THE

SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1981 – 86

THE SENATE

Wednesday, December 12, 1984.

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Public Buildings on Wednesday, December 12, 1984 at 11.10 a.m.

PRESENT

His Honour Senator the Honourable Sir Arnott Cato, K.C.M.G., (President)

His Honour Senator J. C. W. Wickham, M.B.E., (Deputy President)

Senator the Hon. N. A. Barrow, (Minister of Information and Culture) (Leader of the Senate)

Senator the Hon. O'Brien Trotman, (Minister of Health)

Senator the Hon. C. A. Griffith, (Minister of State, Prime Minister's Office)

Senator St. C. E. Howell, (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance and Planning);

Senator J. E. D. Williams, (Parliamentary Secretary of the Prime Minister);

Senator H. R. Linton
Senator Mrs. E. M. Lynch, G.C.M.
Senator D. A. C. Simmons
Senator Miss J. Clarke
Senator Mrs. M. O. Reece
Senator E. E. Greaves
Senator the Rev. Canon I. McK. Jones
Senator L. A. Ward, G.C.M.
Senator C. Jemmott, B.S.S., J.P.

Prayers were led by Senator the Rev. Canon I. McK. JONES.

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Mr. PRESIDENT: Honourable Members, just for the Record, I have a letter addressed to Mr. President from His Excellency the Governor-General:

"Dear Mr. President,

I will be absent from the island during the period 7–9 December, 1984 on a short private visit to Miami. On the advice of the Prime Minister, Senator the Hon. Sir Arnott Cato, KCMG will be appointed to be my deputy under the provisions of Section 30 of the Constitution for the period of my absence.

As your Honourable Senate is not expected to meet before my departure, it will not be possible for a formal Message to be sent down to it, but I thought I would let the Senate know, in any case, for the Record."

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I have the honour to lay the following documents:

Statement of Return of output of locally produced spirits during the quarter ending December, 1984.

The Annual Report of the Community Legal Services Commission for the year 1984.

The Auditor's Report and Financial Statement of the Barbados Board of Tourism for the year ended 31 March, 1984.

Report and Audited Financial Statement of the Barbados Marketing Corporation for the year ending March, 1984.

Consumption Tax (No. 2) Order, 1984.

Financial Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for six months ended 30 September, 1984.

The Annual Report and Financial Statement of the National Petroleum Corporation for the year April, 1983, to March, 1984.

The Annual Report and Financial Statement for the National Training Board for the year April, 1983 to March, 1984.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1984.

The Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1984.

The Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances) Order, 1984.

The Senate and House of Assembly (Remuneration and Allowances of Members) Order, 1984.

MOTIONS RELATING TO THE BUSINESS AND MOVED BY A MINISTER

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, today on the Order Paper there is at least one Bill which we will need to proceed with, and that is the Foreign Sales Corporation Bill.

I beg to move the suspension of Standing Order 45(2).

Mr. PRESIDENT: I think the Minister's intention is to request the suspension of Standing Orders in relation to this particular Bill, and of any other Bill of which notice may be given, and of which it may be expedient to deal with later on, with the Senate's approval. Do you have something to say Senator Greaves?

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Yes, Sir.

Mr. President, I sought clarification from the Leader of the Senate on whether or not the suspension of Standing Order 45 was for the specific purpose of the one Bill which he indicated, or other Bills which he may want to give notice of and which he may want to do today. The assurance which I got from him was that it was for one Bill. I want to be very sure. Let us be very clear where we are going from here.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: I have given no assurance.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I want to find out, since the Leader of the Senate has moved the suspension of Standing Order 45, whether he intends to move the following money Resolutions: Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances) Order, 1984; Resolution to approve the Senate and House of Assembly (Remuneration and Allowances of Members) Order, 1984; Resolution for the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1984 and the Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1984.
11.20 a.m.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I wish to respond in the affirmative. Standing Order 45(2) says:

> "An interval of not less than five days must elapse between the first and second reading of a bill, unless the Senate on motion made and question put, agree to proceed with the Bill at an earlier date, or forthwith."

Consequently, when I talked about 45(2) I was dealing entirely with Bills, not Resolutions. The Resolutions have been given ample notice of and may be proceeded with today, and I so intend, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You are not clear yet, Senator Greaves?

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Yes, Sir. Can I make a statement?

Mr. PRESIDENT: Do not address the Chair from your seat.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I am sorry, Sir.

I would like to appeal to the Minister by stating that the Resolutions relating to the salaries, of which notice was given here today, really only came into my hands last night and I have had no time to look at them in the way I would want to look at them. I think it would be a travesty of all that is just and democratic for the Government to proceed with these Bills here today.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just a minute.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I am therefore.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just a minute, Senator Greaves! Please sit when the President is speaking.

The question of suspension of Standing Orders relates to the Bills. When the Resolutions to which the member is alluding are up for discussion, it is at that point that Senator Greaves can appeal to the Minister and make the points that he is making now. I am just trying to keep the thing in its proper order and its proper sequence.

I will put the question in relation to the suspension of Standing Order 45(2) in relation to the Bills of which the Minister spoke, and any other possible Bill of which notice may be given today.

The question that Standing Order 45(2) be suspended so that the Bill in question and possibly any other Bills with the agreement of the Senate may be dealt with later on was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Mr. PRESIDENT: When the matter of the Resolution comes, Senator Greaves, it will be in order for you then to speak in the way you were going to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I beg to give notice of the following:

A Bill to amend the National Health Service Board Act;

A Bill to amend the Caribbean Agricultural Research and Development Institution Act;

A Bill to amend the Stamp Duty Act, Cap. 91;

A Bill to amend the Defence (Amendment) Act, 1984;

A Bill to make provision for income tax and other concessions to foreign sales corporations established in Barbados.

Sir, there are a number of Resolutions. Some are on the Order Paper, while others have been given the notice required by the Standing Orders but are not on the Order Paper. Those are:

A Resolution to approve the vesting in the Barbados Industrial Development Corporation of parcels of land at Brighton, St. Michael;

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Passage Road, St. Michael for the purpose of housing development.

What appears as Order No. 5 should not have been on the Order Paper. It was a matter in which the other Chamber had been asked to do a guarantee, but the terms of the Resolution do not permit of its being before us.

A Resolution to approve the lease of land at Grantley Adams International Airport, Christ Church to Jennifer Atkinson Limited;

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Six Men's, St. Peter for the construction of the Speightstown by-pass road, phase three, and for housing relocation;

A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1984;

A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1984;

A Resolution to approve the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances) Order, 1984;

A Resolution to approve the Senate and House of Assembly (Remuneration and Allowances of Members) Order, 1984;

A Resolution to approve the borrowing of the sum of £466,720 sterling from the Crown Agents for Overseas Governments and Administrations for the supply of equipment for the Police Department and the Fire Service.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Let it be recorded in the Minutes that the Bills have been read a first time.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I do not know how many items of business we are going to get through today. I know that some Senators have some commitments, in some cases inescapable, and we wish to seek to accommodate them as far as possible.

The order of Government Business which I therefore propose is as follows: I propose first of all to deal with the Resolutions for the approval of Civil Establishment Orders and the other two pay Resolutions as the first four Orders of the day. I propose then to deal with the Resolutions at Orders 3, 4, 9 and 10, all of which I shall manage. Then we will take the Bill at Order No. 8, the foreign sales corporations, and after that we will see whether there are other items we may be able to deal with, anything else that may be urgent.

I have to find out what is the status of the Resolution for the borrowing of money from the Crown Agents for the Police Department and the Fire Service, to see whether that has to be dealt with today. If it is not urgent, then that will also wait until next week.

Since Senator Greaves already intimated his position, just let me say that the fact of the matter is that in respect of the Public Service salaries, Parliament has already dealt with Resolutions, and as a result of upgradings these Resolutions on the Public Service and the teachers are before us. The principle has been established

now for some years that the political officers will have salaries related to those of the public officers. If Senator Greaves does not want to deal with the political officers' salaries, it will be a matter for him, but I am not really prepared to concede on that point.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Sir, as I was saying, I would just like to make the point – obviously I am making it for the Record, but I think the point should still be made – that it would appear as if the rights of minorities in this Chamber seem to have gone through the window as far as the Leader of the Senate is concerned.
11.30 a.m.

I would just say that these documents came into my hands last night. I have not had the opportunity to look at them and give them the kind of study which I think that matters of this nature ought to have. This is with regard to the so-called principle Senator Barrow refers to. The fact is whether a principle has been established or not.

I think that if this Parliament means what it should mean, where there ought to be a proper dialogue and discussion of matters; then I believe that the opportunity ought to be provided to all honourable Senators to study whatever documents are placed before the Chamber so that they could make an intelligent presentation on the matters. I believe that if the Government proceeds with the discussion of these matters today, it would be nothing short of being indecent, vulgar and disgusting.

I do not see any particular reason why there is so much haste to proceed with this matter because it is not that the Ministers and Parliamentarians are waiting on these increases. I do not think that Senator Barrow is hand-to-mouth that he could not wait for another week, two weeks, or even next year for that matter, where proper study could be made of these proposals so that one could make an intelligent contribution to this matter.

It really baffles me to think that we could be in here talking about democracy, the rights of minorities and that kind of thing, and I am the lone member of the minority in here, as it were and I only received my papers last night, and I being called at 11 o'clock this morning to look at these matters. I am therefore appealing to you, Sir, to your good judgement, to your sense of fair play, to prevail on the Leader of the House to postpone discussion on these matters until a subsequent meeting.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The matter is perfectly clear. It is a decision of the Senate. I would point out that in so far as the Standing Orders are concerned, the Resolutions have met the conditions of notice. As far as the discussion part of it is concerned, my impression, from what I have read in the Press, is that the Other Place which dealt with these Resolutions did not get any more notice than Senator Greaves, and certainly did not get anymore than I did, so it is now a matter for the Senate to decide.

I think that as far as our Rules are concerned, it is perfectly within the Rules to proceed.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, the fact of the matter is that Standing Order 22, which covers the point of notice, does, indeed, as you point out, require a full day's notice, and notice was to be given to the Clerk. Since notice has to be given to the Clerk a day before it is put on the Order Paper, and notice was given to the Clerk some time on Monday, there is absolutely nothing in the argument advanced by Senator Greaves.

The second point I want to make is that the Constitution clearly locates responsibility for financial matters in the power given to us in dealing with money Bills, and the limitations put on that power clearly locates that power in the Other Place. If members in the Other Place, having received their papers at 12 o'clock yesterday, found it possible to deal with them, I trust I would be pardoned for regarding it as either grandstanding or hypocrisy if somebody says that we in this Chamber cannot deal with it.

Thirdly, I have listened carefully to Senator Greaves on every point. He never made reference to the Orders in respect of payment to public officers or teachers. At every point he made reference to the payments in respect of political officers. I submit that anybody who is competent to deal with one is competent to deal with the other, and since.....

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: On a point of order: I indicated the four Resolutions. I read them out at the very beginning and I referred to them again.

Asides

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Check the Record.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President Senator Greaves wanted to know why these Resolutions cannot wait. His argument referred only to those relating to political officers specifically, and he went on, as though he wants to be reminded, to suggest that I can wait. I am not a public officer, and there is no telling whether I can wait or not. That is my private business.

The fact is that where the vulgarity and so on to which Senator Greaves refers really exists is in the fact that he sees his mission as having to get up and talk as long as pay relates to any political officers, but if it relates to anybody else, it is all right. Because as long as he is in Opposition, he enjoys the security of drawing his

cheque in Mangrove and not having to care who else gets a cheque and where they get it from. Those of us on this side, I am afraid, have to be operating from slightly different principles, and also from a higher and less politically opportunistic level. I have no intention at this point of giving in to what, really, is no argument by Senator Greaves.

Mr. PRESIDENT: All right. Order, order.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 3) ORDER, 1984

Order No. 11 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1984.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, the subject matter of all of these Orders are governed by the same principle and, therefore, in my introduction of one I will be saying precisely what relates to the introduction of all the others.

We find that there are a number of public officers in this land who, because of their clear relativity, have enjoyed a general standard of pay in which either you will find, for example, the Director of Public Prosecutions, who is, under the Constitution, unfettered to prosecute, remunerated in the same way and at the same level as a judge who, under the Constitution enjoys a discretion, again unfettered; or you will find a number of persons, whether Auditor General, Chief Parliamentary Counsel, senior grades of Permanent Secretary, Solicitor General, whose level of remuneration was always set just a little below that of the judges. The result of the recent salaries adjustments, in 1982 and subsequent to that, was that these relativities were completely disturbed. Therefore you found staying with the point about the Director of Public Prosecutions, an officer who requires the precise same qualifications for holding that office as the qualifications set for a puisne judge, and an officer who would normally qualify to be a judge, except that he might prefer to be a Director of Public Prosecutions, that he and a number of those officers went way ahead of the level of remuneration attaching to the judges, the judges having refused to accept the $108 per month increase which other public officers receive.

11.40 a.m.

We dealt I believe, at the beginning of this year with the problems created for the judges, and they received a settlement backdated to 1st April, 1982, in which their pay was then set at $62 400 per year. This meant that in that settlement, the relativities between the judges and the others to whom they were related had become completely unsettled, and the Permanent Secretaries made representations and had a compelling case. As a result of these representations regradings had to take place, and, evidently with regradings taking place at the top, it meant that other posts were disturbed in terms of their relativity. This is why, although one looks at this settlement and talks about a larger percentage increase at the top than at the bottom, the fact of the matter is that we have to look at the regrading exercise as an exercise on its own.

The effect of re-adjusting the salaries has meant embracing a number of posts going right down to Z.15. I do not know whether members are fully aware of what I am referring to when I talk about Z.15. If you enter the Public Service with a university degree, you go into the Administrative Officer Grade II level. If you became an executive officer you would be at the same level of pay as an Administrative Officer II. In other words, the administrative level and the junior management level of the Public Service begins at Z.16, and the first such salary scale is Z.16 to Z.11. So when we talk about regradings going right down to Z.15, we are talking about regradings going right down to the level just above where the clerical level stops – a quite far-reaching regrading exercise.

The point about whether there is a larger percentage at the top than at the bottom on this occasion also has to be addressed in the following terms: The practice of negotiation has grown up where you always go for more at the bottom than at the top. Where salary levels are low in absolute terms, this makes sense, because you cannot talk about percentage increases as though they do not have to be seen in some context. When salary levels themselves move to a reasonable position, what happens as a result of continuing the practices of large increases at the bottom graduating to small increases at the top of that the differentials which are supposed to represent and to reflect responsibility levels become eroded, so it then becomes a disincentive for persons to aspire to management positions within the service.

What I am saying is generally accepted. I know that even within the Barbados Workers' Union it is accepted, because there is no way that the clerical officers in the Barbados Workers' Union will ever receive a level of pay comparable with that received by Senator Greaves or Mr. Trotman, or, to go a little higher, comparable with that received by the General Secretary. That is to be expected.

For the period 1973–76 settlement was 30 per cent at the bottom and 25 per cent at the top; 1973–74 a 5 per cent increase across the board for each of the years; the period 1976–78 a settlement of 50 per cent at the bottom and 20 per cent at the top, an award as to 35 per cent to 12 per cent for the year 1976–77 and the remainder during 1977–78; 1978–80, 20 per cent at the bottom and 10 per cent at the top; 1980–82, 38.3 per cent at the bottom and 22.5 per cent at the top. In

1982 there was an award of $25 a week or $108 per month and the deleting of the two lowest points in the "Z" Scale. This resulted in the bottom being awarded a 33 per cent increase and the top 3.5 per cent. For 1984–86 there has been a 15 per cent across-the-board for 1984–85 and an additional 5 per cent for 1985.

From time to time, it has been recommended that emoluments in the senior management posts in the Public Service should be made more attractive, when considering that comparable management personnel in the private sector are paid much higher salaries in relation to other perquisites. The need to attract and retain senior management and professional grades in the public sector, persons of high calibre, has also been stressed over the years, and this argument is being given greater recognition on this occasion. Clearly, if we do not give that argument recognition, then the Public Service management will collapse.

There are all the signs that this will happen. I am very hesitant to make this point because it might seem as though I am making personal reflections, but there is a great deal of difficulty every time you look through your Department and ask where is the talent that will tomorrow become their Permanent Secretaries. Something has to be done to restore the attractiveness of this service to young aspiring people with ability, with drive and with ambition, so we are not talking about an unrealistic situation. It is not pie in the sky. This is the actual hard work of running a political department.

There are points which can be made which only if I were pushed I would make, because it is not, in my view, necessary to select people in any category of employment in order to make the points. What I do wish to say is that we recognise that within the public sector we are not going to be offering salaries at the same level as in the private sector. We recognise that where you are holding a political office or where you are holding an office within the Civil Service, what you will be paid within the public sector is going to be much less than what you will be paid in the private sector. However, there is a level of realism which must permeate the whole business, and the question is, are we able to offer salaries and conditions which are sufficiently attractive that we can expect to have the services of people competent to manage what is in fact the most complex enterprise, the enterprise of Government?

11.50 a.m.

If we started talking about letting the pay reflect the size of the task and the quality of work required, I would wish Senator Greaves, when he starts to talk, to tell me when he weighs it, for the task performed exactly how he would pay a Minister and not just to make cheap political points about it. He can tell me what are the posts that he finds comparable, whether the duties and responsibilities are as enormous, and he can tell me how then he would weigh those persons and how he would pay them.

So when we look at this Resolution there are always going to be points that can be made. But the question is, are we recognizing that the important posts within the public sector have at least been remunerated at a particular level, and when these regradings have taken place, that is what, within the means of the Public Service you are attempting to recognize.

There are certain other specific points. One is that it has happened over the years that the post of head-teacher in the secondary schools has suffered in all this. I, for one, am particularly please to see that something is done within these Resolutions to restore some of the stature to those posts, especially insofar as emoluments can reflect the stature. When the business of moving away from providing houses begun, I do not think it was generally recognized that what was in fact happening was that unless a conscious decision on regrading was taken, the emoluments of the managers of our schools were being whittled away. I am very glad to see that something has been done to restore that former situation, not by providing houses but by providing more meaningful emoluments.

As to the point which will always prove contentious, not for good reason but for political expediency, the relativities have been established before this Government came into power, as evidenced in the salaries revision that took place since Independence while the Democratic Labour Party was the Government of this country. Those relativities have all been observed since this Government came into power, and if we want to put them in real terms, one must consider, for example, that a Permanent Secretary is remunerated at the level of $60 000 a year and a Minister at $62 400 a year. My colleague is making the point about six weeks vacation. I feel that all of us are entitled to vacation, so I do not buy that. If we do not take it, it is our fault, and we would be stupid enough not to take it. The point is that the pension which a Permanent Secretary receives is fully funded by the State. In addition, the State funds a part of his contributory pension under NIS. The Minister funds his own NIS pension as a self-employed person. The Minister also contributes 5 per cent of his salary to the other pension, of which the state is the other subscriber.

If we really wanted to talk about relativities, we would have to take all that into consideration, and then we would not be talking about paying a Minister $2 400 more than a Permanent Secretary, because the value of the fully-funded pension alone, compared with the Minister who pays 5 per cent of his salary for pension, is obviously already much greater than the $2 400 we are talking about. So even though on paper it looks

better, there is absolutely no doubt as to who is worse off. The fact is that we are prepared to live with the situation where, on paper, there is a token situation of being better paid than your Permanent Secretary, your chief adviser. This is why I am saying that if you want to you can start weighing the posts, you can start telling me who ought to be receiving what on what basis. But I do not believe that there is any logical argument that would say that there should not be a relationship between the pay received by the Minister and the pay received by his chief adviser. Quite clearly, that, I think, would be unthinkable nonsense which this Chamber would reject out of hand.

I said that I was going to let one introduction do for all, so I should make reference to the other Resolution which deals with Members of Parliament. There has been an undertaking given by this Government that there would be a relationship established between the pay of the Leader of the Opposition and the Speaker of the House. I do not have before me the figure which I think represents that relationship. I believe it is expressed in terms of thirteenth – it may well be 12/13.

We believe that the post of Leader of the Opposition, as a constitutionally protected post, and that of the Speaker of the House are posts which must be treated as being in close relationship to the ministerial posts. For all that we recognize that the Ministers are full time and, therefore, unless one has private means, what one takes home from this source is one's full remuneration, whereas in the case of the Speaker and the Leader of the Opposition they may have another source of income, particularly if they are lawyers, as both the present holders happen to be. But the point is that the posts must be remunerated at a certain level. We have passed the days when we should have the kind of embarrassment that used to be suffered by one Speaker of the House within my memory. I am not talking about the most recent one. Those posts are therefore remunerated at the level clearly bearing relation to the posts of Ministers.

In relation to ordinary Members of Parliament, their posts have for some time now been linked to what used to be Assistant Secretary's post, which is the post now called AO1, Administrative Officer Grade 1, within the Public Service. Their salaries are linked to that at the minimum of that salary scale. It is a long salary scale. My own view is that putting them further up the scale at the point where the professional salaries of Government begin, which is, I think, around Z6 rather than Z10, would be more appropriate. These are things which can be discussed from time to time, and those who hold one view may well, in fact, give way to those who hold another, as always happens in discussion among reasonable people. But the relationship in those salaries is to the relationship with the point Z10 in the salary scale.

12.00 noon.

To sum up, the Resolutions are being introduced as a package, because as soon as we are dealing with Public Service regradings, there are a number of relativities which have to be brought into consideration, and these Resolutions reflect the bringing and consideration of those Resolutions. The first shot fired was that of where to place the judges. Once that was done, then it followed that adjustments would have to be made at the level of Director of Public Prosecutions, Permanent Secretary Grade 1, and so on right down to Z. 15. These adjustments have been made. The teaching posts where relativities had been disturbed have had their relativities restored. In terms of the political posts, whether at the level of Minister, Speaker of the House, Leader of the Opposition, Member of Parliament, all of these posts have now been slotted in with the relativities which have been established for a long time.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the first of these Resolutions, the Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1984.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. President, Senator Barrow in introducing this first Resolution indicated that he was going to make one speech that would cover all three Resolutions which are related. I just want to say that I will in the course of the discussions determine whether I will be making one speech or four speeches. I just want to make it very clear that his making one speech does not tie me down to making one speech. I may very well wish to make four speeches.

Let us look at the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, No. 3, which is the instant Order of the day. I want right at the very outset to raise my objection to the manner in which this particular Resolution, as indeed all the other Resolutions, are being introduced in the Senate here today. I know, as you have indicated, that the Rules of the Senate permit this to be done, and I am not commenting on that. However, I believe that this kind of matter, the question of the late submission of these papers, is one which ought to be taken into consideration when one is called upon to deal with these matters.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. President: It is a matter for you how far a member is within his right to reflect on the Standing Orders and the rules governing debate. That is a matter for him. It is, of course, obviously a time wasting exercise, but I must point out that it is not true to say that the papers were delivered late. It is true that I got mine yesterday, and it is true that Senator Greaves got his yesterday, according to his own admission. That, according to the Rules of the Senate, is not late, and I would like the Honourable Senator to observe the truth a little more.

Mr. PRESIDENT. Just a minute, Senator Greaves. At an earlier stage in this meeting, at what I thought was the appropriate time, I allowed Senator Greaves to make known his views on the question of dealing with these Resolutions today. He did, and as far as the Chair is concerned that particular issue has been discussed and settled.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES. Sir, I wonder what kind of moral conscience is guiding this country, particularly from the political level, where we have a situation where the Prime Minister, the Governor of the Central Bank and those people who speak on financial matters are constantly calling on workers who are less well paid, who are not as well off as persons who are going to benefit from these Resolutions here today, to tighten their belts, to make all sorts of sacrifices in order for this economy to stabilise, and for this country to grow.

We have a situation now, for example, where hotel workers – and it is recognised that the hotel industry is a key industry in the social and economic development of this country – are being called upon to tighten their belts to the extent that the employers in that industry have offered no increase to those workers. Indeed, they are being called upon to work for the same level of wages which they enjoyed in 1983 to be enjoyed right up until 1986. The same can be said of many other categories of workers in this country. Those workers who are really in the productive sector of the economy are being called upon to make the kind of sacrifices that I have talked about. But we have a situation where the Government is moving to regrade persons in the top rungs of the Civil Service and in other areas of the Civil Service, thereby placing a base on which Ministers and Parliamentary salaries can be fixed, against which.....

(SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Foolishness!)

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Foolishness? It is a fact! By your own admission you talk about that!

This question of regrading has a very long history. The unions, certainly I can speak for the Barbados Workers' Union, have been seeking to get a number of categories in the lower rung of the Public Service regraded for a number of years without any avail. The Government has paid absolutely no regard to the cogent and logical arguments which have been presented for the regrading of people in these categories. I refer to people in the key scales, particularly the skilled workers, the electricians, the masons, the carpenters, the mechanics and those categories whose skills would demand that they be paid a higher level of wages. Little or no regard has been paid to this.

You will very well recall that when the increases were granted earlier this year there was some regrading which took place, and you will recall the extent of that regrading; very, very little. In fact, I think one category was dropped and the few workers of that category incorporated into a higher category. The result was that their net increase in salary was $1.66 a week. It was of no consequence whatsoever, and it certainly did not pay attention to the kind of arguments which were advanced by the Barbados Workers' Union to regrade these areas.
12.10 p.m.

I well remember that in 1982, when we were discussing the wages and salaries in the Public Service, at a meeting with the Prime Minister he gave an undertaking that the Government would look favourably at regrading, particularly to the skilled workers in the key scales. Up to this day, nothing has been done. What do you find? You find, as I described earlier, an indecent haste, as demonstrated in this kind of exercise here, where the people who are really going to benefit from this exercise are people in the higher rungs of the Public Service.

I am speaking from a position of disadvantage, because, as I said, I have not had the opportunity to really look at these proposals in the way that I would have liked to look at them, and therefore I cannot make the kind of comparisons that can be made in this exercise. But I suppose this is the way in which the Government wants to do things. I do not really see any particular reason for it, but it suggests to me a behaviour short of cowardice on the part of the Government. We are reaching a very low level in our political life when matters like these, which ought to be widely ventilated and discussed, are rushed with the indecent haste that we are seeing these things rushed here today.

So, as I have said, from a point of view of principle I cannot support this Resolution, for the reason which I indicated earlier on and which I do not want to repeat, lest I am ruled out of order. Secondly, as I have said, submissions have been made in the past, long ago, for regradings in other areas of the Public Service which really need regrading, and they have been paid scant attention to by the Government – and we now have a situation by the Government where consideration is being paid to the higher echelons of the Service, to the exclusion of those people in the key scales for which requests and proposals have been made for some time. I want to indicate very clearly that I will not be supporting this Resolution.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I have noted Senator Greaves' points and I have noted that, in fact, not one point which he made contained any points objecting in principle or otherwise to the subject matter of the Resolution.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put to the Senate and agreed to, SENATOR GREAVES dissenting.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (TEACHERS) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) ORDER, 1984

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1984.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. President, I am seeking some guidance. Can the Leader of the House indicate whether teachers from the Barbados Community College are covered in this Resolution?

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, there has been a relativity between the salaries of teachers from the Community College and teachers covered in this Order. The fact is, however, as they are under a Statutory Board, their emoluments, as I understand it, are not usually reflected in the Civil Establishment Order.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: The reason why I am asking is that I did read in the newspaper that the Prime Minister had made some reference to the fact that regradings would also take place for teachers at the Barbados Community College.

Asides

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: That is not right?

There is a principle of dealing with matters. I really do not know what has become of principles these days. The Barbados Workers Union had submitted proposals for the regrading of teachers at the Barbados Community College, and I know that we have been experiencing extreme difficulties in meeting with the Board and the Ministry in order to have these matters discussed, and we were taken back to discover that the Government has gone ahead and done the regradings without any discussion or consultation with the union which represents the teachers at the Community College. I thought that at least some kind of decency would have prevailed....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Order.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: I thought that my advice was specifically sought and specifically given. I thought I said that, as far as I was aware, the Order did not cover those teachers since they are employees of a statutory board, but that evidently there would be relativities.

I do not think that there is anything I can do to change the fact that there will be relativities. I do not think that the Senator's comments are therefore in order.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I do not see anything in the Schedule to the particular Order that deals with the Community College.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put to the Senate and agreed to, SENATOR GREAVES dissenting.

12.20 p.m.

MINISTERS AND PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES (REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES) ORDER, 1984

Order No. 13 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances) Order, 1984.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I beg to move that the Senate concur in the Resolution to approve the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances) Order, 1984.

SENATOR E E. GREAVES: Mr. President, I feel very disturbed to think that in the light of what I have said previously, this Resolution is now being discussed here today. I believe that there should be a certain quality of leadership, and there are certain examples which ought to be indulged in by the political directorate. People, to some extent; still tend to look for some kind of example and lead being set by people who enter the political arena. As a result it is my contention that we ought to demonstrate some concern for our nation, our economy, and for our development, rather than having a situation where the words "greed", "deceit", "a lack of principle", and "a lack of morals" can easily be directed. That is the kind of way in which I submit these increases which I will deal with in a minute have been granted, the way in which the whole exercise is being carried out, and the background against which it is being carried out. That is how I would characterise that Government, the Barbados Labour Party Administration.

Let us look at the kind of increases which are being granted here today. I want to do two things: first, to look at the increases which have been granted this year on top of the 1982 salaries, and then I want to trace the trend of increases in parliamentary salaries since 1976. I believe we are going to find a very interesting picture emerging.

Senator Barrow talked about this question of increases. One would have gotten the impression, certainly when salaries in the public service were discussed, that the

same level of increases which were granted to people in the Public Service would have been granted to people in the political directorate. But we get a new departure. That is no longer the case – that used to be the case – and now the Government is talking about restoration of relativities, and when I say that the Government lacks principle, that is what I am talking about. In one instance, they have said that they were prepared to take the same level of increases which were granted to people in the Public Service, 15 per cent and 5 per cent. Now we are talking about relativities, and do you know what relativities mean? It means 15 per cent and 5 per cent and something on top of the 15 per cent and 5 per cent, so I am saying that the Ministers, the Prime Minister, Parliamentarians and the people in the political directorate who will be getting increases based on these recommendations will be getting more than 15 per cent and 5 per cent.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: On a point of order: Not only is the honourable Member talking arrant nonsense, but he is also misleading the House. There is no increase in this for the Prime Minister or Deputy Prime Minister.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: When Senator Barrow introduced the Resolution he said that one speech would do for all. I believe that I can exercise the option if I want to talk about the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister. When he introduced the Civil Establishment Order No. 3, he talked about the Ministers. He wanted to know how I would rate the Ministers and what would I pay a Minister, so why can I not talk about this now.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just a minute, Senator Greaves. I do not think anyone is trying to stop you from speaking about the Ministers and the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister in this Resolution. What the Minister was saying was that if you are speaking about them, you should speak accurately about what refers to them.

I am the person conducting this debate and I allowed on the first Resolution's introduction a wide scope in relation to the other Resolutions, because quite obviously they overlap and it would save this Senate a tremendous amount of repetition and waste of time. They are all relating to the same subject. I am still of that opinion and I am still allowing that. Senator Greaves proceed.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Sir, I am saying without fear of contradiction from Senator Barrow or anybody else that the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister will get an increase. I said from the beginning that I will show the increases which have taken place between 1982 and the proposals for 1984. I said that and the Record will show that very clearly. So do not worry to come and tell me there is nothing in here for them. There is something in here for them.
12.30 p.m.

Let us look – since you want to deal with the Deputy Prime Minister and the Prime Minister separately, I will deal with them separately – at the Ministers. The Ministers of Government, the thirteen or fourteen of them – I do not know how many Ministers there are, are getting an increase of 25 per cent on their 1982 salaries. That is the extent of the increase. In 1982, the salary of a Minister was $49 812. The proposal in 1984 is $62 400. Further, they are getting a 53 per cent increase in their entertainment allowance, which is moving from $8 640 per annum to $13 200 per annum. They are getting an increase of 31 per cent on their travelling allowance, which moves from $9 360 to $12 264.

A lot can be said about this kind of situation. One has only, for example, to look at the entertainment allowance of a Minister now. One would find that entertainment allowance, which is free of taxation, is more than the wages or salaries that some people earn in Barbados today. For a travelling allowance, you will find that he also gets a figure in excess of some of the wages and salaries which are paid in Barbados today. That is not all. There are some Ministers of Government who have the privilege of driving a car assigned to the Ministry which is fully serviced by the Ministry, and I doubt very much that it takes less travelling allowance or that there is any per rated arrangement for the travelling allowance. So, as a result of this, one finds that the Ministers are in a most privileged position.

Let us go back to 1976 and let us trace this whole scenario of salaries for Ministers. In 1976 a Minister of Government was working for $24 000 a year or $2 000 a month, with a duty allowance of $9 600. His total emoluments in 1976 were $33 600. This salary has now moved to $87 864, a percentage increase of 161.5 per cent. Parliamentary Secretaries are going to get a 63 per cent increase on their salaries in 1984. The Parliamentary Secretary in 1982 was getting a salary of $27 216 per annum, and it is now proposed to raise the salary to $44 400. In addition to this 63 per cent on his salary, he will get an increase of 56 per cent on his entertainment allowance, which moves from $5 760 to $9 000. He will also get a 38 per cent increase on his travelling allowance, which moves from $6 240 to $8 640. So if you were to look at the salary of a Parliamentary Secretary in 1984 and compare it with the salary of a Parliamentary Secretary in 1976, you would find that in 1976 a Parliamentary Secretary earned $21 600 per annum and in 1984 the Parliamentary Secretary will earn $62 040. Of course, in 1985, which will be the period of this new arrangement that we are talking about, it will be more.

The Speaker will get a 32 per cent increase in his 1982 salary in 1984, moving from $40 140 to $52 800. He will, in addition, be getting $10 224 per annum as a duty allowance, which has been reintroduced. It was dropped in 1978 from the Speaker and now in 1984 it has been reintroduced. His entertainment allowance rises by 50 per cent, moving from $7 200 to $10 800. So one finds that if one were to make a comparison between the salary earned by the Speaker in 1976 with that which the present Speaker, if he is a full time Speaker, will earn, will move from $19 800 to $73 824, or an increase of 272.8 per cent. Just for the Record the Parliamentary Secretary's salary moved by 187.2 per cent. The Deputy Speaker will benefit to the tune of a 49 per cent increase on his salary.

(SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: What about the Leader of the Opposition?)

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I am going to deal with everybody. I sat down in peace and listened to you. If you do not want to hear me, you can go outside. I am going to take my time on this.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Try and address the Chair, Senator Greaves. You know that.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Yes, Sir.

The Deputy Speaker gets an increase of 49 per cent on his 1982 salary, moving it from $21 156 to $31 476. In addition to that, he will benefit from the reintroduction of a duty allowance of $7 152 per year. He will further get $9 000 a year as entertainment allowance, which shows a 56 per cent increase on the entertainment allowance which he was granted in 1982. If one were to compare the salary of the Deputy Speaker in 1984 with that of the Deputy Speaker in 1976, one would find that the Deputy Speaker in 1976 earned $14 400 per annum and in 1984 he will be earning $47 628, which would be an increase of 230.7 per cent.

12.40 p.m.

The Chairman of Committees will move from $27 132 in 1982 to $36 000 in 1984, or he will be benefitting to the tune of 33 per cent increase on his salary. He will also benefit from the re-introduction of a duty allowance of $7 152 per annum, and his entertainment allowance has been increased, from $4 320 to $7 200 or an increase of 66 per cent. His salary between 1976 and 1984 has moved from $14 400 to $50 352, or 250 per cent.

The Leader of the Opposition was getting $34 296 in 1982. In 1984 he will get $52 800, or an increase of 54 per cent. A duty allowance of $7 152 has been re-introduced, and an entertainment allowance, which was $5 760 per annum in 1982, has now jumped – and notice the word I have used, I have not used it with any of the others – to $10 800, or an increase of 87 per cent. The emoluments of the others – to $10 800, or an increase of 87 per cent. The emoluments of the Leader of the Opposition in 1976 were $16 200, and in 1984 the emoluments of the Leader of the Opposition has risen to $70 752, or a percentage increase of 336.7 per cent.

Other Members. In 1982 a Member of Parliament earned $16 056 per annum. In 1984 a Member of Parliament will earn $23 436 per annum, or an increase of 46 per cent on the 1982 salary. There is also the reintroduction of a duty allowance of $7 152 per annum, and the entertainment allowance has jumped from $4 320 to $7 200, or an increase of 67 per cent. If one were to compare the salary of a Member of Parliament between 1976 and 1984, one would find that whereas in 1976 a Member of Parliament earned $12 000 per annum, in 1984 a Member of Parliament is earning $37 788 per annum, or an increase of 214.9 per cent over the period.

The point I am making in this is that one would find, if one were to examine the increases on the salaries of Members of the House, that these increases, in some instances amount to 46 per cent, 54 per cent, 33 per cent, 49 per cent, 32 per cent, 63 per cent and 25 per cent, will leave the others for the next debate. These increases are far in excess of the general increases which have been granted in the Public Service during the last negotiations. So much for the principle that the Government talks about, that increases which apply to people in the Civil Service will apply to Ministers and parliamentarians.

I did not refer to the President of the Senate, the Deputy President of the Senate and Senators. Can I just seek your guidance here, Sir? I do not want to run into any trouble with you, Mr. President. I will be speaking of an office, I am not trying in any way to cast any aspersions on the office. I will be dealing purely with figures.

The President of the Senate in 1982 earned $20 100 per annum. In 1984 the salary of the President of the Senate will move to $31 476, giving the holder of that office a percentage increase of 56 per cent. The holder of the office is also entitled to a duty allowance of $9 000 per annum. That has not been touched. If you were to compare the emoluments of the President of the Senate in 1976 with 1984, you will find that in 1976 the President of the Senate got a duty allowance and an entertainment allowance combined, which came to $4 800 per annum. He did not get a salary. In 1978 the President of the Senate was put on a salary, so in 1984, if you were to combine the salary and duty allowance, you would find that the difference between 1976 and 1984 in

terms of emoluments received would be $4 800 in 1976 as against $40 476 in 1984, or a percentage increase of 743.2 per cent.
12.50 p.m.

The Deputy President of the Senate in 1982 earned $7 800 per annum. In 1984, he is earning $9 000, thereby getting an increase of 15 per cent. If you were to make the comparison between 1976 and 1984, one would find that whereas in 1976 he received a duty allowance of $3 000 per annum, now the duty allowance has been increased to $9 000 which is an increase of over 200 per cent.

In 1976, Senators received a duty allowance of $3 000. In 1980, it was moved to $6 000. In 1982, it was at $6 000, and now in 1984 there is a proposal to move it to $7 200, or an increase of 20 per cent. Between 1976–1984 one finds that the duty allowance of Senators moved from $3 000 to $7 200, or an increase of 140 per cent.

The point is that this exercise demonstrates very clearly that, on the basis of salary increases, the people in the political directorate have come out handsomely. This is indecent. This is vulgar. This is disgusting. It shows a lack of principle and a lack of morals to do something like this. This could only be characterized as people who are determined to feather their own nests at any cost. This is nothing short of people feathering their own nests at the expense of the taxpayers, who you are calling upon to tighten their belts, to make sacrifices in order for this country to get back on an even keel, when all that you are doing is just raping this country everyday.

This has nothing to do with the amount of allowances when those Ministers travel at the taxpayers expense. Each one of them earns between $20 000 to $25 000 a year travelling on behalf of the Government – at the expense of the taxpayers of this country. I say that without any fear of contradiction.

Asides.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Do you want figures? It is embarrassing? It is nothing short of feathering your nests. That is what you are doing, and yet you are calling upon the poor people to hold strain and tighten their belts and all these kinds of things. How can you expect, with this kind of example that you are setting, that one can ask the hotel workers – we are now locked in negotiations with the Hotel Association, and one recognizes the problem – who do not even get as a wage or salary what you get as entertainment allowance per month, or indeed as travelling allowance, to hold strain. How do you expect those persons to feel when they know that they are the productive sector. They are the people who are really making a meaningful contribution to the development and growth of this country, and they are being asked to tighten their belts, when all the Government is doing is feathering their nests, ripping off this country. That is what the Government is doing, and all the members who are a party to these decisions.

I said earlier on what kind of moral leadership instructs these kinds of decisions. I believe that this kind of behaviour on the part of the Government can only further add to the disrepute that politicians have in this society. It is nothing short of being greedy and exploitative. That is how one can characterize these things.

In the figures that I have given you for the increases between 1982 –1984, only in two instances would one find an increase in the region of 20 per cent. Because between 1982 and 1984, Senators will get a 20 per cent increase; the Deputy President, 15.4 per cent, the President, 39.1 per cent; Members of Parliament, 46.3 per cent; the Leader of the Opposition, 55.4 per cent; the Chairman of Committees, 36.4 per cent; the Deputy Speaker, 47.1 per cent; the Speaker, 34 per cent, the Parliamentary Secretaries, 58.2 per cent, Ministers, 29.6 per cent. That is the range of increases which have been granted by these proposals, and yet you are asking some people to tighten their belts, and make all sorts of sacrifices, forego increases. There is no way that I can support this Resolution, and I believe that anybody who has any concern for the country ought not to support it.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, my first point in relation to all that Senator Greaves has said is to express the solemn hope that the next time he comes in here and tells us how unprepared he is, he does not bring along such detailed annotation. Really, it is asking the Chamber to accept a lot to listen to his arrogant nonsense and, at the same time, put up with untruths.

I now understand why it is that Senator Greaves cannot now be called upon to negotiate for the Barbados Workers' Union. In any significant negotiation his absence is a most obvious factor, and when you look at the way he is jumbling his figures together, the way he puts salaries and allowances together in order to arrive at a particular effect, there is no wonder that Mr. Walcott would not trust him to go anywhere with a negotiation team, because the first thing in a negotiation is to ensure that you understand what you are doing. In this particular case, not only does he not understand what he is doing, but he does not understand that we over here understand what this exercise is about.

Take, for example, his throwing percentages left, right and centre. What is the point talking about a Minister's percentage increase, even if you were accurate, being 161 per cent without saying that at the bottom of

the range workers in the Public Service got percentage increases of over 300 per cent, so that we understand that if we are talking about eroding the differences which reflect responsibility, there has to be some redress. And he is looking at the 1973 salaries, do not mind he talks about 1976. That 1976, was the year the Government refused to come down with an increase, so he is talking about what salaries were settled in 1973.
1.00 p.m.

What is the point of talking about 161 per cent without noting, other things. I want to know if he really wants to mislead this Senate. If he wants to talk about morality and be so dishonest at the same time as not to mention that Permanent Secretaries on the same 1973 settlement were getting over $18 000 a year or $19 440, and therefore now their salary is multiplied by more than three, where Ministers have multiplied by less than three on his own 160 per cent-odd, what is the point of throwing out figures like that which of themselves have no meaning, and also corrupting the process by misleading the Chamber into believing that the public officers were doing worse at the same time? That is the implication of what he has been trying to do.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: On a point of order: I do not think it is fair for the Senator to say that I was misleading the House to suggest that public officers, and I am assuming the public officers he is talking about would be Permanent Secretaries, were doing worse, because I have not talked about Permanent Secretaries.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, let me explain what I mean by misleading the House. In the first place, Senator Greaves in his long dissertation, or whatever you want to call it, spent a lot of time making the point that at the political level we said we would take whatever increases are given to the public officers, but that, in fact, that is not so. As a matter of plain simple direct honesty, if he is referring to what the Permanent Secretaries are getting, he cannot say that is not so. The internal logic of the position is that he is seeking to compare politicians and what they are getting with what officers at the lower end are getting. However, as he develops his point, he then goes back to 1976 for politicians, but sticks closely to 1982 for public officers at the bottom, comparing like and unlike. He is either ignorant to do it or very dishonest, but in any event he is misleading this Chamber.

In order to arrive at his conclusions, he takes allowances and salaries and lump them together. And he does more, because as I sat down here I felt relieved for a bit, and then I realised that tomorrow I will still have to return to reality, because he even gave me an increase in my travelling allowance! The documents before us and every other conceivable document will show there has been no increase in travelling allowance. But the whole question of lumping these things together is dangerous, because Ministers have their allowances separately stated. We get a salary and we get an allowance for this and an allowance for that, all very clearly set out.

If you compare the allowances, you will find the relativities between the salaries and the allowances; you go back to 1973 and come up to 1984 again. But that is not how he wants it. The way Senator Greaves wants it, is for us to return to the practice of 1973 when you got something called duty allowance – you no longer got a travel or entertainment allowance as the case used to be when the first Labour Party was in power; it was changed to a duty allowance – and then you operated in relation to entertainment expenses, like how the General Secretary or the Deputy General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union or a Managing Director of a firm in Bridgetown would operate – sign like you have got an expense account. They do not have to talk about allowances at the top of the union.

The union is a funny place, because if you go like poor Trotty did one year and try to negotiate on behalf of the staff, you suddenly find that you are out forever. Or if you go to the Telephone Company and put up phoney notices. Poor Trotty! But I am not getting in that; I am dealing straight with Senator Greaves. I am not going to deal with the other fellow yet.

When Senator Greaves was talking, one of my colleagues made a comment, and I had to agree with it. He said, "Is this all the money we are getting and we have to listen to this?" Because the hardest work in the world is to listen to Senator Greaves and try to pick sense out of it. One of the things that Senator Greaves should have done when he was talking so energetically and so loudly was to stress – mark you he said enough about the Leader of the Opposition to cost him his Senate seat. I have seen two fellows fired from in here for less – he pointed, but he did not worry to emphasise it – that the only holder of a public office who on his calculations got the percentage increase which people at the bottom have got was the Leader of the Opposition, because on his calculations the Leader of the Opposition is the only person with an increase of 336 per cent. Why do you not call the Leader of the Opposition immoral for accepting it, and why does Senator Greaves not decide he is not accepting his?

This whole debate on salaries has been significant. Check what happened in the Other Place. The general tenor of debate from Opposition benches was not disagreement. It was a case of not that we do not want, not that we do not think you are entitled and that we are entitled, but it is the way you do it. Why do you not set up a tribunal? Set up somebody so that we can hide behind that body and then say we did not pay ourselves, he paid us. I am not going to call it dishonesty, but you can decide. It is very obvious what you are getting on with.

When they came to vote, the only person in there who was not there to vote was the Leader of the Opposition. He is never there to vote against coppers. Never in one debate will you find that the present Leader of the Opposition voted against increases. Even when he was in Government, he would send down, but he was never there to vote against coppers. I think 1971 was the exception.

It is known that members of the Opposition, Senator Greaves' colleagues, were very upset when the Administrative Assistant to the Leader of the Opposition was found to be getting more than they. His post was equated with that of an Administrative Officer II which caused people to look at the relativities again, and they recognised that in the meantime the Members of Parliament, whose post used to be equated with Administrative Officer I, which is the higher of these two administrative posts, had slipped and they put it back. Then Senator Greaves will get in here and talk about his members, really, because he is not talking about us.

The fellows are making enough noise. I have been told some hard things over it, at least in the Other Place, and Senator Greaves talked about morality and decency. They had the decency and the morality not to be there for the vote, so this debate will go down as the one in which Senator Greaves and Dr. Haynes alone were there to vote against. I have been wondering for a long time which faction the DLP Senator belongs to; now I know.
1.10 p.m.

He is worried about the emoluments of the President of the Senate. Let me put the position. Just as we accepted the principle of the relativity between the post of the Minister and the post of the Leader of the Opposition, we accepted that the post of President of the Senate should be equated with that of the Deputy Speaker for purposes of remuneration.

When I went to school, it used to be very difficult to express a precise percentage when you were saying what percentage of zero, say, seven was. I went to school too long ago to remember whether that is infinity or what. Senator Williams says once you divide by zero, it is infinity. He dealt with the emoluments pertaining to your office carrying it from a time where it got nothing at all for salary to a time now when it is given a salary, and arrives at 743 per cent.

(SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: He was not receiving any money before.)

SENATOR THE HON N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, if Senator Greaves wants to tell me that taxable salary and non-taxable allowances are the same thing, then I would understand again why he cannot negotiate for anybody.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: (Money that comes in your hand.)

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: The money that comes in your hand apparently is the same thing. Whether it is a non-taxable allowance or a taxable salary, it is the same thing. I do not know what he is talking about.

(SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: The President of the Senate was getting no money before. That is all.)

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I feel that I should be able to find something more in what Senator Greaves said, and I am really searching these bits of paper I have before me. I do not want to be doing any disservice to a man who talks about greed, deceit, lack of principle and lack of morals.

I find it difficult to accept the whole contribution which Senator Greaves made, which is so clearly marked by lack of sense. People who are accustomed negotiating for people who work for $52 000 per year and more, and who are still asking for an increase, should not come in here and talk in those terms. If you want to argue that somebody who exercises a certain level of responsibility should hold strain, then why do you not go and argue that somebody else should hold strain? I would like Mr. Walcott to try out Senator Greaves with a couple of minor negotiations, because you cannot put him in anything big initially, and then let him get the feel of what it is like to have to negotiate and face facts.

We on this side never suggested that the Port workers were not entitled to an increase, and yet we know that a security guard at the Port works for more than a Permanent Secretary. We know that $52 000 is peanuts down there, but we did not say they should not get an increase. But the Port is the backbone of the Barbados Workers' Union.

Why should the union now come in here to suggest that people who are working hard and holding offices with the awesome responsibility as Ministers should not get an increase? It is cheap, dirty, political tricks. That is the real trouble. If the Senator does not stop with that foolishness, he is not going to get back in the House.

The question that the Senate approve the Resolution was put to the Senate and agreed to.

THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY (REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES OF MEMBERS) ORDER, 1984

Order No. 14 was called – Resolution to approve the Senate and House of Assembly (Remuneration and Allowances of Members) Order, 1984.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, just before I formerly move this item, I crave your

indulgence for a moment, because I should like to change the order which I had given a little earlier. We propose to take the Foreign Sales Corporation Bill immediately after this.

I beg to move that the Senate concur in the Resolution to approve the Senate and House of Assembly (Remuneration and Allowances of Members) Order, 1984.

Mr. PRESIDENT: It is proposed that the Senate concur in this Resolution.

Senator Greaves. Just a minute. It was my understanding that you took advantage of the latitude I gave on the other Resolution.....

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Wrong!

Mr. PRESIDENT: Are you listening to me, Senator Greaves? Kindly do not interrupt. I think you took the opportunity of the last Order and spoke on this. I merely wish to point out that unless you have something new to contribute to this issue, I will have to pull you up.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I know that you listen very carefully to what I say in here. If you did not hear or if you did not understand what I said, I would suggest that you get a copy of the Record, because I indicated very clearly, at the beginning that unlike Senator Barrow, I may be speaking four times. There are four separate and distinct Resolutions, and I said that, unlike him, I will determine whether I want to speak four times or not. Nobody can determine that for me. So I will be proceeding with this other one now, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You will speak, but you will not say anything that you said in the last debate pertaining to this Resolution.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I will not talk about greed. I will not talk about lack of moral leadership. I will not talk about deceit. I will not talk about raping the country under this Resolution. But I will talk about the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister and the salaries relating to them.

In 1982, the Prime Minister earned a salary of.....

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Yes.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: The point I sought to make a lot earlier had to do with accuracy, but this time it has to do with relevance, because we are now on a Resolution to approve the Senate and House of Assembly (Remuneration and Allowances of Members) Order, which Order does not relate to anyone holding ministerial rank.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Since the two were combined, I assumed they were done on the same Order.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am very glad that you have made a mistake and accepted it so graciously. This is something new.

Laughter.

The question that the Senate approve the Resolution was put to the Senate and agreed to.

BARBADOS FOREIGN SALES CORPORATION ACT, 1984

Order No. 8 was called – To move the First Reading of a Bill to make provision for income tax and other concessions to foreign sales corporations established in Barbados.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: This matter before the Honourable Chamber has to do with the Act for the establishment of foreign sales corporations in Barbados. Before I move into a few details on the Bill, I would just like to point out that we have had an opportunity to bring this Act before Parliament to take advantage of changes in law in the United States Senate, and we were only able to take advantage of United States law because of the fact that one of our Ministers has been able, through a series of visits to Washington, to negotiate a double taxation treaty which is of inestimable value to this country. When we talk about Ministers travelling abroad and so on, we can use this instance as a pointer to indicate that if the country wants benefits one cannot sit in Barbados and obtain these benefits. This is a simple example where the benefits to Barbados are manifold.

1.20 p.m.

As far as the FSCs are concerned, it will mean the generation of jobs in the professional area, particularly for accountants and attorneys-at-law. An increasing number of accountants will be required to service the kind of anticipated activity which will come about because of the establishment of FSCs.

There will also be contributions deriving from expenditure in connection with the trade operations of the foreign sales corporations and also the expansion of Barbados' offshore sector. An additional benefit to the country would of course accrue because of the presence of these operations here, the opportunity is provided for using investment capital for further development in the

country. These are some of the benefits which will accrue as a result of the signing of the double taxation treaty and the exchange of information agreement which is very important to this country.

Because of the laws relating to the Foreign Sales Corporation Bill, the foreign management requirements would also be beneficial to this country in terms of more quality visitors, since all directors and shareholders meetings must be held out of the United States jurisdiction. That is a legal requirement of the United States. So if foreign sales corporations are established in Barbados, it is most likely that directors and shareholders will be meeting in Barbados, hence a contribution to the tourist industry.

A further benefit as a result of the foreign management requirement is that the foreign sales corporation must maintain its principal bank account outside the United States of America. Therefore, if Barbados is to attract some of these FSCs, it means more banking activity in this country. It also means that the dividends, legal and accounting fees, officers' and directors' salaries and so on will be paid out of the corporate bank accounts outside of the United States of America.

It is important that we recognise that when Government is involved in activity of this kind, that it is foolish to try to calculate what it costs for a Minister to travel abroad, especially when it is recognised that there are tremendous benefits accruing to the country from the Minister's visits. Anybody who understands or is involved in the process of Government would appreciate that you cannot run a Government in isolation, that the country has a number of international obligations, and therefore Ministers must travel. I do not know how to calculate the cost of Ministers' travel in isolation, because you have to look at the benefits accruing to the kind of activity being pursued.

The leader of the Workers' Union travels to Geneva and other countries on ILO business, and it is a benefit to the country. He travels a lot, he travels first class on the Concorde, and stays in two bedroom suites. And it is the workers' money, but nobody hears about it.

To get back to the FSCs and the reason for the establishment of the FSCs, this is a very happy marriage in this instance. It is a happy marriage because before the establishment of the foreign sales corporation there was something called the domestic international sales corporation, which was an establishment in the United States of America, and as a result of complaints and threats, particularly by countries in the European Economic Community, complaining that the domestic international sales corporations in the United States were benefiting to the disadvantage of countries in the EEC and other areas, the United States Government decided to change the law. It was, in fact, pointed out that the operation of the domestic international Sales Corporation was in violation of the General Agreement of Trade and Tariff. In 1984, this new law was established, which makes it mandatory for U.S. companies to operate abroad.

The attraction for U.S. companies to operate abroad is more one of income tax benefits, since they will gain from exclusion of certain income tax provisions in the United States of America. There are about 10 000 companies which will come of stream, and therefore we will be looking for offshore applications between now, I daresay, and some time next year.

Barbados has moved very quickly in this regard. It is one of the countries certified by the United States as a qualified domicile, and it qualifies because of the signing of the Exchange of Information Agreement in November, when Dr. Cheltenham negotiated the double taxation treaty. I believe that this is a further step towards the establishment of Barbados as an offshore regime. We have offshore banking, we have exempt insurance, shipping, and the international business companies, and the passage of this legislation will ensure that Barbados again is one of the countries in the forefront trying to take advantage of this new business which will come offshore the United States of America, and which will be of inestimable value to the country as a whole.

I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. President, I want to get some information from Senator Griffith relative to the agreement which was signed between the Barbados Government and the United States Government concerning the exchange of information. He did indicate that in November such an agreement was signed as the prelude to this particular arrangement coming into force, and I wonder if he could give the House the benefit of the kind of information which would be involved in this particular exercise, and certainly what this exchange of information arrangement covers.

This is the major thing I want to find out, because I would think that this bit of legislation, since we are into this whole question of offshore banking, not necessarily offshore companies operating in Barbados, would be a natural development from that. I am just interested in that particular aspect. I wonder if he could enlighten us on this agreement, – how it will be operating and what it is.

1.30 p.m.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: During the negotiations on the Caribbean Basin Initiative, there was a process where the U.S. Government teams came out looking at the countries in the Caribbean talking about need for an exchange of information agreement. This

related particularly to the kind of information which would impact on those people who were American citizens and probably laundering funds or engaging in such illicit activity. This has been a significant problem in the United States. If we look at offshore banking regimes in some countries, even in the Caribbean, it was noted that there was significant suspicion that American citizens were putting their money into offshore banks and thereby laundering money which could be considered money gained because of the drug trade, or, indeed, keeping money offshore to avoid taxation.

The United States negotiating team, at the time when they were looking at the CBI designations, therefore asked as a part of the designation process that countries in the Caribbean who wanted to be designated as CBI beneficiary countries, would, in effect, sign an Exchange of Information Agreement saying that they are prepared to provide information on American citizens suspected of laundering funds and keeping external accounts. This was done as a pressure tactic, because some of the offshore regimes in the Caribbean were reluctant to provide the kind of information that the U.S. authorities needed, for instance, for prosecution purposes, if they suspected people. At the time, the Barbados Government rejected the request out of hand. We said at the time that we were not prepared to just accept any blanket agreement from the United States, or, indeed, any Government, where they were operating on the basis of suspicion. We did not accept it as part of the CBI designation process.

There are a lot of countries in the Caribbean which, because of their own laws, were not prepared to subscribe to any Exchange of Information Agreement, and the two penalties that the United States sought to impose on countries were (1) no C.B.I designation, and (2), not allowing American organizations to have convention expenses deducted when the conventions were held offshore. These were the penalties they were holding over the heads of countries that wanted benefits.

Under this present designation, we were able to get the United States to revise their position on the whole matter and agree to a simple Exchange of Information Agreement where their laws were first put in place so that they could identify people who were guilty, because we did not want to be part of a witch hunt. It is just a simple Exchange of Information Agreement allowing basic information to be passed on to the American authorities, and not allowing them in the first case, to use the offshore countries that wanted the benefits to conduct witch hunts, because the American authorities, particularly the Internal Revenue Service, were looking at Americans who they suspected of laundering money or keeping offshore accounts.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put to the Senate and agreed to.

On motion of SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH, Mr. PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate went into a Committee on the Bill, Senator J. C. W. WICKHAM in the Chair.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. Deputy President, I beg to move the the Bill be taken in Parts.

The question that the Bill be taken in Parts was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Parts I and II were called and passed.

Part III was called.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. Deputy President, before I move that Part III stand part, in Part III some amendments were made in the other Chamber, and for the benefit of this session, but in Part III, Sections 11 and 12 there were minor omissions.

In Section 11, the Bill should read "with the permission of the Minister of Finance". The words "of Finance " had been omitted in the introduction of the amendment. In Section 12, it should be "Minister of Finance " also. These changes are printing errors and I believe we should pass the Bill as submitted to us and then we can re-submit it to the Other Place.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Deputy President, obviously there is a little confusion here. This legislation has to become law very urgently, and if we go beyond the scope of the amendments made in the Other Place, we would evidently be referring it to the Other Place.

I would advise Senator Griffith to bring to the attention of the Chamber that if these omissions are held to be material, then at some future date the amending Bill will be sent back here. But we want to pass the Bill as amended in the Other Place.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. Deputy President, I beg to move that Part III stand part.

The question that Part III stand part of the Bill was put to the Senate and agreed to.

1.40 p.m.

Part IV was called and passed.

The First Schedule was called and passed.

The Second Schedule was called and passed.

On motion of Senator the Hon. C. A. GRIFFITH, the Senate was resumed and the Bill was reported as having passed the Committee without amendment, Mr. PRESIDENT in the Chair.

On separate motions of Senator the Hon. C. A. GRIFFITH, the Bill was read a third time forthwith and passed.

BORROWING OF £466 720 FROM THE CROWN AGENTS

Order No. 15 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the borrowing of the sum of £466 720 from the Crown Agents for Overseas Governments and Administrations for the supply of equipment for the Police Department and the Fire Service.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, we propose that this be the last Order of the day, and for that reason we did not wish to adjourn for lunch and come back.

This item is a rather straightforward item. It is in the nature of balance of payments support. At the time of consideration of 1984–85 Estimates, approval was obtained for the Police Department and Fire Service to acquire certain vehicles and equipment. Since then there has been an offer of financing, which is the subject of this Resolution, and evidently if you get reasonable terms to meet purchases to a certain period of time by way of an equipment loan, then it constitutes good business to do it that way. So instead of having to finance this out of general revenue, they are being financed over a longer period of time by an equipment loan.

I therefore beg to move that the Senate concur in this Resolution.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Sir, I just want to say that I found this Resolution in here when I came in. Maybe the rule which once talked about twenty-four hours' notice does not apply in this particular case. That is the way in which Government does its business.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: On a point of order: If Senator Greaves is saying he has not seen it before and would like us not to proceed with it, I am quite prepared to adjourn the Senate – we are going to adjourn until next Wednesday anyhow – because in this particular case I understand him to be saying he has not seen the Resolution before now, which is quite reasonable.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: As far as I am concerned, the Government can do what it likes, because it has been doing what it likes. Rules are bent according to the situation.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Under the circumstances, I believe we may as well proceed. Evidently, Senator Greaves' comments have only been for nuisance value.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I would like to test the feeling of the Senate as to whether they wish to proceed with this Resolution.

In view of the last statement made by Senator Greaves, the House will proceed with this Resolution.

The question that the Senate concur in the Resolution was put to the Senate and agreed to.

THE ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I beg to move that the Senate do now adjourn until Wednesday, December 19, 1984, at 11 o'clock in the morning.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to, and Mr. PRESIDENT adjourned the Senate accordingly.
1.50 p.m.

CONTENTS

Message re absence of Governor-General from island 581

Presentation of Papers 581

Motions relating to Business of Senate 582
Senator Barrow, 582; Mr. President, 582; Senator Greaves, 582.

Introduction of Bills 583

PUBLIC BUSINESS

Motion re Order of Business 583
Senator Barrow, 583, 584; Senator Greaves, 584.

Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1984 585
Senator Barrow, 585, Senator Greaves, 587, 588.

Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1984 589
Senator Barrow, 589; Senator Greaves, 589.

Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances) Order, 1984 589
Senator Greaves, 589, Senator Barrow, 592.

Senate and House of Assembly (Remuneration and Allowances of Members) Order, 1984 594
Senator Barrow, 594, Senator Greaves, 595.

Barbados Foreign Sales Corporation Act, 1984 595
Senator Griffith, 595, 596; Senator Greaves, 596, Senator Barrow, 597.

Borrowing of £466 720 from the Crown Agents 598
Senator Barrow, 598; Senator Greaves, 598.

ADJOURNMENT 598

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

BARROW, Hon. N. A.
CATO, His Honour Sir Arnott
GREAVES, E. E.
GRIFFITH, Hon. C. A.