
THE SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1991 - 96

THE SENATE

Friday, October 8, 1993

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Parliament Buildings, on Friday, October 8, 1993, at 11.20 a.m.

PRESENT

His Honour Senator M. deL. JORDAN, (President);
His Honour Senator J. J. PAYNE, (Deputy President);

Senator the Honourable L. V. H. LEWIS, G.C.M.,
(Minister of the Environment, Housing and Lands)(Leader of the Senate);

Senator A. MORRISON;

Senator Mrs. V. C. FRASER, B.S.S., J.P., M.C.F.A.;

Senator A. J. N. PHILLIPS, G.C.M.;

Senator the Honourable Dr. C. D. CLARKE
(Minister of State, Ministry of Economic Affairs and Deputy Leader of the Senate);

Senator Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE;

Senator Miss Y. V. WALKES;

Senator Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH;

Senator J. J. PAYNE;

Senator Mrs. A. STRAUGHN, G.C.M.;

Senator Mrs. M. WALCOTT, S.C.M.;

Senator W. L. INNISS;

Senator the Venerable Archdeacon J. L. SPRINGER;

Senator J. G. BELLAMY;

Senator T. E. BARKER;

Senator Miss M. A. MOTTLEY and

Senator T. C. BECKLES.

Prayers were led by Fr. Errington Massiah.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The Senate is in session.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, I am commanded to lay the Annual Report of the Chief Medical Officer for the year 1990.

QUESTIONS TO MINISTERS

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, I am to lay the reply of Parliamentary Question No. 1 asked by Senator Tyrone Barker on December 16, 1992. I see the Honourable Senator looking as though he wants me to read it. It is there but I do not think that we should take up the Senate's time by reading it.

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

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Order 45(2) to enable us to deal with Item 5 on the order of business for today.

The question that Standing Order No. 45(2) be suspended in order to deal with Item No. 5 on the Order Paper for today was put to the Senate and agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, I beg to move the first reading of a Bill entitled the Public Service Suspension of Increments Bill, 1993.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 1 - TO MOVE THE PASSING OF A
RESOLUTION TO APPROVE A LEASE TO SEAWELL
AIR SERVICES LIMITED OF LAND AT GRANTLEY
ADAMS AIRPORT, CHRIST CHURCH FOR PASSENGER
SERVICE FACILITIES FOR AIRCRAFT
USING THE AIRPORT

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, the Resolution before us seeks to implement Government's proposal to lease 6,430.9 square metres of land at the Grantley Adams International Airport to Seawell Air Services, one of the firms presently doing business at the Airport. During the early 1970's the Crown in its right of Government had negotiated a lease agreement with Aircraft Services International Limited in respect of a parcel of land comprising 3.77 acres of land at Grantley Adams International Airport. That lease was for a period of 15 years with effect from April 1974 and an option to renew for a further period of 15 years.

In 1985, Aircraft Services International requested permission to sublet part of the area on the lease and it was indicated at that time that two buildings had been constructed on the land but that a considerable portion of the land remained undeveloped. It was the undeveloped portion of the land which Aircraft Services Limited, formerly known as Aircraft Services International Limited, was seeking to sublet to Trident Aviation to erect a hangar and a workshop for the purpose of carrying out repairs to small aircraft. A request to sublet was not pursued, but in September 1987 Aircraft Services Limited became amalgamated with Seawell Air Services. Before the amalgamation both companies were wholly owned subsidiaries of Barbados Shipping and Trading. After the merger, the company was referred to as Seawell Air Services Limited.

In 1989, Mr. President, Barbados Shipping and Trading indicated to the Minister of Housing and Lands that Seawell Air Services were exercising its option to renew a 15 year lease which started in 1974 which had been passed on to them and they sought to exercise the option. The Ministry of International Transport which has responsibility for civil aviation consulted with Seawell Air Services and the Ministry of Housing and Lands and it was established that Seawell Air Services had in fact breached the contract with the Crown. More specifically, the lessee had not obtained the Crown's permission to sublet the buildings to American Airways, British Airways, Air Canada and Liat.

In addition, it was observed that Seawell Air Services did not carry on any operational business on this site but was an absentee tenant and that approximately one-third of

the total area is occupied by a single two-storey building which was sublet to Air Canada, Liat and American Air Lines. Further consultations were held with the Ministry of International Transport which shared the view that there should be a renegotiation of the lease arrangement. However, Mr. President, in the unexpired lease agreement, there is a clause to the effect that the lessee should take down and remove buildings on the expiration of the lease unless the lessor had given notice to purchase the same. It is noted that the period of the lease, that is to say ten years from 1989, has been shortened to reflect the passage of time. The lease which we propose to enter into now is a shortened lease based on the 5 years from 1989 which would have elapsed.

11.30 a.m.

The proposal to Parliament is to correct a deficiency and to grant the lease on terms which are now agreed in principle between the parties so that Seawell Air Services may have proper authorised use of this land at Grantley Adams International Airport.

I beg therefore to move, Mr. President, that this Resolution relating to the parcel of land situate at Grantley Adams International Airport in the parish of Christ Church, containing by admeasurement 6 430.9 square metres or thereabouts, abutting and bounding on land now or late of the Government of Barbados on two sides on a service road and on a public road, be now passed.

SENATOR Mrs. M. WALCOTT: Mr. President, I would like to make a few remarks on this Resolution, because I consider that any matter relating to the Grantley Adams International Airport and its development is one of great concern. Our two main ports of entry to this country are of great importance to its economy, especially so in respect of the airport. So I feel that everything possible should be done to make this terminal one of efficiency and one that provides the appropriate facilities to make it a convenient, comfortable and welcome point of entry, or stopover, as the case may be.

I have noticed that there is no quiet room or chapel in the whole compound and I do feel that this is desirable. A nicely and suitably decorated room could and should be made available for passengers to spend a few minutes in quiet reflection away from the incessant bustle and loudspeakers that you find at a busy airport. I do think that such a facility would be appreciated by many - a place to cater to the spiritual needs of the weary or sometimes nervous traveller. Also, the various religions could be invited to send a representative to be present at given times if they so wished.

Another area where I think merits some more attention is the washrooms. These could be upgraded

in general, but in particular there should be better facilities for mother and children travellers, especially mothers with babies.

These are not adjustments requiring major overhaul or expansion, I am sure there are many of those in various plants. These are merely improvements that could be introduced to ease and smoothe the way for the users of the airport. Upgradings like these are those that in any case should be dealt with in an ongoing process.

That is all I have to say and I support the Resolution.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. President, I rise to speak on this Resolution as it relates to the lease of land at the airport to Seawell Air Services Limited.

I wish to raise a number of concerns that I believe the Barbados Labour Party has in respect of the manner in which development seems to be taking place at both our ports, but particularly the airport, since we are now awaiting a study which will determine how best we can rationalise the airport and the services offered there, given the fact that some 20 years or so have passed since the construction of the building, and particularly since there seems to be a number of ad hoc developments, whether in terms of refurbishing, when one visits the airport you see them building some elevator here or something else there or whatever on the lands surrounding the development.

We know, Sir, that 10, 15 years ago there had been some talk about a free trade zone around the area of the airport, and indeed the 8 or 10 acres of land that is opposite the airport, which subsequently went into some cotton production, I believe, although there is now present a rum shop right at the edge of one of those fields. I am not sure when that Resolution came before Parliament to grant the leasing of that land to have the rum shop there, or whether that is part and parcel of Government's developmental plan for the airport and its surrounding areas, but nonetheless, Sir, the point I am making is that there seems to be an absence of an overall plan as to the development of the airport. It reminds me of the manner in which we have dealt with the Transport Board where a year or two ago a number of Resolutions came in here prior to the completion of a study.

We know, and the Minister for this area has confirmed that a study is presently being done about the airport. We also know that during the course of the last year we in this Chamber have also approved Resolutions for other leases of land, for example, one to Simpson Motors or some meteorological institute or something like that on the lands abutting and bounding the airport proper. I am asking whether it makes any sense for us to continue with this ad hoc development of the airport in the absence of waiting for the final study, particularly since we seem at

the moment to be partaking in a rationalisation of the other port, that being the seaport, although there seems to be some difficulty in understanding the manner in which that rationalisation is taking place, because what was originally intended does not seem to be what is coming about, and I hope that the manner in which the decision to create a company to control the duty free area at the seaport, that there will in the future be no similar decision at the airport; that this Chamber will not be called upon to approve that, particularly where it is done in circumstances where we do not know how it is that two major private sector companies had access to such a large shareholding, what criteria were used to allow them to participate as opposed to other companies or persons. I hope that we do not see this development taking place at the airport, because both ports are concerned with the development of a duty free sector.

While we support the concept of the duty free sector in principle, I believe that this party has gone on record in calling for a great degree of transparency in the manner in which we allow this sector to develop. I understand, for example, that \$1 million was spent by Cave Shepherd and Harrison at the airport in the refurbishment of the airport, because at the time Government did not have the money to do that refurbishment, and I am asking that we be informed as to the terms and conditions that this money was spent by these two companies for this refurbishment. I am asking that this be made available to us, because I believe that one does not want to feel that a Government may become beholden to anybody regardless as to whether they are major contributors to the economy or to the foreign exchange earning sectors or not.

11.40 a.m.

I am also asking that we be told what are the plans of this Government as it relates to any expansion of the duty free sector at the airport itself. I just now expressed my caution as to hope that it does not develop in the same manner as I saw the one at the seaport being developed this week. Indeed, Sir, the same fact that the minimal share holding which is possible is \$5 000 for the public to subscribe which, in my view, Sir, rules out a lot of small Barbadians who may wish to participate in that share holding, particularly since they are given such beneficial terms of reference like US\$2 per head, each cruise ship passenger who passes through, and the terms of reference in terms of its rent and options to continue the lease at the Port etc.

I hope that this is not mirrored at the Airport, because what it reflects is a propensity to participate with big business at the exclusion of those who may well be willing to participate but who are only given the opportunity to participate in things like handicraft rather than things that have a guaranteed profit like liquor, crystal and china, like jewelry. Those are being reserved unto a particular class.

I am also a little weary as to why in the development of a duty free sector and a company that controls and manages this duty free sector that a 5% shareholding should be reserved unto a company called Beer Beverages Ltd. as opposed to anybody else. Any one of us here in this country would like to know what is the criteria that would have reserved unto Beer Beverages Limited the right to have that 5 per cent in the same way Cave Shepherd and Harrisons put up 20 per cent.

Sir, I am speaking in this way because when these concerns were raised the Minister of Finance gave the impression that there was still a lot of room for small black Barbadians to participate; but it is interesting that the role which he identified for small black Barbadians to participate in was that high labour intensive, value added area of handicraft, the area of things that the distributive sector in Bridgetown does not want to participate in because there is no guaranteed profit. I am saying that that is not good enough. I am saying that I hope this same thing does not happen at the Airport.

I think there is room for further expansion and rationalisation of the duty free sector at Grantley Adams International Airport. It must be done with a level of equity and fairhandedness where each and every one of us in this country feel that we have a chance to participate on an even and fairhanded level and that we are not being outstripped by the hands and the power of big business, whether it is because they have helped Government when Government was in need of such help or not.

It is interesting, Sir, that it is this Government which should be showing these signs now, particularly given the accusations that this Government has heralded against the Barbados Labour Party, particularly between the years 1976 and 1986. Perhaps, Sir, this will finally reveal the deep, secret ties that this Government has and has always had with white corporate Bridgetown stretching as far back as the late 1950's when they received the support of the Conservative Party, lock, stock and barrel for white corporate Bridgetown.

Insofar as the rest of the airport development is concerned, I wish to register also that it is my understanding that studies are reflecting that there may not be that much of an increase in air traffic and we need to confirm this in order to determine whether we are going to be facing a further expansion of the airport or indeed just a rationalisation of what is there.

I believe also that there was talk, certainly under the last Barbados Labour Party Government of the use of Terminal II as an area to allow total free trade within the CARICOM sector, but we recognised that that prospect becomes a little more difficult, especially with the

movement and transshipment of illegal products such as drugs and the increase in that traffic within recent years. We need to look at how best we can rationalise the use of Terminal II at the airport as well.

We need as well to determine ultimately because an airport at the end of the day is no good unless it has airlines. We need to rationalise our international transport policy, whether it relates to what exactly is the Barbados Government's position on the sale of LIAT is going to change or remain the same. Indeed, Sir, it needs to make available to the Opposition and other sectors in this country all the information as it relates to the sale of that airline, particularly, given now the increased interest by the Trinidad Government all of a sudden. I think that this is an issue that needs to be discussed nationally and should not be decided within the reserves of Cabinet alone.

I would hope, Sir, that we would receive information to generate such debate. I think we need also to look at what is the position of the Barbados Government as it relates to carriers coming out of North America. We have seen in the last 3 to 4 years total confusion as it relates to this area. We have seen the demise of Eastern Airlines. We have seen the demise of Pan American. We have seen American Airlines take a decision to establish a hub in Puerto Rico that for a time removed any direct flights from Barbados to New York or other ports in the States other than Puerto Rico, other than BWIA.

We have seen, Sir, the rise and the fall of Trump Airlines as it relates to coming into Barbados and we see at the same time movements by other Caribbean Governments to have other American airlines establish their hubs in other areas of the Eastern Caribbean. I want to know, Sir, in the context of all of this, what are the clear plans of the Barbados Government as it relates to the rationalisation of a civil aviation policy in terms of carriers coming in and out of North America. It is critical. I do not need to dwell on it because we all know that it is the life-blood of our tourism industry which but for the grace of God is keeping this country's foreign exchange sector floating at the moment.

These are a number of concerns which I believe need to be answered by this Government in respect to this area as it relates to airport and airlines. I notice that we may have a new airline from South Africa flying in soon. I hope we are not acting with indecent haste, having been the first to lift sanctions. I hope there will be no more killing of black people when this airline starts to land in Barbados. While I recognise that Mr. Mandela himself has asked for the removal of sanctions, I do believe that the fact that there is still not one man, one vote is the most critical thing. I find it a bit offensive to say the least – it may not be my business – that we are moving with such indecent haste before we see corresponding or factual

improvements in the conditions of black people in South Africa. There is nothing wrong with talking at this stage. I did not see Mr. Sandiford rush off in an airline with Mr. Mandela but he rushed off in an airline with a number of white people from South Africa. That, Sir, was instructive.

With those few words, I hope that the number of questions I have raised in here will be given serious consideration and serious answers be given. The terms and the limits of the debate prevent me from speaking as frankly and as fully as I would like but, as I said, I will have that opportunity soon to speak more on this topic as it relates to the interlocking expansion of corporate Barbados in the duty free sectors at our port or the expanding wings of South African interests whether it is at the airport or otherwise. Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: Mr. President, it is indeed discouraging to listen to allegations from the other side about corporate Barbados being in league with the Democratic Labour Party. Sir, I take very strong objections to those remarks because the Democratic Labour Party, as I know it, from a historical point of view has always had to fight the big money interests in this country. Even when the late Errol Barrow decided to take a White Paper to London to ask for independence for this country that league of white business people in Barbados, along with the Barbados Labour Party, proceeded to England in order to oppose independence for this country.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the Chamber and re-inventing the history. That was not the position of the Barbados Labour Party as it relates to any collusion with any sector of white Barbados to go to England to oppose any independence. The Barbados Labour Party was clear in its position as it related to the Federation of the Little Eight and it never went to England with any bunch of white people.

Mr. PRESIDENT: All right. If it is a point of order we cannot have another speech by you.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: Sir, I remember the late Errol Barrow remarking when he sat down at Clarence House and saw these people walking behind Mr. Fred Goddard then the Opposition Leader that it reminded him of Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs. Among those...

Mr. PRESIDENT: Order!

SENATOR A. MORRISON: This is on record. The machinery was very fully operational at that time, Sir, and there was no doubt whose side the Barbados Labour Party was on in those days. That was a further culmination of the whole history of the Barbados Labour Party in negotiation with the mother country when the late Grantley Adams

ostensibly on every sugar conference that there ever had in this country used to take Honourable H. A. Cuke as his advisor in deference to the financial sector of this country. The main advisor for the Government of Barbados in those days was the Honourable H. A. Cuke at every sugar conference that we had in London, the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement. They would always talk about machinery first and there was no question of...

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barker: I do not welcome your interruptions.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: It was the question of machinery and once Honourable H. A. Cuke had made the point about the rates of depreciation of machinery in the sugar factories then when it came to the very last thing they then talked about the poor labouring classes in Barbados who had to reap that crop.

So from a historical point of view, Mr. President, the Barbados Labour Party has always been in league with big money interests in this country. There was a time in the 1971 General Elections when the Big Six... You made an accusation against my Party and I am going to give you the chapter and verse on that.
11.50 a.m.

Aside.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: In 1971 at the General Elections when the late D.G. Leacock issued envelopes on the very last week of the election campaign to every worker in the Shipping and Trading to vote out the Democratic Labour Party. We have never been assisted by any big money interests in this country so do not speak about us being in any league with any white people.

We have been able as a party, Sir, to provide the kind of economic climate that businesses have been able to thrive in this country and make money when they were saying that we were a government and we were Communists, that Errol Barrow was a Communist and that he was going to put Barbados in this thing and the next thing. Despite that, the moves and the progress made by Barbados in the years 1961 to 1971 is unprecedented in the whole history of the Commonwealth. Never has a country been able to move with such speed and efficiency as under Errol Barrow in 1961 - 1971 administration under the Democratic Labour Party. We must remember that.

All the politics of the people at that time were saying, and even your former leader he went to London and told the Colonial Secretary that a bunch of wild boys had now taken over the country of Barbados. He was so much in line with the colonial people and he was so much in favour of the white plantocracy in this country that he rushed off to London and said, "Well look, a bunch of wild boys

has now taken over this country". But the business community has never seen such profits as when Errol Barrow became Premier of this country because he provided the kind of economic climate.

Aside.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Let us have order. Senator Barker, I will not have that.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: That is how you have your existence. That is how you have your being because he did not only do that. He brought about free education for everybody. He introduced school meals and from hence forward people who were not able to gain admission into a secondary school in those days were able to walk in on the result of an examination and then give everybody education free up to university level. So we were dealing with Barbados as it was and raising the standards of people who had never had a chance before. That is the kind of country that you all inherited in 1976 and which you set about to disintegrate after 1976 that when we got it back in 1986 it had gone out to such an extent ...

Aside.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: I am saying that when we took back the country from you all in 1986 after giving you a good country in 1976 it had deteriorated to such an extent...

Aside.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: You would deny that?

Mr. PRESIDENT: No, No. Address the Chair, please. Will you please address the Chair, Senator Morrison.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: I am addressing the Chair, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: When you say "you". No, No. Please address the Chair, Senator Morrison.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: Sir, I am using the language of Parliament and I am challenging the Honourable Senator Barker to deny that.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You cannot have a cross-talk.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: I am not cross-talking, Sir. I am making my point in relation to what I am hearing on the Floor. I am not arguing with him but these things give life to debate and help clear up a lot of misconceptions which one might have about the role and the true position of the Democratic Labour Party in the history of this country. It is a history unparalleled by any other party that ever graced this country. The Democratic

Labour Party is the foremost and most progressive party this country has ever seen and will ever see. Get that straight.

Aside.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: The IMF is a creation of the Barbados Labour Party. We never went there before you all. You all went there first.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Will you please ignore the asides, Senator Morrison.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: There is no ad hoc development at the Airport, Sir. The new Airport was opened in 1979. It has a life of about 15 years. Already we are very much on train in that a study is now being organised. It has already started to prepare the Airport for the 21st Century.

Aside.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: We have had a study commissioned which is being undertaken now. In the last Estimates I had outlined the clear objectives of the Airport study and the terms of reference. We will give that information probably at another sitting when we have the Airport under study.

All I want to say, Sir, is that the development at the Airport has not been *ad hoc* and that we are very much aware of what we have to do at the Airport. In due course of time members will be served with the new Airport plans, what is intended to be done at the Airport to make it more in line with the 21st Century and to make Barbados a real hub for aircraft.

Terminal 2 has been mentioned. That has performed its own role, Sir. Right now at Terminal 2 it provides accommodation for the airport maintenance operations. There are also 3 courier companies right now at the Terminal II buildings. There is Federal Express, ABC Couriers and United Parcel Service. It is also a venue for trade expositions and it also has an office warehouse and other commercial space for LIAT, as far as catering is concerned.

It is felt that the buildings were built at that time in a very ad hoc manner and in some cases, in the new Terminal 1 certain valuable space is now being occupied. It is almost in the way of where you get big wide-bodied aircraft and we find difficulty in providing certain parking facilities because of how that building has been constructed. But with the new Airport Study all these problems will be alleviated and we will have a brand new airport soon from now with all the modern additions in order to cope with 21st Century traffic.

This particular lease, Sir, is nothing new because they already occupy the land. All they are asking for is to be able to get their lease signed and get approval and that is what is now being asked for in this Resolution.

Aside.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: I do not want to go into a debate on the seaport, anyhow, Sir. I do not want to be drawn into that debate at this time. I will leave that for another occasion.

Sir, with those remarks I support this Resolution.

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

ORDER NO. 2 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE VESTING IN THE NATIONAL HOUSING CORPORATION OF LAND AT MOUNT POYER, ST. LUCY FOR HOUSING PURPOSES

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, this Resolution relates to vesting of land at Mount Poyer in St. Lucy in the National Housing Corporation. The land is part and parcel of Crown lands at Spring Hall in St. Lucy. The proposal is to provide 14 lots measuring 3 800 to 4 200 square metres for the purpose of continuing the housing programme to meet the demands of prospective householders in St. Peter for sites. This vesting would allow the National Housing Corporation to dispose of the lots either by sale or by rent to would-be tenants.

I beg to move that this Resolution be passed.
12.05 p.m.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Just a few words, Sir, on this Resolution. It is interesting that I just realise that the Honourable Member who spoke just now was in fact the Minister of Housing. I hope, Sir, that he can enlighten us in his reply or hopefully after I speak, as to the exact position of Government's housing policy given the stabilisation programme of the last two years and indeed Government's intention to embark on a structural adjustment programme that it has been trying to embark on for the last two years as well.

There are a number of things that cross my mind. When the Barbados Labour Party left Government in 1986 we had negotiated a number of loans for major housing projects. One of them, Sir, related to the urban renewal programme and funds, I believe, were obtained from USAID for the development of these housing projects.

Secondly, Sir, I believe also that the Labour Party had at that time been actively pursuing its policy of sites and

services which allowed people to have access to a certain development of areas without necessarily placing the strain on Government to build the houses in those particular areas all the time.

Sir, I am wondering to what extent is the Ministry still pursuing the active policy of allowing people access to this whole sites and services policy. I am also wondering what is the current status of a number of part-finished houses in Jackson which I believe were started by the Venezuelan company Inversiones which remain unfinished and remain unfinished in the context where there is a distinct and clear housing need in Barbados, particularly at the lower level of the community.

It is interesting, Sir, that all the figures on housing will show that this Government's housing programme has virtually come to a halt in the last three years and there has been no expansion of that basic housing stock for rental purposes because at the end of the day, Sir, while we need to develop a policy for people to be able to purchase part of Government's housing stock, there is a section of this community who at some stage of their life would always be in need of that ability to rent subsidised housing. Government therefore has a strong social responsibility regardless of what the international agencies tell us about making these things cost effective.

In fact, Sir, it is interesting and I would make bold to say that Government in the last 3 years rather than exercising any sort of developmental role at all within the Ministry of Housing has become nothing more than a landlord who partakes in policies of a bailiff, putting out people who cannot pay their rent, increasing rents without reference to the fact that the general economic conditions of the last few years has increased perhaps more than ever since post independence Barbados the need for access to that subsidized housing.

I am asking how do we balance these factors. We understand that you are saying that the stabilisation process and your intention to embark on a structural adjustment programme has totally re-ordered your developmental perspective. Indeed, Sir, we know that your developmental plan for 1988 was thrown out the window in no time at all.

I am asking, Sir, in the absence of any clear statement from this Government for the last 3 years as to its housing policy, I am asking, Sir, for this Government to announce it because each and every one of us in here, Sir, know that there are people who come asking for and talking about their dying need to get access to housing almost on a daily basis in this country.

I believe also, Sir, that those part-finished houses at Cane Wood, if Government is not in a position to finish

them, that Government should explore some plan or some proposal where people who have the ability to finish them by dint of their own labour that those houses be conveyed to persons who are prepared to purchase them for a small sum, because right now they are sitting down there rusting and given the fact that it is unlikely that they will ever be able to stage any conference or accommodation for any delegates of conference I don't see how they are going to be finished in the same way that Sherbourne has received the priority for that \$17 million.

I am also urging, Sir, that we need also to look now, very carefully, in the context of any housing policy in this country, as to how we create immunities again. We have had a lot of talk in this country about the dislocation of our society and a lot of this has come out through the breakdown of the older styled communities.

We in the Barbados Labour Party have always supported a form of smaller housing units and terrace housing, particularly within recent years. To that extent we welcome the fact that this development at Mount Poyer will be providing terrace units and will be providing them in small enough numbers that will perhaps just enhance development of old communities rather than creating concrete monstrosities as we did in the past. Because at the end of the day when we create these concrete monstrosities without the services and without the facilities, whether it be to the church that was traditionally there, whether it be to the schools that were traditionally there or to the other services that were traditionally there, when we create these concrete monstrosities without providing these other services, Sir, we create a social problem that will ultimately affect us in terms of our economy in years to come.

We do not want to see those mistakes created by both Governments in the past because the Barbados Labour Party was responsible for a number of large housing projects in this country as well as the Democratic Labour Party and one would not want to see us repeating this mistake in terms of how we plan Government's housing.

We believe, Sir, if it is possible to put an additional 10 or 20 houses on to every village in Barbados that perhaps, Sir, should be the way of the future rather than creating these great monstrosities again.

Sir, we also wish to know what is the current status of the Church Village housing project as to when these units will be occupied. I believe as long ago, Sir, as late last year or early this year the then Minister of Housing stated that those units were finished and we would like to know what is the position with them and when it is intended that they should be occupied given the backlog, I believe figures given by him, Sir, of nearly 10 000 applicants for housing from the National Housing Corporation. Those figures are astonishing particularly

when you consider you have 70 000 households in this country. Those figures represent almost 12½% without access to that shelter and shelter is as basic a right as food, as health, as education, although, Sir, if we judge from the track record in the increasing of user fees and increasing of services in education and health, Sir, perhaps there is not a very bright future in the housing ability for youngsters in this country to get housing particularly since unemployment among the young population, Sir, of those under 21 still stand at 60% figures given by the Government.

Sir, we are also aware that over the last two years a number of resolutions have come before this Chamber for pieces of land to be vested in the National Housing Corporation. I would want to know what is the status of those pieces of land, particularly given that we do not believe that this is a time for Government to be creating any land bank. This is a time for us to be meeting the demands of those people who need housing given the stringent economic circumstances.

All of those Resolutions that have passed through this Chamber, where the vesting of land has moved from the Crown to the National Housing Corporation. I believe that we need the reports to see fully what has happened to these pieces of land since as we all know once the land is vested from the Crown to the National Housing Corporation they need not to report back to these Chambers to determine how they have divested themselves of these lands and that makes it all the more important why reports from these Statutory Corporations need to be filed on time.

Sir, with those few remarks, I hope that this Government will at last tell us, after the last 2½ to 3 years what is its housing policy, particularly given the demands, given its change in economic circumstances over the last 3 years. It is imperative that we know, Sir, and it is imperative that they announce it and while I would wish to support this Resolution, Sir, I will say that I am not in a position to do so unless we are taken into Government's confidence on how it expects to continue its housing policy. I thank you, Sir.

12.15 p.m.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, all I can say to the Honourable Senator is that she should be careful to listen sometimes. Because I specifically said that this land is going to be used for sites and services not for terrace housing and somehow that crept into it, but never mind. The question of Government's policy on Housing will be clearly enunciated before the end of 1993. So you will get your wish to hear what we have in store for the people of this country who deserve better conditions.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir. I hope that the Honourable Minister did not misunderstand me, but I am glad to see that, like in

most other Ministries that he has been moved to, he has been able to act as a catalyst to get something going after a period of extended dormancy.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: My ears did not hear, Sir. Let me also say though that the concerns expressed are in most cases matters with which I am familiarizing myself and I can certainly give an assurance that something will happen about those Venezuelan houses as well. I had the opportunity to visit the site and I left with an idea in my own mind as to what we might do about them as a matter of urgency in response to the needs of Barbadians for housing in that particular area and from all over the island for that matter.

In addition, the houses in St. Philip which it is alleged are unfinished, I am yet to visit them. I am already aware of the fact that potential tenants have been identified and also that sooner than we think that housing development will be opened up for use by the public.

I, therefore, wish to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

ORDER NO. 3 - TO MOVE THE PASSING OF A
RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY
ACQUISITION OF LAND AT THREE HOUSES, ST.
PHILIP TO DEVELOP THE THREE HOUSES
IRRIGATION PROJECT

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, this land at Three Houses, St. Philip which Government proposes to acquire is needed for implementation of a project relating to the irrigation of lands in St. Philip. The project is to be administered by the Ministry of Agriculture.

In August 1991, Cabinet had agreed that an area of land be acquired. The project is designed to control the use and extraction of spring water by certain persons whose properties are contiguous to a stream and who by law are entitled to the use of the water. The primary purpose of the project is to harness the water in the spring, to provide storage and filtering facilities and to redistribute the water to a much larger catchment area and farmers than those who traditionally had access to it. The effect of the project is to maximize on the use of a very valuable resource in an area where there is low rainfall and also to assist in re-establishing agricultural production in the Three Houses area.

There is a cooling pond, Mr. President, situated in the compound of the old Three Houses factory and it is essential to and forms part of the infrastructural

development of the Three Houses Project. Some years ago there was a commercial operation here at Three Houses and the cooling pond was used in a manufacturing process. It was found, however, if the commercial operation continued that the water would have been polluted to such an extent that it would not have been possible to use even the spring water probably or for agricultural activity for that matter. Indeed, the water when it seeps back into the soil could well have contained pollutants which could be dangerous to the health of individuals. Therefore, that project was not permitted to continue.

This project now is in the interest of safeguarding and preserving the agricultural integrity of the area and that is the basis of the decision taken in 1991 to acquire the parcel of land. The necessary acquisition proceedings required by law were duly carried out and notices under the Act were issued. We are now seeking parliamentary approval for the acquisition of 27 129.63 square metres of land at Three Houses Project for the purpose of development of the Three Houses Irrigation Project.

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

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Fraser.

SENATOR Mrs. V. C. FRASER: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise to support this Resolution wholeheartedly. This is something that has bothered my mind for many years and I think the Government is very wise in trying at this time to gather together, if you want to use that term in a very simple way, all that water which Government can find necessary at this time, not only just Three Houses but I suppose there will be other areas. For a long time those farmers around that area have had serious problems during the dry season and even beyond the dry season because, although the rain was falling, it was not falling around that area. We are talking seriously now about an export drive in agriculture. The markets are wide open and the potential is there. Indeed, it is a question now of production. Because there is this serious question of production and we know the markets are really there, we think that we have to move swiftly. We cannot do much without the use of water. Water is such a valuable resource. I think the more springs and so on that we can tap in Barbados is helpful because we can utilize the water for agricultural purposes.

I should like at this time to congratulate the Government for doing this and I hope that I will see everything moving with extreme haste in order to get that market that is really there for peppers and all sorts of vegetables especially those that like cool conditions.

Further, Mr. President, I think there can be many things done not only of the water used by the farmers. But I would like to see that whole area made into a beauty

spot. Along with the water catchment, there is a park. But I think that park can be made a little more historical in adding a few more things to the park and the whole area. We could get some money from that for the tourism.
12.25 p.m.

I think every time we look at something we should look at it not only for one particular aspect of its development, for bringing water to the farmers, but we could also look at other areas like horticulture, because those plants need water as well. We are into the area of anthurium lilies and we can expand some if we have water around there. There are cool areas and there is a cooling pond. We could also look to many of the other flowers, because we are doing very well with flowers and we need more foliage. A lot of ferns can do well in that area and we could form some other industries out of this very area, although we are looking at it seriously now for the utilisation of water for farmers. We can still find that the National Conservation Commission could probably carry out a study there and look at the growing of ferns. Ferns especially make a large sum of money on the export market and I think if we can get into the area of some exotic ferns in an area like that we could have an industry. You need people to reap them, you need people to package them, you need people to clean them properly and to box them, and so it will find some work for people in that area.

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I just wanted to make those short comments.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Mr. President, I am told that since 1986 or 1987 this project was designed and it was even put into the annual Estimates, so we are glad that at long last Government is seeking to do something about the Three Houses project.

Before I talk about Three Houses *per se*, I want to talk a bit about compulsory acquisitions. In the 2½ years I was in this Chamber, on many occasions we have compulsorily acquired other people's property and we have not been always keen to pay the people for the property we have acquired.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I do not think you should say "we have not been always keen".

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, the Government has been tardy in making the necessary payments.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Oh, that is a different matter.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I always bow to your greater wisdom.

I believe, Sir, that we have to get our act together with regard to compulsory acquisitions. I am not denying

that the State has a fundamental right to acquire any property that it believes is for a public purpose. That is a right of the State which we are not questioning, but what I am saying is that when we carry out this function we know that we are discommoding people and I believe that they should be adequately and quickly compensated for the property which the State has taken from them. I speak, noting that the Horse Hill project, the road improvement which was finished about two years ago. I am told that up until now people's lands which have been compulsorily acquired to make way for this impressive highway, if I may call it such, and it is a boon to our tourist sector and will make access to Bathsheba much smoother and so on, so I have no quarrel about that. What I am quarrelling about is that two years after the road was completed people in the area have not been compensated for the land which was compulsorily acquired to make way for the road improvement.

I call upon Government to expedite matters so that the people who would have suffered a lot of costs, in terms of relocation and so on, in terms of lost agricultural output, in terms of loss of livelihood, we have to make sure that as soon as possible they are compensated, because they have done the country a service and we in turn should make their life as easy as possible. Now that we are acquiring the land at Three Houses, I hope that the owners will not have to wait as long as other people have waited over the years for their true recompense.

Sir, I also have good feelings about agriculture, being myself from an agricultural community, and whenever things are done on behalf of agriculture I feel good. The whole Three Houses project is going to be beneficial to agriculture in a parish which has traditionally been an agricultural parish. St. Philip has grown some of the best canes in Barbados. They may not be the biggest, but in terms of sucrose content they have been some of the better cane growing areas in Barbados, so when something is done in St. Philip for agriculture I feel good about it.

This is an irrigation project, which brings us to the whole question of water resources, which is fundamental especially as we seek to diversify our agricultural activity. Traditionally we have had a mono crop agricultural system, based on sugar cane, which did not need irrigation because it can stand up to the semi drought that we have pretty easily. But as we move into other areas of agricultural activity the need for water is going to become even more pressing, so I am glad to see that something is being done about the water at Three Houses.

I want to ask a question now. What about the water in Bath? Are we harnessing all the available water in those springs around the Bath area? What about the water that is wasted every year due to run off in the Scotland area?

The water that is lost to the sea in the St. James area? As we seek to improve our agriculture, we need to harness this water for the good of agriculture.

I am told, Sir, that a water resources study commissioned by the UNDP is now in the hands of Government. I have not yet received my copy. I am waiting, because I have been alarmed by the fact that, according to the expert, at the rate we are consuming water, in about 10 years' time we are going to face the prospect of having to go in for expensive desalination. Whether or not the report is accurate, whether or not he is overstating the point, to me is a bit irrelevant. Whether it is 10 years or 15 years is not really the issue here, the point is that somewhere down the line unless we try to reduce the rate of consumption and look for other water resources, we are going to be in trouble. Whether it is 15 or 20 years is beside the point. The point is we have to act on these two matters urgently.

This project is a timely project. I want to impress upon Government the need for looking at other areas where water can be harnessed, and I come back to something I mentioned before, that we cannot afford to have the millions of gallons of water flowing into the sea from the sewerage plant and from the two plants – the south coast/west coast – which are being built. We have, as a matter of urgency, to look at ways of using that water probably for irrigation purposes.

When we come to water consumption, whether it is for irrigation or for domestic usage, we have to look at the role of another form of agriculture, because, Sir, according to the Minister of the Environment, Housing and Lands, he said he was told that golf is a form of agriculture. I hope I have not misquoted him. There is a proliferation of golf courses on the island, this new form of agriculture, which we are told will be consuming a tremendous amount of water.

12.35 p.m.

The question I want to ask is where is the water going to come from to be used at Westmoreland, Kingsland, Bushy Park in relation to Sandy Lane which I am told has been given permission to expand that particular golf course. There is a limited amount of water. There is no infinite amount of water unless we talk about sea water. Excluding sea water, there is an infinite amount of fresh water available in Barbados. Sorry, Sir, there is a finite amount. My mathematics is rusty. There is a finite...

Mr. PRESIDENT: All right. Proceed, Senator Barker.

Senator T. E. BARKER: I always like him to talk.

Mr. PRESIDENT: No. Not when you are talking.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I love him to talk. Sir, we have to be very careful. There is a finite amount of water available and I am not happy with the fact that we are going to be using up this water at a tremendous rate for golf.

I was extremely annoyed when I read the report. I do not know how true it is but the report says that the Water Authority with all their experts recommended that the Westmoreland Golf Project use the wells at Porters and they were given a maximum amount which they can extract from the wells at Porters for use on the golf course; but Cabinet which has 13 hydrologists, decided that the experts at the Water Authority know nothing so they are going to increase by a tremendous amount the water that the developers at Westmoreland can draw from the wells at Porters, St. James.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Did you say you read that in a report, Senator?

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I never said I read it in a report. It was reported in the newspaper.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Oh, I see. That is different. I did not hear you say it was reported in the paper.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I now say it but I did not say it originally that I read it in a report. I did not read the report yet because the report is still hidden – Sorry it is still deposited in the Ministry and we would never see it unless it falls off the back of a truck. But the point I want to make, Sir....

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: It is a pity that Honourable Senators behave dishonourably and come in here and repeat things that are hearsay, that cannot be substantiated. I feel, Mr. President that things like that should be struck from the records when people come with that. No Cabinet overruled anything by anybody. That is an untruth and it should be struck from the records.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I have been seeking to find out where he got this information from and that is why I asked him which report he had read it in and he said it has not been in a report but that he read it in the newspapers. I wasn't aware that this was in the newspaper. Where did you read it Senator Barker? What did you say is the source of your information, Senator Barker?

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Do I have to say? I am not quoting anybody. It has come to my information that Cabinet has increased the amount of water that the developer can draw. He has denied it so I have nothing more to say. He has denied it but I will stand by my assertion that Cabinet has increased the amount. If

he denies it, well, I cannot call him a liar. I would love to but I cannot call him a liar because you would not allow me to call him a liar.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Then it is my ruling that what you said about Parliament having done that be struck from the record.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, on a point of privilege. The Honourable Minister accused me of being dishonourable. I sat down here and I did not hear any ruling from you on the matter. If I had said it, I would have been sent out of in here. I will not allow my name to be carried through the gutter like that. I am not dishonourable and I want your protection. The same way as if I had said it I would be sent out he should be sent out for saying I am dishonourable.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barker, I make the ruling. Your cannot tell me what I shall do or what I should not do. Senator Barker, you may proceed.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of privilege.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley you will wait until you are permitted to speak. That is all I am saying.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of privilege, Sir. I take the greatest possible offence, particularly given the rulings and the previous rulings of this Chamber for a Senator to cast aspersions to other Senators in this Chamber as to their being dishonourable. Whether other senators wish to object to that aspersion is a matter for each and every Senator. I, Sir, am not allowing my name to be included in a general sweep that refers to me being dishonourable. I take it as a deep offense and I am asking for those remarks to be expunged from the record.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Did you hear it said that all Senators were... What did you understand was the statement, Senator Mottley?

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Any understanding of the English language would show that there is a finite possibility as to who that statement could affect. Sir, there are people in this gallery who are former Senators. It was not referred to former Senators acting dishonourably. It was referred to Senators acting dishonestly. Whether other Senators in here choose not to object, it is a matter for each and every other Senator but, I believe, Sir, that I have a privilege which is to be protected by this Chair regardless of whoever is in the Chair and regardless of the previous rulings of whoever is in the Chair. I am asking, Sir, for those rights to be protected. If it is that they cannot be protected, inform us now. I am asking that those remarks be expunged, Sir.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: I do not understand why it is necessary to create problems when what I said was very specific in relation to a specific comment made by the Honourable Senator and the Honourable Senator responded by saying that since the Minister had denied it he was satisfied. So I do not understand the need for the heat.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just a moment. Let the Member finish what he is saying. You cannot interrupt like that. Senator Barker you may not just interrupt.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: I have not said that anybody is "dishonourable". I said that a statement was unworthy of an Honourable Senator. I did not use the word "dishonourable" and if I used the word, "dishonourable" I am prepared to withdraw it.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barker, I will not tolerate that cross-talk while someone is on his feet. Senator Barker, for the last time, I will not tolerate the cross-talk. I will permit you to speak when the time is ripe. You will continue.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, everybody in the Chamber who wants to understand will recall that I referred to a specific comment and I denied it and the Honourable Senator said in reply that since the Minister had denied it, well, he was satisfied. I do not understand why it is necessary to create a problem about it. But if I said that the Senator was dishonourable I withdraw that but I certainly did not say that.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Thank you.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I heard the words "dishonourable".

Mr. PRESIDENT: You may proceed, Senator Barker with your debate.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I thank you for your aid.

Sir, the Minister has said that Government did not overrule the Water Authority. I have no evidence to contradict that statement but I know in my heart that they overruled and Barbados does not know that they overruled it. The point is that the Government is messing around with a vital resource called water. The Government is messing around with our most vital resource and they are experts. They are hydrologists and all sorts of experts. They cannot get the country run but now they are experts in everything.

Sir, with regard to agriculture in St. Philip, I want to pause a minute. Water is a scarce resource in spite of

what the Minister may think. We have got to make sure that we cannot in this Island take into account the fact that there is a finite amount of water available and almost half of the year Barbados is faced with almost drought conditions. The fact that there is water available does not necessarily mean that you can change all the crops you have grown historically over the years because sooner or later you may find that you may be exhausting at a faster rate than you had envisaged the water that comes from the spring because the water that comes from the Three Houses Spring is probably rain water that may have accumulated somewhere else in the Island and because of the geography of the Island find its way to a particular area.

We still have to be careful that we do not overuse or use at a faster rate than we should the water that is available from the Three Houses Spring or from any other spring in the Island. That is why I want to reiterate that we need to continue growing sugar cane in St. Philip. Apart from the water reason there is another good reason which is that in the future sugar cane has to be fully mechanised, both the reaping as well as the planting. St. Philip has the flattest land in Barbados.

If we are going to have a sugar industry in Barbados we need those flat lands in St. Philip. That is why it was a mistake for Government to allow Bushy Park to go out of agriculture into golf. According to the Minister, golf is another word for agriculture. I don't know where he got that from, but such is his logic. Government has made terrible mistakes but this is one of the most terrible. If you want, you can go to other parts of the Island but St. Philip has to remain in agriculture.

Government is one of the biggest land owners in St. Philip. I think Government may probably own about 3 or 4 plantations in St. Philip through the ADC, River and Dodds and a couple more. We cannot afford to have land in St. Philip going out of agriculture especially as we move away from the coast. Action must be taken soon to avoid further alienation of good agricultural land.

In this regard, another mistake was made a few years ago. Carrington should never have been allowed to close. It was a colossal mistake and people in the sugar industry have told me as much. They agree it was a mistake for Carrington Sugar Factory to have been closed. It is not a mistake that cannot be rectified. I know of a plan – I have seen it – where it is envisioned that Carrington Sugar Factory can be remodelled and brought back into production.

12.50 p.m.

If we are going to get sugar at 75 000 to 80 000 tonnes, we are going to need St. Philip and to have the canes travelling from Three Houses and those areas right

down to St. James, or St. Joseph because I am told that Bulkeley may be closed in another 2 or 3 years. The transport costs are going to be astronomical and it will further affect the viability of the sugar industry while, on the other hand, if Carrington's was somehow brought back into operation, and I am told that it is feasible, St. Philip and Christ Church, places like Searles, Lowthers and so on would have better access to sugar factories than would happen if Bulkeley was allowed to close, as the Booker Tate model is calling for because Booker Tate is calling for having a factory at Porters and one at Andrews. In any case, the factory at Andrews, I am told, that the Government is not allowing the 20 tonne trucks to use the roads around Andrews because the roads are not suitable for that type weight of vehicle so there are very good reasons why Carrington's sugar factory should be brought back into operation. It needs to be done.

Aside.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Address the chair, please.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, people will say, who shut it down and it is typical of the Democratic Labour Party Administration that they are catching at straws. It does not matter who shut it down. It matters that this is the reality of the situation. The reality is such that if we are going to remain in sugar we are going to need Carrington's Factory so who shut it down is irrelevant. I call upon Government to examine the facility of such and since they are now in control of the sugar industry through the new company that they can affect such a move which would obviously be to the benefit of the sugar industry in particular and Barbados in general and then St. Philip will achieve its potential as an agricultural parish in the way that it probably once was.

Sir, since I am on irrigation and we note that one of the problems facing the Spring Hall Land Lease Project was the fact that irrigation water was not readily available, first of all, and secondly, when it was available the cost to the farmer was prohibitive. Now, the Spring Hall Project with all its flaws and whatever, can be a model for further land reform in Barbados because there is still an urgent need in Barbados for some measure of land reform. We can look at the Spring Hall Land Lease Project, look and see that probably the main area of difficulty was the fact that some of the plots were too large, which is a minor problem because if a plot is too large you can always divide it into 2 or 3 depending upon the optimal size that the agricultural economics would suggest. So if it is too big, it is not a problem. When you do another project based on the experience from the existing Spring Hall Project, you then would be in a better position to affect land reform because this is a vital area. But, of course, land reform without proper water resources would not really be very

helpful because what will happen is that the people would then, given the availability and cost of water, not be able to grow the crops they would want to grow.

Sir, I am glad that the Project is coming on stream. I am not too heartened by the fact that this Resolution has come because given the way how this Government operates, probably when the Government changes in 2 years' time nothing much would have been done. A classic example is, I think it was the first few months in the life of this particular Senate...

Mr. PRESIDENT: Not so quickly. Did you say that in 2 years' time nothing much will be done when the Government changes?

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Yes. Sir, you are just being...

Mr. PRESIDENT: Not so quickly. Speak slowly. Let me hear what you mean.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: If you listen, Sir, you will hear.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Are you inferring that I am not listening?

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, at times I get that impression.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Well, Senator Barker, maybe if you speak a little more slowly and distinctly we will hear you far better.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I will try to help you as much as I can.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I would appreciate that.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: In the same way you have helped me, Sir, when I was called dishonourable.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am not aware of that.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I am just admitting, Sir, that you have a problem with hearing.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I see. What kind of hearing?

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I said you have a problem, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I see. I have a problem hearing.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Yes, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Oh well, all right.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: So, Sir, as I was saying, I hope that the same thing that happened in the Scotland District because I remember in the first few months in the life of this Senate we passed a Bill to give the Minister certain powers in the Scotland District and as far as I know, 2½ years afterward, nothing has been done. I hope the same thing does not happen with regard to this particular Project because this Government is very good at words but actions is a totally different matter.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. President, On a point of order. The Honourable Senator just said that in the early life of this Senate we passed the Scotland District Act. He did not mention the Act but that is the Act he was referring to, and to this day nothing has been done. That is not correct. If you will recall, Mr. President, where formerly it was "the Chief Agricultural Officer" we amended that to substitute "the Minister" and we gave him certain powers to deal with stray animals, impound them and so on in the Scotland District. Senator Barker just said nothing has been done. It is not true.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Thank you.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, if the only..

Mr. PRESIDENT: No, No. Just a minute. Thank you very much for your elucidation. Proceed.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I am glad that the Honourable Member spoke because if the only thing they can do is to impound people's stray animals, well then I am sorry for the country. I will call them a government of pounds, a dog and animal pound. If that is all they can do I am sorry for them.

With those words, Sir, I just want to caution Government to bear in mind that water is a valuable resource and they must stop playing politics with our water resource and make sure that it is used for the benefit of every citizen in the country and not only those who want to use our water to make a fast dollar.

Thank you.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: Sir, I rise to support this Resolution. I was expecting to hear a very good debate on the policy to provide irrigation services in another effort to boost agriculture production in this country but I am so sorry that the Honourable Senator Barker has been so distressed, owing to his lack of information about the sugar factories in particular, and about our agriculture policy in general because he has been making a very passionate plea recently to bring back Carrington's sugar factory into production.

Sir, we are moving on. His own party has been talking about rationalisation of sugar factories which

has been going on for the last 15 – 20 years in this country and I do not think the Honourable Senator could be serious when he makes the point that we should bring back Carrington's into the processing of sugar because we not only lost Carrington's but we lost Foursquare in St. Philip. For your information sugar factories are not made back. That is never done.
1.00 p.m.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is not in a position to say that.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just a minute. You are on a point of order. Yes. Well let us hear what is this point of order.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: The Honourable Member is not in a position to say what can be brought back into operation because he is not an engineer and he never will be either.

Mr. PRESIDENT: What rule is he breaching. If it is to be a point of order that is not a point of order. You may proceed Senator Morrison.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: Sir, the only time a sugar factory has been recreated in Barbados is Portvale in St. James which has resulted in the most astronomical cost ever experienced in this country by way of a new sugar factory which was rehabilitated by various sections of different machines which were brought in from overseas. The cost for Portvale factory has not even been paid off yet. They are not made back after they go, Mr. Senator.

I have been involved in an exercise before, where I was trying to see if Searles Factory, which was easily the best run factory in this country and when I intervened at the time as Minister of Agriculture that factory was dismantled in the matter of a day or two. When I gave the directive that it should not stop grinding canes we were told the next day that the factory had already been taken down. It was taken down in about 2 days.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barker, we will not have your constant interruptions.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: The Sugar Producers at that time killed a good factory that was working – the most operable factory they ever had in Barbados – because there was a time in Barbados when Bulkeley was not producing profitably and used to be further financed by Searles' profits and then they said they would upgrade Haymans. In another 2 years Haymans went also. And it continued. Then they said that they could do the work at Four Square and Carringtons. After they had killed all the syrup factories in Barbados they decided they would make syrup and sugar at Four Square. We thought that we would at

least have had Four Square in production for a long time because they were doing not only sugar but syrup and molasses as well. But in another couple of years that also went. Then other machinery was put in at Carrington in order to accommodate the loss of Four Square. Carrington was further capitalised. It was given new machines and next Carrington went.

I do not know by what omniscience you might have to restore Carrington to a degree of usefulness. It would call for an omniscience not even known to the medical profession, how to bring back a dead man alive. I do not know if the Barbados Labour Party has that omniscience which I do not think that even the medical profession can boast of in this day of catscans and things like that and the rapid movement of people. I believe the Senators should have been in praise of our irrigation policy and this is a very good thing because we have been fighting for the last few years to provide....

The Spring Hall project, Sir, is a very good model project only it lacks the very water we are now talking about in St. Philip. If we had this volume of water in St. Lucy we could have gone basically to the Spring Hall project. It lacks water because the water has to be pumped and we have to control the pumping of the wells in order not to over pump and then bring in salt in the pumping. It has turned out to be a very good project and it is a project that can be used as an example to extend across the country.

We also have water in Gibbons and when we went out of office in 1976, when that project was formulated to irrigate 100 acres of land in Gibbons which has a good water production, we were prepared to stagger those wells so that each farmer would not have been able to put down individual wells but to use 5 wells in all to preserve the life of the water and to have a planned production with the agricultural extension staff in attendance and also to advise the farmers how to plant. When your Party got into office in 1976 you all killed that whole project.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Please address the Chair.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: So the time has now come when you are now preaching to the converted about irrigation. We have always been in the forefront in providing irrigation facilities for farmers as well as providing the kind of concessions to farmers by way of helping them with rebates on their pumps and things like that. I would have expected that you would debate this thing to its extent without talking about sugar production as such.

Christ Church and St. Philip are the fallowest lands in Barbados and it lends itself to mechanisation as far as

sugar cane production is concerned. It also has the driest and most shallow soils. If you have regular rain in St. Philip and Christ Church you will have good crops. A heavy downpour of rain does not help St. Philip or Christ Church. They need a regular sprinkling all year round and you will get the best canes and also the best juice quality. That is why the recovery rate for sugar at Searles was so high in comparison with other factories in Barbados. The juice quality in Christ Church and St. Philip is of a very high quality and it takes less tonnes of canes to produce a tonne of sugar unlike the canes from St. Thomas and St. Andrew which are fat and watery and do not have much sucrose content. These are the facts of sugar cane production if I may so inform the Honourable Senator which cannot be disputed.

I believe the House should be made aware of the fact that we have always been in the forefront of a very active policy when it comes to irrigation and we have identified the parts in Barbados which have water available for irrigation because there is not much water around for irrigation purposes and we try to develop the projects along those areas so that we can have farmers in the areas benefitting from the benefits of our irrigation policy. I thank you, Sir.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, there is not a lot that I need to say after the Honourable Senator has spoken but it would be necessary for me to indicate that this Three Houses Stream and the water from this cannot be used for either River Plantation or for Dodds as was suggested by one of our Senators. Indeed there are springs at River which are used to assist and the yields from River are said to be the best in St. Philip at the present time. There is no need for action on that. Comments were made about the waste of water and the run off of water. I am aware of some sort of work that is being done to try and control the outflow of water from Bath and I also know and I am sure that other Senators know that in the Scotland District certain dams have been established in order to retain water for use of agriculture in that parish.

1.10 p.m.

Much of the debate really has nothing to do with this. Regarding the comment which I hear repeated from time to time that some Minister said that golf is a form of agriculture, no such statement was said. Mr. President, I made a statement that I was informed that preparation of golf courses is a form of agriculture. If you want to think about it, for golf courses you have to grow grass. The point was being made that it was a way of retaining soils when they become loose and likely to be washed away to put them into that. Now I am not suggesting at all that any Government should proceed to take land out of agriculture and put it into golf courses.

My position on golf courses is well known. I said it when I was Minister of Agriculture and I say it again. I am not for taking land out of agriculture to put it into golf courses. But by the same token there is Cabinet responsibility and, if a decision has been taken for golf courses to be established, I am not going to say anything against it. What I will try to ensure is that any land that is going into golf courses that it goes at the appropriate time. I will do that through the mechanism of the Town Planning Department for which I have responsibility. So we are not going to have lands going idle waiting for golf courses. We are not going to have it that way at all.

In addition, Mr. President, regarding all the comments about Bushy Park, most of us know how long Bushy Park had been allowed to remain idle to be used for a Formula One Race Track which never came into being and a small portion of it was being used for a race track. My understanding is that the persons who recently purchased from the former owners the land at Bushy Park have not ruled out the possibility of some small race track being there. Look at the picture and see which Barbadians run to the race track not that that picture is necessarily a good one because all classes of Barbadians go and watch motor racing. But the fact is that in addition to the golf course, and nobody seems to realize this, there will be other development. In the case relating to Bushy Park, a 500-bed hotel is contemplated. The Government has said clearly that it will not even examine applications for casinos, so do not worry to come with that. It is not anywhere within consideration of the Government of Barbados. In addition, the persons who plan to have that golf course and the 500-bed hotel are looking to establish a one thousand seating conference facility. They are planning water sports facilities and other games facilities at St. Philip. I am certain that for per square metre of land it will be far better utilized in terms of its economic return to Barbados than even if that land remained in agriculture, but that does not arise. It was not in agriculture for many years and there were not many claimant voices about bringing it back into agriculture. I was the person who raised the question two years ago.

With regard to the irrigation project, it is contemplated in addition to this Three Houses Irrigation Project to arrange for the lands which have been offered to the Crown in its right of Government to be properly transferred and vested in the Crown in relation to the Three Houses Park. That was mentioned in passing and I would like to give an assurance that is happening.

I do not wish to enter into the subject of agriculture. Suffice it to say that the Carrington Factory which was suggested to be returned to full usage, I had the misfortune of challenging the Chairman of BSIL about the closure of the Carrington Factory. I was given an assurance that

Carrington would not be closed and I had to look the gentleman full in his eyes and say, "It will not be closed. It is already closed". I say that to explain that Government had absolutely no say. They were not consulted about the closure of Carrington and, if we had been consulted, we would never have consented. We said let us contain the premises at Carrington as a transfer station. So that now Carrington receives canes from the plantations of St. Philip and the surrounding areas and it is used as a transshipment point to the other factories. That is the story of Carrington.

With those remarks, I beg to move that this Resolution be passed.

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS RECOMMITTED

FIRST READING OF BILLS

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, when we were dealing with the first reading of Bills, I failed to move the first reading and I wish to do it now.

I beg to move the first reading of a Bill to validate acts done by certain persons purported to have been licensed as Lands Surveyors under the Land Surveyors Act, Cap. 370. I beg to move that Bill be read a first time.

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

SUSPENSION

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 2.20 p.m.

The question that the sitting be suspended until 2.20 p.m. was put to the Senate and agreed to.
1.20 p.m.

RESUMPTION

Mr. PRESIDENT: This sitting is now resumed.

ORDER NO. 4 – THE LAND SURVEYORS (VALIDATION) BILL, 1993

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, the Bill before us comes as a consequence of a fiction which was unintentionally created. The Land Surveyors (Validation) Bill before us seeks to validate

surveying activity undertaken by land surveyors, who were properly graduates of the University of the West Indies, whose land surveyors licences state that they have passed the final examination of the Land Surveyors Board, but such statements were in fact not backed up by the grant of a licence. As a consequence, those statements, those certificates were regarded as not being valid to allow persons to practise as land surveyors, although they have been performing the duties and functions of land surveyors without obtaining a licence as well.

This Bill, Mr. President, validates the work which had been done previously by those graduates in land surveying from the University of the West Indies and in fact authorises them properly and other surveyors who have obtained qualifications from other institutions....it now puts them in a position that they can be approved and accepted by the Land Surveyors Board, and their work accepted as being validly done from 1985 onwards, even although now in 1993 they will be granted licences for the first time.

The Bill really has the effect of regularising the actions which they would have taken in good faith, in full knowledge of the authorities, without the recognition that the certificate by the University was not in itself a licence to practise as land surveyors.

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

The question 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 went into Committee on the Bill, SENATOR His Honour J. J. PAYNE in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Senate is in Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 were 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 motions of SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ORDER NO. 5 – THE PUBLIC SERVICE SUSPENSION OF INCREMENTS BILL, 1993

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: Mr. President, the Public Service Reduction of Emoluments Act, 1991-13 provided for the suspension of the payment of increments and suspension of the surmounting of

qualification bars. This Act expired on 30th September, 1993. As a result, Government agreed that discussions would be held between the Ministry of the Civil Service, the Ministry of Finance and the Coalition of Trade Unions and Associations on the subject of the payment of increments to Government employees.

Four meetings between the Government and the Coalition of Trade Unions and Associations were held under the chairmanship of the Deputy Prime Minister. During these discussions the Coalition was asked to agree to the suspension of increments for a further year with effect from 1st October, 1993. The underlying factor for this request, Mr. President, was the parlous state of Government's finances. When we take this in conjunction with the fact that the 8% on salaries was restored with effect from 1st April, 1993 at a cost of approximately \$36 million, further aggravating Government's finances but affording Government the opportunity to keep its word and to honour its pledge when it said that it would restore the 8% at that time.

The Coalition's position, Mr. President, was that Government should agree that the increments were due and owing with effect from 1st October, 1993. However, the Coalition was willing to agree to the postponement of payment during the period 1st October, 1993 to 30th September, 1994, provided the arrears for the period 1st October, 1993 to 30th September, 1994 would be paid from a date after October 1994 and such date of payment to be negotiated at some later time.

In order to fully appreciate the issue before us, Mr. President, I believe it would be appropriate for us to say something about the payment of increments. The payment of increments today in the Public Service is not presently tied to efficiency or merit, and they are usually paid on an annual basis to those persons who are entitled, except in such rare cases where payment is suspended, withheld or deferred as a penalty following some disciplinary action. Lack of efficiency, unsatisfactory service or conduct may also lead to suspension, the withholding of an increment or deferment. In any of these cases the Public Service Commission must advise on the appropriate action to be taken.

In 1969 payment of increments was further extended from the normal annual increments by adding an arrangement by which payment was made for the possession of qualifications over and above the normal entry requirements. For instance, in the clerical scale a maximum of 9 increments can be paid for possession of Ordinary Level and Advanced Level subjects, that is, 5 increments for O Levels and 4 increments for Advanced Level subjects. Another example is in the case where the possession of a degree is a requirement for appointment. However, a person will be paid 2 increments above the

minimum entry level for that scale if that individual is in possession of an honours degree.

In 1974 a system of payment of bonus increments was introduced. This provided for payment of a maximum of 2 increments within the appropriate scale for possession of qualifications over and above those required for appointment but relevant to the duties being performed in the post.

It is against that background, Mr. President, that we must now look at the cost and the consequences of restoring increments at this particular time. It has been estimated that the cost of restoring increments to officers in the Public Service at this time will cost around \$7 million for a complete year. There are approximately 22 645 Government employees. Included in this figure are 7 468 employees of Statutory Boards.

2.35 p.m.

The current wage bill for the general service is estimated at \$397.4 million. The computerised pay sheets show that 5 580 public officers receive annual increments. An additional 678 temporary persons whose pay sheets are not computerised receive annual increments. There is, therefore, a total of 6 258 persons who are eligible for annual increments. The size of annual increments ranges from \$504 to \$1 356, an average of \$930 per annum, giving an approximate cost of \$5 819 540 and to this figure should be added \$1.6 million representing the amount paid out from Statutory Boards. These result in an overall approximate figure of \$7 419 940. That figure is the cost of restoration of increments at this point in time.

Mr. President, as I said earlier, in light of the financial position of the Government at this point in time, Government finds itself unable to afford the payment of increments without a further reduction in the number of public servants and/or an increase in taxes which would further reduce the country's competitiveness, with the logical result reflected in a decrease in Government revenues and a further loss of jobs in both the private and public sectors. For those who might be tempted to say why don't we borrow the money and pay it the answer is quite simple. We have to pay back the money which will be a further erosion of the foreign exchange added to which the additional funds will out-flow and be reflected in greater imports, further aggravating the external balance of the country.

Mr. President, the Public Service Reduction of Emoluments Act 1991 – 13 having expired on September 30, 1993, legislation must now be put in place if payment of increments is to be suspended for a further year. The proposed legislation before us is the Public Service Suspension of Increments Bill, 1993 which has as its salient features the following:

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

Computations, Mr. President, in order to give effect to this, show that officers will be eligible for additional leave ranging from .56 of a day to 1.54 days. It is therefore been suggested that instead of using such figures there can be an across-the-board award of 3 days to each officer entitled to an increment. These 3 days refer to the period October 1, 1993 to September 30, 1994. This Act is scheduled to come into effect from October 1, 1993 and will cease as was done in the restoration of the 8% when we gave our word and kept it on April 1, on September 30, 1994.

Mr. President, this Government has had an excellent track record in keeping its word. It restored the 8% cut in the face of stiff opposition that said it would not and should not have been restored. We kept our word. We kept the faith.

Mr. President, I do move that this Bill be read a second time.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Mr. President, before I start, I just want to correct the Honourable Minister. The 8% was not restored. What happened was that they stopped taking it out. Restore means to give back and the money that was taken out was not given back so it was not restored. But I don't want to get into those semantics. I want to go to more substantive points.

In 1991, Government, after a so-called plebiscite, brought in a Bill which took away 8% from not only the civil servants but people working at the National Bank the Development Bank and all such corporations and bodies. That Bill was for 18 months and it specifically said that increments would be restored at the end of September 1993 – last week. Therefore, Sir, when Government prepared the Estimates for the present financial year 1993-94 it knew before hand that increments had to be restored according to

law at the end of September 1993. Therefore, if it was not acting in bad faith, it would have made sure that money to pay for the restoration of these increments for the period October 1, 1993 to March 30, 1994 would have been a part of the Estimates. That is the first point I want to make.

Government knew that at the end of September 1993 it had to restore increments. Therefore when the Estimates were being prepared for Government not to have put in provisions for the increments in the Estimates is an act of extremely bad faith. It meant that a year ago because Estimates are prepared... All like now so Estimates for 1994-95 are being prepared. That is a fact. I am sure the Honourable Senator knows that in his Ministry they are going through and preparing budgets for the upcoming financial year.

Therefore, I am at liberty to say that since they did not make provision for the restoration of increments in the Estimates that we discussed in March of this year it meant that they had no intention from the start to restore increments. That is the only inference we can make: Government had no intention *ab initio* as the Latins would put it, from the very beginning, of restoring these increments.

Certain remarks made by SENATOR T. E. BARKER were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. PRESIDENT.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, when I make a statement in here I make the statement...

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley, we will not have you having that sort of cross-talk at all. Go ahead. Senator Mottley, we will not have you interrupting like that.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of privilege, Sir, I did not know that the Chair was taking cognisance of asides again. But since it is, maybe I should reiterate what I said.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley, you will...

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I am on a point of elucidation.

The Honourable Senator Alleyne is misleading the Chamber when he says the Minister never said that...

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley, you are out of order. I have not given you permission to make a speech.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I am not making a speech, Sir. I am on a point of order. Every Member of this Chamber has the right to stand on a point of order unless you are now depriving me of that right in the

same way as you have deprived Senator Barker of his right to free speech.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley, you are out of order. Senator Mottley, you will take your seat. Senator Barker you may continue.
2.50 p.m.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Thank you, Sir. I will continue by saying that the present Minister of Finance at a meeting in St. John said that the restoration of the 8% will lead to a devaluation and I stand by that.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: On a point of order, Sir. In introducing this measure I was at pains to point out that the 8% was, in fact, restored. This is a matter of fact. It is a matter of record and I would believe that the Honourable Senator would want to conduct his debate along the lines of the restoration of the 8% having been restored.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, with all due respect, the Honourable Minister cannot tell me what to say and what not to say. He is beside himself if he can tell me what to say. The only person in here who can tell me what to say is Your Honour.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You may proceed, Senator Barker.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Thank you, Sir. The point I want to make is that the Minister said that the restoration of the 8% would lead to devaluation.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barker that is repetition. You have

SENATOR A. MORRISON: Sir, I will like to make a point of order again on his submission. I am not disputing Senator Barker's statement. All I am saying is that the House deserves the right to know the source of his statement.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Well, he has just told us.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: At a meeting? Who reported the meeting?

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Morrison, please take your seat.

Senator Barker, you may proceed.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, it is clear that the Members on the other side do not want me to talk but I will talk.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barker, you will proceed.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Yes, I will. I am proceeding.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Go ahead.

SENATOR BARKER: The point I want to make, Sir, is that the Minister having said that and noting that he was reported and commended for his ability to listen, it only led me to believe that tremendous amount of pressure was placed on Government with regard to the taking away of the increments from the civil servants.

Sir, the point I wish to make is there is a belief in the World Bank, the IMF and the IADB that wages in Barbados are too high. That is a well known fact that they believe that us poor black boys down here do not deserve to have no TVs, videos, nor fridges but they want to put us back to the Dark Ages where we are supposed to be living and cooking on coal pots and all of that. That is their believe and they are aided and abetted by members of a government whose sensitivity to the aspirations and needs of the people is sadly lacking.

Sir, this Bill that we are discussing has nothing to do with Government's finances. This is more to do with the overall IMF policy that wages in Barbados have to be reduced. That is my contention. It has nothing to do with Government's finances because, I want to point out that the Minister by his own words, and I always take his word.

Certain remarks made by SENATOR T. E. BARKER were ordered by Mr. PRESIDENT to be expunged from the records.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: The point is, Sir, that he said that \$7.4 million is the cost for one year which means that if we use straight line arithmetic \$3.7 million is the cost for the half of the year because, do not forget that the increments were only supposed to be given back from October 1, that is last week, to March 31 next year with regards to the present financial year so \$3.7 million is the bill that Government will have to look for in order to restore the increments for this present financial year. Given the fact that all of these public servants are paying Income Tax since the Government decided to bring down the threshold from \$15 000 to \$13 000, all, if not most of them are going to be paying Income Tax. It means that the net cost to Government is going to be about \$2 million. Two million dollars is the net cost - \$3.7 million and then when you take out Income Tax, which is a direct transaction, the net cost of the restoration of increments is \$2 million.

Sir, Government's budget is \$1 280 million. The Government came and we approved expenditure of \$1 280 million and this was passed in March this year - \$1 280 million and \$2 million net expenditure is going to cause us in here to come and sit down listening to a Minister calling for a reduction in emoluments. The Minister is going to

plead that this \$2 million is going to cause such damage to the Barbados economy especially when we note that only about 2 or 3 weeks ago the present Minister of Finance said in Canada how good the economy was doing, how we have stabilised. So you stabilise and \$2 million out of a total expenditure of \$1 280 million is going to cause you to be destabilised. What sort of stabilisation is that that such a small sum in proportion to the overall expenditure would cause problems?

Sir, this is less than 1%. This is less than a quarter of a percentage. You are talking about a minuscule figure in relation to the overall spending by Government. That is why I said that this Bill had nothing to do with Government financing. This Bill is part of the overall plan hatched in Washington to bring down wages in Barbados. The 8% reduction was part of it. The Income Tax changes, especially as they affected the lower paid workers was part of it because the general feeling is that Barbadians are living too well.

Sir, the members of the international community can go to some parts of Barbados and tell me if what they see, if the fact that they see children who are barely able to go to school, and some are going to school without the necessary books, lunch money and so on, when they see that they can come and say how well the average Barbadian is living because, according to the reggae song, "there is suffering in the land." What we have here is then Government trying to hoodwink a population into believing that the restoration of the increments, as they solemnly promised to do, would wreak untold havoc on the Barbados economy which they have said had stabilised. Not only that, Sir, they found a trade union movement which was more than willing to accommodate them. This alliance which in the past, and I am talking about the 1940s and 1950s now, worked to the benefit and for the upliftment of the Barbadian working class is now seeking to destroy the very psyche of the Barbadian worker because when you are tangling with a man's fundamental rights, his expectations, his hopes, you are destroying his psyche.

3.00 p.m.

Sir, when a person enters the civil service he is told, your salary is so much, increasing every year by so much until you either come to the top of the scale or in some instances there is a qualifying bar. That, Sir, is his expectation. That is the contract between himself and his employer. Now he cannot unilaterally break it because, Sir, any time he breaks his contract Government has the right, through its legal channels, the Public Services Commission and so on, to say, look, you have broken your contract, therefore that is the end of the matter and we will make the necessary arrangements and get rid of you. Government has a right to do that if the worker has broken his end of the bargain.

Now, Sir, what is happening now? Government is now breaking their end of the bargain and there is no sanction. What hurts me, Sir, is that Parliament, of which I am a Member, is now called upon to do Government's work for them, especially as it relates to the suffering of the workers.

Sir, I was in here and I agonised over the Public Service Reduction of Emoluments Act 1991. It hurt me. I agonised, Sir, when Parliament, of which I was a Member, was a part to a Bill which in effect cost an officer his job. Now I am party to this where 6 258 workers, according to the Minister, are denied what is rightfully theirs. I, Sir, have to take collective responsibility. Only this Monday I was in St. Lucy and a gentleman came to me and hearing that I was a Senator he accused me of getting in here and passing legislation to the detriment of the worker. So I, Sir, have to take collective responsibility. All I could say is, the record will show that I voted against it. But that is not enough because I am part and parcel of this Chamber and when we are called upon to do Government's dirty work ...

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: On a point of order.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I take back the word. When we are called upon to do Government's work I have to take part of the responsibility. All I will do, Sir, is to put on record my objection.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: Sir, on a point of elucidation. The Honourable Member makes reference to this Parliament voting to make somebody lose his job. If he is referring to the Chief Electrical Officer, we never voted for anybody to lose his job. We voted for a post. The post was a different post that we were dealing with. We deal with posts, we do not deal with personalities. Only the Public Service Commission can deal with personalities.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Thank you.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, the Honourable Member has a problem. I never said we voted out a man. I said we voted for legislation which in effect caused a person to lose his job, I never said we voted to take away a man's job, so if he is not listening that is not my problem.

Sir, the Honourable Minister mentioned that this suspension of increments was subject to 4 negotiating sessions with the Coalition of Trade Unions. Sir, that is true because up until Wednesday of this week the Government was still negotiating. Sir, what hurt me is that while the Government was negotiating the legislation was being circulated. I got mine last Saturday. It was delivered at my house last Saturday and Government was still negotiating. While they were negotiating they were

circulating the legislation. While they were talking with the Coalition of Trade Unions the Government printers and those involved were printing the Bills and the Honourable Minister is calling that good faith. Even before they reached a position Parliament was called upon to put certain things into effect. That is not good faith. And Government has got to stop this charade, the charade of negotiating when they know very well what they intend to do. It is not advancing the cause of trade unionism because it may look to the ordinary rank and file as though there is some arrangement between their leadership and the Government and the trade unions are coming out of this looking very bad indeed.

I do not want to say much about the trade unions because the last time I spoke about trade unions I got a severe 'busing from one of them.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You got what?

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: A severe 'busing. That is a Barbadian term.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Well let us have English while you are here.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: It is English, Sir. Everybody knows what I mean by the word 'busing.

Mr. PRESIDENT: We prefer you to use English while you are here. This is supposed to be the standard.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: A severe cursing, Sir, from a member of the trade union.

Sir, the Honourable Minister said that the increments were not paid on any merit but were just a legal That may be so but that is not a fault of the Civil Service, that is a fault of the system. That is a fault of the administrative system.

Sir, we are always crying out about civil service reform and we say it in such a way as to make it look as though the ordinary civil servant is lazy when in actual fact the trouble is not at the bottom end of the Civil Service the trouble is that the Managers in the Civil Service are not doing what they are supposed to be doing. But, Sir, there is a good reason for the increment system because it allows the officer when he comes into the service to be paid for his experience, in a nutshell. Because if you come in today and work 3 or 4 years, the person who comes in after you, who theoretically should not be as productive as you are would then get less salary than you.

Now what is happening is that with the fact that the increments have been stopped for 2 years so far, and this Bill will mean a third year, it means that an officer with 3

years experience would get the same salary as someone who has just come in, off the streets so to speak, but he has 3 years experience and he could be a good officer with 3 years experience. If he is properly supervised his contribution to the organisation should be much higher than the fellow who just came into work but is being paid the same salary. This does not work to anybody's advantage. Even in the private sector a worker with 3 years experience is going to be paid more than a fellow who comes in for his first day on the job.

If the system is working properly the 3 years experience will mean that he is more productive but he is not being paid for it and he is watching a fellow coming in with just qualifications and he may have to teach that same fellow certain things about the job carrying home the same salary that he is carrying home. That is wrong but that is going to be the direct effect of this legislation — that for 3 years in spite of how well the officer is performing he is going to get no increase in pay and it will take a very committed officer if he is going to perform to the best of his ability in those circumstances. Not only that, Sir, people in the Civil Service who have skills which are very marketable may be attracted away from the Civil Service. You have to be very careful about that.
3.10 p.m.

Sir, we have had a problem with nurses leaving and going to work in other countries. We train them for many years both in the school and in the institution, because a nurse takes a lot of years to train. I do not mean training in terms of getting a qualification, but she must also get experience to be a top-notch nurse. So it may take about ten years to be a very good nurse. I am talking a little bit more than schooling. I am talking about the experience which you can only get from doing the job.

When we invest maybe ten years in a nursing officer where we cut the salary and suspend the increments, they are going to be looking at offers that are going to be put to them. We are talking about a profession for which the demand generally outstrips the supply. Not only nurses, there are other professionals in the Civil Service that are going to have the same incentive to leave. I am saying that this Bill as well as the 8 per cent reduction Bill can cause damage to the efficiency of the Service and we can lose some of our best trained and highly competent and qualified officers. You do not trouble a man's salary. You do not trouble a man's incentive. You do not trouble it without remembering Newton's third law that to every action there is an equal and opposite reaction.

Sir, this Bill is bad for Barbados and it is bad for the Public Service because it is sending a signal to the civil servants that their security is not what they thought it was and, secondly, their remuneration can be subject to the whims of Parliament. Never before in our history could

we have imagined that there would ever be a reduction in wages. If you had asked a person that four years ago, he or she would have said that is a joke but we have lived to see it. So that which may attract or keep a person in the Service, it is no longer there.

Certain remarks made by SENATOR T. E. BARKER were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. PRESIDENT.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: My whole speech can be struck.

Aside.

Mr. PRESIDENT: That, too, I agree is disrespectful. You may proceed now. Senator Barker, I have told you about the standard of debate and I do mean that. Address the Chair. Proceed. Senator Barker, address the Chair.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, the Honourable Minister has stated that 6,258 persons are going to be affected by this legislation. Sir, I hope that I am quoting correctly. He said that 580 in the Public Service and 678 temporary workers and he even added correctly because he said 6,258 and I accept his arithmetic. But who are they? They are basically to be found at the lower end of the Civil Service. When you are in the top quarter, you are in what we call the skilled category. The skill has no increments. They are fixed from S9 to S1. But the ones to whom increments matter the most are the lower paid workers. That is a fact. These 6,258 are mainly in the lower end of the Civil Service in the Z38 to Z23 Scale which has about 14 years from bottom to top and they depend on the increment system to get real improvements in their wages. By real, I mean in the economic sense. In general, wage negotiations tend to take into account inflation and they do not normally go above inflation. If you want a real increase in your standard of living, you depend on the increment system basically.

Now we are talking about 6,000 low paid workers. What has happened in the past two years and is likely to happen in this present year when they are being denied an increase in their real income? We notice that insurance has gone up. House insurance, motor insurance and car tax have all gone up. We note that income tax for the lower end has gone up for two reasons: (1) the \$15,000 tax free income has been reduced to \$13,000 and, in addition, the bottom end of the income tax has moved from 20 per cent to 25 per cent. This was passed since July of last year where the bottom rate of tax has increased from 20 per cent to 25 per cent.

Sir, those workers have had to bear the bulk of the income tax changes because the change in income tax in 1992 benefited the higher paid workers at the expense of

the lower paid. That is a fact. What we have now is that these workers' income has not only been subject to a savage cut but their costs have gone up and they are not being compensated for increases in the cost of living. These 6,000 workers are bearing the brunt of the so-called adjustment programme. As I mentioned before, the civil servants who are at the top end in 1990 as a result of the regrading exercise have benefited tremendously. They were the main beneficiaries of the regrading exercise, not these 6,000 workers who are on the incremental scale. But the middle and the top levels of the Civil Service have benefited.

3.20 p.m.

So that when the 8% cut came the following year, it probably would only have put them back into the same position they were in before the regrading took place, so they are not really affected, but the lower paid workers have taken the brunt of Government's assault on the standard of living of the people of Barbados. What are they given in return, Sir? They are offered 3 days' holiday. Let us pause there. Take a teacher at a primary school who is told "we cannot pay you increments, take 3 days off." What is going to happen to her class? Government is not going to bring in anybody for those 3 days, so do you know what will happen? The other teachers in that school will be called upon, out of their free periods or whatever, to look after that class. That is what will happen, because I would not like my daughter's teacher to go off for 3 days and there will be nobody to look after her class. That is a very serious matter, so it means that other teachers in the school will have to give up their free periods or whatever to look after my daughter, but they will not be compensated for it. I mention a teacher just as an example, so giving here 3 days' holiday is going to disrupt the school basically, because it means that others will have to rush in and fill the void. The same thing will happen in secondary schools, because if you give them 3 days holiday you cannot give them 3 days holiday during the regular holiday periods, you have to give them during term time, so this is bare foolishness. To give a man in the Public Service 3 days' holiday, invariably when he comes back he will find himself with the same amount of work to do. I do not understand how this is going to pan out, as the saying goes. To me, Sir, this is unthought of. Nobody sat down and realised the implications of this.

The Minister has said that the increments cost between .56 and 1 point something of a day. I do not want to misquote him, but between a half day and a day and a half would be the true cost of the payment of increments, but yet Government is giving them twice what they deserve. Is not that a cost? When you send home a worker, are you saying that that worker in those three days would have been producing nothing? I know that Senator Beckles will say yes.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: On a point of order, Sir. Senator Beckles has not yet entered the debate and I do not believe that Senator Beckles' name should be mentioned.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Thank you. I have tried my best to get him to improve the standard of his debate, to no avail.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, there are a lot of things we all fail at, but we continue to try, and I wish you luck in the future.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Thank you.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: But I can assure you, Sir, I will not be cowed. The point I was making before I was interrupted was that it is all right for some Members on the other side to talk about the unproductiveness of the Civil Service, because the Democratic Labour Party has been noted for casting....

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: On a point of order, Sir. Senator Barker is stating that this side has stated that Members of the Civil Service are unproductive. That has not been said in the debate so far by any members of this side, and I ask that it be struck from the record.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barker, you will withdraw that statement.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, what I am saying, in case any Members on the other side, as I have heard them on many occasions say that members of the Civil Service are unproductive, only

Mr. PRESIDENT: You would have to tell us what occasions there were. I am not aware of that.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I just heard it in this Chamber, Sir, as an aside.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Oh, we are not taking cognisance of that. Suddenly now you are telling me that you heard it as an aside. You are not supposed to be answering to asides. Let us have your debate now.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I will say then, if I am not supposed to hear asides, probably the other Members should not be making asides.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Well, I hope you will remember that.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I have no problem with them replying to my asides. I want them to respond to my asides.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I hope you remember that. Senator Barker, I have told you repeatedly about the standard of your debate.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, with all due respect, I see nothing wrong with it.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I realise you see nothing wrong with it.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: The point I want to make, Sir, is that in spite of what people say about the Civil Service, the Civil Service is one of the more efficient organisations in this country of Barbados. We talk so much about the private sector. What about Home Centre? What about Trade Confirmers? What about Plantations? We are always willing to castigate the Public Service, so when Members on the other side are casting aspersions upon the ability of the public servants I have to defend them.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: On a point of order, Sir. I will not sit here and allow Senator Barker to persist in making a statement which is totally false. Nobody on this side has said anything about the productivity or the efficiency of the Civil Service.

Aside.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barker, you are not on your feet and I do not find it funny, I do not find it amusing. Your behaviour leaves much to be desired. You may continue.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, in spite of all the interruptions I am getting, I will say that the Civil Service does Barbados credit, and this assault upon the Civil Service is unwarranted and uncalled for. To hear members of the Democratic Labour Party constantly berating the Civil Service leaves one to wonder what agenda they have for the Civil Service. That is what I will say. They have an agenda for the Civil Service.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, I did not want to intervene in this, but when one hears a comment like "the members of the Democratic Labour Party constantly berating the Civil Service", then you are including those of us in here who are not party to that, so I would wish to have that struck from the record.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I never said anybody in here berated them. I said members of the Democratic Labour Party. I never said Senators. If the Honourable

Minister can speak for all members of the party, then something is wrong.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barker, you will refrain from making those statements.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Why?

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barker, you must have some basis in fact in order to make the statement. At least you ought to have.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I can only speak to those things I have seen and heard, to quote the Bible. I have heard in here...

Mr. PRESIDENT: You have heard in here?

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Yes. In and out, but the point I want to make is that if you are saying that three days' holiday will mean nothing to the performance of the Civil Service, you are speaking about their efficiency, their loyalty and their productivity. That is what you are saying. You are saying that for 3 days these people are doing nothing and you could well give them time. That is a very serious implication and for members of a political party to tolerate that sort of berating of the Civil Service speaks about them and not the Civil Service.
3.30 p.m.

As I said before, this 3-days holiday is nonsense because it is not well thought out and it will create more problems than it is solving because you will have the situation where you have 2 officers in the public service, one gets 21 days and the other gets 24 days. It will cause so many anomalies and frictions within the Service that I think it should be thought about again. Indeed, I wish that the whole Bill would be thought of again because the Bill is doing nothing at all to advance either the civil servants or the country. There is no economic justification for it. Not for \$2 million or \$1 280. It could only be seen as an appeasement, especially to the World Bank who have been constantly harping on the fact that wages and salaries in Barbados are too high. Little do they recognise that you cannot only look at wages in isolation. Wages and salaries must be weighed against that which can be purchased in the market place.

We know for a fact that it is probably more expensive to live in Barbados than in most other Caribbean countries because our cost of living tends to be reasonably high. We need a higher wage in order to have a comparable standard of living. Not only that, Sir, wages must also be related to productivity and all the studies have shown, especially by the Central Bank, that in Barbados we have no problem with labour productivity at all. Our labour productivity is increasing. All studies show that we are paying high wages

but productivity, that is, output per worker, is increasing. Still we hear all this talk about wages.

There is nobody in Government who will stand up and defend the worker. We hear Ministers are commended for their ability to listen when it should be the other way around. Our Ministers should be talking to the international organisations and saying this is what the position is, this is what the country can bear, not listening. I don't send – and I use the word "I" in a plural sense – a Minister to listen to the IMF. I send him there to put Barbados' case instead of "we want assistance and this is what we are prepared to do for these reasons". That is what I want a Minister to do, to go and argue a case not to go and listen and to be told what to do and then be commended for being a good listener. I cannot imagine a Minister of Finance like Errol Barrow being a listener. He would not be a listener. I cannot imagine Tom Adams being a listener. You go with a programme with a set of policies saying we want finances to fund this programme and this is what we are prepared to do.

No other Government in the history of Barbados would have allowed the interests of the working-class of Barbados to be trampled on like this present Government because they have no programme. They virtually have no policies; so anything that that organisation tells them they are not going to resist. So we get imposition upon imposition which acts against the interests of the working-class of Barbados. This is another case of such an imposition. It had nothing to do with Government budgeting, had everything to do with wages in Barbados. \$2 million cannot cause instability in Barbados. I stand on that.

Sir, I will vote against this Bill and I will invite other Members of this Honourable Chamber to vote against this Bill also. It will not advance Government one step further. If anything, Sir, it may be a case of "one step forward and 10 steps backward and the whole of Barbados trembling." That is what this Bill is. The workers are trembling when they see their fundamental rights being unilaterally breached in such a callous and almost underhand manner where Government is said to be negotiating but at the same time when they are negotiating they are already imposing.

So, Sir, I invite Members in this Chamber to vote against this Bill because voting against this Bill they are voting against stupidity. They are voting against foolishness and you are voting to uphold the rights of the working-classes in this country of ours. With that appeal, I encourage Members to listen to their conscience and vote with their conscience because their conscience can only tell them that this is a bad Bill hatched in the pit of Hades and nothing at all to do with the advancement of Barbados. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR T. C. BECKLES: Mr. President I rise to support this Bill and crave your indulgence just to make a few remarks.

Mr. President, it is a good thing that economics is not only about arithmetic, otherwise our colleague would probably be a professor. I remember first coming into the House you indicated that you would like me to keep debates at a high level and I propose to do exactly that. I try to get away from this Joe Tudor sort of stuff. I don't even read comics. I find that it is important for the education of oneself that one at some time try to be serious. This is a matter that we have to be serious about, Mr. President.

First of all, let me deal with the arithmetic that our colleague misused. He said that the \$5 million or \$6 million when you take out income tax that the net result would be approximately \$2 million.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: On a point of elucidation. I said \$3.5 million and not \$6 million or \$5 million.

SENATOR T. C. BECKLES: Thank you. \$3.5 million and the net result would be \$2 million. Mr. President, I think that this clearly illustrates the lack of ability of a person to understand how economics work. In the first instance, there is an economic concept which we refer to as a multiplier. It is calculated by... Write it down. It is a lesson to you. Divided by 1 over the margin of propensity to consume. Even given that in Barbados we save about 20% of our income I am positing that this \$5 million even with his calculation is going to cost the Government more than \$5 million. In the final analysis, because the Government must find all of the money and Sir, it must be accountable for all of the money that is required. He can even work out what it would cost if he uses the formula. That is one thing he can do because at least I know he is a statistician but not an economist.

The point I am making is that his calculation is wrong. Your calculation with regard to how much money the Government will be required to finance this is wrong.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, on a point of order. I am grateful for the Honourable Member to talk about multiplying and so on. It only backs my point because if the people get more money in their hands they will spend more and Government will rake in more. So in actual fact it may end up to be \$1 million. So I thank the Honourable Member for finding that.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Thank you.

SENATOR T. C. BECKLES: Anyhow, Mr. President, so much for that. Again it just demonstrates the ignorance

with regard to economic analysis. It will always cost more if you understand economic reasoning. But I leave that and I am sure one of his tutors will help him.

Mr. President, one of the reasons why this Bill is before us is the fact that the Government has indicated its inability to pay. We are all in Barbados aware of the dynamics of wages. We have understood and been fortunate over the past 25 years to observe the ratchet theory in practice. That is, we get increments and they never fall. We just build on those all the time. In spite of the level of productivity we are mindful of the consequences of that factor or that behaviour.

I am again positing that one of the reasons why we are in the particular present economic impasse is that we follow this method of rewarding ourselves year after year in spite of the fact that anyone who was paying attention would have recognised that we were paying ourselves income for which someday we would have had to repay the persons from whom we were borrowing. That is a fact. When the time comes that we would have some difficulty in making the adjustment.

We are not crystal ball gazers and we probably could not have envisaged the impact to be as severe as it is. We could probably recognise sometime in the future that we might have had to make the adjustment but we would not have recognised that the adjustment would have come at a time when the entire world is in recession. The economy of Barbados is not just driven by the 166 square miles and the 256 000 persons that are here. We are part of a world economy and we have to adjust our economic behaviour in accordance with the rest of the world.

I do not want to say too much about that because I think that is already history. What we have to start doing in Barbados now is to start fashioning our remuneration, the way we pay ourselves in accordance with our productivity. I think this is clearly the route that the Government is going. This Bill is part of that approach and that is why I am supporting this Bill.

This Government recognises that things must happen. It is a tough period in our history and what is required is a people who can take tough decisions, people who do not have to look over their shoulders but who can decide and make decisions based on what is good for Barbados at a particular time. No one, and certainly I would not be part of that, enjoys freezing anyone's wages or reducing anyone's wages. If you are from working-class stock and I suggest that Barbados is essentially a working-class population then of course you must be concerned with the reduction of wages or the freezing of wages because it impacts upon all of us.

But what are the alternatives? Are the alternatives better for us in general? That is the question we must

ask. Again, the Senator went down one road of economic reasoning and he is speaking to an economic model in which you have – probably he does not understand the difference between the two – I think he had the problem this morning – the difference between finite resources and infinite resources. Clearly, the resources of the world is infinite. I think this morning he was making the point even with regard to water, something that we would in early Barbados have regarded as relatively cheap, but we are now recognising that water is a problem because it is finite. The more pressure you put on it, the higher your standard of living the more you consume, of course, the more expensive it becomes and this is so with all the resources in the world.

3.45 p.m.

It is no secret that we in Barbados have had a reasonably good standard of living. We have had a good run since the 1950s, 1960s into the 1970s and so on. This has been enjoyed by all of us. The myth there is for us to think that that could continue forever. That is to assume away scarcity. That is to assume away finiteness and to say that the world resources are infinite. If you are going to accept the reality that the world resources are finite, if you want to accept the reality that Barbados is now in competition with the rest of the world for some of these resources, and if you want to accept the fact that the way the new economic order is unfolding puts Barbados not at an advantage the way it was structured but as a disadvantage, then you can address a question like this. You can talk, and I am speaking to this Resolution along those lines.

Mr. President, one of the things I am always aware of in my life are people who are ever ready to talk about the poor people. One thing that I have always remembered is the story of a creditor. A creditor never gets rid of all his prey. Any politician that can only make points with regard to only looking after the poor is a politician who must make sure that there is poverty there and if you cannot lift your debate and argument above that always that you are the pall bearer or whatever of the poor, then I think it is time you start refashioning your thoughts because to say that some people would get hurt as a result of a recession is to say the known. To say that a rich person would not be hurt as much as a poor person is again to say the known. That is what society is all about. People try to immunize themselves from these shocks. That is why they save. That is why they put aside money. That is why we call those the rich people. The more money you have put away, the richer you are, then the more likely you are to be able to immunize yourself from these shocks. To move from there to assume or to say that people who do not agree with you are people who are anti-worker and people who are anti the poor and who do not do things for the poor is a bit too much.

Mr. President, any Minister of Finance can continue to increase the nominal wages of anyone he wishes. What that person cannot do is to maintain the real value of that money unless that person acts prudently and this is what this debate is all about. This is really what we are talking about. When you are in the Opposition it is good Opposition politics now. I am surprised, in spite of the fact in the fertile area that the Opposition is in, that our colleagues cannot make a better case rather than Joe Tudor around the place. Of course this is a time when the Opposition can make a case but they have to sit down and think through what they want to say and try to persuade....

Aside.

SENATOR T. C. BECKLES: No. I think he was a very good comedian and I enjoyed his style.

Mr. President, as I was saying, the thing is that money does not give value to things. It is the other way around. Things give value to money and apart from the economic theory, we have seen it through the world where people in developing countries time and time again make this error thinking that because they are increasing the volume of money in their country they are increasing the wealth of their country. I think we have reached the stage now, those of us who are concerned about these things, to recognise that was an error. What you have to do is to look back, look at your economy and try to start producing more goods and services that other people want which gives value to money. Money does not give things value. Things give money value. Money is essentially one...

Mr. PRESIDENT: It has no intrinsic value. I take it that is what you mean.

SENATOR T. C. BECKLES: Very little. I am saying that things give money value.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I understand that.

SENATOR T. C. BECKLES: Mr. President, I am supporting this Bill because the Bill is part and parcel of the Government's programme to make sure that the value of our money is maintained and that it is not destroyed. To do this we must get the level of our production up. We must increase our productivity. We must make sure that our remunerations, our payments to ourselves do not exceed the rate of productivity. If we continue to do this then I will say that we will have no choice but to watch the value of our money depreciate further and further.

Mr. President, another point, and I am coming back to Senators concern about the poor and the needy. Who are the poor? Who are the needy? What are the provisions made for these people in our society and what more can be done for them in spite of what we are going through?

When you look at the actual things that are being done to cushion the shock on the poor, you would recognise that the present Government is certainly a caring one.

Now, if you look at the situation with regard to the 3 days off, what are the alternatives? Is it better to have the total number of workers in the work force working and having these 3 days off or to pay them their increase and then putting off some people because that is the alternative. It is one thing to talk about it is only \$2 million or it is only \$1 million, or it is only a small amount but the important thing is that in terms of Government revenue it has to come from somewhere else. It must come from somewhere else ...

Aside.

SENATOR T. C. BECKLES:...and even if you take it from the St. Thomas School it means that the people who are now working at the St. Thomas School..

Aside.

SENATOR T. C. BECKLES: Well you cannot take it from there then.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the Chamber. There is nobody working at the St. Thomas School, and anybody who takes the time, whether in Government politics or Opposition politics, to think out what they are going to say before they say it would know that that is an untrue statement.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Thank you very much.
3.55 p.m.

The Honourable Member is misleading the House. There is nobody working at St. Thomas school and anybody who takes the time whether in Government politics or Opposition politics would think out what they are going to say before they say it would know that that is an untrue statement.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. You may proceed.

SENATOR T. C. BECKLES: Thank you very much, Mr. President. The point I was making is that as long as it is Government finance it must come from some where else and the impact will be proportionate. If the Government takes it out of agriculture then somebody in agriculture will lose and since the majority of the Government's money is in emoluments, wages and so on it tends to follow that people will go home. I am saying that is not a solution. The solution must be in trying to maintain what the Government has set out to do over the last 2 years, that is

to get the people of Barbados to condition themselves to a situation in which they work and increase their productivity and pay themselves higher wages out of increased productivity.

If we want to go back to the old guard, to the period of the sixties and into the seventies and probably the early eighties, I am saying to this House, Mr. President, that the facility is just not there. What is upsetting to the Senator who spoke before me is the fact that he knows the Government will succeed. He is trying to derail....

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: On a point of order. I am trying to derail?

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barker, allow him to finish his sentence or his statement.

SENATOR T. C. BECKLES: He knows that the Government is on the right track in trying to put the economy back in place. In many private conversations he has indicated this to me.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, that is an outright lie.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barker, are you speaking now on a point of order?

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: On a point of order, that is an outright lie.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Oh that language is not permitted here.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, the Honourable Member is misleading the Chamber in a very deliberate manner when he says that I told him in a private conversation that ...

Mr. PRESIDENT: You cannot say it like that. If you wish to say that the Honourable Member is misleading the Chamber that is all right.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, on a point of order. Is that statement a part of the record that I told him the Government was on the right track? Sir, I want it to be withdrawn. I have never yet in private, not even in my sleep ...

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barker, this is not a clowning show, it is not a circus. Senator Barker it is just a matter of his word against yours and he said that you said that.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, on a point of order. I am saying that I never made that statement.

Mr. PRESIDENT: All right. Thank you, Senator Barker.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: And I am asking him, through you, to withdraw that statement, that stain on my character.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Thank you, Senator Barker.

SENATOR T. C. BECKLES: I am prepared to withdraw the statement.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barker, we will proceed now.

SENATOR T. C. BECKLES: Mr. President, as I was saying, the economy of Barbados is on the right track. We must not allow it to be derailed even by the most sophisticated arguments of persons who would wish to see this happen.

I believe wholeheartedly that the majority of the civil servants are understanding of this situation. The majority of the civil servants understand that you cannot or you ought not to be spending money that you have not got. You cannot spend money that you have not got in the hope that you are going to recoup it in taxes. This is crucial. It is a real situation. Earlier the Senator let go some kind of wild lash at the private sector.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley you just do not jump up like that. You do not scare us and suddenly just jump up and make those noises. If you wish to speak on a point of order, first of all you get my attention in a different manner but you do not ...

Aside.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You do not behave in that manner, Senator Mottley. No, not like that. Let us hear Senator Mottley now. If you are going to speak on a point of order, well then you do so, but not in that manner.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: As far as I know, Sir, Your Honour has continually ruled that asides are not part of this debate. Until I turn on that thing anything I may have said was an aside. Now if Your Honour wishes to take cognizance of those asides yet again let me know.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley you will not tell me what I will take cognizance of and what I will not take cognizance of. Senator Mottley I am telling you that you will wait until I recognise you then to speak but you

cannot jump up and just suddenly start making noises and expect that that is the norm and the behaviour which I will accept.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, that may not be the norm for yourself or other people. It is the norm for me.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Well it will not be acceptable by me in here.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Oh no, Sir, you say you may not like it.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I will not accept it.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Your Honour cannot tell me how to rise out of my seat. That is one thing Your Honour cannot do.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I may not tell you how to rise but there is a certain code of conduct. We cannot just hear noises suddenly interrupting something else.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: You mean the noises from the other side of the table earlier when Senator Barker ...

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley, I am not going to have an argument with you. If you have a point of order you may proceed with it.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. In the same manner that Your Honour has for the day, without any sort of prodding from anybody else, asked Honourable Senators not to make statements that are inflammatory and that impute dishonourable intentions to Honourable Senators, I am asking since Your Honour has not clearly asked the Honourable Senator who is speaking to withdraw his dishonourable imputation or his imputation of this Senator being dishonourable, I am asking Your Honour to protect my privileges in here and have those remarks expunged from the record because it is also a reflection of this Chair since those remarks were not expunged from the record this morning and therefore he is reflecting on the Chair.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am not aware of what you are talking about.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am asking for a ruling.

Mr. PRESIDENT: On what?

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: The wild remarks that an Honourable Senator in here was alleged to have made in relation to the private sector this morning and there were only two people who spoke in relation to the private sector this morning. The fact that Senator Morrison does not wish to get up and have his name cleared is a matter for Senator Morrison but I, Sir, take the gravest objection to any imputation about any wild remarks made about the private sector in here this morning.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley, you will sit now. Thank you.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am asking for a ruling. Sir, I am entitled to a ruling.

MR. PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley, you will sit.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of privilege, Sir, I am entitled to a ruling and I am asking for a ruling. Your Honour can rule good or bad but I am entitled to a ruling.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley, when you are finished speaking you will take your seat.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of privilege, Sir, I am asking for a ruling.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley, when you have sat I will then speak. Senator Mottley, I do not accept at all your attitude. I do not accept the manner in which you behaved and I repeat it is not at all in keeping with the dignity of this Chamber.
4.05 p.m.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, on a point of privilege. I am asking for a ruling.

Mr. PRESIDENT: A ruling on what?

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Since Your Honour's memory is so short, I will repeat. I have asked that remarks relating to wild comments by Honourable Senators in this Chamber this morning as they related to the private sector be expunged from the record.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Beckles, what exactly was your statement?

SENATOR T. C. BECKLES: I indicated to the House that the previous speaker made reference to the public sector and he said that the public sector is efficient and then he went on to give inferences of failures in certain areas of the private sector.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir. I am asking for the record to be delivered to us.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley, I will have to make such a ruling. Senator Beckles, let me hear what you are saying.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You will not interrupt.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Yes.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, by imputation, the Honourable Senator indicated to me when I spoke about the failure in the private sector about a wild lash.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I have heard you now.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I have not finished.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Oh! Well, go on.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Therefore, Sir, he is saying that I made a wild lash at the private sector.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You said that he is saying that you said that.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Yes, that I made a wild lash at the private sector. I made no such lash. It is obviously false and I am calling upon the Honourable Senator to withdraw such imputation.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. Senator Beckles, you were telling us what.

SENATOR T. C. BECKLES: Mr. President, with regard to the private sector, the Honourable Senator indicated that there were some failures in the private sector. Since he was comparing this with the behaviour in the public sector, he illustrated that by making the point that the public sector is as efficient and by implication the private sector may not be so.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Would you wish to word that differently?

SENATOR T. C. BECKLES: Do you mean the wild lash?

Mr. PRESIDENT: Yes.

SENATOR T. C. BECKLES: I can withdraw that.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Yes. All right, it has been withdrawn. You have just two more minutes, Senator Beckles.

SENATOR T. C. BECKLES: All of that took away from my time. Anyhow, Mr. President, I still have to say something about the private sector because I work in the private sector. I have not been blessed like some others. I work in the private sector. I am saying that the private sector is bound to be efficient to survive and those that fail may be an indication of other things that may have come together.

With regard to the comparison, I think that it is unfair and because my time is short I cannot develop that. Because there is no way in the private sector when you make a mistake with regard to your pricing and so on that you can come back and tax your people after in order to make up. So the comparison is not there. The private sector by implication must be efficient to succeed. Those that are not are the ones that go by the way. I think that we have to recognize whether we like it or not that the period we are going into now is one in which must be led by the private sector. In spite of all the speaker's desires to have a padded public sector, I believe that those days are gone.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: On a point of order, Sir. I have no desire, Sir, to see a padded Public Service and I wish that the Honourable Senator stop imputing motives and words that I did not state.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Thank you.

SENATOR T. C. BECKLES: Mr. President, in concluding, I am saying that we must have an efficient public sector supporting an efficient private sector in order for Barbados to succeed. I think that this Bill is keeping us on the rails to that objective and, therefore, I have no hesitation in supporting this Bill.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Walcott.

SENATOR Mrs. M. WALCOTT: Mr. President, as was drawn to our attention a while ago, two years ago legislation was passed in here to reduce salaries of the members of the Public Service by 8 per cent and increments becoming due were suspended for two years at the end of last month. We have today another piece of legislation providing for the further suspension of the increments of the Public Service for yet another year.

I note, Mr. President, from the Protocol that there will be a general freeze on increases in basic wages and salaries in both public and private sectors. This Protocol was passed in here some weeks ago and this will be for another year and a half. So perhaps the new legislation was to be

expected to be put in place in view of what the Protocol said. But in the case of the public servants they have been through this already. They suffered the cut for a period as well as not having an increment for two years, but in all of that they have also been called upon to produce more since the numbers in the Civil Service have been reduced over that period. There have been many lay-offs, so those remaining certainly had to do extra work and they must have had to produce more.

Now apparently anticipating such a situation, I see also that the Protocol provides for increases in wages and salaries in terms of productivity bonuses. So it would appear that members of the Public Service could qualify for some recognition of their performance in respect of the extra duties that they have had to undertake because of the reduction of the staff.

Mr. President, I am asking for a clarification on these points. Will the public officers and other employees of the Public Service and related bodies qualify for a productivity bonus despite the provisions of this legislation before us today? That is, although the public officers lose an increment for which they might qualify, is there still a chance of them earning a bonus?
4.15 p.m.

Also, Mr. President, at the end of the period of the protocol, will the public officers have the suspended increments restored? Or will they have to forego them altogether?

I recognise and accept that sacrifices have to be made by all Barbadians. We need to play our part and co-operate in order to put the economy of the country back on a sustainable basis. However, Sir, it does seem that for one group things have been and continue to be rather difficult. They have had to bear more than their fair share of the strain.

Thank you.

SENATOR W. LeR. INNIS: Mr. President, at this time of the day I will try not to delay Honourable Members too much. I take up somewhere along the lines where the last Senator ended off, and that is the particular burden which is being borne by a particular sector of our society.

I believe that it was a good and mature sign when the various trade unions got together and came to an understanding with Government that in the interest of Barbados there would be a freezing of salaries and wages for a particular period. I do not know if it was envisaged at that time by those who were making the decisions that it would include the contractual increments which form part of the civil servants' terms of employment. I myself do not

believe that Government is acting in a callous or unsympathetic manner, and I accept that it is an inability on the part of the Government at this time rather than an unwillingness to pay the civil servants. But I have confidence in Barbados that Barbados will not always remain in the particular state in which it finds itself today, and I would sincerely hope that the civil servants who are being called upon for a second time in a reasonably short space of time to bear a particular burden, which their colleagues in the private sector are not being called upon to bear in the same manner, will be remembered and adequately rewarded when better days are upon us. In other words, since they will forego an increment at this time, we would hope that in bumper times they may see an accelerated increment. But it is a little difficult to give more increments to fewer people and send home some of those who are already in employment.

Why I say that there is a difference between the civil servant and the employee in the private sector, the very way the Civil Service is structured prevents any increments to be given for productivity. As a matter of fact, I think there are some persons who believe that it would be impossible to award productivity increments in the Civil Service sector. It is the feeling among some people, but I was very pleased only recently to hear the Chairman of the Public Service Commission himself state the need to take a closer look at the Civil Service in terms of how you can give accelerated promotion to those who wish to produce as opposed to those who sit quietly, behave well and come to work and go from strength to strength.

I think it is a good thing, Mr. President, that we could not have got the agreement, even for this part of what we are doing today, to come from the discussions between Government and the civil servants' representatives, because I myself do not ever like to see a Government having to legislate salaries or any other conditions of work of these employees. I like to think that our unions will be given the necessary respect and that the Government's position as well will be understood and that employer and employee, which is Government and its civil servants, should be able to sit down and work through these kinds of things.

The time has come, and I am not casting any aspersions on the trade unionists, when trade unionists will now have to see their role as having changed. Gone are the days of saying "give me more money or I strike". This is a brand new ball game and the trade unionists have now to equip themselves and see a different function because there is very much work to be done for the workers. The whole idea of getting a few more dollars every two years is now something of the past. We have to get a brand new thinking. If the trade unionists themselves do not come to grips with that idea, they will keep running into trouble.

I find as soon as we have these kinds of problems there is a certain section of this country that starts saying pull all trade unionists out of politics, because they are sleeping with Government, or sleeping outside of Government, or something of the sort. I think first in 1993, because we may have occasions when there seems to be some kind of dialogue between a Government and a trade union, to say that trade unionists should be removed from politics is to forget our history. Whenever the history of Barbados is written, one of the greatest names to be remembered is that of Grantley Adams. I think that he would turn in his grave if it was ever suggested that there was no room in politics for trade unionists. Sir Hugh Springer, himself a parliamentarian and a trade unionist, the great Sir Frank Walcott, a parliamentarian and a trade unionist. We must not forget our history. LeRoy Trotman is too young at this game for us to put him in history. He is still an active player and history will record his achievements in due course.

This is not something peculiar to Barbados. If we look throughout the Caribbean, the working-class movement has been in the forefront of the betterment of the same people we speak about all the time, the poor who are among us. If we look at the Antigua Labour Party, it grew out of the trade union movement, sometimes the trade union movement grew out of the party. The Grenada Manual and Metal Workers Union, whatever you want to say about Eric Gairy in the latter days, it was Gairy the trade unionist that became Gairy the politician. If you look in St. Vincent, in St. Lucia, throughout the Caribbean, there has been the marriage of the trade union and the party, and for those of us who believe that we must take a leaf out of the book of Britain and nowhere else, in Britain indeed the Labour Party has the trade union so greatly entrenched that it has gone a bit too far, where they are now trying to take away some of the trade union's power from the party itself. So do not let us get along with this nonsense from time to time about no room for that. Who has ever said business people should not be in politics?

4.25 p.m.

Clearly, there must be some occasions that it will look like a conflict of interest because what goes on in the boardroom of a business place will not go on in Cabinet in which a business man may sit. Are you going to say because a man is running a business he cannot make any contribution to the political life of Barbados? If he can, why can a man who is representing the workers' interest make a significant part in the life of the Parliament in Barbados. We should broaden, not contract. There was a time when it was thought that the Church should stay out of politics.

One of the most sensible changes in the 1974 constitutional changes was to bring in the Church. If a churchman wants to come into active politics he may

come. That was one of the few things I did not worry about. There were some things to be worried about but I never worried about that one. So, Mr. President, I think we must not let these trying times when they come upon us cause us to change our structures and cast some kind of strange motives to the works of people who find themselves in a position where everybody in Barbados today is scrambling to hold his own position.

We cannot make brick without straw. What we have to do is to get together and get as much straw as possible so that the brick can be made for the benefit of all of us.

Mr. President, as I said, I have sympathy for the civil servants just as I have sympathy for the persons who have been retrenched in the private sector. It is never a pleasant thing for people not to get their money; but I hope that in the short term little suffering for the civil servants will be for the good of the entire country, including the families of these same persons who are paying the little price today.

I sincerely plead with Government that when better days come upon us that we always look back at this time when the civil servants were called upon to lead the banner in the national interest and in despite of those who will criticise them for being generous to the civil servants that when the kitty becomes full generosity will be shown to those who are bearing the brunt today.

I thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR Mrs. A. STRAUGHN: Mr. President, my contribution to the debate will be consistent with my contribution to the piece of legislation brought before us 2 years ago, namely, that legislation which dealt with the 8% pay cut in the salaries of public servants. Let us turn for a moment to the teaching profession, whether or not we want to regard it as a profession or a quasi-profession encased in a bureaucracy. By preferred arrangement, Mr. President, teachers are out of school at the same time as the children. It is the children who get their vacation not really the teachers. Teachers are always on call. There is really no justification for a 3-days off break. If it is a question of money, Mr. President, I think that consideration should be given to the fact that people are prepared to wait, people are prepared to accept instalments so long as they know that that money is coming. In a decision of this nature, Mr. President, one that affects so many and so many whose service is paramount to the growth and development of a country, in a decision of this nature, people must be mentally prepared.

I submit that there ought to have been enough time for proper consultation. At the risk of being over-simplistic, Mr. President, let us envisage what could happen at any time in any one school, at any level of our education

system, if all or part of its teaching service took the 3-days off period at the same time. It is unthinkable, Mr. President, what the result could be if a similar thing took place right across the country.

We know from past experience where the blame and the accusations for dislocation and disruption will be levelled. Surely, Mr. President, this 3-days off measure cannot operate among nurses in our health service or any of our institutions providing health care. These departments, Mr. President, are already under-staffed or short-staffed, whatever terminology we want to use. The administrative departments of many of the branches of our public service are under extremely heavy strain resulting from lay-offs, cut-backs, redundancies among its personnel. The 3-days off duty can only serve to exacerbate the strain.

Mr. President, the backbone of any country is its public service. A properly run public service is more effective in the operations of a country than any political party; this is because the public service is constant in the operations of a country. It is an axiom that there are more honest, God-fearing and caring people and people of good will than there are dishonest and uncaring ones in the world.

In this context, Mr. President, I make bold to say that our public service is for the most part staffed with more people of quality and character than otherwise. By this token, therefore, Mr. President, and because of the fact of reduced staffing, many of these people are over-worked, and therefore productivity cannot be to its maximum.

Mr. President, we know that difficulties and sufferings are a part of life's package and none of us should expect to be spared these difficulties, but I see no reason why many of the difficulties of others should be compounded and made more severe. In this case, it is not just others – it is "significant" others.

This Bill, to my mind, is not only an expression of a lack of awareness of some of the hardships that exist around us. It is also an expression of the poverty that is within us. The poverty of our thinking; a lack of sensitivity to some of the problems of others. This legislation, Mr. President, smacks of salesmanship tactics: "Buy a little of this and a little of that as a panacea for some of your ailments, and all will be well."

Mr. President, are we prepared as legislators to deal with the side effects of some of our own prescriptions, like 8 drops of this, in the case of the 8% cut and 3 teaspoonfuls of that, in the case of this 3-days off that we are proposing? Recovery is a process. In the slow process of this recovery from the present economic recession, is not a measure like the one before us, the one under discussion, a way of removing the confidence of a people and

replacing this confidence with disillusionment? Disillusionment that arises from not getting what they are entitled to.

Mr. President, I repeat. Suffering is a part of life's package; but I have a great respect for the predictive validity and the strong prophetic component in that popular calypso which says: "One step forward, 2 steps backward and tremble. Hold your belly and tremble." This Bill, Mr. President, to my way of thinking, purports a mythical "sop to Cerberus" which is undermining the Barbadian intelligence and his pride, 2 qualities of which we never hesitate to boast. It is a case of adding insult to injury, as I see it, when we consider the target group at which it is especially aimed. These people, Mr. President, have made their sacrifice. For many of these people it has been painful and for some, even unbearable.

In all fairness to my professional colleagues past and present and by the term "colleagues" I am not only referring to my teaching colleagues, but in fairness to all those who toil in the vineyard of human and humane endeavour so that this country can reap a true harvest of productivity – productivity, which results from the training of young human minds; productivity which results from the restoration of health and all means of effective functioning among many other resources.

In all fairness to my own conscience, Mr. President, with which I have to live for as long as I have to live, I cannot and with a lot of feelings, I cannot support this Bill. I thank you.

SENATOR J. G. BELLAMY: Mr. President, I have listened to the contributions to the debate thus far and felt disposed to stand and make a small contribution, particularly with respect to some of the comments made about the private sector. Senator Beckles, in coming to the end of his submission, ran out of time but I want to support what he started to say by pointing out that throughout the world today even in the previous Soviet Union there is an undisputed recognition that the private sector is the engine of growth of all economies and is the engine we will rely on to further our economies and to pull ourselves out of the difficulties which we all face.

I totally support the view that in order for the private sector to thus function it must be supported by an efficient public sector. I do not wish to discount the importance of the public sector, but I must defend the manner in which the private sector is criticised and the conditions under which the private sector has to work. As Senator Beckles said, towards the end of his contribution, the private sector does not have the privilege of being able to levy increased taxes to take care of deficits. This has to be done within the confines under which any business operates. It is also

a well-known fact in the private sectors of all countries throughout the world that businesses come and go. The more efficient ones succeed. Those that are not so efficient disappear. I do not believe that it is fair to generalise a comment comparing the public sector and the private sector as a result of one or 2 failures that may have been experienced in any country. Therefore, for that reason I felt that I should make that submission.
4.40 p.m.

I think the Bill before us – quite frankly, it is unfortunate that this Bill ever had to come to Parliament, ever had to be written, ever had to come before us. My understanding, and I must admit that my understanding of Government operations may not be as good as it should be, of the reason for this Bill is because the increments that are being suspended for a year by virtue of this Bill were contractual arrangements made for the members of the public sector, both public officers and members of statutory boards, and it is something that they would have been employed with the understanding that they were supposed to get and by virtue of previous legislation it therefore became necessary for this legislation to be enacted to avoid the reintroduction, or re-establishment, or whatever the right term is, of these increments as of October 1, this year simply because previous legislation existed that indicated that it would be at that date. I think it is unfortunate that we have had to find, because of the background, the necessity of introducing a piece of legislation.

I was particularly pleased when, some months ago, the Government of Barbados first started looking at the manner in which it would deal with the wages and incomes policy. I believe I am right in saying that at one time there was a proposal to legislate a wages and incomes policy and there was a lot of outcry against such legislation. I was particularly pleased that the social partners were able to meet and agree on what has now become known as the Protocol in respect of the wages and incomes policy. In that regard it is unfortunate that all aspects related to wages and incomes in both the public and private sectors could not have been handled under the terms of the social protocol. Therefore this is my understanding of why this legislation has come before us today.

I also want to take the opportunity, while in no way intending to belittle the contribution that has been made by the public servants of Barbados, of pointing out that the private sector has not been paying increases on an annual basis, to my knowledge, for the last 3 years, at least, or even more. There was an appeal 2 years or whatever the time was when we first entered into the structural adjustment programme for conservatism to be exercised in this area and as far as I am aware the vast majority of all private sector operations in Barbados adhered to that appeal in more ways than one.

I think the sad reality of the figures of unemployment in Barbados today also reflect that because it was not only in the public sector that jobs unfortunately had to be made redundant. This also has occurred in the private sector. The private sector has experienced a decline in business. I this country declined by 4% in 1990, 1991 and 1992 each year. We have all of the facts and figures relating to the declines that have been experienced since our peak year 1989 in tourism. We saw declines in 1990. We saw declines in 1991. We saw a further decline in 1992 and it particularly heartening that the most recent results that I have seen which take into account figures up to the end of July this year, indicate that so far this year there has been an overall 2.7% increase in the numbers of staying arrivals in Barbados. It is heartening that we have seen some upturn in that but 2.7% increase is 2.7% increase over the figure that was achieved in the same time period of 1992 and that came after declines in 1990, 1991 and 1992. While it is heartening to see that upturn, I would not like anybody to feel that we have suddenly reached a panacea that we can take off from and start paying out an increase in wages because if we make that mistake we will learn the sad reality of life in a much harsher manner than the manner in which we are being asked to deal with it at this point in time.

One of the things that disturbs me is, and I think this has been discussed on many occasions in many areas by all different types of people from all walks of life, we have heard the continual call for some form of accountability from those who are in positions of making decisions. Accountability can be handled in many different ways. What I would suggest, given the serious circumstances that we are still in economically, hence the need for this piece of legislation, that all people in authority who control, particularly public money, explain when money is being spent, where it is being spent, how it is being spent and most particularly why it is being spent because from some of the arguments that we have heard today, we have heard arguments earlier on in the debate today about the smallness of the cost of these increments, when certain adjustments are made may be of only being \$2 million cost in reality in 6 months of the financial year, and I think that there may be a tide of opinion in the wider countryside that may listen to such a statement and may be influenced to think well, \$2 million, what is the big deal over this \$2 million when we can take up \$17 million and spend it on Sherbourne, or however many million dollars were spent on the St. Joseph Hospital and areas like that.

I believe in all honesty that it may be situations such as these that give rise to discontent because of a lack of understanding of why money is being spent and the reason why it is being spent. If the money is being spent for a particular reason that will demonstrate a return, a return either in terms of money or in terms of some other benefit to the country of Barbados, I think that there is a real need

for this to be explained in greater detail so that everybody can understand why these things are being done.

Not only has the private sector not been increasing wages over the past few years, but we also have situations where many companies in Barbados have been in the habit for years after considering their year-end results, of awarding annual bonuses to members of staff. Many of these companies, that I know of, have either cut out bonuses entirely in recent years, or they have seriously cut back on the rate of bonus that is paid so that the members of the private sector have made, in terms of their expectations, or their normal expectations, a real contribution in respect of the cost of the suffering that has been experienced by all of us in Barbados. None of us are immune from this suffering. We are all caught up in it.

I am somewhat disturbed to feel that the tone of the debate thus far may have been interpreted to believe that this legislation was aimed at a particular segment of the population of Barbados who are the ones who are carrying the brunt of the suffering. I want to ensure that there is a understanding that the suffering is being felt by the entire island of Barbados. I believe this is something that is very important. As I said before, if we can stick to our protocol in respect to our wages and incomes policy, if we can do all of the right things and avoid the spectre of devaluation of the Barbados dollar, because that is the reason why all of these things are being done, this Island of Barbados will be a lot better off. There is no doubt about that.
4.50 p.m.

Throughout the length and breadth of the Caribbean, which is the region in which Barbados has to operate, there are people questioning why the Barbados dollar has not yet been devalued. There are people in other countries of the Caribbean where devaluation has taken place, in some cases several times, who cannot understand why we have not had to devalue our dollar. There are some experienced people, both in the public and private sector who believe that this is something that we cannot avoid. There have even been statements made to the effect that when the Barbados dollar is devalued it will sink like a rock. These are ridiculous statements to be made and we have to prove that these are ridiculous, by all of us doing the right thing.

At this point in time a protocol has been agreed. The protocol exists between the three social partners of Government, the Trade Unions or workers representatives and the Private Sector. Any one of those three agents can destroy that protocol by doing the wrong thing and I sincerely hope that none of them act in an arbitrary fashion to destroy the protocol.

Barbados is a country that has been held up as an example throughout the world. We pride ourselves on

our educational standard. There is an on-going debate as to whether we can still afford the marvelous free education that we provide in Barbados but nevertheless we have provided that with the result, I believe, that today, if one accepts the fact that education has been made free for all, we must, of necessity, have an educated public out there today, much more educated than they were in years gone by. Therefore I would hope that all of the people of Barbados, all of these educated people in Barbados who must, because of their educational standard, have a greater understanding than maybe existed not that long ago, that they be treated with the respect that they deserve and that explanations be given to them as to why things are being done. I am sure that the vast majority of Barbadians would understand if it is put that way. I have no difficulty with that but we should not treat them as being ignorant because they are no longer ignorant. We boast about that fact all over the world so we must recognise that and we should take that into account.

The fact that we have been able to reach this protocol agreement is a tremendous step in the right direction. Checking back on several of my previous contributions in this Honourable Chamber I have frequently referred to my on-going desire for a much stronger tripartite arrangement to exist between Government, the workers representatives and the Private sector. If this protocol is another step in the right direction I am extremely pleased. I hope that in the context of all of this there will be a clear understanding rendered to all of the people of Barbados why things such as the Bill before us are necessary and there will not be too much dissent. I do not believe it is possible to make everybody happy all of the time but we should try to make most of the people.

I cannot remember which Senator it was who said it before. I believe it was Senator Inniss who referred to his confidence in the Barbadian people and the Barbadian ethic to succeed and to get out of our difficulties and I believe, like him, that we can achieve the desired objective if all of us do the right thing.

I felt that I should stand and make these comments, Mr. President. I thank you very much.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Fraser.

SENATOR Mrs. V. C. FRASER: Thank you very much, Mr. President. I rise first of all to say that I am supporting this Bill. I am not supporting this Bill for the reason that anybody likes to have increments or 8% cuts or anything of that sort. None of us like it but there are times in your life, even in your personal life, that you have to cut your coat according to the cloth. We have all grown up in a Barbadian situation, those of us who are in my age group where we had to pay for a number of the facilities. Our parents were no richer than anybody is today. As a matter

of fact they were poorer. If you were going to a secondary school from an elementary school you had to buy books, you had to pay school fees, you had to get lunch and the parents were able to find it. I think those people should come back and show Barbadians how they can live now. I find that those were the greatest economists of our time.

Lifestyles in any country change from time to time. We in this Caribbean region have been copying lifestyles of many different types of people and it is all well and good to say that we aim at and target a particular person. I would like to say that that is not true because some of the people at a lower economic level, the kinds of things that they buy, the luxury items that they buy, a lot of people in the upper class do not buy. The trips that they take to Marguerita and Miami, a lot of the people who can afford it do not take because they are trying to count their cost during times like these.

We did not get into this serious situation yesterday but some people were just trying to put clouds over their faces and pretend that it was not so.

Mr. President, if we are serious about taking Barbados back on the road to serious recovery and not devaluing our dollar then it means that we have to look at alternative arrangements in the interim, until we are able to do the kind of exporting and getting the kind of foreign exchange that we hope to get. We have started on the right way, in many other areas. For instance, Mr. President, last night I was very happy to hear of the number of industries in Barbados and the sort of money that they were bringing in, like the Offshore industries and they are increasing. This was really something that was refreshing, from hearing the other side of the coin. Nobody is doing this, nobody is doing that, nobody is trying to do this or the other. There are so many different incentives for doing a number of things. I think if we would sit down and think before we criticise we would get a lot further.

For example, Sir, and I am referring to you, Mr. President, the whole question of hearing in this Chamber all about these poor people and so on, I remember one day doing a budget and people do not realise how badly off the middle class are and they keep talking about the poor people. When I did this budget, the professor got up and said to me, "Do you know something? I never really thought about it like this before." I put up all the figures on the board. This man is working for \$4,000. His wife is working for \$2,000. He has to pay a mortgage of over \$1,000 a month. Okay, that is a thousand dollars gone. He has to pay taxes and he has to buy food. He has to pay for a car because he needs transportation. They live in a remote area and they cannot get a bus. They have to buy lunch for their children. They have to pay all sorts of fees. When we looked at it, the man's family was in a minus

position because they were not even growing anything around the house to supplement their income. Yet, we continue to talk.

5.00 p.m.

The services that are provided for the poor people and, if you really want to talk about really poor, that is the difference of those people who have very little privileges or no privileges at all. Government has tried very hard with the taxpayers' money which is our money as well to make them as comfortable as possible. How many of us realize that we have welfare houses in Barbados where people do not pay rent and where they can also go to the Welfare Department and draw money for themselves and their children? I say that a Government that looks after these things is very caring. There are lots of children whose petty fees and so on have been waived in this country. They do not pay the \$75.00 that you hear a lot of people come and argue about. The Government has to find money to put in for people who are welfare cases and those parents who make out a welfare case. Look at all the number of schools and multiply \$75.00 by all of those number of children and see how much money that Government is paying to help those who are supposed to be less fortunate. So the Government is playing its role in helping those persons. You have the polyclinics where they can go and get health services. There is the Drug Service and, therefore, a number of people can get their drugs free as well.

What my concern is that we must rationalize whether it is better to devalue the dollar or whether it is better for us to take some money and then see our colleagues go out of work and maybe ourselves too, because most of the corporations and so on do not have a lot of money and do not earn a lot of money. If you were to take some of the corporations that are really hamstrung, they have had to lay off a number of people. Nobody likes laying off. Well, I should not say nobody but I certainly do not. I do not like to see people unemployed. It is a good thing that the small enterprises business centre has been set up in the IDC to give a number of services free. We are going to have to look on the other side to help Barbados. This is our country. Those persons who have been laid off from jobs will also be provided with opportunities by the National Training Board. While they are learning a skill, they will receive \$100.00 a week to assist them. When they get the skill, either the IDC or they can go to other agencies and make a small loan. In other words, we have got to build on small business and general entrepreneurship. It is amazing that many civil servants who are working now are going into these ventures while they are still working. They are trying to supplement their own incomes. It means that we have got to utilize a lot of the God given talent that we have. I have never seen so many people going into their own business now. It is a very good and healthy sign for Barbados at this time.

Mr. President, I also would like to say that to talk, talk, talk is one thing. But I sincerely hope that a lot of people and agencies that are talking will get together some of these people who they regard as being so unfortunate to help them to learn skills to be more fortunate and to help themselves. I also hope that we are looking at the things that we import and cut our eyes during this transition period on a number of things and support our local tailors, dressmakers, basket-makers, earring-makers and all the people who make things locally so that the money can remain in Barbados. Some of the very people who will tell you this will go and buy the can of beans, tomato sauce and all sorts of things and spend whatever little they get on a lot of foolish food, not even some yams or potatoes that could help their bodies to be strong. But they will go and buy a can of something which will not serve a family of five. Whereas, if they bought a few fish and they bought some potatoes or yams, that would satisfy the family and they could start to grow something in the backyard. People do not realize how important it is to start small and I think that this is one of our biggest problems. We are copy cats and it is time that we stop copying and use our God given talents.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator, I should like you to confine yourself to the subject of debate.

SENATOR Mrs. V. C. FRASER: Mr. President, in all fairness, I thought that I was confining myself to it because these are reasons that I am putting forward why some of these things have happened to us and why we have fallen into this position that we cannot pay increments at this time and also some of the things that we can do to ensure that we do not have to devalue our dollar and be in a worse situation. Therefore, I do not think that I can just give you a half-baked thing. I would have to give you reasons to back up what I am saying and make some suggestions.

However, Mr. President, I will continue to say that we will have to make stringent belly cutting and cost cutting measures. I do agree that all people should be made to make the same kind of measures. I support that in total and I believe that at this time Government is trying its best to do all in its power and we always seem to take Government only as the people in the legislature which is not strictly correct. There are officers who are responsible for things who have some degree of flexibility in terms of how they spend money in Departments and things of this sort and what they can substitute in order to cut cost and all of that. We were promised the 8 per cent and we got it back. I bore the same needs as my colleagues and I was happy to do it. I felt that I would rather do that than to see a whole string of people going home everyday because then we would be no better off.

5.10 p.m.

So in order to keep people in work who are still working and in order to encourage people – because Government has now provided the facility – who were working before and are now unemployed, the facilities are there for people to help themselves, and we have been blessed with many things in Barbados with which we can help ourselves. We are a country where we encourage tourists and there are lots of things we can make in the handicraft area, because we are now importing millions of dollars in these souvenirs. We are also importing \$250 million in food. We can do a lot more to help ourselves in the area of providing food for our country. We can do a lot more in the area of fishing to feed not only the Barbadians but the visitors as well. So we have to ask ourselves the question, why have we reached this stage? How have we reached this stage? Let us all as Barbadians try to get up and do something very practical about it.

When you ask some people what are you going to do to help? Are you going to assist the small business sector even with giving them your knowledge? I do not have any time with that. We cannot build up a country like that. We cannot get a country out of a rut like that. Everybody has to sit down and seriously study the attitude of the people of the country and let us see if we can get their attitudes back on the right position. But some people feel the moment they cannot get something, like a little child playing with a toy, and the moment the mother cannot give that toy, they raise up their hands and say my mother is no good. That is not the way Barbados must go. We have been respected by all the people in the Caribbean region. There are people getting far less salaries than we, and I hear many people talking about people going to other islands. Ask about how the wealth is distributed in those islands. Ask what are the things that those people have in that island for their use....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Fraser, you must return to the subject in hand.

SENATOR Mrs. V. C. FRASER: Mr. President, I am very sorry that it seems to you as though I am not on the subject, and I would not like in any way to interfere with your thinking or anything to do with the subject. I have heard other Senators get up and expand and go all sorts of ways, but anyhow, if you want me to stick to the subject, I have been sticking to it. I cannot stick to the subject except I find some solutions. I think people are accustomed to hearing people belly aching and not giving any suggestions for improvement. I am making suggestions for the improvement of Barbadians. We have found ourselves in a position now that we do not want to find ourselves in for the next 5 or 10 years down the road. We want to get rid of this position and therefore we have to take strict remedial measures, else we will not be able to get out of the situation, and I sought to list a number of the remedial measures.

I agree that one of the measures, as somebody mentioned, was informing the people of many of the things they do not understand. We can go around and have series of meetings in school rooms and so and encourage the people from the various villages to understand what we are talking about. At the end of the day the economic activity of people in this country will be the serious note. Either they are going to sit down and ask the Lord to send manna from heaven, or they are going to get up and get themselves involved in economic activity in the country, whether they buy and sell or whether they sell mauby or sugar cakes or whatever, but they are going to do something to generate income in this country. This is the only way back, along with the other industries that we have, seeking to improve. People talk about Ministers and about people travelling, but you have to travel to see some of those people in other countries who will secure markets for your produce. Also, you have to travel to see to it that you can get some money from some of the agencies that may be able to offer you money to help you to earn money for your own country and to earn foreign exchange.

Mr. President, in closing I should like to say that the ball is now in our court. I started by saying it is regrettable that we have to come to this, but something is regrettable, you have come to it and you cannot stop there. You have to move forward, you have to look for solutions and you have to put your hands to the wheel and get it done. While you may miss the increment, it is better to miss that and still be able to have a job and to be able to feed your children in the interim and to help other people to build up Barbados, as we all in here, I believe, want to do and see. Except we do this, we can have all sorts of confusion in this country, and that is putting it mildly.

Mr. President, I hope that the labour unions, the private sector and the public sector will accept the importance of co-operation and collaboration in bringing back any country into its full working developmental role. As we say, with Christ in the vessel and hard work in your hands, we can smile at the storm.

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

SENATOR THE VENERABLE ARCHDEACON J. L. SPRINGER: Mr. President, I should like to say from the outset that on this occasion I shall either abstain or vote against the Bill, because I would like to stay as close to the position of the workers' representatives as possible. I must say at the outset that it appeared to me from Press reports and what I had gleaned from any source that the arrangement was not adversarial, not as it had been in the past, and that was a plus for the people involved in the negotiations leading up to this Bill. But I had hoped that the lessons of 1991-92 would have been learnt *in toto*. I refer to the debate on the 8% deduction and the decisions taken at that time. Even in that case, in spite of all

the unpleasantness that surrounded the whole thing, it is on record that several persons within the Civil Service had signed documents to the effect that they were prepared to lose the 8 per cent. I know some of them changed their minds later and gave various reasons, some under pressure and some otherwise but at least in 3 institutions that I am associated with I was aware that the appropriate forms were passed around and a number of people had signed their intentions to go along with it. I was on safe ground in supporting it because that was what the workers were saying. I am therefore a little sorry that we cannot report that this is the case on this occasion. So I say I hope we had learnt the lesson.

5.20 p.m.

It seems to me that there is a genuine cry on the part of the Coalition, the workers' representatives, to have a further search for a different kind of solution. That is what I hear coming through. Even the last press report that I was aware of, there was an indication that the workers had not given up and there was more to explore. Indeed, I am sure I heard the Acting Chairman of the Coalition saying that they favoured another way rather than a monetary solution to the problem. I do not know what that is. We do not know what way that was. Those who were around the negotiating table could probably tell us. The point is that we do not know what was being talked about. Therefore, before I could vote on a matter like this I would have to have further information. I would want to know what went on, what were the routes explored. The workers should have been challenged to put something in its place, not just to say, "We don't accept this one, go and come again", but rather to challenge them to come up with some solutions which ought to have been drawn to the attention of those of us who have to make this kind of decision.

So without really going on and on, I don't really want to do that but to explain that when the motion is put and I do not support the Bill it will be because I do not have sufficient information and because I think that the workers have expressed their desire to continue a little longer looking for the solutions.

I do not know what was the cause of the urgency of this Bill and I really do not understand why it had to be rushed because if there was an understanding that there would be a solution in the amicable kind of discussions that were taking place, surely the deadline did not really matter, in my way of thinking. So for me, it is a matter that has come to a sudden end while people were still willing to talk and I see a traumatic kind of experience in all this for people who knew that at a certain date they would have been expecting their increments to be effective and then to find that it has been postponed for another year.

Those of us who have worked in situations where that kind of thing, that waiting was implemented, would know what I am talking about. I remember when I started out my working life as a school teacher having to come down to the Ministry of Education in those days, in the 50's to collect a pay cheque at the end of the month, having worked by the day, and the cheque would be a small one, to arrive at the appropriate place and be told, "Sorry, it is not ready yet." Or, "We have no money for you", and then having to go back. In those days coming from St. Andrew you had to get 3 buses to get to the Pine where the Ministry of Education was.

I understand that kind of trauma when people are looking forward. Nobody said along the way during the past year or past months that this decision was going to be taken to postpone. I feel myself morally bound to support the position of the workers in this regard. So I will myself not be supporting the Bill. Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. President, as we debate this Bill there is some dispute as to whether the level of unemployment is 24% or 27%. The fact of the matter is that within the last 10 to 15 years I think this is the first occasion that the numbers of openly unemployed has been so high as it is at present. My position as a professional economist is crystal clear. Any additional Government monies which are going to be spent should be spent on bringing unemployed people into work. I am crystal clear on that. I am not dealing in sentiment. I am dealing in the area of economic policy. With great regard to my friend Senator Springer, I respect the position he has taken. But I have to be concerned about the large number of persons unemployed who wish to find work. It is against that particular background that I wish to make my contribution, Mr. President.

I have heard many things said this afternoon. I have been pleading in this Senate before to have these debates broadcast because I believe the most effective sanction on unparliamentary conduct is public opinion. This evening we were subjected to the spectacle of Senator Barker in this Chamber. I, with great respect, believe Senator Beckles was very generous in comparing Senator Barker to Joe Tudor. Joe Tudor was a first class comedian.

Mr. President, the international economy is going through convulsion after convulsion. State capitalism is going through convulsions, starting with the Soviet Union, the bastion of state capitalism. In the United States of America, the bastion of private sector capitalism, that is going through convulsions. Canada, the whole set of them. Who are we in Barbados to sit down and to believe that we can cut ourselves off from the mainstream of what is happening in the national economy today?

The problems which the Government of Barbados is grappling with at this time are directly related to what is happening in the international economy and we have to understand that. Some unfortunate statements were made by Senator Barker on the private sector. What those statements reflect is an abysmal degree of ignorance of the functioning of the private sector. I recall Senator Barker contrasting the efficiency in the private sector with that of the public sector and adverting to the fact that a couple businesses in the private sector failed and that was reason to suggest that the private sector was no more efficient than Government.

Mr. President, what this reflects is a misunderstanding of private sector capitalism. The whole dynamic of private sector capitalism is that the market will throw out those who cannot make it and make room for those who can lift the level of activity in the private sector, not so in Government. In Government you can always go to the taxpayers and say pay me the money. The mere fact that businesses are failing is not reason enough to suggest that the private sector is inefficient. It is a recognition of the fact that the whole dynamics of private sector capitalism is at work.

I took issue earlier this afternoon, Mr. President, with a statement which Senator Barker attributed to the present Minister of Finance and I recall the statement because, as I said, it was a very exclusive statement, that is, that the restoration of the 8% would cause a devaluation. It is not likely that any intelligent person would make that kind of statement, specifically the present Minister of Finance and I know him well enough because I had a hand in his teaching. He was one of the best students I had in first year economics. He would not make a statement like that. He might say it might tend to but you do not make that kind of statement which would shut you into a corner like that.

I am at a loss to discover that after 12 years of discussion in Barbados about the IMF – because it was just around 1981 or 82 that this country went to borrow – that you can still have so much ill-informed comment coming from people who should know better about the IMF and the World Bank running Barbados. It is the height of laziness and if it is not laziness, it reflects a level of stupidity which is not in consonance with this Chamber. The IMF cannot tell anybody in Barbados what to do. The World Bank cannot tell anybody in Barbados what to do. What is sure is if you want my resources I will lay down conditionalities. If you can accept those conditionalities, you can access my resources.

We in Barbados are under a system of Cabinet Government. The Cabinet has to make decisions about what happens in Barbados, not anybody at the IMF, not anybody at the World Bank or the IADB. The Cabinet has to take responsibility for what is happening in this country. This nonsense must stop and the Press encourages it. A lot

of stupid statements about IMF running the country, the World Bank doing this and the Press will highlight it.

Senator Barker observed the \$2 million is minuscule. I don't accept the Senator's calculations. He himself said this afternoon his mathematics is a bit rusty. I think his brain is rusty.

My position is any additional Government financing should be spent on investment to bring into employment those who are out of work and are desirous of working. Senator Beckles made a profound observation earlier this afternoon and I hope all of us remember it. Money does not give value to a product. You can start throwing money all around like Brazil and Argentina and Mexico. You have 1000% inflation in a single year and you just destroy the economic structure. I have, and I believe some persons know my personal position on the restoration of the 8%. It is not for me to state it here now. It is very consistent with my position on additional government expenditure, given the situation with this economy.

A government which has to look for an additional \$36 million in this financial year to restore the 8% in one financial year. You are talking about \$36 million and Senator Barker will say, "You put another \$2 million on top of \$36 million and that is neither here nor there." I find, Mr. President, the argument is so simple it is incredible. This statement from Senator Barker that the workers are being denied what is rightfully theirs betrays a level of misunderstanding, a level of silliness. Mr. President, I am sorry to say that but it is incredible that someone at his age could make that kind of statement, given our type of mixed economy.

The public sector sets the rules within which the private sector will function but the private sector is the generator of wealth. The public sector cannot get what the private sector is not producing. We have to understand that. This notion about workers being denied what is rightfully theirs is one big joke. It is a misunderstanding of history and at that, contemporary history. General Motors is now throwing out thousands of workers. All the big corporations are downsizing and here in Barbados we can hear a Senator saying you are denying somebody what is rightfully theirs.

If Senator Barker understood the dynamics of the private sector he would not be making that kind of statement. If a private businessman is not making money, he is going to collapse and if he collapses nobody has any work. Senator Barker had better start to understand that Government does not have an unlimited cheque book. It cannot just keep on writing overdraft after overdraft and saying, "Come, come, come!" It cannot do it. Once the productive sector of your economy is contracting there is no way Government can continue to spend as if money was just created.

5.35 p.m.

We have to understand that in Barbados, and I do not care what is your political colour, if you do not understand that, Mr. President, as far as I am concerned, you are a political ignoramus. I will quote a statement from Senator Barker and I will try to reproduce it in the way in which he said it. You do not trouble a man's salary. You do not cut his salary. You do not suspend his increments. Mr. President, there are several people in Barbados who have lost their jobs in the private sector as well as the public sector and this notion that the private sector people have not taken cuts is one big joke. There are some people in the private sector who were getting 3 days a week, a 40% pay cut up front. Some are getting 2 days, that is a 60% pay cut. So this notion that the private sector people have not taken cuts is one big fallacy.

I have heard, even before Senator Bellamy spoke, of businesses who for many years now have not given any increases but the workers understand the primary objective is to keep the business going. This notion that Government is some fairy godfather and all it has to do is to go out there and rake in taxes and pay wages, those days are over. This phoney notion which Senator Barker is advocating that workers depend on their increments for improvements in their standard of living is a dangerous notion.

It is time that a meritocracy be built in the Public Service where people have the motivation to improve themselves, become more productive and to strive after promotion. It is not good that persons should come in at the lower rounds and wait there patiently year after year to get an increment. This country cannot improve itself that way. Irrespective of what you may wish to say about the strength and the merits of the Public Service, I have no doubt that it is high time the Public Service be reformed and a meritocracy be put in place where the people who want to travel quickly can travel without obstruction.

This is why at the University I have taken an uncompromising position on this matter in relation to our own position. I have said that this business of pay freeze does not have the same impact upon people in the University and institutions like the University as it would have in the Public Service and the reason is this. In the University you are responsible for your own advancement. You can decide to get down and work hard and get promoted or you can sit back and wait and eventually you get fired. Those options are open to you. You have to choose and I believe that is something which has to be brought into the Public Service of this country.

This statement about the incidence of direct tax reform cannot be allowed to go unchallenged. Mr. President, the allegation that the lower paid workers of this country, all of those workers below the S.9 scale carry the brunt of the direct tax reform is without foundation. It is

the most empty and inane statement I have ever heard in a Chamber. Mr. President, what is the percentage of revenue from direct taxation the lower paid workers would pay? It is small compared with the upper income workers. If you pay a smaller percentage of the revenue from direct taxation how on earth can you bear the brunt of the adjustment? You cannot lose that which you never possessed. It is impossible. I think Senator Barker has to be more careful with these loose statements.

Senator Barker talks about this present administration taking advantage of public servants. It is a matter of record that the administration of 1976 to 1986 in Barbados was unmatched in the way it brutalised public servants in this country. It is a matter of record. I know of a Permanent Secretary today, he was not a Permanent Secretary then. He was at a funeral one afternoon and he was charged with inciting school meal workers to go on strike. In order to get away from being fired from the Public Service he had to call on some of the mourners at the funeral that afternoon to come and give evidence on his behalf to prove that he was at the funeral of a certain deceased person who was being buried in St. John and that is how he escaped being fired. That was the kind of Gestapo type operation you had between 1976 and 1986 and Senator Barker has the guts and temerity to get up and say that this administration has brutalised people.

Mr. President, it is true I am part of the Government side but even if I were not part of the Government side I would recognise that the administration which has been more sensitive to the needs of the Public Service in Barbados has been this administration. That is a matter of fact so I am not going to allow Senator Barker to come inside here and make these loose statements like that.

My distinguished friend and colleague, Dr. Carl Theodore in St. Augustine, one of the senior members in the Economics Department working on the St. Augustine Campus, and one who is a distinguished researcher and writer, not like Senator Barker, what does he have to say about structural adjustment in the Caribbean? He has examined the experience of Jamaica, Guyana, Trinidad and Barbados. What conclusions did he come to? On the evidence available to him he said that the performance of Barbados interfacing with the international institutions was unparalleled compared with the other 3 countries. He went on to say that it was a pity that in Trinidad they did not have a government like the one in Barbados to champion their cause in dealing with the international institutions. This is not a fly by night economist. This is a distinguished economist who is a writer and researcher. Mr. President, the time for calling a spade a spade has come. I am no longer going to allow people to come inside this Chamber and talk foolishness. If you talk foolishness I am going to expose you.

Mr. President, the substance of this Bill that is before us this afternoon has nothing to do with sentiment. We have to face the harsh reality. Somebody has to pay the bill. Everybody would like to have more but in any particular situation you have to prioritise your goals and the major goal of this country today should be bringing into work those people who want to work and put them into directly productive activities. That has to be our main goal. Ever since the early 1980s a trend developed in this economy which had to be reversed. Yes, the economy was expanding but it was expanding because the non-tradeable portion of the economy was expanding and whenever that is happening in any economy you are drifting into trouble. You are undermining exports. I wrote a paper about it.

Mr. President, in 1986 I wrote 2 papers dealing with this particular problem. I distinctly remember that one was presented at a symposium held at the University in Oxford and another in Brussels. Those Papers are a matter of record. If anyone cares to see them they can go and check the University Library and they will see them. I did not wait until the problem developed. I addressed my mind to the problem and dealt with it. I do not believe in hearsay and rumour.

I have no doubt that serious restructuring of this economy was necessary as early as the 1980s and we should have done it in the late 1970s. We did not do it. We played for time. We went on a borrowing spree. But the reason why we have survived so long, and I have said it in here before, is that it is nothing less than a miracle that the Barbados dollar has not been devalued. To understand why the dollar has not been devalued has nothing to do with the performance of the economy. It has to do with the resilience of the Barbadian people. In spite of all the loose talk you hear, Barbadian people are a resilient people and that is why the dollar has not been destroyed.

I lived in Jamaica at the time when the Jamaican dollar in the late 1960s was valued at Bds. \$2.40. Mr. President, I am sure you know today the Jamaican dollar is valued Bds. 0.08¢. All across this Caribbean, Central America and Latin America there has been that reversal of fortunes. Brazil which was the show-piece in terms of developing countries in the 1960s and 1970s we know has been beset by economic convulsions which have crippled that country. We need to stop catching at the shadow and go after the prize. The prize is restructuring. The opportunity is now. If we stay in Barbados and talk in terms of form rather than go after the substance, the goal is going to elude us and the second time around we will not have the option which we have at this time. The second time around nobody can save this dollar never mind how resilient we are.

5.45 p.m.

As far as I am concerned what we need today in Barbados is a meeting of minds so that this country can have access to an assured source of long term financing to support our restructuring programme. That is the major objective to which all of us should be attached.

What is the alternative to the present restructuring model which the Government has? Senator Barker is saying a lot of things but he is not giving an alternative. I am sure his leader knows better, and is unlikely to support an increase in the public sector wages bill at this time. If you go and increase the wage bill the cost is a lower capital works programme, so you will throw people out of work. If you further cut back capital works the private sector has less positive feedback. They will have to lay off workers too. If they lay off workers the tax base will contract, therefore the revenue base is contracting, the base for the National Insurance is contracting. What happens is that you put more money in the hands of fewer people. What you will find is that those people who get that additional money will spend a substantial portion of their new purchasing power on imported consumption goods.

What is worse, Mr. President, if we pursue that route it is going to send a dangerous message to the international capital markets. They will say that what you have in Barbados is a Government which does not understand the problem. It is the worst thing that could happen to Barbados when you send a message to the international markets that you are not ready, and if you are not ready I believe all of us here know what will happen, the economy will crumble overnight.

Mr. President, it does not give me satisfaction at this time in the evening, when I had a short week but a satisfying week I would say, when I am looking forward to rest, to be dealing with issues of this nature. There is an upper limit of taxation which any sensible Government will observe. I have heard some people say it is just a couple million, levy taxes and give the workers the money. But what is the price? The price of additional taxation is reduced investment, not only new investment but you might knock out of business, businesses which are known to be on the margin of survival. This means you will throw people out of work. I think, Mr. President, people have to be prepared to sit down and work through these hard issues.

I understand and I sympathise with the points of view expressed by Senator Springer because I have written elsewhere that a national consensus is vital to the ease and the success of a restructuring programme. Unless that consensus is arrived at, the restructuring programme is likely to falter. So I understand the need for that and my plea to the Government is that they do everything to instil confidence, to generate confidence between the private sector, the workers and the workers representatives.

They must do everything in their power, otherwise with the best of intention, with the best of technical work, this restructuring programme will not succeed.

Mr. President, I have to admit that the circumstances are not 100% but there is not every situation in which one is going to find 100% and that is not going to cause me to waiver in support of this Bill. I have the greatest confidence in the level-headedness and the resilience of Barbadians. If I had any doubt about it, when I look at what is happening to resources in our commercial banking system, when I look at what is happening with the accumulation of resources in the credit union movement it tells me Barbadians are a sensible people. What they are saying by the way in which they are putting their resources in the financial system is, this is not the time for spending, what we want to do is to hold strain, get those resources into productive investment and get the engines of growth in this country moving again.

I want to close, Mr. President, with these remarks. Barbados and most of the Caribbean missed a great opportunity for sustainable economic development in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Mr. President, we recall that there was a tremendous expansion of the economy in the sixties and the seventies, as far as tourism was concerned, as far as export agriculture was concerned. In Trinidad there was that big oil boon in the late seventies and I would like to believe that in the Caribbean we can learn lessons from these experiences. One commentator observed on the Trinidad situation that the oil money went through that economy like a dose of salts. I hope we can learn lessons because it is absolutely necessary that when economies, fortunately, experience these export booms that policies are put in place to make sure that the entrepreneurial expertise is developed and the technical expertise and the institutional support which will ensure that that influx of foreign exchange operates to facilitate a sustained transformation of the economy. Otherwise we run the risk again, if at all we experience another export boon it will be boom and bust again. The bust is in proportion to the boom. That is why Trinidad is the way it is today.

Mr. President, with those few remarks I support this Bill and I urge the Government to do everything in its power to build bridges with the social partners in this country.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Clarke.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: Thank you, Mr. President, it is a difficult and hard act to follow after Senator Alleyne's sound and erudite contribution to this debate. However, as the person introducing this measure there are a few comments I would like to make for the sake of the record. I can hardly add anything further to what Senator Alleyne said.

There has been some concern voiced by Senator Archdeacon Springer, Senator Inniss and I believe also Senator Straughn about the need at this time for this legislation.

I would like to reassure this Honourable Chamber that it is absolutely necessary since the last legislation expired at the 30th September, it was therefore incumbent upon Government either to pay or to seek to extend the legislation. It is my understanding, I have not been at the negotiations between the social partners, but it is my understanding that an agreement was reached about the deferment of payment of the increment and after that agreement was reached a member of the Coalition of Trade Unions had some questions about the position taken by his union and there appears to be some sort of problem within that union at this time. But it is my understanding that there was general agreement about the course of action by all of the social partners.

Senator Straughn raised a question about the quantum of money and also the burden being placed upon past colleagues and present colleagues in the teaching industry in particular and the public service in general. The hard lesson, I thought I had introduced this and Senator Alleyne again touched on this rather forcefully.

5.55 p.m.

I thought that I had introduced this and Senator Alleyne touched on this rather forcefully. Government has not the wherewithal to make it. It just has not got it. People seem to think that because it is Government that it can go and print money. There is a cost for printing money and the economic history of the world is replete with countries who have sought to meet their obligations by just printing money. These countries, by the way, were much more self sufficient in terms of their economies. We cannot even at the margin, and I think there is an old saying in Barbados that it is the last straw that broke the camel's back. That one straw in and of itself will not break the camel's back. But when you add it all to the restoration of the 8 per cent cut and now to add this, the economy just cannot take it at this point in time. I shall also add that something is happening in the economy in Barbados today that the reserve position is beginning to look a little shaky to the extent that you are willing to put more money into the hands of individuals who in turn will use it to import goods to further aggravate this position. We must strengthen the foreign reserve position of the economy especially at this time when there appears to be a run on it. It is nothing to be taken lightly because, believe you me, all of us especially those of us who are on fixed incomes if there is a devaluation in this country will suffer. Those who have worked and set up their monies in insurance policies and savings will be the worst off at the end of the day. I think we have to address this matter not with our hearts but rather with our heads.

Senator Straughn was concerned about teachers going off and if they all wanted to go off at the same time. I think this was begging the question and it was really in a lighter mood. It is normal for vacation to be scheduled based on the needs of the service. The vacation will be 3 days due and owing but will be scheduled based on the convenience of the particular institution and we would not expect to have the children running around the place.

Senator Barker, in this Chamber, led us to believe that he was the champion of the public servants. Senator Barker has been making statements outside of this Chamber about the veracity and the validity of the employment figures which have been published. This echo was taken up on October 3rd by Phillip Goddard writing in the Advocate Newspaper thanking and saying that the public of Barbados owes Senator Barker a public debt for bringing certain information before it and that Government has been dissembling information. I want to make it clear in this Chamber that the public servants in this country of whom we have heard so much today are the ones who prepare the unemployment figures. I am sure that Senator Barker, as a trained economist, clearly understands this. He was questioning how come the unemployment figures were 27 per cent in January at the end of the first quarter in March and now they are 24 per cent at the end of June. Let me tell Senator Barker, if he does not know since he ought to know, that the factor mainly responsible for this is this. If the labour force contracts and if the decrease is greater than the decrease in the labour force, then of course the percentage will be small. That is what is before us. So to question the validity of the figure is to really question the integrity and character of honourable and decent hard working public servants. We cannot say one thing from one side of our mouth when it suits us and something else from the other side of our mouth. Let us really be honest and sincere in what we say and stop making clowns of ourselves in this Chamber and elsewhere. We ought to know better.

On the question of stabilisation, I believe the Minister of Finance said that the Barbados economy is stabilised. For those of us who understand what stabilisation means, it does not necessarily follow that there has been improve-

ment. It just means that the slide has been arrested. Stabilisation does not mean that there has been improvement. To say that because it is stabilised, therefore we should be in a position to pay is a *non sequitor* and again one of which should not be heard from the mouth of someone who claims to have been exposed, not necessarily educated in, but exposed to the discipline of economics.

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

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. Dr. C. D. CLARKE, the Senate went into Committee on the Bill.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Senate is in Committee.

Clauses 1 - 7 inclusive were called and passed.

Schedule was called and passed.
6.05 p.m.

On the motion of SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE, 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. Dr. C. D. CLARKE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, I beg to move that this Senate do now adjourn *sine die*.

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

CONTENTS

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS 1494

The Annual Report of the Chief Medical Officer for the year 1990.

QUESTIONS TO MINISTERS

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS 1494

Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 1, asked by Senator T. E. Barker, was laid.

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

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS 1494

Suspension of Standing Order 45(2) for the remainder of the sitting.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS 1494

The Public Service Suspension of Increments Bill, 1993.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 1 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE LEASE TO SEAWELL AIR SERVICES LIMITED OF LAND AT GRANTLEY ADAMS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT 1495

Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 1495; Senator Mrs. M. Walcott, 1495; Senator Miss M. A. Motley, 1496; Senator A. Morrison, 1498, 1499; Mr. President, 1499.

ORDER NO. 2 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE VESTING IN THE NATIONAL HOUSING CORPORATION OF LAND AT MOUNT POYER, ST. LUCY 1500

Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 1500, 1501, 1502; Senator Miss M. A. Motley, 1500.

ORDER NO. 3 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE THREE HOUSES IRRIGATION PROJECT 1502

Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 1502, 1509; Senator Mrs. V. C. Fraser, 1502; Senator T. E. Barker, 1503, 1504, 1505, 1506; Mr. President, 1504; Senator Miss M. A. Motley, 1505; Senator Dr. F. W. Alleyne, 1507; Senator A. Morrison, 1507, 1508.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS (Recommitted)

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS 1510

The Land Surveyors (Validation) Bill, 1993.

SUSPENSION 1510

Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 1510.

RESUMPTION 1510

ORDER NO. 4 – LAND SURVEYORS (VALIDATION) BILL, 1993 1510

Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 1510.

ORDER NO. 5 – PUBLIC SERVICE SUSPENSION OF INCREMENTS BILL, 1993 1510

Senator the Hon. Dr. C. D. Clarke, 1510, 1536; Senator T. E. Barker, 1512, 1513, 1514, 1515, 1516, 1518; Senator Dr. F. W. Alleyne, 1532; Mr. President, 1517; Senator A. Morrison, 1514; Senator Miss M. A. Motley, 1522, 1523; Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 1517; Senator T. C. Beckles, 1519, 1520, 1521, 1524; Senator Mrs. M. Walcott, 1524; Senator W. LeR. Inniss, 1524; Senator Mrs. A. Straughn, 1526; Senator J. G. Bellamy, 1527; Senator Mrs. V. C. Fraser, 1529, 1530, 1531; Senator the Venerable Archdeacon J. L. Springer, 1531.

ADJOURNMENT 1537

Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 1537.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ALLEYNE, Senator Dr. F. W.
BARKER, Senator T. E.
BECKLES, Senator T. C.
BELLAMY, Senator J. G.
CLARKE, Senator the Hon. Dr. C. D.
FRASER, Senator Mrs. V. C.
INNISS, Senator W. LeR.
LEWIS, Senator the Hon. L. V. H.
MORRISON, Senator A.
MOTLEY, Senator Miss M. A.
SPRINGER, Senator the Venerable Archdeacon J. L.
STRAUGHN, Senator Mrs. A.
WALCOTT, Senator Mrs. M.