THE

SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1986 – 91

Wednesday, November 4, 1987.

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Public Buildings on Wednesday, November 4, 1987, at 11.15 a.m.

PRESENT

His Honour Senator F. L. Walcott, O.B.E., (President);
His Honour Senator M. deL. Jordan, (Deputy President);
Senator the Hon. Sir James Tudor, K.C.M.G., (Minister of Foreign Affairs) (Leader of the Senate);
Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, (Minister of State, for the Civil Service);
Senator A. Morrison;
Senator V. C. Fraser;
Senator G. L. Eastmond;
Senator A. J. N. Phillips;
Senator T. A. Prescod;
Senator B. A. Miller;
Senator J. C. W. Wickham, M.B.E.;
Senator the Rev. Canon I. McK. Jones;
Senator L. A. Ward, G.C.M.;
Senator C. A. Blackman, Q.C.;
Senator P. Y. Forde;
Senator Dr. L. L. Shorey.

Prayers were led by Rev. Dr. Lionel Crawford.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The Senate is now in session.

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Mr. PRESIDENT: I have a Message from His Excellency the Governor-General to the Honourable Senate which states:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL
TO
THE HONOURABLE THE SENATE

His Excellency the Governor-General has the honour to inform the Honourable The Senate that, in accordance with the advice of the Prime Minister under section 39(1)(f) of the Constitution, the seat in the Senate held by Mr. Frederick Gladstone Smith, Q.C., was declared vacant with effect from 20th August, 1987.

HUGH W. SPRINGER
Governor-General.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE
BARBADOS.
11 September, 1987.

There is another message, and it states:

Ref.GG:4 Vol. VIII 14th October, 1987.

Dear Mr. President,

I shall be away from the island from 24 October to 19 November, 1987, on a private visit to Britain.

In accordance with the provision of Section 29(1)(b) of the Constitution, The Hon. Sir Denys Williams, Kt., GCM, Chief Justice, will perform the functions of the office of Governor-General during my absence.

As The Honourable The Senate is not in session, it will not be possible for the usual formal

Message to be sent down to your Chamber. Will you therefore please bring my absence formally to the attention of The Honourable The Senate when next it meets.

I have the honour to be,
Yours faithfully,
HUGH W. SPRINGER
Governor-General

His Honour
The President of the Senate

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I beg to lay the following

The Housing (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1987.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1987.

The Cinematograph Film Censorship (Charges) (Amendment) Regulations, 1987.

The Cinematograph Film Censorship (Fees and Travelling Allowances) (Amendment) Regulations, 1987.

The Report of the Air Transport Licensing Authority for the year 1986.

The 18th Annual Report and Financial Statements of the Barbados Development Bank for the year 1986-1987.

The Travel Ticket Tax (Rate of Tax) (Amendment) Order, 1987.

The Post Office (Overseas Parcel Post) (Amendment) Regulations, 1987.

Report of the Accountant General for the financial year 1986-87.

The Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Insurance Corporation of Barbados for the year 1986.

The Annual Report of the Chief Medical Officer for the year 1985.

QUESTIONS TO MINISTERS

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. President, I ask leave to submit a question later in this session. It is currently being prepared.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS OR PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I am hoping that this is the appropriate moment for me to interrupt the Senate's proceedings on a matter which I think will be of some consequence to us all. I wish to draw the attention of the Senate to the fact that, during our recess, we got some unfortunate news, 11 of us did, I think, that Senator John Stanley Goddard was taken seriously ill and had to be taken abroad for medical treatment. I am able to report from my latest information that he is well on the way to mend. I am sure Senators would not only be glad to hear this, but also, in whatever fashion they wish, to send some expression of their concern and best wishes to him and his family.

MOTIONS RELATING TO THE BUSINESS OR SITTINGS OF THE SENATE AND MOVED BY A MINISTER

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Order 45 (1) and (2) to accommodate certain items on the Order Paper which have come from the Other Place and which we wish to deal with today.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. President, I know that the Rules do not, strictly speaking, permit debate on the motion. But I wish to say, Sir, that some other Senators and I received our Order Papers very, very late. I received my Order Paper very late on Monday night, and I wonder if it is really feasible for us to be expected to deal with the Order Paper today. They have given very late notice of receipt of the documents.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I ought to have explained this when I was on my feet a moment ago. The honourable Member's comment is timely. The Clerk has explained to me that, for once, if not in its life, in a very long time, the Printery had some difficulty which prevented the getting out and circulation of the papers. I wish to apologise for this. I accepted the explanation, and I think that Senators would wish to indulge me.
11.25 a.m.

I hope that while we may have a legitimate grievance on this matter, it will not be great enough to prevent us from conducting our business. I think that there are some occasions when there are circumstances over which we have no control, and I am hoping that this is one of them and we could regard it as such.

I apologise for the inconvenience to Senators.

The question that Standing Order 45 (1) and (2) be suspended was put to the Senate and agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I beg to give notice of:

A Bill to amend certain enactments.

When passed, this will be cited as the Miscellaneous Amendments Act. It was passed in the Other Place yesterday.

While I am on my feet, I wish to move that Orders Nos. 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 be now read a first time.

Mr. PRESIDENT: If there is no objection to those Orders read by the Honourable Leader being read a first time, leave is granted.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

POST OFFICE (INTERNATIONAL MAIL SERVICE) (VALIDATION OF FEES) ACT, 1987

Order No. 1 was called – To move the passing of a Bill to validate the collection of fees for international express mail service without the necessary legislative authority.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, the Bill deals with an amendment to existing law, to validate the collection of certain fees for international express mail service.

During 1983, the Cabinet of the day agreed and decided that the Barbados postal administration should enter into discussions with postal administrations in the United Kingdom and the United States to implement an international express mail service. The service was then introduced in Barbados in October of 1984 in conjunction with the postal administrations of the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

Since that time, discussions have taken place with other administrations, and from time to time, there have been amendments to the rates of the fees charged for this service. The most recent discussions have taken place with the administrations of Norway, Sweden, the Federal Republic of Germany and Japan, and it is to our certain knowledge that the service has already been extended to Canada, Belgium, France and Guyana.

In order that these fees may have the appropriate legal authority, this Bill, which we now introduce, seeks to validate the collection of fees charged for this mail service, and to ensure that any fees collected in 1987 shall be deemed to have been validly collected. The fees under reference are found in Statutory Instrument No. 96 of 1987.

I therefore beg to move, Mr. President, that this Bill be read a second time.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Senator the Hon. SIR JAMES TUDOR, Mr. PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate went into Committee on the Bill, Senator M. deL. JORDAN in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. L. V. H. LEWIS, seconded by Senator the Hon. SIR JAMES TUDOR, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. PRESIDENT resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.
11.35 a.m.

On separate motions of Senator the Hon. L. V. H. LEWIS the Bill was read a third time and passed, and cited as the Post Office (International Mail Service) (Validation of Fees) Act, 1987.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) ORDER, 1987

Order No. 2 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1987.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, it will be recalled that, earlier this year, negotiations were held with several unions, and that arising out of the conclusions, certain adjustments to salaries were approved. Over and above that, the opportunity is taken, based also on negotiations with the unions, for certain regradings to posts to take place.

In this instance, it is proposed that the post of Electrical Engineer in the Electrical Inspection Department should be regraded from category S.5 to S.3. This arrangement replaces a previous one in which the incumbent to the post

was paid a non-pensionable allowance to ensure that we could attract to that position a suitably qualified person.

In addition, based on representations made not only by the unions, but by the Public Service Commission, the opportunity is taken to regrade the post of Manager, Government Printing Department, the post of Deputy Airport Manager and the post of Private Secretary and Administrative Officer at Government House. The re-grading is from other categories to category S.5, which equates to the post of Senior Administrative Officer.

Further to that, it is also contemplated that on this occasion we should establish certain posts in the Fire Service. These had been approved since 1985, when an examination was done of the staffing structure of the Barbados Fire Service.

It was decided that the senior position of Station Officer, Sub-Officer and Leading Fire Officer should be provided to properly supervise the complement of personnel which had been recruited into the Fire Service. On this occasion, we propose to establish one additional post of Station Officer, two of Sub-Officer and three of Leading Fire Officer.

In the case of the Government Printery, it is further proposed to redesignate the post of Manager to that of Government Printer. The other posts of Assistant Manager will be designated as Assistant Government Printer, and that of Deputy Manager as Deputy Government Printer. The reason for these changes in title is to ensure that there is absolutely no question as to whether the authority provided for in the Constitution is the person who is associated with the management of the Laws of Barbados. I recollect that the legal person presently responsible for carrying out amendments and upgradings to the laws pointed out that the title "Manager, Government Printery" was not in keeping with the laws which authorise amendments to be done, hence the change in title to "Government Printer."

In addition, opportunity is taken to regrade the post of Instructor at the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic to ensure that persons who have qualifications which would allow them to be treated as graduate teachers if they were in other parts of the education system would be eligible for similar salaries if they hold the post of Instructor at the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic.

Those are the amendments contained in the Civil Establishment (General)(Amendment)(No. 2) Order, 1987, and I therefore beg to move that this Resolution be concurred in.

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

INCREASE IN RATES APPLICABLE TO CATEGORY 9 OF KEY SCALES

Order No. 3 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to increase the rates of pay applicable to Category 9 of the key scales.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, while introducing the previous Resolution, I alluded to the salaries revision in 1986-87. The agreement with the unions called for a swift decision and action by Government to cut off the last two Z. scales, Z-39, point from salaries of existing personnel. As a result of the adjustment to the Z.39 point, there are certain consequential amendments which are necessary in the Key scale rates, and this Resolution seeks to amend the rates payable in Category 9, with effect from April 1, 1986, and thereafter with effect from April 1987, to ensure that the promise made to the unions is kept.

I beg to move that this Resolution be concurred in.

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

VESTING IN NATIONAL HOUSING CORPORATION OF LAND AT GOLDEN MILE, HEYWOODS, ST. PETER

Order No. 4 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve of the vesting in the National Housing Corporation of land situate at Golden Mile, Heywoods, St. Peter, to be developed mainly for housing purposes.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, we had dealt with one aspect of this matter before, and therefore I believe most of us are familiar with it. What we are asking for here is in connection with the earlier decision which was made and approved by both Houses of Parliament to acquire certain lands at Speightstown in St. Peter, those lands being several portions from the Golden Mile Resorts Limited as well as a portion of land from the estate of Mr. Bellamy and another portion from the estate of Mr. Yearwood. Those six portions are what we are dealing with here.

This land is recommended for residential use in connection with the Speightstown Development Plan, and for the application and enjoyment of such services as transport, schooling, shopping, postal, police, hospital and other health services which either are or shall be established close by.

In addition to this, as an added part of the development of this area, the Barbados Water Authority has advised that the land may be serviced with water from existing mains nearby, and that there will be no restrictions to the

development of parcels of land for housing because the area is located in Zone 5 of the water protection area.

The reason for all this is that there is, as honourable Members know, a growing demand for house spots all over this country, and none more so than in the Speightstown area of St. Peter, and in view of the fact that the situation was made somewhat worse by the October 1984 floods, it was considered that it would be prudent for the Government to acquire these parcels of land. Such an acquisition, it is felt by the relevant Ministry, would not only afford Government the opportunity of providing a greater number of house spots for residents in St. Peter or elsewhere, but would also allow for a more comprehensive and, I dare say, practical development of the area by taking into account the tenantry which already exists in the nearby Church Street Gardens. So when the acquisition is complete, together with the planning which is determined for it, will make for a comprehensive development.
11.45 a.m.

It is also desirable that some of this land should be used to facilitate the resiting of houses from the Six Men's area which are being adversely affected by the erosion of the beach there.

Of the six parcels of land appearing to be considered by this Resolution, two of them are already in tenantry. These two portions have been leased by the National Housing Corporation from Golden Mile Limited for a long time now, for about a quarter of a century, for the nominal sum of $1 per annum for a period of 25 years. This lease is now about to expire, if it has not already done so. In the light of this, it is considered that steps should be taken to push forward this acquisition now with the guarantee that the people who occupy the individual lots will in no way be disturbed. The National Housing Corporation has given a very definitive assurance to the tenants on these two spots that the compulsory acquisition of the land will not adversely affect the terms and conditions of the existing leases which these tenants have, bearing in mind, of course, that the rental rate is nominally still $1 per annum.

Very little remains to be done in terms of the infrastructural developments at Golden Mile. The sites and services project has already been completed, and therefore it is all the more easy now for the acquisition to proceed.

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

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: Mr. President, I want to concur with the vesting of this land to the National Housing Corporation. I believe it is symbolic of the Government's intention to alleviate the difficulties that we are facing with the great demand for house spots. I believe that the Government has to move expeditiously to amend or to examine the present Tenantry Freehold Purchase Act, which, in my view, has served as an encumbrance to many intended tenants who would like to purchase land from some of the landowners in Barbados.

The background of the denial of land to working class people is rooted in the epoch of slavery. But we must examine our contemporary difficulty and realise that as a result of the implementation of the Tenantry Freehold Purchase Act, many people are now turning to Government for assistance. Landowners in Barbados are finding it difficult to allow persons to become tenants on their land because of the fear that they might impose the provisions in the Act which give them a right to owning the land if there are more than two persons existing on the property.

There are still many people with houses in Barbados who are finding it difficult to own land. And therefore I think that we have to examine that aspect of our housing policy. In addition many persons would like to move into more modern conditions, and when you are renting land, it is extremely difficult for persons to use the more modern techniques. Therefore, on this occasion I think it would not be impertinent for me to urge Government to move as hastily as possible in this direction.

The question that the Resolution be now concurred in was put to the Senate and agreed to.

VESTING IN NATIONAL HOUSING CORPORATION OF LAND AT APES HILL, ST. JAMES

Order No. 5 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve of the vesting in the National Housing Corporation of a parcel of land situate at Apes Hill, St. James to be developed mainly for Housing purposes.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: This one, I think, Sir, has been hanging fire, so to speak, for quite some time. The history is not a very complicated one. The Cabinet decided some three or so years ago to acquire an area of land at Apes Hill, owned by the plantation there, for resiting the residents, I think, of Spring Tenantry and Taitt's, St. James. Ten residents of those areas for a long time have been living under quite unsatisfactory conditions, and to put in adequate electricity, water and waterborne services, it was decided that this land should be acquired for the tenants to move from where they were to more commodious and more helpful living circumstances.

This Resolution now seeks the approval of the Senate for the vesting of the land at Apes Hill in the National Housing Corporation so as to give the tenants a clear and what is known among lawyers as an indefeasible title to the land, and in that way to facilitate the sale of the land by the corporation to the tenants who have moved on to it.

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

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Mr. President, I wish to make a statement first, and then ask a question.

The land which is now sought to be vested in the National Housing Corporation at Apes Hill in St. James, and also the one at Golden Mile in St. Peter.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Golden Mile was passed already.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Yes, Sir. I am fully aware of that.

This housing development for Apes Hill was a development started by the Barbados Labour Party. Most of the people lived at a place called Springhead, not known to many Barbadians, which might be described as the back of beyond by those of us who do know Springhead, where for generations, not in recent times, there was literally no road. It is not even correct to say that the road was impassable. There simply was no road. People had to pass and repass to get into the Springhead Village through a gully – you would know it, Sir, because you know St. Peter, and this is not far away – and it was impossible to take the utilities which most Barbadians had become accustomed to to the people at Springhead.

The Barbados Labour Party Government at the time decided that if Mohammed could not go to the mountain, we would have to bring the mountain to Mohammed. So we took the people out of Springhead and re-established them in housing much superior to that to which they had been accustomed at Apes Hill and Sion Hill. The fact is, Mr. President, that this development already exists. The process now of vesting in the National Housing Corporation is something that is occurring after the fact rather than before the fact.

11.55 a.m.

I come now to the area in which I want to ask the question. We are not clear on whatever is the housing policy of this Government. Statements have been made from time to time by the Minister of Housing, but we are not clear. Some while ago, earlier this year, a joint venture between the Barbados Government and that of Venezuela in respect of a project, just getting on the way also in St. James, came before us. An attempt was made then, I think, to elicit from the Government what its housing policy was, because a housing policy, Mr. President, is more than the National Housing Corporation developing housing estates at one place or another for the working class community or for the middle class communities in this country. A housing policy is a far more comprehensive statement than that, and speaking for myself, and I believe this is an opinion generally held in Barbados, people wish to know what is the wider policy in respect of housing. What is the policy in respect of private sector housing? Apart from a joint venture between the Barbados Government and several local building contractors for the development of houses at West Terrace, which again was conceptualised and started in the time of the Barbados Labour Party Government some years ago, and which has come to full fruition at this time – this Government, of course, is continuing that project – what long or middle range plans does the Government have for housing?

We hear, from no less a person than the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, that much reliance is going to be placed on tourism and the construction industry for the salvaging of the Barbados economy. The Government has no capital works programme which we know of. Of course, there is the arch, which is very soon to be completed, and yesterday we heard that there is going to be an auditorium. But that cannot be a capital works programme designed to trigger, both in the Government or public sector and in the private sector, a major building programme which would generate substantial employment.

Mr. President, it is a fact that employment in the construction industry has begun to fall off as projects left by the Barbados Labour Party are coming to a close and contractor, sub-contractors – I believe Senator Phillips can attest to this – and people who are ancillary to the construction industry, people who are suppliers to the construction industry in terms of lumber and cement and other building and plumbing fittings, are very nervous indeed, simply because they do not know what is on the drawing board. The architects that I have spoken to say that there is not a great deal on the drawing board, neither in the public nor the private sector, likely to come on in 1988 and 1989. Plans of this sort do not come into existence over a three to six months period. It needs a longer lead time than that, and we very much need to know what is going to happen to all of those working in the construction industry and industries allied to the construction industry when current capital works programmes come to a close.

I am asking this question particularly because the most recent Economic Report of the Central Bank makes the point, at page 6. I am willing to make this a document of the Senate, Mr. President, and I quote from page 6, under subheading "Capital Expenditure and Financing" – the main heading is "Public Sector":

"Capital Expenditure fell to $86.1 million or $11 million less than in the first half year of 1986."

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Miller, I do not wish to stop you, but bear in mind that you are dealing with a specific Resolution. You are dealing with the vesting of a piece of land into the Housing Authority. You cannot run all over

the economic circuit of Barbados to deal with this Resolution. Do not expand it.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: I will come to the point, Sir. Skipping a sentence, I will read one sentence.

> "Spending on health, housing and agriculture declined by $5.7 million, $5 million and $2.7 million respectively."

The Economic Report of the Central Bank of Barbados most recently published in mid-October, is saying that spending on housing declined by $5 million. I wish to know, Mr. President, what are the implications of this cutback, because it cannot be described any differently than that. What are the implication of this cutback for any housing policy which this Government may have? The question is: what is the Government's policy on housing?

Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I do not think it is pleasant to roam over a subject and to pick occasional relevancies, because the speaker feels that he or she is well versed in the subject, to make all sorts of things relevant to the matter under discussion. I will respond to one, possibly two, of the points raised, but before that, I want to make a general comment.

When I was introducing this Resolution, I was careful to say that this particular matter began three or four years ago. But then the Senator gets up and says that this is a Barbados Labour Party project! I am not the kind of person to deny there was a Government in power before this one. As a matter of fact, if people were perhaps as interested in politics as I am, they would try to recall all the things that that Government in power did, and then some of the nonsense we hear now would be answered perhaps much more effectively, indeed, fully.

The Springhead people were moved from where they were, where the living conditions were bad and put where they are now long before the change of Government. I know that, and I think the Springhead people know it better.
12.05 p.m.

I believe that it was only in early 1986, maybe February or March 1986, that the decision to make the acquisition was taken, and in the natural course of events it has now come up through the mill. Therefore, we do not need to have any quarrel about that. Springhead has been attended to before we came in, and we are now trying to carry that process a little further.

The Senator asked about the housing policy of the Government. This can be simply answered. It is to build as many houses as we can, and we are committed specifically to the construction of 2 000 in this very year.

Asides.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: What about the $5 million? If you had left it, it would be here for us to use it. A Government is always an ongoing concern, so that if it now happens that there is a shortfall somewhere – and we are not talking about money being put down somewhere – the economy which you people are quarrelling about every day that has now come to a grinding halt, according to you, started to have the halt long before you demitted office. We are not shedding any responsibility for trying to put it right, we should put it right. And when we get it right, as I know we shall, we do not expect that you will give us any credit for it, you will find something else to quarrel about.

I also want to make the point – you did not ask about this, but I throw it in for good measure – that the Pondside development is going on. My understanding is in another two or three months it will be completed. I hope the Senator will come to the opening ceremony.

(*Aside:* SENATOR B. A. MILLER: What about Greenfield?)

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: We shall look after that. Everything comes in its time and place.

You are not going to throw us on the defensive by asking questions about the economy. We will attend to the economy, because we have the competence to do so, and when we do it, we will not be looking forward to any praises from you, because we do not think we will get it anyhow, but the fact that it has been done will redound to the credit of all the people in this country.

Sometimes I wonder whether it would not have been better for me to be out of the battlefield. There is a long argument going on that I would like to join, but the conventions governing Ministers of the Crown do not permit it.

There is a housing policy. It is to build more and more houses. The Senator did ask a very important question in respect of housing construction in the private sector. I think the answer to that must partly lie in the greater encouragement which we are trying to give in releasing mortgage money into all the sources from which it can be got. If people can borrow on easy terms and on good terms, and quantities of money are readily available for them to do it, they will contract for their own housing.

But what is built by private construction is part of the general effort and complements what is done by the state sector. We understand all of this, and I want to give the

assurance that we are not going to be found wanting in it. Everything we said we are going to do, we are going to do, and you are going to be astonished at the way in which we are going to get it done.

The question that the Resolution be now concurred in was put to the Senate and agreed to.

PORT AUTHORITY (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1987

Order No. 6 was called – To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Barbados Port Authority Act, Cap. 285B.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, the Barbados Port Authority came into existence as a result of the merger of certain activities of a company called Port Contractors Limited and the former Government Department for the Port, known as the Port Department.

When the Port Authority came into existence, provision was made for pension rights of persons who were transferred from the former Port Department into the Port Authority, but there was a deficiency which prevented the service of these persons with the Port Department and the Port Authority to be aggregated for pensionable purposes. What would, in fact, have happened is that the persons could qualify for a pension because they transferred, but their service would not be counted unless the amendment which is now proposed was done.

There has been a lot of discussion about the matter, and since it is necessary to have the persons who transferred from the Port Department continue to work with the Port Authority, and since there would be no positions anyhow in the Public Service for some of them with specialised skills – like the Harbour Master and people like that – to come back into the Public Service, it has been decided to remedy the defect in the previous legislation and to amend the Act so that persons who worked in the former Port Department will have their service aggregated with their service at the Port Authority for the purposes of computing retiring benefits, that is, pension and any appropriate gratuity.

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

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Senator the Hon. L. V. H. LEWIS, seconded by Senator the Hon. SIR JAMES TUDOR, Mr. PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate went into Committee on the Bill Senator M. deL. JORDAN in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Clauses 1 – 3 were called and passed.
12.15 p.m.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. L. V. H. LEWIS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. PRESIDENT resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Senator the Hon. L. V. H. LEWIS, the Bill was read a third time and passed, and cited as the Port Authority (Amendment) Act, 1987.

FISCAL INCENTIVES (VALIDATION OF BENEFITS) ACT, 1987

Order No. 7 was called – To move the second reading of a Bill to validate certain benefits enjoyed by certain enterprises which were granted otherwise than in accordance with the Fiscal Incentives Act.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, the Fiscal Incentives Act, Cap. 71A, defines the parameters within which certain incentives are to be granted to manufacturing enterprises, and there is a detailed procedure set out for the grant of concessions.

Section 27 of that Act provides for the appraisal of each enterprise initially and after a three year period. It seems, therefore, that the Act contemplates the grant of concessions to an enterprise for a period of three years, after which the matter is reviewed, and either there is an extension for a period not exceeding a further three years, or there could be a revocation of the concessions which were granted.

It appears that, through an oversight as far back as 1984, the original concessions granted to the companies listed in the Schedule were not reviewed in accordance with the Act. Extensions were granted in the case of Chemical Industries up to 1987; in the case of Pinkie Polly Ltd., up to February 1988; in the case of Soilax Barbados Limited, up to May 1988; Chemical Industries, up to May 1988; Gulf Stream Industries (Caribbean) Limited, until June 1988; Audio Magnetic (Barbados) Limited, until September 1989; and Henkel Chemicals (Barbados) Limited, until May 1988. The existing legislation does not provide for retroactivity, and hence it is necessary for this Bill to validate the benefits which were granted under Section 7 of the Act, and without any formal publication of these extensions of concessions.

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

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Mr. President, to be sure it gives us all a good feeling, and some relief and satisfaction certainly among other feelings, to see that these companies

set out in the Schedule continue to operate in Barbados and to enjoy certain fiscal incentives under the Act before us. But it brings me back, I am afraid, Sir, to the Economic Review of the Central Bank of Barbados, the most recent publication, which was published at mid-October.

The story of manufacturing, to which fiscal incentives such as these under the Act apply is a very sorry one. It is described at page 3 of this report as "severely depressed, with an output declining by an estimated 16 per cent," and there does not seem to be again, as with other sectors, any immediate or medium term hope for the raising and the replacement of markets which we have lost in this region, the Trinidad and Jamaican markets which we have lost, nor, according to this report, penetration of markets outside of the region.

We heard that a certain member of the Government was supposed to be bringing a lot of business here from Hong Kong. It is not the Minister of Trade and Industry, the member is now the Minister of Transport and Works. He was supposed to be working a lot of magic in Hong Kong that was going to bring industries here. That was since before this time last year, and we are still waiting to hear about these extra-regional industries which would come and set up here, or those extra-regional markets to which we would export.

It has been clear for many years, Mr. President, that the old industrial incentives cannot allow Barbados to respond in the way that it used to do. In manufacturing, particularly of garments, wearing apparel, we have lost markets to the Far East, the Middle East, Central America and to other CARICOM countries because our wage bill component cannot compete with theirs.

When the Barbados Labour Party was in Government, it was advised that the answer to this was to recognise the fact that we simply could not compete with the wage bill component as far as the garment industry and certain other industries were concerned. We were told that, recognising the highly educated work force potential in Barbados, we should perhaps seek out within the region, but mostly outside of this region, industries which would not be attractive to these competitors where the education component of the work force was not as highly developed as our own, and in that way hope to attract – how shall I say it –I do not want to use the word "markets", it is a much used and abused word nowadays – industries which would not be attractive to them, but which would be easy for our people to be employed in, and for some of them to be retooled, redeployed and retained in.
12.25 p.m.

To some extent, we started that in the electronic industry. But even in the electronic industry, in the metropolitan countries there has been a falling off which has to do with market forces over which we have no control at all. It has to do with competitive market forces in Japan, Europe, West Germany, California and in other parts of the world over which we really have no control. So we have suffered some setback, particularly with the closing of the INTEL plant here in recent times.

Of course, this Government's attitude to some of the metropolitan countries has not been entirely encouraging. It is not an incentive for industries to want to come here when you say of a country that it has no culture, it is nowhere, and nobody wants to trade or deal with it. In many respects, to my certain knowledge, in particular the Puerto Ricans have been holding certain business and industrial initiatives which might have benefitted Barbados, and they are still holding to see what the attitude and the situation will be with respect to the most recent Prime Minister.

We are deeply concerned that the Government can simply take the attitude that manufacturing is dead. I am distressed to see public commentators using this phrase, that "manufacturing is dead". We cannot afford in this country for manufacturing to be dead. Because when we listen to the Minister of Agriculture and we hear that no more price support is going to go to the sugar industry, and we know what the long term and the medium term implications of that will be, particularly in terms of foreign exchange, not to mention the 6 000 people employed in the sugar industry today, Sir, on what do we fall back? I have already made the point that there is no capital works programme that the Government has, not to our knowledge anyhow, and so we would be expected again historically to be putting all of our eggs in the one basket of tourism. We have simply got to be more inventive and courageous, more innovative, more persistent in our whole attitude to manufacturing.

I must say too, Sir, and again it is borne out by this Economic Review just recently published by the Central Bank of Barbados, that the policies of the Government are not, in some respects, giving incentives to industry. At page 5, this report states that import duties rose by 18 per cent in response to increasing imports of consumer goods. Company taxes, despite lower rates, increased by 16.7 per cent, and the increased purchases and higher tax rates helped to push up consumption taxes and stamp duties by 24.2 per cent and 25.3 per cent respectively. That is at the bottom of page 4.

The consumption taxes are biting everywhere, in the wholesale and the retail sectors. Senator Phillips is looking very sad over there, and I am sure that he will bear me out

on this. So what you appear to be giving with the one hand in some sectors, you are taking back with the other hand, and I wonder how many of the industries benefitting under this Fiscal Incentives Act will find it possible to continue operation under the present economic climate which prevails in Barbados. The prognosis for the immediate future is not a good one.

The distinguished Leader of the Senate has said already this morning that we are going to be – I do not think he said shocked – astonished at the ways and means that are going to be found for this Government to carry out its policies. We are already bleeding under those policies after the July Budget of 1986 and the April Budget of 1987. So I can agree with the Honourable Leader of the Senate that, indeed, we are going to be astonished. I believe we are going to be astounded!

The question I wish to put, and the people are asking this question, Mr. President, not only the calypsonian, all people who are thinking and concerned, people who are unemployed, concerns the one omission of this report: where and what are the third quarter unemployment statistics? That is what the people wish to know. There is great unease with people not knowing if they are going to have their employment next week this time, next month this time or next year this time.

Normally, when we are running up to Christmas, we see a little movement in employment. My own information as I move around Bridgetown is that the opposite is happening now. Do not let us be misled by the 1 500 who ran behind the 21 jobs yesterday. In many industries there are layoffs, and some of those layoffs are a direct result of the Government's economic policy. The Government's creditors are bleeding out there in the industrial sector. Some of them have not been paid since February of this year, and because of severe cash flow shortages have found that a few weeks before Christmas, and before the Independence celebrations, they are having to lay off people, not take on people. It does not augur well.

This document is a document up to the end of September 1987, but it was not published until the middle of October, when, I believe, the third quarter unemployment figures were available. And I believe they are available now. I would not like to think that there is any conspiracy to cover up those figures before the 30th November this year so that we would be mislead into believing that all is sweetness and light in time for the 21st anniversary celebrations of our Independence. I think it is time that we must face up to facts. We are grown up now, and it is time, like adults, that we be made to face the facts and deal with them. I believe that that unemployment statistic for the third quarter is within the knowledge of the Government, and the people of Barbados are entitled to know them. They wish to know them!

We have a new Minister of Finance, Mr. President, but he has not addressed himself to the economy. That is understandable. He was busy being Minister of Education and busy being President of the Democratic Labour Party and busy travelling. He is here now, although I gather he is to go off again.

I gather that, at last, the Governor of the Central Bank has arrived here to take up his post. I hope so.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Miller, those are not matters to do with the debate.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Fiscal incentives, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You are rambling too much.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Fiscal incentives, Sir. I appreciate....

Mr. PRESIDENT: That has nothing to do with the Bill.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: ....the latitude of Your Honour.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I give you plenty.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Yes, I appreciate it.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I wanted to see when you would stop.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: I appreciate it greatly, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Let us get down to the Bill.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Perhaps the Honourable Minister of the Public Service, who introduced this matter, might enlighten us as to what current fiscal incentives this Government is offering to the industrial sector. If they can tell us one thing, we would be glad to know it.

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: Mr. President, at the risk of being accused of rambling like the previous speaker is supposed to have done, I wish strongly to support her plea for more information. I cannot speak, because I do not have my ears close to the ground as the more astute politician who has just spoken has, but certainly I am concerned about not only the disquiet among the people I meet and talk to about what is happening, especially since the gyrations and the gymnastics of the Wall Street market, but I am alarmed at the silence with which our economic masters have greeted this news.

12.35 p.m.

People want to know. Prices are rising in the Supermarket. I shop in the supermarket, and almost every day something goes up. I am not sure if this is related to

any market, except there is a certain greed out there among the merchants. But people do want to know, and we hope that we can be assured by the statement that the answers lie within the breast of the present Government.

We want to know, and I want to put my feeble worth in support of the spirit of the last speaker's plea for information.

Thank you.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, I will not attempt to respond to the very lengthy statement about the economy, except to say that, from time to time, information is published by the Central Bank, and to suggest that the absence of information is any conspiracy is probably to reflect on one's knowledge of what might or might not be possible.

The present state of Barbados, if it can be attributed to anything other than pressure of problems in the metropolitan countries, can be related to the fact that when one Government comes into power, it reaps what is sowed, and the problems of today did not begin when the Democratic Labour Party was elected to lead this country.

The Democratic Labour Party has the total responsibility for providing the answers to the questions raised, and those answers will be forthcoming in good season. You do not press the button and answer the question to the problems which are presently unfolding in Wall Street. Not even the most efficient economists in the United States are probably able to answer those questions now, far be it for somebody like me to even attempt to answer those questions.

That is not to suggest that the questions are not important questions. For a minute, to suggest that the questions are not very important and need to be addressed would be trite of me. I, therefore, can only say that I would expect that the Minister of Finance and his associated persons will respond to those questions in time to rescue the economy of this country.

The question about what a Government proposes to do on matters relating to fiscal incentives would be dealt with at the appropriate time, when a Budget is being done and there is any introduction of alterations to existing incentives. Those answers will also be forthcoming whenever the next Budget takes place.

(*Aside:* SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Do we have to wait for the next Budget?)

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

On the motion of Senator the Honourable L. V. H. LEWIS, Mr. PRESIDENT, left the Chair and the Senate resolved itself into Committee on the Bill, Senator M. deL. JORDAN in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Clauses 1 – 3 were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. L. V. H. LEWIS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. PRESIDENT resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motion of Senator the Hon. L. V. H. LEWIS the Bill was read a third time and passed, and cited as the Fiscal Incentives (Validation of Benefits) Act, 1987.

GOVERNOR-GENERAL (CONDITIONS OF SERVICE) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1987

Order No. 8 was called – To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Governor-General (Conditions of Service) Act.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I think this Bill is a simple one and will probably not detain the Senate beyond a certain point. It would appear that up to 1979, as I understand it, the Governor-General's terms and conditions of service allowed for him to have leave not unlike the terms and conditions of service of a public officer. I suppose the reason for that was that the first Governor-General was the last Colonial Governor and, therefore, was a public officer, or his office was interpreted as a public office under the Act.

In respect of the terms and conditions of leave attaching to the office of Governor-General, what we are trying to do now is to institutionalise this in an Act of Parliament. The operative point here is in Section 3, which amends Section 14 of the principal Act and gives a new section in its place.
12.45 p.m.

The new section merely says "The Governor-General is, subject to the approval of the Prime Minister, and under such conditions as the Prime Minister specifies, entitled to the payment of leave passages and first class rates for himself and his spouse to any place whether within or outside the Caribbean area."

I believe that in practice it will be found that within the period of his service, he will probably take advantage of this on four occasions, and the benefits of two of those occasions will be exercised within the Caribbean area and two of them outside.

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

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

On the motion of Senator the Hon. SIR JAMES TUDOR, Mr. PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate went into Committee on the Bill, SENATOR M. deL. JORDAN in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. SIR JAMES TUDOR, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. PRESIDENT resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Senator the Hon. SIR JAMES TUDOR, the Bill was read a third time and passed, and cited as the Governor-General (Conditions of Service) (Amendment) Act, 1987.

JUDGES (REMUNERATION AND PENSIONS) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1987

Order No. 9 was called – To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Judges (Remuneration and Pensions) Act.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Sir, I do not know what I need to say on this.

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

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

On the motion of Senator the Hon. SIR JAMES TUDOR, Mr. PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate went into Committee on the Bill, Senator M. deL. JORDAN in the Chair.

Clauses 1 – 3 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. SIR JAMES TUDOR, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. PRESIDENT resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Senator the Hon. Sir. JAMES TUDOR, the Bill was read a third time and passed and cited as the Judges (Remuneration and Pensions) (Amendment) Act, 1987.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Sir, I think we can take the suspension now.

I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 2 o'clock.

Mr. PRESIDENT: This sitting is now suspended until 2 o'clock.

12.55 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. PRESIDENT: The sitting is resumed.

QUESTIONS TO MINISTERS

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Blackman had given notice of a question that he wanted to raise.

QUESTION RE STATE OF LOANS

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: Thank you, Mr. President.

The question reads as follows:

"To enquire of the Leader of the Senate:

Will the Minister state the amounts drawn down between 1st July 1986 and 30th June 1987 in respect of each loan approved and/or guaranteed by Parliament during that period."

Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATE AND HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY (REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES OF MEMBERS) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1987

Order No. 10 was called – To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Senate and House of Assembly (Remuneration and Allowances of Members) Act.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, there are two cognate Bills, maybe that is the proper description on this subject, and I am going to make the speech now, because what I say on this one will apply *pari passu*, I think I should say, to the other one.

I am glad to have the opportunity to address this particular topic, because I am not without some experience in this particular matter, having had to do with it for much of my parliamentary experience.

Let me say, first of all, that I have never believed that there should be erected any specific relationship between emoluments paid to politicians or Ministers, or any category of them, as the case may be, and civil servants. I believe that it ought to be possible, I have always believed this, for arrangements for remuneration for politicians serving in either House of this Parliament to be attended to without necessarily linking that matter to Public Service or public sector pay. I do not think that I necessarily should receive a salary above that of a Permanent Secretary, not necessarily, although I think I could make a case out, as most of us could, for a proper level of pay for parliamentarians.

Before we get into that detail, I want to address some general principles, and perhaps it is only politicians of our

experience who could address those principles, because you, Sir, for certain, and I soon after, entered the political field and this aspect of public service in the days when remuneration simply did not exist.

The first thing I want to say in this respect is that the argument for paying politicians has to rest, if it rests on any principle at all, on the fact that if you have universal adult suffrage where the vast majority of the population exercise the franchise to choose their representatives, they will necessarily at some time or other, or perhaps at most times, choose representatives who are no better off in pocket or financial competence than themselves. So if public service is done at that level from among the wide catchment area of the population, then there is justification for attaching to that service in Parliament some reasonable remuneration.

All of these people who cavil at pay for Members of Parliament at whatever level, and who cite as an example of the principle they wish to establish the fact that there was a time when service in the House of Assembly was done for nothing, conveniently forget that the House of Assembly in those days was not a place where public business was done, except in a very formal sense. It was only the place where public business or the decisions of public business were rubber-stamped. The real business of the country in those days was done in the Bridgetown Club, The Savannah and Yacht Clubs, on the verandas of politicians' houses on a Sunday morning, and around the dining tables on more formal occasions. So I want to establish that so long as the suffrage becomes broader and broader, and the catchment area for Parliament becomes wider and wider, the justification becomes more secure for attaching adequate remuneration to it.

I want to add that those like yourself, Sir, Mr. Lloyd Smith, Mr. Owen T. Allder, Sir Ronald Mapp, Sir Mencea Cox, Mr. Wynter Crawford and the late Mr. A. E. S. "TT" Lewis have to be complimented because when you made the decision to go into parliamentary and public service, you did not make it with any calculation that there would be remuneration. I have tremendous respect particularly for Sir Ronald Mapp. Although we do not agree on the broader principles that divide us, he, like others, made a genuine sacrifice when he decided to leave the Public Service and go into the Lower Chamber through elections.

The second thing I want to say is that this is an issue on which each person can have a point of view which is not necessarily part of the accepted wisdom. Of the few issues – and there were not many, probably not more than half a dozen – on which I and the former Prime Minister, Mr. Barrow, disagreed, this was fundamentally one of them. He had in my judgment a very honest, but at the same time very idiosyncratic, view of this matter. He genuinely and honestly believed that people in our station, that is to say, people who go to people and get themselves elected on the basis of serving, should be the last persons to appear to be pressing upon the public treasury for remuneration. That was his view, it was not mine. My view was that I could only be faulted if I refused to do the work or undertake the tasks which were allotted to me in the course of the service.

I read that it was said in the Other Place, as a justification for receiving increased remuneration, that the people abused us or we get abused for it. That is not the justification for it that I would choose to make, because if the truth must be told, we abuse each other far more than the people abuse us, and perhaps they abuse us, if in fact they do, because they hear us abusing each other. If we want to avoid the abuse of the people we represent, it is possible – I do not put it higher than that – that when we stop abusing each other, they will get the message and stop abusing us.

But the fact that people abuse us is no justification for our being paid more. The justification for our being paid more is, of course, that we are doing the work which is expected of us. I do not hold myself up as any particular paragon in this respect, but I have always, as a matter of principle, believed that so long as I chose to ask people to do me the honour of putting me in the House of Assembly, I had to be at what we call in common Barbadian language, their beck and call, so I could not complain if I was got out of my bed at minutes past midnight to take somebody from Pie Corner to the hospital. That was part of the bargain that they had struck with me, and I with them, and so long as I had woken them out of bed at five minutes past midnight to ask them to vote for me, I thought it was fairly all right on their part, however inconvenient it might have been for me personally, to ask me to perform that kind of service for them; or if they wished to see me, to make myself available to be seen by them, because that was my work. Even now, although I do not have the kind of Ministry which brings me into wide contact, except at Cabinet level, with the administrative and executive functions of Government, people still ask to see me to discuss problems that have nothing at all to do with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Some 80 per cent of my time in my office is taken up with people whose business has nothing to do with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. So my point is that if the work is done, the money should come behind it, or at the same time.

The former Prime Minister, as I said, had this very honest, in my judgment, idiosyncratic view about these matters, a view not shared by me. I came into the Cabinet on this recent occasion after the decision had been made to reduce parliamentary and other salaries by five per cent. Having come in and found it, I did not make a fuss about it, but I let it be known that it was not particularly favourable

to me, because I saw no reason for it, and I will tell you why I did not see any reason for it.
2.10 p.m.

I have sitting opposite me a former Minister of Government. There are others of her party who are out of Parliament, both out of the other House and of this one. They are drawing pensions, or ought to be. That is what the law of the country provides for, and it is quite all right. But if you are telling me that I am in any way inferior in status to a former Minister who served, I say, as conscientiously – I give them that – as I try to serve, and only because there has been a change of Government and a decision has been made in respect of parliamentary salaries, I must accept that, in my mind, I do not. I accept it only because it is part of a consensus. This has to be said.

Those of us who serve now, even with the increase in salary which they are paid, on a *pro rata* basis merely, because the law of the land says that when Public Service pay is done Ministers and other people serving in these two Houses of Parliament should receive whatever increases are due to them on the basis of what the law says – that is all right – even so, when you do that, and when you do it a second time perhaps in two years' time, all of us who are Ministers now will still be below the level of pay which the retiring Ministers have enjoyed. I do not know how other people feel about that. I can only speak for myself on this, because if you take off five per cent from what I would have expected to enjoy and then give me a two per cent or a one and a half, or whatever it is, I am still three and a half or three down. And even if you put on another two and a half again, I am still going to be below what Mr. Craig, Mr. O'Brien Trotman and all of the others of them are enjoying. This is how I feel about it, and I make no bones about this.

What I am saying, Mr. President, to develop my third point, is that we get into these hassles about the pay for parliamentarians because we have not yet established the principle upon which it would be proper to settle. The argument is, and we see this in the newspapers on these occasions, that Members of Parliament, or politicians, as they more likely say, pay themselves a rise. Of course we pay ourselves a rise! And we ought not to apologise about that! Everybody who is paid from the public treasury of this island has to be paid in one way, that is, from appropriations made by one House of Parliament and concurred in by this one, or by Acts of Parliament passed in both Houses and assented to by the Governor-General. Everybody gets paid that way. It is therefore inescapable logic that by whatever means you employ to settle parliamentary pay, we are going to have to pay ourselves, because we are the lawful authority for paying money out of the Treasury.

I do not think, therefore, that that is a very strong point that is made, but it has an emotional appeal, because it tends to make the unthinking persons believe that civil servants get paid one way and politicians pay themselves. This is not the case. Everybody who draws money out of the public treasury has to draw money which either arises out of legislation fixed by law, or whatever the other phrase is, or appropriated by Parliament in succeeding years. We have to pay ourselves. There is no trouble about that, because we are the lawful authority for doing it.

How then are we going to find a principle which meets with equity and fair mindedness and, I would say, general acceptability to the public at large? This is what I have always said, and I have never departed from this, what brings the trouble is the fact that whenever we have to do this for ourselves, it is nearly always at the end of a long, haggling, brusing period between Government as an employer and the Public Service and its various sections as employees. When, therefore, there is an accumulated dissatisfaction arising out of those negotiations, and we then come, as Members of either House of Parliament, to address our own remuneration or allowances, everybody then wakes up for the first time and says, 'Oh my God, they cut off so much from this category and that category but they do not say a word when their own things come before them, they pass them without debate.'

Let me now, for the umpteenth time – because for all my years in the Other Chamber, whenever I have had to address this problem I have said what I am going to say what I am going to say now – say that I think it is perfectly possible to settle this matter once and for all by institutionalising a procedure for it. I believe, for instance, that something like this should be done: Parliament ought to be asked to pass a law which says that a percentage increase, it may be 1 per cent or 2 per cent, whatever it is, should automatically come on to parliamentary pay and allowances and come into effect every five years, one year before any dissolution of Parliament. If you refined that and did it that way, what would happen is that with a dissolution of Parliament as there was last year, which took place, I would think, towards the end of April, new salaries would come into effect from April 1 or whatever 1985, and the consequence of that system would be that the outgoing people would be spared the obloquy and the abuse of it being said that they fixed their own salaries before they went out, and the newcomers would be spared the indignity of having to attend to a matter of their own salaries within a month or a year of their coming in. It would be automatic.

I do not know what this would amount to in practice, but I think one advantage of it would be that no Parliament at all, however elected, however constituted, would be under any obligation to touch any matter regarding remuneration

for parliamentarians. This is the way I am always saying that it should be done, and this is the way I hope that one day, when we are tired of all this artificial wrangling, we will have it done.

Another advantage of that system, when it is refined, would be this: any person who felt in all conscience, or for whatever reason, that he wanted to retire at the end of the dissolution, or at the time of a dissolution, from Parliament, he or she would not have to run the risk of fighting an election with poor chances of losing, or solely on the ground that he or she has to come back into Parliament to guarantee a pension. The automatic rise would have taken effect from the year before the dissolution, and he or she would be covered under it. This is how I think it should be done, and I am sure that, sooner or later, some Parliament – it may not be one of which I am a member – is going to have to institutionalise that system so that sitting Members of a particular Parliament would not have to deal with this matter. It would take it out of the political wrangling and take it out of the public domain, and I would urge public consideration of this, because there may conceivably be a better system, and if there is one, I am willing to assent to it, so long as it is a system designed to be automatic, to be self-perpetuating and to satisfy the requirements of the kind of system we have in this country.

The next point I want to make is that I have had a lot to do with parliamentary pensions. They arise obliquely out of this matter, and also for the same reason.

2.20 p.m.

I do not know when we will be able to have a national pensions plan in this country; I mean the sort that will enable a person to start in one career, move to another, move to yet a third, come in and out of Parliament and go back into whatever else they were doing and still be covered under one pension's umbrella. I just do not know when this will happen, but to the extent that I think it will be a good thing, I am hoping that we will move to that some time or other. I see no reason, therefore, if we moved to it, why a citizen of this country could not serve two terms or three terms, as the case may be, or only one, whatever the fortunes of the game allowed, and still have the service in this Parliament be part of the general accretion of pensionable service, no more than I would think it wrong that if you served in here and then went and served in a firm in Bridgetown, or in a manufacturing establishment, the ten years you spent here should not be added to the ten years you spent there.

Under National Insurance, some of this is true, because even Members of Parliament pay National Insurance. But I am thinking of a wider and a more definitive national pensions scheme which we should move to, which will enable people to come into this aspect of public service without necessarily feeling that they have to make the largest and most brutal form of sacrifice that could ever be called on them to make.

The last point I want to make reinforces the point I made before about trying to institutionalise this matter. I left the House of Assembly at the time of the dissolution in 1971. The last salaries revision before I left was, I believe in 1968. There was one, I believe, in 1973, but I was already out of Parliament and serving abroad as an ambassador and High Commissioner, and therefore did not quality for any of that, although I had put in a lot of the time before. But that is the luck of the draw.

In 1976, and I want members of the Senate now to hear the gist of the point I am making at this stage, civil servants in this country were awarded a 50 per cent raise. I do not want to trench on party politics here, but it is a fact that when Mr. Barrow was offering 50 per cent, the other side said that it was not enough, and Mr. O'Brien Trotman and people were clammering for 80 per cent. A General Election was coming up and this was perhaps allowable. The point is that the dissolution of Parliament came and there was a change of Government, and those who lost their seats or went into whatever retirement, whether voluntary or involuntary, were left to disadvantage although they had spent lengths of time in Parliament equal to those who spent lengths of time after.

Both Prime Ministers, the outgoing one in 1976 and the incoming one – there is no difference between them on this – had said that there was not likely to be any increase in parliamentary pay in 1976, 1977, or 1978. Lo and behold, the new Government set up a commission under Mr. Neville Nicholls, a commission before which I went and made some submissions, which I thought in the circumstances at that time were adequate and would have met, even without being too sure about the figures, the principles that I was trying to get enshrined. I think that commission's report, if it was not rejected, was at least set aside or amplified, and parliamentary pay was increased. The increase given then was the 50 per cent which would be *pro rata* with the Civil Service increase of 1976, plus the 10 per cent which would have accorded with the principle we now have in respect of the increases based on Civil Service pay.

So parliamentarians in the 1976-1981 Parliament got a 60 per cent increase, and the jump then started from there, because they enshrined the principle of the correlated increase from then on, which is what has come down to us. I do not disagree with this, but I do not think that it has any right to be part of any legislation connected with Civil Service pay. An increase is all right if it is worked out on

the basis that I have just suggested, or any other basis which is thought better than the one that I have suggested. But the point is that those who quarrel about high parliamentary salaries forget the history of this whole matter in the last ten years, and it is always bad in politics – I have always found this – to start a story in the middle. You have to go back and see what led onto what, and what are the origins of the problem you are now addressing.

There is more to it than this. Ministers in the last Government – I do not envy them of this. I think it is more than their due. I am only stating what I know to be a fact – enjoyed privileges or emoluments or conditions of work which Ministers in this Government do not. Again, I have to say that when I came into this present Cabinet, the decision had already been taken about ministerial cars. I agreed with the consensus, because the Cabinet cannot work if people are always going to say they do not agree with that and therefore it cannot happen. Your Cabinet system requires that unless you have grave, conscientious doubts about something, you go along with the consensus with a private reservation.

You had a situation where most of the Ministers, if not all – certainly it was their right, and I believe that a lot of them exercised that right – had official or semi-official cars as part of the conditions of their work. I see nothing at all wrong with that, but we do not have them, except perhaps for the Prime Minister, and in certain instances, when we have official guests, like during a State Visit, and some of us have to be involved in the State entertainment of the distinguished visitor, we use policecars and we are driven. But that is not now the custom, except perhaps for the Prime Minister, if he wishes it, but it was customary for our predecessors.

I wish to stress this, I see nothing wrong with that. I am not talking this because of the terms of this debate. I genuinely feel that that was right and proper. But I am wondering how people can say that we have just come into Government and are doing this, that and the other for ourselves when, in fact, the status of Ministers in this Government in respect of certain things is lower than the status of Ministers whom we have succeeded. I think this ought to be known, because everybody says, 'they have only just come and look what they are doing', and very few people have taken the trouble to research this matter, or to make themselves familiar with these facts.

2.30 p.m.

I want to say something else about pensions. In addition to the point I made about institutionalising the national pensions plan, I hold, and have always held, that no matter what differences I may have with other politicians, there are certain things in this country, certain institutions, certain people's jobs that ought to be – not many – beyond cavil. You will therefore never have heard me in all my political life talk about a Governor's salary or a Governor-General's salary or anything like that. I think there are certain privileges which should adhere to the Crown in its right of Government in this country, and therefore anybody who holds a Crown office – in one case, the Governor-General, in other cases, judges – should enjoy – this is my feeling, I do not need to be a democrat in all things – certain privileges by virtue of the offices they hold, or have held, above other people, and I do not think it is any argument for democracy that there ought to be a levelling down in this respect. This is how I feel. Therefore, if you hold the office of Governor-General, or the office of Chief Justice, or the office of Prime Minister in this country, I think that special recognition ought to be given to that.

I personally was very hurt when in November 1976 a Bill was introduced into that Parliament – it was a young Parliament then – abolishing the Prime Minister's pension. They had no right to do it. The argument that he was still in Parliament and that he was getting a salary as Leader of the Opposition is, in my judgment, nothing to do with it. He had held the high office of Prime Minister of this country. Not a lot of people can hold that office, and the three or four or five, as the case may be, who have so far held it are honoured and distinguished citizens of this country and ought, when they cease to be, to enjoy their pension whether they are or are not members of either House of Parliament. That is how I feel. But they abolished his pension.

That that happened was not only their fault, it was partly his as well, because when in 1969 we were looking at this matter of parliamentary pensions, I suggested to him one day, why do we not entrench Governor-General's, Prime Minister's, C.J's pensions – well, it did not matter about the C.J. perhaps – in the Constitution and make them inviolable on the basis of service to the State? Again, in all honesty, but it was his particular idiosyncracy, he said, "How? A Prime Minister is a politician, why do you want to entrench his pension for?" Well, he did not, I could not do it in the teeth of his opposition to it, it became the political football at a change of Government and it was abolished.

Since we do not know what can or cannot happen, it is always better to do these things in a proper way when there is time enough to do them, and we have had a situation, which I very much regret in both cases, where Prime Ministers of this country have died in office and have not lived to retire and enjoy their pensions. It is the providence of God, very well, but there it is. I think that all Prime Ministers will not necessarily die in office – at least, I hope not – but I think we ought to have a more generous outlook,

that if a man has been Prime Minister, even if it is only for a day – I do not even agree with any 90 day period – it is the highest office within the gift of the people of this country and it ought to be respected as such.

Mr. President, I do not want to recap, because I have detained the Senate far too long, but I wish to say that the principle of paying politicians salaries as Members of Parliament, or allowances as members of this Chamber, rests on the fact that there has been a democratic development in our history in which ordinary people can not only take part in the political process, but can themselves be part of it at this level, and may not be persons of any wealth, and therefore paying them remuneration at the decentest possible level is in accordance with that principle. And I wish to emphasise to members that I would be very happy if my suggestion of finding a formula for handling these matters could be taken up, so that no sitting member of Parliament, while he sits in Parliament, would be forced into the embarrassing position of having to defend his own salary, or to attack it on tactical, political grounds, merely because he is not introducing it.

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

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. President, the position I take on this measure is not in any way contradictory to the learned Minister, except to offer a correction as to the factual position. I was not a member of any of the previous Parliaments, but, as a matter of record, I think that the legislation which he refers to in terms of the Prime Minister's pension was more a matter of suspending the payment of the pension rather than abolishing the pension. It suspended the payment of the pension while the person was a sitting Member of Parliament, rather than abolished it, and preserved the right to it on leaving Parliament. I think that position is one that is maintained in other Parliaments.

The contribution I wish to make, Sir, deals with the issue of the role of the Senate in the structure of Government. Apart from the matter of the introduction of remuneration for members of Parliament, I do not think very much has changed in the structure of Parliament in the almost 350 years of parliamentary government of this country. The conditions under which members of Parliament function are as primitive as they were at the inception, save for the matter of a payment.

I would like to say that if parliamentarians are to be able to do the job, for which they are either elected or appointed, efficiently and well, Parliament needs to give attention to something I have referred to here before, Sir, the provision of research assistance to members of Parliament. I would be willing to forego the additional $55 of $69, as the case may be, that this Bill makes provision for, if I could be afforded the assistance of someone to do the needed research that is necessary if one is to make timely, proper and substantial contributions in this Parliament.

2.40 p.m.

In the Other Place, there is a provision that those Members are paid something called a constituency allowance, and perhaps that is right and proper. There is no similar provision in this place for research assistance, but it has been my experience within the past year that when I have sought some assistance in preparing for this Parliament, I have paid for it out of my own pocket, and on the occasion when I paid, the amount that I was required to pay was in excess of the monthly allowance that I am paid.

I think, Sir, that as we approach the 350th anniversary of Parliament, we need to give meaningful consideration to how we are running our business, that Senators, apart from being given the assistants, be given timely advice of its business. I think that we need to look at our structure in terms of requiring that at least a minimun of seven days' notice of our business be given before we meet. Getting papers on a Friday night, or, more often than not, Sunday morning or Monday, is not satisfactory, and notwithstanding the apology given by the Honourable Minister earlier in the session, I think it is something that we ought to deprecate.

I think, Sir, that the business of the Senate should be structured in such a fashion that Senators, who are all appointed – the fact is that they are being asked to serve here but are independent business people in their own right – should be able to know and dedicate Wednesdays for the business of the Senate instead of meeting on an ad hoc basis. The House knows when it is going to meet, why can't we know when we are going to meet? If we put aside two or three days a month that is required, we know these are blocked off, and whatever business is done in the Other Place, we can deal with it on those days, rather than have an Order Paper of 13 items to push through in one afternoon.

In a speech I made in this Honourable Chamber some time last year, I referred to the substantial number of persons who had just graduated from the University who were out of work. Sir, in just over a week's time, when you will be honoured by that university, a similar number of persons will walk across the platform and receive their diplomas who will still be out of work after three or four months, many of whom could be gainfully and usefully employed by us in this Chamber.

I have been in this body for over a year and I am still to find and identify where the library is, or if there is a library. If one wants to research a matter, one have to rely on one's own resources and one's own contacts, ring

embassies or whatever other resources one may choose to use.

I could not just simply sit here and allow this matter of a $55 or $69 increase be put before the Senate without raising a matter of some concern to me, that the business of the Senate, as we approach the 350th anniversary of parliamentary Government in this country, needs to be reviewed and overhauled. It is not satisfactory to go along the way we are going, without the tools to do the job that I think we are here to perform on behalf of the people of Barbados.

I thank you, Sir.

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: Mr. President, the Leader of Government Business in this Chamber, Senator Sir James Tudor, is an acknowledgedly skilled debater, and I think that he used some of that skill in directing attention away from at least one aspect of the matter before us. But before I draw attention to the matter that I believed has been overlooked, I would like to record my support for Senator Blackman's plea for research assistance. I do think it is something which Senators need to have if we are, in fact, to have the background information on which to make contributions of significant quality.

Sir, I share the view of Senator Tudor that matters need to be discussed and examined in context. I agree with him that parliamentarians should have, to use his words, reasonable remuneration, and in fact, Mr. President, I do not think that the matter at issue, with due respect to Senator Tudor, is really to do with whether or not parliamentarians should have reasonable remuneration. Certainly my concern is not that. I am concerned, Sir, at the proposal to make these increases, and to make them retroactive, at a time when the economy of our country is clearly in bad shape. It cannot accurately be described as a buoyant economy, it cannot accurately be described as being on the upturn, to use one of those phrases. If it is not in the doldrums, if that is too strong a word, it is certainly quite legitimate to describe it as being in very difficult circumstances.

The report from the Central Bank, which has already been referred to in this Chamber this afternoon, Sir, I think provides more than adequate evidence that we are in very difficult economic circumstances. I therefore find it difficult to see how, given that situation, Government can fail to set an appropriate example by exercising restraint, the very restraint which I think is very clearly called for in so many words, using those specific words by the Central Bank.

What is more, if one takes this in context, one will remember that the way in which the 5 per cent reduction was projected was in the context of saying, 'look at what we the leaders of the country are doing, we are taking a cut in pay.' And at a time when the available evidence suggests that the economy is in worse shape now in November 1987 than it was in June 1986, it is almost unbelievable that the Government should bring before the country a Bill which says it is ignoring that entirely and is going ahead with retroactive increases.

Let me make the point for the record, Mr. President, that the actual amount of money is a relatively small sum. I am not making the suggestion, nor am I implying, that we are talking about $20 million. I am concerned about the principle that we need to focus on, and I am suggesting that in these circumstances, the action of the Government raises serious questions about its credibility so far as example to the citizen is concerned. In fact, without being unduly facetious, one could almost say that it is as though Government is setting out to annoy the people of Barbados, and I cannot understand why Government should act in this way.

This is a matter that I have spoken to several citizens on. I would not pretend that I have canvassed the length and breadth of the country – that would not be true – but I have certainly raised this matter, and it has been raised in my presence, and those persons to whom I have spoken about it, or whom I have heard speak about it, have all reacted in this way; why are they doing that? It is on those grounds that I am suggesting that this measure must necessarily serve Government ill.

2.50 p.m.

Aside.

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: Mr. President, I am not liking that at all.

(*Aside:* SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Let that pass.)

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am going to be extremely rigid with this utter misconduct. Senator Miller, you know you cannot behave like that. After all, this is not a barn yard. This is the Senate. Shouting out like that! Can you be behaving like that?

Aside.

Mr. PRESIDENT: He did not shout out like that. I was going to speak to him about that. I cannot have you bawling out to the top of your voice.

(*Aside:* SENATOR B. A. MILLER: I beg Your Honour's pardon.)

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: If the honourable Senator would give way, I wish to apologise to him, and to you, Sir, for the intervention.

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: Sir, I am concerned that the Government and our country should not lose face with its citizens. One does not expect any Government to escape criticism, but it seems to me that there are actions which go out of their way to seek it, and I am suggesting that this is one of those actions.

On a matter of principle, and in the present state of the economy, it is my considered view, Sir, that this is a most ill-advised action on the part of the Government, and I cannot support the motion.

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: I must say I heartily endorse what has been said by Senator Blackman and Senator Shorey. I think Senator Shorey has taken the right path in this debate, and that is, that the question is not the quantum of the raise.

I must say, Mr. President, that politicians and Government bamboozle me. I really cannot understand what kind of thinking they have at times. I remember that in 1984, I had to speak in this very Chamber and criticise what the then Government was doing. They also raised salaries at a time when thousands of people were out of work.

Aside.

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: In 1984.

(*Aside:* SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: There were?)

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: Thousands of people were out of work.

(*Aside:* SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I did not know of that then.)

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: I spoke about that then. I said that I considered the action of the Government very insensitive, and that is the word I am going to use again.

This Government has come into power, and in 1987, with thousands of people again out of work, is increasing the salaries of parliamentarians. I really cannot follow that logic. If you are telling me that you are the Government and you are there trying to help the masses, and you are doing this and that for the masses, I cannot see how you can be telling the masses to tighten their belts, things are a little tough and you are extending yours. It just does not make sense to me. I have never been able to understand that, and I never will be able to understand it.

There was all this talk about this present Government taking off 5 per cent when they came into power, trying to impress the people that they were making an economic sacrifice and showing them that they understood the economy, the economy was in such a shambles or in such bad state and they would have to try and take something off their own personal salaries and show that they were making a sacrifice to the country, hoping that that would go down very well with the people. But what we did not realise was that the $15 000 that people were allowed off their Income Tax more than compensated for that 5 per cent that they lost. They really did not lose anything, but that was just to make people believe that they did lose something.

We feel it is a most inopportune time for this Government – and the last one, too – to be coming asking for an increase in salaries when thousands of people are on the bread line and thousands of people are out of work. If we were really a Government for the people, we would be thinking about them rather than thinking about ourselves.

That is all I have to say now.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: I would like to start out, Mr. President, by saying that reference has already been made in this debate to the Nicholls Commission. This was a Commission which was appointed early in the first term of the Barbados Labour Party Government, soon after 1976, to look into salaries for parliamentarians. It was headed by Mr. Neville Nicholls, who I think is now Deputy President of the Caribbean Development Bank. He was not as exalted then as he is now.

I totally disapproved of the findings and the recommendations of the Nicholls Commission. I found it highly offensive that Mr. Nicholls, who resided in the splendour of a tax free salary at the Caribbean Development Bank of no mean proportion, should think so poorly of the function of parliamentarians that one of his recommendations was that we should be paid like day labourers in the agricultural field. He said we should be paid on a daily basis, and the day we did not come to Parliament, we should not be paid. That turned me off him and his report forever!

I do not believe that we can be equated with people who labour on a daily basis. We are not jobbing labourers. Some of us, like myself, view it almost as we would view a profession. I view myself as a professional parliamentarian, and I believe that as time goes on in this system, and in other democratic parliamentary systems like ours, you will get more and more people like myself – and I hope more women will come forward in that system as well –who will come forward prepared to spend many years in service as parliamentarians, if the people would have them.

I feel that parliamentarians must be properly paid. There cannot, in my view – and here I must disagree with the Leader of the Senate – be any comparison with the parliamentarians and the Parliament of 1951 and the

Parliament of 1987. There cannot even be any comparison between the Parliament of 1975 and the Parliament of 1987. In 1951, we were dealing with an economy counted in hundreds of thousands. By 1975, we were dealing with an economy counted in millions. In 1987, we are dealing in excess of a billion dollar economy. The job of a Minister is a far more responsible and onerous one than it used to be.

We have seen two Prime Ministers die in less than a five year span. Nobody in Barbados doubts that, whatever may have been said, their deaths had to do with pressures of office. It is not only parliamentarians, there are other professions and other undertakings which have a high mortality rate because of the nature of the jobs. But we must not try to pretend otherwise. We do important business, and if, bearing in mind that Parliament is the highest committee in the land, the highest council in the land, we can be entrusted with the business of the Government of this country, I really do not see why we cannot be entrusted with the business of fixing salaries for ourselves.

I do not have any strong feelings one way or the other about the fixing of salaries, or who would fix them, except that Mr. Neville Nicholls must not fix them, because he would pay us on an hourly and a daily basis, and there would be a time clock in the corridor. But I feel that parliamentarians must be properly paid. Whatever strategy, whatever mechanism we employ, we must be properly paid.

I do believe that there should be some relativity between what senior civil servants are paid and what Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries are paid. That is the nature of business. Something must be terribly wrong if there is not some relativity in there. I do not think that a system in which a Minister is expected to enjoy a salary at the level of a Senior Secretary and a salary many percentage points below that of, say, a Permanent Secretary or a Chief Technical Officer, could obtain for long.

Even in the Workers Union, Mr. President, there is some relativity based on seniority.

Laughter.

3.00 p.m .

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: It is true we do not know what the General Secretary of the union earns. That is one of the best kept secrets in Barbados, and I do not have any quarrel with it being the best kept secret. There must be some relativity in the hierarchy of any organisation, including Parliament.

I wish to agree with other Senators who have spoken that now is a particularly inopportune time for parliamentarians to be voting themselves increases. I think it is a poor example that we would set, and I use the word "we" in view of calls from various sectors for restraint, particularly meaning wage restraint. We know that they mean wage restraint. There are some people who believe that import restrictions are due anytime now and that other restrictive practices will be brought in by the Government, but I think that when the call for restraint went out from the Central Bank, most people immediately understood that to mean wage restraint. So I agree that the timing is inopportune.

There are two matters on which I must pick up the Honourable Leader of the Senate. One has to do with levels of remuneration existing among Ministers now and among Ministers of more recent vintage. Mention was made of motor cars. I want to be very clear on this, Mr. President. I have always driven my own personal motor car, and I will always drive my own personal motor car. I did not believe then, and I do not believe now, that it is proper to draw a travelling allowance and drive a Government car at one and the same time. Ministers, Parliamentary Secretaries and parliamentarians, of whatever hue, like civil servants, should be made to choose, and their salaries should reflect it, and the same goes for housing allowances and any other kind of allowances. We really cannot have a situation in which they are going to expect to eat their cake and have it in their hand at one and the same time. I thoroughly disapproved of it, I did not participate in the practice, and I still disapprove of it.

I think that the situation needs to be regularised. It is still not regularised. We still have a situation where certain members – I do not want to be invidious by calling names, but some sit in this Chamber – are the beneficiaries of regular, and in some cases daily, transport, courtesy of the taxpayers of this country. I think that the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Minister of the Public Service or whoever should regularise the matter and have it clearly stated that you either draw a travelling allowance and you do not have access to a motor car, or you have access to a motor car and you do not draw a travelling allowance, and it would be reflected in your salary accordingly.

The other thing that I want to take up the Leader of the Senate on has to do with the reference he made in relation to the Prime Minister's pension some years ago. I think Senator Blackman raised this point as well. What happened then, and I like to speak in plain language, Mr. President, was that the man who from 1976 – well not quite in 1976, he refused to take the post. We keep forgetting that, and it is slipping my memory now – from 1978, the gentleman who became the Leader of the Opposition was found to be drawing the salary of the Leader of the Opposition and drawing a Prime Minister's pension at one and the same

time while he was a parliamentarian. Both the pension and the salary were relative to employment as a parliamentarian and this was thought to be improper, and it was thought that the recipient should be made to choose either that he would take the salary of the Leader of the Opposition or he would take the pension of the Prime Minister. What happened was that, in the circumstances, it was suspended, with the knowledge and consent of the gentleman involved.

The Prime Minister of this country's pension was never abolished. The one who is Prime Minister now and the three who preceded him all became eligible to draw their Prime Ministerial pension at the 91st day. I do not agree with the Honourable Leader of the Senate that they should draw it at day one. I think that the 90-day period is a suitable interim period for us to be sure that the incumbent is, in fact, going to be a Prime Minister and that he should draw his pension. I do not have any quarrel with him having a different pension arrangement than other Ministers do and other parliamentarians do.

I am not going to go into any detail about my own views about the salaries and pensions of Ministers. It is a long story, but this area also needs review. There are people sitting in this Chamber who know that their presence here partly has to do with the fact that they are upgrading their pensions. Nobody blames them for it, nobody thinks any less of them for it, because it is the only way their pensions can be upgraded, but something has to be done about that. I think that is a fit matter for review.

A man or woman will retire as a Minister at a relatively young age and find that 40 years hence his or her pension is still being computed based on a salary that was earned 40 years before. There are no increments that one can naturally expect. Governments from time to time, I suppose out of largesse, will accommodate people. Generally speaking, that is how it is, and ways and means have been found to upgrade the pensions of Parliamentary Secretaries and Ministers who find themselves out of the Other Place and who may well find themselves in here making up time in order that their pension may be upgraded. I think it is *infra dig*, and I think this is something for a parliamentary review committee, and I do hope that parliamentary salaries will be reviewed. After all, salaries for everybody else who work are reviewed from time to time, and there is no good reason why parliamentary salaries should not be reviewed. Both the Leader of the Senate and myself sat on a review committee some years ago.

I want to, Mr. President, agree with Senator Blackman on what he said about conditions under which parliamentarians work in these two Chambers. I continue to sit on the committee which monitors, I suppose that is the word to use, the refurbishment of Parliament. Everyone knows that the refurbishment, apart from being absolutely essential –I mean we have come to a point in the Other Place where a bucket had to be put between Ministers on the front bench to catch the water when the rain fell – the opportunity was taken to undertake an entire programme, bearing in mind we have a 350th anniversary coming, and bearing in mind that the post office, after many, many decades, was moving into its own establishment, and that, for the first time in a very long time, these buildings were being returned to the use of parliamentarians.

3.10 p.m.

That refurbishment committee, certainly when it was under my chairmanship, had full plans and intentions for total refurbishment. We took a long view that we would not possibly touch these buildings for another 200 years, and that it was not fair, as Senator Blackman said, that members had no decent library.

There are plans drawn up by an architect, which are available to the committee, and those plans show that the intention is for us to have a library of a certain size downstairs which would afford the kind of research capability that Senators are calling for, a library which would have journals, newspapers of this region and the metropolitan countries available to members and research assistance. We did not contemplate that members could have individual research assistants, but that research assistance would be available to all members of Parliament.

Those plans will show that the room immediately under this is meant to be a formal and proper dining room for members of Parliament. They will show that the west wing was going to be pressed into use, that there would be reception rooms in which Parliament and the Government could have access for entertainment. Something is wrong with the fact that when the Government has to entertain, when parliament has to entertain, you have to go to somebody's hotel lobby and that sort of thing. There was even a facility planned for a small parliamentary museum, because we are one of the oldest democratic Parliaments in the world, and many other plans.

I hope that members are pleased with the refurbishment of the Other Place. This place is now due for refurbishment. I only hope – and I have made this plea in another place in the presence of the Prime Minister and the then Minister, the recently deposed or recently reshuffled Minister of Communications and Works – that amidst all the calls for restraint and the cutback, Parliament will continue to be given some priority. If we cannot respect the institution, including the physical building of Parliament, as somebody has intimated in debate already today, Sir, we cannot expect that the man in the street is going to respect it either, and buildings speak for themselves.

Institutions that are important, that importance in society is reflected in buildings. I have said this already. There was a time when the Cathedral was the biggest building in Bridgetown, and that reflected the power and influence of the church. We have to face the fact that there are banks now, there is this building and other buildings pertaining to other institutions which are larger than St. Mary's and the St. Michael's Cathedral, the two churches in Bridgetown, and that says something for the ascendancy of other sectors. We may not like what it is saying, but the fact is that buildings speak.

The new Central Bank building speaks to the new technology and to the importance of economics and finance in our system of government in the closing decade of the 20th century. The size of the National Insurance building speaks to the kind of priority that we give to the very concept of Social Security. This Parliament speaks to the respect that we hold for the institution of free speech and all those other liberties and privileges which Parliament guarantees to us, and it does not behove us to let it fall into a state of any greater disrepair than it now finds itself in.

There is still serious leaking over in the west wing, and if we do not arrest that by repairing the roof, it is going to ruin the entire building, the same problem that we had here. I really appeal to the Government for Parliament to continue, that this building to have some kind of priority in whatever capital works programme the Government is devising, and that it be not put off.

The last point I want to make, Mr. President, has to do with a passing reference that was made to constituency allowances. In the Other Place, Members do not get constituency allowances. A salary is paid to a Constituency Secretary; it is not paid through the Member of Parliament, it is paid directly from Parliament to that Constituency Secretary. The point I want to make is that I believe that parliamentarians should have a constituency allowance, and I hope that any review committee on any salary adjustment will consider this.

I said, we are now a billion dollar economy. The days are gone, such as the Honourable Leader described, where you would get a phone call to come and take somebody from Pie Corner to the hospital at minutes past midnight. We now have an Ambulance Service and a Health Service that is superior to any in this hemisphere that the taxpayers put there to carry out that function. But there are other important functions that parliamentarians have to carry out. Parliamentarians may have to do that sort of thing in an emergency situation, but that is not part of the daily function of parliamentarians any more. We have become more sophisticated and more businesslike than that, and we have put our constituents beyond the whim and the fancy of their representatives. We have put certain social services in place to answer those needs, the people should not have to depend on the M.Ps to do that sort of thing for them nowadays. Of course, in an emergency, anybody would rise to the occasion.

I do think that parliamentarians ought to have constituency allowances which will assist them. I do not expect that the constituency allowance would be without a ceiling, or would be expected to cover all constituency costs, but most parliamentarians have to think in terms of a constituency office, which requires rental in most cases, utilities to be paid, a salaried person or two working in the constituency office, and there are many other things that parliamentarians are expected to do nowadays. They are expected to subscribe to journals which cost a lot of money. They are expected to be well read people, well informed, so that when they come to Parliament, they know what they are talking about and they can address themselves to almost any matter that comes before either the Other Place or this place. I would certainly wish to support the principle of a constituency allowance when the time comes for any review of parliamentary salaries.

Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, there is not much more I think that I need say in winding up this debate, but I make one observation immediately. There is much more in common, I think, between the speeches from the two party leaders than there is in common between their speeches and the other speeches we have heard, and it is because the two of us have been through the experience of the things we are talking about.

One thing that puzzled me, as I listened particularly to Senator Jones, is his obvious distress of what perhaps he may have wanted to describe as a special quirk in politicians. His distress was expressed, if I understand him correctly, that at a time of stress and hardship, or whatever, we are increasing our own salaries. It seems to me – I may be mistaken – that he did not particularly go against the principle, although he did criticise it in some sense, but he was more against the accumulation arising from the back-dating of the arrangements.

3.20 p.m.

The way how this thing works, if you could have had a salaries revision taking place and agreed on for the Public Service, let us say, in the last month of a financial year to take effect from the beginning of the next financial year, and if against all experience you could have got all the decisions and all the legislation ready to make it effective from the beginning of a financial year, having concluded it only two or three weeks before, the question of accumulated back pay would not arise. From April 1, 1986 you would

have paid the new salaries for the Public Service, and you would not even have had to pay them back pay. *A fortiori*, if in addition to doing that you could have got the legislation which follows from that and which applies to parliamentary salaries, you would have done it on April 1 or in time for April 1, or in the first week of April, and there would be no question of retroactive pay. It is because arrangements made in this respect take some time to get made, and because finality for these arrangements does not often come until months after through the legislative and Cabinet processes, that when you do decide to bring the legislation to Parliament, you have to make it retroactive if it is to become law.

If you think that this is a bit of special pleading that politicians like to make, let me tell you that there was another reason why we had to make this retroactive. There are Ministers of the Barbados Labour Party who are now in retirement and who are entitled to pension, and their pensionable emoluments would have been in good standing on April 1, and indeed on May 1, 1986, because they were still in office and did not cease to be Ministers until June 4. So unless you are going to say that because we had won a Government on May 28, everyone who was in office before that should have reached their cut off point because the Government changed, you have to agree with this. I do not think that a lot of Members have understood this, that we are safeguarding the pensions of Mr. Bolden, Mr. Craig, Mr. L. B. Brathwaite and the ones I cannot remember, who are entitled, and this must be known. So the retroactive pay, in any case, would have to go back to that date.

I do not want to be contentious in this, because the person is beyond the reach of our cavil or our argument now, but I am astonished and a bit surprised to hear it said that the late Prime Minister had acquiesced in the arrangements for the cutting off of his pension. I do not know that is so, I do not know that it is not so. He was a very forthright kind of person and never spoke under his arm, and if he had at any time agreed to that, he would have said so, because the one quality he had was his bluntness.

The next thing I am astonished to hear was that he drew salary as Leader of the Opposition when he was not. I would like to have proof of this. I do not know, I was not a Member of Parliament.

Asides.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: If there was an overlap, there was, but I have never heard it said until now. I think that I must be so solicitous of his memory and his good name that I would not like that to go down as a black mark against him. I think he could have taken care of himself if he were here in the flesh, but I do not want that to be said, so I would be happy to see the circumstances in which he did it.

He was a man that was very careful about his personal finances, about money. He did not even like to bother himself about things that were rightly due and owing to him. He died leaving uncashed cheques in his briefcase which were due and owing to him. I am astonished to hear that this was the case with him. I hope it is not so, but if it is so, I will not rest until I find the reason for it.

Lastly, Sir, I wish to again apologise to you, Sir, for that intemperate intervention. I was only harking back to my bad old days as a contentious politician. In apologising, which I do unreservedly to the honourable Senator whom I crossed while he was speaking, and I am very sorry for this, I want to tell him that Senators are not inferior to mad dogs and we should be allowed the first bite.

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

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: Divide.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I beg to move that the Bill be not committed and that it be read a third time.

The question that the Bill be not committed and be read a third time was put to the Senate and agreed to.

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: On a point of order: I think Senator Shorey should have his "no" recorded.

Mr. PRESIDENT: We do not have questions being asked for other members of the Senate. These persons must know what they want. This is not a question and answer occasion.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: It has been drawn to my attention, Sir – I was not even aware of this, although I knew what I was talking on when I was speaking – that the Bill we have just done is the Senate and House of Assembly (Remuneration and Allowances of Members) Act. Does the Senator want his dissent recorded against this?

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Tudor, honourable members must be clear as to what they want. As I said already, it is not a question and answer Assembly, and therefore I cannot conduct that sort of affair of asking members what they want. The question has been put and passed. Members of the Senate must be able to deal with matters when they come here and not seek for guidance from the Chair in these cases. They must be clear about what they want.

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: Mr. President, may I ask whether it is in order that I ask to have my dissent recorded?

Mr. PRESIDENT: You can have the Clerk record your dissent, certainly.

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: Thank you.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

The question that the Bill do now pass was put to the Senate and agreed to.

MINISTERS AND PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES (REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1987

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I have already made a speech covering both. 3.30 p.m.

This is the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances)(Amendment) Bill.

I beg to move that it be now read a second time.

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

On separate motions of Senator the Hon. SIR JAMES TUDOR, the Bill was not committed, read a third time and passed.

INCREASE OF ANNUAL SALARY OF THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Order No. 12 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to increase the annual salary payable to the Governor-General with effect from 1st April, 1986.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I beg to move, Sir, that this Resolution do now pass.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put to the Senate and agreed to.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Sir, if I may ask the Senate to indulge the Government for a few minutes longer, I should like to deal with a Bill which was done in the Other Place and has come to us today. I think it has been circulated. It is called the Miscellaneous Amendments Bill.

I am also asking leave for my colleague to take charge of it.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The honourable Member is asking leave for the Honourable Senator Lewis to take care of the Miscellaneous Bill that came to the Senate today.

There being no objection, leave is granted.

MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS ACT, 1987

Order No. 13 was called – To move the second reading of a Bill to amend certain enactments.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, this Bill deals with the National Insurance and Social Security Act and the National Health Service Board.

Earlier this year, notice was given that the Government proposed to amend the National Health Service Board legislation and to arrange for contributions to the National Health Service Scheme to be paid into the Consolidated Fund instead of into the National Insurance Fund, as previously.

These two amendments, which it is proposed should come into effect from November 1, 1987, will give effect to that earlier decision for the contributions collected under the National Insurance and Social Security Act to be paid fully into the Consolidated Fund, and for the payments which were formerly paid under the National Health Service Board Act, Cap. 381A, to be paid as money voted by Parliament for the purposes of the board.

I believe that this was one of the matters which was dealt with by the Minister of Finance in another place somewhat earlier in the year. There has been a lot of debate, I am certain, about the paying of contributions into the Consolidated Fund.

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

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Mr. President, I am deeply concerned at this move. It is not a concern born of most recent times, it is a concern born from the time this Government committed an about turn on levies.

Before it became the Government, during its days in Opposition, the Democratic Labour Party was loud on the levies, and in fact promised that it would abolish the levies. The Democratic Labour Party became the Government, and in less than a year, far from abolishing the levies, it has increased the levies, both the quantity of the levies and the number of levies.

There was another promise which was made, and that was – this was after the about face of course – that levies would be paid into the Consolidated Fund. What we have today is a very confusing situation where some levies are paid into the Consolidated Fund and some are not. I want to know, what exactly is the Government's policy on the levies?

It is clear that the levies will continue. As I say, they are expanding and increasing the levies. But what is the rationale behind the levies? Why is it that some are paid into the Consolidated Fund and some are not to be paid into the Consolidated Fund? I wish the distinction between these

two to be made clear to me and to all Barbadians. I will say why in a moment.

I go back again, Mr. President, Sir, to the Economic Review of the Barbados Central Bank, most recently published, September, 1987, at page 6, which says that spending on health declined by $5.7 million. I am very glad that the Barbados Labour Party managed to start the expansion to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and that it has reached such a stage that it could not be stopped, because it was needed, and it was part of the health programme and the health policy of our Government.

What are the implications of the cutback in $5.7 million on the capital health budget, because I am dealing here with capital expenditure, which fell by some $11 million, and $5.7 million of that $11 million was health? We are hearing that there are shortages of drugs at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and at the polyclinics. We are hearing that operating theatres at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital are not operating for lack of equipment, and particularly, I am informed, a lack of drugs. We are hearing, and seeing, to some extent, through letters to the newspapers, that the chaos which we used to know years ago at the Casualty at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital has returned. We are hearing that polyclinic services have been cut back. Those of us like myself who patronise the polyclinics, and have cause sometimes to take senior citizens or children to them, know of our own knowledge that polyclinic services are being cut back.

3.40 p.m.

But we are hearing, too, that the Government is negotiating to buy the St. Joseph Hospital. That is not a capital work, but that is meant to be a capital expenditure, if it ever comes to past. The St. Joseph Hospital never enjoyed above 38.2 per cent occupancy in all its years, never fulfilled its promise of bringing a service to the north of Barbados, but some people, for their own personal gain, fondly wish to persuade the Barbadian public that the St. Joseph Hospital can function. We are hearing now that Government is to find God knows how many millions to purchase that, but operating theatres are short of drugs.

The question I want to ask is this: what guarantee do we have that when the Health Levy is paid into the Consolidated Fund, those monies will, in fact, be spent on health rather than be used as a device to replenish a flagging Consolidated Fund, flagging for want of revenue? We must never be allowed to forget that the July Budget of 1986, for the first time in the history of any Budget in this country, raised not one cent in revenue. We never heard of it before, a Budget which gave away all but did not raise one cent in revenue, and we are paying the price for that, and we will continue to pay the price for that for some years to come.

These capital cuts that the Central Bank Economic Review refers to are partly because of that misguided policy that we could give it all away and that somehow it would fall like manna from heaven and you would replenish the Consolidated Fund. It does not fall like manna from heaven, and since no revenue was raised, you borrowed what you could, and what you could not borrow, you cut back. I think that the people of this country have a right to know and to understand that critical social services are being cut back. And it is not only social services – they would be shocked, if they would only read this Economic Review, to see that even in the productive sector there have been cut backs. In health, education and in agriculture there have been cut backs. But the largest cut back of all is in health – $5.7 million.

Now we hear that the Health Levy is to be paid into the Consolidated Fund. We know that the Consolidated Fund is in a bad way. The Treasury of this country is telling Government workers who are paid on a weekly basis, maids, porters and messengers, that it cannot cash any cheque in excess of $100. These workers have been accustomed, all these years, to going to the Treasury on a Thursday evening or Friday morning to have those salary cheques cashed, but each one has been told that if he or she does not have a bank account, he or she should go and open one, because the Treasury cannot cash any cheque in excess of $100. When that happens, you have to know what the situation is with the Consolidated Fund, you have to know what the situation is in the Treasury. We know that that is what the Tax Refund Certificates are all about.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Do not let us go that road.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: I am not going to go that road. I am going to keep that for a later point. I am going to stay with Health.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Stay with (a) and (b).

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: I will reiterate my question: what guarantee will the people of Barbados have that when the Health Levy, which they continue to pay, goes into the Consolidated Fund, that money will, in fact, not only be earmarked for, but be spent on health.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Ask the Minister.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: I am asking him.....rather than agriculture, or rather than to pay wages and to shortfill some of the gaps caused by the lack of revenue? That is the question I would like answered.

Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, the honourable Senator asked a question knowing

full well the answer, which is that there is only one Barbados and there is only one Consolidated Fund, and that when monies are paid into the Consolidated Fund, they cannot be identified completely for any one type of activity. All levies, when paid into the Fund, will serve all of the services which the Government of the country, whether it be a BLP Government or a DLP Government, provide. That answer is very well known. If one disagrees with the principle and practise of paying levies into the Consolidated Fund, which is the place where they should have always gone anyhow, I understand that disagreement. There are shades of opinion on how best to tackle these things.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: On a point of order, Sir. I really hate to interrupt, but I do not like words being put into my mouth. I can speak for myself. I know that there is one Barbados. I know there is one Consolidated Fund. But I also know that the Health Levy can be quantified in dollars and cents and that the Health budget can be quantified in dollars and cents, and in that way we will know.

Mr. PRESIDENT: That is not a point of order, Senator Miller.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Senator Miller knows that that is simple arithmetic. If the Government of the day so elects to prepare its Estimates, to fashion its expenditure on health services to match the anticipated incomes from levies, then it will do that. Again, that is not an unreasonable arrangement. But I am not in a position to say whether the Government, in preparing the Estimates for 1988-89, will do that.

Another point made which I need to respond to was the suggestion that it will affect the capital budget. It is not customary for monies going into the Consolidated Fund to be earmarked for capital expenditure, certainly not in recent times. But again, if levies are raised, there is no reason why it cannot be done, and although up to now Government has not taken a stance to put the Transport Levy into the Consolidated Fund, there is no reason why that as well could not be put into the Consolidated Fund. All of these things will in due season be corrected if the levies are to go to the Consolidated Fund. It so happens that the Transport Levy, as far as I am aware, is probably the only one that has not yet gone into the Consolidated Fund. But the Democratic Labour Party took a position on the levies, and it is pursuing this position. That is why this Bill comes before us this evening.

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

On the motion of Senator the Hon. L. V. H. LEWIS, Mr. PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate resolved itself into Committee on the Bill, Senator M. deL. JORDAN in the Chair.
3.50 p.m.

COMMITTEE

Clauses 1 – 3 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. L. V. H. LEWIS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. PRESIDENT resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Senator the Hon. L. V. H. LEWIS, the Bill was read a third time and passed and cited as the Miscellaneous Amendments Act, 1987.

ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, this concludes the business of the day.

I beg to move that this Senate do now adjourn *sine die*.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: Sir, on the motion for the adjournment, can the Minister indicate when Private Members' Business on the Order Paper will be attended to? There is an inconclusive foreign policy debate and there is a Resolution in the name of Senator Jones, and in respect of the foreign policy debate, there are a number of us on this side who have not spoken on that Bill.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: The answer is that I cannot give many assurances. In the case of the foreign policy debate, it will not be possible to continue next week, and it is just likely that we can resume that debate on the following week.

I asked to adjourn the Senate *sine die* because I would like to be in a position to be specific, but I cannot. I will raise with the Leader of Government Business in the Senate the question of debate on the other Resolution.

Mr. PRESIDENT: This sitting of the Senate stands adjourned *sine die*.
3.53 p.m.

CONTENTS

MESSAGES

Mr. PRESIDENT. 570

Senate Seat of F. G. Smith, Q.C. declared vacant from August 30, 1987.

Absence of Governor-General from the island from October 24 to November 19, 1987.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

Senator the Hon. SIR JAMES TUDOR. 571

The Housing (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1987.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1987.

The Cinematograph Film Censorship (Charges) (Amendment) Regulations, 1987.

The Cinematograph Film Censorship (Fees and Travelling Allowances) (Amendment) Regulations, 1987.

The Report of the Air Transport Licensing Authority for the year 1986.

The 18th Annual Report and Financial Statements of the Barbados Development Bank for the year 1986-1987.

The Travel Ticket Tax (Rate of Tax) (Amendment) Order, 1987.

The Post Office (Overseas Parcel Post) (Amendment) Regulations, 1987.

Report of the Accountant General for the financial year 1986-87.

The Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Insurance Corporation of Barbados for the year 1986.

The Annual Report of the Chief Medical Officer for the year 1985.

QUESTIONS TO MINISTERS

Senator C. A. BLACKMAN. 571, 581

of the Leader of the Senate (Senator the Hon. Sir James Tudor) re state of loans approved and/or guaranteed by Parliament between June 1, 1986 and June 30, 1987.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

Senator the Hon. SIR JAMES TUDOR. 571

Illness of Senator J. S. Goddard.

MOTIONS RELATING TO BUSINESS

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS 45(1) and (2). 571

Senator Tudor, 571; Senator Blackman, 571.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Senator the Hon. SIR JAMES TUDOR. 572

A Bill to amend certain enactments.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

POST OFFICE (INTERNATIONAL MAIL SERVICE (VALIDATION OF FEES) ACT, 1987. 572

Senator Lewis, 572.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (No.2) ORDER, 1987. 572

Senator Lewis, 572.

INCREASE IN RATES APPLICABLE TO CATEGORY 9 OF KEY SCALES. 573

Senator Lewis, 573.

VESTING IN NATIONAL HOUSING CORPORATION OF LAND AT GOLDEN MILE, HEYWOODS, ST. PETER. 573

Senator Tudor, 573; Senator Prescod, 574.

VESTING IN NATIONAL HOUSING CORPORATION OF LAND AT APES HILL, ST. JAMES. 574

Senator Tudor, 574; Senator Miller, 575.

PORT AUTHORITY (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1987. 577

Senator Lewis, 577.

FISCAL INCENTIVES (VALIDATION OF BENEFITS) ACT, 1987. 577

Senator Lewis, 577, 579; Senator Miller, 577; Senator Wickham, 579.

GOVERNOR-GENERAL (CONDITIONS OF SERVICE) ACT. 580

Senator Tudor, 580.

JUDGES (REMUNERATION AND PENSIONS) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1987. 581

Senator Tudor, 581.

SENATE AND HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY (REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES OF MEMBERS) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1987. . . .581

Senator Tudor, 581, 591; Senator Blackman, 586; Senator Shorey, 587; Senator Jones, 588; Senator Miller, 588.

MINISTERS AND PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES (REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1987. .593

INCREASE OF ANNUAL SALARY OF THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL. 593

MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS ACT, 1987. 593

Senator Lewis, 593, 594; Senator Miller, 593.

SUSPENSION. 581

ADJOURNMENT 595

Senator Lewis, 595; Senator Blackman, 595.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

BLACKMAN, C.A.
JONES, Can. I. McK.
LEWIS, Hon. L. V. H.
MILLER, B. A.
PRESCOD, T. A.
SHOREY, Dr. L. L.
TUDOR, Hon. Sir James
WALCOTT, His Hon. F. L.
WICKHAM, J. C. W.