
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1994 – 99

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Friday, February 23, 1996.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 11.20 a.m. on Friday, February 23, 1996.

PRESENT

His Honour I. A. ROETT, B.A., Dip. Ed.,
(Speaker)

His Honour R. D. MARSHALL, (Deputy Speaker)

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A., (Econ.),

J.P.

Mr. B. M. TAITT, B.A. (Hons.), M.P.A., LL.B.
(Hons.)

Mr. L. A. WEEKES, G.C.M., J.P.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, M.Sc. (Econ.), (Prime
Minister, Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs and
Minister for the Civil Service)

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Q.C., LL.M. (Attorney
General and Minister of Home Affairs)

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON, LL.B. (Hons.) (Leader
of the Opposition)

Hon. Sir HAROLD St. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B.

Mr. L. R. TULL, Q.C., M.A.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, Q.C., M.A., M.Sc.
(Econ.)

Mr. J. O. TUDOR, J.P.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE, (Minister of Public Works,
Transport and Housing)

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND, J.P., B.A. (Hons.), Dip.
Ed., LL.B. (Hons.), L.E.C. (Minister of Agriculture and
Rural Development)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES, M.B., Ch.B., F.R.C.P. (Edin.)

Mr. D. CARTER

Hon. R. N. GREENIDGE, B.A., LL.B., (Minister
of Labour, Community Development and Sports)

Mr. G. A. CLARKE, B.Sc., Dip. Ed.,
(Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Public Works,
Transport and Housing)

Mr. J. M. EDGHILL
Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER, J.P., B.A., Dip. Ed.,
B.Sc. (Chairman of Committees)

Mr. H. F. LASHLEY

Hon. R. St. C. TOPPIN, LL.B., (Minister of State,
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tourism and International
Transport)

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON, LL.B. (Minister of
Health and the Environment)

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY, LL.B. (Minister of
Education, Youth Affairs and Culture)

Prayers were taken by Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: This House is now in session.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of Tuesday,
February 20, 1996.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the
Minutes have been circulated. I beg to move that the
Minutes of the meeting of the Honourable the House of
Assembly of February 20, 1996 be taken as read.

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

PAPERS

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I am
commanded to lay the following:—

1. The Civil Establishment (General)
(Amendment) Order, 1996.
2. The Civil Establishment (Part-Time
Officers) Order, 1996.

3. The Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1996.
4. The Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances) Order, 1996.
5. The Senate and House of Assembly (Remuneration and Allowances of Members) Order, 1996.
6. The Parliament (Administration) (Salary) Order, 1996.
7. The Judges (Salaries) Order, 1996.
8. The Ombudsman (Salary) Order, 1996.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:—

Report on the Vital Statistics and Registrations for the Years 1990, 1991, 1992 and 1993.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice of the following:

The Customs (Validation of Duties) Bill, 1996.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

On the motion of Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS seconded by Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, the Customs (Validation of Duties) Bill, 1996 was read a first time.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: 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 day's sitting.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I beg to second that.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

ORDER NO. 7 – THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1996

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, the Civil Establishment Act, Cap. 21, provides at section 2(1)(d) that

the Minister may from time to time by Order determine the emoluments to be attached to offices in the public service. The purpose of the matter before the Honourable House of Assembly is to get the approval of the House for a Resolution to amend by deleting section (d) of the existing Civil Establishment Order and substituting Schedule that is contained in the Schedule before the House which action is intended to enable the Government to give effect to its decision in relation to an increase in wages and salaries for the public servants of Barbados who are covered by the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order.

Sir, without anticipating or prejudicing the debate of this House, Orders Nos. 8 – 15 will seek to indulge in a similar exercise on behalf of persons paid from the Treasury but who are not covered by the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this particular matter before the House obviously has to be set within the context of action that has ensued since 1992 and, more especially so, of the existence of the Incomes and Prices Protocol as the governing instrument for the settlement of salaries. The House will recall that the last agreement on salaries and wages for the public service expired on March 31, 1992. As a result of the economic crisis of 1991-94, and the first Prices and Incomes Protocol which called for a freeze of wages, there has been no increase in wages and salaries in the public service since the expiry of the agreement effective March 31, 1992.

Indeed, Sir, in September 1991, Parliament was requested by the then administration to approve the Public Service (Reduction of Emoluments) Act which authorized an 8 per cent reduction in the salaries of public servants for the period October 1, 1991 to March 31, 1993. In addition, no incremental credits or passage beyond the qualifying bars were permitted to civil servants during the period October 1, 1991 to September 30, 1993. The suspension of increments was extended to September 30, 1994 by the Public Service (Suspension of Increments) Act, 1993.

Sir, the Resolution before the House takes place against the background of a recent experience in this country where civil servants' salaries have not been increased since 1992 and in the interval have been cut by 8 per cent in one instance, and where increments to civil servants were denied by Act of Parliament for a specific period in the face of protests of the then Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment to the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1996 which is intended to give effect to a pay increase for public officers has to be taken in the context of the existing Prices and Incomes Protocol. This Protocol which has recently been debated and approved by this Parliament establishes a policy framework within which all parties to the

Protocol agree that there will be a general restraining of wages and salary increases for the period of duration of the Protocol. It also establishes that to the extent feasible, increases will be related to the growth in productivity and, where practical, parties to wage contracts will, in addition, to moderate wage increases seek to supplement those increases with productivity bonuses and profit-sharing arrangements.

Sir, I am saying upfront, therefore, that the wage increases this House is being invited to approve today have to be seen and understood in the context of the existing Protocol where all the Social Partners have agreed to moderate rates of increases in wages and salaries and have agreed that increases should bear some relationship to productivity increases for the economy as a whole.
11.30 a.m.

I have agreed that we were going, to the extent practicable, supplement wage increases with productivity bonus or where practicable, in the private sector, Sir, profit-sharing arrangements.

The House therefore, Sir, is going to be invited to agree that the Government should proceed on the policy that allows moderate increases in wages and salaries that bear relationship to the level of productivity increases in the economy and to agree, also, that the Government should proceed to discuss and put in place a productivity bonus for public servants as part of the overall package of benefits to be put in place this year.

I should like to give the House, Mr. Speaker, before I come to the specific terms of the settlement, some background as to the manner in which the discussions and negotiations on this matter progressed, as well as to give the House the benefit of the information regarding the claims and counterclaims that were put on the table by the respective entities during the process of these negotiations.

In June 1995, a Government negotiating team led by the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of the Civil Service and supported by the Director of Finance and Economic Affairs and other public officers started talks on increased wages and salaries and improved conditions of service with the National Union of Public Workers, the Police Association and the Congress of Trade Unions and Staff Association which represents the following organizations: The Barbados Secondary Teachers' Union, The Barbados Union of Teachers, The Prison Officers Association, The Barbados Registered Nurses Association, The Firemen's Association, The Barbados Workers' Union and the Association of Secondary Principals.

The House obviously understands, Mr. Speaker, that the business of negotiating a wage settlement involves the business of offers and counter offers being put and bandied

around until a settlement is reached. The Congress of Trade Unions and Staff Association made an initial proposal that would have required the wage bill of central Government to increase by \$30 million for the financial year 1995-1996 representing a 7.2% increase in the wage bill in percentage terms.

The initial position of the Congress of Trade Unions also included several proposals for the improvement of the terms and conditions of teachers, principals of schools, prison officers, fire officers, policemen and nurses, among others. The total package initially put on behalf of the Congress involved a package of wages, salaries and improved conditions that would have amounted to approximately \$45 million. The Police Association initially requested increases for a 3-year period amounting to 8% in the first year, 4% in year 2 and 3% in year 3.

Mr. Speaker, the first position put by the National Union of Public Workers was submitted to Government on May 5, 1995 and it was intended to cover not the period 1995-1997 but increases for the period 1990-1997.

I really do feel that the House should have the benefit of the initial position and proposals of the NUPW. In its first proposal, the NUPW requested that, for the period 1990-1993 the employer, namely Government, should have made a one-off award of one month's pay in the case of monthly paid workers and of 23 working days' wages in the case of weekly paid workers for each of these years 1990-91, 1991-92 and 1992-93 and that this one month's salary should have been free of taxes. That would have cost the Treasury \$99 million. One month for each year 1990-1993 tax free.

It also requested that the Government should agree to pay the 8% outstanding, it said, in respect of salaries and wages that was deducted from public servants' pay between October 1991 to March 1993, another \$53 million. It required that the Government should pay a 5.5% increase, across-the-board in respect of 1993 and 1994 and in respect of 1995-1997. It required that the Government should pay 5% in the first year and 3% in the second year.

The NUPW's initial position ignoring the fact that we were dealing with a wage settlement for 1995-1997, would go back to 1990, provide one month's salary increase, free of tax, for the first 3 years, increases amounting to no less than 5% in each year subsequently, except for the last year where they were seeking a 3% increase and, in addition, it sought a number of other improvements in terms and conditions which, when all totalled, amounted to some \$266 million in increases.

The Union soon after making its initial submission withdrew the request that Government should consider

the granting of a one month's tax free pay for the years 1990-1993. But it left, on the table, Mr. Speaker, as its initial position, these conditions:

The repayment of the 8% which was deducted from public officers' wages for the period 1991-1993.

A wage increase of 5.3% across-the-board for the financial years 1995-1996 and 1996-1997 and an increase in various allowances averaging 26% across-the-board.

The additional cost to Government, excluding the cost incurred by the payment of these increases to statutory board employees who depend upon the Treasury would have exceeded \$100 million, as compared to the initial position of the Congress of Trade Union and Staff Associations.

Mr. Speaker, Government's initial position was a 2% increase and that was later improved to a 2% in the first year and 2% in the second year. It was then varied to 2½% in the first year at the top and 3½% at the bottom with 2% in the second year. And then, finally, Sir, the Government offered 2½% at the top in all the S scales categories of employees rising to 3½% at the bottom at Z38 for the maids in the first year with a 3% increase in the second year on the understanding that a one-shot productivity bonus would be paid in the second year that will be developed, taking into account the performance of the economy and drawing upon a mechanism that is being developed by the Productivity Board to measure productivity in the general economy and in the society as a whole.

The Government's offer, Mr. Speaker, for 2½% for the S scale employees in the first year in the top echelons of the public service rising to 3½% for those at the bottom with a 3% in the second year together with a productivity bonus has been accepted, although I must enter the qualification, and I must get this correct, that the Barbados Union of Teachers does not accept the consequence of a productivity bonus as being applicable to the teaching profession and consequently the teachers' union does not accept the notion of a bonus payment which is tied to productivity in the teaching profession and that matter, Sir, is subject to the question as to how we incorporate the teachers in the productivity scheme and is one of the matters to be resolved.
11.40 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, the Government's pay increase, as outlined, has been accepted in principle formally. Pay increases have been accepted by all of the parties with which Government has been negotiating except the National Union of Public Workers. The National Union of Public Workers met in January, revised their offer from

5% across the board to 2½% at the top and 5% at the bottom for the first year and 3% for the second.

It is also understood, Mr. Speaker, by all parties that talks on the other terms and conditions of employment affecting all public workers represented by the unions will continue. This, Sir, has been agreed to and those talks are continuing. Mr. Speaker, the increases being proposed, as I said, have to be set, not only in the context of the incomes policy, but has also to be set in the context of the other measures that the Government has instituted and will continue to institute to generally improve the conditions and terms of employment of the public servants of Barbados.

As I have pointed out, Sir, agreement has been reached on the wages component of the settlement. Discussions are continuing on the productivity bonus. Discussions are also continuing on terms and conditions but I must point out to the House, Mr. Speaker, that the Government has already instituted an arrangement whereby the loans to public servants have been increased and the schedule of public officers entitled to interest free loans for the purchase of vehicles has been expanded to include public health inspectors and other persons who were not on the previous schedule.

The Government has also instituted, as promised in its Manifesto, the proposal to allow postmen to purchase their motor cycles free of duty and Cabinet has taken the decision that for the future, the time spent by public officers in acting appointments up to certain levels will be taken into account in determining the calculations of their pensions. This, Sir, is a very important initiative because there is a large number of public officers who have spent a large proportion of their working life on acting appointments. Many have gone home but had their pensions related not to the salaries to which they were entitled when they were acting but to their substantive post and Cabinet agreed, and they have informed the unions, that pensions legislation should be amended to allow officers who have been acting in posts whether permanent or temporary for three years or more, either continuously or periodically, to be given the right to full pension of that office.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is a substantial improvement that have been granted in their conditions to the public servants of this country. It was not a condition that the unions requested. It was a condition that the Cabinet thought was fair and reasonable and we have put it on the table to the union as one of the things that we have been putting into the pot among others, including the grant of larger loans to purchase vehicles as well as the relief to the postmen.

I must also add, Sir, that this wage increase must also be set against the background of the determination of the

Government to put all public servants who are now on a three-day week or were on a three-day week, back to work on a 5-day week basis, Sir. That has already been instituted in relation to the NCC and it now stands to be instituted in relation to the National Sports Council, the National Assistance Board and all other places in the public service of this country where people have been deprived of an income by being put on a 3-day week by a wicked Democratic Labour Party. So that this settlement takes place within that context.

It also takes place, Sir, within the context of arrangements by this administration to fully fund, at Government's expense, the training of all the public servants of this country involved in clerical posts and above in the use of computers on a year by year basis until we have made the entire public service of this country computer literate.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, last year we provided funds in the Estimates for that purpose. This year we are providing even more funds for that purpose because we believe that one of the cheap ways by which the efficiency in the public service of this country can be improved and also the career opportunities for public servants can be enhanced is by making them, at public expense, become fully computer literate. That is an important improvement, Sir, in the conditions of service of public officers that has been independently put on the table by Government and that we are pursuing as a matter of policy.

I just want to say therefore, Sir, that the unions who have been party to this exercise recognise that the Government has been involved in negotiation of a pay package for them, not only in good faith, but conscious of the necessity to generally improve the terms and conditions open to public officers and conscious of the need for us to put in place systems that would allow for efficiency in the public service and higher levels of productivity and more interesting careers. I must say that a spirit of cooperation and good faith has generally attended these negotiations. I must also make the point, Sir, that the settlement must be set in the context of the wage increases that are now being allowed in the rest of the non-public sector of the economy and it is instructive that in the tourism industry a two-year wage settlement for 6% has been agreed to, and that what is being allowed here for the Public Service is relatively consistent with the pay settlements that are being obtained in the rest of the Barbados economy. It is consistent in that respect, Mr. Speaker, with the spirit of moderation that is built into the Incomes Protocol.

11.50 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, the question of the payment of salaries to the offices of the Chief Executive and others of the Barbados Tourism Authority was an issue raised and dealt

with openly and fully during the course of these negotiations and Government made its position clear that the Protocol provides that where increases are the result of job evaluation exercises, that such are permitted by the Protocol and that the new salaries attaching to the post of the new officers of the Tourism Authority were as a result of a professional job evaluation exercise undertaken by independent people. Therefore, it was entirely consistent with the provisions of the Protocol but we could not generalize that to the rest of the Public Service because there was not a similar job evaluation exercise done for the rest of the Public Service to provide such increases.

I find it very instructive, Sir, that despite all of the clamour by the Opposition benches the workers in the tourist industry have accepted a 6 per cent increase for 2 years, because they understand the principle involved in a way that apparently the Opposition cannot understand. They understand, Sir, very clearly the precept involved and I just want to stress the point that all stages in these discussions on the settlement of Government's pay package and conditions of service for the public servants were undertaken in a spirit of good faith except, Mr. Speaker, I must say in relation to overtures by the NUPW. It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, from the proposals that were submitted to Government on May 5, 1995 in which the union which was invited to discuss with Government a new package for the period 1995 to 1997 ignored what we were about, ignored what all other unions were about and thought it desirable to go back to 1990. It is obvious that such a union that could have done such a thing obviously could not have been intending to go into negotiations in the very best of faith and I put it no higher than that. We had a situation where Government invited members of a trade union movement to sit down and discuss with us a pay settlement for the period of 1995 to 1997 and the first thing the NUPW did was to say let us go back to 1990, as if the 1990 to 1992 settlement was not covered by an agreement and as if what happened between 1993 and 1995 was not covered by laws. But that is what you had from a trade union, Sir, a union that I am charging was prepared by that initial claim to disclose its true intention in these negotiations, and submitted to Government a total package amounting to \$266 million as the basis for discussion. That claim for increased wages and salaries amounting to \$266 million has, Sir, represented the tone and the temper with which the NUPW has unfortunately gone about its negotiations with Government in this exercise.

I am saying to this Chamber, Sir, that we can infer from the nature of what was put on the table the manner in which the NUPW intended to proceed in these negotiations come what may and that, Sir, really is in many respects what a lot of the controversy surrounding these negotiations has been about. Because the reality of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is simply this, that all of the other unions have reached agreement in principle with the Government on

the wage and salaries increases as part of the overall package to be paid to public workers. But the NUPW wants us to continue negotiations in circumstances where the other unions representing almost 60 per cent of the workers in the public service have already agreed. The issue that confronts this House and confronts us as a Government is a very simple issue. As a practical matter, can Government agree to different wage increases for the same category of workers merely because they happen to be represented by different unions? That is the issue, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, at the very start of the negotiations and under the auspices of meetings convened with the social partners, Government put the case to all of the unions that, if they were going to negotiate separately, they should try to reconcile at the end of the day their demands because it would not be possible for Government to pay a maid employed in one department one increase and pay a maid employed in some other department a separate and different increase merely because they happen to be represented by different unions. But this is the crux of the matter.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I am saying that the history of wage settlements in this country is replete with instances in which Parliament has been, in fact, called upon to exercise the statutory requirements that we must amend these things by Order without full agreement with all of the unions, because you had these instances in multi-union situations where some unions have agreed and others have not. But, Sir, it comes down to a question of judgment. I would not expect that a Government will go because one small union has agreed to a wage increase to say that is the end of the process. What we have in this instance, Mr. Speaker, is the case where all but one have agreed in principle except the NUPW which represents 43 per cent of public servants. All of the others representing 57 per cent of the public servants have agreed in principle with the wage increases and we are led to believe that it is a practical matter for the Government to ignore the fact that all of the others have agreed in principle and settle with one which does not represent the majority of the workers in the Public Service. That is the absurdity of it, Mr. Speaker. If a union representing 0.8 per cent had settled, Sir, then obviously we would be totally outrageous and out of order to come and bother Parliament with amending the Civil Establishment Order. But all have agreed but one and they represent the majority of the public servants and we are being called as a practical matter to prolong discussions particularly on behalf of a union that started the negotiations not dealing with 1995 to 1997, Sir, but wanted to extend it to 1990 to 1997. That is what we are dealing with here.

Sir, the Democratic Labour Party comes to this debate with a tattered reputation on this matter. I want to say to them that nobody in Barbados is taking the Democratic Labour Party seriously about the false tears they are now preparing to shed on behalf of the public servants. That is why, Mr. Speaker, there is no uproar in Barbados about the settlement with the tourist industry. That is why there is no uproar in Barbados with the settlement in agriculture.
12.00 noon

That is why there is no uproar in the public service about this intended settlement. The public service of Barbados is aware of what Government is intending. I heard about guerilla tactics and stoppages, and the public service is continuing to work. Nobody in Barbados is attaching any credence to the false tears that are now being shed by the erratic leadership of the Democratic Labour Party on any matters pertaining to wages and salaries in this country. Do they expect anybody is going to believe them about wage increases after that party not only cut people's salaries, not only froze people's salaries, not only agreed not to pay them their increments, Sir, but also sent home 3 000 workers? Then they have the nerve, having cut people's salaries, having frozen people's salaries, put some on a three-day week, sent home 3 000, to come now and quarrel about the payment of increases to people that have been agreed by the majority of the unions in this country, in the context of a situation when we are now also going to allow public servants to claim acting periods for the purpose of pension as part of that scheme, Sir! Nobody in Barbados is taking the Democratic Labour Party seriously on this issue, and that is why this matter is coming to this House in the context of relative industrial peace.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: It is coming to this House, Sir, within that context. I will expect today that we are going to hear the same froth of the DLP about how they cannot support it and how we are legislating salaries, but the reality is that nobody in Barbados is taking them seriously on this issue. The Government is fortified in the fact that we are doing something that is practical, something that is fair.

Mr. Speaker, what is being brought to the House is being brought after the most lengthy process ever of negotiations. I am also saying that it is fair. That is why serious leaders in the trade union movement are supporting what we are bringing here today. It is fair, because what we are asking the Government to grant to public workers is consistent with what their unions have agreed should be granted to the private sector and that it bears a relationship to what has been happening in the economy.

Now, Sir, I want to set the NUPW clear in that context. There is nothing that happened in the economy in 1995 that supports a 5% increase, because it does not

bear a relationship to the rate of inflation for the year, nor does it bear a relationship to the rate of growth. Those are the principal benchmarks against which increases would have to be determined. I want to tell the NUPW, as the other unions have told them, to go back with the 5% for the first year. It is because you cannot show any index that supports a 5% in the first year, because the economic growth was 2½% and the inflation rate was less than 2%. So how do you grant a 5% in that context?

The Government's negotiating team was mandated to tell the unions that we expect the second year of the agreement economically to be better than the first, we will also grant a 3% in the second year and we are going to introduce a productivity bonus for public servants so that they too can share in the benefit of any increased performance of the Barbados economy in 1996. They, like the private sector, will get increases that they have not had now for four years and a productivity bonus in 1996. It means, in short order, Sir, that during the course of the next nine months public servants at the bottom will have a 3½% increase, then a month after another 3% on tops of that, and later in the year a productivity bonus. A 6½% increase, plus a productivity bonus, and the workers understand that. That is why, as I said, this matter is being brought to this House in the context of relative industrial stability in this country, and we are hearing a lot of froth by people, whose only skill is in cutting salaries, freezing salaries, denying increments, downsizing the public sector, that they are not supporting this. I can only say that the Democratic Labour Party is being consistent, because they would not know what it would have been of late to bring a wage increase to Parliament. We must, therefore, expect that of a party that does not know, or has not known in its recent history, how to increase people's wages. We can therefore better understand how such a party would find it offensive to support wage increases for public servants. It would be a major departure from the recent history of the Democratic Labour Party for them to support anything that has to do with improvement in the terms and conditions for public servants, because they also went on record not only as supporting wage cuts, wage freezes and the denial of increments, they also went on record in this Parliament recently of refusing to agree that the Constitution of this country should be amended to strip from Government the right to cut people's wages. So nobody at all in Barbados, including members of the DLP, is taking the DLP seriously on this matter, because their recent history on this matter cast the DLP spokesmen as serpents with forked tongues on the question of wage increases to public servants.

The practical reality, Mr. Speaker, is that if the Government of Barbados were to continue negotiations with the NUPW, representing less than half of the workers in the public service, there would be one of two options. We would have to agree to pay the same category of workers different salaries....

Aside.

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

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: ...merely because they happen to be represented by different unions, or all we would be seeking to do is contribute in this exercise to an element of competition among the unions. The reality of this matter simply is, as the General Secretary of the NUPW speaks, that he wants a bigger piece of the market. It is a market share exercise where he is concerned, and if he can appear to be more aggressive than the other unionists, even when he cannot rest a case on economic reality, he believes that....

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have found a very striking coincidence between the public utterances of the General Secretary of the NUPW and the statement on this matter by the Leader of the NDP. It might happen to be just a question of happenstance, but I would urge the General Secretary of the NUPW not to take advice on economic and financial matters from the Leader of the NDP, because we know what his record is. He is the man who will bring packages in here, in July, purporting to cut taxes, and then come back in April the next year and impose the heaviest burden of taxes ever in history on the people of this country. That is his public record. He is the kind of man who will leave, in the words of the Member for St. Michael South, the economy floundering on the rocks. I am therefore not going to go into trite discussions before the House about legislating salaries or not and whether in fact all salaries have to be legislated. I have seen in previous debates that rationalisation advanced that because you have to bring it here by law this legislation is a nonsense.
12.10 p.m.

The truth of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that the Government of Barbados entered these discussions in good faith and our good faith was established in the fact that we were able to put on the table improved conditions even beyond those that the unions were asking for in fundamental areas affecting the livelihood of the public workers of this country. We have reached a settlement that reflects realistically what is happening in the general economy. We have reached a settlement that bears a relationship with what is accepted in the private sector. We have given the commitment that there will be continued discussions beyond the settlement of the wages aspect of the package on improved terms and conditions affecting the employment of other public servants. Those discussions, Sir, are continuing.

We have given the commitment, and it was the Government that gave the commitment and put it on the table, that we would like to pay a productivity bonus for public servants. The Government put that on the table, Mr. Speaker. These discussions have been pursued by Government in good faith.

We come now to the practical issue as to when they must conclude; and we say, Sir, that that practical moment has come, because the Government has entered a relationship in good faith with the majority of the trade unionists for a settlement that bears relationship to what we can afford, what makes sense in our context and I want against that background to commend this Resolution to Parliament. I am obliged to you.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, the people of Barbados at the end of the day, and not what I say in this debate or what the views exclusively of the Democratic Labour Party may be, have to be the ultimate judges of the efficacy, the decency and the integrity of the actions of politicians in Barbados. Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is not an exercise in see-sawing. I assume that when the Barbados Labour Party was elected in 1994 it viewed the perspective of elections as what the Americans would call a paradigm shift in Barbados. I think that the fact that there has been little public reaction to the comments of the Honourable Member for St. Peter on his proposals here today is not something that he should take comfort from. Sometimes when people are totally dejected they are taken by surprise and are flabbergasted and their initial reaction is simply to accept whatever decision is taken.

This is a conscious decision of the Minister of Finance of Barbados and the Minister responsible for the Civil Service and he couches the decision which the Government has taken to legislate salaries in Barbados in 1996 against the context of other changes which the Government has made in the public service as if, and this is his own admission, it does not seem to me as though he is saying that the salary increase by itself is adequate. He says you have to judge them against a context of a whole range of other matters, for example, Sir, that acting appointments in the public service will now count for something in relation to your pension, that his Government extended the Schedule for which car loans were to be made available and he even took credit for increasing the level of car loans which, in fact, was a decision of the Democratic Labour Party prior to demitting office in 1994.

So, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the essence of what the Honourable Member for St. Peter has said to this House today is that the reasonableness of the offer which had been made to the public servants of Barbados has to be seen against the context not of the offer standing alone but

against a context of a whole host of other things that the Government has either done or proposes to do.

I am saying, therefore, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that he has answered his own question, because we are not here legislating car loans today, we are not here legislating for acting appointments to bear some relation to pensions. What we are legislating in this Chamber today is how much we will pay public officers based on a scenario in which the Government has not reached agreement with the trade union which represents the largest number of public workers in this country. I refute the claim which the Honourable Member for St. Peter makes to this House. It was almost akin to misleading the House to suggest that the NUPW does not represent the largest number of public sector workers in this country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, even if you were to accept that puerile allegation, you would then have to look at the categories of workers in the public service. We have to be particularly concerned about those workers at the bottom and those who are more severely affected by the outcome of structural adjustment policies and the outcome of some of the policies which the Democratic Labour Party had to undertake in the process of restoring this economy to health.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, they should be the first beneficiaries and if opportunities exist for proper remuneration and rewarding them for the sacrifice that they make, the Prime Minister should have seen it as his duty to consider whatever reasonable options were available to him to reward them first.

From 1994 it was made clear by the Democratic Labour Party. This salary increase, I do not think, even amounts to the amount by which levies were removed by the Democratic Labour Party in 1993 and 1994. The Honourable Member has the temerity to talk about this odious record of the Democratic Labour Party. Between 1993 and 1994 we removed those iniquitous levies which were eating into the income of all workers in Barbados and in particular into the income of public workers. The removal of those levies amounts to more than this salary increase which the Rt. Honourable Prime Minister extolled as being so significant to the people of Barbados. The transport and health levy, a whole range of levies which amounted to at least 7% off the top of people's wages in this country. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Democratic Labour Party had to remove as part of the process of tax reform.

But let's talk a bit more about the concept. The Rt. Honourable Prime Minister always likes to give the impression that his skilful management of this economy is what has been responsible for all the actions which he takes. Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is only because he operates in an ambience of persons who are willing to do the Labour

Party's bidding when it comes to trotting out public relations and propaganda on their behalf that this is so. I am still saying that 80 per cent of Barbadians do not realise this country is in a structural adjustment programme. Mr. Speaker, they thought that structural adjustment ended when the Democratic Labour Party's programme with the IMF came to an end; but I don't know if people realise that on October 16, 1995 while the Prime Minister was parading all over Barbados about his skillful management of this economy he was writing to the President of the Inter-American Development Bank committing Barbados to continue to implement a comprehensive, economic adjustment programme to lay the foundation for sustained real growth with price stability. In the context of that structural adjustment programme, Mr. Speaker, he is bound to take certain economic actions, use certain economic tools and meet fiscal targets.

12.20 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Prime Minister cannot pretend that he is not bound by that because the document is a document of this House. It says:

"The stabilization phase of this programme will continue to manage aggregate demand through appropriate fiscal and monetary policies."

Mr. Speaker, he obviously has targets with respect to the wage bill. I have had a question on this Order Paper for more than a year trying to discover what the targets for this country are relative to the wage bill particularly in relation to the life of this IADB loan. What are the targets? The House cannot have access to that information. We have never been told. Even today in this Chamber the Prime Minister has not had the courtesy to tell the public of Barbados that in his method of forecasting, which he says is not soothsaying – he accused the then Minister of State in Finance of soothsaying, his is forecasting – but he cannot tell us what are the targets he believes are appropriate in the context of the wage bill in Barbados over the period of this IADB loan because he must have had something in mind.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Member is misleading the House. I could not give the House a year ago any numbers of wage increases because those wage increases were the subject at the time of negotiations between the Government and the trade unions. For the Member therefore to be imputing that a year ago I had reached some numbers when wage negotiations were taking place is to mislead the House.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I think that should be taken with the same pinch of salt that I take everything else which the Prime Minister says because a year ago the private sector and the unions in Barbados

were publicly setting what one would describe as a ceiling. They were setting a ceiling for wage increases in this country and they were already telling the public of this country that wage increases should not exceed X per cent.

Mr. Speaker, I assume, as I said, that the Honourable Prime Minister is using all his forecasting skills and if a year ago he did not have an idea of what would be a reasonable settlement in the context of Government's fiscal planning, in the context of the economy, in the context of inflation, all of which would have been known to him, and all of which he just told this House are the key things the NUPW should have been looking at, then something would have to be wrong with his economic genius. I am sorry that a year ago today the Honourable Member for St. Peter was not making those kinds of forecasts and was not taking into his confidence the people of Barbados relative to what would have been an appropriate level in terms of the expenditure on wages and salaries into the medium-term.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Prime Minister is not going to shift the ground that the people of Barbados understand to be reality today. The context of this settlement is firstly that just over a year ago the Government of Barbados was engaged in an exercise of parading legislation in this House of Assembly, the object of which they said was to protect public workers, and it was not just protecting them constitutionally. They also had the temerity to say that that legislation was also protecting public workers from all of the highhandedness which politicians of the past had practised.

Mr. Speaker, nobody reading the presentation of the Honourable Member for St. Peter in that debate could believe that the speech he delivered in here today could in any way fit into the context of that presentation which was made in this House some short months ago when the Government then took the position that it was outlawing the reduction of salaries in Barbados forever, a point, Mr. Speaker, the contrary of which has been borne out by this debate today.

Government has not lost its ability to legislate salaries where there is no agreement. To those civil servants who felt that that amendment to the Constitution meant that the Government of Barbados had lost its power to set wages at whatever level the Government felt it was desirable, whether it was \$1 a month increase, or a .50¢ a month increase, this exercise in here today should demonstrate that nothing has changed in Barbados and that the Honourable Member for St. Peter, and those who would have supported that stance have disproved their own theory. All that happened relative to that amendment is that it will be necessary to have a 2/3 majority to reduce salaries in Barbados. That is all. But, Mr. Speaker, if you wanted to increase it, as I say, by .50¢ a month the Government still has the power without a 2/3 majority to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of this country also enshrines the principle of collective bargaining. I thought that was understood to be the case in the first Protocol on Prices and Incomes. The first Protocol made the point very clearly that collective bargaining was to be maintained in Barbados, but it is a curious omission, but an understandable one, from the second Protocol. I assumed it was in the second Protocol and I obviously spoke too soon because now that I have carefully read the second Protocol, the commitment to the process of collective bargaining in this country has been removed from the terms of the second Protocol for the implementation of a prices and incomes policy, and that is a serious matter, Mr. Speaker, coming as it does from a Government who brought a constitutional amendment and coming as it does from a Government which itself says constantly that it is committed to the process of collective bargaining in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the process of collective bargaining relative to these wage increases has broken down and the Prime Minister has used all of – well, Sir, you have already ruled that the word "sophistry" is unparliamentary...

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not use it then.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Well, I will follow your advice. I would describe it, Mr. Speaker, as an exercise – you could even put it as low as dippy-doodling. It was one of these convoluted presentations which sought to attack everybody who had a justifiable reason in a democratic country for raising any concerns about the actions of this Government.

Mr. Speaker, this was an unbelievable exercise in here today because it was the same NUPW, one assumes principally, for whom the legislation would have been brought to protect public sector wages. But that same NUPW is now being described in language which would essentially cast it in the role of a charlatan and a villain in the trade union movement in this country.
12.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it to be an act of cowardice for any political leader and Prime Minister of this country to be saying on the one hand that he is not going to intervene in the collective bargaining process but will let the unions deal with the negotiators, and at the same time to be constantly critical of the leadership of the National Union of Public Workers and to constantly be critical in the newspapers of the stances which the National Union of Public Workers take. Any leader worth his salt, if he has strong views like that, would face the negotiators at the table and tell them: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this is my

view", but to say you are not getting into the collective bargaining process, "I am not interfering", but then go on constantly to undermine the position of one of the bargaining agents, to constantly undermine the position of the leadership of one of the bargaining agents, is a questionable kind of activity for any Prime Minister of this country. It is those kinds of stances that have to be factored into what the Prime Minister calls the context of this wage settlement.

First of all, there is this lofty view that public workers were being protected by a Government bringing legislation to amend the Constitution and make it for ever impossible for politicians to do acts which are inconsistent with the interest of public officers. Secondly, the spirit of the Protocol – and I am going to deal with that a little bit more as we move on – and thirdly, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Right Honourable Member for St. Peter has consistently sought to undermine the role of the National Union of Public Workers, and he has convinced some other people to undermine them too. In the process of doing that, I am throwing out a warning to the Right Honourable Member for St. Peter that that carefully crafted alliance and that important alliance between the trade union movement in Barbados is going to be wrecked by the stances which the Right Honourable Member for St. Peter has publicly been taking, joining with others to undermine that very carefully crafted alliance.

I am in favour of a congress of trade unions. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Labour Party supported the stance that it is desirable for the trade union movement to come together and to reach common positions both in the public and private sectors, and we went a step further of introducing the social partnership and signing the Protocol. That is part of the record of the Democratic Labour Party. Therefore, any attempts, even where there are unwitting accomplices in the trade union movement being brought along, to undermine that process of agreement in the trade union movement is something that we in the Democratic Labour Party cannot accept.

Mr. Speaker, I warn the Prime Minister that while he may be getting some short-term satisfaction from feeling that he is able to encourage others to undermine the strength of their brothers and sisters in the trade union movement, that short-term advantage may be outweighed in the end by the break up of the alliance of the trade union movement, which I think will be very unfortunate.

I want to salute the Chairman of the Congress of Trade Unions and Staff Associations for his very hard work in putting that alliance together. I believe he should use every sinew in his body, every ounce of blood to ensure that those charlatans who are seeking to break up the trade union movement in this country are exposed for whom they are.

Mr. SPEAKER: I believe that you are not referring to Honourable Members.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I have not addressed my mind to that, Mr. Speaker. Not yet.

The fourth element is that you have an economic policy letter which ties the Honourable Member's hands and he continues to pretend that his hands are not tied, and people who know better are only laughing at the Government when they say that they have freed the country of institutional tutelage. I read an editorial this week, Mr. Speaker, which was rehashing the question of a World Bank loan. Would you imagine that the Prime Minister had already told the country that if fees were to be charged at certain institutions his stance would be to tell the World Bank "thank you very much, but we do not need your assistance"? All of a sudden the argument arises again and this big pretence is being made that the Prime Minister has put on the breastplate and armour and is fighting with the World Bank for the sovereignty of Barbados. You would not believe, Mr. Speaker, that could be written in an editorial at a time when, four weeks ago, the Prime Minister signed a loan agreement which committed this country....

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member is....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what do you rise?

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. The Government has informed the World Bank that it is not going to proceed with the decision of the Democratic Labour Party to ask university students in this country to pay fees at the university.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, let the Honourable Member say what he wants to say. As I say, all of that is water under the bridge. The public spoke to those issues already. What I am saying is that you would not believe that any of that could be said in Barbados today a few short weeks after the Prime Minister sat down with one of the international institutions and committed this country to other terms and conditions, including a condition relating to the resources of this country, the land use policy. As I say, it is a matter for those who believe it is better to tout the Government's public relations programme than to see through these things, suggesting that the Right Honourable Member for St. Peter has on the attire of King Arthur and is fighting valiantly with the World Bank for Barbados. The Honourable Member believes all of that. That is what really concerns me, that the Right Honourable Member for St. Peter believes all of those things which his own minions write in the newspaper. He believes that when he reads those editorials they represent the view of the

majority of Barbadians who are happy to get 40 cents a day more, according to an Advocate editorial. They said this means 40 cents a day more and the NUPW should not fight for 40 cents a day more for public workers. Obviously the Right Honourable Member for St. Peter believes that the public is supporting him when he fights against 40 cents a day more for public workers, so their support for him is silent support. That is the interpretation we are to put on it, Mr. Speaker, that it is silent support.

Mr. Speaker, let us spend a couple of minutes – because I have done it already in relation to the Incomes Protocol – but I will not be much longer. The Right Honourable Member for St. Peter is constantly misleading this House when he gives the impression that the clause in the Prices and Incomes Protocol that relates to negotiated job enhancement exercises refers to job enhancement exercises for individual posts in the public sector. When this clause was negotiated originally it referred to precisely the scenario which the Honourable Member does not even contemplate, that the job enhancement exercises would be industry-wide exercises or company-wide exercises or, if you want to put it another way, employer-wide exercises. That a job enhancement exercise, for example, in relation to the Barbados Tourism Authority as a whole, not only in relation to the top three posts, a job enhancement and evaluation exercise in relation to the Barbados National Bank as a whole which would seek to put all of those categories of workers....

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: On a point of order, Sir. Again, the Honourable Member is misleading the House. The agreement that was reached with the Light and Power and the Workers' Union for job enhancement was for 13 people. That was done under the auspices of this Protocol and it gives a complete lie to what the Honourable Member is saying, that this job enhancement has to apply to an industry as a whole. If you have a job evaluation for a few workers and the job evaluation says they should be paid more, it is appropriate under this Protocol, as under the previous Protocol, for those few workers to be paid. The 13 or so linesmen at Light and Power who were given an increase because of a job evaluation should give the lie to the line on which the Honourable Member is trying to mislead the House. That is nonsense he is trying to introduce in the debate, Sir.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: If the Right Honourable Member wants to extol foolishness as the norm, that is his affair. I am saying what was contemplated when the Democratic Labour Party negotiated the first Protocol. Job enhancement exercises could not relate only to the job at the top of a statutory corporation, the job enhancement exercise was in some cases supposed to be carried out, for example, throughout the public service. What the trade union movement was saying then, and I understood them

very clearly, was that you needed to have those kinds of job enhancement exercises throughout the civil service, throughout statutory corporations to evaluate comparisons between the public and private sectors. If the Right Honourable Member for St. Peter does not understand that, fine, and if this country is going to be locked into an arrangement...

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON:...if this country is going to be locked...

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member is on a point of order. You have to listen, you know. Please, please.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, if job enhancement exercises for the Right Honourable Prime Minister can only relate to the Managing Director of BNB, the President of the BTA, the Vice Presidents of the BTA, but there can be no job enhancement exercise for maids, gardeners or anybody else at the bottom of the scale – and I ask the Prime Minister to identify one job enhancement exercise that he has initiated even under his new Protocol for other categories of workers – then something has to be wrong in this country. His vision should be broad enough that that job enhancement exercise should apply to top management, middle management and the workers at the bottom as well. The context of this wage increase, Mr. Speaker, Sir, is that the Government has committed itself to a policy where employees at the top are going to be remunerated. I mean the top of selected statutory corporations and selected employees too, remunerated at a level that compares favourably with the private sector and nobody else in those statutory corporations is going to receive any award or benefits which are substantially different from those which the protocol accepts. So you may have a situation when the BTA goes to the bargaining table this year that the Government would be ludicrous enough to tell the workers at the BTA that they should get 2.5% in the first year and 3% in the second year.

12.40 p.m.

Could you imagine the Government negotiators, the Ministry of Finance, the Establishments Division and the officials of the BTA sitting down in a negotiation this year telling people that they should get 2.5% at the top and 3% at bottom, whereas the top executives get increases in excess of 50%? Could you imagine the workers of the Barbados National Bank being told, read the protocol but yet the managers can be brought in and paid salaries far in excess of what the protocol contemplated?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not know. If the Honourable Prime Minister tells me that that is a rational way of running the affairs of Barbados and that the silent support

of the people of Barbados for those iniquities is something he can feel confident about then this country does need a level of leadership, Mr. Speaker, Sir, which is going to take those at the bottom seriously. Mr. Speaker, Sir, that is not what is happening. It is because of that that you have the level of apathy and the level of indifference because if there is one thing that the public servants of Barbados could legitimately have expected, Mr. Speaker, Sir, it was that this Government should have righted what they alleged were the wrongs in 1994 and one of the principal wrongs that the Honourable Member for St. Peter put before the public of Barbados was that the public sector bore a disproportionate burden in relation to the stabilisation process in Barbados, that even though there was adjustment in the private sector, that it was not as severe as the burden which the public sector was forced to bear in this country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, furthermore that the Honourable Member for St. Peter, to my memory, consistently from the 1980s took a strong stance against the concept of legislating salaries. Mr. Speaker, Sir, that has gone through the eddies too. You have a scenario in this country, Mr. Speaker, where you will find it hard to take anything which the Honourable Member for St. Peter says seriously.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, during the 1994 period the Honourable Member for St. Peter, although he likes to say otherwise, I cannot say pretend otherwise, suggested constantly that the terms of the incomes protocol were like a noose around the neck of the citizens of this country. We subsequently heard him say he always supported incomes policy but that is not what was being said on the streets of Barbados. On the streets of Barbados that protocol was being used as a whip against the Democratic Labour Party. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for St. Peter went the length and breadth of Barbados, including that in his indictment against the Democratic Labour Party. The person who therefore stands in the dock again and who delivered an unsworn statement at the beginning of today's proceedings is the Honourable Member for St. Peter and Mr. Speaker, Sir, not many people have three opportunities to deliver a speech which is akin to an unsworn statement from the dock.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I went on the Floor of this Parliament in debates that were televised to the public and committed myself to support an incomes policy even to the point where my support of it even offended my colleagues. I attended countless seminars at the Labour Party to support an incomes policy and I now cannot have it said about me that I went the length and breadth of Barbados not supporting an incomes policy. I am asking that those words which are known to be untruthful be withdrawn from the record.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member ...

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, what do you want me to do?

Mr. SPEAKER: Well the Prime Minister is asking that you withdraw those remarks that you made just now.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: But I did not say anything untruthful, Mr. Speaker, Sir. The Honourable Member for St. Peter...

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member, the Chair is not going to be judging veracity. All the Chair is asking, an objection has been raised over a point that you stated that the Prime Minister went the length and breadth of the island stating a position. He is saying that he did not do this. His position was made clear and he is asking you to withdraw that he did not do what you are alleging that he did.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, if it will facilitate the conclusion of my debate I will withdraw it but I am going to say this now, Mr. Speaker, Sir ...

Mr. SPEAKER: So you have not withdrawn the words.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The Honourable Member for St. Peter during the course of the 1994 election campaign joined with others in going throughout Barbados and laying...

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have gone on record in Hansard, the records of this Parliament, in committing myself to support an incomes policy. I did it, Sir, more than once. The records of this Parliament reveal that I said that even if I offend my colleagues I will support an Incomes Policy, Sir. I am asking the Member, Sir, to withdraw his remarks because he has cast me now as a person who is hypocritical, that I will say one thing in this Parliament and say something else off the Floor. My statements on the Incomes Policy, Sir, are not only categorical but I had from the Floor in the Opposition to say that I would support it even if it meant that I offended my colleagues. I stand on that, Sir. I am asking the Member to produce the evidence or withdraw his scurrilous inference.
12.50 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has already withdrawn the remark. Could we proceed please? Order, please. May I remind the Honourable Member about the Standing Order that clearly states about reflecting on a matter that has already been passed in the House. Do we necessarily have to dwell on that point relating to Incomes Policy, Sir?

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is put in the context of the Incomes Policy. The Honourable Member put it in that context.

Mr. SPEAKER: Proceed, please.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly legitimate for me to get in this Chamber and say I support in a generic sense an Incomes Policy and fulminate in here and give the impression that I have some principled stance relative to Incomes Policy, but then go outside and take the very document which contains the terms of an Incomes Policy which the trade unions, the Government and the private sector of Barbados agreed on and to draw up as part of the evidence and the indictment against the Democratic Labour Party the terms of that same Protocol. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am saying that there are people in the leadership of the Barbados Labour Party who went throughout Barbados criticizing the terms of the Protocol which enshrined the very aspects of the Incomes Policy which they said they agreed with.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the essence of the point that I am trying to make in relation to this debate is that I take what the Prime Minister says on these things with a pinch of salt. That is me. Anybody else is free to give any other kind of judgment they want. I am saying that the public is going to take what the Honourable Member for St. Peter says with a pinch of salt too, because his position has shifted, turned around and there are reversals. The public service in Barbados most of all are the first people who should have been rewarded in terms of the sacrifice which Barbadians made in 1991. The principal platform of that sacrifice was a reduction in public sector wages.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, before all of these other elements in the society can be reaping the reward of that sacrifice, the Honourable Member for St. Peter and his colleagues owe it to the public servants of Barbados and to their principal trade union to see if they can right those alleged wrongs. Therefore, I am the most shocked person as would be anybody on this side to hear the Honourable Member for St. Peter 18 months or so after an election turning on the very same people whom the Honourable Member for St. Peter used as examples of the inequity and the indecent policies of the then Democratic Labour Party Government. What we have had in here today, Mr. Speaker, Sir, is an exercise in which the Honourable Member for St. Peter has savaged the NUPW. He has savaged them in here and outside of here. He has accused the leader of the National Union of Public Workers of trying to rape the Treasury of Barbados. Mr. Speaker, Sir, those have been the stances which the public at the end of the day has to judge and the silence which the Honourable Member for St. Peter interprets as being in his favour is something that I would be very concerned about. Mr. Speaker, Sir, you have people who you can line up before a firing squad and they will show no resistance. So all of this talk which

the Honourable Member for St. Peter has about the efficacy of his policies simply because people are silent about them is something that I would review.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, what you have in Barbados today at the end of this debate is that the entire context in which this settlement with some of the trade unions have been made and non-settlement with the largest Government employee trade union in Barbados is an entire breach of faith. It has to be a breach of faith, Mr. Speaker, Sir, and not any breach of faith by the Democratic Labour Party. That is why I say the Honourable Member for St. Peter should pay no attention to what I say. It is what the Honourable Member for St. Peter says because the public of Barbados including the public officers entered into a covenant with him. That is your word – a contract. In the context of that covenant, there are certain rights and responsibilities on both sides. The Honourable Member for St. Peter has abandoned all of his responsibilities in this matter and the public workers are expected to accept this based on the contribution which the Honourable Member for St. Peter at the beginning made today in which he sets the context of this exercise as being tied up in a whole set of other matters as acting appointments, car loans and all kinds of other matters which have nothing to do with what is before this Chamber today.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this has to be a historic occasion. There have only been two occasions in the past two decades when a Government has had to legislate salaries in this way before agreement was reached.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, if the Honourable Member will yield. There are only two occasions in which salaries have not been legislated. But the truth is that since 1974 salaries have had to be virtually legislated on almost every occasion. Under the Barbados Labour Party in 1978 there was an agreement on all sides and that was the only occasion between 1976 and 1986. In 1974 as well, Sir, the then DLP administration had to legislate salaries. But generally speaking salaries have had to be legislated on almost every occasion.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member must not mislead this Honourable House. My recollection, Sir, is that the first occasion that salaries were legislated was in 1974 when a certain gentleman called Mr. O'Brien Trotman made demands of the then Government far in excess of what the NUPW is making today and subsequent to that there were two occasions in the early 1980's when salaries were legislated. My recollection is that they were not legislated after that as far as I can recall.

Mr. SPEAKER: Sir, on a point of elucidation also.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order. I am saying that the information which the Honourable Member gave is not accurate. I do not wish to detain the House, but if you wish I can give the details. The point about legislation – I am talking about legislation without agreement and we have to discuss when agreement was reached not whether it was legislated because that would be a technical error. If he is saying that they were legislated without agreement, I have here the record of all from 1986 to the present and on that basis alone that is not correct.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am saying that it is a historic occasion. If the Honourable Member for St. Peter does not view it as a historic occasion, well that is his problem. But I have indicated that there are two occasions and that is what the historians tell me. They have pointed out the two occasions when it has happened before. I am talking about legislation without agreement. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for St. Peter has a chance to speak again. He can put whatever information he wishes into the record. I am saying to you, Mr. Speaker, that the gap is small and that the effect on the NUPW of the action which the Honourable Member for St. Peter has taken and on the trade union movement as a whole is going to be very, very negative. I am saying that it is a calculation on the part of the Honourable Member to create that scenario within the trade union movement in Barbados that is coming against the background of the Protocol as well as the Constitutional Amendment and that these acts have to be viewed as a breach of faith with the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, let us make it clear. I may not be here when the vote is called because I came off of my sick bed to participate in this exercise. I want my comments to form part of the record. But let it be clear even in my absence that I want to be counted as one of the people who is saying "no". I am not supporting it, Mr. Speaker, not in that context and the other Members of the Democratic Labour Party have indicated to me clearly that they will not be supporting it either. One has to understand our position of consistency. If you analyze our stance on the Constitutional Amendment and now you analyze our stance on this, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Democratic Labour Party feels entirely vindicated by the stance which it has taken – the Constitutional Amendment, Protocol and this – and we have to be consistent.
1.00 p.m.

We have to understand that there are going to be occasions in here when the Honourable Members of the Government are going to do what they have to do. The points that divided the Barbados Government from the principal negotiator on behalf of the public workers of Barbados are so small, Mr. Speaker, as to give us a clue as to why the Government could not reach agreement,

and that clue is not to be found in anything the Honourable Prime Minister said about the conduct of any union, it is to be found in the financial planning, the straitjacket, the medium term economic programme which the Honourable Member for St. Peter is operating on. Mr. Speaker, contrary to the impression he has given the public, he does not have all the elbow room which he suggests that he has in relation to this economy. He is not a free agent, so I sympathise with him and I think I will join at this stage, in relation to the others, the silent majority. That silent majority is fundamentally against the stances which the Government is taking. In due course they will have their say on all of these matters, but at the end of the day the Democratic Labour Party has to maintain its consistent position on behalf of the public workers of Barbados, who made the greatest sacrifice during the period of stabilisation, and has to applaud the consistency of the NUPW, whichever Government had been in office, to ensure the best deal for the public workers of Barbados.

With those few words, Sir, I want to say we will not be supporting these Resolutions.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for lunch until 2.15 p.m. today.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I beg to second that, Sir.

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

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that we revert to Government Notices.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no objections, so be it.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to give notice, Mr. Speaker, of a Resolution which is consequential upon this day's debate. It is to grant the sum of \$7 469 733 from the Consolidated Fund to place at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1995-96, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1995-96, No. 13 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I just want to inform Honourable Members that they will be receiving shortly a copy of the Bill to amend the Income Tax Act. It

is the same Bill as Honourable Members had before, except for two Clauses, which are now Clauses 12 and 13. The substantive Bill is there, it is just that we want to make provision for certain types of activity to benefit from profits earned overseas, and this is done at Clause 13.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS (resumed)

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business will now continue. The Honourable Member for St. Michael North East.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to give support to the Government on this Resolution which seeks to ensure that the workers of Barbados for the first time since late 1991, when they had to endure a pay cut of 8%, will have the opportunity to receive, for the first time since September 1991 an increase in their statutory personal emoluments as relate to the terms and conditions of service of an employee of the Crown of Barbados.

Sir, it seems as though any mere reminder of the 8% pay cut so jolts the Democratic Labour Party that they perhaps take leave of their senses. That perhaps explains the reaction here today and their opposition. . . .

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Democratic Labour Party has been running the affairs of this country for so many years, it is incapable of losing its senses. The Honourable Member must not mislead the Chamber giving the impression that the Democratic Labour Party is incapable.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, as I was saying, the Democratic Labour Party has been so jolted that it has taken leave of its senses and seeks to oppose a Resolution which seeks to improve the terms and conditions of workers in this country, for the first time since September 1991, and particularly in the context where it does not come as a single, isolated incident but comes in the context of other proposals put by this Government since September, 1994 to ensure that the general terms and conditions and the quality of life of public servants in this country could be enhanced, particularly given the ravages of the period 1991 to 1994.

Sir, this debate has to be seen in the context of a Government that is prepared to do what is correct without jeopardising the future of this country's economy or indeed the future of this country's public servants and so to put them in a position that that Democratic Labour Party left them in, having brought to this country in 1990 proposals to regrade civil servants only at the top of the scale, leading to a package worth some \$33 million in 1990, only to end up with 3 000 public servants being sent home in less than a year.
2.25 p.m.

I want to make the point that when I heard the Leader of the Opposition speak just now and say that this Government is committed to a policy of only doing job enhancement exercises to put money into the pockets of those at the top, he clearly forgot the part he played as a member of the Democratic Labour Party Government in 1990 that led to \$33 million going to persons only at the top, with no reference to those persons' direct relationship to the productivity of this country, not related to the productive sector that earned the most foreign exchange for this country; but as a whimsical, gratuitous, political exercise to put them in a position to retain a government.

Sir, if you want to talk about hypocrisy in this Chamber, let us talk about it, because at the end of the day what we have sought to do here today has to be seen in the context that we made a commitment to the workers of this country which we have tried our best to fulfil since being in government. We told the workers, before being in government and since being in government, that we do not believe a government should have the right to cut public servants' salaries. We kept our word and faith and brought the amendment to this House.

We also took a position through the Rt. Honourable Prime Minister that the Prices and Incomes Protocol which came before this Chamber in 1993 was one that we believed was necessary for successful management of the macro-economic framework of this country and we proposed a fixed exchange rate. We kept faith with that decision in relation to the policies of this Government and we successfully concluded a prices and incomes protocol with the social partners which was introduced into this Parliament last year.

In addition to that, we also took a decision, without reference to these direct salary increases, that there were certain terms and conditions that brought a level of inequity and hardship upon public servants and we believed that we had the responsibility as a Government to alter those without having to wait for any general increase in salaries *per se*.

The postmen of this country for years made representation to Government that they needed duty free access for motorcycles because that was their primary mode of transportation; that their salaries did not allow them to be able to buy motorcycles that had duty attached to it.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir, there is a rule which says that an Honourable Member ought not to cast aspersions on the integrity of another Honourable Member. The Honourable Member for Christ Church South as Prime Minister and Minister of Finance of this country would have had no negative attitude to the postmen of this country. The Honourable Member is casting aspersions on the Member for Christ Church South.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I will give the House the assurance that I would not treat the Honourable Member for Christ Church South in a negative way as the Honourable Member for St. Michael West treats the Honourable Member for St. John. The House can have that fullest assurance.

The point I am making is that the postmen made representations that their salaries could not allow them to be able to purchase easily the very things they needed to do their jobs. The Honourable Attorney General as a Minister of Home Affairs took the representation and having consulted it with the Cabinet and the Prime Minister that was one of the first measures introduced in this Government's Budget in 1995. We also saw the iniquitous position being corrected.

The Honourable Member for St. Michael West, like the rest of us who have had any dealings with the public servants, knows that public servants suffer from having to act in positions for years and years. They are well aware of people whom they left acting for 10 and 15 years and whom they selectively left acting after asking for other people to be appointed in the same department who were there for less time, two days before the election in 1994. That's what they did in the School Meals Department where a number of persons were appointed on September 2 and school workers that were in the School Meals Department for many more years...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. I do not know what the Honourable Member is saying, because I have difficulty following what she is saying. She mentioned the Member for St. Michael West and then I heard her say something about they left somebody after 15 years. I categorically deny leaving anybody acting for 15 years. I know the Barbados Labour Party left a man acting for 17 years, but I was not aware that we had left anybody for 15 years.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I would not expect any better from a person who attempted to fire a person...

As I was saying, Sir, people who have been acting in positions for years very often come to the age of retirement acting in positions for years and they have to revert to their substantive positions in respect of the calculation of the pension. Sir, this means that where a person is acting for 5 years or 6 or 7 years at a higher position and is being paid in respect of that higher position, and the time for retirement has come and all of a sudden he is told to disregard all the work he did in that acting position, the fact that he was even getting an acting allowance, and that we are only calculating his pension on the basis of what his salary in the substantive post was.

This Government took a decision that that situation had to be remedied as a matter of urgency and we remedied it without having to wait to come as part of a package where we were introducing salary increases for the public servants of this country. Mr. Speaker, it is significant, and I want to place my comments in the rest of my speech in the context of where we are as a government and what we have done.

This Government has brought an approach which reflects at the same time a level of sensitivity while ensuring a level of responsibility continues to inform the actions of the Government. We have brought to this House a resolution which will recommend the situation that will see the Government of Barbados placing the interest of public servants as a priority in terms of their needs for a wage increase while ensuring that the kind of recklessness that informed Government's behaviour in 1990 does not repeat itself, in fact, Sir, a wage increase which does not approximate to a package as that claimed first by the NUPW which was valued at some \$266 million, but, indeed, Sir, a package that bears relationship to the fact that this economy in 1995 is expected to grow some 2½ per cent and indeed with an inflation rate of about 2 per cent. Any form of increase has at the end of the day to bear relationship to growth in the general economy and the level of productivity within the individual sectors of the economy that have been seen.

What we have done therefore is to say that we believe that in the first year this is what we can afford – 3½ per cent at the bottom of the scale, 2½ per cent at the top, that we believe that there will be more expansion in the economy in 1996. We are not sure as to the extent to which that will occur but at the very least we believe that there can be an increase across-the-board in the second year of some 3 per cent with the undertaking that we will give a productivity bonus payment in respect of any further growth in the economy so that for the first time across-the-board in respect to the public servants they will be given an opportunity to share in any bountiful growth that takes place in this economy during 1996.

Sir, I want to say that there are those who will argue that we have come still to legislate in a position where only 57 per cent of the workers who have been represented have agreed to the positions outlined by Government and have said that they will accept the packages as outlined and that 43 per cent as represented by the NUPW have failed to reach an agreement with the Government.

Sir, a government at the end of the day has to be able to exercise discretion and to take judgment. A government at the end of the day has to be able to determine whether it can in fact allow for negotiations to continue with the possible prospect that you will end up with the same

category of worker receiving two different settlements merely because they happen to be represented by different unions. Now, I want to make this fundamental point. We would have loved if there was unanimity in respect of the wages negotiations. I don't think that there is any government which would not admit that. But the reality is that the history of this country of the NUPW in respect of wage negotiations, particularly as evidenced by the first package put to this Government in May 1995 that resulted or would have resulted in a package of \$266 million, was clearly not in the context of any restructuring that they became part of out of the 1991-93 exercise when they were as quiet as a lamb.

In the context of their behaviour and in the context of their own statement that this was their final position the Government, I believe, in good faith and in the interest of the majority of the public servants of this country had to take a decision to come here to legislate in the context where full agreement had not been reached with the NUPW.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Government has taken that decision on the basis of what would otherwise be known as a simple majority. The majority of the workers represented are represented by other unions all of whom have accepted the proposals outlined by Government, to be more specific, that 57 per cent of the workers represented by other unions have accepted the proposals as opposed to 43 per cent represented by the NUPW. That, Sir, was done on the basis of a simple majority. What makes this so interesting, Mr. Speaker, is that the same NUPW, 2 weeks ago, said to this country that they did not have unanimous support for industrial action against the Government on this same wages issue and that they had taken the decision in respect of what they dubbed as guerilla tactics on the basis of a simple majority, not having unanimous support within its council. But now, Sir, we will hear from the Opposition in this country that the Government cannot take a decision on the basis of the same simple majority; that 57 per cent of the workers represented by other unions have agreed to the proposals and the bottom line, Mr. Speaker, Sir, is that the rules must be the same, both for Government and for the NUPW, in terms of exercising its judgment and discretion as to where we go from here on.

If the NUPW accepts that they have a right to take a decision on the basis of a simple majority in the interest of what it considers to be all, so, too, does Government. The Rt. Honourable Prime Minister has already made the point that there has been a general acquiescence and acceptance on the part of the population reflected by a level of industrial quiet in the context of the announcement as to what the package reflected for public servants.

I don't think people understand that public servants will receive three different forms of increases this year, either in the form of a lump sum or in the form of a

continual increase. I don't think, Sir, people have been told clearly enough that what they will receive before the end of this financial year is a sum reflected of an increase of 3½ per cent at the bottom, from April 1995 to the present, and from the 1st April 1996 what they will receive in hand will be 6½ per cent more than they are receiving now, and before the end of this calendar year in the context of any significant increase in the economy, what they will further receive is a productivity bonus payment. These are for public servants who had to endure, as I said, from an 8 per cent cut right back through to being sent home, to having their terms and conditions altered and their level of security threatened in the most raucous of ways.

In this context this what Government is doing it not only with a level of sensitivity but with a level of responsibility as to what this country can afford, to ensure that there is sustainable economic growth and that we are never carried out to sea again by a government, dumped out of the boat into the sea and then told swim back to shore or we might come back and rescue you, as was done by the last Administration.

I believe, Sir, that the public servants of this country will understand that this Government has kept faith with them, that this Government has kept faith and ensured that the deprivation which they saw for the last 3½ years between 1991 and 1994 is no longer a hallmark of their relationship with the Crown of this country; that they will understand that they have a government which is prepared to be sensitive to their needs without threatening the overall security of this country and what is more, Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Government spent an inordinately long period of time negotiating with the unions of this country. They spent almost 10 months on this issue, and we have come to the conclusion that it will be impossible to reach an agreement with the one single union outstanding.

Sir, I don't know whether the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central will come to that same conclusion because he may have a better rapport in finding out whether the NUPW position has changed. I don't know whether the Honourable Member for St. John...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Point of order. Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the Rule about irrelevance in a debate. The Honourable Member is discussing the Member for St. Michael South Central who has not spoken in the debate. It is improper for an Honourable Member to refer to a person's potential speech in a debate. I draw that to Your Honour's attention.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I accept that if we cannot refer to someone who has not yet spoken that we equally cannot refer to someone who has spoken and said nothing. Therefore, to that extent, there is

a level of irrelevance that may well clothe the remarks of the last speaker.

Sir, I don't know whether they may have better and stronger knowledge as to what extent there may well have been a possibility for further movement in the negotiations process. Perhaps they are better informed than the Rt. Honourable Prime Minister or the Permanent Secretary of the Civil Service who conducted the negotiations. Maybe even the Honourable Leader of the Opposition who may have more opportunity to be apprised of these matters may well be better informed, particularly in the night dew of St. Philip.

I want to say, Sir, that at some stage a government has to take stock and determine whether enough is enough in terms of how long it can hold out and to what extent it can continue to delay what is rightfully due to the majority in the interest of a minority. Sir, Government is not about taking easy decisions. Government is not about being always able to please 100 per cent of the people 100 per cent of the time. Members on both sides of this Chamber are painfully aware of that fact; but Government is about doing and being responsible to the public interest to the extent that one can fully please, bearing in mind the oath of office that we have all taken as officers of the Crown. I want to suggest that I believe this Government has been patient in the negotiation process. I believe this Government has been fair in the settlement which has come about.

2.45 p.m.

Sir, reference has already been made to the relationship these settlements make, not only to the growth and inflation in the economy, but generally to other settlements in the private sector. We believe that if we are not to go through the psychological battering and the type of deprivation we went through between 1991 and 1994 we have to be fair but still hold the line. We have to ensure that we can build the kind of sustainable foundation that the children of this country can inherit an economy that is not subject to the whims and fancies of all forms of activity that will cause it to go off base and cause us to go through a structural adjustment programme in this country again. I believe, Sir, this is the type of maturity and responsibility that the people of this country voted for in 1994. I therefore want to support this Resolution wholeheartedly.

I end, Sir, by saying yet again that we would have loved for it to be on the basis of unanimity in terms of agreement but, at the end of the day, we have to do what is in the interest of the majority when the majority is most in need. We believe that having been deprived of such increases and improvements in terms of conditions for as long as four years, the public servants of this country

deserve this increase now, and that they deserve all three forms of payment they will receive in the course of the next calendar year.

We also have given the commitment, and there are a number of matters with which I am intimately familiar because they relate to the terms and conditions of service of Teachers and Principals, that those will be discussed as we continue to see how we can generally improve the terms and conditions other than salaries that they are forced to work under in the school environment of this country, as with other public servants in their own environment if they are in offices. This Government has given the commitment that we will seek to accommodate through negotiations whatever improvement in terms and conditions that we can, given in a realistic examination of Government's outturn in revenue generally I believe that no one could expect to see less in respect of fairness from this Government while it still ensures that sensitivity was there.

Now, Sir, in respect of the opposition shown by the Democratic Labour Party and the National Democratic Party, I would only say that they have been caught between a rock and a hard place. They have taken a position which would seek to deny the public servants of this country this increase in the same way as they took a position that would seek to deny the public servants of this country the protection of the Constitution against pay cuts as was done by them in 1991. They have done so in the context of a Government that wrought a level of hardship on the people of this country that had not been seen in post independence Barbados, that young people of my generation had never been exposed to until it was brought about by the last Government. I want to say that it has left an indelible scar on many of us.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please. Let us keep it orderly, please.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Members, please. The Honourable Member for St. Michael West, please. Could we continue this orderly, please?

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, it has left an indelible scar on the young people of this country that has, perhaps, led us to accept that while we may want more for ourselves in life, we do not get there overnight, that there is a process in life that requires building a foundation and maintaining that foundation to be secure.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has two minutes to conclude.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If, Sir, there is anything worthwhile that the Democratic Labour Party has done, it is to ensure that that attitudinal adjustment has come about through the harsh experiences we were forced to undergo. People in this country 15 years ago going into a profession felt they had a certain level of progress to make going up the ladder professionally, being able to access houses for themselves, and now today having gone through what we have gone through in the last five years has led us to a much slower pace of advancement on the part particularly of young black people in this country. We need to ensure that experience is never repeated. I believe the leadership shown by this government in being prepared to meet the needs of people, while not threatening the economic underpinning of this economy, is an example for all governments to follow in good governance.

I therefore, Sir, readily support this Resolution and would wish that the negotiations on the other terms and conditions which will improve the quality of the work experience for public servants in this country would continue in the context of us being able to ensure that we can get and own a strong public service that is capable of responding to the needs of Barbados as we move into the 21st Century. That ranges from training and educational possibilities right down to physical condition.

Mr. SPEAKER: Could the Honourable Member conclude, please?

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: That is why I am happy, Sir, to be able to preside over the completion of the new Ministry headquarters in Constitution Road because that Government, in the form of the Democratic Labour Party should have been ashamed to refuse to access the World Bank funds to finish the Ministry of Education headquarters, and to continue to pay \$35 000 a month to the contractors...

Mr. SPEAKER: Time. Just conclude, please.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I am concluding, Sir.

...instead of providing what would be a fit and proper place of work for the employees in the Ministry of Education. That is all I want to say and I heartily support this Resolution.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I have been travelling for much of yesterday and the day before. Normally I would ask if not verbally, but certainly by my absence, your leave not to be here today but the importance of this debate resides in one area, and one area only. I must say that I am deeply perturbed over the flagrant attempt

at demonisation of the National Union of Public Workers, its elected bodies, including its executive and its employers, including its General Secretary.

Now, Sir, in our party we are totally committed to the concept of collective bargaining. The Barbados Labour Party who marched hand in hand with us, and with the NUPW, and with other unions in this country only a few years ago committed themselves then, and I believe even in its last Manifesto, to the principle of collective bargaining. It is a process which underpins the democratic rights of the workers of this country. Government as an employer has a duty to set the best example in that it should not rush into the process of using the heavy hand of legislative authority to abort the process of collective bargaining otherwise we are going to run into serious problems in this country. It is the NUPW today and it would be other unions in the future. The bottom line will be that the workers of this country will suffer.

2.55 p.m.

Now, Sir, we are talking about a union which is the successor to the Civil Service Association which began, as far back as 1944, before the birth of persons whom I have heard seeking to demonise – and I use no other word, this is a straightforward attempt at demonisation – the National Union of Public Workers. When the facts are set out in this Chamber today by me, then we will see precisely what I am talking about when I talk about demonisation.

Mr. Speaker, what is the substantive issue in this debate? We have had several occasions in this House, where Governments have legislated salaries, having aborted the collective bargaining processes, in which unions have made claims which were patently exorbitant and the negotiation process did not reduce the gap between those claims. What is the gap today that is causing us to come in here and breach such a fundamental principle which the Caribbean Congress of Labour itself passed a Resolution only ten years ago, in 1986, condemning, this kind of practice that is taking place in this House today, where people are legislating salaries for no good reason. What is the reality? What is the gap between the NUPW and the Government of Barbados? As I understand it, they are both agreed that in the second year there will be a 3% increase across-the-board, so the second year is settled. There is an agreement. In respect of the first year, they are both agreed on 2.5% at the top. Where is the gap? The gap is within 3.5% and 5% at the bottom, 1.5% for the maids and people working at the bottom of the ladder in the public service today, and this has resulted in this kind of Resolution coming before the Parliament of this country.

Asides.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat what I said because I wish this Parliament and this country to be absolutely clear about what is the substantive issue or the apparent issue before this Parliament. The NUPW and the Government of Barbados have agreed on the 3% across the board in the second year. They have agreed on the 2.5% at the top in the first year. The only difference between them is a 1.5% affecting the lower paid workers in the public service in the first year, and for that we are faced with this exercise today and what I can only describe adequately as a persistent orchestrated attempt at demonisation of the National Union of Public Workers. I am very sorry about it. I have never seen anything like this. In all the years I have been in this Parliament I have never seen this legislative step being taken when the gap between the Government and the NUPW or any other union is very narrow indeed. That is the reality and that is where the negotiations have reached.

I also want to ask the Government of Barbados how many times did they meet with the NUPW. Did they meet once? Did they meet twice? Did they meet three times? Did they meet four times? Over what period? I am saying that from the records of the Press reports and other documentation that I have no systematic attempt was made by the Government of Barbados even to close that gap, if you look at the number of meetings that were held. I am saying that the Prime Minister may well have a problem in the amount of money that he can offer the National Union of Public Workers, or the public workers of this country, because of the macro-economic straitjacket in which he finds himself. I do not wish to get into that because I have said before I am not getting into that until 1997, and until 1997 that is my position. I am not getting into those areas, what constraints are on the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance. I said two years and I am going to stick to that. At the same time, if he wants to adhere to that policy he cannot do it by making the kinds of statements which have caused considerable hurt to all members of the NUPW at all levels. For example, Sir, I think it is a fallacy to say that the NUPW represents a minority of unionised workers in the public service. That is not true. It may represent a minority of the total number of people employed in the public service, but as a single entity it is my understanding that it has more unionised workers than all the other unions together in terms of public employees.

I cannot understand what is this hatred being generated. What is the emotion being generated? Can the NUPW or the Barbados Workers' Union or any union of this country be expected to cede or abandon its right to seek the best terms for its workers? That is what the process of collective bargaining is all about.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I don't want to get into those things, I am dealing simply with a matter of principle. When we look at this so-called extraordinary package which the NUPW was supposed to have presented in the first instance, it was suggested to the public of Barbados that the NUPW was asking for \$266 million over a two-year period, or to cover the years 1995 and 1996. It is only today that we have heard that they were addressing grievances going back to 1990, grievances in which they were supported by the Barbados Labour Party and the NDP when the Barbados Labour Party was in opposition. They made the very fundamental error of believing that the Labour Party was true in its position. I will stand by the sacred trust I have made with the workers of this country, that I will stand by them at all times. I will not allow myself to depart from those positions on the grounds of expediency or otherwise.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what were the grounds on which the NUPW sought from the Government of Barbados, the Government of Barbados being a continuum – the Government of Barbados did not begin in 1994, it is a continuum – and therefore they brought their legitimate grievances to the Government of Barbados, not to a Barbados Labour Party Government. They said: "We are employees of the Government of Barbados and since 1990 we have been faced with a number of problems, and we are asking you at this point in time to see whether you can address them." Is that something for which a union should be abused in public? Abused in editorials? I have a list of the comments made by members of the Government of Barbados in relation to the NUPW. It was a legitimate position for them to take. They are not negotiating with the Barbados Labour Party, they are negotiating with the Government of Barbados.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: On a point of order, Sir. The records of the House will show that the salary revision of 1990 was agreed to by the NUPW and therefore it is quite misleading for the Honourable Member to try to purport that the NUPW has had any outstanding grievances with the Government of Barbados since 1990. I just want to say for the record that nobody on this side, as far as I am aware, nor anybody on that side, including members of the NDP, has ever agreed with any union that the Government of Barbados should pay any trade union members one month's salary tax free for the period 1990 to 1993. It is a travesty of the records of this House for anybody to believe that that representation by the NUPW represents a grievance that was ever expressed.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, the Right Honourable Member might not have been around at the time, but he may have forgotten....

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: To start with, Mr. Speaker,...

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not going to be sidetracked by red herrings. I have said nothing about any tax free months in my speech. As I understand it, that was one of the mechanisms which the NUPW suggested to try to assist the Government in trying to reach a figure which did not appear to be excessive in terms of the Protocol.

Aside.

3.05 p.m.

In their first proposals, yes. Now the point I am making, Sir, is this. June last year to January, a very short period to negotiate on the one hand and in addition how many meetings. I think there were about 4 meetings I saw reported in the Press. Certainly there were no big lot of meetings anyhow. What was the case that the NUPW was putting? They said, look we have suffered an 8% pay cut, we have suffered job losses, we have suffered reduction by way of a work week, we have suffered various other impositions and we are asking the Government of Barbados to consider these things when they come now to make an arrangement for the future. Is that unreasonable? Is that something for which a General Secretary of a Union, who is an employee of the Union, not an elected official of the union, an employee of the union who has to take to the Government the position of the executive and the general body of that body, is that something to lambaste somebody for?

It was the union that first raised the question of a productivity bonus as part of the settlement not as the Prime Minister said this morning. The productivity bonus was first raised by the union in respect of the years when a smaller number of public workers were running the country. Therefore in their judgement, on that basis, that their output would have been greater and that if you cannot consider any other mechanism since the concept of a productivity bonus was in the first prices and incomes agreement, can it apply? This is the question they asked. Is that unreasonable?

Mr. Speaker, could that be deemed to be unreasonable? If they say, look we are doing the work now which 3000 or 4000 more people used to do and since we were operating in the context of an agreement in those two years which provided for a productivity bonus, can it apply to us? Is that an unreasonable proposal to put on the table? Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that it cannot be deemed to be unreasonable by any stretch of the imagination. And I would suggest to my good friend the Honourable Prime Minister that he has over-reacted

and in the long run I think he is going to damage his situation even more because they have taken note of the readiness with which he has intervened in a large number of private sector disputes. They are all listed here.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, this man is given to hyperbole.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: But he is a man. What must I call him? Honourable?

Mr. SPEAKER: He is the Honourable Member.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On one occasion, in a dispute involving the Light and Power Company, the Prime Minister was asked to intervene. The Honourable Member is now advancing that from one to a large number. Why is he so given to hyperbole? It will soon lead to untruthfulness.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure the Honourable Member is not given to untruthfulness. He would not want to interpret one as many.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there was ...

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: On a point of order, I really must beware of the Member misleading the House and distorting the record. The Member is saying that there is a dispute over productivity bonus. The Government of Barbados is offering a productivity bonus for the period 1995 to 1997 when this agreement is in place. The NUPW is seeking a productivity bonus for a previous period without having asked for that productivity bonus during the period when the incomes protocol governing that period was in vogue and we are saying, Mr. Speaker, that the Union cannot come after a contract has lapsed and ask for the matter to be reopened. If the NUPW had asked for a productivity bonus in that period they would have an issue but they did not ask for a productivity bonus then. We are prepared to entertain a discussion about a productivity bonus for the period 1995 to 1997. You cannot reopen a contract after it has been completed.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I wish to express my gratitude to both Members who rose on points of order. First of all I thank the Honourable Prime Minister for repeating with greater clarity exactly what I said, that it was the NUPW that raised the issue of productivity in respect of the first two years of the protocol. That is what I said and you have repeated exactly what I said.

Now, in respect of other interventions in relation to industrial disputes in Barbados, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if

you may have heard about a dispute involving Carters, a dispute involving BET, a dispute involving the Barbados Light and Power.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. The dispute involving Carters was settled when I was acting Prime Minister, not the substantive Prime Minister.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is the Prime Minister. I am talking about the Prime Minister. There is only one Prime Minister in this country. If he is not here, if he is disabled in any way then you are the Prime Minister *de jure* on one occasion and *de facto* on another occasion and most other occasions.

Now, Sir, you may have heard, Sir, of a Barbados Light and Power dispute. You may have heard of the problems of downsizing in the hotel industry, you may have heard of a problem relating to the junior doctors at the hospital only last week or this week. I am a bit confused. Now, Sir, let us test the veracity of my statement. I said the Members of the National Union of Public Workers are deeply aggrieved, hurt, humiliated because the Prime Minister of this country can find it possible to be heard to intervene in a large number of actions which I have just detailed, Mr. Speaker, to this Honourable Chamber and has refused to meet with his own charges, the people who allow you to work and to function. You should have your first responsibility to them and you should not be afraid or ashamed to meet with them because you knew what you intended to do in the long run.
3.15 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like making any charges but on this occasion, seeing that 7,000 people have been so humiliated, I believe that I am entitled to use the word that this debate is not about money, not about substance, not about the 1.5 per cent gap that stands between the Government and the union in respect of the lower paid workers. But it is a debate about spite in putting the union in its place, putting the lower paid workers in their place. Surely, Mr. Speaker, they cannot hurt...

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. He has gone too far. If you remember, Sir, when he began his speech, the Honourable Member spoke of the demonization of the NUPW. He has now elevated that to spite. Clearly, he is accusing the Government of spiting the NUPW. That is not only imputing an improper motive but it is such a nasty slur, Sir, that I am asking that it be struck from the record, expunged from the record.

Mr. SPEAKER: Could you proceed please?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, spite is not a listed word. If I had said malice, Sir, that would be a

different matter. That is a listed word. I am very careful in choosing my words in this Parliament, guided by May's. If I may continue, Sir. So really there is no issue here. There is no fundamental economic issue at stake because the difference is between the two. I came across a lady who was crying...

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: ...and, Mr. Speaker, do you know what she said to me? She said to me, Sir: "Do you know they are going to pay the Personal Assistants and those people more than the few cents that you have to go into Parliament today and legislate against us?" – to quote her exactly. She handed me this document that sets out the actual figures. I have not quoted from any document. I do not intend to quote because we are not going to have an argument as to whether or not we should make it a document of the House. But the exact amount is contained in this document and we have to come down in here and bring down the full weight of the law against the maids, the orderlies – 1.5 per cent and after they are taxed it may only be 1 per cent or less.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that I have put a pretty firm case to demonstrate that this action is totally unnecessary and I believe that the only argument which was totally misplaced was the argument that if some agree to one figure and some do not agree to that figure then you have to come here and legislate.

Certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central were asked to be expunged from the record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: What I will say, Sir, is that it was not an argument that was based on reason or logic to say that the reason why you have to legislate is because some unions agree to 3.5 per cent and one union which represents the majority of unionized workers did not agree to the 3.5 per cent and wanted 1.5 per cent more. That is no reason to legislate and then to go on to build on that argument to say that workers in one area will get one salary and workers in another area will get another salary. That is not a properly thought out argument because the Government had it in its power to agree to the 5 per cent increase and settle the problem.

Mr. Speaker, my case rests because I do not wish what I have said to be diluted in any way. I have deplored in no uncertain terms the attempt at demonization of the National Union of Public Workers. I have pointed out to this House beyond a shadow of doubt that the gap between the Government and the union is so minimal that it can never ever justify this kind of legislation. We have seen it in the days when the NUPW under a Mr. O'Brien Trotman was calling for a 60 per cent increase.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. It was 80 per cent.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: There are rules governing this Parliament and Members who want to call other people's names, particularly in a context to discredit the Members and to misrepresent the record, have to give notice. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that those remarks be struck from the record.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member please. The Member is correct as we refer to Standing Order 28(10) which refers to the point that was raised by the Member. Could you make the point without any reference to the name please?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: We have had a situation in this House where a former General Secretary of the NUPW who subsequently became a Minister of the Crown in a Barbados Labour Party Government was then demanding a 60 per cent increase and in those circumstances, Sir, legislation was brought down. If today the NUPW was asking for a 20 per cent increase, I would sympathize and vote for the Government. If they were asking for 15 per cent, I would vote for the Government. But they are asking for a 1.5 per cent increase at the bottom among the very poorest. How can I support this and go and face the people in my constituency, the people of Delaware Land, Howells Road, Carrington Village? How can I do that? It is impossible.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I am going to go there and tell the whole of this country who were the people that voted against them getting 1.5 per cent more on top of 3.5 per cent at the very bottom.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Honourable Prime Minister through you a simple question. Do you deep down inside feel comfortable about this situation now that it has been properly exposed? You cannot, you must not and you will not because we are going to make you very uncomfortable over this particular act in relation to the poorest people in the country.
3.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has two minutes to conclude, please.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much for the opportunity to try to set the record straight, to try to let Honourable Members understand clearly what they are voting for. You are voting against giving the very poorest people in the public service a 1.5% more.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I plead with the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, the Members of his Cabinet, the Members of the Front Bench, to reconsider this matter, because it is not worth it. Believe me, it is not worth it. It is not even worth the cost of the sitting so far today. The Honourable Member for Christ Church South, who has gone through many of these debates, knows fully well that he would never have come in here to legislate salaries with such a narrow gap. He is throwing up his hands in despair because he cannot understand what is going on.

I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to use all of my time, I just want to make a few points in this debate.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. Let us hear the Honourable Member.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I have not even started yet. Mr. Speaker, let us start where the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central finished. He said that between the Government and the NUPW there is a gap of 1.5% at the bottom and we should never try to legislate for the acceptance of the payments that have been agreed with the other unions. In 1980, when the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was a Dem, the NUPW had demanded at the bottom 40%. Do you know what the Labour Party settled for? 38.3%. There was a gap outstanding of 1.7% and we had to legislate then.

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You are so ridiculous, you get involved in a lot of minutiae.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please, please. Let us keep it parliamentary, please.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: When I say 'you', Sir, I mean the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.

Mr. SPEAKER: I know you are not referring to me, but let us keep it parliamentary.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He gets himself involved in a lot of minutiae, but the history of the NUPW is instructive in this matter. I will give you the history, Sir. In 1976 the NUPW demanded, when the Democratic Labour Party was the Government, at the top 30% and at the bottom 60%. Do you know what it was settled for, Sir?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. The

Honourable Member is indicating that the NUPW was asking for 60%. The fact is that they were asking for 80% and they were aided and abetted by the then Leader of the Opposition, the late Tom Adams.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Why do people have to tell lies in the House of Assembly? I have the research here, you can see it. Did you come and say 80% just to be facetious?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir, on a point of order. I was a Member of Parliament under Tom Adams and the Labour Party. The Honourable Member said that I am being facetious. I am saying that I was a member of Cabinet and the indication was 80% at the bottom. The Honourable Member cannot say I am being facetious.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Members, please. As I stated earlier, the Chair cannot rule on veracity. I am here because I expect that all Members will be proceeding on the point that we are all honourable. We base what we say on that.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, in 1976 the percentage which was finally legislated was 12% at the top and 35% at the bottom. In 1980, Sir, they asked for 25% at the top and 40% at the bottom. It was legislated that they would get 22.5% at the top and 38.3% at the bottom and 1.7 and 1.8 was the difference at the bottom. I am going through to show that it is almost impossible to agree with the NUPW. In 1982 they asked for 39.4% at the bottom, 25% at the top and everybody took \$108 a month across-the-board. In 1988, when the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was a Dem, before he crossed the Floor or whatever he did, Sir,...

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: When you were trying to get me to come with you, yes, when you were lambasting the Honourable Member for St. Michael South. The NUPW asked for 10% at the bottom. Do you know what the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central agreed with? A settlement of 8.2%, a difference of 1.8%. Why did you not go and tell your party and your Government then? Don't come in here ever....

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central sat as a Member, behind there, of the Democratic Labour Party and legislated a settlement with the unions at a point where the NUPW and his Government were 1.7 percentage points apart, and

he has come in here today with a lot of grandstanding. The history of this is in fact that the NUPW is 1.5 apart from the other unions, because for the other unions what Government has offered is acceptable. On 26th January this year the Government had moved four stages, the NUPW has not moved once, and he comes in here to suggest that the NUPW was negotiating in good faith? The others moved, members of the Democratic Labour Party, leading unions in this country saw sense and moved. The NUPW did not move until after 26th January, 1996, by which time the negotiations had been going on.

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Do you want me to call Bobby Morris' and Trotman's names in here?
3.35 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let's continue orderly, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I really hate to interrupt the Honourable Member. The Honourable Member said in his statement that members of the Democratic Labour Party are leading unions. Sir, I am General Secretary to the Democratic Labour Party and I know of no unions which we have in the Democratic Labour Party. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. We have no members leading unions.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order. Let us proceed, please.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the NUPW has a membership which is purported to be 7256, although a lot of those are retired civil servants. The Police Association has 1095, Secondary Teachers' Union - 367, Barbados Union of Teachers - 1900, Fire Officers' Association - 135, Prison Officers' Association - 164. This is the membership.

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The Registered Nurses' Association - 655, the Workers' Union - 5000 plus a medical officer who is a coward, representing 30.2 per cent. Sir, at the 31st December last year there were some 13 601 posts in central government; 6 216 posts in statutory boards, about 4 000 casual posts, 2 514 teaching posts and a police force including special constables - about 1500.

I have given the figures and if Honourable Members do the percentage they will see NUPW of the total unionised membership represent 43.7 per cent assuming the 7 000 to be inaccurate. I find it very hard to believe that, as I indicated earlier, mature and responsible leadership in other sectors of CTUSAB could agree with the Government

and just another wing, another trade union, would find it difficult to settle for something that was reasonable. What is Government supposed to do? The majority from that list of percentages that I gave, the majority of unionists as represented through their unions were prepared to accept the Government's offer for wages in terms of 2.5 per cent at the top and 3.5 per cent at the bottom and then Government's assurance.

We have not really spelt out this. What we are getting this year is 2.5 per cent at the top, 3.5 per cent at the bottom. From the first of April this year your salary will have been topped up to that extent and then you will get the 3.5 per cent again in the second year plus Government has given an assurance that it will be prepared to negotiate a productivity bonus in the second year so that you will be getting 2 increases plus a productivity bonus and then an assurance that certain terms and conditions of employment will be on the front burner for continued negotiation.

Let me just indicate what some of those things are, Sir. In my Ministry, for example, the Fire Officers' Association is asking for a further reduction in the hours of work, the prison officers are asking for increased numbers. We got 17 last year and we have got 20 temporaries that should be taken on shortly. They were going through interviews and exams recently. The teachers are asking for regrading of principals. They are asking for secretarial assistants for principals. Primary Schools are asking for the creation of the post of deputy principal, a general increase in the teaching establishment. The police are also asking for increases in washing allowances and driving allowances. I will explain those next week Tuesday, hopefully, when other matters come before the House. But those are the kinds of things that are on the table now for continual negotiation and Government has said that we are prepared to discuss them. We are prepared to negotiate and arrive at something that would be mutually acceptable.

The package, in my submission, is a package which will bring relief and for the benefit of the Honourable Member who has left, 2 weeks ago I had a branch meeting and a number of public officers turned up at the meeting. One said that she spoke on behalf of the others who were there and they made it clear that they were not in favour of holding out that they had waited so long to get an increase having regard to what the Democratic Labour Party had done to them between 1991 and 1994 that they were prepared to accept the Government's offer because they said they were talking about \$13. They said what is \$13. Let us get the settlement rather than spread out negotiations for another 6 months. Let us have the money. That was the reaction. I mean there were only 7 or 8 people. At least that was my empirical experience.

The Government is clear in its mind that the public workers of Barbados in 1990 suffered serious

discrimination when \$33 million was dished out the month before the general election of 1991 for what ulterior purpose I do not know. I can guess. Those who were the principal beneficiaries of that largesse were the ones at the top. The ones at the bottom didn't get anything. There were lots of people who didn't even have a regrading and reclassification. \$33 million went through the top echelons of the civil service. After that they were hit in 1991 with structural adjustment and the consequential Public Service Reduction of Emoluments Act, the freeze on wages, the freeze on increments, all those things to the extent that it is 4 or 5 years since the public workers in this country have got any increase, notwithstanding the increase in inflation. Albeit it is modest, still there has been an increase in prices over time and the Government feels that there has been some improvement in the economy. There was growth last year of about 2.5 per cent. What is being proposed by way of increase is not out of line with the level of economic growth and if there has been growth in the economy public workers should get a piece of the action. We are able to give a piece of the action that is commensurate with economic growth and that is what these resolutions are about today.

I just wanted to make those points. Let me make it very clear because I will see a headline: Simmons Blasts – they like that – NUPW. Nobody is against a union for trying to get the best deal for its workers. That is what they are established for. From time to time demands can be unreasonable. All we are saying on this side is that when the NUPW started the negotiations in June last year what they at first asked for was outlandish because they were in fact asking for a total package of \$266 million. The country could not afford that, and everyone of us would understand that. Okay! They modified their position and one recognises the reasonableness of that. Because they had modified they gave the impression that that was the last point that they were at; that there was no further room for negotiation when other unions had moved and the Government itself had moved 4 times. They refused to move once they had modified.

I don't think that was in the best interests of the workers. That is my personal view. Now we have a situation in Barbados where one set of unionised persons or several sets of unionised persons under one umbrella of CTUSAB are saying they think that what the Government is offering is reasonable and they are going down this road and out there NUPW is saying they are nothing to do with that, they are all unionists together but don't mind the police, the firemen, the nurses, the teachers and all these people, they are wrong, we are right.

How do you expect a government to function in that kind of situation? The only thing that we have to do now is to say that the majority say they want 2.5%, 3.5%, let us...

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: With the 8 per cent cut... Don't let us go into that. A lot of bogus voting, a lot of people were threatened. People got damages off that. Don't let us deal with the 8 per cent cut. I am amazed that the Honourable Member for St. Michael East would have the gall to talk about the 8 per cent cut. He is a braver man than I anticipated. He is even willing to introduce into this debate the virtues of an 8 per cent cut that was done by his Party that caused him to be at war with his former Prime Minister, that was all over the newspapers, that he bragged about.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I have not said a word in this debate, Sir.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He has not spoken on his feet, Sir, but he was talking to me from his seat.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. It is a well known ruling in this Chamber that asides are not recorded. It is therefore unfair for the Honourable Member to say that someone was speaking to him while Your Honour would know if somebody has spoken. He cannot leave that in the records, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: You know that the Chair does not hear asides. I was only listening to the Honourable Member who is on his feet. The Chair would not know anything about that. As usual I believe the veracity of the Honourable Member who was on his feet. He is an Honourable Member.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, this debate started as a serious debate and despite the levity that passes between us this is still a serious debate. A man cannot be too serious. Everybody has to have a sense of humour or else you would go off your head.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that in today's world, Honourable Members on the other side would agree that the big settlements of 22½%, 38%, 35%, the days of those settlements worldwide, are over. In 1980, 38.3% onwards. The days of those big settlements are over. The world is becoming a more competitive and a harsher place in which to live and do business. Government and the social partners sat and negotiated a protocol under the previous Government. That Protocol was raised on the principle of wage freeze, no increases for 2 years.

The Protocol has been re-negotiated to provide for wage restraint. In other words, increases but on racks. Increases that are reasonable. Parties who were negotiating these salaries with the Government were parties to the Protocol. And I am submitting, they made sure that what they were seeking and what was finally agreed did

not do violence to the integrity of that Protocol. The settlement, therefore, that Government is legislating has been in harmony with the Protocol to the extent that that Protocol has operated in the private sector. The 2.5% and 3.5% are paradigms operating in the private sector. The unions are negotiating within that range and the private sector is negotiating within that range, and it is regrettable therefore that, given all that has happened, the growth in the economy is 2.5 per cent. In fact in the private sector settlements are within those limits.
3.55 p.m.

The fact is that in the private sector settlements are within those limits and one union in Barbados finds itself as the odd man out, and it would really be asking too much of a government to have these negotiations protracted at a time when on the call-in programme and on the back page of the 'Nation' two weeks ago, a member of the Council of the Union was saying that there was a little split in the NUPW...

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order. The Honourable Member has given information that is not accurate. There was a subsequent indication that the same person who had given that story on the back page apologized and accepted that the vast majority of his union, and therefore his union by its constitution had made the decision. I do not think you should put that in the record.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Except to say, Sir, that on the call-in programme the General Secretary of the Union was moved to say that he was "done with that." Now, I will not accept that there was not the censure within that union but the personal business of the union is not necessarily one that should concern us except that if there is instability in the union one would never know when that instability would subside to allow for negotiations. Government cannot operate in that situation.

If there were three or four other unions holding out, it would be a different matter but they are the only one. In the circumstances, Government feels that it is about time to let the people who have not had their money for so many years get a piece of change, the back pay, the distinct probability of productivity bonus and improved conditions of service. The public servants of Barbados should be satisfied that this Government is taking steps to put more money in their pockets in recognition of the valiant job they do for the Government and people of Barbados.

I do not say anything about any adjustments that are being made in taxation to give those who are able an ease.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has two minutes to conclude.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I do not want to reflect on anything that is coming. I will deal with that later. There are adjustments that were announced by the Prime Minister in the Budget last year that will contribute to the improvement of the quality of life and, certainly, give public officers the opportunity to take home more money this year than they were able to take home for the last four or five years.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, when one listens to the other side, one gets the impression that the public servants of this country were not given increases for the last five years and they should be extremely grateful for this pittance that is being given to them now. But when one looks at the statistics, Sir, and I have in front of me inflation figures for the years 1991 to 1995, and in 1991 inflation 3%, 1992 inflation 7%, 1993 inflation 2.4%, 1994 inflation .5%, 1995 inflation 1.8%, total inflation 14.7% over the five-year period. The civil servants of this country did not get an increase for that period. Are you to say to me today that the maid should feel proud? When one listens from this side that is the impression coming from the other side that the maid in the civil service should feel proud to get a 3.5% increase and should say thanks to the Government for giving a 3.5% increase.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Yes, and I agree with you. Ask the question now because they have the right to have the numbers in here. Have the count and I will await your decision, Sir.

That same maid, Sir, would have given up 18 months at 8%. In other words, that same maid gave you \$1 604.48 and do you know what that same maid is getting back in return? That same maid is getting back \$883.12 and you want me to believe that that maid is ungrateful for asking for a higher increase? That maid would have given to Government a total of \$721.36. I am saying that the Government of the day owes the maid \$721.36 plus an additional increase to compensate that maid, if you want to give them a salary increase.

What you are actually giving the maid, Sir, if \$721.36 less than what she gave you over that period in time. In truth and in fact you did not give the maid a salary increase but the maid is getting a salary reduction.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: If anybody wants to challenge those figures, challenge them now. I am prepared to sit. I am prepared to allow you to have a point of order to tell the Speaker that I am misleading the House and

I know you cannot do that. Mr. Speaker, when you look at the Z.38 person, who happens to be the maid, that person is getting \$467.97 for a year which works out to \$1.28 per day. Furthermore, if you break it down in working terms per hour that person is only getting .16¢ per hour. Am I to feel that this person should be happy to get a salary increase at this point in time, just .16¢ per hour? Am I to believe that this is too much for a maid?

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I am always representing the small man and I would like to believe that I am the voice of the small man in this Parliament. If people who were there to represent their interests are not, I have taken on the mantle to represent that class of people.

Mr. Speaker, we speak about 3.5% increase up to 1995. If you divide that over the last five years you get .7% per year and if you divide it by the day, Sir, and you have a calculator that has two decimal places, you know what your calculator would show you? A point zero, zero. But if by chance you have a calculator that has four decimal places you might be able to acknowledge the increase and you would get .0019%. So, Sir, if you are grateful to have a calculator with four decimal places and not two you would acknowledge the increase, but if you have two, they would not get an increase per day because your calculator would not be able to pick it up. If you go by the hour, Sir, it is even worse. That percentage is only .0002 per hour.
4.05 p.m.

I had no intention of speaking, Sir, but when I heard those figures and people saying they are so grateful, how the maids should be proud and happy to get this increase, I had to ask myself what increase.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: You ought to know. You were in here. You heard her.

Mr. Speaker, we also have a situation where the person who is working at the top, in the S.1 category, can see his increases on a calculator, whether there are two decimal places or four, and that is why maybe there was a settlement by some members of the union. We have a problem in this country and it is time we deal with it. There are some people who feel that once they are getting something they do not care about the people behind them and it is time it is stopped. We must understand that for us to progress the people behind must also progress. This is a serious problem in this country. We tend only to look for ourselves and not for the people who are coming after us, and we have to do something about that. I will tell you why, Sir. The man in the S.1 scale is getting \$1 860.68 more per year. When it is divided by the day he can get

\$5.09 more. When it is divided by an eight-hour day he is getting 63 cents, and I am saying this is not fair. I want to hear those people in the S.1 category speaking on behalf of those in the Z.38 category and then use a calculator that has two decimal places. When you use the same calculator for the maid we will get fairness in this country. It is just like the private sector saying to Government: "Give us the concessions" and after these incentives and concessions are given, they fire the workers. What are we saying to these people? Are we saying to the maids, who might be our mothers or cousins or relatives, that they are no people? That they are not important and do not deserve a salary increase? Am I to believe that a calculator is not important to them? That this is a modern day thing and they are accustomed to counting on their fingers, so it is not important whether their increases can be shown or not?

Mr. Speaker, these workers must be taken into consideration. As you know, these workers are very strange people. You squeeze them and they say nothing, but there comes a time when they speak. I know that when we do not look after their interests they will not look after ours. This is the point I will end at, Sir.

Thank you very much.

Hon. R. N. GREENIDGE: Mr. Speaker, I agree that when you squeeze the workers, as the Honourable Member for St. Lucy has said, there comes a time when they speak to you in no uncertain terms. I believe that no one knows that better than the Honourable Members on that side, because the workers spoke to them in no uncertain terms before, and I believe they will continue to speak to them as time goes on.

The last speaker has given us a list of figures, percentage points and so on. I was trying to follow them, but I could not and I do not know if they were figures which were tested or proven or whether they were just figures....

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is giving the impression that I have created figures and they have no use. If he wants me to make this document a document of the House, I am quite prepared to do it, because he will see all the figures here. I know he will be able to understand them because of the way they are set out.

Hon. R. N. GREENIDGE: Mr. Speaker, if I may continue. I want to say that I personally think that Government's offer was quite reasonable, considering the very dark hole into which we were plunged under the last administration, at a time when we were told we were going to see this bright light somewhere at the end of the tunnel and we never saw it.

Mr. Speaker, we have to look at where we are coming from. We are coming out of an economic crisis where we had no increases since March 1992. We may very well be in better hands now, the economy may be better managed, but I do not think we can say at this time that we are entirely out of the woods. Therefore, for us to contemplate massive salary increases is totally out of the question. Most of the unions have exhibited a level of maturity. Most of them have seen the wisdom to accept the settlement – the Police, the BSTU, the BUT, the Prisons Officers, the Nurses Association, the Firemen and the BWU. As I said they have seen the wisdom in accepting it and they did that after Government had moved some 4 times to come a bit closer to meet their demands.

4.15 p.m.

It is that level of maturity, Mr. Speaker, which causes Barbados to stand out as a beacon in the Caribbean where industrial relations are concerned. There are lots of other territories which look to Barbados for a kind of leadership in industrial relations. On this occasion I think that we have virtually exhibited a kind of responsibility which I am sure that they will admire.

As the point was made earlier, I think it was the Honourable Member for St. Thomas who made the point that in spite of what we may say here today no one should take that to be a signal that we are castigating the membership of the National Union of Public Workers. Indeed, far from that, we have to applaud the union for the stands which they take, obviously in trying to get the very best for their members. I do not know what we have to attribute this resistance of the National Union of Public Workers' leadership to. I do not know exactly why it had to be like that. I have always envisaged the stance of the NUPW, not so much as the membership clamouring for unreasonable wage settlements, but I saw it really as, and I hope I am wrong, but I saw it more as a battle and a tussle for recognition somewhere in the trade union hierarchy in this country, and that it was done by someone who clearly believes that, perhaps I am not getting what I should get and the respect I should get as a trade unionist and I want the country to know that I am here and that I live here. I believe that it was no more than that, someone wanted to say, remember I am a top trade unionist in this country too. How else can you explain, Mr. Speaker, those demands which were made on Government in the initial stages where they were asking to make the settlement retroactive from 1990 and in so doing to saddle Government with a bill of some \$266 million?

I am pleased to realise that in this instance the majority of the workers were willing to accept Government's offer and this is one of the experiences which we would have gone through in terms of salary revisions when there was absolutely no need for us to be

reactionary. There was no need for us or for anyone to advocate discontent or anarchy among the workers of the country. I do not think there was any need for any trade union to be militant on this occasion.

The Opposition has termed Government's proposals to legislate salaries as a breach of good faith and they have gone on to say that it is in conflict with the protocol. I do not see how it can be in conflict with the protocol, Mr. Speaker, when it speaks of the same type of wage restraint, the same type of moderate increases, the same type of productivity sharing and so on. I see it more as being on all fours with the protocol rather than working in conflict with the protocol but they have twisted everything and they have said that it is something in conflict with it.

They are opposed to our legislating the salaries. They do not even seem to realise that they legislated too because they legislated the Suspension of Increments Act when they suspended people's increments. Mr. Speaker, we are legislating to give, they legislated to cut. We legislated to prevent them, because we never had it in mind, from cutting workers' salaries again and they opposed it because they wanted to retain that guillotine to cut. But while one is legislating to improve the condition of the worker, the other is legislating to do just the opposite, to pull back.

The Honourable Member for St. John has said that he sees no difference between the law which is aimed to prevent the cutting of salaries and the legislation which is aimed at a wage increase. He went on to say that as far as he is concerned nothing has changed and I would like all the workers in Barbados to take note of that because that is his view, that nothing has changed so Barbados had better beware, Mr. Speaker, because as far the DLP salary cutters are concerned nothing has changed. Let the civil servants beware, Mr. Speaker, because they stand ready for business as usual.

I have already said on the Floor of this House, Mr. Speaker, that the workers of this country have become a lot more responsible today than they were, let us say, in the 1960s and that they have been taught a very bitter experience from 1992 onwards and the workers have also come to know a good Opposition and they know a shallow and uncaring opposition too.

If you talk to the workers of this country, Mr. Speaker, you would realise that, as I said, they are quite understanding. Many of them now, when you speak to them, yes they are concerned about their wages, yes they are concerned about their salaries, but the primary concern which they have now and which we are addressing is about conditions of service. That is the primary concern which you find in workers of the day. The workers want incentives. They want opportunities, Mr. Speaker, for promotion. Teachers are saying they want things

like car loans. They want to have the post of the Senior Teacher termed Deputy Principal and so on. They want to be recognised and they want better conditions of service and we are still having all of this as an on-going process. Talks are still going on about ways and means of improving the conditions of service for the workers.

The Honourable Member for St. John, again has said that things like car loans and appointments do not mean anything to the workers in this day and age and I think he is wrong in that. We have also made more money available this year for training the workers than we did last year because we realise that this is one of their primary concerns. So, Mr. Speaker, I want to give my whole-hearted support to the Government on this occasion and obviously I want to let the workers know that this particular Government will continue to do whatever is humanly possible to ensure that the workers of Barbados are always placed in a very comfortable and a very happy position. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a very brief intervention in this debate. I will not be long on it because I do not believe that the issues that we are considering are new issues. Moreover, Sir, they have been well canvassed in this country.

The basic issue that is being considered is one of credibility, Sir, and integrity. That is how I see it and credibility and integrity are at the heart of the society in which we live and in the society that we may wish to create. I believe that when we get alarmed about increases in deviant behaviour, increases in crime, increases in whatever index one may wish to use, civility, politeness, courtesy, whatever, it depends on the type of people we are and the type of people that we are turning out. Even though we in this Parliament are unable to attract an audience to come when important debates are being staged and, when the public itself quarrels if debates are televised in conflict with other options which the viewers may wish to exercise, I think that all of us who are interested in the social, economic and cultural development of our country must stop and think. We ourselves in this Chamber must try to set an example.

4.25 p.m.

Now I have sat in this Chamber on the other side and I am now sitting on this side and I still hear the former administration being blamed for whatever is wrong in the public-affairs of this country in the national economy. You know, Sir, sometimes I have to ask myself whether the Government realizes that they won an election in 1994 and that they are responsible for the conduct of public affairs in this country. I am well aware that the Democratic Labour Party lost the election. I am well aware of that, but I wonder if the Government realizes that it is responsible

for the public affairs of this country. Whatever they criticized when they were in Opposition and whatever they find wrong now, it is well within their power both at a policy level and at the level of the implementation of policy to seek to correct. Sir, that is a simple political lesson which we must all learn. The Government must realize that it is the Government and you cannot continue blaming the Democratic Labour Party Administration instead of correcting the things that need to be corrected.

Sir, the whole approach to wages settlements in this country has been out of line for many years.

Hon D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. Since the Honourable Member has said what we on this side find wrong with what they did on that side then we should correct, he admits the debate. I just want to make sure that he did not get the wrong information about what was being said in the debate. It was that his Government, particularly when he was Prime Minister, did not give the public workers salary increases for 4 years. We said that was wrong and we are now seeking to correct that by giving them a piece of change this year.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, I will come to that particular point shortly but I do not wish to be diverted from the main thread of my argument by that non-point of order, Sir. I recognize those types of interventions which are devices to throw inexperienced people off the record. The point that I am making, Sir, is that it is for the Government, if they felt that salary revisions were too low or even non-existent for them, to correct it. Sir, when we look at the record, what do we see? What is the position? We have had since 1976 substantial increases under both administrations that were out of line with what the economy could afford. But in the give and take of negotiations and in this bargaining process settlements were arrived at and in some instances there was legislation without agreement. People of all walks of life and of all shades and stripes of opinion marched against the policies of my Government when it was necessary to put Barbados first and to take decisions to ensure that recessionary conditions could be corrected and that Barbados could be put back on a path of economic growth.

It is no secret, Sir, that there was a recession and negative growth during the years 1991 to 1993. There was recession and negative growth during the years 1981 to 1983, Sir. It has happened under both Governments and within the context of an international situation that was very brittle and critical any Government faced with those conditions would have had to take defensive action and corrective action. That is the only responsible thing to do. It is the only sensible thing to do and you have to take the consequences. I took the consequences and my Government took the consequences. We now have a Government that knows about economic management. They boast about

that. Let me say, Sir, that by 1993 the economy had started to grow, unemployment had fallen and inflation was kept at a low level. Three of the main economic aspects that one must look at when one is talking about correcting a situation. I say this, Sir, particularly for the edification of the Member for St. Philip North who seem to think that the economy is now growing, that unemployment is only now falling and that inflation is only now low. But it started because of the corrective actions that were taken and it is within that context that the wages issue that we are dealing with now must be seen. I do not think that we have to go into any extensive debate on this.

The coming issues of "The Constituent" will deal with these matters. So there is no point for me to spend too much time on this matter. But what we have to bear in mind, Sir, is that coming after such a din that was created and generated in this country, one would have thought that the public officers would have been given back what was taken away from them and these were reasonable expectations. That is what I am saying. I would have thought that after all of the noise and the fuss one would have assumed. Instead of that, Sir, what they got was a Constitutional Amendment that was not bankable and still is not bankable. This did not refund one cent but that is easy to do, Sir.

I believe the Attorney General sat down one night, because according to him he could not wait on the machinery to get that out, Sir. He had to do a lot of those things, Sir, and that was it and that was something this is not bankable. I have maintained and I continue to maintain that it is the public officers of this country who responded magnificently to the request which the Government made and by majority determined that they would agree to take an 8 per cent cut which was legal, Sir, and it was tested in the Courts. They even took us to the highest Court that we could be taken to, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and they were given short thrift – one of the shortest cases...

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am not boasting. I am just stating a fact.
4.35 p.m.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let's hear the Honourable Member.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I believe Honourable Members when they are in these precincts are immune from all the lock up and lick up we are talking about.

Mr. SPEAKER: Unfortunately, we cannot stay here all the time.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Yes, Sir. The position is that if these measures are passed it is 2½ per cent at the top for the public officers and 3½ per cent at the bottom at a time when in certain parts of the public sector some persons have been given 100 per cent increases at the top. I think all of that is wrong and comes back to what I was talking about at the start of my address. We are talking about integrity and that is a problem for us. We cannot seek to put it in terms where the vast majority are only given small increases and others are given very large increases. I think this is something that has to be looked at whichever side of this Honourable Chamber we are sitting on.

I would like to say, Sir, and I would like to do it from the Floor of this House once again, to thank the public officers of this country for answering the national cause and national call. I regret that up to this point they have not been recompensed in terms commensurate with the sacrifice they were called upon to make and I can only say that that would have been one of the first issues that a government with which I might have been associated would have tackled. They will have to wait. They are very silent now, Sir, because they know what happens to public officers who may not be silent. They know that and they perhaps are being as wise as serpents and as harmless as doves. So that is what it is all about.

I don't think there is any necessity to be up and attacking one another. We know what the name of the game is. Some loud noises were made in opposition and now the Opposition has become the Government those noises and the stances that were taken then are being quietly forgotten, now that the economy is improving and now that things are getting better as we had predicted, because we have to look at what our projections were. Whenever we look at it we will see that there was a carefully and well-laid plan for the management of this economy and the Government, then in Opposition is reaping the fruits, but they do not know how to use those fruits in the interest of the masses of the people of this country.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The Honourable Member just said that if he might have been part of a DLP Government that won after the 1994 General Election they would have restored all the funds that the public officers lost. Sir, I have gone through the manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party on page 41 and 42 and there is nothing by way of a commitment to the public officers that the Democratic Labour Party would have done that even if they had received a gift of US\$900 million from somebody.

Further to that, they did not even thank the public officers in this document for the restraint which they showed.

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

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, If I may conclude, the Member for St. Thomas is quite adept at getting up and making such points. I never said the words... You have ruled that it is no point of order so once again I never said any such thing. Sir, that is the position. I don't have anything further at this stage to add. They can continue to distort my statements, my records, my positions and therefore I think these issues will be dealt with in due course as I have indicated. I thank you for your intervention, Sir.

Mr. G. A. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this Resolution. It is in fact an important resolution here today. We are seeking today to give income to the civil servants of this country. We are not seeking to reduce income as the last Government did during the years 1991-94. In fact, the record shows that since September 1993 the workers of this country did not get any increase in salaries and furthermore increments were not restored to them and therefore I believe that, as the last Honourable Member has said, the workers of this country are indeed putting Barbados first. They are putting Barbados first because...

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: The Member for St. George North is unwittingly misleading the House. He indicated that increments were not restored and this Parliament itself passed legislation which made it possible for the increments of public officers which had been withheld to be restored.

Mr. G. A. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, as far as the record shows the increments were suspended up until September 30, 1994. In other words, workers had to go through a severe hardship during the years 1991-94. It is also important to note that the workers of this country are indeed putting Barbados first. There is no industrial dispute. Workers of this country seem to be very happy. As we debate this resolution today workers out there are asking for their increase of wages and are happy. The Rt. Honourable Member for St. Michael South asked about credibility and integrity. Credibility has returned to Government. It returned not only in increments but it returned in good governance. That is important.

I believe that the economy for the first time in 4 years is now firing on all 6 cylinders. Agriculture is doing well. Tourism is doing well. Manufacturing is doing well and therefore the Government is in a position for the very first time to give an increase to workers of this country.

Mr. Speaker, my main contention here today is the process of collective bargaining. I want to spend a few minutes on the process of collective bargaining. The process of collective bargaining is one of give and take in which all sides, the worker, the union, and the employer... The process of collective bargaining does not mean that one side must give and the other side must not.

Mr. Speaker, the Government during the process of this collective bargaining met several times with the unions. The Secondary Teachers' Union, the Barbados Union of Teachers, the Prison Officers' Association, the Barbados Registered Nurses Association, the Barbados Workers' Union and of course the NUPW. There were several rounds of negotiations, and if you look at the process you will see that the Government over the past year or so has moved away from its original position.

The Government's original position was 2 per cent in the first year, no percent in the second. It moved away from 2 per cent in the first year to 2½ per cent at the top in the first year to 3.5 per cent at the bottom in the first year and then 2 per cent across-the-board in the second year. In the 4th round of talks the Government moved from 2½ per cent at the top, at the level of S scales, to 3.5 per cent at Z38 and then 3 per cent at the bottom.

If you look at the percentage of the NUPW they started at 5 per cent across-the-board and 3 per cent respectively from 1995-1997 and it never moved away from its position. It was hard core. The process of collective bargaining means give and take. You cannot expect the Government or the employer to make all the moves and the unions decide to be hard. As the Member for St. Michael South Central made the point only less than 2 percentage points separated the union's position and that of Government.

The point we have to look at is, do we want to keep the process of collective bargaining going over and over, to last for 2-3 years when the workers want their money. Government has to be the body prepared to come in when negotiations are taking long, but one finds that a union, the NUPW in particular, was not bargaining in good faith. When you have a position with more than 4 unions accepting Governments' proposals and one union which represents less than 43 percent of the workers deciding that they do not want to bargain, then Government must come in to settle the negotiations for workers. And the workers are happy.

I believe the workers want their money and we must understand that within the NUPW there was constant confusion and constant quarreling. The workers themselves were at war. They were quarreling with the executive of the unions. So although it was collective responsibility on the part of the executive, one finds that the unions did not control their members, to the extent that the members were not happy with the process that the executive was bargaining on their behalf. It was reported in the Press that members of some sections of the unions were not happy. They wanted to know why the union could not bargain in good faith and settle, seeing it was only a matter

of less than 2 percentage points. That is the point that I want to make today. The Government had to come in because the workers of this country really need their money. Government must settle. The process cannot go on and on.

In some parts of North America when the process goes on for long you have wildcat strikes, sick-outs and so on. To avoid this type of activity, to have the proper industrial climate remain in a country, Government has to step up and I believe it is on this background that we must support this Resolution today. I thank you.
4.55 p.m.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this debate is a very interesting one. As one listens to the position of the Government, one cannot help but have a sense of strangeness about the attitude of the Honourable Members on the other side in this debate.

Mr. Speaker, if you had been here over the last number of Parliaments to have discussed and debated negotiations between the Government and the public officers, you could not help but be a little disappointed in Honourable Members on that side, that many of them would not have done their research and would have taken what appeared to be spurious, if not specious positions on the National Union of Public Workers.

The last Honourable Member who sat down, for example, I would forgive him because it is clear that he is dealing with the matter at a very superficial level and does not understand the depth of relationship which has existed between the Barbados Labour Party and the National Union of Public Workers. It comes as a shock, certainly a surprise, to hear some of the utterances which have been made by Members of the Government who seem to forget that they are the Government and not a political party on the hustings. They function most times, it seems to me, as if they cannot understand that yesterday's victory, or yesterday's battles, have been over and that they have a responsibility to Government.

Now, Sir, the Prime Minister and Minister responsible for the Civil Service came to us today and made a case which I am sure on reflection he would not see as one of his shining moments in the public affairs of this country. The Prime Minister made a very interesting case today. But why are we here? If one is to observe the sources as reported in the national media, and Mr. Speaker, when you read anything in the newspapers, especially one of the newspapers in this country and they refer to sources, you have to take those sources very seriously, if you read the media, they say that sources indicate that the Prime Minister will not be here next week and therefore they have to get this thing over with. What a very strange

reason for the Prime Minister to hustle the legislation of salaries without agreement into the Chamber.

I think it is important to revisit the issue of legislating salaries without agreement in the context of the new arrangements which have governed relations between the so-called social partners in this country ever since 1991. I think it is important, Sir, because whereas the arguments in the past about legislating salaries were arguments emanating from the actual circumstances which occurred, we are in a situation now where this country made a paradigmatic shift in its industrial relations when it signed the first Protocol. It was agreed by all and sundry that we had moved to a different plateau of relationships between the social partners. It was agreed by all and sundry that whatever else we would do as a people we would recognize the inherent desirability of the negotiated settlement in industrial relations. It comes as a surprise, a disappointment and for some of us a shock, the cavalier and sometimes specious approach to this matter when we are discussing the relationships among the social partners.

If there had been no Protocol, if there had been no discussion among the social partners, it might be acceptable for the Prime Minister to come down and say enough time had elapsed, I have to get the estimates in place, I have to get the country's business going and therefore I am bringing the salaries to the legislature as I am required to do. That is what has happened in the past. But for the Prime Minister to come down here to this House, Sir, and talk about the \$266 million initial shot across-the-board by the NUPW, and the subsequent reduction to \$100 million, and to carry us down that path is really to fly kites. We know the Easter season is upon us. It is the kite flying season. But it is to try to put a veneer on the relationships with the trade union movement in this country which flies in the face of the new arrangements which we are alleged to have forged beginning with the first Protocol.

Anyone who had listened to the discussion about the second Protocol, anyone who had heard the plaintive enunciations by the Government in the last few weeks about what new considerations they were bringing to the fore could not believe the specious nature of the argumentation which has been put here today by the Members of the Government in relation to the public officers. You would believe that we were talking about the public officers of Grenada. You would not believe that the National Union of Public Workers is a serious union that represents the people that have to keep the engines of Government of this country going on a daily basis. You could not believe that at all. You would think this was some new union that had just come on the scene and suddenly was behaving in a manner that was different from what the Government had come to expect.

I am disappointed, Sir, because I fell victim as part of the Government to the machinations of the Barbados Labour Party when its own minions were in control of the machinery of that National Union of Public Workers. I was part of the Government when the Barbados Labour Party manoeuvred the National Union of Public Workers to the point where they did not even understand what was happening, where they brought this country to its knees. Sir, it is ironic that we could come here to discuss salaries today and there is not a single placard in the Public Buildings and what we have is a Government that is making mock sport of the Executive of the National Union of Public Workers.

The Government is contemptuous of the public officers. I think that you may be right. If the public officers allow you to make sport at them through your machinations as a Government, then you may be right. It just strikes me as odd that here we are discussing the National Union of Public Workers in terms which I have heard today which surprise me.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, they continue to talk.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please. We still have to hear him.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, the Government came in this Chamber today and said with a very honest face that the NUPW is only 43% of the public workers. The Government does not deal with the Police at all. We have not heard from the Police.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I begged the Honourable Member to take his seat, Sir, because he was talking foolishness.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please, not foolishness.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Nonsense, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not nonsense. Use a parliamentary word.
5.05 p.m.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, you will recall that I deliberately read out the membership of the public sector unions and associations. I said Police 1095, Secondary Teachers 367, Barbados Union of Teachers 1900.

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You may not have been here. I read out all of that.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I was here and I heard that, Sir. He read out the numbers of the members. I am saying that unless they got a letter... No one has said to us up until now that the police had indicated acceptance. I have heard nothing since I have been here that the police have accepted, but it may very well be that the Right Honourable Prime Minister has received a letter, but until we came into this Chamber we were under the impression that the agency that represents the police had been silent. No one has vouchsafed that information to us. But be that as it may, Sir, even if....

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You see, now we are hearing they are a very small union. What disturbs me is the number of facetious comments that are being made about the public officers and the people who are in the public domain, and there seems to be a kind of public sport by the Government at these people because the NUPW has not been able to do their tactical manoeuvres, whatever they said they were going to be. The Government has been able to neutralise them, so the Government can come in and make mock sport at the public officers. I say bully for the Government. If they are able to do that, more power to them, but it is interesting that the Government itself is only about 43% of the electorate in this country.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You talk about 43% not being significant? The Government only got about 43% of the electorate in this country. If you compare the number of people who have voted in this country and look at the results, the Government itself is only about 43%, so 43% cannot be insignificant.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member is saying 49%, so let me use the phrase they used, less than a majority. Less than a majority of the people care anything about the Barbados Labour Party....

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Precisely! The Honourable Member is saying the law allows them to govern, which is true, Sir, and we intend to allow them to govern, not without some difficulty. I am amazed that they are not prepared to pay attention to the fact that the National Union of Public Workers has the majority of public workers in that union in this country. Small point in the eyes of the Government, but remember the old Barbadian proverb

that 'wuh sweeten goat mout' does bun 'e tail'. The Honourable Member says the people want the money. You would think it was a lot of money, 2%. They are casting aspersions on the people, but what disturbs me in the debate is when they seek to move the debate to a level of politics where they say the Democratic Labour Party Government did not give the people an increase since 1990.

The Right Honourable Member for St. Peter must make a decision if he is putting forward his position on the Incomes Protocol as one of principle or if it is one of convenience. If it was one of principle, and if he agreed with it at the time, it follows as night the day that he agreed that the public officers in this country were in fact doing a public service to the rest of the community when they did not get the raise which the Democratic Labour Party Government did not give them. The Democratic Labour Party Government did not give them a raise, not out of any feeling of contempt, not out of a situation of spite. It did not give them a raise, first of all after consulting them.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I feel a personal commitment to this, because we went into the highways and byways. I went into the auditorium of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and I asked the people in the auditorium to give some consideration to the state of the country at the time and the people, who work in the public service, agreed and overwhelmingly voted, Sir, to allow the Government to cut their salaries. Furthermore, they allowed the Government to accept that it is possible not to get an increase in this country for a period of time so that the dollar would not be devalued in this country. I find it genuinely unacceptable that we can subsequently hear an argument put forward by the Minister of Finance and his colleagues that the Democratic Labour Party did not give increases. That is a fact, Sir, but to say that without more is to not only beg the argument, it is to put forward a position that is morally unacceptable in the context of what we are discussing now.

The Honourable Members themselves came into Government and agreed that arising out of the measures which were put in place, that in 1994 and subsequently in 1995 the country found itself in a position where, once again, it could resume sharing the bounty. It stands to reason that those who had gone to the battlefield and who had won the victory, that is to say, the public officers, should be first in line to share in the kudos, to share in the benefits, to share in the profits, and when the Right Honourable Member for St. Peter is able smoothly to dismiss the \$400 000 for three persons in the BTA with a reference to a clause in the Protocol in such a manner as to give a misrepresentation of that clause, it is a cause for

concern as to what level of public life we are going to have in this country.

Let me read from page 5 of the Protocol:

"(e) where increases are the result of job evaluation exercises or negotiated job enhancement exercises, wage restraint shall not be used artificially to suppress valid claims for increases in employee compensation;"

A normal non-legal reading of that suggests that somebody who is already in the system would be the beneficiary of this, not somebody who is going to be imported from New York, not somebody who is going to be brought from outside on some specious pretence that you need a massive kind of bionic man to run a department that has been run before. The Honourable Member for Christ Church South presided over a Ministry, which I subsequently presided over, and we had a number of people who were not bionic men or women who were able to bring all, I repeat all, of the prosperity we had in this country from tourism.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: That is all right. The Honourable Member acquaints shortness with everything, so I don't get into that. The Honourable Member has a problem with shortness and I understand that.

Mr. Speaker, we presided over a Ministry of Tourism. This country has had a Ministry of Tourism from time immemorial and all of the benefits were not related to any bionic men. I find it remarkable that here we are seeking to approve an Order by the Minister which said in effect that all of the Permanent Secretaries in this country are inferior to the bionic people in what the Honourable Member for St. Michael East called the Lotto salaries place, the Lotto high flyers. All the Permanent Secretaries we have had in this country do not add up. As a matter of fact, two of them don't add up. Take any two, put them together and they do not add up to the bionic men. They are going to get 2½% from 67 000, or whatever it is.
5.15 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, it is worse than that because it is not just \$150 000. It is \$150 000 plus \$24 000 a year for rent, plus a new car that all you have to do is turn the wheel. Mr. Speaker, it is not as easy as that. They have a new, fully serviced automobile, a Maxima. They get telephone paid. They get entertainment allowance. These people, Sir, who are going to run the industry on some specious argument have been framed on this clause in this agreement which, Mr. Speaker, you and I know was not designed to apply to people who were being brought in for a new job.

You mean to tell me, Sir, that they can find that the turnover of the amount in the Board of Tourism is superior to the turnover of the total economy which has to be run by a Permanent Secretary. The man or woman who will hold the position of Chief Executive Officer in the Board of Tourism has to answer to a Permanent Secretary but here we are, Sir, we are going to give that Permanent Secretary 2½% or whatever it is and we are saying that that individual who is going to answer to the Permanent Secretary, who is going to help the Minister formulate policy is superior to the person to whom he is going to respond.

Mr. Speaker, I have nothing against the 3 or 4 persons who get the salaries but the Minister of Finance came in here today, Sir, and sought to suggest that there was an evaluation. Where are the evaluation results of the rest of the jobs in the Ministry of Tourism? Why have we not heard of the relativity between the 4 lotto high flyers and the rest of the Ministry of Tourism who carried the Ministry of Tourism in the interregnum? In between the wars at the Ministry of Tourism there were some people.....

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes, let us admit there were wars but in between the wars we had people carrying the Ministry of Tourism. Those people have not yet been evaluated. Their negotiated job enhancement exercise has not yet occurred. What is more this Government, Sir, has chosen, while giving lip service to the concept of equality of women and the equal treatment of people, this Government has taken an officer in the same entity that has given yeoman service, whatever else may be her short comings, yeoman service to this Ministry and this Government and this country and put her on special leave and is paying her on an ongoing basis to do nothing on a daily basis. They have not evaluated her. They have not evaluated anybody else and then they want the public officers in the National Union of Public Workers to do nothing, to say nothing, and to accept that after 4 or 5 discussions they should come in and accept because the other unions accepted.

When the Barbados Labour Party was leading the National Union of Public Workers to accept first and the Barbados Workers' Union and the rest did not accept the same Barbados Labour Party used to come in this Chamber and say that if the NUPW had accepted they should proceed. But today the National Union of Public Workers, that distinguished successor to the Civil Service Association which has a history of high level, high quality people of integrity leading it, that distinguished union has been reduced in this Chamber today to buffoonery, buffoonery by the Government, that distinguished union with a long history of representation of the rights of the

people who work for the rest of Barbados in what is called the Civil Service. They have suddenly been brought to nothingness by this Government.

Mr. Speaker, you too, Sir, cannot speak to this debate, but you must have felt a tinge. You must have begun to wonder if you were hearing about the same agency that has functioned for well nigh 40 years to maintain the stability of this country, the same public officers that have helped to stop this country from a devaluation, the same public officers who have given all of us the right to say how stable Barbados is among the rest of the developing countries and we listened today and heard it being vilified.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has two minutes to conclude.

Mr. B. M. TAITT:.....vilified by the Government in a manner that could only leave those of us who have been around for longer than 5 days in a sense of shock. Mr. Speaker, I cannot vote for it, Sir. As a matter of principle I cannot vote for it because I feel that the difference between the point they had reached in the negotiation and the point we are going to legislate does not warrant the kind of calumny that has been heaped upon the heads of the leaders and the directors of this representation of the public officers.

Mr. Speaker it would be difficult for a normal person to support this. It is impossible for a politician who has sworn to represent ordinary people to support it. And for all the public officers that live in my constituency it would be a travesty, it would be a misrepresentation of all that is decent if I supported this. There could be no way that I could support it and I am glad that my party feels as I do. We cannot support this legislation which has been brought here by the Minister, which apparently has only been brought to satisfy his convenience so he could trot off once again to some far off place.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I really do feel that I should begin winding up this debate at the point where the Member for St. Michael West stopped on the question of the standing of the NUPW and its leadership and its role in negotiations in Barbados. I should like to refer the House to the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals made by the Right Honourable, the Prime Minister, Mr. Errol Walton Barrow on the 6th of June 1972. In that budget, Sir, on page 8 he said:

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

There is some kind of superstition that the public service is automatically entitled to a 3-yearly upward revision of salaries. This is the main preoccupation

of the Civil Service Association, which has now dispensed with the term civil and has changed their sobriquet to the National Union of Public Workers and which registered as a Trade Union in 1964 and not at any time during the regime of the National Conservative and/or Labour Party.

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

5.25 p.m.

This is Errol Barrow, Sir.

"I wish to make it clear that what I decide as Minister of Finance is not predicated by exhibitions of bad manners and ill will of the detractors, but by concern of the overall good of the country. Negotiations may take place provided that a sensible rather than the present insolent and truculent approach is adopted. The appropriate time for increases will be the time when the country can afford them."

Sir, throughout history Ministers of Finance and Prime Ministers of this country have had to come to this Parliament to speak about the sometimes unfortunate attitude of persons engaged in wage negotiations and central to this debate, Sir, because this is what it has basically come down to, is the attitude of the leadership of the NUPW. The whole core of the Opposition's argument is that we are establishing a dangerous and wicked precedent by not allowing negotiations to take place when only a 1.5 per cent difference exist between the Government and the NUPW. The House has been enlightened by the input from the Attorney General that at least on two previous occasions, in 1980 under the Barbados Labour Party and in 1988 under the Democratic Labour Party a difference of no more than 1.5 per cent or thereabouts existed between the Government negotiating team and the NUPW. Despite the nature of the slight difference, Sir, the Government of the day was put to the necessity of having to appear to go through the process of legislating unilaterally because negotiated settlement could not be reached.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of elucidation if the Honourable Member will give way. I was very clear in my mind and I was very careful to make the point that what had gone before having heard the Attorney General was noted but that what was occurring now was occurring in

the environment of two Protocols which specifically addressed the issue of negotiations.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the NUPW in this matter is not only at odds with the Government and that is the point that has been made from this side which the Opposition has not been able to blunt. It is not only at variance with the Government, Sir, but it is also at variance with every other trade union organization in this country representing the interest of workers. The point has also been made, Mr. Speaker, that during the course of the negotiations the Government in ensuring its good faith moved its position 4 separate times. The NUPW held to a position even in circumstances when other trade unions were moving theirs and only sought to change its position after the other unions had settled with the Government. The question that this House has therefore to adjudicate on is the question as to which set of entities in the negotiations have been worth showing good faith or not. I believe, Sir, that the weight of evidence must be that the Government and those unions that went through the process of putting offers and counter offers were conforming to the good faith that must exist in proper collective negotiation processes and that the union put a position and refused to move, entered into negotiations in bad faith and maintained bad faith throughout. That is why, Mr. Speaker, it is because of those salient facts that Government feels justified in bringing this matter to Parliament because we are not bringing this matter to Parliament without a context and background that justifies our action. If the NUPW had been in the process of doing what other unions have been doing, we could understand that there is a genuine desire on the part of the union to negotiate. But the union saw it fit, and this is a matter of public record, only to move a position after the other trade unions of Barbados had agreed. The word must go forward from this Chamber therefore that the NUPW is not only at odds with the Government in this matter, Sir. They are at odds with every other trade union organization in the country. If the DLP wants to criticize this Government therefore for agreeing with the other trade unions, the same strictures that have been applied to this Government because of this package will also have to be applied. The DLP wants to tell the public that Mr. Frost of the Teachers' Union is a wicked man.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please let us keep it how we have been going today. That is the General Secretary of the Teachers' Union.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was not calling his name in disapprobation. But the General Secretaries of all of the unions in this country are dishonourable and wicked men.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. Bearing in mind the way these matters are reported, I wish

to state categorically that the Democratic Labour Party has taken no position on the wickedness or otherwise on the integrity of these honourable persons who are officers in the various unions of this country. We have always treated them with the utmost courtesy and we have a high regard for all of the persons chosen by the ordinary people of this country to represent them, Sir.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it has been represented in this debate that we on this side are wicked people for having agreed...

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please. No, I am not as quick as you. We have objected to the word "wicked". I am sure you can find another word.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, it has been represented in this debate that there is something objectionable for Members on this side to have agreed that the public servants of this country should be paid the wage increases that provision is being made for. The logical corollary of that, Sir, is that all of the other trade union people who have also agreed to this are in the eyes of the DLP subject to being condemned.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House with regard to our position. None of the agencies articulated by the Honourable Member has the responsibility of the Government of the country. The Government of the country has a special and different responsibility so that even if all of the constituent members of negotiating groups took a particular position it is the duty and the responsibility of the Government to sensitize those positions and reach its own different conclusion. Therefore, the conclusion which the Honourable Member is drawing as having been said by the Democratic Labour Party is obviously false.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am really beginning my wind up response at this level because the Leader of the Democratic Labour Party who I presume is qualified to speak on behalf of the Democratic Labour Party, and I say that is a presumption and I may have to speak subject to correction, made certain snide remarks about the unwitting accomplices of the Barbados Labour Party and the trade union movement – Those are his exact words, Sir. – who are working through this settlement to undermine the trade union movement. He cast a terrible aspersion of unwitting accomplices working to undermine the trade union movement by this settlement. The implication therefore is, Sir, that those trade union leaders who have agreed in principle to this wage settlement has to be tarred by the same brush and in the same terms that the

Democratic Labour Party wants to cast all Members of this BLP administration for agreeing with the same wage settlement. That is the implication, Sir. As I said, Sir, what is being brought to this House is the wage and salaries part of an overall package that has already been agreed to by the leadership and rank and file members of all other unions and a staff association other than the NUPW. Mr. Speaker, Sir, let the record show that, if the Democratic Labour Party is opposed to this settlement, they are not only opposed to the Government in the matter but they are also opposed to the judgment of all of the other trade unions and staff associations other than the NUPW.
5.35 p.m.

This is not a matter that the Government has entered into lightly. I have posed the question. Is it the wish of the Democratic Labour Party that the Government of Barbados should have different rates of increases of salaries for maids in the same Government department, merely because they happen to be represented by different unions? If the Democratic Labour Party is arguing that a different wage settlement should have been arrived at with the NUPW, separate and distinct from that arrived at with the other unions, the logical inference must be that they are saying that the same category of workers in the same department should be paid different wage increases merely because they happen to be represented by different unions.

If they are not saying that, then based upon their own experience, they must know that a judgment has to be exercised at some stage where in the context of a multi-union negotiating process one union and one union alone is taking a position that is so entirely contrary to the position of the whole, as in and of itself to undermine the good of all. That is what this is about, Sir. This Parliament, unfortunately has been plagued with a succession of exercises of this exact nature. We operate in a multi-union context and in every instance where a Minister responsible for the civil service has had to bring to this House legislation to ask the House to improve increases in salaries without the negotiations having been successfully completed it has invariably, except in two instances, been in a context where some unions have agreed and others have not. At some stage, the Minister of the Civil Service has to exercise a judgment as to what is in the best interest of the public. That is why I go back to Mr. Barrow's wonderful words of 1972. In this instance, Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that the refusal of the NUPW to move its position during the entire process when it entered the so-called negotiations was illustrative of the fact that it was not genuinely interested in negotiating. It was interested in stringing out the Government. That is a fact. The ploy of appearing to negotiate only after the other unions had settled only compounded the facade that was intended to represent true and genuine representation and negotiations.

We have exercised a judgment that is reflective of the good of all. We are not going to undermine the integrity of the negotiation process and the integrity of the leadership of the trade unions in Barbados in general by throwing out a wage settlement that has been arrived at between the Government and the majority of the trade unionists in this country after a genuine process of genuine negotiation has taken place. I want to stress that point. I am satisfied that a process of genuine collective bargaining and negotiation took place between the Government and the other trade unions. The Government and the other unions put a case. Each side day after day countered offers and each side made the effort to come to a settlement in the interest of all concerned. Therefore, Sir, what is being asked of us from the other side is to ignore absolutely the efforts of those who in this exercise have made a commitment to go through the process of collective bargaining.

Sir, I just want to repeat that the so near and yet so far concept is typical of instances in the past as the Attorney General has said. In 1980 only 1.7 per cent separated the Government and the NUPW and the Minister of the day had to legislate in 1988 under the Democratic Labour Party: 1.7 per cent was all that separated and they had to legislate.

I want to touch on the contributions that have been made and to thank all Members on my side who have spoken so well in this debate. I must speak to some of the issues that have been raised by the Leader of the Opposition who is unfortunately not in his seat. The Leader of the Opposition has a most unfortunate tendency of picking up documents and purporting to quote from the documents and then making statements that can only be described in the nature of unbelievable lies. It is a most unfortunate habit. Once in a budget debate I saw the Leader of the Opposition take up a report on the National Assistance Board and purport to read about some reference to Everton Greene and the building of houses that is not in the report. The Leader of the Opposition came to this House today and lambasted the Protocol for not affirming a commitment on anybody's part to the collective bargaining process. He made the point that he was shocked that a prices and incomes protocol could be signed in this country and the social partners had no respect for nor committed themselves to the collective bargaining process.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Protocol for the Prices and Incomes Policy in 1995-97 is already a document of the House. It has already been debated by the House and I would like to quote from it under the section called Administrative Procedures:

"The Social Partners re-affirm that the collective bargaining process will be maintained;"

Certain remarks made by the Rt. Honourable Member for St. Peter were ordered to be struck from the record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, the records of this House have to show that once again the Member for St. John came to this House, picked up a document that is a document of this House purporting to read from it, to cite it and to cite it in a way that was intended deliberately to mislead the House because....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member knows that no Honourable Member can deliberately mislead the House. That would be a breach of the Rules. He is accusing the Honourable Member of deliberately breaching the Rules and I again ask Your Honour to ask the Honourable Member not only to withdraw that but to have it struck from the records.

Mr. SPEAKER: I don't think that any Honourable Member will deliberately mislead the House. Please proceed without stating that about another Honourable Member. Deliberately misleading the House is a serious offence.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, I have now had the opportunity at long last to spend some time going through all of the files that dealt with the DLP negotiation of a structural adjustment programme and the DLP's IMF programme. I have now had the opportunity and they make very interesting reading. In due course, the record of a number of things that have happened will be disclosed in this House and it will be soon. The facts are that the Democratic Labour Party Administration ended its relationship with the IMF unable to make the last drawdown of funds and it has always been a mystery why that drawdown could not have been realised. A lot of statements are being made in here that seek to vindicate people on positions that are new now to the public domain but cannot be supported by the evidence on file. In due course, shortly and in good order, the facts will be made known.

I hear a lot of discussion in here about how it should have been the first order of business of the Barbados Labour Party Administration to give back the 8 per cent. I ask the Democratic Labour Party if it would be good enough to state once again for the record what was the true position between the then DLP Government and the International Monetary Fund about the cut in the 8 per cent and the question as to whether it should have been given back or not.

I am challenging them to get up and say what was the true position, but I want to tell the House, Mr. Speaker, that the last drawdown of the IMF funds could not

have been realised because of the fundamental differences of interpretation as to what was agreed and what was being done. A lot of people who are seeking vindication will fly in the face of the evidence. Those members of the Democratic Labour Party Administration who were party to the 8 per cent pay cut, who were party to having the case fought at the level of the Privy Council when the public servants tried to get the 8 per cent pay cut declared unlawful, should be ashamed to come to this House now and say that a Government should now have a responsibility to pay it back. They went so far as to fight the case up to the level of the Privy Council not to pay back the civil servants. Now, with a later government, another government, after a government had expended taxpayers' funds to fight the case up to the level of the Privy Council, you can now hear a lot of mealy-mouthing that the first order of business should have been to pay back the 8 per cent. That is what we are hearing now from the other side. But they fought the case up to the level of the Privy Council and the fact will remain clear.

I want in my winding up to say that the case that has been put by the Government has not in any respect been contradicted or undermined by the Opposition. We have shown that the notion of a 1.5 per cent difference between the NUPW and the Government as the basis of a settlement not being reached is not anything new. It has happened at least twice in the past. The argument therefore of the Leader of the NDP that this 1.5 per cent difference is a major, wicked introduction of a bad policy by the Barbados Labour Party, flies in the face of the evidence that was adduced by the Attorney General.

The Members on the other side have not addressed the question that we are dealing here only with the wages and salaries component of a total package of new benefits for public servants. I want to stress that point, that this is a \$15 million package in the first year, \$15 million in the second year. In the course of the next few months public servants will find that their wages will increase by as much as 6 per cent. In addition to the \$15 million package this year and the next financial year we are also speaking in terms of improved terms and conditions for public servants as well as a productivity bonus.

To deal with this whole debate only in the context of the wage increase is to miss the force of the argument on the Government side that the wages and salaries are but part of a total package including conditions that have even been suggested by the Government without the prompting of the unions. That is why the unions have sought to embrace the package, that is why the workers have embraced the package, that is why the Government is embracing the package, because it is a realistic package. The Opposition has also not addressed the issue that has been raised that Government wage increases must reconcile

with what the rest of the society is paying itself. It has not dealt with the issue that in the leading sector of this Barbados economy a 6 per cent increase over 2 years has been arrived at and, therefore, if we are to maintain a semblance of stability in Barbados the Government wage settlement must bear a relationship with what is obtaining in the rest of the society. That argument, Sir, has not been contradicted.

The Opposition has not addressed itself to the question as to whether it feels that the Government should allow different wage increases to the same category of workers merely because they happen to be represented by the same unions.

I have heard, Sir, and I want to close on this particular issue, continued statements by the Leader of the Opposition that these things are dictated by the Inter-American Development Bank. Sir, the Leader of the Opposition distinctly has in the past acknowledged on the Floor of this House that he is not an economist and that he does not care particularly for economic concepts.
5.55 p.m.

The House is not to be misled, whenever it hears that a country has an adjustment programme, that an adjustment programme means that there has to be a formal relationship with an international institution because a country can put its own structural reform programme in place. A country can also have its own stabilization programme. When the Leader of the Opposition picks up a letter saying that the Barbados Government intends to carry out a comprehensive programme that does not mean that that is a programme dictated to it by an international institution. Any government can have its own adjustment programme. It is just a testimony of the pure ignorance of the Leader of the Opposition in these matters, and I mean that in the very finest sense of the word, his pure ignorance, that he should feel that if you say "structural adjustment" it must mean there is a structural adjustment imposed by the World Bank or some other institution. We are carrying out structural adjustments in this economy and they have not stopped.

We will very shortly have to carry out structural adjustments in response to the fact that we will have now to embark on a new sugar policy which will see the Barbadian people stop consuming other people's dirty and rat-infested sugar and start consuming our own. That policy means that there has to be an adjustment in the structure of an institution that was established in this country to import other people's sugar and that is what structural adjustment can be about. But we have a Leader of the Opposition who comes to this House and throws around concepts that he does not understand and tries to impute and read into things implications that are not there.

I want to say again, Sir, for the record that the Opposition has asked for information which it is almost impossible to present. I have indicated that we believe not only in the publication of development plans, but we believe, and my experience and training suggest to me that a country should always have a rolling macro-economic programme which is updated year by year in light of changing economic circumstances. I want to say to the House, Sir, that at the outset of this administration's term I asked for a medium-term economic strategy framework to be prepared and this year we are going to change and update that medium-term economic strategy framework in light of changed circumstances. Year by year we will make the adjustments to the macro framework depending upon the state of the international economy, and depending on the state of the domestic economy to change up Government's policy. There is no such thing as a medium-term framework that is set in concrete that a government can come to the House and say, this is it, publish it. It changes year to year because it is a set of macro-economic targets. Anybody therefore who is asking for that has to ask for it as it was perceived of at a state of time. It is not a development plan that is published to cover a period and is set in concrete. It is updated. The officers of the Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs are even now in the process of updating last year's medium-term economic strategy in the light of the fact that the economy has performed better than was first envisioned.

Sir, when the Leader of the Opposition tries to make a song and dance out of the fact that he asked what the medium-term framework was and he has not received a response, Sir, he is asking nonsense. I just want to reiterate that there are no quarterly targets agreed to with anybody or imposed upon this Government by anybody. That brings me to this debate. No international institution, and I want to repeat this, no international institution has imposed this settlement on either the Government of Barbados or the trade unions which have agreed to it. I must stress that, Sir, because the implications of the statement of the Leader of the Opposition are that the exercise in which all the unions were embarked was an exercise in which they too, not only the Government, because they have agreed to the wage settlement, were under the dictation of the multilateral institutions.

I want, Sir, therefore to rescue the reputations of the trade union leaders of this country from the clutches of the Leader of the Opposition. None of the leaders of the trade unions who are party to these negotiations were at any stage influenced by any international agency as regards the settlement they have arrived at. At no stage did they have any discussions with anybody from the international institutions pertaining to the level of wage increases they thought should be appropriate to the Barbados economy. I can say that categorically. To put out the word that these

wage settlements have been because of some dictation by the IADB is a joke.

The trade union leaders met and independently determined the level of wage increases they thought would give effect to the objective of their members within the context of their understanding that a package of benefits, including wages, other terms and conditions, and a productivity bonus were to be the order of the day. It is a very important slur on the integrity of free men meeting in collective bargaining to impute that they too were under the influence of some international institution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Government had just imposed this, then perhaps that inference might be something that people would want to draw, that the Government has disregarded the collective bargaining process and, following some dictation by the IADB, has said a wage increase must be X. But the trade union leaders, Sir, have also agreed to this. I therefore take the strongest objection in their name, I really must, because they sat down and negotiated in good faith and at no stage in this entire process was there even the most remote semblance of any intervention of any international institution.

Mr. Speaker, that record has to go forward and it has to be stated as such that no international lending institution was involved in the collective bargaining process that gave rise to the wage increases that are before this Parliament. They might have said that they agreed with the spirit of the Protocol but nobody was told that you must settle for 3 per cent and a productivity bonus. It is really doing those leaders a great injustice to have them attacked in the terms in which they have been attacked today by the Member for St. John that they were, he said, unwitting accomplices in an effort by the Government of Barbados to undermine the integrity of the trade union movement. He must stand condemned for his unfounded, unnecessary and ill-considered onslaught on the integrity of the leaders of the trade union movement who went through the process of reaching a decision as their judgment and facts showed them the way.

Sir, I believe I have covered all the points that have been raised in this debate. The Leader of the National Democratic Party who has just come back to his seat, fled from the House when it was brought to his attention that this was not the first occasion on which a difference of only 1.5 per cent separated a government of the day and the NUPW.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, on a point of order. That remark "fled from the House" is a subtle imputation of cowardice and I object very much to it. I had to pursue other business so I went and came back showing good faith that I want to join in the debate.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I am glad, Sir, that he has now come back to the House having gone to a member of his party who had contested two elections and impressed upon him how drastically he had been misled and therefore embarrassed.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Honourable Member must not be allowed to mislead the House. I did no such thing and met with no such person.
6.05 p.m.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: It is quite clear, Sir, that the Leader of the NDP, the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, rests his entire case on the argument that it was such a distressing thing for Government for the first time to have to come to this House when only a 1.5 difference exists between the Government and the NUPW. What was he going to tell the woman in the constituency who gave him a report and said the difference is so and so? It was too dramatic, Sir. This was such a dangerous precedent, we can only now infer that once again, just as he was misled – and this is a fact – by the glowing accounts that a candidate for St. Michael North of the NDP gave of his electoral chances....

Aside.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: St. Philip North, Sir. Just as he was misled and embarrassed by the glowing accounts that an NDP candidate for St. Philip North gave of his prospects in two elections, he has also been misled in this instance....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I must object to the assault that the Right Honourable Member is making on the Honourable Member for St. Thomas.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order, please.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Except that the confusion is multiplied, because the Honourable Member for St. Thomas has never been a candidate for the NDP. We can expect these things, Sir, when once the Leader of the NDP gets himself caught in a trap set for him by people whose judgment he ought to more carefully examine.

I want to repeat, Sir, that this is only the wages and salaries part of an overall package, and we feel that the overall package is in the best interest of all concerned. I want to thank the leaders of the trade union movement of Barbados and to place on record my eternal gratitude for the manner in which they have gone about dealing with these negotiations.

I want to stress that a level of maturity, a level of commitment to the public purpose and a commitment to see this country succeed was exemplified in the attitudes and the stances taken by those persons who were involved in these negotiations in good faith. I believe it will be an ultimate slap in the face of those good persons who have led the trade union movement and who have agreed with Government that this wage settlement is a reasonable wage settlement in the circumstances, those mature leaders of the trade union movement who have agreed to this for this House to say no to it.

It is in that context, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Hon. G. W. PAYNE, Hon. R. C. EASTMOND, Hon. R. N. GREENIDGE, Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON, Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY, Hon. R. St. C. TOPPIN, Hon. Sir Harold St. JOHN, His Honour R. D. MARSHALL, Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER, Mr. L. R. TULL, Mr. D. CARTER, Mr. G. A. CLARKE, Mr. J. M. EDGHILL and Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM – 16.

Noes: Mr. B. M. TAITT, Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Mr. J. O. TUDOR, Mr. L. A. WEEKES, Mr. H. F. LASHLEY, Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN and Dr. R. C. HAYNES – 7.

ORDER NO. 8 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (PART-TIME)
OFFICERS ORDER, 1996

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I just want briefly to say that I also want to commend the Government's negotiating team who so wonderfully well represented the public interest in all the negotiations.

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

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to second that, Sir.

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

ORDER NO. 9 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (TEACHERS)
(AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1996

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers)(Amendment) Order, 1996 do now pass.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Hon. G. W. PAYNE, Hon. R. C. EASTMOND, Hon. R. N. GREENIDGE, Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON, Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY, Hon. R. St. C. TOPPIN, Hon. Sir Harold St. JOHN, His Honour R. D. MARSHALL, Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER, Mr. L. R. TULL, Mr. D. CARTER, Mr. G. A. CLARKE, Mr. J. M. EDGHILL and Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM – 16.

Noes: Mr. B. M. TAITT, Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Mr. J. O. TUDOR, Mr. L. A. WEEKES, Mr. H. F. LASHLEY, Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN and Dr. R. C. HAYNES – 7.

ORDER NO. 10 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE INCREASE IN SALARY OF
THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Rt. Hon. O. S. Arthur: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Resolution 10 do now pass.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to second that, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, on this Resolution there is a no vote. My feeling is that we do not have to divide except on any particular Head in which one has a particular interest. I wish to record that my vote "No" does not apply to this Head.
6.15 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I draw Your Honour's attention to the Standing Order which indicates that on a matter relating to the Governor-General it is not customary to have a debate.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. I think it is important, Sir, that the traditions of this House be maintained.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please, please.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am on a point of order. I am urging, Sir, that the traditions and privileges of this House be maintained in that in matters relating to the Head of State they are not debated or divided.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to wind up this debate and to say that in the Estimates debate...

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR:...and to say, Sir, that in 1990 in the Estimates debate the Head, the Governor-General was subject to one of the most scathing debates in this Parliament. Not only was it debated by him when he referred to the kind of qualities a Governor-General should or should not have.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. That debate did not take place under the Head, Governor-General. I have never, ever in my entire life, as far as I cannot recall I ever spoke on the Head, the Governor-General, in this House.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir ...

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, Honourable Prime Minister. Honourable Members, please let us put an end to this before it gets too far. I follow the wishes of the House. The wish of the House is that we have the Resolution and I am putting the Resolution to the House. The question is that this Resolution ...

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: On a point of privilege, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I am making a winding up speech and I demand, Mr. Speaker, my right to wind up on behalf of Government. I have not finished my speech.

Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution. I moved the passing of the Resolution. Members spoke and the case is that I am winding up on behalf of Government. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am demanding my rights of you.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please. Please. Order please. Proceed please.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Thank you.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, please. The Honourable Member says he is winding up. He cannot just get up and wind up, Sir.

Sir, I heard the Honourable Member, I am just checking with Your Honour. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not wish to be party of any mockery with regard to

this item. I heard the item called. I just wish to be certain, Sir, it is Item 10 which is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the increase in salary to the Governor-General. After that was called, Sir, I heard no debate. I spoke on a point of order, Sir, drawing to Your Honour...

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, you can decide.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please, order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Members, I stated earlier, I follow the wishes of the House. If the House so desires to have a debate on the Resolution, the Chair of course, cannot stop that debate. Is this the desire of the House to proceed with a debate?

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this House has rules. The Member for St. Michael South Central spoke. Mr. Speaker, I rose and spoke and moved that the Resolution do now pass. The Member for St. Michael South Central arose and spoke and then I said, Sir, I am rising to wind up this debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would you wind up now, Sir?

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Thank you.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I rise on a point of order. The Honourable Member says he is winding up. I would wish to put in the record if the Honourable Member is winding up that I would wish to participate in the debate if Your Honour would allow me. Before anybody winds up I must participate in the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Members, please. Honourable Members would you both take your seats, please? I am reopening this Resolution. I am proposing the Resolution to the House. The Honourable Prime Minister has stated clearly that he is moving that the Resolution do now pass. At this point, according to our rules, the Resolution is open to Members of the House.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I just wish to put on the record that in keeping with what I have noticed about this House over the last 20 years, this side does not intend to participate in a debate about the emoluments of the Governor-General. We feel that any debate about the emoluments of the Governor-General will put that office in disrepute. We believe, Sir, that that tradition, from wherever it came is one worthy of emulation and the Members on this side do not propose to participate in any such debate.

Hon. Sir HAROLD St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I have been around here for a considerable period of time. If the Honourable Member wishes not to participate in the debate that is his privilege but to suggest that it is a tradition that the emoluments of the Governor-General are not debated is inaccurate. I well recall, Sir, many debates taking place in here with respect to the emoluments and the privileges of the Governor-General. In particular when the administration changed in 1976 there was a Resolution that was brought in here for the changing of the motor car for the Governor-General. I remember in particular the then Honourable Member for St. John saying that the Government should not accede to any request to change the car because the request had come to them and they had rejected it. I remember specifically a civil servant who was advising the Government at that time who happened to be, I believe, a very close adviser, pointed out that if you looked at the file you would find that in truth and in fact that it was approved. The Honourable Prime Minister, at that time, and Minister of Finance disclosed those facts to the House. So it is not accurate, Sir, according to my memory to say that there is any such tradition, Sir.
6.25 p.m.

I feel that we should not permit the records of this House to reflect a tradition unless that tradition is of such a nature that all Honourable Members agree to it. I certainly will register my objection most vehemently to any suggestion that is a tradition that the office of the Governor-General and its emoluments cannot be subject to a debate.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I gather that this debate is now open again. I would want to say...

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am on a point of order. The Member for St. Michael South Central has already spoken in the debate. The rules clearly state that a Member may speak once in a debate.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: But it has been reopened.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, will you take your seat?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: To the best of my knowledge...

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: On a point of order, Sir. The reopening of a debate can allow Members who have not yet spoken to speak in the debate. I have never yet heard of a Member speaking twice in a debate on a Resolution. The reopening of a debate is to allow Members who have not yet spoken to speak. The Member for St. Michael South Central has already spoken in debate. Sir, I am asking you to rule.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please. Thanks for your advice. Please could I check? The Member for St. Michael

South Central has not spoken to the debate. The Member for St. Michael South Central spoke on a procedural point relating to the debate. Could we hear the Member for St. Michael South Central please?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would humbly suggest that we abide by the traditions of this House in which as you know, Sir, in certain matters which are not spelled out in our Standing Orders we follow the tradition of May's and the Westminster system. In the circumstances, Sir, I believe that since I have never ever heard of any debate taking place on any matter relating to the Head of Governor-General I certainly will be expressing my personal disapproval if this matter is debated by not voting for or against or abstaining, which means that I will not be part of the breach of the tradition.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, if no other Member wants to speak, I rise to wind up the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Proceed, please.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: It is very important that we do not allow the records of this House to be perverted. It is a matter of public record recorded in Hansard that in the 1990 Estimates the Head – Governor-General was debated in this House. The Member for St. Michael South Central made a very lengthy contribution to that debate in terms of the criteria that a Governor-General of this country should possess.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it was a very extensive debate that attracted inputs from the Members for Christ Church West, St. Thomas and St. Michael South. It is inaccurate for the Member for St. Michael South Central to say that he is not aware of any debate in this House involving the Head – Governor-General when he himself...

Aside.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: But it is a matter of fact, Sir. It is important that we maintain standards in this House and I have heard the Member for St. Michael South Central get in this House and deny things that he has made reference to. It is very important if the public is to attach any integrity. It was in the Estimates debate. The Head – Governor-General was called. Mr. Speaker, I remember that I was speaking on agriculture and the Member for St. Michael South Central and my other colleagues told me please to wind up the debate quickly because they wanted to come on to the question of the Governor-General. The word had been put out, Mr. Speaker, that a certain person was going to be elevated to the highest office in the land. Mr. Speaker, I remember the debate very clearly because

the Member for St. Michael South Central said that a Governor-General should embody in his taste, his morals and respect for family morals, values and standards that the rest of Barbados regard as the norm. I also remember him saying, Sir, that if a certain person was elevated to the highest office in the land he would only be able to attend to matters at Government House if it was a constitutional necessity. I remember the intervention for the Member for St. Michael West who got up to say when the Member for St. Thomas was speaking: "I want to be sure that the strictures that are being levelled by the Member for St. Thomas are not being levelled at the incumbent at the time but to somebody else." The Member for St. Michael West can confirm that when my colleague was in full stride, citing all the judgments that had been issued against some politician, he said: "I just want him to clarify that his strictures are not being levelled against the present incumbent." Mr. Speaker, Sir, page 5228 of Hansard, Head 10 – Governor-General, Current \$338,502 Mr. Taitt said, Sir:

"I think you would agree, that it is my duty to draw it to His Honour's attention. I just want to be certain that you are not cursing the incumbent."

And Dr. Haynes at page 5231 spoke in terms that the Governor-General should be a person of good repute, high moral standing, impeccable integrity and of the highest probity and he went on to make statements that he want to be sure – I do not have time to go through everything. But the fact of the matter is, Sir, that at pages 5231 and 5232 you will find references to a speech made by the Member for St. Michael South Central in a debate in this Parliament debating a head pertaining to the Governor-General. So that for him to get up in this House and dispute this is very much like his getting up in this House, and disputing as he has done before that he did not want to impose a consumption tax on vegetables in Barbados.

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 with the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Hon. G. W. PAYNE, Hon. R. C. EASTMOND, Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON, Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY, Hon. R. St. C. TOPPIN, Hon. Sir Harold St. JOHN, Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER, Mr. L. R. TULL, Hon. R. N. GREENIDGE, Mr. D. CARTER, Mr. G. A. CLARKE, Mr. J. M. EDGHILL and Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM – 15.

Abstain: Mr. B. M. TAITT, Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Mr. J. O. TUDOR, Mr. L. A. WEEKES, Mr. H. F. LASHLEY, and Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN – 6. 6.35 p.m.

**ORDER NO. 11 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE INCREASE OF RATES OF PAY FOR
PUBLIC EMPLOYEES AND CASUAL
EMPLOYEES OF GOVERNMENT**

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to second that, Sir.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, could you please record the dissent of the Opposition? This will save some time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Proceed, please.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative. The dissent of Messrs. TAITT, SANDIFORD, TUDOR, WEEKES, LASHLEY and KELLMAN was recorded.

Certain remarks made by Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS and Dr. R. C. HAYNES were ordered by Mr. SPEAKER to be expunged from the record.

**ORDER NO. 12 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE MINISTERS AND PARLIAMENTARY
SECRETARIES (REMUNERATION AND
ALLOWANCES) ORDER, 1996**

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 12 do now pass.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Hon. G. W. PAYNE, Hon. R. C. EASTMOND, Hon. R. N. GREENIDGE, Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON, Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY, Hon. R. St. C. TOPPIN, Hon. Sir Harold St. JOHN, His Honour R. D. MARSHALL, Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER, Mr. L. R. TULL, Mr. D. CARTER, Mr. G. A. CLARKE, Mr. J. M. EDGHILL and Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM – 16.

Noes: Mr. B. M. TAITT, Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Mr. J. O. TUDOR, Mr. L. A. WEEKES, Mr. H. F. LASHLEY, Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN and Dr. R. C. HAYNES – 7.

**ORDER NO. 13 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
(REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES
OF MEMBERS) ORDER, 1996**

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Resolution to approve the remuneration and

allowances of Members of Parliament and the Senate do now pass.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Hon. G. W. PAYNE, Hon. R. C. EASTMOND, Hon. R. N. GREENIDGE, Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON, Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY, Hon. R. St. C. TOPPIN, Hon. Sir Harold St. JOHN, His Honour R. D. MARSHALL, Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER, Mr. L. R. TULL, Mr. D. CARTER, Mr. G. A. CLARKE, Mr. J. M. EDGHILL and Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM – 16.

Noes: Mr. B. M. TAITT, Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Mr. J. O. TUDOR, Mr. L. A. WEEKES, Mr. H. F. LASHLEY, Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN and Dr. R. C. HAYNES – 7.

**ORDER NO. 14 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE INCREASE OF RATES OF SALARIES AND
ALLOWANCES OF THE PERSONAL STAFF
OF THE PRIME MINISTER**

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to second that.

The question was put.
6.45 p.m.

A division was called.

The bell was rung.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

Ayes: Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Hon. G. W. PAYNE, Hon. R. C. EASTMOND, Hon. R. N. GREENIDGE, Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON, Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY, Hon. R. St. C. TOPPIN, Hon. Sir Harold St. JOHN, His Honour R. D. MARSHALL, Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER, Mr. L. R. TULL, Mr. D. CARTER, Mr. G. A. CLARKE, Mr. J. M. EDGHILL and Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM – 16.

Noes: Mr. B. M. TAITT, Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Mr. J. O. TUDOR, Mr. L. A. WEEKES, Mr. H. F. LASHLEY, Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN and Dr. R. C. HAYNES – 7.

ORDER NO. 15 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE INCREASE OF RATES OF SALARIES
AND ALLOWANCES OF THE PERSONAL
ASSISTANTS TO MINISTERS

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Resolution to approve the Increase of Rates of Salaries and Allowances of the Personal Assistants to Ministers do now pass.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to second that.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, on the issue of the Personal Assistants, I wonder if I could have a little information as to the number of Personal Assistants who would....

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I gather that the numbers are stated in the Resolution. I would also like to know if any have been appointed as yet, if so, how long were they in office?

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, on the advice of the Honourable Member for St. Joseph, I would like to know if any have been fired since appointed, or disappointed. "Disappointed" is the word I wish to use. That information, I think, is of some importance to the House.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask one question. I would like to know the difference between the Executive Personal Secretary and the Personal Assistants to Ministers, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I want to raise a question on this. I was not here when the matter was debated. I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he could give the rationale for the very substantial differential between those Personal Assistants' level of salaries and the salary of the post in the office of the Leader of the Opposition. The position of Personal Assistants to Ministers is new. It is a position that is so generous. It does not, as I understand it, relate to the position of Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister which has been established for some considerable time. If therefore the post of Personal Assistant to Ministers is going to be created, it would seem to me that inherent in the arrangements that were made originally for the provision of staff to the Leader of the Opposition was a concept that the Leader of the Opposition would have approximately the same needs as a Minister would have. However, a perusal of the salary scales which have been attached to the Personal Assistant for Ministers and that which has been given for Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister would show a substantial differential. Try as I

might I cannot find what possible rationale could be advanced to show the distinction.

As a matter of fact, based on the Honourable Member's experience as a Leader of the Opposition, he would know that the Personal Assistant to the Leader of the Opposition is required to cover a wide gamut of responsibilities. I do not make here any judgment on the desirability or otherwise of the Personal Assistant. I do not believe it is a matter that calls for further debate since it has been debated in the Chamber and rules preclude my referring to a matter that has already been settled so I would not tempt the Speaker's patience in that regard. I am sure the Prime Minister in his response will be able to show what the difference is.

As the Prime Minister is responding to the question to the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, I am sure he will grasp the opportunity to enlighten this Chamber, and by extension the members of my constituency, and presumably the constituencies of other Honourable Members, what has brought this significant differential in the perception of respective roles of these Personal Assistants. If he could help me in that regard, I think it would help me when I go back to my constituency to be able to explain it.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, if no other Members wish to speak I rise to wind up the debate.

Just to respond firstly to the Leader of the NDP, the Member for St. Michael South Central to say that nobody has as yet been appointed to a position of Personal Assistant. The matter of the appointment of Personal Assistants has been thoroughly gone into. We have now, after detailed consultation with the Ministry of the Civil Service, drawn up specimen letters. People are being appraised for the positions but apart from the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister and the Personal Assistant to the Leader of the Opposition there is, right now, no other person engaged in the position of Personal Assistant.

Mr. Speaker, I really am not in a position to help the Member for St. Lucy on the question about the difference between an Executive Secretary and the Personal Assistants. Those questions, Sir, are frivolous. I really do not think it is for me to explain the difference between an Executive Secretary and a Personal Assistant.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Honourable Member for St. Peter is misleading the House when he gives the impression that the question asked is frivolous. During the Incomes and Prices Protocol the behaviour of the Honourable Member for St. Peter gave the impression that these two positions were the same so I cannot see how a question like this can be frivolous at this point in time.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I truly have to say to the House that I cannot hold myself responsible for the ignorance of the Member, and I mean that in the pure sense of the word.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If there is any ignorance, it would have to come from the Honourable Member for St. Peter when he spoke on the Incomes Protocol.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, from time immemorial there has been an Executive Secretary to the Prime Minister.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Well, from the time there has been a Prime Minister there has been an Executive Secretary and the Executive Secretary is as the name says. Sir, I really am not in a position to delve into the mysterious mind of the Member for St. Lucy and try to unravel the inscrutable workings of that mind to try to answer the foolishness that is before the House as to what is the difference between an Executive Secretary or an Executive Assistant and a Personal Assistant. I really do not know what he is trying to ask, Sir, and I cannot answer a question that I do not understand. I truly concede, Sir, that I am not in a position to react to his innocence.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, Members. Please let us hear the Honourable Prime Minister.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think, Sir, part of our Standing Orders says that members should really show courtesy to other Members. I really think that on reflection the Prime Minister would wish to withdraw his remarks and perhaps couch his response in different terms. The kind of reply that has been given is really highly offensive and discourteous to the Member for St. Lucy. That is advice.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Right Honourable Prime Minister, you heard the Right Honourable Member. Would you want to say what you have to say and not refer to the Member's speech as foolishness?
6.55 p.m.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, you did not rule that it was unparliamentary. I did not use the word "foolish" but I said I was not in a position to try to unravel the mysterious workings of the mind of the Honourable Member for St. Lucy and therefore I could not deal with the inscrutable workings of fate.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am only asking you, Sir, to withdraw the words where you referred to what he has stated as foolishness.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I really believe that for an Honourable Member to get in this House and make a speech, the whole purpose of which is to ask what is the difference between an Executive Personal Secretary, which is a post which has been existing, and a Personal Assistant....

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Sir, on a point of order. We were dealing with salary and not position, so his argument has no basis.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: The answer, Sir, is in the papers, first of all, but the fact is that at no stage in any debate on the Incomes Protocol was there any attempt by anybody to equate or confuse the Executive Personal Secretary to the Prime Minister with the newly created post of Personal Assistant to Ministers. The gravamen of the Honourable Member for St. Lucy's contribution to the debate is that he understood that that was what was being dealt with in that debate. I can only say to him, as a previous Prime Minister once said in relation to another Honourable Member for St. Lucy, that I fear he is hallucinating, because no reference whatsoever was drawn in the Incomes Protocol debate to any equation between the Executive Personal Secretary to the Prime Minister and Personal Assistant to a Minister. He had to be hallucinating.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I never referred to the Executive Secretary to the Prime Minister, I was speaking about the Executive Secretary to the Leader of the Opposition.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: All I will say, Sir, is that I truly cannot help him. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central....

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please. The Right Honourable Prime Minister, earlier you referred to what the Honourable Member for St. Lucy had stated as foolishness. All I am asking you to do is to withdraw the word. I do not think that anything stated in here by an Honourable Member should be termed foolishness. Just withdraw the word "foolishness" and let us proceed.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, I withdraw the word "foolishness" but, as I said, Sir, I truly, truly am not in a position, with the very best will in the world, and in all good faith, to summon the wisdom that would allow me

to assist the Honourable Member for St. Lucy in explaining the difference between an Executive Secretary to the Leader of the Opposition and an Executive Personal Secretary to the Prime Minister. I confess that I do not have the wisdom to explain it and I truly cannot help him. You must bear with me, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, in relation to the question raised by the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, implicit in the question is that for the very same reason the Leader of the Opposition is deserving and needs a Personal Assistant, Ministers need them.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. Whereas I am not able to account for the Prime Minister's capacity to imply, the Rules precluded my alluding to a debate that had already occurred in this Session. Therefore, Sir, it is entirely improper for the Right Honourable Member to imply from the question I asked, which was legitimate, any judgment on the merits – and I did speak specifically to not having any position on it – the merits of the appointment of a Personal Assistant. I didn't address the matter.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: He asked the question as to what explains the difference between the salaries to be paid to Personal Assistants to Ministers and the salary paid to the Personal Assistant to the Leader of the Opposition. Implicit in the question, Sir, as I interpreted it, was that in his judgment the salary paid to a Personal Assistant to a Minister should be of the same level as the salary to a Personal Assistant to the Leader of the Opposition. All I am saying is that inferentially, therefore, he is saying that as far as he is concerned a Minister is as equally deserving of having a Personal Assistant as the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the Right Honourable Member will give way, Sir, I said no such thing.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: But you said so.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation, if the Right Honourable Member will give way.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Right Honourable Member give way, please?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I just wish to say categorically, in case anybody misunderstood my statement, that I make no judgment whatsoever and I do not have any position at this time to put to this House on that matter of the desirability, the requirement or any of the related matters thereto concerning the issue of Personal Assistants. Furthermore, Sir, I reserve my right to take a position on Personal

Assistants that I was not able to take in this debate because of the Rules.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I was just saying that my interpretation of the statement the Honourable Member was making was that he wanted me to explore for him what circumstances account for the difference in the salary that is to be paid to a Personal Assistant to a Minister as compared to that to be paid to the Personal Assistant to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Honourable Member for St. Michael West that both Ministers and the Leader of the Opposition should have Personal Assistants, but I want to say that initially when the Resolution....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The record would show, unless I objected to it, Sir, that he has agreed with some position which I hold. The Right Honourable Member would be misleading the House. I hold no such position, I did not state that I hold any such position and therefore the Right Honourable Member cannot agree with me. There is nothing to agree with.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I want to give a very simple answer to the question, Sir, that the salaries for Personal Assistants are less than that for the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister. The salary for the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister was set by the DLP at \$58 399, the salary for a Personal Assistant to a Minister is now just marginally above that of the Personal Assistant to the Leader of the Opposition, in the conviction of Government that a Personal Assistant to a Minister will have a far greater range of duties to attend to, by the nature of the post, than that of the Personal Assistant to the Leader of the Opposition. That explains why there is a difference, in the same way it was recognised from the beginning that the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister would have a different set of duties from that of the Personal Assistant to the Leader of the Opposition.
7.05 p.m.

It is not been the convention and in fact it is a practice that the Leader of the Opposition's Personal Assistant gets a salary that is different from that of the Prime Minister of the country and that is in recognition of the fact that the two posts attract different functions. Similarly, Sir, the Personal Assistant to a Minister has functions that would be different from those of a Leader of the Opposition and by the same argument and on the same logic would get a different salary. I beg to move, Sir, that this Resolution do now pass.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

DIVISION

Ayes: Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Hon. G. W. PAYNE, Hon. R. C. EASTMOND, Hon. R. N. GREENIDGE, Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON, Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY, Hon. R. St. C. TOPPIN, Hon. Sir Harold St. JOHN, His Honour R. D. MARSHALL, Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER, Mr. L. R. TULL, Mr. J. M. EDGHILL, Mr. G. A. CLARKE, Mr. D. CARTER and Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM – 16.

Noes: Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Mr. B. M. TAITT, Mr. L. A. WEEKES, Mr. J. O. TUDOR, Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN, Mr. H. F. LASHLEY and Dr. R. C. HAYNES – 7.

Mr. SPEAKER: If it be the will of the House we will now recommit Government Business.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$9 807 695 from

the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1995-96 as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1995-96, No. 14 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, that concludes Government's Business for the day. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 27th February, 1996 at 11.00 o'clock in the morning.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I beg to second that, Sir.

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

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS 2469

Confirmation of Minutes of Tuesday,
February 20, 1996.

PAPERS

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR 2469

1. The Civil Establishment (General)
(Amendment) Order, 1996.
2. The Civil Establishment (Part-Time
Officers) Order, 1996.
3. The Civil Establishment (Teachers)
(Amendment) Order, 1996.
4. The Ministers and Parliamentary
Secretaries (Remuneration and
Allowances) Order, 1996.
5. The Senate and House of Assembly
(Remuneration and Allowances of
Members) Order, 1996.
6. The Parliament (Administration)
(Salary) Order, 1996.
7. The Judges (Salaries) Order, 1996.
8. The Ombudsman (Salary) Order, 1996.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS 2470

Report on the Vital Statistics and
Registrations for the years 1990, 1991, 1992
and 1993.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS 2470

The Customs (Validation of Duties) Bill,
1996.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS 2470

The Customs (Validation of Duties) Bill,
1996.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS 2470

Suspension of Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18,
20, 42(5), 43 and 44 for the remainder of the
sitting.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 7 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT
(GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER,
1996 2470

Rt. Hon. O. S. Arthur, 2470, 2474, 2475,
2505, 2506, 2507; Mr. D. J. H. Thompson,
2476, 2477, 2478, 2480, 2481.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS 2483

The Income Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1996.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$7 469 733
from the Consolidated Fund and place it at
the disposal of the Government to supplement
the Estimates 1995-96 as shown in the
Supplementary Estimates 1995-96 No. 13
which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS (Resumed)
ORDER NO. 7 (Resumed)

Hon. Miss M. A. Mottley, 2483, 2484, 2486;
Dr. R. C. Haynes, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2491;
Hon. D. A. C. Simmons, 2492, 2493, 2494;
Mr. D. St. E. Kellman, 2495; Hon. R. N.
Greenidge, 2496; Rt. hon. L. E. Sandiford,
2498, 2499; Mr. G. A. Clarke, 2500; Mr. B.
M. Taitt, 2501, 2503, 2504.

ORDER NO. 8 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (PART-
TIME OFFICERS) ORDER, 1996 2510

Rt. Hon. O. S. Arthur, 2510.

ORDER NO. 9 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT
(TEACHERS) (AMENDMENT) ORDER,
1996 2510

Rt. Hon. O. S. Arthur, 2510.

ORDER NO. 10 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE INCREASE IN SALARY OF THE
GOVERNOR-GENERAL 2511

Rt. Hon. O. S. Arthur, 2511, 2513; Dr. R. C.
Haynes, 2511, 2513; Mr. B. M. Taitt, 2512;
Hon. Sir Harold St. John, 2512.

ORDER NO. 11 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE INCREASE OF RATES OF PAY FOR
PUBLIC EMPLOYEES AND CASUAL
EMPLOYEES OF GOVERNMENT 2514

Rt. Hon. O. S. Arthur, 2514.

ORDER NO. 12 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE MINISTERS AND PARLIAMENTARY
SECRETARIES (REMUNERATION AND
ALLOWANCES) ORDER, 1996 2514

Rt. Hon. O. S. Arthur, 2514.

ORDER NO. 13 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
(REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES OF
MEMBERS) ORDER, 1996 2514

Rt. Hon. O. S. Arthur, 2514.

ORDER NO. 14 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE INCREASE OF RATES OF SALARIES
AND ALLOWANCES OF THE PERSONAL
STAFF OF THE PRIME MINISTER 2514

Rt. Hon. O. S. Arthur, 2514.

ORDER NO. 15 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE INCREASE OF RATES OF SALARIES
AND ALLOWANCES OF THE PERSONAL
ASSISTANTS TO MINISTERS 2515

Rt. Hon. O. S. Arthur, 2515, 2516, 2517; Dr. R.
C. Haynes, 2515; Mr. D. St. E. Kellman, 2515;
Mr. B. M. Taitt, 2515, 2517; Rt. Hon. L. E.
Sandiford, 2516.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS 2518

Resolution to grant the sum of \$9 807 695 from
the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the
disposal of the Government to supplement the
Estimates 1995-96 as shown in the
Supplementary Estimates 1995-96 No. 14 which
form the Schedule to the Resolution.

SUSPENSION 2483

ADJOURNMENT 2519

Hon. D. A. C. Simmons, 2519.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, Rt. Hon. O. S. (St. Peter)
CLARKE, Mr. G. A. (St. George North)
GREENIDGE, Hon. R. N. (St. Philip North)
HAYNES, Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central)
KELLMAN, Mr. D. St. E. (St. Lucy)
MOTTLEY, Hon. Miss M. A. (St. Michael North East)
St. JOHN, Hon. Sir Harold (Christ Church South)
SANDIFORD, Rt. Hon. L. E. (St. Michael South)
SIMMONS, Hon. D. A. C. (St. Thomas)
TAITT, Mr. B. M. (St. Michael West)
THOMPSON, Mr. D. J. H. (St. John)