this Chamber only a couple of months ago when there was a

problem at the Airport relating to Barbadians not being able to buy goods duty-free and complained that the Government was doing absolutely nothing to enhance a sector which he said would earn million of dollars for this country if we were serious enough about it. Now that the initiatives are taking root in the system, Members on that side are acting as if there is some underhand deal with the private sector to grant concessions to the distributive sector on some basis of caprice or, as I said, over brandy, tea and snacks. This Joint Committee made certain specific suggestions to Government and those documents are not private documents. Now that the story is coming out, nobody wishes to hear the specific suggestions. 1.15 p.m.

Aside.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am going to do that. I am not going to let anybody get away either in here or in Independence Square or anywhere else with any statements which are not true, which appear to reflect on me or any other Member on this side in any way that is adverse. I am not going to permit that. You can bring all the people you want to talk, down to Independence Square or in here. But so long as you are dealing with the integrity of this Cabinet and individual Members, then I will stand up to defend the position. The Task Force on duty free shopping recommended that a levy be imposed on the operators of the duty-free sector which would be used for advertisement of Barbados as a duty free shopping destination. We did not agree with that in Government. So it is not to say that we are lying prostrate on our back waiting for the private sector to make recommendations and we told them that we did not agree.

We said that in this new spirit of making space for the private sector that, if they wish to extract a levy from anybody, they can go and extract it themselves and find whatever means that are necessary for the private sector to pull its own weight and not rely on Government to impose taxation on any sector. We said that if you want to collect 5 per cent, go out there and canvas your members who are benefiting and get the 5 per cent from them. There is already a Tourism Development Corporation which, as I understand it, is able, even though Government grants some concessions to extract from members in the hotel sector a certain level of contribution for their operation. The private sector must now start to find its own legs and develop and build its own institutions for its own further development.

We are not imposing any more taxes willy-nilly and, of course, I mean successive Governments. There is also a new spirit in relation to that where taxes must be transparent and they must have greater efficiency, not only in the way in which they are collected but the way in which they are eligible. Therefore, there is not going to be

any silly 5 per cent here and a 2 per cent there. So they will find their own way to collect that money.

They also suggested in that Report that we establish a Duty Free Authority by statute and we said no, that there is no present intention by the Government to create any additional statutory authority in areas like this. We said that if they wanted to continue the public/private sector collaboration with us that could be done on the very successful informal basis on which it is presently being done and that the Task Force itself produced results and it should continue collaboration at that level without a new institution on which the taxpayers at the end of the day be required to underwrite and guarantee the expenditure would not be agreed to. So we did not agree to that.

However, we did agree to concessions. That is not a secret. The Cabinet took a decision after looking at the whole report that we would grant concessions to those new businesses and for the refurbishment of existing duty-free operations and that those concessions would be 50 per cent of the imposts payable on those items used in the refurbishment. Similar concessions obtain in the hotel sector and similar concessions now obtain in the manufacturing sector. So it is no more generous than other concessions which are being granted in other sectors, even though it may be true to say that there are some sectors who feel that they should pay no tax at all. From what I have been hearing from certain persons delivering speeches to the private sector, they feel along with the private sector that they should not pay those taxes either. Yet, this is the Government that is accused of being in bed with the private sector.

Aside.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The Chairman of the Task Force Committee is the chairman, I believe, of a private sector corporation which is owned by many Barbadians, as I understand, and which operates one of the largest department stores on Broad Street. Well, it is not a secret. If I had the list, I would read all the names. Do not feel that there is any secret about anything. The Honourable Member for Christ Church West has had access in the past and has read out documents in here from the Foreign Exchange Committee. The Honourable Member for the City always has so much information. She is a director of a private sector organization which has shares in one of the companies which is going to invest in the cruise terminal. Check it and see. You may not understand the interlocking business relationships in Barbados. But I am not a director of anything and I was never a director. You are the director of a public corporation in Barbados which has shares in one of the companies that is going to be involved in the cruise ship exercise.

Aside.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: That is not a big thing. That is the point that I am making. So do not shout things over here on this as though we are under cover and somebody has up a shield waiting for these arrows to be coming at us. The system for the award of the concessions was transparent. It went through the Ministry. It did not come directly to any Minister for some kind of fiat. Now the point is that, regrettably, an announcement of the policy was delayed and was going to take place on Friday between myself and the Minister of Trade because our respective schedules could not permit it earlier. But the Press already knows that the policy will be announced. I only want to make this point, Mr. Speaker, because it is very serious. The allegations very unjustified and elitist in background, I must say, because there are no directors of any private sector corporations that own any of those properties on Broad street over here. None. None of us will get a look in. Not even in the most transparent system of voting. That is reserved for some of them over there. So when people say that they are in the bosom of the private sector, they are in the bosom. None of us have ever sat on the board of any of the big ten corporations in this country. 1.25 p.m.

They are the Directors of the Mutual, Life of Barbados and all those other major corporations. None of us has ever, ever been a member. That point needs to be made. I do not mind the accusations about the private sector, I do not mind the accusations about the new found ideology. The Honourable Member for Christ Church South speaks about this new found ideology. After a restful weekend the exuberance of his presentation today left out some very material facts, but I will excuse him. Perhaps I left out some too. The questions he asked did not really get to the root of the issue, which is: should we commit ourselves to the further development of the duty free sector? That is a big issue and I think you owe it, on that side, to be consistent with your former leader, the Honourable Member for Christ Church West, and to throw in your lot with the Government on this, because we have decided that the duty free sector is a sector that can grow, that we can earn foreign exchange in a relatively short period of time with some heightened investment and that this is an area which we feel can employ more Barbadians and can provide opportunities, particularly for the new small businesses. And room must be made in our planning for small businesses, whether it is at the port or at a refurbished Pelican, or in the public markets in Barbados. We have to look at investments in those areas which would permit Barbadians, particularly those involved in craft, those who wish to own small shops and businesses of their own, to get involved in the duty free sector.

This is no attempt by the Government to pave the way for the perpetuation of the mentality that the only thing the Barbadian business class can do is function in the distributive sector, because if that is all I am here to do I

would forget it and go back in Bridgetown like everybody else and practise law. The exercise here is about getting people who do not now have access to resources involved in productive economic activity. The exercise here is to broaden opportunities for people to be involved in existing successful business operations, and that is what the thrust of the duty free, exercise is about. Those who feel and do not have confidence that the Barbadian business community, together with Government and, one would hope, the enlightened contribution of an Opposition which itself has said it is committed to this, cannot get together and produce a successful blueprint for the development of duty free shopping, and hopefully free zones. And I think Government has made it clear that the resources which it has available to productive investments have to be very carefully marshalled and monitored. There is no superabundance of long term finance for new initiatives of this type and therefore we will need to have a symbiosis between Government and the private sector in creating these new initiatives. But as I said we are not creating them for the perpetuation of existing practices, these new initiatives are to bring new faces into play in the productive development of this country.

With those few words, Sir, I hope I have clarified any misapprehensions which Honorable Members had. If they have any more they may ask and they will be answered.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The report from the Foreign Exchange Committee can be made available easily. It is not a big matter. It is not a secret and confidential document, it is a document of recommendations and any member of the private sector who has been on the Committee has been freed to make that information available. If necessary, the report can be made available here and in due course, the Honourable Member says he wants a copy, he can have it.

I hope I have clarified the doubts. With those few words, Sir, I wish to give support to this particular Resolution.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Honourable Minister has completely misunderstood the point which was made by Honourable Members over here, particularly the Honourable Member for Christ Church South. The point is that if there is a change in the duty free arrangements, it is normal to bring the legislation before Parliament, as was done in 1986. There is a Statutory Instrument, No. 53 of 1986, where Drawback of Duties on Sale of Goods to Tourists Regulations were made. Unless the Regulations have been changed during the vacation and have not yet been gazetted, in my view the

Government is in duty bound to bring the relevant legislation to Parliament.

In 1986 when we changed the duties so as to give duty free arrangements to a number of new articles and to make it available to those persons who wanted to engage in that enterprise, the legislation was brought before Parliament, laid in the House under the Customs Act, Cap. 66, and the necessary changes were made.

The Foreign Exchange Committee made a series of reports which have inspired Government's changes. Those reports have not been laid in this Parliament. I have spoken before on the fact that it is possible to earn tremendous foreign exchange in the duty free sector if we are to develop this sector in the way that it is developed in St. Thomas, Virgin Islands, both British and U.S. Virgin Islands, and in Aruba, Curacao and St. Maarten. Those are the main jurisdictions to which the Foreign Exchange Committee have looked and they considered them to be in competition with them. But whatever is done must be transparently done. It is not transparently done merely because it has gone before a Minister or Ministry. One has to have equal terms of competition, those terms must be published and known and everybody who wants to be involved must be given an opportunity, particularly the smaller people in Barbados and particularly the smaller black business people of Barbados.

There have been considerable complaints that the developments which are taking place, both in the expansion of the airport and the sea port, are coming to be monopolised by people who are in the existing trade. This is a point that must be taken seriously. A time of restructuring is a time that people who have wealth and money will be able to take advantage of new opportunities ahead of those who have been disenfranchised for several years in this country. The Government's role must be one of assisting the disenfranchised and the up and coming business people - and there are a lot of young Barbadians not only studying business administration but who are interested in getting into business and being part of the new commercial enterprise in Barbados. What we have to ensure is that just not the few who have been in the business before, whether it is Seawell Air Services or anybody else, but the new entrepreneurs in Barbados get an opportunity and that we get a new entrepreneurial class that would lead to economic democracy and enfranchisement in this country. If the Labour Party therefore has to hammer the point continuously in whatever sector it will be, we will hammer the point. I believe that is the major point that the Honourable Member for Christ Church South wanted to be clearly understood by the Government. 1.35 p.m.

Now, I am aware of the fact that \$1 million in investment was put into the Airport by 2 public sector

companies in Barbados who are in the duty-free area, Cave Shepherd & Co. Ltd. and Goddard Enterprises Ltd. The Government did not have that money, apparently the \$1 million, to reorganise the inside shops and therefore they used their money up-front to reorganise the inside shops. Therefore the improvement you see there is due to their direct investment.

I have not seen the terms. I do not think the Government has brought to the House the terms under which that investment was made. If it has not done so I feel the Government is under a duty to make the terms available to Parliament so that Members would understand that things are being properly done and are not being done at the capricious whims and fancies of a particular Minister or Ministry. That is the point we are making, Sir.

Now, Sir, I have certain complaints about the Airport that I believe are valid. Every time I go to the Airport I notice that there is a piece being added on here and a piece being added on there, in the incoming lounge, for instance, where you collect your luggage. Upstairs the Government has added a new look-out. Now, that might be for security purposes, purposes of Customs and what not. It is now building what I understand is a lift in the departure lounge but the piecemeal approach is disfiguring the aesthetic and architectural beauty of the Airport and it is not making the best use of available space. I am surprised that some of these decisions are being taken ahead of the report which the Government expects from the present consultants whom the Government has looking at a review of the use of the Grantley Adams International Airport for the year 2010, I am told. Now, that report is not yet in. The consultants are still working. I understand that is the position.

I also have seen statistics which show that Barbados' anticipation of the growth of air traffic in the next 10, 15 years is not all that vast for us to anticipate a second terminal and that what we may need to do is to look at the existing terminal and rationalise how we are using existing space there. It is for that reason that I ask the Government therefore not to make *ad hoc*, piecemeal decisions and put up physical structures when in the long-term the best advice maybe a reorganisation different from what is being done now. For instance, I do not believe that we are making the best use of the space occupied by the small shops in the entrance to the Airport. I think that just as inside in the inner departure lounge we have made an improvement, I believe that those entrepreneurs who are operating outside need a better opportunity for reorganisation to use the space there in a much more attractive and effective manner than is being done.

Now, Sir, I have a grouse about how we deal with Government buildings as a whole and in the case of the Airport, it is obvious to me that there has been no programme of consistent maintenance of buildings.

The Honourable Member for St. Joseph and the Honourable Member for Christ Church South have themselves already spoken about specific omissions that have occurred in the field of maintenance. Leaking roof, for instance has been one of the areas mentioned.

I want to mention in addition cleaning, not cleaning in the sense of cleaning in the area of sanitary toilets and so on, but cleaning the structure of the Airport itself because it is obvious to me that we should have had a programme for continually renewing the structure as a whole and keeping it attractive so that when people come to Grantley Adams International Airport they would want to return because of the beauty of the place.

In this regard I am disappointed in the fact that the gardens are not properly maintained as they were formerly. This cannot make Grantley Adams International Airport attractive and in competition with airports in other Caribbean jurisdictions. We have to take into account that Trinidad is spending millions of dollars on the development of Piarco after all these years and will shortly be doing the same on Tobago. The point is we have to take this into account. They have announced as a policy direct competition in making Piarco the natural hub and gateway into South America to, from and beyond. Obviously that is only part of the competition here in the Southern Caribbean that we can anticipate and if we are to be ahead of that competition in the one sector that has perhaps the quickest opportunity for us to earn foreign exchange then we have to be spending money.

Now, the present Leader of the Opposition warned this Government repeatedly that we should not have been cutting back. We should not have in nominal terms been remaining at the same amount being spent in at least 2 sectors and this is 3 or 4 years ago. We are not talking about today. Had we been spending in this way then part of our present troubles would be over, or would be on the way to solution and instead of the continuing negative growth which we see in the economy as a whole, and the limited growth in tourism, we would have had more growth in tourism and some positive growth in the economy as a whole, and our foreign exchange would not now be dependent as it is on the cut-back and imports and that sort of thing to say that we are having two and a half months' balances in foreign reserves. It would be in real growth areas that Barbados can say it is moving out of its structural problems it has had and into positive growth.

Now, Sir, I also have a grouse at the Airport about the manner in which the environs of the Airport have been allowed to develop. Honourable Members who have spoken on this side have made specific reference to what I would call the north-eastern side of the Airport just by the roundabout. It is wrong to have allowed fringe development

of a commercial nature to take place in such proximity to the roundabout and in such close proximity to the road without an adequate reserve and parking arrangements being made. Anybody who passes the Airport regularly would realise that there is not enough parking space on the other side and that it is creating a problem.

Now, Sir, I would be one to encourage some competition even with the shops at the Airport. The smaller man, people who are working at the Airport and otherwise, prefer to go across the road, even some of the tourists who come with haversacks on their backs, to have a snack at a cheaper price than to go upstairs to the Flight Kitchen and otherwise to pay some of the prices you have to pay to support the rent that you have to pay. So there is a market for that type of development. But it must be done in a structured and sensible manner.

My complaint is that I do not know what planning permissions have been given, and how they have been given. But I would suggest to the Government that we look at the planning permission and, if necessary, the Government itself may have to use part of its. Spencers land on the other side in order to provide proper parking arrangements there. I also believe that there are times that the parking at present being provided for people who come to the Airport face bottlenecks. I have been there and had to wait for quite some time to merely get into line to get out because one of the machines was not working. That again is a maintenance problem. 1.45 p.m.

If we are to be ahead of time we must give total quality service of the highest standard to our people and to visitors using Grantley Adams Airport and indeed using the Seaport so as to keep ahead of the competition and to give satisfaction in order to earn money. If I know that I can go into the parking area and get out quickly I am not going to steal a park alongside the road. I have no objection to paying a reasonable price. But if you know you are going to be stuck in there and the machines are not working and that sort of thing then you are going to take a chance and obviously the Government is losing revenue. Sometimes the girls cannot read properly the tickets that they have got and they are asking you how long have you been in here and it is left to your honesty to allow the Government to get the revenue that it should be getting at the airport. These are facts that I have to draw to the Government's attention.

With respect to this particular leased area, Sir, the Minister has quoted the price, having come to us to approve leasing a certain amount of square metres. The price is being quoted in square feet. Obviously I have not been able to work back the square metres.

- *Asides.*

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: I want to know how it compares with the lease which was made to Simpsons Inc. How do the terms compare? I believe there must be occupying Lots 1, 2 and 3 and that neither Seawell Air Services Limited, nor Simpsons nor the other Lessee should be in any more favourable position than the other and I am not sure, I have not had the chance, Sir, to look at the debate on the Simpsons' lease but I have an inkling somewhere in my head that the terms have not been properly synchronised in this regard.

Now, Sir, the nature of the Resolution would probably not allow us to raise a debate on other aspects of civil aviation but I would hope that the Government would take the earliest opportunity to make a considered statement in this House about the disposal of the people's interest in Leeward Islands Air Transport. Surely, Sir, this House and the public of Barbados deserve to know the terms on which the Government is selling the shares or would agree to selling the shares. We want to know how this will impact on the Government's long term strategy for Civil Aviation. We want to know what protection is being given to air rights owned by the people of this country and how the present proposed arrangement will fit in with the long-term aim of this country to ensure that there is a single national Caribbean airline to protect the vital tourist industry of Barbados.

I am saying this against the background of statements made by the Chairman of American Airlines as recently as a couple of weeks ago in which he indicated that that airline may be considering getting out of the airline industry and going into other areas. Now American Airlines is our major carrier at present from the United States into Barbados. It is the major carrier and in some instances it is the only carrier on certain routes. It is incumbent on us as a Government and a people to be well ahead of market changes in this respect in order to safeguard our vital economic interest. It is in tourism, at the moment, that we depend for the quality of life which we will have in the foreseeable future. I have heard no considered statement from this Government either at the level of the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister or the Ministers with responsibility on this subject. No considered statements, in public, to be debated by this House or to be considered by the Members of this House in any way, of Government's views on these matters and proposals.

If Government wants to benefit from the expertise and from the knowledge accumulated on this side of this House in this area it is in duty bound to be transparent and open. That is why I believe that information such as this should not be a secret. Every little man in the private sector throughout the whole Caribbean and beyond has got hold of the report from Every little man from anywhere has got hold of the discussions that went on at the Heads of Governments Conference and elsewhere dealing with the

sale of LIAT. It seems to me that the proper thing to be done is for those matters to be brought to Members of this House, both the Back Bench, Front Bench and the Opposition, who after all are responsible to the people for how we deal with public property and making policies in their long term interest. If this is not done we are side-lining ourselves as politicians.

I warn the Government we have been side-lining ourselves as politicians in the public's mind. I see there is no reason why some of the people who have got hold of this information should have it and, Mr. Speaker, this House has not had the same information made available to it. I am not satisfied in my mind that the proposals at present, as I have enunciated, are in the long-term interest of Barbados.

I am going to ask the Minister, at some stage, he may not want to do it in this debate, but certainly to bring to the House that information that is public so far in relation to the sale of our shares in LIAT so that we will be able to understand what is happening.

I promise the Government, Sir, if the Government believes it is going to be able to sell shares without keeping the House informed I am going to use some of my brain power to draft an amendment to the Financial and Audit Act and introduce it here so that the House will have to debate the sale of these types of shares, if the information is not made available. I will have to do that, Sir.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member pleaded with me that he was not going to get into any debate on Civil Aviation or the matter and I took him on that. I am surely not going to allow any other Member to get into that.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: I am not going to listen to the asides, Sir, because if I listen to the asides the Honourable Member will have me bringing into the House, legislation to deal with that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not worry about the asides. Order, please.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, I am sorry the Honourable Member for St. John did not remain in the House to hear and to have clarified for his benefit the Opposition's position and that he made his speech and immediately departed, but he will have the benefit of reading what was said, Sir, so that he will understand what we are hammering for. We are hammering for transparency

to the extent in which it has been explained in the interest made by this side. 1.55 p.m.

SUSPENSION

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that the sitting be suspended until 3.00 p.m. today.

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

The question that the sitting be suspended until 3.00 p.m. today was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 1.57 p.m.

RESUMPTION Mr.

SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of discussion which has taken place on this Resolution which seeks to approve the lease of an area of land at Grantley Adams International Airport to Seawell Air Services Limited. It is important, Sir, to give some of the facts surrounding the lease which is before this Honourable Chamber. I wish to point out that during the early 1970's the Crown negotiated a lease agreement with an agency known at that time as Aircraft Services International Limited in respect of a parcel of land at Grantley Adams International Airport. The lease was to be for a period of 15 years set from April 1st, 1974 with an option to renew for a further period not exceeding 15 years.

The Honourable Member for St Joseph referred to the fact that Seawell Air Services has, as it were, done some things during the course of this lease arrangement which were contrary to the lease. That is a fact because in 1985 the records show that Aircraft Services Limited formerly Aircraft Services International Limited requested permission to sublet part of the area on the lease. It was indicated then that two buildings had been constructed on the land in question with a considerable portion being undeveloped. It was this undeveloped portion which Aircraft Services Limited wished to sublet to Trident Aviation to erect a hangar incorporating a workshop for the purpose of carrying out repairs to small aircraft.

On September 29, 1987, Aircraft Services Limited became amalgamated with Seawell Aircraft Services Limited. Before amalgamation both companies were wholly owned subsidiaries of the Barbados Shipping and Trading Company. After the merger, the company which remained a subsidiary of the Barbados Shipping and Trading was referred to as Seawell Air Services Limited. It was during 1987, Sir, that Seawell Air Services recognised formally

that they had breathed the contract with the Crown because they had not obtained permission to sublet the two buildings on the land to American Airways, British Airways, Air Canada and Liat. I am pointing out that these buildings were erected somewhere in the early 1980's and they did not seek the Government's permission to sublet and they acknowledged in the 'early 1980's that they had done that.

The fact of the matter is that I agree we have to be a lot more careful in the management of the airport and particularly in terms of the lands which are the property of the Government surrounding that particular Airport. There is obviously need for rationalization in this area because basically the lands outside of the buildings proper are managed and leased by the Ministry of Housing and Lands. Within the Airport when it comes to leases in respect of shops, basically these are let and the leases are negotiated with the Airport management.

Sir, I should point out that the Honourable Member for St. Joseph ought to have known because this is not only public knowledge, but it was stated in here by my predecessor in office on more than one occasion that the Government had commissioned a study of the Airport by a Canadian firm called Seiffer and Mueller. It was stated in here. I can say emphatically that it was stated.

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: The point is, Sir, that the Honourable Member ought to have known that. In the same way that the former Leader of the Opposition when he got up to speak stated very clearly that he was aware of this Study that is being done. But the Government has commissioned a study to look at the Airport and to make recommendations in terms of expansion and a number of other matters to do with making the Airport more efficient in its management and in its delivery of its services.

This Government is committed to ensuring that Grantley Adams International Airport remains the premier airport in the region and, indeed, we will do whatever in our power to make sure that Grantley Adams maintains that particular position.

The Honourable Member for St. Joseph made reference to a number of matters which are in need of attention up there. His source might very well have been the same as my source. I happened to be at the Airport and even before that it was pointed out to me that there were some matters there which are in urgent need of attention. I pointed out sometimes after my visit at a Press Conference which I held that one of the matters which we have to deal with and we recognise is a problem is the leaking roof at the Airport. It is not since 1979 when the Airport was opened that any close attention has

new corporation, all the lands which were vested in ADC have been transferred to that corporation. If one of those corporations has lands vested in it, then it can dispose of or lease such lands without having to come to Parliament. It is only lands which are owned by the Crown and managed by the Ministry of Housing and Lands, when we lease or dispose of such lands we have to come to Parliament. So I think Honourable Members ought to understand that distinction very clearly. The lands over there, where this rum shop that is causing so much discussion is situated, are owned by the ADC.

The further point that has been made about Town Planning permission. I assume that Town Planning would have given permission for the place to be established, because if it had not presumably some notice would have been served on the person and they would have been able to take enforceable action against the person. I was not aware, over the past two years it has not been drawn to my attention that there was an enforcement action contemplated or implemented against the particular individual. What I would say is that if Town Planning has made provision for parking or entry through the other side, then I am saying that the owner should insist that its patrons follow those instructions and not just pull off the road as is being alleged.

I think that one has to understand very clearly, Sir, that contrary to what the Honourable Members might have said, the Government does have plans for the modernisation of the airport to ensure, now that it has been operating for a period of time, there is time to review its operations, and we are looking at that and when the report, which should be handed over towards the end of the year, is done, we will look at the recommendations and see how best we can implement the various points which have been made in those recommendations.

I know that the Honourable Member for Christ Church South has made reference to the expansion for airline counter space within the airport. This is being looked at. One has to recognise that the management of the airport will certainly, within the context of what is available, and the requests which are made, make the necessary arrangements for accommodating the various requests which are made. I believe this is a matter which when it is looked at will be addressed. Sometimes it is a fact that there are periods of congestion both in terms of departures and arrivals and which may very well indicate that we need to either expand or reorganise the Airport in a different way. Hopefully the study will address this particular point. 3.20 p.m.

I am sure that the Deputy Prime Minister when he winds up this debate will certainly make reference to shopping at the Airport and the arrangements which have

been made there but one must point out that airports over the world usually place a lot of emphasis on duty-free shopping. Also you will see that there is a trend now towards developing shopping in the Arrivals halls and we have taken cognisance of this at the Grantley Adams International Airport because I think one has to recognise that Caribbean Airways has an inbound duty-free facility there which we expect will be expanded to give itself more room to operate in time for the forthcoming season. That is an operation which has been successful. Unfortunately, like everything which the Government is successful in the private sector would want to get its hands on it There has been no secret that there have been suggestions and even open attempts to get their hands on that duty-free shopping in the inbound section. I would certainly like to indicate very clearly that we think we should spread these things out among many more people to provide more opportunities for people to participate in these kinds of activities. I will just let that stay there at that point for the time being.

As far as machines in the parking areas not working as alluded to by the Honourable Member for Christ Church West, I believe that in any operation from time to time one would find that machines will break down. They will have problems so that the same thing would happen in this particular instance. Obviously if the breakdown is for a prolonged period then this would be cause for concern. It has not been drawn to my attention. It is true that I have been the Minister for International Transport for a mere month or so but it has not been drawn to my attention of any serious problems with the machines in the parking area. But, like everything else, I would want to say that, maybe since the machines have been there for a long time there is need to have a look at them to see whether they need replacing or not. Those machines are known to function for a very long period of time so we may have to look to see what preventive maintenance programme has been in place and whether spare parts are available and the kinds of things which would normally be associated with the breakdown of such machinery. I would want to give the Honourable Member the assurance that this is another matter which I certainly will be looking at.

' The Honourable Member for Christ Church West made reference to LIAT and the fact that the whole question of LIAT has not been debated in here. I am sure that in the not too distant future the Honourable Member will be given an opportunity to discuss this particular matter. Suffice it to say that at the moment it is at a very delicate stage. I would want to assure the Honourable Member that the Government of Barbados recognises the importance of LIAT to its own tourism and other developments associated with that and will do whatever we can to ensure that LIAT continues afloat. We cannot make any promise about injecting necessarily any money into LIAT but we would like to make sure that whatever

is done would be for the benefit of LIAT and of course, the benefit of the Caribbean.

Those are the basic points, Mr. Speaker, that I would wane to make certainly in response to some of the points which have been made by Honourable Members.

In closing, let me just indicate that the Addendum to the Resolution states very clearly that the lease shall be for a period of 6 years. It is important that one understands this. Normally under these leases we would usually say it is renegotiable, or it can be renegotiated but the agreement which we have with the BS & T and Seawell Air Services suggests very, very clearly, that at the end of the period of 6 years, because 4 years have already gone - these leases are usually for a 10-year period - the lands will revert to the Crown. At the expiration of this 6 years the lands will revert to the Crown. It is not a renewable lease. The rent, however, will be reviewed in 1994 and the lands reverting to the Crown will be for nil consideration. The lessee has accepted this condition in principle. That is an important factor I just want to leave with Honourable Members. The conditions are set out in the Second Schedule which have been read out and Honourable Members are aware of.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, as the person who introduced this Resolution, it falls to me to wind this up. It is not a position I would like to be in at the moment seeing that the Minister mostly concerned with this particular matter has spoken. I am only doing so because of the fact that I have introduced the Resolution and there are certain matters, perhaps, within my knowledge that I can assist this House with because of my long association with that particular subject.

Mr. Speaker, the debate on this matter ranged widely.

Aside.

Hon.-P. M. GREAVES: I am corrected and am told it was far and wide, I believe that most of the matters that have been raised have already been addressed by the Minister responsible for Civil Aviation. But still, Sir, there are some matters I thought had been spoken of which I think I might better be able to speak about.

Now, *the* Honourable Member for St. Joseph was the first person to have raised it followed by the Honourable Member for Christ Church South and that is the question of building within the departure lounge. I want to make this statement that the developments that took place in the departure lounge did not make any space available to the travelling public any less. In fact, it improved the space. It made more seating accommodation available in the departure lounge.

If one could remember, I want to make this point...

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: It was made by the Honourable Member for St Joseph. That was the point made by him that we were impinging on the seating accommodation for passengers who are travelling but that is not the case.

Sir, we have not provided any space for Cave Shepherd & Co. Ltd. or Goddards Enterprises Ltd. They were always in the lounge. The fact is that where they were situated in the lounge that in itself took up a lot of space that could have been made available to the travelling public. What has happened is that shop has now been relocated and not relocated at the expense of the Government. The Honourable Member for Christ Church West is right. He made a reasonably good speech on this matter. It was relocated at the expense of the concessionaires, Goddards Enterprises Ltd. and Cave Shepherd & Co. Ltd.

What is more, Sir, the place where they are now cited is far better, not only does it provide more space but it is more aesthetically pleasing to the eye and everything else. They were not the first persons to have resiled or done any adjustments to their lettings. It was done before that by the Liquor Barrel and the Liquor Barrel at his expense, if one could remember how those liquor shops were sited. To get to the BMC shop one had to go down an alley way. That at the expense of the Liquor Barrel was readjusted so that the Liquor Barrel is now facing on to the Lounge itself where people are sitting and so too the BMC shop, Sir. 3.30 p.m.

Now that brings me on to the question of Columbian Emeralds. Columbian Emeralds do not have a concession at the Airport. Cave Shepherd has the concession, not the Columbian Emeralds. I do not know what is the point raising the issue of Columbian Emeralds when in fact there is knowledge on that side available to Honourable Members that it is a fact that it is Cave Shepherd that has the concession and not Columbian Emeralds. We cannot tell Cave Shepherd what to call their shop or how to sectionalise their shop. They deal with their sections as they think fit and they call their sections as they think fit. They have the concession and therefore the point is that the development that took place in there made the Departure Lounge better, not worse. That, Sir, I believe must be part of the *ad hoc* development that the Honourable Member for Christ Church South spoke about.

Not only was some work done in there that improved that part of the airport* work was also done in the arrivals hall that in no way did any violence to the aesthetics of the arrivals hail in my opinion. What was done in the

arrivals hall was the additional accommodation made available to the Immigration Department, the Customs, as well as the Inbound Duty-Free Shop.

Anyone looking at what has happened in that area saw that ugly looking rails or barriers between Customs examination and the conveyor belts were removed. All of that has improved that area as well. I will have to say I am not so sure if the same improvement applies to where now we are putting the lifts. As a matter of fact we also did some work in the Caribbean Air Lounge section. The Barbados National Bank was up there at one time. The bank was removed and put at the ground floor level and although we have not done any additions yet we have improved that area as well. But the lift, Sir, to me is a problem.

I want to make this point that work on the lift was started before work on the consultancy began and that is the problem. I agree with the Honourable Member for Christ Church South that there is a problem in the airport accommodation for travellers. I am referring to customer checking. The space is now becoming a bit tight but there are problems with expansion. We have looked at it time and time again. To expand eastward of where American Airlines now have their office is a problem. There is a big staircase there leading up to the Met Office, making expansion in that direction very difficult.

As I travel I always look at what is going on in other airports around the world. I have seen some of them that have the check in areas in the middle of the concourse but they are able by underground tunnels, I believe, to take the bags away so that when one checks in, one does not see when any bags are taken away.

I believe, Sir, as the Honourable Member said that one of the terms of reference of the Consultants is to look at finding additional space for those airlines that serve Barbados. I believe, Sir, the time will come when we will have to do this because in fact we have been trying, with moderate success at the moment, but there are signs and signals with greater success in the not too distant future of attracting more and more airlines into Barbados.

As I said just now, we are looking towards more and more airlines coming into Barbados. We are in great competition with other countries within the area and outside of the area. I think Honourable Members are well aware there is a Mission leaving in a couple of days time for South Africa - the 11th October. In the meantime, and before they leave I think I can state here now that some time tomorrow about 7.20 p.m. a brand new South African Airways 747 airline 400 series is touching down here in Barbados with 120 people on board. They have just taken delivery of this aircraft in the United States of America and they are flying this aircraft into Johannesburg or wherever

they may be flying in South Africa and they are going to make an intermediate stop here in Barbados.

They will be here for some time and we hope that we will take advantage of their presence here and as well we will continue those discussions in South Africa the question of perhaps looking at Barbados as a gateway to somewhere into the United States of America because that will be a natural.... They fly past Barbados all the time and this can be a natural point where South African Airlines can touch down on its way to the United States of America. The South African Airlines and the persons on board will be spending 4 hours in Barbados tomorrow evening and should be leaving somewhere around midnight. I thought, Sir, I would titillate the interest of Members on the other side and I think that is a good point on which to end my response to Honourable Members in this particular debate.

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

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: Earlier today we did not take Parliamentary Questions. I was hoping that we would have had them. They were ready but not prepared for this morning at the time when the item was called. I think the House would have no objection in calling that Item now. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South East - The Transport Board financial year deficit for 1993-94. 3.40 p.m.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following question to ask the Minister of Labour, Public Works, Community Development and Sports, Question 79:

- (1) Will the Minister please state the extent of the financial deficit realised by the Transport Board in the financial year 1992/93 and the projected deficit for fiscal year 1993/94?
- (2) Will the Minister please state whether it is Governments policy and intention to subsidise the Transport Board to cover the deficits realised and projected?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same Honourable Member re: the closure of Haggatts depot.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, to ask the Minister of Labour, Public Works, Community Development and Sports, Question No. 80:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that, consequent upon the closure of the Haggatts depot, there has been a drastic deterioration in the public transport service on routes previously serviced from that depot?

- (2) Will the Minister please state what measures Government will put in place to ensure that commuters on routes formerly serviced by buses using the Haggatts depot are provided with a regular and satisfactory public transport service?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same Honourable Member dealing with old age pensioners and welfare recipients.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, to ask the Minister of Labour, Public Works, Community Development and Sports, Question 81:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that old age pensioners and welfare recipients have been experiencing grave difficulties in being accommodated on the public transport system?
- (2) Will the Minister please state what measures his Ministry proposes to introduce to rectify these difficulties, and when those measures will be instituted?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same Honourable Member dealing with" privatisation of the Transport Board.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, to ask the Minister of Labour, Public Works, Community Development and Sports, Question No. 82:

- (1) Is it still the intention of Government to privatise the Transport Board?
- (2) If yes, will the Minister state:
 - (a) the names of the entities which have offered to purchase the assets of the Board,
 - (b) the terms and conditions under which it is proposed to dispose of the assets of the Board, and
 - (c) the measures Government proposes to introduce to ensure that the public will be provided with a satisfactory public transport service both before and after privatisation?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same Honourable Member dealing with flooding at 1st Avenue, East Terrace, Wildey, St. Michael.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, to ask the Minister of Labour, Public Works, Community Development and Sports, Question No. 83:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that 1st Avenue, East Terrace, Wildey, St. Michael is impassable due to flooding whenever heavy rain falls?
- (2) If the answer is yes, will the Minister state how soon appropriate action will be taken to alleviate the problem?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Peter dealing with revenue and withholding tax on interest on savings accounts.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, to ask the Minister of Finance, Question No. 84:

- (1) Will the Minister please state the amount of revenue realised from the imposition of withholding tax on interest on savings accounts?
- (2) Is the Minister aware that the imposition of withholding tax has created hardship for pensioners in general, and particularly those whose income falls below \$20 000 per annum?
- (3) Will the Minister agree to the waiver of withholding tax on interest on savings accounts held by pensioners?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same Honourable Member re: the number of persons and individuals who have sought waivers of duty and tax.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, to ask the Minister of Finance, Question No. 85:

- (1) Will the Minister list the persons and individuals who have sought waivers of duty and tax for any commercial purposes since 1st April, 1992?
- (2) Where tax waivers or concessions have been granted, will the Minister please state the details of such waivers or concessions as have not been gazetted or are not required to be gazetted?

Mr. SPEAKER: End of Parliamentary Questions. Order No. 5.

ORDER NO. 5 - TO MOVE THE PASSING OF A
RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE VESTING
IN THE NATIONAL HOUSING
CORPORATION OF LAND
AT MOUNT POYER,
SAINT LUCY

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, this is a relatively easy Resolution in that there is an area of land in Mount Poycr which has been identified as being

the property of the Government. Because of their location, it was considered that it would be suitable for housing development. As I understand it, it is expected to provide accommodation for 14 lots measuring between 3 800 to 4 200 square feet. The land is part of Springhall Plantation. The layout of the area has been approved by the Chief Town Planner and it is therefore necessary for the National Housing Corporation to sell these lots to have this Resolution to vest this land which measures 5 964 square metres into the National Housing Corporation.

I beg to move, Sir, that the Resolution to vest the area of land at Mount Poyer, St. Lucy in the amount of 5 964 square metres which is part of Springhall Plantation be vested in the National Housing Corporation do now pass.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Michael East.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, this side certainly has no objection to Government acquiring land for housing purposes. This Opposition recognises that housing is in crisis and everything should be done in order to rectify the situation. 3.50 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the Resolution before us will be supported by this side, but I want to make some observations and some points. I hope the Government will understand that they cannot expect the Opposition to come in here and just approve or support Resolutions.

The area of land in question is approximately 1V₂ acres. The Honourable Minister who introduced the Resolution said that some 14 lots, around 3 000 square metres, would be accommodated. There are a number of persons in Barbados who would like to build their own houses. They have applied to the National Housing Corporation to either lease or purchase

Mr. SPEAKER: All dealing with Mount Poyer.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am as relevant as this. The Resolution is quite clear. It is to vest land in the National Housing Corporation which would then enable the National Housing Corporation to sell or dispose of the land for housing purposes.

Mr. Speaker, let me go back a bit. This Honourable Chamber could have been asked to approve a Resolution under the Crown Lands (Vesting and Disposal) Act to do the same thing. The Government chooses to come the route of vesting in the National Housing Corporation so that it could dispose of these lots. The Government feels that that is the easier way. The Ministry of Housing and Lands

could have done the subdivision and sell the lots directly or leased them to the persons. I want to make that quite clear. That is why I said there must be a reason and I must point out something here.

The National Housing Corporation has been given, through the vesting process, a number of pieces of land to be developed for housing purposes. This is another piece, and I must speak on it. Bear with me on this, Mr. Speaker. I have a fear, and I think it is a fear which has come on all of us in here, that the same way we have vested lands in the National Housing Corporation and nothing has been done, I have not heard the Minister say whether there is going to be any guarantee to make sure that National Housing Corporation develop the land and dispose of it as is intended in this Resolution. I have to have that fear. It is a genuine fear. What is the sense of our coming in here time and time again vesting land in the Corporation for housing, when in fact we have seen lands vested in that Corporation yet to be developed? I am saying it is for the purpose of housing.

I am also going to state this, and I am not .going to withdraw this viewpoint, that National Housing Corporation has not demonstrated its willingness and its ability in recent times to develop these lots. If you are going now to do this, I am hoping that the Government has reviewed the building policy of the National Housing Corporation and is serious now of delivering the goods. Otherwise we are going to have the same debate time and time again. The National Housing Corporation is starved for money. We are now giving a starved corporation, a corporation that has not demonstrated its ability to develop lands in Cutting Road or even some of the lands that were vested in it. I would like to know if they have the money to carry out the purpose of this Resolution. You are giving someone something. Assure me that they have funds.

It is not only that, Mr. Speaker. There is a serious point here as well. When you vest in the National Housing Corporation, you are vesting assets, making assets available to the Corporation. Why is it that we have vested in the Corporation and up to this time they are saying that they are not in a position to manage themselves financially? Something has to be wrong. The Government will have to tell me what they have put in place in order to make Housing that entity that can discharge its functions, that is, developing the lots, putting in the services - water, roads and other facilities - so that people will be able to buy. The Minister in introducing this did not tell us how soon, or whether the Corporation has the money to carry out this development.

I am asking those questions. The Government cannot at this time be thinking in terms of any land bank. We used to hear that before. There is a need out there for people to get* land. Do you know why, Sir? Because land is

expensive if you have to go through a private developer or a private agent. It is my hope that the National Housing Corporation is able to develop the kind of funds, because they have not found the funds to do it in other areas that were vested in them. They have not done anything in most cases, and I want to know if the Government intends now to make a subsidy available to the same National Housing Corporation so that it could carry out the development that is proposed in this Resolution.

I want these questions answered. The Government had better listen and hear what is being said. I am not criticising the Government, I am saying this is a serious state of affairs. We are seeing a sorry situation where even where Government has had vested lands, the National Housing Corporation is unable to dispose of them even when they build, and that is in Cane Garden. I am only asking the Government to get those lands sold, get the 50 unfinished houses sold, so that at least a couple million dollars could come in that we could get this project serviced, provide the lots and get them sold. It is not easy. I am not going to go into areas that could be considered....

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, because Cane Garden is not part of this problem.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I am saying it was vested. This area of land at Mount Poyer is Government's land. I do not know what is the reason for coming for use a mere 1V₂ acres of land, 5 900 square metres. What is the magical figure? I am asking, because there are lots of people on the waiting list. Is it not possible to have more than the 14 housing lots in that area or somewhere else? I am going to be asking these questions. We have to be serious. The National Housing Corporation must wake up and understand that there is a need and it has a duty to make sure that it houses the people who are in need.

The Minister did not say what is the proposed selling price. Nobody can tell me that you are providing 14 lots and do not* know what is the intended selling price. The Corporation must know. The Ministry of Housing usually solicits the views of the Land Valuation Department to find out what is the economic selling price of land. I am surprised that the Honourable Member on that side does not understand that. The Government proceeds on that basis. They ask the Chief Valuer to see whether or not the land is worth it, the price you are going to pay for it, the price at which it can be leased and the price at which it can be sold. 4.00 p.m.

I am submitting that the Government already knows because all of these factors should have been taken into consideration before thinking in terms of selling.

Mr. Speaker, it is important. When you are developing, as this Resolution seeks to develop land, there is a cost of development and that cost must be recovered through the sales. The selling price must reflect that. This Opposition wants to be satisfied that the money that is put out in development is realized as a result of the sale otherwise we are into a subsidy. That is the point I am making. All you are saddling the Corporation with is a debt they will have to incur as a result of this so we have to understand.

Aside.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I want to know if it is a social responsibility. Are you going to subsidise? I can understand that but I want to be told and this Chamber needs to be told up-front how you are going to get the subsidy, whether you are going to sell the land because Government has sold some of these lots at subsidised prices. I want to know. It would be useful because the bad experience has been that we come in here and say we vest and we give a selling price and a few months or so later that selling price has been changed by the Corporation. Since this Chamber has some input in this matter I think it is only fair that we be given that assurance that we would not be taken for a ride or something would not be changed significantly so as to embarrass us.

I would hope that from time to time that these things are made quite clear. Let me say this that I am not too happy that the Resolution is being dealt with, and I am not provided once again with a copy of the plan. Mr. Speaker, let me say this to you. It is not fair to the Opposition. I am saying that and I am submitting it. It is not fair to the Opposition. Lucky for me I know the area in question but my colleagues on this side, and certainly other Members on that side, do not know where it is.

Aside.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: It is only 2 of us? What I am saying is that still the plan would show whether or not the land we are talking about...

Aside.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Government understands, and I am going to say this. It is all right for us to vest lands. This is a very serious thing. I am warning the Government. The Government will stand to be criticised always if it does not understand that it is not sufficient to vest lands as in this case but to make sure that the aim and the purpose is fulfilled. I am saying there is only one way of fulfilling it and that is to make funds available to the National Housing Corporation.

All of us know that the National Housing Corporation has repeatedly said that it has no money to carry

out these things, not even to handle what they have. What they have presently they cannot handle because they are saying they have no money. All I am saying and this side is saying, is that to make things meaningful and to get things done it is necessary for the Government to find funds to explore where they can be made available to the Corporation so that the Corporation can carry out this function.

As I said, and I am going to finish by saying that housing is in crisis. There is a crisis in housing. There is a need for housing the people in Barbados and the National Housing Corporation, I am sorry that I could not recommend that rather than have the 14 lots, Government reserve part of the land for terraced housing because there is a great demand by the same Corporation, judging from the 3 000 to 4 000 applications there, that people are in need of rental houses. That is why I said that I want the Government to understand that the service lots should be complementary but at the same time I would hope that Government understands that this in itself does not solve the housing requirements.

The Government must consider building terraced houses to meet the needs of those persons who cannot and will never ever be able to own a house because of the conditions laid down and which exist in this country as far as mortgage and financial institutions are concerned. Let us face that. Not all person in Barbados will be able to own a home. That is why I am saying that whereas you are enabling a certain section of the community to purchase land and get a mortgage, I want you to understand that those persons we must assume will be in a position to qualify for a mortgage. Therefore this Resolution addresses one section of our society, not the most disadvantaged group. The most disadvantaged group is the group that cannot buy or face up to the task of saving money to qualify to get a mortgage. That is what my appeal is. Therefore, I must make the point that this Opposition has no difficulty in supporting this Resolution because it goes a little way to relieve the housing problem.

But, Sir, there are other measures that need to be done. I do sincerely hope that the Government takes my point on this and find by some way of a housing bond or something else to place funds in the National Housing Corporation so that it can develop this area in St. Lucy and do not leave it there like a white elephant. Do not leave it there where you have lots subdivided and people cannot buy them. We have a number of those existing. I hope that the Government takes the advice, because it is offered in good faith. I do hope we will be able to address this whole question of housing in much further detail in another debate.

As I have said, Sir, I thought I would speak to the Resolution without much irrelevance and I do not think

there was much in my contribution because I think there are times that we must say certain things so that the Government understands that it is not a matter of just coming here and rubber stamping any resolution. This Opposition is prepared and I am prepared at all times in making my contributions to offer the Government some advice which I think if it pays heed to, it would go a long way in reducing or alleviating some of the problems that confront this country particularly in housing and I rest my case.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I really would not spend too much time in responding because I think the Honourable Member has made some useful points. I apologise again to the Honourable Member that I did not pass out the plot to him before but I thought it was such a simple matter that the oversight could have been overlooked. But it is really a piece of ridge land which is very rocky and which is ideally suited for building and it was considered that this would be useful to develop into lots.

Very often in making these decisions one has to take into consideration the community in which the development is going to take place. The Honourable Member has made reference to the need for terraced units. I would say that in some areas of Barbados terraced units go down very well. In some other areas people have developed such fierce independence and a feeling of wanting to own their own piece of land that it is not easy to go with the idea of terraced units.

I believe that knowing the parish of St. Lucy better than anybody else in here, that this is one area where there is a very strong desire on the part of people who live there to own their plot of land. Therefore, it is for this reason that the decision was taken rather than constructing terraced units in this particular area to subdivide the land for sale to prospective purchasers. 4.10 p.m.

The Honourable Member wants to be satisfied that the cost of development would be covered by the price of the land. I am in no position to state at this point what the price would be but basically what the National Housing Corporation seeks to do when it develops land is to ensure that it recovers as much of the cost as possible or all of the cost of construction. These would include road developments, the provision of water services and also the provision of electricity services. And then of course the Corporation adds on a certain percentage to cover its own internal expenses. That basically is the way in which they seek to arrive at a price for the land. I have no doubt that this same principle would be applied in this particular instance.

I would like to think that in my capacity as representative for the constituency I would try to impress upon the National Housing Corporation that this be developed as soon as possible so that the land would be made available to the number of people who have expressed an interest in owning a piece of the land in this particular area. With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

ORDER NO. 6 - A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE
COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
THREE HOUSES, ST. PHILIP

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks to acquire 27 129.63 square metres of land at Three Houses, St. Philip, as the Addendum to the Resolution states, for the development of the Three Houses irrigation project. It is necessary for me to give this Honourable Chamber a background to this particular decision which was made by Cabinet.

The Cabinet decided to acquire an area of land at Three Houses in St. Philip for the purpose of developing the Three Houses irrigation project which project would be administered by the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries.

The project is designed to control the use and extraction of the spring waters by those persons whose properties are contiguous to the stream and who are by law - and I will quote the law, The Three Houses Spring Act 1713 - entitled to use of the spring water. That is, those persons who are contiguous to the land are entitled by law to the use of the spring water and this law dates back to the year 1713.

The primary purpose of the project however is to harness the water of the spring, provide storage and filtering facilities and to redistribute it to a much larger number of farmers in the area than those who traditionally have access to it. In effect the project aims to maximise on the use of a valuable resource in an area of low rainfall and to re-establish agricultural production on an intensive scale. The cooling pond situated in the compound of the old Three Houses factory is essential to and forms part of the infrastructural facilities of Three Houses irrigation project.

Some years ago the proprietor of a commercial enterprise purchased the yard area of the old factory for the construction of a manufacturing plant and if my memory serves me right I think this was supposed to be used for the manufacture of batteries. It was intended to use the cooling pond in this manufacturing process. If such had been

permitted the cooling pond would have been involved in the handling and disposal of chemical waste. The operation of the factory would have severely polluted the spring water thereby adversely affecting agricultural activity in the area and this would have rendered the irrigation project impossible.

I believe, Sir, that the decision by the Government ought, hopefully to be commended by those persons who are so very much into the environment and I think with a positive development and a positive decision like this, I would look to see what kind of attention is drawn by the environmentalist who are in this country and who like to highlight things which, in their view, may have some negatives and now we have something which points to something which is of a positive nature, I hope that those persons who write will pay attention to this.

It is therefore in the interest of safeguarding and preserving the agricultural integrity of the area that the decision was taken to acquire this parcel of land. I should point out, Sir, that acquisition proceedings required by law were duly put in place with the publication and execution of notices under sections 3 and 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, Cap. 228, and Parliamentary approval is now being sought for the acquisition of 27 129.63 square metres at Three Houses, St. Philip for the development of the Three Houses irrigation project.

I have every reason to believe that this project is a clear demonstration of the desire of the Government to ensure that there is in this particular area intensive agricultural activity and will point the way for the development of other such projects in areas where water of this nature is available. I am sure the Ministry of Agriculture will be looking into those areas, some of which I am sure exist in other parts of Barbados, to see how this can be done.

I personally would like to see some development taking place where we could have fresh water fish farming being developed in areas such as this. I happen to know, for example that there are some people who are looking into this possibility in an area somewhere in the Springhall area.

All I am saying, Sir, is that I think this is a very positive development and we have ensured that that particular manufacturing process does not take place to harm the water which obviously it was recognised way back in the year 1713 and the farmers in the existing area that is contiguous to the Spring would be able to benefit and I would want therefore to commend this Resolution to this Honourable Chamber.

I beg to move, Sir, that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Opposition is not going to raise any objections to the matter before the House, except that we feel there is a need on the part of the Government to speak more clearly on the overall plan of development for the area which is to be served by this irrigation facility. Having regard to the fact, Mr. Speaker, that one of the most important parcels of land affected by the Three Houses Spring is River Plantation which is over 600 acres which was acquired by Government in 1985/86, and which has tremendous possibilities for development, provided that the right kind of system is brought to bear. 4.20 p.m.

Sir, the Minister who introduced this Resolution spoke without having a clear background as regards the recent history of this project. As far back as 1986 and the Estimates of 1987, this House has been asked year by year to commit public funds to the development of the Three Houses Scheme for irrigation purposes. Year by year, Mr. Speaker, these funds were falling into obeyance. So that if the Minister believes that this matter is intended to give evidence of a clear demonstration of the desire on the part of Government to show its commitment to agricultural development, we say on this side that the Government has more than ample opportunity between 1986 and 1993 to show that it recognizes the potential of the Three Houses area in general. This, is the largest area of flat land in Barbados that has access to a water resource. This area properly developed could be in many respects evolved as one of the food baskets of Barbados. But this Government has dithered on this matter even when you had a Minister of Agriculture serving as the representative of the constituency in which this land is located.

Sir, I know the farmers on this land very well. In fact, I spend some time on some of the farms on this land. They have been anxious since 1987 for the Government to give its commitment for clear resources and force than the Government was prepared to do. It is necessary if the Government is serious at this time for the Government not only to tell us about land acquisition. But the Government must also tell us what are its plans precisely for the development of the area of land owned by the Government that is going to be serviced by the Three Houses Irrigation Project. I say that for this reason, Sir. From time to time we hear statements issued from Government which would seem to indicate that Government is unclear as to the use in which it wants to put River. From time to time we are told in this House that River is, in fact, going to be earmarked for allocation to anybody who wants to come onto the land in order to undertake farming on their own account. Our position is simply this. Just to take up River and parcel it out in a random and *ad hoc* way to a large

number of persons to go on the land is just going to multiply the problem of management at River. Unless you have the commitment of resources to draining River and putting in proper irrigation facilities, Government's investment in the acquisition of River is going to be a wasted investment.

Sir, there is a lot of clarification required by Government on this matter particularly in relation to River. Now that the Government is committed to putting in an irrigation facility to service the entire area effected by the Three Houses spring, is it still the intention of Government to have a large number of people come onto River or is it the Government's intention to maintain River Estate as one contiguous block of land to be supervised by one management under the auspices of the Agricultural Development Corporation.

Sir, I thought that I would intervene in this matter to make these two points, that is (1) this is not new. In fact, it has been knocking around this House since 1987 and this is not the first time we are hearing about Government's commitment to developing Three Houses Spring. Secondly, what is Government's economic plan for the development of the area? Sir, since we are being asked to commit resources for irrigation, what is the overall plan and precisely, Mr. Speaker, what are the plans for that part of the area at Three Houses Spring that is owned by the Government?

I am obliged to you, Sir.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to in a few words support this Resolution before the House. As the Leader of the Opposition quite rightly said, this matter is one that we have given some long and serious thought. But the first thing I want to put right is that the land owned by River is at the end of the stream and, therefore, as a result it would not be entitled to the quantity of water that we think. The reason is that when we did the study we determined that even with a drip irrigation system that the available water can only service properly about 150 acres. The difficulty that we had was that of this 150 acres quite a large size of it belongs to Three Houses holding, because most of the stream goes through the land now presently owned by Thickets which comes under the Three Houses and Golden Grove and River has an entitlement. But under the proportional situation the entitlement of River would be relatively small because it comes at the end of the system. As I said, the 150 acres is the amount that we figured we could justifiably irrigate even by a drip system from the catchment pond. My difficulty at the time, Mr. Speaker, was whether or not putting in resources like that if we could allow places like Thickets and Golden Grove to retain the ownership of those lands or whether or not Government would not look at it as a possible agricultural cooperative because

it is ideally suited for intensive vegetable and fruit farming. This is the area that we would be looking at. Considerable thought was given to approaching Thickets and Golden Grove for the possibility of acquiring or some working arrangement where we can have a cooperative arrangement for the people in the area who wanted to do intensive farming in even 2 acre lots. Because with the availability of water, we determined that even two to four acre lots would be economically viable for farming.

The area that we are now acquiring was the old catchment cooling pond. Therefore, the idea was that at the high flow of the river that the catchment pond would act as a reservoir and during the slow period we would pump from the catchment pond back through a series of controlled PVC piping along the existing river way. We would take off points along that dependent upon the people who own and they would be given an allocation of water that they can take off the system. This is why I was saying that the allocation that was worked out for River at the end of the system would only allow fifteen or 20 acres. At that time we figured that allocation should be used for River for fruit farming.

As you know, River has some very difficult soil in that it becomes very saturated and, therefore, the root system of most crops find it very difficult to operate in those clays at River. As a matter of fact, River has the worst land in Barbados where it is only suitable for canes. Even when you have heavy rain falls like in the area that goes back to Marley Vale, where the Leader of the Opposition knows very well having spent considerable time in that area from a cultivating interest in the constituency, canes are very difficult to grow. We have difficulty even in growing sugar in that area.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to support this Resolution and hope that now that we have gone through the acquisition of the catchment pond we can put in place the second phase of the operation and seriously consider having some type of farmers' cooperative in that area to maximize the use of the lands available for this irrigation scheme.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 4.30 p.m.

ORDER NO. 7 - THE LAND SURVEYORS (VALIDATION) BILL, 1993

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill which, as the Objects and Reasons state, would validate acts purported to have been done by certain persons: purported to have been licensed as Land Surveyors under the Land Surveyors Act.

As I understand it, the Bill seeks to validate surveying activity undertaken by Land Surveyors who are graduates of the University of the West Indies, but whose land surveyor's licence states that they have passed the final examination of the Land Surveyors' Board. Such licences, I have been informed, have been deemed as invalid by the legal authorities who stated further that such Land Surveyors have been performing their functions without being licensed. The Land Surveyors (Validation) Bill, 1993 therefore validates surveying work previously carried out by the graduates in Land Surveying from the University of the West Indies.

The aim of this amendment is to incorporate the degrees of Bachelor of Science in land surveying from the University of the West Indies into the Second Schedule of the Land Surveyors Rules, 1985. Basically, as I said, the purpose of the Bill is to validate those persons who have received degrees after 28th May, 1985 from the University of the West Indies. I think it is set out very clearly in the Bill and I beg to move, Sir, that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, could the Attorney General probably explain to us why a separate Bill instead of the incorporation of these provisions into an amendment of the Land Surveyors Act. It cannot certainly be that the Bill is going to expire immediately and it seems to us that it would have been proper to amend the Land Surveyors Act, Cap. 370 by incorporating the provisions of clause 2(1) into it. It would have had an effect on the Regulations *per se*, if there is a need to amend the Regulations, but it seems to me that we are going to have a Bill hanging around by itself somewhere until the Law Revision Commissioner has incorporated it into the Sections of the Bill. We could have done that by simply dealing with it here in Parliament, I do not know what is the drafting thought behind it.

I support the principle of the Bill. I will say this to the Attorney General, that at the earliest opportunity he should take the opportunity for a new Interpretation Act in order to get around the problem where, if you have not got a licence, or you have not been reregistered, you may find yourself losing your fees for work done because of the use of the word "shall" which under the Interpretation Act imperative rather than directory. In many instances, course it is not intended that people should be penalised that way in a civil matter. Where there is need for legislation dealing with criminal penalties, it is stated in the Act. I am lost, Sir. There must be a legal reason which justifies it but I see no reason why this Bill should do that. I am not suggesting that we should amend the Land Surveyors Act, but I see no reason why this Bill should do that. I am not suggesting that we should amend the Land Surveyors Act, but I see no reason why this Bill should do that.

I support the principle obviously where we are now giving our own degrees at the University. I believe some associate degree is given in land surveying, or some course is done in land surveying, at the Community College. I think we have to recognise these degrees as qualifying people to practise land surveying. I believe there has been an increase in the number of land surveyors now available, although there seems to be still a shortage in the Government Service, but some of the problems of getting Government lots available could now be overcome. They are not completely overcome as yet. I know that the Land Surveyors' Association has been co-operating fully with the Government. On the other hand, we need a certain number of surveyors to deal with the problem of land registration. Not iff this Session, it may be in the last Session of the House, it may well be in this Session - I hope I am not reflecting on the result of anything done - but part of the difficulty we had in delaying the registration of lots in Barbados under the Registration of Lands Act was because we were not getting out the necessary maps and surveying lots and plans in time. Perhaps the Member who shadows the Ministry in this House - because I believe the Minister is now in the Other Place - the former Minister will tell us what progress is being made in having enough Land Surveyors available to complete the necessary plans and surveys to enable us to speed up the registration of land in Barbados. It will in the long run, in my view, make title easier to research and it should reduce the cost of transferring land. I have great difficulty, Mr. Speaker, in this regard where plots of 3 000 and 4 000 square feet of land are costing up to \$7 a square foot in the private sector. When you ask why, the inputs that go into it included of course land surveyors' costs. Frankly, I am one of those who believe that because that size lot is the lot necessary for the lowest paid people in our society, we might have to control the price of land at that level. For a poor man in Barbados \$7 per square foot is murder, as far as I am concerned. Some lots between 3 000 and 5 000 square feet are being sold at \$7.50 per square foot, and in my view that is unfair and I will ask the Minister to look at that. I do not think the surveyors' costs are so high, they may be small in comparison, so something must be wrong, and I would ask the Government carefully to look at that, because it is wrong, wrong, wrong for the price of land to the small man to go at that price when he can least afford that. We want to encourage him to feel as much a part and parcel of this country and having a stake in this country. I am appalled at the price I see prevailing for lots of that size.

Anything to facilitate more people into the profession. I want the profession to make a living and I am not accusing the land surveyors profession of cost causing an increase in the price of land. I do not think so at all. In fact, I found they have been very co-operative and their scale of fees seem to me to be quite reasonable. The lawyers' fees are controlled on certain lots, Sir, and the

surveyors' fees are controlled for conveyancing and that sort of thing. The Minister of Economic Affairs can rest assured that there has been no increase in these fees for years now, so we are not the ones contributing. The surveyors' fees are controlled for conveyancing and that sort of thing and there has been no increase. The Minister of Economic Affairs and the Minister of Finance can rest assured that there have been no increase in these fees for years now so we are not the ones contributing. The Government should look at why, despite no increase in the fees for surveyors and in conveying costs, we have bought small lots. It is only the smaller lots for the smaller man, the man at the bottom, costing so much. 4.40 p.m.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, the Land Surveyors Act, Cap. 370 indicates at section 6:

"Subject to subsections 2 and 3, a person who satisfies the Board that,

- (a) he is of good character;
- (b) he has attained the age of 21 years;
- (c) he has obtained the prescribed qualifications; and
- (d) he has paid the Accountant-General the licensing fee, is entitled to be issued a license by the Minister."

The point I am addressing, Mr. Speaker, is that section which relates to a person obtaining the prescribed qualifications. Now the qualifications are prescribed in the Land Surveyors Rules, Statutory Instrument 1985, No. 111. In those Rules people who held degrees, a Bachelor of Science in Land Surveying at the University of the West Indies, were not persons who held prescribed qualifications included in the subsidiary legislation.

What we have in fact done, Mr. Speaker, in addition to validating the actions of persons who had qualified from the University of the West Indies is to amend the Rules. These are amendments to the Rules. I do not know if these have, in fact, been laid. There are the Land Surveyors Rules of 1993 which have been made by the Minister.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: I said they have been made. I do not know if they have been laid. The Land Surveyors (Amendment) Rules and the Land Surveyors Regulations of 1993...

- *Aside.*

Hon. M. A. KING: They have not been laid? They should be laid. They were made but I do not know if they had been laid.

The Land Surveyors (Amendment) Rules, 1993, Mr. Speaker, amend Rule 3 of the principal Rules which prescribe the qualifications for land surveyors and indicate that any person who possesses any of the qualifications set out in Part I of the Second Schedule, any qualification in land surveying from an institution approved by the Board may be exempted by the Board. The Schedule is amended by inserting in its appropriate alphabetical order the following: "CARICOM countries, a Degree of Bachelor of Science in Land Surveying at the University of the West Indies" and by deleting the words "North-East London Polytechnic" appearing in the third columns thereof opposite the words "United Kingdom" in the first column and the words "Bachelor of Science and Land Surveying Science" in the second column, and substituting the words "University of East London" formerly "North-East London Polytechnic".

What has been done is that in the Land Surveyors (Amendment) Rules the prescribed qualifications have been amended to permit persons who hold a degree in surveying of the University of the West Indies to be regarded as persons holding prescribed qualifications. These were the recommendations, as I understand it, from the Land Surveyors Board. The Rules may be made by the Board and signed by the Chief Land Surveyor, who is Chairman of the Board. It is by this measure that the prescribed qualifications can be adjusted so that all that is really of critical importance from the point of view of the Bill is validating what was invalid, what, on the face of it, was not properly authorised before, so that once you have changed the prescribed qualifications and recognised graduates of the University of the West Indies from there on in, any actions done by them under the Act would be valid. I do not know if I have answered the question.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Christ Church West in his speech made reference to the need for Land Surveyors to speed up the work which has to be done in order to ensure that lots are easily transferable and at reduced costs. He wondered whether or not part of the high cost for land development which presently exists in Barbados that one of the reasons for it could not be surveyors' fees.

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: He has indicated that he is not satisfied that this is not the case but it is something which has bothered me and certainly has bothered also this

Government not only the price of land in the private sector but also the development costs which have to be met by the National Housing Corporation in developing its lots. When one examines this what do you find as some of the major imposts into the cost for development of land? There are costs associated with roads and because of the high standards-which we demand in this country, it is going to be very difficult to have a development where roads are not of a standard size, properly paved and with-, all of the necessary areas for making sure that drainage is properly taken care of. That is the cost which is fairly high. Also, Sir, the cost of putting in electricity in a development runs fairly high. Of course, then there are surveyors' fees and legal fees and also the cost of putting in water.

This matter, I know, has caught the attention of Government and some time ago, because a number of developers have been complaining about the high costs which they encounter in the installation of water and which costs have to be met up-front. There are a number of developers who have indicated that they would, because up to sometime ago, even cutting the pipe tracks had to be done by the Barbados Water Authority. Some time ago the Government took a decision that a developer could dig his own track which, hopefully, would have reduced some of the costs. I would personally like to see a time come when not only would that be permitted but also when the developer would not only be able to dig his pipe track but also make his connections which would assist in reducing the cost of the development.

Maybe while I am at it, we should begin to consider looking at the possibility of using materials other than the cast iron or the kind of material which we use for conveying water into developments because one has to be aware of the very important advances in technology which have been able to produce plastics of very high quality which are long lasting and, certainly the cost of which is much less than the cost of the iron pipes which are used at present. Maybe it is something we ought to look at if we are talking about the cost of developing lots.

I just thought that I would make reference to that indicating to the Honourable Member for Christ Church West that it is not the surveyors fees which result in the high cost of land in developments but these are other costs which are associated which I ought to bring to Honourable Members' attention. 4.50 p.m.

With those remarks, Sir, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

COMMITTEE

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 -were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. E. E. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. M. A. KING, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to His Honour, Mr. SPEAKER, the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. E. E. GREAVES seconded by Hon. M. A. KING the Bill was read a third time and passed and cited as the Land Surveyors (Validation) Act 1993.

SUSPENSION

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, that concludes the business of the Government for this day. As indicated to yourself and as indicated, Sir, to the Members on the other side through the Leader of the Opposition I move the suspension of this sitting until 2.00 p.m. tomorrow, Wednesday.

The question that the sitting be suspended until 2.00 p.m. tomorrow was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 5.00 p.m.

RESUMPTION Mr. DEPUTY

SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

ORDER NO. 8 - THE PUBLIC SERVICE SUSPENSION OF INCREMENTS BILL

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as you are aware discussions have been held with interested parties on the matter of a prices and incomes policy and as a result of those discussions and as a result of understandings arrived at, such a policy was placed before this Honourable Chamber. The Chamber deliberated on the proposals and adopted or passed the Resolution relating to that prices and incomes policy.

It will be recalled too, Sir, that the Public Service - Reduction of Emoluments Act 1991-13 which provided for the suspension of the payment of increments and suspension of the surmounting of qualification bars expired on the 30th September 1993.

Sir, in order to ensure the orderly administration of emoluments in the Public Service discussions have been taking place on the most appropriate way to continue remuneration to public officers consonant with the health of the public finances. Some 4 meetings, chaired by the Deputy Prime Minister have been held with the Coalition of Trade Unions and Associations in an effort to reach some agreement on the issue of increments.

The payment of increments is not presently tied to efficiency or merit. They are paid on an annual basis to those persons who are entitled to them, except in cases where the payment is suspended, withheld or deferred as a penalty following disciplinary charges. Lack of efficiency, unsatisfactory service or conduct may also lead to suspension, withholding or deferment of the increment. In either of these cases it is the Public Service Commission which has to be consulted and must advise on the appropriate action to be taken.

Looking back, Sir, at the history of these increments I recall that in 1969 payment of increments was extended from the normal annual increments by adding an arrangement by which payment was made for the possession of qualifications over the normal entry requirements and therefore this led, for example, in the clerical scale to a maximum of 9 increments being paid for possession of "O" and "A" level subjects - 5 increments for "O" Level and 4 increments for "A" Levels. That is how it is broken down. In posts where possession of a degree is required for appointment a person is paid 2 increments above the minimum for the possession of an honours degree.

Some years later, Sir, in 1974 I believe, a system of bonus increments was introduced and this provided for a payment of a maximum of 2 increments within the appropriate scale for possession of qualifications over and above those required for appointment but the qualifications must be relevant to the duties being performed in the post.

Sir, I give this brief background so that Members would be aware of some of the contingent considerations which have to be taken into account in seeking to determine this matter which is of very great importance both to public officers as well as to the public finances.

The cost of restoring increments is estimated to be \$7 million for an entire year. There are approximately 22 645 Government employees which includes 7 468 employees of the Statutory Boards. The current wage bill for the general service is estimated at \$397.4 million.

The computerised pay sheets show that 5 580 public officers receive annual increments an additional 678 temporary persons, not on the computerised pay sheets

also receive annual increments so there is therefore a total of 6 258 persons who are eligible for annual increments.

Sir, the size of annual increments range from \$504 to \$1 256, that is the range. That will give an average of \$930 per annum per person and when we take that across the number of persons eligible for the increments it would give an approximate cost of \$5 819 940. 2.15 p.m.

To this figure, it should be added \$1.6 million representing the amount that would be payable by the statutory bodies, resulting therefore in the figure that I gave earlier of an overall approximate figure of \$7 419 940.

I said, Sir, that we have had discussions with the Coalition on this matter and in the discussions the Coalition was asked to agree to the suspension of increments for a further year with effect from October 1, 1993. The request was based on the state of the Government's finances at this time which cannot bear the restoration of increments together with some \$36 million that is being paid during the year as the restoration of the 8 per cent pay cut. What has happened, Sir, is that we have undertaken during this year to restore the 8 per cent pay cut which cost approximately \$36 million. That is what we have been doing, Sir. In accordance with our examination of the public finances for this year and our projections into part of next year, it would be an undue burden to add the \$7.4 million onto the pay packet in addition to the \$36 million that we are paying as restored 8 per cent salary cut.

The position is that a counter-proposal was made that the increments were due and owing with effect from October 1, 1993, that there was a willingness to postpone payment during the period October 1, 1993 to September 30, 1994 and that the payment of the increments would begin again on October 1, 1994 and, in addition, that the arrears for the period of October 1, 1993 to September 30, 1994 would be paid from a date after October 1994 to be negotiated.

Sir, the Public Service Reduction of Emoluments Act, 1991(13), as I have said, expired on September 30, 1993. It is, therefore, necessary for us to put in place other arrangements if the payment of increments is to be suspended for a further year. That is what we are proposing to do, Sir, namely that some arrangements be paid in relation to the increments, but I will spell out precisely what we are proposing to do.

Sir, the proposed legislation is the Public Service Suspension of Increments Bill, 1993 and that Bill provides for:

"(a) the suspension of officer's entitlement to proceed beyond qualification bars during the

period 1st October, 1993 to 30th September, 1994,

- (b) the suspension for the payment of increments during 1st October, 1993 to 30th September, 1994,
- (c) the pensions and other retiring allowances of officers to be calculated on emoluments including the suspended increments that would but for the Bill have been payable to the officers, and
- (d) the compensating of officers who are affected by the suspension by granting to them a period of leave from duty of no less in value than the value of the increment that would but for the Bill have been payable."

In other words, it is time that is being offered in place of the monetary arrangements.

Aside

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDEFORD: Sir, computation based on the proposal at paragraph 90 shows that officers would be eligible for additional leave ranging from .56 of a day, Sir, to 1.54 days. That is on a strict compensation basis of time for money. This is the conclusion that we have come to. We are not operating on the basis of a .56 of a day, Sir. I was just being arithmetical. Instead of using those fractional arrangements, Sir, what is being proposed is that there would be an across the board award of 3 days to each officer entitled to the increment. 2.25 p.m.

These three days refer to the period 1st October, 1993 to 30th September, 1994.

Sir, the proposals that we are making are very basic. The Government during this financial year cannot and has not made provision for the restoration of the increments. We have made provision for the restoration of the 8% pay cut and that, as I indicated, comes to some \$36 million. The state of the public finances requires that we continue to keep a tight rein on those finances, but in recognition of the requirement to compensate for the loss of increments we are providing three days to each person so that the requirement to compensate would be met by that particular provision.

This is a simple provision, Sir. This is a national requirement. It is necessary to do this and we expect that by next year we would be in a position to resume the payment of increments so that we will therefore work towards that to strengthen our public finances over the period and to make the necessary provisions.

Sir, the Bill is a very short one. I have given the background to the matter, I have given the numbers involved and I have given the reason. Let me put it this way again. This is a requirement for the prudent management of our public finances and this is the road that we are proposing to go, and with those words I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to second that, Sir, and reserve my right to speak.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I very much wish that I could have agreed with the Right Honourable Prime Minister that this was a simple matter. It seems to me that for the Government to add to the burdens of the public sector workers by unilaterally altering their contracts of employment is a very serious matter.

Aside.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Yes. In my note, which I was very careful to take, you did say it was a simple matter and you had been careful to give the background to it.

I was making the point, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that for the Government to add to the enormous burdens of the public sector workers, and they have had to carry a disproportionate share of the burden of stabilisation in this country, by now unilaterally breaching their terms and conditions of employment once again by further depriving them of their annual increments is a very serious matter indeed. It is serious in terms of the impact on the workers' pockets; it is serious in terms of the example that you are setting or not setting in the country in industrial relations. It is serious because in the entire exercise the workers' representatives seem to be silent. I cannot allow the occasion to pass without observing that they are absent from today's proceedings, conspicuously absent, that they were only partially present on the occasion of the reduction of severance payments benefits in the country; and that they have been totally absent when several serious measures affecting the workers of this country have been debated in this Parliament over the last two or three years. So that I cannot agree with the Right Honourable Prime Minister that it is a simple matter.

I think it also raises questions about the credibility of the Government. Can we believe the Government when the Government is saying that the stabilisation package has been a success, that the fiscal imbalance has been largely corrected and that we are now poised for take off, that the fiscal imbalance has been reduced to a very comfortable proportion of the GDP. In fact, I think the projection by one or two of their spokesmen was for a surplus on Current Account.

If indeed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it turns out that that hopeful picture that was painted of the economy was false, was misleading, was premature, I think the Government has a responsibility to tell the country that the Government's finances are in serious trouble, more so than they have led the country to believe a few months ago, and that in that respect they need to give us all the details.

For the Prime Minister, as he does on some occasions, to boast that he is managing a billion dollar economy, and then to claim that he cannot find \$7 million, when upwards of 40% of the \$7 million will be returned to the Government either by way of income tax or National Insurance payments is unbelievable in addition to that, the money has not got to be found in one fell swoop, because increments become due and payable on the anniversary of public servants' appointments, so that you have to spread the money over a year. The same Government that could a few weeks ago come here to this House and seek approval of \$1.2 million for an Institute of Democracy, the same Government that could be spending half a million dollars to watch a partially built structure in St. Thomas, where already half the material and also the equipment has been removed, but we are spending half million dollars to watch it, and in several other respects is spending money freely, cannot fulfil its contractual obligations to the public sector workers which in my calculation will equal no more than about \$4.2 million for the year. 2.35 p.m.

You are talking about a class of persons, public sector employees, who have had to bear the brunt of the stabilisation. Over 3 000 of them have lost their work in the public sector. I think of the many hundreds at the National Conservation Commission, the Transport Board, the Ministry of Public Works, to mention but a few of Government's establishments.

These are the same workers who did not benefit from the regrading exercise. These are persons who fall within Z.I-38. They are not members of the super scale. They are the same people who did not benefit from the regrading exercise and in the last 7 years have got perhaps no more than an increase of \$74 across the board. Now, in the face of all of that, they are the ones who suffered like everyone else the 8% suspension and deprivation of salaries under the 1991 Public Servants Reduction Emoluments Act and, no one told them or led them to believe that the increments which were suspended from September, 1991 until September ending 1993 would not have been restored in October, 1993.

In fact, I have it on good authority that the matter was raised during the discussion on the Protocol by the workers' representatives and in the second draft it was included. The first draft was torn up as worthless. The second draft included it and the Government said that

they were under pressure from the international agencies, they were trapped for time, they would take it out and the matter would be discussed as a separate matter. But none of that was made clear to the workers because a clear pattern is emerging that the workers' representatives are in cahoots with the Government and are selling out the workers. That pattern is clearly emerging in this country over the last 2 years.

It is a very serious situation where the workers are being deceived by the Government and betrayed and sold out by their representatives. The Government may feel very proud of the fact that they are able to manoeuvre the workers' representatives but, in the end, they will do incalculable damage to the trade union movement in this country. At the end of this session they will meet, that is Government members, and exchange a brandy, and congratulate themselves on another hoodwinking. That may be all good for them but, at the end of the day, they will help to destroy the trade union movement in this country.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Now, the Honourable Member has said that the workers allowed themselves to be deceived by the Government. I did not rise on that occasion because I figured that was borderline. Then he comes now and talks about Government hoodwinking the workers. My submission, Sir, is that is not in order for the Honourable Member to use those terms.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is not an accurate recall of what I was saying. I was making the point that the workers' representatives have been selling out the workers but Government has been deceiving the workers.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No. That is not the point that the Deputy Prime Minister is rising on. He is rising on the point that you said some time or the other the workers' representatives will meet with persons I believe from Government, share a brandy, and something about hoodwinking.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: No, No. The Government share the brandy with themselves and congratulate one another for having hoodwinked the workers yet again. That was the point I was making.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will go along with the...

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: You want "hoodwinking" withdrawn?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, Sir. I should be grateful if it be withdrawn.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I am happy to.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: My allegations remain.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Put it a different way.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: No, No. That particular point need not even be repeated.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: The main point is on record that the Government has been deceiving the workers and that the workers' representatives have been betraying and selling out the workers. That is the point.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise again. The Honourable Member is saying that the Government has been deceiving the workers. The motive is imputed on the Government and the Government is, in fact, the Cabinet. The imputation is that we are deceiving people. That is the imputation. It is my submission that the Honourable Member is out of order. We are not deceiving anybody.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I continue. It is very difficult for thinking Barbadians to accept that non-affordability could be an issue in the Government breaching its contractual obligations to its workers by not paying them the emoluments to which they are entitled. It is difficult to accept that when the Government is at the same time boasting that the stabilisation measures of recent years have been successful, that the fiscal imbalance has been corrected and that the country is now poised to take off. The Prime Minister was able to boast that notwithstanding the fears of some people that the, 8% would not have been restored, that the Government was in a position to honour its word that come the ending of March they would have been able and they did restore the 8%. Now to say that the Government cannot find, spread over a year, no more than \$4.2 million for the increments makes no sense.

Aside.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Call it \$5 million. It is still spread over a year. It does not fall due in any one fell swoop. It is very difficult to accept. If, indeed, the Government is correct, if they are speaking to us honestly and accurately about the Government's finances, it means that their earlier statements were premature, perhaps, were misleading and were certainly inaccurate; for it is impossible to accept that in the context of a billion dollar economy, in the context of being able to find \$1.2 million for an institute of democracy and a half million dollars for watching purposes at the St. Thomas unbuilt school and so on, that the Government cannot find \$4 million to \$5 million to pay the workers.

Aside.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: The Honourable Member who is speaking in *sotto voce* remarks here - I do not think he appreciates what is happening.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the price. I think that we are being penny wise and pound foolish. The Government is destroying the morale of the Public Service and the public servants have already reacted. We have been reading recently of the epidemic. It is more than a rash. It is an epidemic of sick certificates. We know for a fact that several civil servants refuse to answer the telephone after 2.00 o'clock and they make it clear that they are working out the deprived 8%, although it has been restored. What will happen now in relation to the further suspension of the increments? What we will lose in productivity is so much that we would have been much wiser to have given the civil servants their increments and realise an improvement in the efficiency and an enhancement of productivity. 2.45 p.m.

As it stands we are forcing them to work to rule. We are forcing them to go slower than they are already going. We are forcing them to be less productive than they are. We are forcing them to lose faith in Government and in the employer at a time when the national situation calls for an improved and an increased effort on the part of all of us. But if the manner in which the Government has presented itself at the meeting with the trade union representatives, if that was an accurate representation of their position, they ought to tell the country that the real reason why we are here today has little or nothing to do with affordability. Rather than the international agencies that may be seen in part to be blackmailing the country, are raising bogey other than devaluation this time. You will recall and this was in Circular No. 9 of 1991.

When the Government sent out that circular to the civil servants they said that the International Monetary Fund was insisting that there had to be a significant cutback of Government's expenditure, something like \$170 million, within a short period in order to get the deficit to be something like 1% of GDP. They were then calling upon the public servants to appreciate the notions of service involved in the whole concept of public servant and insisting that if they did not cooperate with respect to the 8% we would be faced with devaluation.

I knew then, and I said it openly, that it was a false equation and that it was nothing more than scaremongering, even though a much larger sum of money was involved. I believe it was something like \$40 million that was involved. They cannot invoke the devaluation bogey in relation to the increments because the sum involved is very small ~ minuscule. What the Government has told the

workers representatives at the meetings is that the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the IADB are saying in effect that you are going to ruin Barbados' relationship with the international lending agencies and that the structural adjustment loan will be in very serious danger.

Now, we have been hearing that story for a long time. Every Estimates for the last 3 years the Prime Minister has come here and told us that a structural adjustment loan was imminent. For 3 years we heard it was imminent and it was to inject new financial life into the productive sectors - agriculture, tourism and industry. For 3 years we have waited in vain and we have got no structural adjustment loan and, every time the international agencies want to have their way in this country, when they do not insist that it will be devaluation they now tell you that the structural adjustment loan is in danger and your whole relationship with the international agencies will be in danger too.

I think it is time that the Prime Minister and the Democratic Labour Party Government take the people into their confidence and speak to the people with candour with respect to these issues because no self-respecting Barbadian can take with composure the fact that they have voted and put into office a Government of men, no women, who seem incapable of managing their affairs except that they have been dictated to fully by the international agencies. It is a blow to our pride which every Barbadian feels that on the slightest issue the Government cannot do what they consider best for the people of Barbados but they must follow the dictation of the international lending agencies.

I have addressed this matter before. I have called upon the Prime Minister publicly to take the people into his confidence because I believe that if these issues were put before the people in terms of the pressure that they are attempting to put on the people, the people would soon have reacted in their letters to the Editors, in the call-in programmes and in other ways that the representatives of the International Agencies in our midst would have been able to report that the Government could go no further given the nature of the Barbadian democracy. It is just not on. The Government must be allowed some leeway in this or other particular matter.

It is because the Government is not taking the people into its confidence that the Government cannot get the help of the people and the international lending agencies cannot hear the voice of the Barbadian people protesting and resisting against these encroachments on their freedom and their right to direct their own affairs. So that for \$4 million we have got to come to this House and the suffering public sector workers that have been deprived of their 8% for 2 years and have had their increment frozen for 2 years must now be further deprived of their increments.

Mr. Deputy speaker, the ground given by the Government for not paying the increment, is not a genuine one and nothing that we have been told about the performance and the condition of the economy justifies the Government not being able to meet its contractual obligations to the workers in terms of giving them the increments to which they are entitled when they fall due.

While on this point we have no particular evidence that even when the Government goes along yet again with the International agencies that they will get the structural adjustment loan. There is no clear and convincing evidence that even a further concession on our part here now, a further bowing and genuflecting, will help us to get the structural adjustment loan.

Long term financing is available in the private international markets of the world and this is the best time to approach them because interest rates are down and the projection is that they will be down for many years to come. I do not believe that our standing is such that we cannot approach the international financial agencies and borrow money to refurbish our tourism plant, to inject into our agricultural sector and into our industrial sector. But the Government cannot begin to think of these alternatives until it puts the people into its confidence and let the people help to strengthen and embolden them in the direction they need to take in the interest of the country.

A lot of partially trained and immature people from Latin America and many other parts of the world populate the middle and the senior reaches of these international agencies and come to these countries and want to dictate to Prime Ministers and Ministers of Government, Central Bank Governors and so on what they should be doing according to a model which the United States of America itself does not follow. We need to take our pride seriously and begin to stand up to these encroachments and determine what is best for our country. We have gone in directions that have lamed the pride of all of us and hurt the standard of living of the people of this country over the last 3 years simply because the Democratic Labour Party administration will not stand up and represent Barbados. 2.55 p.m.

Now I have looked very carefully at the Protocol with respect to the Incomes Policy, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I would have very much have liked the representatives of the workers to be present here today. As I look at page 5, Section 3(a), there will be a general freeze on increases on basic wages and salaries in both the public and private sectors provided however that this shall not be made to apply in areas where wages are deemed by the social partners to be substandard.

3(b) says: The freeze on increases on wages and salaries will apply to all remuneration under contract of

employment for any kind of work to be performed wholly or substantially within Barbados, provided that where increases are the result of job evaluation exercises or negotiated job enhancement exercises they shall be valid.

So 3(b) applies to all forms of work and excludes the categories that did not embrace incremental increases.

3(c) says that the freeze will extend to all pay including wages and salaries at all organizational levels, allowances, payment in kind, fringe benefits and lump sums. It will also apply to all types of employment as well as both full-time and part-time work.

3(e) says that increases in wages and salaries during the life of this agreement will be made only in terms of profit sharing arrangements or productivity bonuses based on assessment of productivity or improvement in productivity.

The point that I am making, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is this. It does appear as though the workers' representatives have actually agreed with the Government in the course of negotiating the Protocol to exclude the increment. Although it has not been specifically mentioned by agreeing to no increase in all forms of wages and salaries and in the exception not insisting on getting in cases of incremental increases due to public sector workers in accordance with the terms and conditions of their contract, by not getting that into the exception, it seems to me that weeks ago the workers' interests had been sold out. So that what we are doing today may be no more than a charade and all of the negotiations recently with the union representatives might have been an exercise in futility. When you read this with an eye of a lawyer, the incremental increases are already excluded in this Protocol. That is why it is important among other reasons that the workers' representatives should have been here today. I can think of nothing that could have been so important to be responsible for the absence of all the workers' representatives here today. It would appear to me that this matter had already been determined and settled ever since the Protocol was agreed upon and signed with the Government and that the meetings we have been hearing about that took place up until 10 o'clock today were all a charade and an exercise in futility.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Deputy Prime Minister from his seat was heard to support the Prime Minister and to make the comment of the figure of \$7 million a year. I really insist that they have some responsibility to explain to us how they arrived at that. Because even though that is the gross figure which we are prepared to concede, when you take out what goes back to National Insurance and also to the tax man, we are left with a figure of no more than \$4.2 million stretched out over a year.

Aside.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I am hearing a concession in a way, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that at least MS has to be taken out. But taxation is to be taken out too. We are saying that the figure of seven million dollars is misleading and that it is important that we get the accurate figure.

Sir, that brings me to another point. In the course of the negotiations, in fact, the earlier figure disclosed by the Government was \$3.4 million. It was earlier said that the incremental bill would have been about \$3.4 million. That figure was in the public domain.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It is not correct to say that I conducted negotiations with the coalition. All four meetings with the trade unions I was in the House. It is not correct to say that at anytime did I say or any of us on the Government's side say that the figure was \$3.4 million. We always stated that the figure was around \$7 million.

Aside.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I think it is unfortunate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that no attempt was made to correct what was carried repeatedly in the public organs of information and attributed to the Government. Now it is understandable that some stories can be ignored where they are not attributable to the Government. But when a source is attributable to the Government as saying that the amount will be \$3.4 million when it is going to be \$7 million, I think that the Government in those circumstances has a duty to intervene and say that figure is inaccurate. It is more like \$7 million than \$3.4 million. The real truth as I understand it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that the Government has conceded that it has no way of working with accuracy what precisely is the incremental bill from year to year. That stands on the same footing as the disclosure made by the Government a few years ago in this Parliament that there is no inventory of the persons in the public sector with degrees and the type of degrees they have or the range of skills available to the Government as an employer. It is unbelievable that in 1993 with the technology available to gather information, store it and retrieve it that the Government does not have an inventory of the skills available in the Public Service, 3.05 p.m.

I am not surprised that the Government itself may not be aware of precisely how much the bill is when you take away the tax and the National Insurance deductions. That is not surprising, because the clear story given to those who are negotiating, as I understand it, is that the Government itself could not be precise with respect to the incremental bill.

I am concerned about what this is doing to the people's faith in the Government, the issue of credibility.

While we on this side were warning the people that the sacrifices of the last two years might well have been in vain and that that light which they were talking about at the end of the tunnel may very well have been a fading light, the Government was saying the stabilisation measures have been successful and we have corrected the fiscal imbalances. We have done so well we may even have a surplus on Current Account and we are now poised for take off once again. We are in a position to boost capital spending and to have some capital works projects. All of that was the rhetoric with which we were fed in this House of Assembly and outside in recent months, and now to tell the workers, those who have borne a disproportionately heavy brunt over the last three years, that they cannot get their incremental increases is devastating indeed.

It is also a fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that in this very difficult time the workers have not been consulted by their representatives on this particular matter. There has been no meeting held by the leaders of the NUPW with their members, or by the leaders of the Barbados Workers' Union with their members, or any of the unions with their members, and that is a very serious thing indeed.

I have heard the same strictures made in relation to some of the Unions in relation to the incomes policy, but I have not heard of a single union in relation to this whole question of the further suspension of the increments that has taken its members into its confidence and said "let us have a meeting and arrive at a position and let us tell you what the Government has been saying to us." That is a very serious blow to trade unionists' faith in their unions. It is a very wrong-sided and wrong-headed approach to trade union leadership. There is bound to be a fall out in the country in relation to it. I am concerned about the cynicism that is likely to follow from all of this, that people will lose faith not only in their unions but also in their leaders, because whatever might have been told to the workers' representatives by the Government, the workers as a whole were never told by the Government in recent months, "the 8% will be restored but we want to serve you early warning that we cannot restore the increments, and the reason is so and so, and the evidence in support of our non-affordability is to be found in the following figures," The case was never put that way. In fact, the case that was put to the unions is that the international agencies will not allow the Government to give any signal that they are breaching the wages freeze and the incomes policy, and that the international agencies regard the restoration of the increments as a signal that the wages freeze and the incomes policy is being breached. That is the real reason. They said, therefore, that if you were to go along in that direction you may very well ruin your relationship with us and we cannot be sure that the structural adjustment loan which continues to be under discussion will be forthcoming. That is how the case has been put to the Government by the international agencies, and that is

how it has been put by the Government to the workers' representatives.

I am disappointed that we in Parliament should be getting a different story which, when we examine the evidence, is obviously false. I am equally disappointed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the workers have been so supine, so lethargic in relation to these matters that are adversely affecting them. I am happy over the fact that we in the Barbados Labour Party remain the lone voice speaking out in their behalf. They have suffered grievous blows at the hands of the Democratic Labour Party Government. Most of the gains of the workers in the last 25 years in this country are being eroded under this administration, and the tragedy is that all of us in Parliament are called upon to participate in the 'erosion exercises from Tuesday to Tuesday. A whole stream of anti-worker measures have come before this Parliament. We could start with the cut in severance payment. It reached its high point perhaps with the 8% and we are continuing in the same train here today. A cut in unemployment benefits, making the workers pay for their own severance, contrary to the ILO provisions, a whole series of anti-worker measures, and the tragedy is that we are members at this time and that even though we resist and protest we may somehow be seen and are seen as part of the process.

This has been a savage assault on the workers and the gains of the workers in the last three years by this Parliament and by this Government, and we are continuing that today, and the workers' leaders and representatives who have been elected to Parliament are absent and there is not a voice to be heard on that side on behalf of the workers. Not even the trade unionist who has been elevated to the Cabinet. Not a voice to be heard on behalf of the workers.

Aside.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: The expression being used is "submerge to the top", Mr. Deputy Speaker. 3.15 p.m. .

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are several aspects of this matter which my colleagues might want to develop as they make their contributions. But we on this side have a duty to speak up on behalf of the workers. We are the only voice left now in the country on behalf of the workers. I know the Honourable Member for St. Philip South would like to be included in our camp in that respect but he would need to do a lot of things and do them soon if he wants to be included in that otherwise he too, by continuing to be on that side, will be seen as one of the champions of the anti-workers' voice.

Aside.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I do not think there is any need to beg, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The circumstances do not support begging. There is no need to beg. Just a bit of friendly advice. I have been around too long.

I make the point, Mr. Deputy Speaker, however, that there are several points to be made, many of which will be elaborated upon and made anew by the Honourable Members on this side. But for now I wish to record as vigorously as I can the resistance of the Barbados Labour Party to this measure introduced in this Parliament today by the Democratic Labour Party Government. We regard it as a betrayal, an act of perfidy. We regard it as a sell-out on the part of the workers' representatives. We are proud to be able to raise our voice aloud on behalf of the workers in this matter. I fear that the sacrifices of the last 3 years have been in vain in that there will be more anti-worker measures to come once the Democratic Labour Party Administration continues in office.

Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I want it to be known from the outset that I am deeply opposed to this Bill. The suspension of increments to public workers for a year or for any period of time is a wage cut by another name. Do not let us beat about the bush. There are a lot of people out there who are not civil servants who may not even understand what the term "suspension of increments" means and they need to understand just as the public workers to their cost understand today that it is a wage cut by another name.

The question has been asked in here by the Honourable Member who just took his seat, the Honourable Member for St. Joseph, and I pose it in my own way. I want to know by what sophistry, that is my word - that is the word I would use, Sir, - does the Government legislate 8% out of the hands of the workers, say to them earlier this year in March that they were restoring the money, proceed in the following month April to tax it back out of their hands and now in October of the year come to this House to take yet another cut out of the wage bill?

We have just heard the Honourable Member for St. Joseph talk about a steady stream of anti-worker legislation and anti-worker measures which have been coming before this House and which have been visited on the workers of this country. A lot of that has eaten into their pay packet. It can only be described, and I am trying to use parliamentary language, as a prevarication for the Government to appear in April to give back the 8% and now in October want to take it away yet again.

The question has to be asked and I am going to ask it because it has to be laboured in here today. Where are the unions in all of this? There are 5 trade unionists in Parliament, 4 here and one in the Other Place. It is sad that as I speak to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that none of the 4 trade unionists is now in his seat. One I am told is

in Pakistan. The Government knew they were bringing this measure down, brought us in here yesterday after a recess, begged us to wait over to today. There was ample time for him to get back here but he is one who likes trips. He is to be bought with trips. Some people are bought with \$40, \$35...

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: But if anything is unparliamentary, Sir, and out of order that has to be and I am urging you, Sir, to have it struck from the record.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am certain that the Honourable Member will seek to withdraw that entire sentence.

Miss B. A. MILLER: I was mis-stating the case. He is not worth that kind of money.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central is not in his seat. The Honourable Member for St. Lucy is not in his seat. I want it to go on the record. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is not in his seat. The Honourable Member for St. Michael Central is not in his seat. These are the generals, the colonels and the lieutenants of the trade union movement. These are people who make up the hierarchy of the National Union of Public Workers and the Barbados Workers' Union, in particular.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not believe that it is any massive coincidence that caused this Chamber now to be deprived of the presence and voice of the 4 trade unionists on the day when this Bill, designed to take yet more money out of the workers' pocket, comes before us. But I have said it before and I say it again. The unions in this country do not care about the workers. They do not care about the workers who are not subscribing and paying dues to them and even some of the ones who are still paying dues to the trade unions in Barbados are questioning the priorities of the hierarchy of the unions. We know, of course, that they do not give a fig about the unemployed. Thirty-five thousand people in Barbados are unemployed today. One in every 3 Barbadians is unemployed and we do not hear the unions about that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, we hear every day about the severe damage that is being done to the national psyche, to our national fabric, to the national image and to our national self-esteem. Barbados is becoming a nation of beggars and not because people do not want to work. It is not everybody who wants to turn to crime.

A constituent of mine came to me a day last week, a young man. He had done everything that Barbadian society had asked of him. He had gone to school and learned well. He had learned a trade. He is a refrigeration technician. He went out and got himself a job. He got himself a wife. He

has 2 children, a small family. Through no fault of his own he finds himself laid off. He came to me in deep desperation because my first question was, what have you done to ameliorate your situation? He was very cleanly and tidily dressed and he was wearing heavy, black work boots, a young man who could not understand how everything that the school, the Church and society had promised him could come to nought, so young in his own life.

This young man, Mr. Deputy Speaker, could tell me how he had gone from work place to work place. In some instances he had sought to persuade employers that it was cheaper to employ him full-time than to wait for equipment and machinery to break down then to call in, perhaps, one of the big firms to be told "but we have consultants on a retained basis." 3.25 p.m.

He has tried to make employment for himself but the particular skill that he has does not make that an easy thing to do. This man is desperate. He lives in Government housing and that is what brought him to me. He is now in danger of being evicted for non-payment of rent. He confided to me also that his wife is hurt and she is angry and she is quarreling and putting ultimatums to him. I had to explain to him that it is very difficult when mothers cannot feed children not to lash out at who is the next nearest person and he is the next nearest person. Somebody has to be a scapegoat and he is the scapegoat.

This young man finds, Mr. Deputy Speaker, during the best years of his life, during his prime, that there is nothing for him. The most productive years of his life and he is being thwarted and frustrated on every side by a Government, a Democratic Labour Party Government, which fooled him that there would be a job there for him. He did not hide his mouth. He said, Miss Miller, I voted for them in 1991. He told me he went to the Minister of Housing, could not find him. They lied to the people. They deceived and they betrayed.

The Honourable Member for St. Joseph is right to use those words. Thirty-five thousand Barbadians can't be wrong. And 35 000 Barbadians are saying today that the Government lied to them in 1991. They told them that a vote for the DLP was a vote for a job. We heard all about a bountiful Barbados and how wonderful things were.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I have to tell you that it is my personal experience that there is hunger in Barbados today. There is hunger in Barbados today that I had never thought I would live to see in my life time in the 1990s. Children cannot go to school on a daily basis in this country in 1993 because parents cannot afford lunch. And you know it is so too because it is so in your constituency. Every Member in here knows it. The same way people are trekking to me out of the city I

know they are trekking to other Honourable Members from their constituency.

During the month of September just gone, do you know how many people have come to people on both sides in here? I have heard the talk down stairs and in the lobby. Nobody can deny that constituents have come. They have to outfit children for school. New shoes. The boy or the girl has outgrown shoes. They can't be half-soleed anymore. They have outgrown uniforms. They must have clothes. You cannot send children to school without clothes. You cannot send them to school in an old dress so that they are not in uniform. Either the teacher is not going to allow them in there or if they are allowed in there it makes them stand out among their peers and become the subject of ridicule. You and I know all of these things. I am not talking anything that is strange or different. We knew this of a time in the past. Maybe in your age grouping, Sir, you may only have heard of it but you did not think you would come to see it pass in your time.

The thing with the man who came to me was that he could not feed his children and that he was going to be put out of the house because he could not pay the rent and every day he treads the street looking for a job. He is now what you call a desperate man. Anything could happen. Do you know what is a great tragedy, Sir? No union in Barbados cares about this. I keep making the point over and over again. This is 1993. Traditionally the things that the Unions shed blood and sweat for in the 1930s and the 1940s, the 1950s and even the 1960s in Barbados have come to pass. Thanks in large measure to the Barbados Labour Party workers got decent working conditions, they got holidays with pay, they got reasonable wages. All those gains of the 1960s and the 1970s are now being eroded through the indolence and the lack of foresight of the workers unions in Barbados.

The truth is, Sir, that in the 1990s, not only in Barbados, in other countries too, the Trade Union Movement really has to re-invent itself because there is still a very important job it has to do out there for workers and I am not talking about things now like worker participation. Unions have always in Barbados given only lip service to that because they have only seen it as the thin end of the wedge that they would be literally working themselves out of a job if they really and truly promoted workers interest in worker participation so they are not interested in that. They give it lip service because it sounds a certain way. But the unions have to get into the new technology. The unions have to begin to understand about how to manage human resources in a way that they never have before. They have to get honed management skills. Now this is a great opportunity for the unions to facilitate the redefinition of the very word worker as we approach the twenty-first century.

The worker in 1955 in Barbados is not the same kind of worker in 1993. Not in the agricultural industry, not in tourism, not in any of the productive sectors. That worker is a different creature and in the 1990s largely on account of the new technological input and new directions the work place is taking on a different look. The work place is taking on different imperatives and the union needs to get into this. All those old fashioned techniques of the 1960s and the 1950s cannot apply today. That is what the union needs to be getting busy with. Do you know what we are hearing? We are hearing that somebody wants to run as an independent.

How long is it going to take for them to learn a lesson? The Barbados Labour Party walked the length and breadth of this country begging people to understand that it was not in the interest of the workers for their representatives to be one and the same person as trade unionists, that a man cannot wear two hats at the same time or serve 2 masters at one and the same time.

The General Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union has found that situation to be so too and has become so uncomfortable in it that he now finds himself, I can't say occupying a chair because he is hardly ever here. That needs to be known in the public domain as well. He finds himself removed from the Government Benches only fulfilling the prophesy that he is hardly ever to be found sitting down here in no man's land because sitting down here behind us is no place at all. And now has the gall, with unemployment running in excess of 30% in this country, with a Bill like this coming before the House, not only to be absent but to be putting it abroad that he will run in the next elections as an independent. Independent what, Sir? 3.35 p.m.

Independent what, Sir? The people in this country would not even have Frank Walcott as an independent. We thought that we had seen the last of trade unionists in Parliament way back in the 1970's. Today, as I said earlier, we have four in here. Do you know what this is, Sir? It is the last desperate heart-stopping cry of workers for recognition and thinking that if we do this at least we will get noticed. But betrayed, betrayed! The interests are incompatible. They are mutually exclusive.

What has happened with the unions in this country now is that they neither represent the interest of the Government nor the workers. The unionists are marching to the Government drum and the workers are marching to the IMF drum. That is what is happening in this country. They are crying out that they are losing membership. They deserve to lose membership. Is he coming back in here as an independent? I do not think so, not if the people have anything to do with it. The unions have taken the workers' dues and bought big houses for headquarters, big cars to drive about in and pay themselves big salaries. Do

you know what the workers get? They get the downs. The hierarchy gets the ups and the workers get the downs. The workers get the small houses. They do not have one penny in the bank for a strike fund if it had to come to that. Nothing! There is nothing that the workers can point and say that this is what the unions have done for us in these last years.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, we have come to a sorry pass in Barbados when the majority of the workers after 52 years; the Barbados Workers Union was 52 years old last Sunday; it is really a terrible indictment that on a day like today that they have all absented themselves and we are not hearing a word said on behalf of the workers. What about the workers used to be the cry when I was a student. I did my share of marching too. What about the workers? Well, what about them? The truth is this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this is not the end of it. This suspension of increments for public servants is not the end of it. I went back and read the debates from September and October 1991. We were told at that time that the 8 per cent wage cut was going to cure the situation and put the economy back on an even footing, that we should bear the pain and sacrifice, that it would be restored after 18 months and that it was necessary to avoid devaluation. All of that is there.

Now we are hearing that all is still not well and the state of the economy is still not well and that the public servants have to endure this suspension of increments. I have to ask like those who spoke before me and I am sure some of those who will speak after me since we have not heard him -yet. I do not know what he will have to say because the Prime Minister introduced this Bill. Can he really expect us to believe that for the sake of \$7 million when this Government has already in less than 6 months come back to this Chamber for a whopping supplementary provision of \$56 million and a significant chunk of that is for Ministerial travel?

Aside.

Miss B. A. MILLER: Yes, we know that the vote is busted again and I am coming to that, Mr. Deputy Speaker. When I look back at my speech, I saw that in October 1991 exactly two years ago when we were debating the 8 per cent that they had to hurry it up and get it through Parliament by a particular day so that the front bench could go globe trotting. I hear, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that after today we are going to go into another recess. I want that explained to me and to Barbadians. I want to hear again now. We just had a recess. We are being paid to come in here and do the people's work. There is nothing on the Order Paper. Nothing is happening in the Cabinet.

Certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for the City were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.

Miss B. A. MILLER: Well, maybe I included too many people. Do not forget, Sir, that I have a Resolution in here calling for the resignation of one. I am willing to put down in a Resolution in respect to others. Any of you who want to get up and...

Aside.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member cannot bring in a big rush and talk about others like that, Sir. I submit that the Honourable Member is out of order.

Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir...

Certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for the City were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.

Miss B. A. MILLER: What cannot be expunged from the record is my Resolution.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, deal with that when the time comes. Thank you. Proceed. You have about three more minutes. Ignore the asides. Order.

Aside.

Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir...

Aside.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member must proceed in silence. 3.45 p.m.

Certain remarks made by Miss B. A. MILLER were ordered by Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER to be expunged from the record at this stage.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Your time has expired but I will give you an extra 2 minutes for the interruptions.

* Miss B. A. MILLER: Thank you, Sir. What I am saying is that there is no one from the trade union movement who will get up and speak on the workers' behalf.

Aside.

Miss B. A. MILLER: And it needs to go on being said. A lot more people are going to say it in here today. We sit down in here day after day and watch workers' rights and entitlements being whittled away. Do you expect that we are not going to labour the point? Mr. Deputy Speaker, it would be better if the trade unionists

would have the courage to walk out of this Chamber, give up their seats and not fight for the pension. That was something to be said of Frank Walcott. He was not fighting for a pension for himself, this Honourable Chamber in the end had to give him - to paraphrase Milton - footless in Gaza, a pension.

Certain remarks made by Miss B. A. MILLER were ordered by Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER to be expunged from the record at this stage.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member wind up now then, please?

Miss B. A. MILLER: Yes, Sir, to say in a sentence that the very proof Of what I have just said is the fact...

Certain remarks made by Miss B. A. MILLER were ordered by Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER to be expunged from the record at this stage.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member's time has expired.

Asides,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Order, please. Let the Honourable Member for St. Thomas be heard in silence. I have not yet looked into the Rule Book, so let me not have cause to do so.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: After all these years, Sir, you have not looked into the Rule Book?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I mean today, to impose the ruling.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to begin first by offering my congratulations to the Honourable Member for St. Joseph who delivered an excellent speech in here today. He covered most of the ground.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The Honourable Member for St. Michael West has obviously not heard how the Honourable Member for the City spelt his surname, otherwise he would not be talking so freely.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it occurs to me that the country is not listening closely to the Prime Minister. On 29th August this year at the Democratic Labour Party's annual conference the Prime Minister boasted of a number of achievements within the last year. 3.55 p.m.

Included in that list of achievements was a balanced budget for the financial year April 1, 1992 to March 31, 1993, a rise in the net international reserves.\$189.3 million at the end of June, this year, a few months ago, Sir. For the first 6 months of 1993 reduction in the decline of real output to 1.6% compared with a fall of 5.6% in 1992 and after 3 consecutive years of decline the balance of payments registered an overall surplus, 1992/93 of \$75.3 million. He said that all of that was very "heartening". During the course of the said speech he also called on Barbadians to work extremely hard to bring our country around by putting our hands to the plough.

When he dealt with the Prices and Incomes Policy, he warned that we in Barbados have two choices in this respect, "either we introduce a prices and incomes policy to help reduce cost of exports or we go the route of currency devaluation to achieve the same result. It is as simple as that."

The third quotation which I wish to take from his speech is where he said in relation to the structural adjustment programme that "I also said that the World Bank had adopted the position that it was not prepared to give Barbados its support in this respect if we were not prepared to enter into a new standby arrangement with the IMF which would mean another series of painful measures or alternatively, that we devalue the Barbados dollar." Those are the words of the Prime Minister.

What he has done today is to have introduced a measure which is clearly painful, particularly for public workers, but he has omitted to issue the threat of devaluation if this Bill does not pass. Nowhere in his speech to his annual conference, and I have searched it carefully, did the Prime Minister advise the country, or as the Honourable Member for St. Joseph said, take the country into his confidence, that as recently as 6 weeks ago, his Government was contemplating denying the reasonable and legitimate expectations of the public officers of this country to a little pittance by way of incremental awards every year. Therefore, it seems to me that the first issue that is evoked by this Bill today is whether the Government is not playing fast and loose with the people of Barbados and in particular the public workers.

Clearly, on September 1, or August 29, the Prime Minister ought to have known the fiscal position of Barbados to such an extent that we could have been prepared for this kind of behaviour today or misbehavior. But, he has eschewed for the last 6 or 7 years since he has been Prime Minister disclosing to the country in a package what is the state of the country, what are the measures needed in total to redress any imbalances or disequilibrium that there may be in the economy and what he is doing is, in fact, using an incremental method himself to work hardship on the people of Barbados and he is feeding you the little "poison" a little bit at a time.

Now, it cannot be argued that during the budgetary process this year when the Prime Minister promised the restoration of the 8% that he must have known then that the increments were tied up with the 8%. I will tell why because the Reduction of Emoluments Bill, 1991, contained provisions related to the 8% and related to increments and everybody thought, all of the public workers in Barbados assumed that when they got their 8% back, if they got it back they would also get back their increments. What has he done? I accused him in here once of sleight of mind, not sleight of hand, and I accuse him again. What he has done is tried to be clever-clever with the public of Barbados.

I want him to know now that his days as Prime Minister are numbered, according to the democratic process. He will never again sit in that seat as Prime Minister of Barbados after the next election. I say that, Sir. Going from Sunday night in Speightstown he will be holding some lashes...

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The Honourable Member for St. John may be Prime Minister in the year 2025.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The thousands we had in Independence Square,. Sir, we will multiply them by 3 in Speightstown. But I am serious, Sir.

The biggest issue confronting the Democratic Labour Party is not so much the credibility of the individual members on the front bench, but the credibility of the Prime Minister. That is the biggest issue confronting the Democratic Labour Party and nobody on this side has brought that lack of credit on him. He has done it himself. I am not going back as to what happened in 1990 before the last elections. I am dealing with what happened since.

Now, Sir, the public workers of this country in 1982, like the whole country, were asked to bear the pain of the Barbados Labour Party's Government involvement with the IMF and the economic recession that plagued the world at that time and still we were able to give all the public workers in Barbados, and across the board, an increase of \$108 a month.

This Government, which really is a minority Government, because when the votes of the two Opposition parties are added the last election, they are, in fact, a minority Government- but they are the Government of Barbados. This Government has paraded on the local scene, the regional stage and the international arena as the great defender of the working class, the great promoter of working class interest and since 1991 what has happened,

Sir? They have asked the public servants of this country, first of all, to take a cut in salary from 10 right down to ultimately 8%. They have then asked them to agree to a freeze where they do not get any increase of salary for another 2 years and in the middle of all that they are asking them now to take 3 days for each officer who is entitled to an increment. 4.05 p.m.

I will tell you what they robbed him out of, Sir. That where people were looking forward to money in their pockets by way of increment the Government is saying take 3 days. I want to see which public servant will go to J.B Supermarket or the one at the bottom of Worthing and tell the Managers down there, Edwards or Bynoe, I am a public servant, I was expecting an increment. I got three days leave let me pay you for these goods with 3 days leave. That is what they have done, the whole Front Bench that agreed to bring this in here today. That in effect is what they are saying.

Now, the ignorance of it is that in the same speech at the DLP Auditorium the Prime Minister called on the workers of Barbados to be more productive. How can they be more productive and they are now willing to say, take 3 days. Five thousand, five hundred and eighty plus the 678 temporaries they are all to be asked to take 3 days.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I want Honourable Members to know that this is not a question that you must take 3 days and go home and do an intellectual exercise. That is what I understand the Honourable Minister of Foreign Affairs to be saying. Sir, that really is making fun at serious matters and making fun of the people of this country. Sir, the wickedness of this measure is that it has come at a time when the Government is giving the world the impression that the economy, and Government's fiscal position has stabilised and yet Government is so poor-rakey that they cannot find about \$5 million.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: If it is not a word, Sir, I have now coined it and it will find its way.

This Government is now behaving to the workers of Barbados as though they are so impecunious that they cannot find \$5 million to pay public workers over a period of time.

I am not going to rehash what the Honourable Member for St. Joseph said, except to say that in relation to St. Thomas it is a disgrace that that school which was in the course of being built to attract votes in 1990 to 1991 is now, even though work has stopped, incurring continuing liabilities to the tune of about \$400 000 a year.

Now, Sir, how can the Government explain to the public of Barbados that they are prepared to throw \$400 000 down the drain of a half-built secondary school and at the same time human beings who could benefit from that money, who have need of that money, are being denied. The priorities of Government must surely be wrong. They are now prepared to submerge the problems associated with animate objects and elevate the inanimate objects to positions of eminence where those inanimate objects should be the recipients of the largesse of the Government from the Treasury. It is unfair.

The public workers of Barbados have been the ones principally who have borne the stress and the strain brought about by Government's policies in the last 2Y₂ years. It really is not fair because the private sector has only been asked recently to join in this exercise of sacrifice but it is really the public workers who have had to carry this strain and the time is going to come when somebody will have to ask if constitutionally it is not discriminatory as against the public workers.

I am not getting into a legal argument in here today. I am not offering advice, looking for briefs, nothing so. With this constant pressure directed against one section of workers surely the time will come when somebody will have to look at it from the angle of public law and ask if what is being done to the public workers is not discriminatory as between them and other workers.

I think it is unfair. The Prime Minister's attitude is, I will cut, I will deny increments and I will send home and he has sent home 4 000 or 5 000. There is a certain callousness about the attitude of this Government that bodes ill for the continuation of democracy as we know it in Barbados. There will come a time, if this foolishness does not stop when the people will rise up or will be forced to rise up as they did in October 1991. They are being pushed again because there is no leadership in Government. There is no leadership from the Ministry of Finance. I do not include the Honourable Member for St. John in this. He is new to the business, Sir. You have to give him a learning period. He is a neophyte, Sir. He needs time to learn and digest so I do not include him in that. He was in community development and things like that. Leave him there. Their principal architect has been the Prime Minister. The principal architect of all the foolishness and all of the pain has been the Prime Minister. He would not even come in here and let me point my finger at him. I am pointing at an empty chair, but he can hear outside.

When the workers of Barbados should have found solace in their leadership they have been denied the quality of leadership to which they had become accustomed over the years since 1939 when trade unionism started in Barbados. I think it is a shocking disgrace. I have used that word three times in this speech because I can't find another

word that more aptly describes what the Government is doing today in this Bill other than behaving a very disgraceful way in relation to rights of workers. 4.15 p.m.

But the leadership of the trade union when in 1987 and it made the headlines in both newspapers, I urged that the workers should give grave consideration no longer to make their contributions to the unions. Two members of this House who are members of the Barbados Workers Union challenged me down in the yard under a tree and asked me to reconsider what I had said and for sometime I relented in the sense that I did not make any further statements. But I am convinced that in the intervening years that what I said was right then and I will no longer resile from irresponsibility of conscience that now dictates that we must let the public of Barbados know clearly that their best interests are not being promoted by the leaders of the trade unions. They are being asked to take three days instead of getting pay. Look what they are getting. They are forced to get \$42.00 a month in some cases and at the top \$113.00 a month and they are being asked to forgo that. I am going to advise them once again to withdraw their contributions from the unions. I do not want to hear anybody tell me that I should not really say that because the union was borne out of the bosom of the Barbados Labour Party. The union was borne out of the bosom of the Barbados Labour Party and it has behaved like a wayward child in the last 6 years and it must be flogged and chastised. I want that clearly understood. I am no longer going to be sentimental in appealing to notions of this attachment because Grantley Adams formed the Labour Party and the trade union movement. What he did served a time well. He would not recognise the Barbados Workers Union now if he came back. Sol make no bones about it, Sir, that I have never been against trade unions as members in here have heard, both the member for St. Michael Central and the member for Christ Church East Central compliment me on my stance when I was chairman of various corporations in this country, but enough is enough. If a worker's organisation is not acting in the best interest of the worker, then that organisation must be told frankly and bluntly, and I want to make my position clear. I am not speaking for anybody else. This is my position in regard to the unions. The time has come when we must say to the workers - break with them. They have let you down. The Honourable Member for St. Joseph said "sell out". He has characterized their conduct as sell out and that is perhaps the best way that it can be characterized.

What was shocking about this whole exercise, Sir, is that last week, I suspect it was Wednesday or possibly Tuesday, I read a statement attributed to the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central in which he said that he had had meetings with the Deputy Prime Minister on this very business of the increment. Those meetings had been inconclusive. They had not reached any agreement.

The Deputy Prime Minister had promised to get back to him by the end of last week. That statement was attributed to the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central. One was left to believe that they were negotiating but Friday night the messenger of Parliament, while we assumed they were negotiating, was delivering this Bill at my house for debate in here.

Sir, this is a serious matter. The leader of the coalition is saying to the public that they had not concluded negotiations. He was waiting for the Deputy Prime Minister to get back to him and while he was virtually waiting for the Deputy Prime Minister to get back to him, for we can only assume that further negotiations were continuing, the Government as an act of bad faith - I say it with justification - was sending to Honourable Members a Bill which was overriding any consideration of negotiation. Now that cannot be right, Sir. All of them who will write things in the Press about the human rights record of Barbados, well this is something for the book. This is something that we must look at. What can you expect for rights can a Government have when it is negotiating with somebody, presumably leading them to believe that legislation will not be introduced and when they leave the country and go away to Pakistan, Istanbul or wherever, then the Government at the same time is sending through legislation which says that do not care what we have been talking about that we are going to vote because we have the numbers. Civil servants will not get the pittance by way of increment from this October to next year September.

Sir, that cannot be right. That is not the quality of behaviour we should expect from a Government and the secretary of whose party speaks of the Prime Minister as being the elder statesman in the Caribbean. That is why I said very early in my speech that the Government is playing fast and loose with the public of Barbados and the time is fast approaching when the people will rise up and say that they have had enough.

The Honourable Prime Minister is cribbing that* Government's fiscal position will not allow the disbursement of \$7.4 million. I am not using big words like "non-affordability". I am speaking to the man on the street who must understand what I am saying in his own language. Government cannot find \$7.4 million to pay these increments for the next year. That is what he is saying. On August 29th at the Annual Conference he said in addition and I quote: "Provisional figures for the current financial year down to August 24th - (Do you see how up to date he was? Five days before the Annual Conference). - indicate that we have achieved a small surplus of about \$7.8 million which will help to step up our capital works programme and put more people in jobs." I am not going to deal with that now because he talked a lot of rubbish about Sherbourne and all of these things. Do you know what? He did not tell them that he came in here just before

we went on reteess for \$14 million to throw into Sherbourne - \$14 million dollars to throw away at Sherbourne to host a big conference here next year. Now the Democratic Labour Party has from time to time accused the Barbados Labour Party of having wrong priorities and not having a human face to development. Somebody went and ran his mouth off and invited all of these people from all over the world here next year without knowing whether •we could properly host it. 4.25 p.m.

It reminds me of the day in here in 1987 when the same Prime Minister promised that Sherbourne would be built and would be ready in time for the CPA Conference in 1989. It is not finished yet. He said so in here. I believe in Brazil when he delivered the ode he invited, as they say, every and severy, whosoever will may come, "come to Barbados in 1993, we have a place called Sherbourne just above my house, come we can lime up there." It is not ready yet, it will not be properly ready either when the big set of people come here next year. Now, look, \$14 million for that...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member should wind up.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Wind up already, Sir?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Just let me finish, Sir. It will cost \$14 million to host all these people in Barbados and 6 000 public workers are denied a little increment of \$7.8 million, out of which there would be a recall by way of taxation into the Treasury and this Government cannot find \$5 million spread over the year.

Now, Sir, I have always heard that charity begins at home. It is really sad and depressing that the attitude of the Democratic Labour Party Government, and in particular the Prime Minister and Minister of Economic Affairs, should have treated his own Barbadians in this way, to ask them yet again to take an unreasonable burden and bear an unreasonable strain while he makes preparations to parade with a whole set of people from the international community next year in a half done building above his house in Two Mile Hill.

Mr. R. C. EASTMOND: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to intervene in this debate, especially because on this occasion the Chair is governed by a different type of administration from that which normally prevails. I am very happy to address you on the matter which is before this Honourable House, first of all to indicate in no uncertain terms that in my subjective but respectful judgment this measure before the House was brought with the utmost bad faith.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Honourable Member has said that the Government has brought this matter in the utmost bad faith. What could be worse than that? I submit that that statement should be struck from the record.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I quite agree with the objection. I am certain the Honourable Member will rephrase the statement and withdraw that remark.

Mr. R. C. EASTMOND: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as far as I understand it, negotiations between the Coalition...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do I take it that the remark has been withdrawn?

Mr. R. C. EASTMOND: If you so rule, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I want however to lay the foundation for what...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have not ruled, I am asking you to withdraw the remark based on the objection of the Honourable Member.

Mr. R. C. EASTMOND: I withdraw it, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr. R. C. EASTMOND: Mr. Deputy Speaker, so far as I understand it, only today persons aligned with the Coalition of Trade Unions and Staff Associations were indicating that on this very day they were supposed to meet with Government to discuss this issue which has been brought before this Honourable House today in circumstances where such negotiations were not completed, were not brought to fruition, where the Trade Unions and Staff Associations were not allowed to put their case, and I am saying that in terms of the timing...

Aside.

Hon.-D. J. H. THOMPSON rose.

Mr. R. C. EASTMOND:... and I will not be distracted, Sir, by any insinuations which the Honourable Member for St. John, who is not given to talk anything else, and I am sure my colleagues on this side will not permit the Honourable Member for St. John to interrupt proceedings when he has nothing to offer. I will argue, Sir, that my colleagues will join me immediately in walking out if the...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER rose.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John is on a point of order.

Certain remarks made by Mr. R. C. EASTMOND were ordered by Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER to be expunged from the record at this stage.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have risen on a point of order merely to indicate to the Honourable Member that he is misleading the House. The Government met today with the Coalition of Trade Unions and Staff Associations and no agreement was reached, but we put our final respective positions on the matter. He indicated that we did not meet and that we did this in bad faith. I am saying that those things are grossly misleading and dishonest in the sense that the House is being misled by him. None of those things are true.

Mr. R. C. EASTMOND: Mr. Deputy Speaker...

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member for St. John made his point in order, but in my submission in making that point of order he has accused the Honourable Member for St. James North of making statements that were dishonest.

Certain remarks made by Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON were ordered by Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER to be expunged from the record at this stage.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. James North will proceed, in peace.

Mr. R. C. EASTMOND: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if one were to examine closely the purpose and contents of the Bill before this Honourable House, the first thing that is transparent is what is the effect of this Bill if passed into law. The reason why I am asking what is the effect of this Bill is because if Government is permitted to go on with its policy of suspending increments to public workers, then clearly the principal interpretation that can be put on such suspension is that Government is so doing to save revenue and to protect the integrity of the Treasury. But if Government is passing a measure before this Honourable House where the idea is to postpone or to curtail Government spending, then one must ask why the need for such curtailment especially when at the end of August 1993 the Honourable Minister for Finance at that time and Prime Minister of Barbados was saying that based on his projections Barbados was recording \$7.8 million surplus revenue over expenditure. Let us subject that, Sir, to the analytical microscope. 4.35 p.m.

Sir, if our monies which are in the Treasury are projected to realise \$7.8 million more in revenue than expenditure, then clearly, the interpretation we can reach is that expenses have so been held back that revenue is now ahead and that the situation has become one where far from a deficit position Government is in surplus. If we are

here today in early October, a few days after August, we must ask ourselves to what extent can we really trust the projected surplus which Government had prided itself on and enunciated at the end of August, 1993. That is why I am joining with the Honourable Member for St. Joseph, the Honourable Member for the City of Bridgetown, and the Honourable Member for St. Thomas who just spoke, to register my protest against such a measure.

The reason why I am registering my protest against such a measure would be as follows. As far back as 1991, . prior to 22 January, 1991, Barbadians were told "you never had it so good." Barbadians were assured that the integrity of the national Treasury was intact, that the Treasury was under no attack whatsoever and that all was well. But it was the very 1991 where we saw 3 measures before this House, where we had the annual budget followed by a mini-budget and then close . to September 1991 supplementary proposals which were requiring public servants, above all other categories in Barbados, to bear a sacrifice, to undertake a detriment which no other sector had been called upon to bear.

In the opening remarks, Sir, when I suggested that I was weary of Government's timing and the purport of what I was saying in respect of what the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central and the Honourable Member for St. John had tried to suggest, was that in a situation where the party that now heads the Government has prided itself on a close nexus between itself and trade unions, we are left to wonder to what extent is this relationship- between the trade union movement and the current governing party being compromised because in a situation where Government, even though meeting with them, and even though having discussions with them, can rush to Parliament in advance of a definite agreement because do not mind what Honourable Members out there would say, if there was one true thing the Honourable Member for St. John said, he is not often given to brilliance, not often given to accuracy but if there is one true thing he said is that the negotiations....

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: That behaviour in here cannot be acceptable. How can somebody get up and say that somebody is not given to accuracy. What are we coming to? The statement has to be withdrawn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: All that has to be mellowed and somewhat dealt with in a different way. If you are objecting to what he is saying...

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am objecting and asking for that statement to be withdrawn and struck from the record.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: First of all you should withdraw what you said about him.

Hon. D. J. Ef. THOMPSON: Oh yes. I am sorry, Sir. I will withdraw that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Now I will ask him to do the same.

Mr. R. C. EASTMOND: I stand indicted of breaking the Rules of this Honourable House. I withdraw. But at the same time the point I want to make is that the Honourable Member for St. John himself...

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I withdrew the statement I made and the Honourable Member must not feel that he is smart inside. He must withdraw the statement that he made and he has not yet done that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The statement that...

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am not often given to accuracy. That is the statement that I am objecting to. He must withdraw it. * '

Mr. R. C. EASTMOND: On what do you want me to withdraw what I have said.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am having a little difficulty with the request of the Honourable Member.

Mr. R. C. EASTMOND: However, Sir, I was merely adverting, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to a fair comment made by the Honourable Member for St. John who said that there was indeed a meeting today between industrial relations interest and Government but that the meeting was not brought to a happy conclusion. He said words to that effect and I crave your indulgence, Sir, to explain to him that the language in which he so expressed it was language acceptable to this Honourable House and acceptable to me but it was language purveying the truth for he said that no definite agreement was reached between Government and these industrial relations interests.

Now, if you have a situation where his side, the Democratic Labour Party, the only party to which he has ever been exposed, the only party in which he has been a member, the only party, perhaps, that he will ever be a member of, if his side has so prided itself in being a close social partner of these trade unions and staff associations, and if initially they were negotiating at arm's length, a term familiar to the Honourable Member for St. Michael West who is a learned man, perhaps more learned than the Honourable Member for St. John, but if those two parties were indeed negotiating at arms' length, if each party had taken the other into its confidence, we would then be asking naturally if they were indeed coming to a position where they were *ad idem* why was there this indecent haste in -bringing this measure before this Honourable

House today? Why could they not have waited? Why could Government not have waited until actual agreement had been reached between itself and the trade unions before seeking to impose this measure on the industrial relation bodies in this country? That is what I meant when I was saying that at the outset I had surmised that there might have been an act of bad faith on the part of the Government. That is all I meant and the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, a learned and honourable man, understands and possibly agrees as he nods and bows, not overtaken by any quality of speech I am making, but overtaken clearly by conscience.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if we were to examine what had been occurring in Barbados prior to 1991, we would have been accustomed to a scenario in which Government, even though principal employer, was always prepared to listen to various sectors represented by various social partners in this country. I am afraid that some external agency is responsible for fracturing an otherwise good relationship between the Government and the social partners and by social partners in this particular scenario I mean the trade union movement.

I am saying that some external agency, namely the International Monetary Fund and related bodies, would have been responsible for an element of dictation because it is not unknown to Honourable Members on this side that the IMF was always unhappy that the 8% would be restored. The Government, obviously for political reasons, would have realised the potential to its side for not restoring it, and in that the Government went on against the urgings and dictation of the IMF and gave back the 8%. The IMF is now saying, having conceded that to you, let us have our pound of flesh in return. That is what is governing the measure before this Honourable House.

I want, Sir, to look at the plight and condition of civil servants. Our Civil Service has, within the last 10 years, been called on to undertake a greater sacrifice than other Civil Service Departments in the rest of the Caribbean. We have - a Civil Service which is very sophisticated, very well trained and very devoted. One cannot make any allegations that true professional civil servants are delinquent or derelict of duty. We have a Civil Service prepared to serve the nation in a loyal and patriotic way and these civil servants are often parents, mortgagors, debtors and are normal members of the citizenry of Barbados. They have been called on to pay increases in telephone bills. They have been call on as parents to pay increases in textbook fees for their children in school. They have been called on to pay increases in land taxes. They have been called on to pay increases in water rates. They have been called on, much to their gall, to pay increases in property insurance in circumstances where the property insurance was mandatory in that it was tied to their mortgages, that they were not given breadth or any space or any breathing room

on their mortgage arrangements and in the circumstances therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, civil servants as a category have been called on to pay a greater sacrifice as citizens of this country than perhaps any other category. 4.45 p.m.

We must therefore in this Opposition ask why the civil servants? Why is it that these persons, innocent for the most part indeed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, innocent in almost every respect be called on to bear a sacrifice which some of them just do not have the capacity to understand? It is like a maiden who is innocent, who has served her lord and master well, who has not sinned or swayed nor transgressed the ways of her lord. It is like a maiden saying, why do I deserve to be given such brutal and vicious treatment?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking that as we consider this measure the very civil service was hard hit in the period 1991 to the end of 1992 by tax and expenditure apart from ordinary cuts directly relevant to salaries. They were hit by layoffs and in addition to this were in a situation where they were expected to make a contribution to an economy which at the same time was contracting under the misguided policies of this administration. So we have a situation where civil servants are supposed to produce, they are supposed to maximise their productivity, they are supposed to be patriotic, they are supposed to do their utmost, they are supposed to go beyond the call of duty and at the same time the Government is doing its best to make the economy go into contraction. I refer of course, Sir, to instances where this misguided administration has cut the subsidies for manufacturing industry, has cut the subsidies for agriculture and therefore the economic effort of that was that a lot of business activity that should have been occurring to sustain the economic momentum of the country was not going on and at the same time they looked for a guinea pig. Whilst the economy is retrogressing, whilst the economy is receding they look for a guinea pig and what guinea pig do you think they found - civil servants, Mr. Deputy Speaker, It is not fair to any of them, those who have been called on to face up to cuts, to an 8% reduction, have been called on to work and work hard from 1991 to 1993 with no real increase in their income. Far from an increase in their income an actual reduction for 18 months. We are further seeing them being called on, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to walk the tight rope when these people have their bills to pay, their expenses to pay, and when these people do not deserve the type of treatment which we are seeing this misguided and badly run administration mete out to them, Sir.

I am therefore saying in conclusion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that where the Honourable Prime Minister was able to give assurances to his political organisation in August that surplus revenue was being recorded, that in terms of the internal revenue there was now no

fiscal imbalance and if there was one, it more than imbalance in favour of the Government by way of a surplus rather than a deficit I am saying what then is the rationale. If Government so managed the economy, don't mind the external forces are managing it, if Government so manage the economy that at the end of August Government expenses stood \$7.8 million below revenue why this, Mr. Deputy Speaker? It means that clearly one possible interpretation is that between September and October all \$7.8 million is gone but we do not want to be so ungenerous. We are saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that far from the \$7.8 million in surplus disappearing we are saying that because the Government is in cahoots with an agency not often familiar with the plight of the poor man, with an agency often interested in the macro economic position rather than the micro economic position, we are saying that this is yet another example, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of clear positive IMF dictation. On those grounds, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the grounds that we are seeing IMF dictation, on the grounds that civil servants are asked to bear too high a sacrifice, on the grounds, Sir, that under this administration the economy is yet to take off, I join with other Members of Her Majesty's Opposition in opposing this Bill and so I must express sentiments in favour of Members such as the Member for St. Joseph, the Member for the City of Bridgetown and of course the Honourable and distinguished Member for St. Thomas. With those remarks, I am obliged to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in seconding this motion relating to the second reading of this Bill, I reserved my right to speak.

I was asked some time during this month by the Minister of Finance along with the Honourable Attorney General to take charge of negotiations with the Coalition of Trade Unions in his absence in respect of the matter pertaining to the increments.

We first of all met on the 20th September and then we held 3 subsequent meetings including a meeting today., All of us at that table I am satisfied we tried to arrive at certain decisions which we would find agreeable to us and which of course we would all be able, in our opinions, to hold our heads up high. It is not that we have not been able to find it. Unfortunately time has taken over. We had scheduled the meeting for yesterday. I had spoken to a member of the delegation on Thursday and I put a proposition to the Member the terms of which are included in the Bill, in other words compensating loss of money by granting of time off. That as I understood from the Member, who reported to me next day, had been put to the colleagues and the colleagues had found it agreeable. Unfortunately, Sir, the colleagues did not have sufficient time to put it to their own membership and therefore that is why we are here at this point today in perhaps the state that we are in today but we have to bring it.

It has been said the Government is unilaterally breaching the terms of agreement. That, Sir, can only be technically true as I explained a minute ago. In 1991 a law was enacted here that not only suspended the payment of increments but also reduced the emoluments of public servants by 8%. 4.55 p.m.

In this particular case, Sir, this law does not affect all the public servants but only affect those public servants who are on the incremental scale or those who are due an increment. Because not everybody on the incremental scale would be disadvantaged, since there are some people on the incremental scale who have reached the top of their scale and cannot move beyond that point. Therefore, this cannot affect that particular person. These are things we spoke about and we thought perhaps that we would have a wide ranging discussion to see how best we can arrive at the solution with which we can all live. Yes, it is true and we cannot deny it to some extent that the public servants have had to bear a considerable portion of the burden of the adjustments that were put in place in 1991.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the country at that time really and truly required that that burden be borne. We all bore it. Honourable Members bore it on the other side. Well, their pay was reduced by 8 per cent as well. Mine was reduced by 8 per cent as well. We did it in the interest of the country because it is not a question of raising any bogey about the International Monetary Fund and devaluation. It was a fact underscored indeed that the IMF had refused to pay up the second tranche. We thought they would have paid up. Against the advice of international institutions and local economists as well, because some came to me, Sir, we came back here and decided we would keep faith with the public workers of this country and we restored the 8 per cent that we said that we would restore because it is the law. Therein, lies the problem.

Sir, it is not only the restoration of the 8 per cent. That restoration of 8 per cent cost the country \$35.9 million or roughly \$36 million. That is not the only thing, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If now we go and we now add another \$7 million on top of this in this one year, that would mean approximately \$43 million.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: The Honourable Member for St. Peter seems puzzled. I do not know why he is puzzled because 36 plus 7 are 43. But even so, Sir, if we were to concede another million dollars in take-out pay, the salary has to be reflected. If we concede another one million dollars in the reduction of pay by way of taxes and levies and NIS contributions, that still brings us down to \$42 million. But that is not all, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If it was just that, it would not be that bad. We have given

an undertaking in the coming year that there will be an abolition of the levies which brings in about \$50 million. So add another \$50 million that brings us to \$92 million.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Yes, this year because the increments will be from October to September even though I am not necessarily talking about this financial year. I am talking about the year. So that will be over \$90 million that will be taken out of the Treasury. Where does that leave us, Mr. Deputy Speaker? How can we responsibly act in a way different from how we are acting today? How can we do this, Sir? As I have said before, I cannot deny that the public officers have had a difficult time since the monies have been taken out of their pay. I will also say this, Sir, and my observations have been that the public officers have worked well despite what I heard on the other side about working slow and even slower. My officers work very well for me. I want to state this quite clearly. I want this to be clearly understood by everybody. I have seen no 8 per cent reduction in the work and in the production given to me or to my Ministry. I want to compliment the workers who work for me and I assume that this will apply to other members. I can only speak for myself and I want to say this, Sir. I believe that all the officers work to the best of their abilities certainly in my Ministry and I am very pleased about it. I said that during the course of the negotiations and the unions' representatives acknowledged that their officers work well or at least they felt so.

Sir, I have no doubt that the officers who are responsible people understand probably better than Honourable Members on the other side the commitment to their country and they will continue to give the service that they have given during this time which must be for them very distressful and indeed for the whole country.

I heard the Honourable Member for St. Thomas say and I am quoting him now: "On the September 1st or August 29th, the Prime Minister ought to have known the financial position that could bring us up to this point in this matter here, today." I have heard words to the effect that that is right. Of course, it was known. I will add that it should also have been known to the Honourable Members on the other side.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Did I say that? It should have been known to members on the other side because I am sure it was not lost on the Honourable Member for St. Peter unless he was not doing his homework. I believe he always does his homework. He probably over does his homework. In the Estimates 1993/94...

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member has misquoted what I said. He

has written down what I said and not understood the implication. What I had said was that on August 29th when the Prime Minister addressed the DLP Conference and said that he had a surplus of \$7.8 million, then he should have known and had in the back of his mind this Bill to come to drop some head blows in the civil servants. That is the implication of what I said, Sir. We did not know anything about the Bill. We thought they were negotiating.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: If the Honourable Member would be a little patient, you will understand what I am talking about. What I am saying, Sir, is that before this financial year began the Minister of Finance laid the Estimates on the Table and the Estimates were debated and went through a fine tooth comb. We never did so many Heads before for many years as were done this year. In those Estimates was included an amount for the restoration of the 8 per cent. Those Estimates did not contain any amount for the return of any increments. Look at the Estimates.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: We knew at the time that it would have been difficult. We said it in a document. It was right there in the document for you to see. Look at it again and you will see it. If you examine the document you will see it there. We did not say it in those words. As I said, the Honourable Member for St. Peter does his homework, and does it very well. 5.05 p.m.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: On a point of order, Sir. The Member is misleading the House. When this matter was raised during the course of the Estimates debate, to the best of my recollection the Government said then that the increments were not included because it was governed by a piece of legislation that was going to be ended on 30th September, and that the matter would have been re-examined when 30th September came. In the Government's initial Paper on the Incomes Policy, Government spoke to the question of the increments but it never said that the increments would not have been restored.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I do not understand why the Honourable Member has risen. He has not spoken before, I am not misrepresenting his speech and I do not know on what he rose, but I am taking issue with what he has just said. It would have been, and have to be, in the Estimates if you are going to deal with the restoration of the increments, and it was not in the Estimates. I am surprised now to understand that Honourable Members on the other side are surprised. They should not have been surprised if in fact they had been doing their homework. I really am surprised to hear all this.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we knew the kind of wage levels that the country might be able to take at a particular time. As a matter of fact, I am not even so sure it will be able to take the wage levels we have today. The point is, we will now be in a difficult position where if in fact we were to go now and increase the wages beyond the level that the country can take, there will be only one answer and one alternative, an alternative that I myself would not wish to contemplate. In other words, if we have to keep the wages at that level and we are forced now to increase them beyond that level, we will have to get back to that level. Is that what the Honourable Members want?⁵ Do the Honourable Members want us to send the workers home? That is what is important.

They said we cannot plead unaffordability, because we have gone ahead and we are doing this capital project here and that capital project there, knowing full well that by doing those capital projects we are providing some form of employment for people working on those projects. If we did not do those projects, Mr. Deputy Speaker, some persons working on those projects would be unemployed. Is this what the Honourable Members on the other side want? We want to have the people employed. We would like to be in a position to embark upon a sufficient development of capital works that would permit the employment of several more persons. Unfortunately, Sir, we are not in a position to do that, so we have to be prudent.

There are a few matters that were raised which I found reprehensible, especially coming from the Honourable Member for St. Joseph, because he was a party to what took place. This is in relation to the absence of at least one Member from this Chamber who now has to be in Pakistan observing elections there. The Honourable Member for St. Joseph did what he could in Cyprus to get the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central on a panel to observe elections in Pakistan, and now says he ran away. That is what he did.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: On a point of order, Sir. I did my best to have the Honourable Member who is not in his seat to be elected Chairman of the CPA, but not to go to Pakistan on this occasion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point is taken.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I take objection, Sir. I do not like Honourable Members trying to link up us with the unions. It was the Coalition we were dealing with, not a particular trade union. We were not dealing with the Barbados Workers* Union per se, or with the National Union of Public Workers, or with any other unions or associations per se, we were dealing with the Coalition of Trade Unions. The Secretary is Mr. Frost, the Chairman is

a Mr. LeRoy Trotman, the Deputy Chairman is Mr. Cedric Murrell, and these are the people, including Mr. Joseph Goddard, with whom we have been negotiating. I too am sorry the Honourable Members are not here, but to hear the kind of strictures, that have been heaped upon their heads here today, which are really and truly not justified, is something else.

I just want to say, Sir, that no one regrets more than I do that we are in this position where we have to suspend for one year the increments of the workers, but it was not a straight suspension. That was not the only consideration, in other words, there were other considerations. We told them that what we would in fact do would be to grant them leave at least equal to the increments that they would have received. When we worked it out, it was discovered that in most cases the leave to be granted would be less than one day, and in no case would the leave to be granted be more than a day and a half. We decided that in fact we would grant them 3 days' leave, not just a half day and a day and a half. 5.15p.m.

We also agreed, and this is what we agreed that we would write them on this and that any officers who, but for this legislation, or the legislation even that this succeeds, would have moved from one point in the salary scale to another point in the salary scale and by so moving would have been entitled to more vacation leave, that they will not be prejudiced. They will get those extra days -in vacation leave.

We also agreed, Sir, that if there are any officers who by way of moving up the scale would have been entitled to leave passages if they travelled, that even though we have not moved them up, we would honour that as well. These are things we agreed with the unions. As well, this is in the Act, their pensions and gratuities would not be affected. These are things we offered to them and we agreed we would write to them on this as soon as this legislation is passed.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. Earlier I rose on a point of order to say that the Deputy Prime Minister said that the question of the increments restoration was not addressed in this House before and that he was misleading the House.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: No, No. He cannot now enter into that point of order, Sir.

Aside.

' Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order. I am waiting to hear what is his specific point of order that the Honourable Member has risen on.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, earlier in his presentation I rose on a point of order to say that when the Deputy Prime Minister said...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am talking about now. I am not interested in earlier. What is your specific point of order now in relation to what he said recently.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: That he has misled the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You rose on that already. Didn't you?

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Yes, Sir, but you did not rule.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not entertaining it now in any event. Proceed, Honourable Deputy Prime Minister.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that I have made the points that I myself have risen this afternoon to make. It is a Bill that I will support. I regret that we have reached the point where we have to deal with matters of this kind but I will have to say that in due course my support will have to be with this Bill because I think I have a responsibility to my country.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am intervening in the debate to make just 4 very simple points. The first point is that this Government is an anti-worker Government and in the last couple of years it has incrementally added to the anti-worker measures and legislation on the statute book of Barbados. This Bill, therefore, is only one of several measures which the Democratic Labour Party Government has implemented to deflate workers' wages and to make workers worse off in Barbados.

Now, Sir, I can find no justification, none at all, for the manner in which the workers are being treated in this matter either by way of negotiations or the end result by way of legislation in this matter particularly when I have to conclude, from all of the statistics that I have seen, that in the last 10 years wages have not risen as fast as inflation, including prices, in Barbados. As a matter of fact what has happened is that the workers' standard of living has by and large decreased in Barbados as against those persons who have been accumulating capital. The Government must understand this.

I am appalled when I hear the Honourable Member saying that he doubts whether the country can take the wage level which we have today. Now, having made that statement, it is obviously within the Government's mind that the Government may well later be bringing other measures to reduce the workers' wages and standard of

living further. I therefore have to give some credence to the statement that the Government has now asked for the support of the international institutions to look at the severance payments position and to reduce further the benefits which workers are being given. Now, all that is on the cards. All that is part of the policy framework within which this Government is operating.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order. I want to state, Sir, that the Government has no intention of further reducing any salaries or wages of the workers.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, the Honourable Member will not recall that his Prime Minister at an address which he gave in March, 1991 to the National Union of Public Workers, made the statement:

"I will share with you that I have been advised that the percentage increase in salaries and wages for April 1, 1991 to April 1992 should be renegotiated with the unions now so that there will be a zero increase in the economic circumstances. I did not even consult with the unions on this suggestion because I know that will be entirely acceptable. We reached an agreement in good faith and I determine that we will stick to that particular agreement."

Now, it was not long before that very same Prime Minister, speaking in the same tongue that the....

Aside.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: ...speaking in the same language that the Honourable Member has just spoken, came into this House and took away from the workers, legislated away from them part of a contractual entitlement. When the Government gets up and says that it has restored the 8% to the workers, let us understand this that the Government took away money that it has never given back to the workers. It took away from each worker's pocket a sum of money representing 8% of his contractual entitlement over a period of 18 months. It is untrue for any Government member to say that that worker has ever been repaid that money. What they have done is that at a point later they have allowed them to resume what they were entitled to before. They have never been paid their arrears, not a cent of it and they have no legal entitlement now to it unless the Privy Council rules against the Government because the Government has never come down here with legislation and say, look we took away money that you were entitled to, we are now going to give it back to you. So I do not want to hear the Government with this lively euphemistic phrase that they have restored the wages to the workers and 8%. It is untrue. You took it away from the people. You are an unsuitable employer. This Government is one of the worst employers we have had in the history of any country.

This Government has never set a standard for employers to follow, this particular Government which is supposed to be a democratic, socialist Government is in league with trade unions, and it is a marriage of pure convenience. It is a disgraceful display by people who come from among the working class and led by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South who said he was born in St. James. He should be ashamed of himself to say that he comes from the working class and to be treating the working class in this manner.

Sir, I will tell you why this gets the ire of people on this side. The Deputy Prime Minister said that 6 558 people are affected by this measure. The Prime Minister said it and you agreed with it. 5.25 p.m.

When the Honourable Member for St. Joseph was making the point that the final cost will be no where near to \$7 million, that it most likely will be about \$4.8 million if you took into account the National Insurance that has to be paid and if you took into account the income tax payable, the Deputy Prime Minister said no, where did you get that figure from? It has to be higher than that. But he also went on to say that most of the people who are affected by the measure will not be persons paying income tax.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have not addressed the House of Assembly on that particular point so the Honourable Member cannot now come and say that I said so because I have not addressed the House on that point.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, the Honourable Member will say he has not. I am saying, Sir, that I know the Honourable Member. Part of the Honourable Member's submission, not necessarily for you to hear in Hansard, Sir, is that a large percentage - however you want to put it I will take your words - of persons who will be losing their increments are persons who are not paying income tax.

Now, if that is true, Sir, there are people who are earning below \$13 000 a year. We have to remind the public that the Government brought on to the income tax role and have taxed a large number of persons who prior to 1985 were not on the tax role. That is the first point I want to make. Now those persons are earning at the lowest level of the public service so they will be those who are economically worst off in our country.

This Government for political purposes, in 1986 told the public of Barbados that the minimum wage at which you can earn to be above the poverty line was \$15 000 in those days. Now what I am hearing is that persons who are below that minimum standard have been taxed by the Democratic Labour Party Government. In addition, the

Democratic Labour Party Government is legislating, putting its hands in the people's pockets, taking away 8% of whatever they are earning and now going a bit further denying them a small increment. In some cases it may be \$20. That is the net amount. The gross amount is \$42. That \$42 may not mean much to the Prime Minister when he goes on his various trips. I understand on leave now to South Africa; if the paper is right because he is going to get his daily allowance. But that is more than the amount the person in Pleasant Hall and in Lynch Gap is getting. I am concerned about it, Sir, because for the person in Lynch Gap, in Pleasant Hall, in Bonnetts, \$42 in some respects probably will go a long way to allowing them to send their children to school. It is a lot of money and that is why I say to this Government I have never seen in Barbados since the worst days of the Conservatives I have never seen legislation of this nature at all.

It is a dark night for Barbados since we have had the Democratic Labour Party Government restored to power. A dark night because you are affecting the people who can least afford to carry the burden in the country and in the meantime you are turning around and giving concessions after concessions to all sorts of people who can more afford to take the burden in Barbados.

I spoke, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in this House in the last few years about the ineptitude and the incompetence of the Government in bringing down orders under the betterment levy tax to affect land that was being sold near to the highways that we have put up at the cost of the public of Barbados. That is one area that the Government could have found money that it would not have to be doing these things. We all know the terrific waste.

Aside.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: It was done late. It was done a couple of years after I raised it in this House. So when we accuse the Government of ineptitude it is along these lines that we are speaking. We know the losses that the Government has suffered. I am told now CARSICOT. The Government cost this country about \$6 million in CARSICOT. The other company that has been formed since then, that too has lost money and they are going up and up. That is why they are having to put their hands into the pockets of the poor people, the poor public servants, putting their hands into their pockets to deny them a bit of money that would provide them with the necessities of life, not luxuries. And then this Government boasts it is for black people. The pejorative terms that they use. They are supposed to be on behalf of the black people and the poor black people. I have never seen a more anti poor and anti black Government than this Government. I have not seen it yet in the history of Barbados. You will go down in the history as the worst Government for social policy that we have ever witnessed in our 350 years of history.

I want, Sir, to deal with the question of the forced leave because I call the section 6 provision a forced leave provision. The imperative language of shall is being used and I am told the Government is legislating for people to take leave in place of getting the \$42 increment or the \$504 that they are entitled to. Whether the person wants it or can afford it or not the Government is telling them by section 6 you have got to go on leave.

Now that is a serious anti-worker measure to bring before this House and expect to get the support of right thinking men about it. The Minister cannot paper over the matter by saying, why don't you give the people the option, Sir. What is the option? Why does not the Government give people the option to take their money if they want to work. You are curtailing the man's work and saying you are not getting any money for it. You can have leave and I challenge the Government's credibility too when they say they are legislating to give them the value. They are doing better than that they are giving them 3 days instead of .56 of a day.

There is no legislation here giving anybody any 3 days. Section 6 does not do that. Why I can't take the Government's word? The Government has gone back on its word to the workers too often and you cannot take the Government's word on these matters. You are not trustworthy. Your credibility is doubtful and you have been disgraced. You are a Government in disgrace when it comes to going back on your word. This Government has gone back on its word to the workers within a short period of time and I am surprised that any trade unionist with any understanding of his rightful role will sit down and discuss anything with the Government these days in seriousness, relating to workers' rights. 535 p.m.

The position is, Sir, that the force leave does not give them an option. The Deputy Prime Minister speaks as well that those, who would have got the benefit of leave passages if they had gone up they too will get leave passages. Where is that provided for in the legislation? Where is the guarantee that the Prime Minister is not going in the next day or next week to come and say that he has miscalculated and he has to change his position on it?

Aside.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: He said the workers will have to take his word for it. Do they have that choice? They have not taken your word. Not even the unions have taken your word on this occasion on it, because the negotiations finished today and within five minutes it was out on the road that they had reached no agreement with you at all on the matter. They know that the rank and file are not in

favour of those few trade unionists who believe that sometimes they have to put party before they put the interest of the workers whom they represent. It is a very sad day for Barbados when I can hear the Deputy Prime Minister get up and say how it hurts his heart. If it hurts his heart, let him show his confidence. He should have shown that it really hurt his heart by resigning. He said that he could not do it, Sir. Why did he not do it?

Aside.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: It is not running away. It is that you are too soft in mind and body to be able to make up your mind about anything serious anyhow.

Aside.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Your conscience is clear what? You sat down and allowed this sort of thing to be pushed at you by the International Monetary Fund and you have not got the guts and courage of your conviction to say that we cannot honestly follow this position. That is the position. I do not see how the workers can take the word of this Government in any way, Sir. Forced leave position for those at the lowest end who are carrying an undue burden and further discussions going on with this Government in setting up a consultancy to look at reducing benefits to workers still further - that is the sort of scenario which we have.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: On a point of order, Sir. With reference to the comment of the Government setting up a consultancy to reduce severance benefits to workers made twice by the Honourable Member for Christ Church West, I am saying that the Honourable Member is misleading the House and that there is no such term or requirement in the consultancy. To the best of my knowledge, the consultants are not considering any matters relating to the reduction of severance payments.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Well, that is to the best of the Honourable Member's knowledge. But to the best of my knowledge and the papers that I have seen, I have interpreted the terms of the consultancy and reference in that way. I have interpreted what you all have exchanged.

Aside.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, I hope that you would not have the guts to bring further legislation in here reducing the severance entitlement. But I want to speak of a particular category as well in addition to those who are the lowest paid in the Public Service who will be affected by this legislation to whom the alternative three days leave will not make sense to me and that is the teachers.

I want to know whether the Government is going to send all of these teachers home in circumstances where the Minister of Education tells me that he has all sorts of problems in the schools. The schools need more supervision. But instead of putting the personnel available to do the job, the Minister is telling them to take the leave. When are these teachers to take their leave? They cannot take it during the vacation period. So it has to be during the school term. How many are you sending on leave and what period of time, Sir? I do not think that this is a proper thought out measure and the same goes for the Ministry of Health. The same goes for the nurses. We know that there is a crisis in nursing other than at St. Joseph.

Do you know this Government is so pretty that they appointed an anesthetist at St. Joseph who has not got enough work to do there and he had to go and work at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital? He was working at the QEH without being registered to do so. That is this Government. They are wasting money down there without having either the number of people who want to be attended and they get their priorities wrong all of the time. Now you are sending them on leave.

Sir, let us talk now about the policemen. They want to send the policemen on forced leave now instead of giving them the few dollars in their pocket in circumstances where the Commissioner of Police tells us that he cannot get enough men to put on duty and where we are told that if we do not control crime we are going to break-up-the tourist industry, which brings us now to foreign exchange.

Sir, I have never seen a set of people who really do not understand government but who understand how to fool the people enough to get back into Government. I have never understood how this Government could really be serious in governing Barbados properly. Do not shed any crocodile tears, Sir. The Honourable Member for St. Michael North should not be shedding any crocodile tears. He was part of the masquerade which gave the people the impression in 1990/91 that this was the land of bounty and plenty and how well this country had progressed when we tried to tell the people the truth. He was part of that masquerade.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Sir. I was not part of any masquerade. I told the people the truth as I saw it and I stand by what I said.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, a wise man usually recognises his wisdom. Do you know the corollary to that? A fool recognises his foolishness, but there are some fools who never recognise how foolish they are. Really, that is what is worrying me about this Government all of the time. It really worries me.

Sir, the Honourable Member's picture appeared on the manifesto supporting all of the promises including not cutting back on wages and salaries and increments of workers. That is in the manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party that was shown to the people just a few days prior to January 21, 1991. What can we cut? Now they have cut everything. I say to the people of Barbados that, if they are mistaken as to give this Government another chance, they deserve the "cat". The public would deserve the "cat" if they give you another chance after the way in which the Government has betrayed the trust of the people. This has been a disastrous period for Barbados and Government's administration has sunk to the lowest level of efficiency that I have seen in this country during my political life over the last 30 years. I would not have thought it even of the Democratic Labour Party, but they have out-classed themselves. Therefore, this Bill cannot get the support of this side. You say that it does not have the agreement of the unions despite the trial of some of your members to do so. I know you have not got the support of the workers and I am going to warn the unions. 5.45 p.m.

I am going to warn the unions. I warned them in 1987 when we went back on the platform, in Brittons Hill. The unions, if they are not careful, are going to break up the trade union movement in Barbados and leave workers totally unprotected. We are finding today that there are several persons besides the Government who are using the excuse of the structural adjustment period to throw people out of jobs without even the courtesy of giving them adequate notice, and the private sector has obviously taken their cue from the Democratic Labour Party Government. I have warned before and I issue the warning again, Sir, if we are to have a cohesive society we must show that we are a caring people and we must show in particular that our actions are directed to helping those who are the weakest in the society, not directed to destroying those who are weak in our society.

This measure is one which will have the effect of further destroying the economically disenfranchised in Barbados, and I could never give it my support, Sir.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Deputy Speaker, does the Honourable Member for Christ Church West have so much contempt for the democratic process that he would wish to inflict cruel and inhuman punishment on Barbadians if they do not follow his prescriptions and vote for the Barbados Labour Party and if they vote for some other Government? I am a little surprised at him, Sir.

There are just a few points I really want to make in the course of this debate, and the first one is this. Whether there has been agreement or not on the terms of this measure, any proposal to suspend increments of public officers for one year more would still have to be legislated. That is the basic point at which I start, because

the provision was there and unless express legislation was passed to suspend them they could not be suspended in any other way. Of course, we all accept that it would have been better if agreement had been reached on this matter before any action was taken.

Some Honourable Members on the other side have accused the Government of bad faith in acting in a way they say which was overriding the negotiations, because on Friday afternoon last week there was communication between the Deputy Prime Minister and the Leader of the Trade Union Coalition and they were to get back to each other on the matter. The position is being articulated that because the Bill was being circulated at the same time, that was undermining the process and that therefore Government stood accused of an act of bad faith. I am saying that is not true.

It was known to everyone that the House had been specifically recalled to deal with this matter.

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: Why do you think the House was recalled? The House had been adjourned...

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: Anyhow, the position is, I think it was generally known - this is my own judgment - that the House was being asked to deal with this matter of the suspension of increments. I am saying too that the Trade Union Coalition must have known that it was in the Government's contemplation as well to bring this Bill before Parliament. In order for the matter to be dealt with this week, the Bill would have to have been circulated by Friday. If that were not so, then it could not have been dealt with on this occasion.

The provisions, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which are included in this Bill form the basis of the continuing discussions-between the Coalition of Trade Unions and the Government, the last meeting of which took place this morning. At that meeting there were a number of issues discussed, the whole issue of compensation by way of a period of leave was articulated. It was put on the table and discussed, and one of the concerns of the Coalition of Trade Unions was that in discussing the total package, what consideration needed to be given to, were such things as ensuring that leave entitlement was not prejudiced because of any suspension of increments, and these points were made by the Deputy Prime Minister; that leave passage eligibility was not prejudiced, that the whole question of their pension and gratuity eligibility was not adversely affected by the Act; and of course the whole issue of seniority of members in the public service was not in any way affected. These were some additional concerns which

the members of the Trade Union Coalition wanted to have addressed and which we gave them an undertaking that we would write them on, because they were issues on which we found that we could agree.

The point has been made on the other side that any agreement in relation to these issues has not been embodied in the legislation. But the Bill was circulated on Friday, and these issues were discussed and settled this morning, and we gave them an undertaking that we would write them formally expressing our agreement to these areas which we thought would present no difficulty. That has been the position. There has been no agreement on the final position. What has happened is that both sides were able to articulate their positions on the issues. They knew that we were coming to Parliament today to bring the measure before Parliament and the Bill is here before us this afternoon to be dealt with.

This debate has taken a turn which is not unexpected. It has developed from the Opposition side in an onslaught on the workers' representatives. I suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there has been that kind of onslaught on the representatives of the workers...

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Do not talk about the Government. You attacked the Government as well, but I am saying that there has been an unholy assault on the representatives of the workers, not only in Parliament but outside of Parliament as well. 5.55 p.m.

Not well justified at all. In this House they have raised the old bogey about trade unionists in Parliament.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: It is a bogey. Of course, it is a bogey that trade unionists have no right in Parliament, that representatives of trade unions and membership of Parliament that there is some incompatibility in that. That is a bogus argument. It should be treated as a bogus argument and should be regarded as a bogus argument because how best can the views of the representatives of the workers of the country be put than in the precincts and halls of Parliament? Then a number of what I call pejorative statements, have been made about the representatives of the workers, statements like the unions have taken workers dues, bought big houses...

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: No. No headquarters was added.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: I am saying what I heard. Unions have taken workers dues, bought big houses and paid themselves big salaries. They have the ups, the workers the downs. Workers cannot point to anything and say this is what the unions have done for us - totally unjustified criticism of the workers' representatives.

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: You were attacking the representatives and it is my right of privilege to say what I have to say about them as well.

Aside.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable Member who is speaking really should not be picking up the cue from the asides. Ignore them.

Hon. M. A. KING: The venom of the comments of the Honourable Members has been so intense that they are urging members of the unions to withhold payment of contributions.

Aside.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER; Order. You have had your turn.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I accuse them of seeking to destroy trade unions in Barbados. You are seeking- to destroy trade unions. You want to break them up. You want the workers to cease paying contributions to the unions and that is the thin edge of the wedge into destroying the trade union movement in Barbados. They stand accused of trying to destroy the trade union movement.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the members of the Opposition seem never to have recovered from the fact that the Barbados Workers' Union has ceased to be under the tutelage of the Barbados Labour Party and all the venom which they are heaping on the unions is being heaped vicariously on the unions because they really want to attack and assault the Barbados Workers' Union and seek to destroy that union because they have ceased to have tutelage and control...

Miss B. A. MILLER: On a point of order, Sir. The Barbados Labour Party would not seek to destroy...

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

Miss B. A. MILLER: That he is misleading the House, Sir. To say that the Barbados Labour Party would seek to destroy the unions, we would not seek to destroy

what we created. The unions have abdicated their responsibility...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No speeches, please. Thank you.

Hon. M. A. KING: The Honourable Member has misunderstood me completely. The Honourable Member has said that they would not seek to destroy what they have created but that is precisely the point I am making. They say they created the Barbados Workers' Union. But the Union is no longer under their tutelage. They cannot, in fact, recover from that, and they are now seeking to destroy it because it is the only way to get even with them.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am saying that destroying the unions is the first stage of an assault on the workers of this country and they are couching their attacks how presently on the institutions. But their attacks are ultimately designed to seek to destroy the working class of this community.

They talk about this Government being an anti-worker Government, the words of the Honourable Member for Christ Church West. There can be no greater anti-worker organisation than the Barbados Labour Party. Let me just make a point and I quote the words of the Honourable Member for the City. The Honourable Member for the City made a statement in the course of her contribution about the Democratic Labour Party destroying all the gains that the workers had made in the 1960s and 1970s. All the workers gains of the 1960s and 1970s were being eroded.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: You said the 1960s and the 1970s. I am saying what you said. The point being that certainly for all of the 1960s; from 1961 and for the rest of the 1960s and the 1970s, certainly up to 1976 the Democratic Labour Party Government was the Government of this country. So clearly this is an acknowledgement by the Honourable Member for the City that the workers have made tremendous gains under the Democratic Labour Party Administrations of the 1960s and 1970s.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: No. You cannot accuse us of being an anti-worker Government. Cannot you see that is an essential point? You cannot make that accusation because you have to look at what is happening now in the context of the international economic environment.

- *Aside.*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. Let there not be any cross-talk of that character, please.

Hon. M. A. KING: History has shown that we have been a Government strongly in support of the working classes of this country. But what I am saying, I am going on further and addressing the problem of the 1990s, and saying that one has to look at what is taking place today in the 1990s in the context of what is happening in the international economic environment, and it would only be a person whose head is buried in the sand like an ostrich who does not understand that the world is going through economic pressures.

Aside.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please, please.

Hon. M. A. KING: In major economies like the United States of America, thousands and thousands of workers are being sent home daily, if you do not understand it, also in Canada and the United Kingdom.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: What does it mean?
6.05 p.m.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: I am surprised that you do not understand.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central should not be picking up those asides. The Honourable Member for the City should desist.

Hon. M. A. KING: I am saying that the economic international environment does have an impact on the policies which are being pursued now, and the actions and the policies of this Democratic Labour Party administration have to be viewed against that background and in that context.

Now, the attacks as I have said, on Honourable Members of this House who are members of trade unions, have been severe. Direct reference was made to the Member for St. Michael Central. When it is convenient to them, when he speaks language that they like they cheer. When it is clearly an attack on the Democratic Labour Party and the Government they cheer, but when he dares to express a view or does not express a view which is consistent with the view which they hold then they heap bitter condemnation on his head.

What I am saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that we understand that the workers of the country are under

pressure. I think all of us too ought to understand that it is not an easy job today for representatives of workers' organisations to be representing them. They have difficulty. They are doing a difficult job in difficult times in a difficult environment. And the Members of the Opposition are trying to make life exceedingly difficult for them. You are not giving them any help at all. You are creating problems for them and all for narrow political purposes and not because of any substantial merit in the arguments which you put forward. I am saying that is not doing justice to people who have dedicated their lives to upholding the cause of the workers of this country. They have spent a lot of hours and a lot of effort in trying to uphold and advance workers' rights in this community. I am saying that it is an injustice to heap the kind of criticism on those representatives as you have done and that your ultimate objective can be only to destroy the workers' organisations and to lead a bitter assault on the workers of this country. I thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have listened to the debate so far this afternoon and I want to begin by saying that the Government has to understand that no one in Barbados today believes that the Government is unable to pay the increase. No one believes that.

The Government over the past 6 or 8 months has been praising the stabilisation effort, how it has worked well. It has corrected the imbalances in the economy giving the impression that everything is fine and dandy. Secondly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, increments are to be repaid and the Government claims that it does not have the money to pay the increments.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me say up front that I have said since early 1992 that I have discovered that there seems to be some difficulty with this Government coming to the people of this country and telling the people the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. All Barbadians wanted was for the Government to take them in its confidence, tell them what the situation is and Barbadians were willing to sacrifice.

In 1991, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was part of a group of Honourable gentlemen who were told, and we believed in a short sharp correction of the Barbadian economy. There were macro economic imbalances, there were other problems with foreign exchange and things like that. So, as I said we believed that we needed this short sharp correction.

Acting on the above, Mr. Speaker, this short sharp correction of what I just said, civil servants were persuaded to sacrifice for 18 months - the short sharp correction.

Aside.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Regardless of whether it was legislated or not a lot of them signed. That is the point I am making. Civil Servants were persuaded to sacrifice 8 per cent of their salary and also to forego the increments until September 30, 1993.

Now this was part of the stabilisation effort, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when these imbalances were to be corrected. We have been told that the stabilisation effort is over and how well it worked. Throughout 1992 and now also in 1993 we have been lectured by one or maybe two members of the Government of how well the effort has worked. In fact only 2 weeks ago the Minister of Finance, as reported in the local newspaper, speaking in Vancouver said that the programme was very successful. He went on to say that evidence of this success was seen in the fact that it improved this country's external sector and it reduced the imbalances in the domestic sector. That is what was said.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Barbadian economy is over \$1 billion. A large economy. You need \$7 million, and I am going to the maximum, to repay the increments to the civil servants. As I said before no one believes that. Let me tell you what the truth is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, before I go any further. The truth is this. 6.15 p.m.

The Minister of Finance at the time convinced the IMF that the 8 per cent was permanent whilst at the same time convinced the civil servants that the 8 per cent was temporary and they would be paid back on April 30th. This is not the first that I have said this in here and this has always been the problem. I have said it on three occasions in this Honourable Chamber. It is a fact. When they restored the 8 percent on April 30th, the IMF was angry and the World Bank was livid. What I am telling you now is John 3:16. Let anyone of them deny it. The IMF complained that they should not have restored it because they were led to believe that it was permanent. The World Bank was extremely angry.

Aside.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me continue. The IADB was actually bending over backwards to lend to Barbados. When that 8 per cent was given back and the World Bank started to cry out, even the IADB began to take notice of what was happening. The IADB then said that they did not mind lending Government money, but I have to get permission from the World Bank. Remember that the World Bank was livid when it was given back.

What is happening now? If you recall as was mentioned in here today, this is nearly three years now that we were going to get the structural adjustment loan. Do you remember that? Up to now we have not got it. In the

Budgetary exercise that we had earlier this year, I mentioned that everything said in that Budget was dependent on Barbados getting those funds. What has happened? With the World Bank being angry with the restoration of the 8 per cent and the IADB taking its cue from the World Bank, obviously Barbados has to get back in the World Bank's good books. That is the problem. That is why they are not giving back the increments. It has nothing to do with Barbados inability to pay and the Deputy Prime Minister knows that is true. Because the Government has to get back in the World Bank's good books and, if they restore these increments, the structural adjustment loan may not come for another year or two years. That is the problem.

We heard in here today that the Deputy Prime Minister say that the time had caught up. The only time that caught up with the negotiations - now listen to me carefully. You have two unionists in the Government and they are overseas. One would have thought that we would have been given an opportunity to hear the two unionists on this matter. What has happened? The point is*that you are back-dating it anyhow to October 1st. So the only time that has caught up with you is the IMF, World Bank and IADB time. That is the only time because you are back-dating it from October 1st. So you are not fooling any person. That is the time it is going back to.

Aside.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: You have to pity me. That is the time it has gone back to. You have to pity me because my job is to sit down and analyze what is happening and my job is to tell the truth and nothing else but the truth. That is my job and I will tell you this. If you are going to back date this Bill that we are doing so that it becomes effective from October 1st, what is the hurry? Why could we not be privileged to debate this matter when these two gentlemen are back here so that we can hear where they are coming from and the civil servants can hear where they are coming from? I want to hear them. The civil servants want to hear them. Every single person in Barbados wants to hear these two people on this matter. You sat for the last two weeks including today with the members of the coalition. You get no agreement. You have to come today to do it with or without agreement. No one has said why you had to come today to do it. We are still waiting to hear why you have to do it today. If you are back-dating it, there is no urgency to do it today or tomorrow. Tell us what is the urgency.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to ask this. What is the state of Government's finances at the end of September? Because on August 29th the Honourable Prime Minister told us what was the state of the revenues and expenditure right up to August 24th. It should not be difficult for us

to find out the state of Government's finances at least by the end of September because we are now in October. As I said, on August 29th we got figures up to August 24th, a space of five days. What I and most people would like to know is the state of Government's finances at the end of September. Even if they are not final figures give us the provisional figures. Are we still in surplus or are we in a deficit position? This is the information that Honourable Members need to have to know if the Government is telling the truth about not being able to restore the \$4 million dollars in increments. We must have the figures to prove what you are saying is true or not.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me just say this. I want only to hear the truth and I am going to tell you why I keep hitting on this matter of the truth. It is not only me who is worried about not getting the information from the Government that we need. There are many, many people out: there in the society who are not getting the full facts from the Government and they are concerned. I have mentioned it in this Honourable Chamber on many occasions that instead of coming straight to the people and saying this is so, we have to take this measure and taking people into your confidence, the Government has been giving things piece-meal and sometimes not the whole truth. This is causing confusion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me just give one example of what I mean about telling the truth. On January 15, 1993 when the consumption tax on gasoline was raised, this Honourable Chamber will recall that the reason given for the increase in the consumption tax on gasoline was that it was raised to pay the \$13 million that they had given back to the manufacturers in concessions. Do you recall that? I stated in that debate from this position that it was to pay back Mobil the \$9 million that Mobil had lent the Government in order that they could meet the IMF target at the end of December. I stated that in here. It was refuted. The Minister of Finance on three occasions said the money was raised... 6 25 p.m.

Aside.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: I do not mean the present Minister of Finance.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The increase in consumption taxes on petroleum products to clear the Mobil arrears was in fact made in 1992, June I think it was, at the point at which I was Acting Minister of Finance. A subsequent increase in consumption taxes on petroleum products took place and that was in respect of making up for a shortfall as a result of the reduction in the CET. I think the Honourable Member has it slightly confused. We made it clear when we increased it on the first occasion that it was to

clear \$9 million in arrears to the Mobil refinery, and we increased it by about 8 cents per litre.

Mr.. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have given the Honourable Member some latitude on that and I am grateful for the explanation, but clearly that is stepping a bit outside the bounds.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Yes, but I do not want anybody to think that I am...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would prefer you not to go down that road on that issue.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, with all due respect, if the matter is left there...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would still prefer you not to go down that line.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: I take your point, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but all I have to say is that if the matter is left there it would look as though I was lying, or that I am lying.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, four weeks ago the present Minister of Finance said, and it was quoted in the Nation and the Advocate. The Nation said:

"Mr. Thompson noted that earlier increases this year in the price of gasoline were implemented to recover the \$9 million due to Mobil under the existing agreement."

The Advocate said:

"The Finance Minister told the media that when petrol was increased earlier this year it was to clear the \$9 million in arrears which had been built up with Mobil."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Could the Honourable Member hold a minute, please? I asked you specifically not to go down that line.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Okay, well I will move on, but I had to put the point. The price of gasoline was increased on January 15 this year when the Honourable Prime Minister and Minister of Finance came in early in January...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member desist from going down that line? In fact, come back on the Bill right now. Deal with the issue which is before the House.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: I just want to make one comment. I have a copy of a document...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not going to permit the comment.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: ... which is headed -

STATEMENT BY THE RIGHT HONOURABLE
LLOYD ERSKINE SANDIFORD, PRIME MIN-
ISTER AND MINISTER OF FINANCE AND
ECONOMIC AFFAIRS, TO THE HOUSE OF
ASSEMBLY ON THE STATE OF THE
BARBADOS ECONOMY ON JANUARY 12, 1993

In this statement the increase in gasoline prices was increased, to take effect on January 15, 1993.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Make it a document, but please get back to the Bill which is before the House.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me proceed. I accept your ruling, but there are persons questioning my credibility, when I have a document in my hand. I cannot understand it. I have the document which shows the increase on January 15.

Let me just say this, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The civil servants would have to be wondering what they have done to be bearing this inordinate burden of what is taking place in Barbados. I sympathise with them. I believe that these people would not mind, and did not mind, sacrificing at the time when they did. Since they made that sacrifice there have been increases all around, left, right and centre. What bothers me is that this Democratic Labour Party Government has moved away completely from everything it had stood for. This Democratic Labour Party had been looked at all through, the years, when I was one of its biggest supporters, as the party for the masses. The party would do things that the masses of people in this country would say that party is looking after me. What has been happening since 1991, and I have mentioned this only recently to a member of the Front Bench, is that the party I have supported all my life seems to have abandoned the very philosophy that made the Democratic Labour Party, where when you are doing things you always looked after the small man.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am only giving examples. Take, for instance, the mortgage interest claim. You come in here and say the big boys are benefiting from the mortgage interest claim, so you throw the whole thing through the window. The philosophy that guided the Democratic Labour Party that I knew would have said if the big boys are benefiting, all those people who have houses valued over \$250 000 or \$300 000 cannot claim,

but those people who are building houses at \$60 000 or \$70 000 can claim. That is the party I believed in.

You have a situation where you have an incomes policy and you are telling the man who is getting \$8 000 a month he cannot get any increase for the next 2 years, and in the same breath you are felling the girls at Tansitor, at CDS and BelTronics, who are getting \$90 a week they cannot get any increase either. I cannot accept those things, because I have not been brought up that way. I have been poor all my life, I still am, and my job is to look after poor people. The party that I knew, the party that I believed in looked after poor people. What is happening now in this exercise is that the people in the S grades, who do not get any increments, are not bothered about it. They are the big boys. It bothers those people in the Z scales, right down to bottom. They are the people who are going to be murdered by this if they are not given back their increments. This is not the party I belong to, this is not the party I have supported all my life. It is time they come back to looking after poor people, it is time they come back to the philosophy of the late Errol Barrow. What is happening now is that we are sitting down and everything we are being told we are doing, right, wrong or indifferent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not claim to be any genius or anything, but if I am to believe that any imposition a World Bank or the IMF or the IADB puts on me just for \$18 million or \$20 million I have to do, then there is something radically wrong. 6.35 p.m.

The banks in Barbados are awash with money with nobody to borrow it. You are telling me that I am to genuflect and bow down and scrape the floor to anybody because he is lending me \$18 million? Errol Barrow used to walk down Broad Street and borrow \$18 million. Eighteen million dollars and everything these people tell you to do you are doing. Something has to be wrong and nobody seems to be able to stand up and say, look this is wrong. You cannot do this all the time. Something has to be wrong.

- I am telling you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I get involved in debates in this Chamber when I have a gut feeling about anything. If I do not have any gut feeling about it I sit down in here, or I go outside and stand up. I believe that it is time this Government comes back to looking after the main and majority of people in this country because this Government has to understand that in structural adjustment, in those times when a country is structurally adjusting, the people at the bottom have to be looked after specially and this is what bothers me because I have heard the late Errol Barrow on many occasions when we were in the Opposition pointing out how those lending institutions operate against the small people in the country.

What is happening is that we are going and taking everything lock, stock and barrel, no more independence. I have said it in here before that there is a saying that Government is about choosing. We are no longer governing because we are not making any choices. We are accepting what is being put to us and doing it and we believe that is governing a country. That is not governing a country.

I want to say this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that if you brought a resolution or a bill and in that bill contained 2 things that the civil servants' salaries would be put by 8% until April 30, 1993, and that their increments would be stopped until September 30, 1993, and you have restored one, morality and everything else demands that you restore the other one. What is worse, the unions now have a case with the Privy Council on this matter. If you go ahead once again or if the unions - the unions realised this early, because if they went ahead and agreed with this not to restore the increments to the civil servants, what are they fighting a case in Britain for? What would there be putting a case up to the Privy Council for when you are agreeing with everything that is being done?

People have to understand what is happening. I believe that those people in the Civil Service want their increments. The \$42 or the \$30, or the \$20 may not be a lot of money to certain people. To those people in the Civil Service, that is a lot of money. That may be the difference between if you could send to school a child or not. It may be the difference as to whether you could buy a lotto ticket hoping that you could win the \$100 000 or not because there is a lot of suffering in this country. This is nothing to laugh about. There is a lot of suffering in this country and it is time this country gets back to its moorings. It is time that this Government understands that you cannot bow down all day long, all night long, all year round to the lending institutions if you want to keep any semblance of your independence. You have to be able to tell these lending institutions, I can do A, B and C but I cannot do D, I can do E and F but I cannot do G because those 2 things will cause social dislocation in this country and I do not want that to happen and I am sure you do not want it to happen either. You have to be able to stand up to these institutions because after all it is a negotiation process. It is not a process where you have to sit down and take everything rammed down inside of you.

What is happening in this country, I will tell you this. What is happening is that the Prime Minister of this country is assured that whenever he comes to the House of Assembly he has the relevant numbers so it does not matter what you say, or what I say. He has the relevant numbers. Even if it is 12:11, 13:11, 14:13 and he wins it, it will pass and that is the end of that, and that is sad. It is time that other people stand up and say, look you cannot do that and that is not happening in this country. Nobody is willing to stand up and say you cannot do that and it is time that that happens.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to begin by asking a couple of questions. This measure before this Honourable Chamber was given notice of over the weekend and over the weekend, as I understand it coming from the mouth of the Deputy Prime Minister, the Government was still negotiating with the Coalition of Trade Unions. These are the questions I therefore would like to ask. Was the Deputy Prime Minister aware that the present Bill was being drafted and ready for introduction into Parliament when he last met with the Coalition of Trade Union members? That is the question. If he were aware, I want to know if it was not reasonable for one to say that the negotiations then conducted by Government were conducted in bad faith?

I am also going to ask the other question because the Honourable Member for St. Michael North said that the Attorney General, the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central, was also present as a member of the Government's negotiating team. My question therefore is - the Attorney General is supposed to be the person who certifies Bills before they come to Parliament. I would want to know therefore if the Attorney General, when he was sitting there negotiating with these very members of the Coalition of Trade Unions, was aware that the Bill was ready for introduction to Parliament?

I am saying, Sir, that the Bill was already circulated, and would have passed Cabinet where the 2 Honourable Members who represent the Government sat, that nothing at all can convince me that those 2 Members were not aware that the Bill was passed and they were sitting down against the background that the Coalition members were there and say what they like, the Bill was going to be introduced and passed. It was Government's intention. I say that is acting in bad faith.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Sir, the Honourable Member is imputing some kind of motive to me. All I am saying is at no time, and I am sure that the Members on the other side would agree with this - this other side meaning the Coalition - all those present that I negotiated with them in bad faith.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am certain that the Honourable Member will withdraw the remarks.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I withdraw the remarks. I am saying it is reasonable for someone or persons to make that accusation. What I am saying is this. When I heard the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central accusing this side, in particular the Honourable Member for St. Thomas, of trying to destroy the trade union movement, I want to make

this abundantly clear that I support the Honourable Member for St. Thomas on calling on members who now support the union to withhold their dues to those unions because I am satisfied that their interest was not properly represented on this occasion.

I am sure any reasonable person, anyone with a legal mind would say to a client, if you feel that your interest is not well represented by a lawyer then to withdraw your services. Fire him. Do not pay him a cent and that is all the Honourable Member for St. Thomas is saying. Your interest is not very well represented by the trade union members therefore do not pay them a cent. That should not be interpreted as destroying any trade union movement.

What I consider is destroying the trade union movement is to have a bill drafted, negotiating with them and not telling them. You have it in your hip pocket. The date for the discussion is set. You know that it is *fait accompli* but yet you are talking about last minute negotiations and trying to get an agreement. What was the purpose of meeting this morning? You tell me. I am not ding ding, or dodo.

Aside.

6.45 p.m.

That is when you are playing poker. You are hiding something along the line but people are reading your hand. I read the paper and I heard. The deputy leader of the Coalition said quite loud and clear that he is not going to agree to it because he said it was his understanding they were going to meet again. The leader of the Coalition was aware and the Government was aware. Why could you not wait for the expert, he is the head, a lot of knowledge, a lot of tributes were paid to him. I therefore want to know why the Government has to wait until he goes out to push something through the back door. You must have something hiding.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have a little difficulty with that remark. The Bill is before the House of Assembly. I don't know where the back door is or what it is.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I am talking about the negotiations.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not know what the civil servants have done this Government. A former Prime Minister, the Member for St. John, called them an army of occupation. You are running true to form. And the civil servants do not understand at all that the DLP does not like them. I feel they want to pull out their tongues, grabbing their jugular on all occasions whenever it is possible. Bite out their throats according to the Member for St. Philip

North. What have they done? They are like pitbulls going after the public servants. I am going to beg you to keep off the public service. You have done enough harm to them. Some of them cannot pay their mortgages. They have to live too.

Let me tell you something before I go any further. I am going to call on the Right Honourable Prime Minister to fire 3 Ministers because they are not productive. If they were productive he would not have to reshuffle them and try to get something out of them. But nothing more can come out of them. They are exhausted and burnt out and nothing would please me more than for the Prime Minister to fire three of his Ministers and save the money and pay the public servants the increments they deserve. Nobody would miss them at all.

I am going on record. I am willing to forego a month's salary provided that the Honourable Prime Minister gets all of his Members to forego one month's salary. Let us start leading by example. I can start it. I am used to doing that. I am used to giving away a month's salary. I am going on record as saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this is my word and my bond. I am prepared to give one month's salary provided the Prime Minister ensures that all of his Members of Cabinet and all Members of this Government make a similar determination and let the people know that we are serious. Do not cause the pain and suffering and hardship to the public servants. Let them see that we can make some sacrifice too.

I know it is going to be a hard act for them to follow because I remember when the then Prime Minister, the Honourable Member for St. John said he was not going to take the increases and asked his Members to take it and give it to charity, not one of them had done it. I know that, Sir.

I am saying that the civil servants have got to pay mortgages. They have had to suffer the embarrassment of seeing the Government taking away the allowances that were given for mortgage interest. The Government proceeded to increase the property taxes. They increased the fees on books for children, the petty fees etcetera and they made sure they paid an increase for the school meals. They made sure that the public paid increased water rates. Good God, are you going to kill them? The civil servants are taking some body blows. You are going to kill them? Ease the squeeze. I will go a little further. Telephone rates are up, electric bills are up.

Let me tell you something. It cost a policy owner some \$980 up to some months ago as a yearly premium on his house. Do you know what that insurance is now? It is \$2* 880, three times the amount. Do you understand? Now you are seeing it everyday in the papers and debated on the radio that the re-insurers are causing people in Barbados

to have to pay a 300% increase and then you have the unmitigated gall to come in here and tell me you are freezing people's increments? Do you realise that these people have to pay increased insurance?

I will tell you this, one thing I notice about this Government is that when one mortgage company decided to reduce the interest rates, this Government is so uncaring that it never even complimented that financial institution, neither did it make one comment or one appeal to the other financial institutions to reduce their mortgage, rates to a similar rate. I am saying that the Government has a duty to lead by example.

When I look back it worries me. I represent the Pine and Wildey Housing area. Those persons have been put out of the houses, the Government goes and rips off the doors in broad daylight. Are those people criminals? At the same time the Government fires the bread winners, the Government is going in Wildey and the Pine and ripping off the doors now. Could this be a Government of feeling? Where is your heart?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Government must understand that people out there cannot get jobs. When I hear them talking about providing jobs at Sherbourne let me say something to you. I pass Sherbourne daily. You cannot count 20 Barbadians working on that site. You are seeing the Chinese up there and I want to tell you this. We should be finding ways and means of putting Barbadians back into work and stop with this nonsense that the restarting of Sherbourne is bringing work to Barbadians. It is not true. I know some tenders have been given out but Barbadians have not restarted in any significant numbers.

You know what hurts me, the people at the top, as pointed out by the Honourable Member for St. Philip South, the ones at the top are not suffering that much in this particular measure, it is the people at the bottom rung of the ladder. Do you mean you are going to keep them poor and forever poor? I want to see a Barbados in which people like myself of humble parentage can have an opportunity to reap some of the benefits in this country. I am not one who, when I get to the top of the ladder am prepared to kick it down. I want to be an example and I am going to call on this Honourable Chamber and all Members who are thinking that that class of person should have no say in this community to wake up. I am not going to remain in political life and allow that to happen. It is not fair.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just want to say this. A lot has been said by Honourable Members on this side and I do not want to repeat it. 6.55 p.m.

But I want the Government to understand that this Opposition makes criticisms and observations in good faith.

We have said this repeatedly that this is our country and in your speeches in your contributions sometimes you give the impression that this Opposition is out for destroying this country. Let me go on record as saying this. The late great Sir Grantley Adams was the founder of the Barbados Labour Party. He helped to nurture and create the worker's organisation. We are proud of that. We are not like a cow having given a good bucket of milk and turn around and kick it down. All we are saying is that there are some standards that were set that we believe in the Barbados Labour Party which we hold very dearly. We are only asking that this Government and the trade union movement in Barbados observe them. If we find as we have found on this occasion and on several occasions that something is lacking and they are falling short, we are going to stand up and be critical. So nothing at all will prevent us from carrying out that role. It is our mandate. We are going to do that.

I call on the Government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to look very closely at what it is doing. Enough pain, suffering and hardship have been inflicted on the people of Barbados particularly on those who can least afford it. I am asking the Government to search for its conscience and help the persons living in Christ Church East and those people who are suffering daily to have the faith in the country and have some hope. I hope that the Government will listen to the pleas of this Opposition and let us get out of the muck that we are in. This is not a good piece of legislation and I hope that the Government will take what we have said in the future as good advice.

SUSPENSION

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move that the sitting be suspended until 7.45 p.m. this evening.

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

The question that the sitting be suspended until 7.45 p.m. this evening was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 7.00 p.m.

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed. The Honourable Member for St. Peter.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I enter into this debate to make a short presentation. Sir, first I would like to thank and to congratulate the members on my side who have joined on with such clarity and with such purpose to the issues involved in this particular matter. I would particularly like to cite the contribution of the member for St. V. John who spoke well and who focused

the Opposition's position on this matter and outlined the precise reasons why we would find it impossible to support this particular measure.

I also, Mr. Speaker, want to cite the contribution of the member for St. Philip South who in his contribution combined fact, logic, philosophy and a conscience and gave, in my estimation, the finest speech that I have heard presented by him during the period that I have been in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to cover the ground that has been covered by other members. I want to introduce a number of new elements to this particular debate and I would like to take the House back to March of this year. Because contrary to what was said by the Deputy Prime Minister, the question of Government's policies on increments and the financial implications of the restoration of increments was a matter that was anticipated by the Opposition and was deliberately raised by the Opposition and properly so in March of this year during the Estimates Debate.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of clarification, Sir. I made it clear. I said that only the Honourable Member for St. Peter. I said then that he does his homework. I did not say that he did not raise it. What I said was that we did not give any undertakings about it. That is what I said.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I want to make the point that has not yet been made in this debate that all of the problems surrounding the restoration of the increments can be traced to poor financial planning by Government in the face of adequate warning by the Opposition. I believe that it is therefore important that we should go back to March. I recall on March 8th making a contribution to this House in these terms and to this effect. I said then: I recall that the Government,, I believe through the Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs, stated what was his position regarding the restoration of the 8 per cent cut. But I also think that Government's policy also affected the payment of increments, The Minister of Finance, as I understand it, has not yet addressed that question as to what is going to be Government's policy. I believe that the legislation that was introduced giving effect to the 8 per cent cut also suspended increments. Sir, I recall that I said words to this effect: Whereas the restoration of the 8 per cent cut was to take effect at the end of March, increments were to be restored in September. That is my recollection of the situation. The Government can correct me if I am wrong.

Sir, I am saying that we have heard what is Government's position in relation to the 8 per cent cut. I have not heard its position in relation to the restoration of the increments. Consequentially, I have not heard if there

are additional financial implications which stem from the restoration of the increments which will affect the execution of these Estimates. Therefore, I rise on this particular matter to raise this precise question. What really is the policy regarding the restoration of Government which is something that legally has to be undertaken by the end of September?

Sir, I also recall that on March 8th the Prime Minister also said in response to the issue that I raised that: "On the question of the restoration of the increments I did indicate at the start of the debate that what I did not say today may be said next week." Next week, Sir, was the Budget. We had the Estimates Debate and let me refresh the Prime Minister because he is getting old. As you know, Sir, when you get old you have a long memory, but things that happened recently one may tend to forget.

The following week the Prime Minister of this country made the restoration of the 8 per cent cut a matter of the integrity of the Government. That is why this debate is important today. He said then that he had a Government that kept its word and that he had given the country a commitment. That is why this debate is so important. He said that he had given a commitment and that the 8 per cent was being restored as proof of the integrity of his administration. 8,00 p.m.

Now, let us go back to March, because I am saying that this whole thing has to do with poor financial planning in the context of a situation where the Government was forewarned. At the start of March this year the Government, which manages a \$1.2 billion economy, was faced with two policy choices. In the context of the same piece of legislation, it had committed itself to ceasing the 8% cut at the end of March and it had also committed itself, as a Government of integrity, to ceasing the withdrawal of increments from the civil servants at the end of September.

The simple financial issue that faced the Government was this. Do I put into the Estimates of this country \$36 million on the one part to accommodate the restoration of the 8% cut, and add to that in net terms an additional 4% to cover the increments? That is \$40 million in the context of a budget of \$1.2 billion. The Government chose then only to make provision for the restoration of the 8%. Although, as I said, Sir, I fulfilled my responsibility as the shadow spokesman for finance on this side in bringing to Government's attention the fact that it had also to take a clear position on increments, as clear as the position it took on the wage cuts.

* Now, Sir, the people of Barbados are cynical about politics. They are alienated from the political system. This Prime Minister went to the country and told the people

of Barbados, "give me 18 months to put this country back on its feet." Part of that request on the part of Government for time involved the notion that "I am going to ask you to sacrifice in the form of wage cuts and withdrawal of increments in 18 months, and when that period has ended the sacrifice will be over." The Prime Minister did that and, as I said earlier in this debate, he made the restoration of the 8% pay cut, on page 3495 of Hansard, a test of the integrity of his administration.

The question, therefore, must arise in this House, if the restoration of the 8% pay cut is a test of the integrity of this administration, why is not the restoration of the increments similarly a test? That really is the issue. I believe that the Government knows that the answer to that issue has in fact been provided by the Member for St. Philip South, that in point of fact the restoration of the 8% pay cut did not meet with the favour of the international lending institutions. That is a fact. And that the institutions have made it impossible for this Government, which restored the 8% pay cut, to now come and restore the increments.

What the Government would want us to do is to agree with them on the ground that they cannot afford it. That is why we say this debate is about integrity, because Government's inability to restore the increments has nothing at all to do with affordability. Tell us so. Tell us that you have agreed in your Letter of Intent that the incomes policy must be the corner stone of Government's economic policy. The Letter of Intent says that in as many words. Tell us also that the Government to-ing and fro-ing on the incomes policy, and in particular the question of the restoration of the 8% wage cut, has been one of the points of issue that has stood in the way of Government being able to carry forward its business with those institutions.

Mr. Speaker, when the Prime Minister spoke on 15th March, he spoke within the context of a situation in which there was a division even in his Cabinet. And he cited it. There was one person who was saying the 8% pay cut should not be restored at all, because it would have been harmful to the economy. And then there was another Minister who was saying you should have an additional 2% cut. The Prime Minister said he had given his word to the people of Barbados and that he was going to keep his word, because he believed that the Government had to be a Government of integrity. I say that the people of Barbados are sick and tired of this. The people are also sick and tired of a Government which believes that you can say anything and do anything.

Mr. Speaker, we have fundamentally to oppose this in this House, not just on the question of affordability, but on the question as to whether we are going to restore political integrity to Barbados. That is the issue in this debate. I feel so. The people out there were led to believe by the Prime

Minister that the 8% pay cut was going to be restored, that the increments would have been restored and they now cannot, for the life of them, understand how the same Government that can be telling us that all is now well, that the financial position is now secure, that the bases of this economy have been rebuilt, is telling them they have now to make a continuous sacrifice in the context of an improved economy. That is the issue, Mr. Speaker, and there are other issues as well.

What kind of precedent are we going to create in this country if a Government can unilaterally change the terms and conditions of a person's employment in such a way as to be able to substitute one set of conditions for the other? What are we doing in Barbados when it falls properly to the lot of a Government to tell a public servant I can either pay you in the form of time off or I can pay you in the form of cash? I know what his limits are and he probably knows what mine are. But are we not creating a dangerous precedent in this society when it can be perceived as falling to the lot of a Government to tell people whether they are going to be paid in cash or in kind, when it falls to Government to say that you can unilaterally substitute one benefit for the other? That is at the heart of this debate, because the Government is now telling this House that a Government of Barbados can look at a public servant and say "I acknowledge that I owe you money. Take it in the form of leave." What are the limits to Government?

Also, Mr. Speaker, must we now agree and believe that it falls properly to the lot of any Government of Barbados to unilaterally change the terms and conditions of any agreement to which it is committed only on the grounds of its inability to pay? Does not the Government of Barbados understand that it has to live up to its financial obligations? What kind of signal are we sending to the people of the world when we come to Parliament and ask Parliament to agree that a Government understands that it has committed itself to pay people but it is going to unilaterally determine that those people cannot be paid because the Government cannot afford it? That is the issue, Sir. 8.10 p.m.

This Government, subsequent to taking financial decisions on this matter, found itself in a position to be able to afford, as my colleagues have said, the establishment of an institute of democracy in this country at the Community College. It has found itself in a position to be able to afford the commitment of \$17 million more of the taxpayers funds for the completion of Sherbourne. The argument about affordability in such a context is thread bare. But beyond the financial aspect of it, is the question of political morality.

I truly believe, Mr. Speaker, that in the context of a situation in which this House is from time to time asked to approve expansions of the borrowing limits of

Government to enable it to cope with its financial obligations, the argument of affordability cannot with any credibility be used in circumstances where the financial obligations to be met by the Government of Barbados are in net terms no more than \$5 million. That is what we are being reduced to. We are telling the world that \$5 million is enough to cause a government of this country to resile from its responsibility. What kind of society are we creating? That is the issue. I therefore cannot find it within me to support the nonsense that is being perpetrated here. It is nonsense and it is done only because, as the Honourable Member for St. Philip South says, because the IMF says that it must be done.

Mr. Speaker, I am the only person in this Parliament who has ever had the opportunity to negotiate an IMF programme. I had to help negotiate one in 1982 but we negotiated. We started with a concept as to what we wanted. We defined Barbados* financial requirements and we went in to those negotiations with a clear concept as to what we were prepared to accept and not prepared to accept on behalf of the people of this country. I fear I must say in this debate that such a sense does not now seem to inform the behaviour nor the utterances of the Government of Barbados. That is, if the Government believes that if it takes a position contrary to that which the international institutions wants it to hold, that there is some way in which they can be penalised by the international institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I find it remarkable that the same Government of Barbados can in one week come and tell the people of this country that we have the best credit rating of any country in this hemisphere in Latin America, but we cannot borrow on the international market. I find that astonishing and that our only recourse now, with the best credit rating in the hemisphere of any developing country is that we must genuflect continuously to the international institutions.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I am not talking about borrowing to pay wages now and I will not be distracted by the nonsense. I am saying that there is a mentality and a psychology that is setting in which will have us discard all of the options that may be open to us and pursue only those that the IMF, or the World Bank, and the IADB say are the correct options for us. I go back to the statement with which I ended my presentation in the last debate. In the last Budget debate, Sir, I warned the Government of the statement by John Steinbeck to John Kenneth Galbraith that: "Some men grow to love their chains and with time come to regard them as wings," This Government has come, I say without fear of contradiction, to love its chains and is beginning to believe that they are wings, And what is involved?

This Government that in 1990 could go to the international market and borrow \$120 million on the strength of the name of this country is now having to genuflect to the World Bank over \$18 million. Twenty million dollars, or some number like that, is but a trifling amount in the context of a country with the best credit rating in Latin America.

I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that the problem staggers me. It really is that the Government does not seem to believe that it can do anything outside the framework of what is prescribed to it by the international institutions. I say that when a Government reaches that stage it is defeated. It will carry the people of the country to defeat and it ought to resign. That, in a nutshell, is the predicament that faces this country at this time. The Government has ceased to govern. The Government is defeated. And the people of Barbados, although resilient, are capable still of building a better future for themselves but can be carried down by a government which is prepared to accept defeat.

I want to speak, Sir, to some of the matters concerning the unions. My colleagues have already addressed them in large pan and have been castigated by the other side for the nature of our contribution on the question of the role the unions are playing in this country. I want to address the matter from a different point of view.

Earlier this year the Government of Barbados presented what was its position of an incomes policy. Many aspects of that incomes policy were offensive to the Barbados Labour Party and we drew public attention to what was offensive about the incomes policy as presented to the nation by Government. Among them was the notion that there should be a general wage freeze. I cited the English case of 1974 in which you had an incomes policy but it did not entail a general across the board wage freeze. It was recognised then, as it should have been recognised in our circumstances, that there should be an incomes threshold below which people are regarded as being so poor that they should not be treated in the same manner in the face of an incomes policy as people at the top of the pyramid.

We argued, Sir, that we would like to see incorporated in the incomes policy in Barbados no such thing as a general wage freeze; but the facility for persons whose incomes were sufficiently low to be accorded wage increases. We have found it possible in part to support the incomes policy because that principle and precept is embodied in the Protocol. I have given this House the commitment that the Barbados Labour Party will be monitoring that and other aspects of the incomes policy.

I would have thought, Sir, that the unions, having recognised the value of the principle, would have by

now started to classify those lines of occupation in this country in which people's wages could be said to be substandard and would have started to negotiate on behalf of those people. But I am not hearing any such things from the trade unions of this country. As I said, Sir, I supported the incomes policy because it does not involve a wage freeze but because it allows the flexibility such that persons at the lower end of the bracket can have wage increases. That is not what the Government is selling. It is not what the private sector is selling. And sad to say, it is not what the trade unions are selling. When we castigate the trade unions from this side, it is because of things like this. I am calling upon them to start doing that work because we are going to monitor it.

We also said, Sir, that you could not have an incomes policy in which you froze wages but did not freeze prices. The Government revised its incomes policy Protocol to make provision to link the two and the private sector and the trade unions would set up special committees to start monitoring the two. Where are those committees, Mr. Speaker? Is the union taking seriously its responsibility to make sure that there is justification for every price increase in this country as is set out in the letter and as it is implied in the spirit of the incomes policy? Are the unions serious?

I go further, Mr. Speaker. The whole point of the incomes policy was to provide, as was said so eloquently in that debate, a framework involving not legislation but flexible guidelines within which the nightmare of layoffs in this country would be put behind the people of this country once and for all. There is no point your constituents or mine being asked to carry the sacrifice of a wage freeze, or a moderation in their wage increases if at the end of the day, even if it is not an increase in employment, at least there is stability on the labour market. 8.20 p.m.

I heard, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Christ Church East Central, and I am going to hold him to his word. He said on the floor of this House that the incomes policy was to provide, the framework within which layoffs in the public and the private sector were going to stop. I have heard, Mr. Speaker, Sir, layoffs in the public and the private sector subsequent to that and not a word from the unions. As I said, Sir, we came to find it acceptable to accept an incomes policy because it was our understanding....

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: The Member said so before the House. We also, when we saw Government's incomes policy proposal, made the point then that what matters to people is not the gross income but their take home income. We made the point, Mr. Speaker, that in other jurisdictions where income policies have been introduced, there were

also accompanied by changes of such a character in the taxation system that even if you could not increase a man's gross pay you could by variation in the rate or the bands of taxation affect his net income in a favourable manner.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am raising it now for this reason. That precept and principle is embodied in the incomes policy. We raised it, and it is reflected in the policy. Despite whatever the NUPW General Secretary says, Sir, if I raise something and a Government policy is affected to accommodate it, Sir, I am not going to spit up into the air to have it fall back down in my face. But we called for the linkage of tax changes to incomes changes in this country as a fundamental part of Government's approach to the incomes policy.

However, Sir, we keep hearing from the Minister of Finance in particular that the Government has just gone about direct tax reform and the Government has to give it a chance to play itself out before it changes. There is only one Minister of Finance as far as I am aware,

Now, Sir, I am warning the Government that you cannot have that attitude and at the same time toy with the workers of Barbados, toy with the private sector and toy with the trade unions by committing yourself to incorporating tax changes and incomes changes as part and parcel of a process of affecting what people take home.

We are going to be monitoring it because, Mr. Speaker, we have put some political capital on the line too. There was an incomes policy proposal by Government that was offensive in its initial formation. We fought for changes, those changes were accommodated in it. We stand to be accused of perhaps being too obliging to the Government but we want to see Barbados become stable, succeed and progress. And I give the House the assurance, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that I will be monitoring the incomes policy. I will be monitoring the specific aspects of that policy that we have fought for. And whenever the Trade Unions of this country seem to forget their responsibility, as they seem to have forgotten it in this instance, Sir, we are going to remind them about it despite the kind of strictures that may come from time to time on the other side to the effect that we want to destroy the trade union movement in this country. The trade unions must understand that they have been put on trial.

There are things, Mr. Speaker, that the trade unions are now prepared to accept that they were never prepared to accept when there was a Barbados Labour Party administration in this country. In the early 1980s, Mr. Speaker, in the same country, facing the same international recession, there was a company called Coopers that was closed because the unions asked for a 33% and the people said they could not afford to pay it. That is a fact.

Mr. SPEAKER: I know the Honourable Member would love to continue. You are already over time but I will give you some time to conclude.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I am obliged to you, Sir. The point I am making is that the unions must understand that they are on trial and nothing that the Opposition Barbados Labour Party is saying is either adding to or subtracting from the trial. There is a perception rooted deeply in reality that the trade unions, particularly the Barbados Workers Union, are aggressive and forceful about advancing the rights of workers, more so when there is a Barbados Labour Party Government than when there is a Democratic Labour Party Government. They have to face their own crisis and I say to this House, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that the absence of the principal members of the Workers Unions from this House during this debate is a mistake.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, I am not going to condone that for one reason/The Honourable Member does not know if any of the Members indicated to me that they would be absent. It is a courtesy that should be extended to me and I take that as an honourable mistake. If you are referring to the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central he had the courtesy and this is what he said on the date. "I seek formal leave to be absent from the sitting of the House on 5th October". I do not need to read anything more. What I want to say is this. As long as a Member indicates to me that he would be absent I take it in good faith and no Member should try to remove that.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, if that information was in my possession prior to my speaking I could understand your sentiments. But I will qualify what I am saying, it was a courteous mistake.

Mr. SPEAKER: Even that I am not going to accept. I accept the Honourable Member's He is an Honourable Member and I have to accept him in that spirit. I gave the Honourable Member time to speak.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I am winding down, Sir. Mr. Speaker, if you want me to withdraw the remarks I will withdraw them.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, I am not going to. But what I am suggesting is that the courtesy which has been extended to me and which I am privy to the absence of the Honourable Member and I would not...

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I was not, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Therefore you should have asked. Therefore I made it for any Honourable Member and I will not permit that kind of aspersion to be made on any Member.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, I am going to conclude because as I said my side has brilliantly put most issues raised by the matter before this Parliament. I am introducing, Sir, the question as was introduced by the Prime Minister in March that when a Government gives a commitment, Sir, and Government does not keep its commitment or does not appear to keep its commitment, it weakens the will of the country. This is one such measure, *Sir, which in my judgement will weaken the will of the people of Barbados. It is in that context and on that ground more than any other that I find this legislation before the House objectionable and perhaps even offensive. And I regret, Mr. Speaker, that a Government of Barbados should be so reduced, that the question of finding \$5 million net to honour an obligation should stand between it and its compliance with a precept which the Prime Minister says is a matter of integrity. I am obliged to you, Sir.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I will be very brief, and I will hope to wind up this debate and deal with most of the important issues that have surfaced. 8.30 p.m.

But I wish to say that I hope when the Honourable Member for St. Peter takes time in his later years to read the speeches that he has delivered on economic issues in this country that he will reflect on the substantial inconsistencies which attend to the position that he takes from issue to issue. Even in respect to his own speech today, this is a speech in which the Honourable Member for St. Peter began by saying that the Minister of Finance restored the 8 per cent in the face, as he knows it, of opposition from the financial institutions as well as the Government. Three minutes later he said that this Government genuflects all the time to the financial institutions. Now if the major thing that has been dividing us consistently from the institutions, according to him and other persons who I will not identify because I am in an *ad hominem* exercise, and if he says that is the principle thing that divides and having been saying that since March of last year, Mr. Speaker, that the Government cannot uphold an Incomes Policy...

Aside.

• Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: He has said that the institutions have no faith in us and that we cannot implement what they say we must implement. He and others have said that the people at the World Bank do not want to see us anymore, Mr. Speaker, in this debate minutes later, not a week later, because politicians are entitled to have short memories. In fact, I think it is advantageous particularly if you are Leader of the Opposition. But you cannot in the same speech accuse the Government of genuflecting and then at the same time argue that the Government insisted on doing things which obviously the institutions and other persons in the community did not implement. I am a bit at a loss.

Sir, I will concede...

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not allowing any interruptions. I am making that rather clearly. I am listening to the Honourable Member for St. John. Continue.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: On the increment, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Peter is correct. He raised it in the debate on the Appropriation Bill. What response were you given? He has not gone to that you know. This is the point that I constantly make. What response were you given? Did the Government tell you that they were going to restore increments? Are you trying to tell this House that you knew then that the Government had made provisions for the increments or had not made provisions? Now do not let us fool ourselves on this.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation. The response that I got from the Prime Minister then was that it would be addressed in a week's time.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, he asked the question. So I gave him the answer, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, he can ask you but I have to direct the debate. That is not a point of order.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I am going to put it another way then. Was the Honourable Member for St. Peter given any commitment by this Government in respect of increments, or can any member of the public say that this Government gave any commitment in respect to the restoration of the increments at anytime either a date or the amount or how it would be restored? Can anybody say that there has been a public statement on that matter?

Now -the Honourable Member for St. Peter has to understand that his own colleague said that the issue of increments was included in the original coalition draft of the Protocol on prices and income. It is correct. It was there. Why do you think it was there? The Honourable Member only has to think. It is because the public servants were obviously aware that provision had not been made for the restoration of the increment. They wanted it on the agenda for discussion. We had discussions on it. They stuck out to nearly the end and at the end we agreed that it was not a matter for the Incomes Policy itself, but that we would deal with it on the basis of our negotiations with the public servants as we would with any other wage negotiation matter. It is as simple as that. Government sits down and negotiates salaries and conditions of service with the Public Service all of the time and legislates them too

when they do not agree. This was treated in this way. Now somebody tonight asked, "Why now?"

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member's language needs to be conformed with parliamentary reproach. All members in this Chamber are known as Honourable Members.

Hen. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I was not necessarily referring to anybody in this Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am dealing with this Chamber. I am not concerned with what happens outside the Chamber.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The question has been asked, Mr. Speaker, why today? The restoration of the increments was to take effect from October 1st. This is October 5th. In other words, the mandate for Government to continue to withhold the increment came to an end. We cannot do it in December. Pay-day will be coming around. Let us be frank. There is no secret about this. I live in Barbados and, even if I were not in this House either, I do not wish to say commonsense because I do not wish anybody to interpret me as either attempting to be arrogant or diminish people so I am not doing that. But I think it is a genuine question but it is a question that does not make sense to me. The law has expired. You can only put a law in place after a law expires. You do not put the new law into place before then and we were still in discussion. We set our deadline for these things. We met with the coalition and we did not agree. It is not the first time that Government has not agreed with the trade union movement on salaries. You have legislated salaries before and I am certain that it will not be the last occasion in Barbados when salaries have to be legislated for lack of agreement or conditions of service may have to be legislated for lack of agreement. We did the best we could in the circumstances and we have brought the legislation to withhold something and to give compensation.

People talk about infringing the Constitution. If we are withholding a right, at the same time by virtue of this legislation we are providing compensation for the withholding of that right.

Aside.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Well, take it to Court if you feel that it is a big issue. The point is that this debate has hinged on the wrong kinds of issues. The issue of affordability is at the centre of this matter. We have already committed ourselves to a balanced budget in this particular year. Mr. Speaker, the targeted fiscal deficit is \$17.6 million. We said that we would have a deficit within the range of 1 per cent of GDP. That is not in doubt.

We have always said so. The Honourable Member for St. Peter told us to run a higher deficit. Other people have suggested outside of this Chamber, Sir, if I am permitted to draw reference to them, that we should run a higher deficit. 8.40 p.m.

We have set our targets. If revenue shortfalls occur, as they have been occurring, it means we have to make compensating adjustments elsewhere. When those compensating adjustments are made, they sometimes have to be made in the capital budget, they sometimes have to be made in other areas.

Aside.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: No, you cannot find it anywhere else, because if you were alert enough you would know for example that there are some items of expenditure that you basically cannot make quick adjustments on. Elements of current expenditure, for example, personal emoluments, interest payments on domestic and foreign debt and current transfers. These are aspects which are almost inescapable commitments that we cannot make adjustments on. If we are therefore dealing with a balanced budget, whenever we come here for supplementaries we have to find corresponding savings elsewhere.

Aside.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: For which a large part of it will be found by corresponding savings elsewhere. That was said. You were not even in the House.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: This is the point, Mr. Speaker, that people who are not in the House are quarrelling about other people who were not here. They do not understand what has happened.

Mr. SPEAKER: Carry on. Continue.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Thank you. I agree, Mr. Speaker. We made the point then that those supplementaries will be covered by savings. When the truth comes out there are all kinds of sitting back and relaxing now, there is no commitment to write down figures any more. When everybody over there was speaking earlier, people sat in silence and everybody was writing down, making copious notes, so we can answer the questions for them. But when we reply, Mr. Speaker, nobody wants to hear the truth about any of those assertions.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not fair to the Honourable Member. I allowed the last Member to speak, as I thought best, without interruptions. Any Member who wants to interrupt, I could do one or two things, make a suggestion... We are near the end of a Sitting and I suppose one may want to be suspended for the remainder of the sitting. Please let us continue the debate as we are going. Can I hear the Honourable Member for St. John?

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I have made the point outside of Barbados and inside of Barbados that the stabilisation programme which we entered into was successful in relation to the targets that were set. I however made the point, and continue to make it, that stabilisation is not an objective in itself, it has to be followed by something else. I take comfort from the speeches of the Honourable Member for St. Philip South, particularly the speech on the original Reduction of Emoluments Bill, where he traced the excesses in Government expenditure and traced graphically for the people of Barbados why this administration should not be blamed, and how we needed to make fundamental changes and suggested that stabilisation was not enough, that there would have to be deep rooted structural reform. I agree with the Honourable Member for St. Philip South. I am saying, therefore, that we have to carry out that element of structural reform and we have to finance it, but we are not going to finance that structural reform on any conditions. All this talk about genuflection, it is precisely because we have not genuflected, particularly to conditions which we think are inimical to the interest of Barbadians, that we have not accessed the World Bank funds which were available, and we have constantly said so. This is the third time I am saying it, the Prime Minister indicated in his budget what the issues were that were dividing us. We have indicated that, yet we are hearing tonight that the IADB and the World Bank are coming in twinned. We have already stated that that is not on.

The arrangement we are pursuing is an enhanced surveillance programme with the IMF and we hope that will trigger resources from the Inter-American Development Bank. The World Bank is still the World Bank and Barbados is still Barbados. We have agreed most recently, on my trip to Washington, to be good friends from here on in. Barbados, as you know, Mr. Speaker, is on the verge of graduation. The Honourable Member for St. Peter has not addressed his mind as to why they are graduating us, even though the effort of graduation took place under a previous administration. They graduate you because of the standard of living, the per capita income, so that we are not going to have access to World Bank funds for ever, and perhaps when the graduation issue should have been fought it was not best fought. We are now the recipients of the 10 year graduation programme which the then Government acceded to. It ended 2 years ago and we are* not entitled to concessionary funds.

The Honourable Member for St. Peter is unique in this House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, and he must not get away with these things. He said he negotiated an IMF programme. He did not tell the House that he was not a policy maker then. I want to make this point clearly, because it shows the way in which the Barbados Labour Party used to function. No public servant leaves here to finalise any negotiation or negotiates on his own remit or otherwise for the Barbados Government in any IMF programme, and no functionary can tell me "we had a concept of what we wanted to do." The only people that can have a concept of what this country needs to do is this House of Assembly and the people who elect this House, set policy, make laws and determine what is in the best interest of the country and public officers execute those policies. It is based on manifestoes, elections and a whole host of other things that go into policy making, and I challenge any public officer after retiring from the Public Service to come into this Chamber and look me eye to eye and tell me he negotiated anything for these policy makers. Big men, lawyers, doctors, all kinds of hard seeds were elected to this House in 1976, and somebody who is a public officer can say he negotiated an IMF programme for the people of Barbados. It just goes to show the extent to which they did not know what was going on, and that other people sitting behind a desk, public officers...

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Member is misleading the House. Public officers in this country have helped to negotiate loans, programmes, all kinds of things on behalf of the Government of Barbados. I also want to say that those public officers, including myself, who have helped negotiate loans and programmes have started, as far as I am aware, with a concept as to what they wanted to achieve. If that is now a new fad of the Government, I am glad to hear about it.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, that is the point. I thank the Honourable Member for St. Peter. He must get up in here and let it be known that he must credit policy makers for making the policy and not be so prejudiced as to suggest that he is the only person who had experience in negotiating something.

Aside.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: He said "I am the only person".

Asides.

Eon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: He does not remember what he said, so I am not proceeding on that. I am only saying to you, Mr. Speaker...

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Member said I was misleading the House. I have never said that I was the only person who negotiated. 8.50 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has made the statement that he has never said that. I would suggest that that matter rest where it is and if a member wants to substantiate that point he would have to bring the records to show that-, so that matter has been laid to rest. Will the Honourable Member continue.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I am not challenging his recollection of what he said. I began this debate by saying that the Honourable Member for St. Peter shifts ground very quickly.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just one moment. Now you can continue.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: He shifted ground in his own speech and I am not surprised now that he does not remember what he said but I am going to repeat, since this statement about genuflecting and all of these other remarks about this Government, as if all the brains reside over there and all of the public servants who were intelligent worked under them, and none under us. I want to let it be known that these policies were set by the Cabinet. I do not care what anybody over here says or over there. The policies set by the Cabinet were enshrined in a letter of intent and all other loans or other obligations that we have to international institutions have been established with the consent and concurrence of the Cabinet of Barbados. Then the public officers take their cue and move on to do whatever is their remit but the policies are made here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that point has to be made very clearly because allegations of poor financial planning, and the riot that members allege is being run in the Ministry of Finance do not stick. I am saying to you that Honourable Members on that side knew, or at least the principal spokesman knew in March that provision had not been made for the restoration of increments. I am saying that the public officers and their representatives knew this and that we agreed to enter into discussions with them and that in good faith, not only during the incomes policy but subsequently we had those discussions with them.

Now tell me what kind of politician would take pride, even as he says, for the paltry sum of \$3 million this year total - restoration figure of about \$7.4 million - in withholding that money if it was available? But the issue of affordability, as I have said, is at the centre of this. We restore the 8% which had a value 4 times greater than the increments and we are asking the public officers to forego payment of the increments and they will be granted suitable leave as compensation for foregoing those increments. If something else has to be done I wish to assure you

that whenever we have to discuss with the public officers or the institutions we always tell them that we can do A, B and C and we cannot do D, and we can do E and F but cannot do G. We do that all the time and will continue to do it. We have not so far accepted any terms and conditions from any group in this country which we think are inimical to the interest of the country.

We have to manage the financial affairs of Barbados prudently. The stabilisation programme, as I have indicated, met those criteria. There are issues relating to growth. . There are issues relating to employment which we are seeking to grapple with but you do not grapple with them by stabilisation. Those are policies you grapple with by a growth oriented strategy to create employment. You do not grapple with unemployment through a stabilisation programme. There is not a country in the world that has implemented a stabilisation programme that during the programme has not suffered increase in unemployment. That is the reason why those programmes are followed by structural adjustment measures, some of which we have introduced and some of which are bearing fruit.

We have to be careful that we do not create a situation where there is excessive demand and that we do not loosen the financial policies to the extent that we have other difficulties in the Barbadian economy and that is the short answer to it. We simply cannot afford this arrangement at this time. As I have said, the inconsistencies with which the Opposition has attacked this particular matter make absolute nonsense to me. I think the good sense of public officers would prevail, that they would prefer to forego that sum of money understanding that people will find employment, either through the capital works programme or through other initiatives which Government embarks upon.

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I will be giving my support to this particular Bill.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:-

Ayes: Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Hon. B. M. TAITT, Hon. M. A. KING, Hon. E. E. GREAVES, Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, Hon. N. K. SIMMONS, Hon. W. W. HALL, Hon. C. V. WALKER, Hon. D. W. BOWEN, Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON and Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE - 12.

Noes: Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN, Mr. O. S. ARTHUR, Miss B. A. MILLER, Mr. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. L. R. TULL, Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW and Mr. R. C. EASTMOND - 7

On the motion of Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, seconded by Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Mr. SPEAKER left the

Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE in the Chair. 9.00 p.m.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 6 was' called.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, in moving that Clause 6 stand part there is a small amendment I need to move and that is 6(b). The first word in 6(b) is "an". In place of "an" put the word "any". In the penultimate line of the same clause 6, rather than "the" put "any". It should read, "the value of any increment". With those amendments, Mr. Chairman, I move that Clause 6 stand part.

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

Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, Sir, we have a little difficulty here with Clause 6 which says that as compensation for such suspension or non-payment, as the case may be, that the officer shall be entitled to a period of leave from duty. I want to be clear because I have to tell the people something.' Compensation now is that you go home? Leave is compensation? So in a natural progression the next thing the Government will do now is send home people from work altogether.

Aside.

Miss B. A. MILLER: No, I do not want to hear from him. I want to hear from the Minister over there. You can be compensated by virtue of being sent home from work. That is all I want to know. I want to be clear on it. I thought that compensation had to be something from which you benefitted. You are taking people's money from them and giving them enforced leave in return. Am I clear on that? That is what compensation is here? Somebody has to ask. I am asking. I want to know if enforced leave in lieu of money is what is meant by compensation here. Clause 6 speaks of compensation. I want to be clear on it.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that the Honourable Member, herself, would raise this question. This is not something new. This is something that is going on even now in the system. Right this minute, Sir, in any part of the health system there are persons who work and get what they call lieu days. They get compensation in lieu of their having worked additional time. This goes on in the Public Service now. It happens in the private sector. It is not a phenomenon that has just...

• *Asides.*

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Now, Sir, the Honourable Member is a lawyer, I am told. The Honourable Member must know that to talk money in the terms she is raising the question is a *non sequitur*. It is value. If I have worked 6 hours I can be paid money for those 6 hours or I could be given something in lieu of the time I am supposed to work. I can be given time off. So, time and money...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not going to tolerate that. The Honourable Member for Bridgetown.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am speaking on this, Sir, because I did not speak on the second reading and this kind of mis-information goes forth into the world regularly and it is generated by people like the Honourable Member. The Honourable Member knows. I know that she knows. She has to know that compensation comes in the form of time off. That is what this clause says. Will the Honourable Member admit that she does not know that and I will withdraw any imputations of her having knowledge of that or anything else, Sir. I withdraw it. It is simple, straightforward.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Honourable Member just give way. I am not going to speak on that again. We are in Committee and each Honourable Member has the opportunity to make his contribution as orderly as possible. I cannot have that any longer. Let the Honourable Member proceed.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member from his seat is saying that it is a change in the contractual terms. We could spend another week discussing that. The Honourable Member is right. You cannot carry leave to a supermarket. You cannot buy intelligence. You cannot do a whole lot of things but the fact is that people who work in the system in Barbados already do exactly what we are doing. Furthermore this system has been tried successfully in a large number of jurisdictions across the world and it has worked. In fact the Barbados Workers* Union itself has recently practised it. It was published in the newspapers that the Barbados Workers* Union had brought in a system by which people took time off so time is money.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Bridgetown. I am not going to repeat.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Bridgetown, I am drawing it to your attention again. I am not satisfied with that level of cross talk. Please desist from doing it.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am surprised the Honourable Member would get up and raise that question.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I am getting a little confused on this. I want to have it clarified. I am no lawyer and I want it clarified. I am a legislator. I want to know, if in case of a teacher, a teacher is entitled 3 to 4 days, are you going to send home the teacher for 4 days and what is going to be the position with the children? I want clarification so I can understand you. Do not assume anything in this. I just want to know, if you have, in the case of a school and the teacher is entitled to 4 days, what is going to be the position since the law states that the teacher is entitled to 3 or 4 days. I want to know how you are going to work this out. Are you going to say, well because the law says you are entitled to 4 days you will send them home or whether you are going to use your discretion or whether you are going to use your discretion if the law permits you to stagger or to choose the particular time. 9.10 p.m.

Aside.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: But a lot of people over there do not use their discretion. I just want to know if the law allows for this. Because it is all right talking about using discretion, use discretion where the law permits, but where it does not you cannot. I want to make sure that there is some degree of flexibility as a matter of interpretation and I want to make that quite clear because the children will suffer. People are going to ask what is the sense of waiting if the law is here. I want to know what is going to happen with the children if you take the teachers off. How are you going to do it?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, if the Honourable Member will give way. Sir, it is very simple. The Honourable Member knows that, if school teachers, nurses, policemen or firemen have to go away, they will then ask for 3-days no pay leave. The Honourable Member knows that all we are doing is saying that you can get three additional days to whatever is due to you. That is all. It is not a mystery. It is that if somebody has 28 days they will get three additional days or whatever it is. It is no mystery and clearly it is going to be worked out between the intelligent nurses, teachers and all of them. They understand and it will only be for those who have the increments. It will be an arrangement and it will be done with the discretion which the Honourable Member is raising. I think the Honourable Members understand.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, the Honourable Member can gloss over this with his public relations stance. But let us face it for what it is. This clause forces people to take leave and not to pay them if they want to work. They have no choice. As I said in the general debate on this matter, the person who is earning very little money - I understand \$45.00 is involved in some of these cases. - may want to work to have that \$45.00 instead of staying home.

The Government is now saying that you cannot work for me because I am not going to pay you. You must stay home even although you want to work. That is what Clause 6 is saying. It cannot be called any compensation. The Government has the numbers to legislate. It is unilaterally breaching its arrangements with the public servants. It is doing so by legislation. It has ignored the views of the so-called social partners and, therefore, it is completely being anti-worker. That is what Section 6 says.

The Honourable Member for St. Michael West talked about this being tried in other jurisdictions. It "has been tried in one jurisdiction and the unions saw through it for what it is worth and the unions have broken their relationship with the Democratic Socialist Government of Premier Rae. In fact, the President of the Ontario Confederation of Trade Unions has come out and characterized the Government's behaviour as dastardly and the worst form of anti-worker type of behaviour that it has had. The Honourable Member cannot cite precedence. This is not the sort of legislation that one would expect from a so-called Democratic Socialist Government. Just as we used to have forced labour, we are now having forced leave. Forced labour was one aspect of a sign of slavery and this is another sign of slavery. A man is being denied the right to work. He no longer has the right to work under this Government. This Government is sending you home and saying that you cannot get any money. Go home and sleep or lime. That is what is happening and we must face up to it for what it is and no good public relations exercise can exercise that.

The question that Clause 6 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 7. was called and passed. The

Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Rt. Hon. L. E. SAND/FORD, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAUT, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill with amendments in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, we can resume our recess and I move that this sitting be adjourned until Tuesday, November 9, 1993 at 12 o'clock noon. •

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

The question that this sitting be now adjourned until Tuesday, November 9, 1993 at 12 o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the sitting accordingly. 9.19 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES 3926

Confirmation of Minutes of 24th August, 1993.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR
THE SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER 3926

Receipt of Accounts and Statements for the
months of May. and June 1993 as prepared by
the Accountant General.

PAPERS

Hon. C. V. WALKER.....3927

Annual Report of the Chief Medical Officer for
the year 1990.

• FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES 3927

1. The Land Surveyors (Validation) Bill,
1993.
2. The Public Service Suspension of
Increments Bill, 1993.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. B. M. TAITT 3927

Suspension of Standing Orders 6, 16, 18, 20,
42(5), 43 and 44 for the remainder of the
Sitting.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 4 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE LEASE TO SEAWELL AIR SERVICES
LIMITED OF A PARCEL OF LAND AT
GRANTLEY ADAMS INTERNATIONAL
AIRPORT 3927

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 3927, 3942; Dr. R. L.
Cheltenham, 3927; Hon. H. B. St. John, 3929;
Mr. DeL. O. Bradshaw, 3932; Hon. D. J. H.
Thompson, 3933; Mr. H. deB. Forde, 3935;
Hon. E. E. Greaves, 3939.

ORDER NO. 5 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE VESTING IN THE NATIONAL

HOUSING CORPORATION OF LAND AT
MOUNT POYER, ST. LUCY.....3944

Hon. E. E. Greaves, 3944, 3947; Mr. DeL. O.
Bradshaw, 3945.

ORDER NO. 6 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION BY
THE CROWN OF LAND FOR DEVELOPING
THE THREE HOUSES IRRIGATION
PROJECT 3948

Hon. E. E. Greaves, 3948; MR. O. S. Arthur,
3949; Hon. W. O. Franklin, 3949.

ORDER NO. 7 - THE LAND SURVEYORS
(VALIDATION) BILL, 1993 3950

Hon. E. E. Greaves, 3950, 3952; Mr. H. deB.
Forde, 3950; Hon. M. A. King, 3951.

ORDER NO. 8 - THE PUBLIC SERVICE
SUSPENSION OF INCREMENTS BILL,
1993 3953

Rt Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 3953; Dr. R. L.
Cheltenham, 3955; Miss B. A. Miller, 3960,
3995; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 3964; Mr. R. C.
Eastnond, 3967; Hon. P. M. Greaves, 3971;
Mr. H. deB. Forde, 3974, 3996; Hon. M. A.
King, 3977, 3995; Mr. H. A. Blackmail, 3980;
Mr. DeL. O. Bradshaw, 3984, 3996; Mr. O. S.
Arthur, 3986; Hon. D. J. H. Thompson, 3991;
Hon. B. M. Taitt, 3995.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW

,,3943

1. Question re financial deficit at the
Barbados Transport Board.
2. Question re the closure of the Haggatts
Depot.
3. Question re the accommodation off old
age pensioners on the Public Transport
System.
4. Question re the privatisation of the
Barbados Transport Board.
5. Question re flooding at 1st Avenue, East
Terrace, Wildey, St. Michael.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR 3944

1. Question re revenue realised from withholding tax on interest on savings accounts.
2. Question re waivers of duty and tax for Commercial purposes since 1st April, 1992.

SUSPENSIONS 3939,3953,3986

ADJOURNMENT 3997

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, Mr. O. S. (St. Peter) **BLACKMAN, Mr. H. A. (St. Philip South)** **BRADSHAW, Mr. DeL. O. (St. Michael South East)** **CHELTENHAM, Dr. R. L. (St. Joseph)** **EASTMOND, Mr. R. C. (St. James North)** **FORDE, Mr. H. deB. (Christ Church West)** **FRANKLIN, Hon. W. O. (St. Philip North)** **GREAVES, Hon. E. E. (St. Lucy)** **GREAVES, Hon. P. M. (St. Michael North)** **KING, Hon. M. A. (Christ Church West Central)** **MILLER, Miss B. A. (City of Bridgetown)** **SANDIFORD, Rt. Hon. L. E. (St. Michael South)** **SIMMONS, Mr. D. A. C. (St. Thomas) St. JOHN, Hon. H. B. (Christ Church South)** **TAITT, Hon. B. M. (St Michael West)** **THOMPSON, Hon. D. J. H. (St. John)**