
THE SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1999 – 2004

THE SENATE

Wednesday, July 3, 2002

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Parliament Buildings, on Wednesday, July 3, 2002, at 11.15 a.m.

PRESENT

His Honour Senator Sir Fred GOLLOP, K.A. (President)
Senator the Hon. J. X. WALCOTT, FRCS (Edin.), J.P. (Minister of Health) (Leader of the Senate)
Senator the Hon. G. S. H. MURRAY, B.A. (Econ.), J.P. (Minister of State, Prime Minister's Office)
Senator T. E. BARKER, B.A. (Hons.), M.A. (Econ.), J.P. (Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Economic Development)
Senator Dame Patricia SYMMONDS, D.B.E., G.C.M. B.A. (Hons.) (P.G.C.E.), J.P.
Senator Miss J. C. ODLE, J.P.
Senator J. E. D. WILLIAMS, B.Sc., MBA, J.P.
Senator D. D. MARSHALL, LL.B. (Hons.), L.E.C.
Senator D. L. HAYNES, S.C.M.
Senator K. D. SYMMONDS, B.A., LL.B.
Senator C. A. MASCOLL, B.Sc. (Econ.) (Hons.), M.A. (Public Finance)
Senator LeR. H. McCLEAN, B.Sc. (Hons.)
Senator C. LeR. TROTMAN, M.A.
Senator Mrs. P. E. RICKINSON, B.A. (Hons.) M.P.H. (Harvard), S.R.N.
Senator C. K. LAURIE, D.I.C.T.A. (S.T.) FBSTA
Senator Sir John Stanley GODDARD, K.A., B.Com., F.C.A., Hon. LL.D. (U.W.I)
Senator B. R. COLLYMORE, C.M.G.
Senator the Rev. L.W. B. ROCK, M. Div.

Prayers were led by Senator Rev. L.W.B. ROCK.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. PRESIDENT: The Senate is in session.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PRESIDENT: I have received excuses from Senator Bolden and Senator Philip Goddard both of whom are out of the island.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

SENATOR THE HON. J. X. WALCOTT: Mr. President, I am commanded to lay the following documents before the Honourable Senate:

1. Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 2002.
2. Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 2002.
3. Civil Establishment (Part-Time Officers) (Amendment) Order, 2002.
4. Judges (Remuneration and Pensions) (Conditions of Service Allowances) (Amendment) Regulations, 2002.
5. Ombudsman (Salary) Order, 2002.
6. Parliament (Administration) (Salaries) Order, 2002.
7. Judges (Salaries) Order, 2002.

8. Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances) Order, 2002.
9. Senate and House of Assembly (Remuneration and Allowances of Members) Order, 2002.
10. Value Added Tax (Refund) (Malcolm Grimes) Order, 2002.

MOTION RELATING TO THE SITTINGS

SENATOR THE HON. J. X. WALCOTT: Mr. President, in view of the absence of Senator Bolden, I move that Senator Dame Patricia Symmonds be elected to reside in his place for today's Sitting.

The question was put and agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SENATOR the Hon. Dr. J. X. WALCOTT: Mr. President, I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions:

1. Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 2002.
2. Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 2002.
3. Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Part-Time Officers) Order, 2002.
4. Resolution to approve the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances) Order, 2002.
5. Resolution to approve the Senate and House of Assembly (Remuneration and Allowances of Members) Order, 2002.
6. Resolution to approve the rates of salaries and allowances applicable to the post of Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister, Executive Assistant to the Prime Minister, the Press Secretary and Executive Personal Secretary as set out in the First Schedule to the Resolution and the rates of salaries applicable to the post of Clerical Assistant to the Prime Minister as set out in the Second Schedule.
7. Resolution to approve the rates of salary and allowances applicable to the posts of Personal Assistants to Ministers as set out in the Schedule.
8. Resolution to approve the payment of an increased Cost of Living Allowance to government pensioners.
9. Resolution to approve in accordance with

Section 3(2) of the Governor-General (Conditions of Service) Act, Cap. 6 the amendment of the Schedule to that Act by deleting paragraph 1 thereof and substituting paragraph 1 as contained in the Schedule to this Resolution.

10. Resolution to approve the Judges (Remuneration and Pensions) (Conditions of Service and Allowances) (Amendment) Regulations, 2002.

ANNOUNCEMENTS (recommitted)

Mr. PRESIDENT: The Message by the Honourable the Senate to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II on the occasion of her Jubilee Celebration was delivered to His Excellency the Governor-General for transmission to Her Majesty.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

Mr. PRESIDENT: Public Business is now the order of the day.

ORDER NO. 3 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 2002

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: Mr. President, in leading off the debate on this Resolution, I would like to advise my colleagues that it is my intention to debate all the other associated Resolutions at one and the same time.

Sir, it would be wrong if we saw this debate strictly in the context of dollars and cents. While the focus is on improved wages, salaries and conditions for public officers, we are seeking to reaffirm the quality of the social capital that exists in Barbados that allows diverse sectors to work together for the common good of the country. This is obtained in this instance where the agreement for the improved salaries, wages and conditions of service for public officers is concerned.

Sir, it is also important that we put this in the context of the role of the public sector as a social institution to Barbados. This institution is important and necessary to the good functioning of any society, any country, or any culture around the world. In Barbados, there is no doubt that the quality of our public sector has made a difference in the way Barbados has been able to achieve progress, growth and development over the years as a country. In fact, so highly regarded has been our public sector that we have been exporting services, talents and the abilities of our public sector officers in the forms of teachers, police

officers, prison officers and nurses throughout the Caribbean and much further afield and the Barbados public sector is regarded in high esteem by countries outside our borders.

Sir, Barbadians today have many career choices and opportunities across the society because of the sophistication and development of the society but it is also true that the public sector in Barbados still continues to attract many of our best educated and trained persons to work for the good of the country. This is because the public sector still offers many attractive and meaningful career opportunities and persons can have interesting careers in the public sector even though the pay is below that of the private sector. The private sector outstrips the public sector where the level of pay is concerned, but as you go lower down the ladder persons are generally better paid in the public sector.

Sir, there is a phenomenon which has grown over the years where after retirement, high level public servants are being virtually snatched up and recruited by the private sector in increasing numbers. This is a compliment to the quality and performance of the public sector and a tribute to the talents, training, and abilities of public servants. It is also testimony to the willingness of the private sector to open its door and eyes to the fact that there are other actors in the society who have things to offer outside of the private sector.

Therefore, in spite of the deeply ingrained stereotype that seeks to portray the public sector as highly bureaucratic, old-fashioned and inefficient, the public sector still has many lessons which it can teach the private sector and the wider society. I am pleased that this phenomenon has emerged and this cross fertilization of ability, skills and experiences can only redound to the good of the entire society.

Sir, it is important to recognise that steps are being taken through the Public Sector Reform effort to improve the image, performance and level of efficiency of the public sector in order to make it more customer-friendly. I wish to reaffirm that public sector reform is very much alive and well in Barbados and while it has not been at the forefront of public consciousness for a while, I can assure the country and my colleagues here that preparations are under way to institute re-branding of the effort and when the national attention of Crop Over is out of the way we should see some of the initiatives brought to the fore to show that the public sector effort is alive and that the country stands to benefit more in the future from public sector reform. Sir, I will speak more about this later but I just want to say that very early. Sir, I think that it is fair to understand and accept that the public sector in Barbados has made the difference. Barbados is highly regarded as a society where things happen and without the public sector Barbados could not have been where it is today and where it could be in the future because it is the public sector which would have to play a crucial and linchpin role in preparing Barbados to cope with whatever

challenges that would confront it in times ahead. Therefore, in this context we can safely say that the public sector officers deserve whatever increase in salaries and improved conditions that can accrue to them from time to time.
11.25 a.m.

Government wishes that it could, on this occasion, give more to public sector workers in terms of higher wages and salaries. One of the cardinal lessons in the principle of politics is facing an acceptance of reality. The harsh reality is that this Government has accepted the fact that it would be morally irresponsible to seek to introduce a higher level of settlement which could do serious damage to the economy of the country.

Sir, while some people may feel that what is happening today is about politicking and that election is around the corner, if that were so, an irresponsible Government obviously would have sought to give the unions whatever increases they asked for because it would be trying to sweeten the pot, so to speak, for election time.

Sir, I think it is testimony to the sense of responsibility of the Barbados Government that even though elections are constitutionally due not very far from now, we are not trying to pave the way or sweeten the pot, so to speak in Barbadian parlance, by seeking to play around with the long-term economic future of Barbados and the Barbadian society.

The Prime Minister and Minister of Finance has pointed out in the past how difficult it has been for Barbados to recover from each successive setback economically. In 1981, we ended up in the hands of the IMF and we had to fight our way out. In 1991, its objective was even more difficult to achieve and the Prime Minister has made it clear that he does not intend to play around with the Barbadian economy for the sake of short-term partisan election gain.

Mr. President, eleven years ago we went through such a predicament. I think that it is important for those who might be calling for higher increases to realise that while the short-term gain might be a higher increase in salary, the long-term loss could be even more detrimental in the future. The Barbados Labour Party has to avoid taking irrational and irresponsible decisions where this country is concerned because we do not want to commit political suicide. It was said in 1991, by the then Prime Minister, when faced with harsh economic circumstances and being warned repeatedly of what lay ahead, who made it clear that his Government was not prepared to take those decisions because they did not want to commit political suicide and they were intent of winning the 1991 General Election.

Sir, I think that we have to be constantly mindful that the problems in 1991 did not come about because Barbados was devastated by a hurricane, had been washed away by a flood or there was an outbreak of a disease. What happened in 1991 was homegrown and self-induced. It would have been avoidable if the Democratic Labour Party had taken the country's long-term interest at heart. Sir, with the World Cup still being fresh in people's minds, at that time it could have been said that Barbados scored a home goal because it was not willing to risk its political future. Barbados and the rest of the world can be assured of the stability and soundness of the economic leadership of the country and that we do not have to worry that current leadership will play around with matters as happened in 1991 by the then Administration.

Government's offer of 5.75 per cent increase over a two-year period must be seen as coming at a time when other Caribbean countries – I will not name any country because I do not want to be invidious – when some of our neighbours are finding it difficult to pay their public servants. Some of them are looking the IMF straight in the eye, so to speak. We are still fortunate in Barbados that we are able to afford an increase of this magnitude over a two-year period when other people cannot afford to do so.

Sir, the Opposition would say that the public servants deserve more, but I would like them to say how higher the increase should be paid to the public servants. If the Democratic Labour Party wants to institute another "back-raise", I would like them to come out and say so. Sir, the point is, we have to deal with the economic realities of the situation and this is where we are today.

Sir, if the Democratic Labour Party is calling for a higher increase, they should come out and pledge to the country what they would do when they win the next Government and make the payment retroactive to this day, and then we would take them seriously.

Sir, at this stage I want to commend the trade union movement for its sense of responsibility in this matter. Government began negotiations in July 2, 2001. Six meetings were held with the Congress of Trade Unions and Staff Associations of Barbados (CTUSAB) and six meetings with the National Union of Public Workers (NUPW) over these wage agreements. After September 11, there was a hiatus of ninety-days when negotiations were put on hold until the economic situation internationally could be better assessed and Barbados' programme of an emergency economic management had been put in place to try to salvage the situation.

Therefore, I think that the country owes a debt of gratitude to the trade union movement. It is to be noted that this settlement was arrived at with eight of the ten entities with whom the negotiation was conducted. I want not only to thank those persons for their sense of responsibility but I could not help but congratulate one of our colleagues,

Senator Leroy Trotman, who has just achieved an outstanding commendation with the International Labour Organisation (ILO).

Asides.

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: Sir, it is a tribute not only to Senator Trotman as an individual but to the Barbados trade union movement, the Barbados Workers' Union and I might say to this Senate because I do not think that we can leave ourselves out of this activity.

I think that Senator Trotman has become the first non-European or non-Canadian to be elected as Chairperson of the Workers' Group of the ILO. I must remember that he was the first black elected President of the Brussels-based International Federation of Free Trade Unions with a membership of 150 million people.

Therefore, we cannot divorce Senator Trotman's international standing from the experience and outlook that he would have brought to marshalling the negotiations with the Government of Barbados over this settlement. Senator Trotman, your reasonableness is highly appreciated and regarded and I want you to know that you are highly respected because of it across the society. We regret that we did not have unanimous agreement but that is the name of the game. We are hopeful that next time around it would be different.

Sir, it must also be understood that the society has notice this development carefully and many people have commented that it is no surprise that the BUT nor the NUPW was able to arrive at the kind of settlement that the eight other entities under CTUSAB were able to agree to. Mr. President, people are seeing it as a narrow partisan stance on their part. They might be wrong, but that is the general perception and we know how perceptions are.
11.35 a.m.

Sir, let me read the entities which were involved with the negotiations so that the society gets a complete picture as to what obtained in these negotiations. The ten entities involved were: the Barbados Workers Union, the Barbados Secondary Teachers Union, the Barbados Association of Principals of Public Secondary Schools, the Association of Public Primary School Principals, the Barbados Fire Officers Association, the Barbados Prison Officers Association, the Nurses, Aides, Assistants of Barbados which is also an association and the Barbados Registered Nurses Association.

I do not think that it can be said that these are irresponsible entities who in any way could be fairly accused of selling out their membership or not being

willing to take the well-being of the society at heart. I think it is instructive Sir, the eight out of ten persons from organisations representing some of the most highly respected and responsible professions of persons in our society were able to settle with Government. Some people feel that the failure of the NUPW and the BUT to attract sizeable membership attendance on the occasions when they were summoned to pronounce on the Government's proposals the 5.75 per cent, is instructive that people actually voted with their feet.

Reports are that when the NUPW had its first meeting – a quorum amounts to 50 – it attracted less than 50 persons and the rules of the NUPW make it possible that at the next meeting whatever number attends the next meeting it is a meeting and, therefore, can validly constitute a quorum. That is what happened. At the next meeting less than 50 attended, but they pronounced. I understand that the same thing obtained with the Barbados Union of Teachers where the decision to reject the offer by Government was mandated by less than 30 people out of the membership. Sir, those are the realities of the situation. Those are the facts.

My information from persons who are much more deeply schooled in industrial relations tell me it is a rarity to the point of almost being virtually non-existent, derisible, laughable for responsible unions to quibble, fight over and reject 0.25 per cent of an offer. It is less than \$4 a month. It just does not obtain.

Sir, I am trying to bring to it the kind of analysis to give you the percentages, the facts and the figures that informed the decision. That is what we mean by analysis. Let me mention, Sir, at this point that while you might try to bamboozle people in economic analysis and lack of figures, whatever is submitted, whether it is economics, accounting or historical, should all be subjected to serious critical intellectual analysis and that is what I want to deal with, but that is by the way.

Sir, I would like to give an outline of what is involved in this settlement. For the record, both the Congress of Trade Unions and Staff Associations of Barbados and the National Union of Public Workers which has been negotiating on its own even though it is a member of the CTUSAB submitted proposals for increases of wages for public sector workers from April 1, 2001 to March 31, 2003 at a rate of 12 per cent at the bottom and 10 per cent at the top. They also requested a 12 per cent in allowances and indicated that there were a number of issues regarding conditions of service which they would want to have an agreement reached on, having been previously submitted to the Ministry of Civil Service.

Sir, the negotiations proceeded apace starting July 2, 2001, and the background and context in which these

negotiations took place was the fact that for the salary increase of the past going back to 1995, for the year 1995-96, public workers had received 2.5 per cent increase at the top and a 3.5 per cent at the bottom. For 1996-97 it was 3.0 per cent across the board; for 1997-98 – 6.25 per cent across the board, top, bottom and middle; 1998-99 – 3.0 per cent across the board; 1999-2000 – 4.0 per cent across the board and 2000-01, 2.5 per cent across the board.

There has been a steady progress and steady record of increases and nowhere did we reach the point where there was going to be no salary increase or where we would give a salary cut as obtained in 1991 when there was an eight per cent pay cut. In truth and in fact, for the 3 000 persons who lost their jobs it amounted to a 100 per cent pay cut. I think it is important to remember that while those who were still in work would have had their salaries cut by eight per cent the 3 000 of those who were sent home had a 100 per cent pay cut. Nothing less than that. That was a hundred per cent Bajan pay cut because it was caused by factors entirely within Barbados. As they say, it was indigenous. Sir, that is the context.

In negotiations, persons often like to juxtapose increases against inflation and if we were to juxtapose the increases that I just read out against the inflation for a similar period I think it is important to know that in 1995-96 the average inflation rate computed on a financial year basis was 2.10 per cent as against the salary of 2.5 per cent at the top and 3.5 per cent at the bottom; in 1996-97, the inflation rate was 4.0 per cent as against the salary accretion of 3.0 per cent across the board; in 1997-98, the inflation was 4.7 per cent and 1997-98 the salary increase was 6.25 per cent across the board; in 1998-99, the inflation was negative and in 1999 the increase was 3.0 per cent across the board; in 1999-2000, the average inflation rate was 1.9 per cent as against the increase of 4.0 per cent across the board and in 2000-01, the average inflation rate was 2.6 per cent while the increase was 2.5 per cent across the board. Therefore, Sir, it is clear that the wage increases over that period between 1995 and 2001 far outstripped the inflation rate for this period by some 7.45 percentage point at the bottom of the scale and 6.45 percentage point at the top.

Sir, throughout the negotiations, the unions have disputed the Government's method of calculation of the rate of inflation. Government used the method that is used by international financial institutions and other Governments of using the moving average method while the unions preferred to use a point method. That is just part of the background to the situation.

With respect to the actual negotiations, from the very outset, emphasis was placed on the policies and practices instituted by Government over the recent years that would

enhance the value of employment in the public service. In other words, we do not see this in terms of just giving more money but thought we had to look at the total package, which included the terms and conditions of service for the long-term durability and enhancement of our public sector's performance and of people's careers.

11.45 a.m.

Sir, a number of initiatives had been taken. You will recall there has been an Amendment to the Constitution which prevented future salary cuts for public sector workers. In 1996 there was also an Amendment to the pensions legislation to allow for temporary workers to be eligible for pensions. In the past, persons would act in higher posts and when the time came to calculate their pension, that period of service was not factored in. Therefore, an Amendment was made so that the last 36 months of that person's career would be factored into the computation of their pension. Sir, then there was the socially revolutionary steps in the conversion of workers in the public service from the status of casual worker to that of public officer. Therefore, the ramifications for that have been stated time and time again. I think it important to restate that it not only improves one's security of tenure and one's retirement benefits but also meant persons were now able to conduct their affairs with a greater sense of security. It also enhances one's social and other status. It erases the institutional and other snobbery to which workers were being subjected over the years, where casual workers were regarded as second-class workers so to speak. Now they have become public officers like other persons. Therefore, that was a revolutionary change in the whole culture within the public sector, both as to how people saw the private sector workers and how the workers saw themselves, *vis-a-vis* other workers within the service. I believe that is a magnificent gesture which will last forever to the credit of society and to public sector workers.

Sir, the true measure of this has to be taken when one recalls that casual employees were not enjoying security of tenure. In theory, they were working only when there was work to be done. This meant they found great difficulty in securing long-term financing for housing and other things. They could not go into Bridgetown and indulge in hire-purchase like other people because when people saw the term "casual" it smacked of instability and lack of security and persons were not willing to do business with them.

Sir, apart from that, there as further enhancement to their benefits... Those who retired at 60 years had to wait for a period of five years before they could receive a national insurance pension. They would have gotten a gratuity but it was as little as 40 per cent of that received by public officers. For example, a maid working for \$14 253 per year, after 33 years would receive a gratuity of \$29,695 but a gratuity to a casual employee was \$12 060, approximately \$17 000 difference which is a large difference in the quantum of money received. Now as public officers, these are allowed to retire with the full superannuation benefits and, therefore, it

gives them a better sense of stability which they can look forward to in their golden years, with a greater sense of calm. Neither would they have to cut and contrive for the five years until the national insurance pension kicked in.

Sir, there is also the introduction of a flexibility allowance for police, prison and nursing officers to compensate officers in those sectors who would have to work outside their normal duties.

Sir, this is Government's recognition of the fact that these officers had to work outside of their normal hours and it was our responsibility and right to acknowledge their effort and service to the community. Sir, this has gone into effect. My latest figures as of February, 2002, more than \$360 000 have been paid out under this new scheme. There had been some administrative difficulties where the police are concerned, and the Ministry of Civil Service has summoned a meeting with the Police Association where we will meet to iron out any difficulties. The point is that the step has been taken and principles have been instituted where these persons are eligible for a flexibility allowance in recognition of their extra work in servicing and protecting the community.

In addition, Government has moved to do other improvements. For example, to appoint more persons across the service. For example, in 1997, approximately 691 persons were appointed. In 1998, 661 persons were appointed. In 1999, 1 365 were appointed. In 2000, over 4 000 had been appointed. These are some of the quantitative improvements that Government has been implementing for the public service across the board. Sir, these are some of the factors that were put on the table in order to get a comprehensive picture of what we were doing in order to enhance the civil service.

Sir, in addition, Government was seeking to ensure the cost of these new increases would be one that could be safely borne by society and not one that would push us back into penury and subject us to harsh conditions for years to come; and that we would not have to undergo tremendous strain in order to do so.

Sir, not only would this 3.75 per cent apply to salaries and wages but also to pensions. Between 1997 and 1998, Government spent \$8.7 million on pensions. For the year 2001 to 2002, it spent \$109.9 million, an increase of 36.2 per cent over three years.

Sir, it is customary when increases are granted to the public sector in general, a rate of increase is given to government pensioners. It is usually $\frac{2}{3}$ of that given to public officers and, therefore, public pensioners will receive a 4.3 per cent increase in their pension from April 1, 2002.

We are seeking to deal with all aspects of the service as we seek to improve terms, conditions and salaries for all concerned.

Sir, the unions have also tabled a number of measures which they thought they would seek to have improved in order to improve the conditions of service. They wanted an improved right to pension. In the past, pensions legislation governing the public sector normally states there is no absolute right to a pension. It is now agreed this will become a thing of the past and persons will now have a right to a pension. Again, this leads to tremendous amount of social stability and goodwill for those persons who have worked for many years in the service but could not be guaranteed a pension.

There was also the question of payment for part-time teachers for bank holidays. It was a policy that teachers were not paid when bank holidays fell within the week and unions asked that this policy be reversed. On the other hand, while part-time teachers were not being paid for bank holidays, full-time teachers were. We felt this was a disparity which we had to reverse as quickly as possible. This is in keeping with the International Labour Convention 175. The ILO Convention 175 states that a worker should not be disadvantaged solely on the basis that the employment is not full time.

We seek to respect and adhere to the ILO Convention wherever possible, hence the tremendous honour that was paid to Barbados, that is, our Prime Minister being invited – for the first time any one from this part of the world – to address a recent convention in Geneva. I understand he did it with great distinction. Barbados is proud of operating in a forum at that level.

There was also the issue of public sector workers being injured on the job. The unions, quite rightly and in all fairness to them, have been pushing to institute an insurance policy to compensate public workers who were injured in the line of duty. Government already pays more than \$50 million a year to the National Insurance Scheme to cover its workers. In addition, it disburses additional compensation under the Crown Proceedings Act to workers injured on the job when liability is accepted by Government. For example, between 1998 and 1999, Government has paid out approximately \$771 145.45 under that Act to approximately 13 public officers who were injured on the job. However, it was recognised there was a deficiency in this armour of protection for public sector workers. This had to do with compensation for those who, unfortunately, suffered death in line of duty.

The present arrangement had been that the estate of an officer killed in the line of duty would receive a gratuity to which he would have been entitled under the pensions

legislation which covers his or her service. Under the National Insurance Scheme, the spouse received 45 per cent of his salary in addition to the gratuity pursuant to he or she being the beneficiary.

Research has shown that most insurance policies provide a death benefit, computed on the basis of five times an officer's annual salary at the time of death. Therefore, Government has moved to come on par with this policy. From hence, the beneficiaries of officers who are killed in the line of duty, would be entitled to five times that officer's annual salary, plus the gratuity, plus the pension. We think that this is an equitable and just provision and we are proud to be associated with it.

11.55 a.m.

Sir, while we are looking at the benefits we also have to look at what it will cost Government and by extension the taxpayers of Barbados to finance these increases we have spoken about. Based on the 5.75 per cent proposed over two years the cost will be \$50.5 million. This will increase the fiscal deficit for 2002/2003 to 4.9 per cent of growth domestic product.

This represents the context in which this settlement is coming about. While it is popular to say that Government is legislating this settlement, all settlements eventually have to come to Parliament for legislation to pass to give meaning, substance and effect to them. It is important to understand that eight out of 10 entities have agreed and it cannot be said that it was a harsh, cold-blooded imposition on workers but rather it was an overwhelming consensus on the part of the representatives of public officers.

I think we also have to be cognisant of the fact that workers are much better off as a result of this settlement, and the increases also have to be seen in the context of not only wages and salaries but in the context of allowances.

Sir, we should remember some of the increased allowances from which workers have benefited since 1995. I will give some examples:

Travel allowances have been increased.

Washing and laundry allowances for police, firemen and prison officers have been increased.

Allowances for workers in the Ministry of Public Works, those working with asphalt and heavy equipment have been increased.

Postman's motorcycle upkeep has increased from \$138 monthly to \$250 per month.

Entertainment allowances have been increased.

Allowances for doctors have been increased.

The ceiling on vehicle loans has moved from \$20 000 to \$35 000 and the repayment period has been extended from five years to seven years.

Postmen have been allowed to purchase motor vehicles free of duty.

Sir, the Police Force and the Defence Force have been equipped to the tune of millions of dollars where they have been given new vehicles and equipment for fighting crime and they are now in a better position to carry out their duties.

It would be unfair of the society to ask them to do more with antiquated equipment and we, therefore, sought to strengthen their hands in the ability to carry out their duties in a meaningful way. Sir, when police officers are off duty and have to attend court they are paid for the standard five hours even if they are only in court for one hour.

We have sought to deal with a broad range of improved terms and conditions for persons across the board. I also think we have to give an account of some of the other initiatives not strictly in terms of dollars and cents that were instituted across the service.

We are seeking to improve the public service in a meaningful and long-term way through the institution of a performance management system which is being called The Performance Review Development System for which a special unit has been set up in the Ministry of Civil Service and the Personnel Administrative Department to carry out this function. It is proceeding at a good pace, there has been great consultation on this matter, it involves the unions who have been very cooperative and are beginning to institute this programme where it aims to identify the strengths and weaknesses of public officers in their performance of their duty so that we can offer them assistance in improving their performance and enhancing their career paths.

This scheme will shortly be introduced into the Ministry of Civil Service, Ministry of Finance and the Office of the Attorney-General on a trial basis after which it will be extended to the wider service after the kinks are ironed out. Sir, we know that Government is working to introduce a new Public Service Act which will streamline the administration of the public service, especially in the area of discipline, recruitment and promotion for the future and bring greater transparency to the whole question of human resource management in the public sector. This is a modern system which we believe will enhance the performance of the service, bring great credibility and boost morale within the public sector.

Sir, there is also the question of the job evaluation exercise. Phase One of this exercise has been completed. Sir, Phase 2 of the evaluation exercise has begun and currently the Evaluation Committee is meeting with stakeholders across the public service evaluating 130 jobs. The Committee is testing the instruments that would be used in the evaluating exercise. This exercise includes the members of CTUSAB and the implementation of this exercise is expected in April, 2003.
12.05 p.m.

Among the other initiatives that would be coming are pieces of literature that would highlight the activities of Public Sector Reform which include strategic planning, organisational reviews, reviewing and upgrading systems, the Customer Charter Activities and the Employer Assistance Programme. The Employer Assistance Programme was put in place since November, 1998, to assist persons who are suffering from stress or are traumatised. These persons are able to have access to professional services provided by professionals in a confidential manner and services are paid for by Government. This programme is widely accepted in the public service.

Sir, the Public Sector Reform initiatives are underway and these initiatives would be intensified after Crop Over. We do not intend for the new initiatives to compete for the attention of the public at a time when people are primarily focussed on Crop Over activities. After Crop Over the country will see and hear of a new set of activities that will seek to ensure that Public Sector Reform is alive and is being conducted on a long-term basis.

Sir, the Smart Stream system has considerably enhanced the management of finances and human resources. This system had some teething problems but these problems have been rectified and is working well.

Sir, I said a lot to indicate that the Barbados Public Service is still a vibrant, energetic and productive entity and Barbados can continue to have great confidence in its performance. The Government could not pay the public officers for all that they have done and this pay increase is a partial recognition in the context of what the Government can afford at this time for what they have done and represent in this society.

Sir, the new wages will come into effect from the next payday, August, 2002 and the back pay would be paid in September, 2002 for most public officers. I have been given that assurance by the public officers who are responsible and I have no doubt that their obligation to the rest of the society will be met and that the public service can settle down and continue with its productive performance and making an invaluable contribution to society.

The public service of Barbados is one of our most outstanding institutions and is one of which we can be proud. We, in Government, are happy to be able to compensate them in this small manner in this regard.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

SENATOR C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. President, I rise to make a contribution in this debate with the full knowledge that Government could have afforded to give the unions what they asked for.

Sir, the ability of the unions to negotiate an acceptable level of wage increase depends on its capacity to push for that wage against the resistance of the employer. In this case the Government's firm happens to be the economy. The economy prior to the year 2001, performed extremely well and then started to stutter around the first quarter of last year.

Sir, when we look at the question of the compensation for the workers, it is a question of the capacity to negotiate. Are you going to give or take? I get the impression here that most of the peripheral issues relating to allowances and some other benefits might have also occupied the attention of the unions and, therefore, they might have conceded on that and other elements beyond the 6 per cent that they were requesting.

In terms of making the overall assessment of how you are going to negotiate, there are several indicators that you can look at in that process. The question of what the past inflation would have been and what was the expected inflation rate would be a major one in that at the end of the negotiation it is hoped that the worker is no worse off than when he started. What that means in real terms is, that the real wage of the worker remains constant over time and that would be translated to mean that there would have been an increase in the nominal wage of the worker that was exactly equivalent to the increase in prices over the negotiating period. In which case, you can say that, perhaps, the worker might be no worse off.

Sir, you then have to look at the impact of taxation and how individuals would move from one tax category to another and the incidence of tax on the increased nominal wage of the worker. That has to be factored into the analysis.

In addition, we look across the various sectors to see whether the private sector is in a state of health sufficient to get an increase that compares favourably with the public sector. In most cases within the Caribbean, the public sector in wage negotiation informs private sector wage negotiation. To some extent, the private sector looks on to see how much

Government can afford or has afforded itself to give in the wage negotiations process and then they make their determination based, of course, on some other factors.
12.15 p.m.

The question of productivity in the performance of the worker is also a crucial factor that we have not been able to evaluate so far effectively in the civil service of Barbados and that is going to take many years to do. I know that we have a National Productivity Council but it is going to be extremely difficult no matter what you do to measure productivity in the public service within any economy, furthermore a Caribbean type economy. I wish the National Productivity Council well. It seems to be good at public relations making itself known but it is going to find its work extremely difficult to conduct in a public sector that has to be reformed.

The reform of the public sector, as I have said in this Chamber before, is perhaps the most significant thing that has to be done in Barbados for us to be able to cope with a new future. If we can get the public sector reform right, then all the discussions surrounding productivity are a waste of time because the real essence of the future for Barbados and the rest of the region is how to narrow the gap between productivity in the private sector and in the public sector. That is the only way that a Caribbean type economy can even come close to being efficient and competitive in a new global order. That has to be discussed, because in the absence of narrowing that gap between the two the public sectors within the region will continue to grow and they will be driven by inefficiencies, and inefficiencies in the public service simply mean that the public service will take more money to do the same job that a private sector can do and that inefficiency is what gives rise to the swelling of the ranks of the public service in today's Caribbean and also in Barbados.

The ability of the employer to pay is most crucial in this exercise. Could we say that Government is not in a position to pay that additional quarter of one per cent? I am wondering whether or not that refusal to pay that quarter of one percent is again part of the strategy to send a signal to the wider community that the Government is indeed undergoing some degree of pressure or is anticipating some degree of pressure on the economic front. In terms of the dollars that are required, it would not be significant and, therefore, I cannot understand why Government would not have agreed in principle to giving the public sector workers that additional quarter of one per cent. I will explain later why I find it hard to understand.

In the public domain, we have been hearing since this negotiation has been settled that this is going to cost Government \$50.4 million. That is not true. I do not say that lightly, Government knows only too well that it has to

factor in the fact that it is going to get at least 25 per cent of that in the form of taxes. Therefore, Government knows that the net impact of the wage settlement cannot be \$50.4 million.

What I am going to do here now is to demonstrate by way of the example provided by the leader of the debate on that Side this morning to show why I am correct. If required, I may have to pull documents to demonstrate that Government itself knows only too well that the real impact of this negotiation is not \$50.4 million but happens to be \$33.3 million. That is not difficult at all to analyse. I will demonstrate that.

The maid that we heard of this morning who gets an annual salary of \$14 253 which translates roughly into a monthly pay of \$1 188 would get, if her salary increases by 3 per cent in the first year, roughly \$35.64 per month more. That gives her a salary of \$1 224 by the time she receives her increased salary. Because you get a threshold of \$1 250 below which you do not pay any income tax it means that the maid still does not pay income tax with that increase of 3 per cent, given the example that I am using.

The maid certainly pays a little more NIS as a consequence of the increased salary. Then in the second year when you impose a two and three-quarter per cent increase, that translates into roughly \$33 more. So the maid's salary now goes to \$1 257 per month. In which case, she ends up paying 25 per cent on seven dollars because the \$1 250 represents, when you put it on an annual scale, the \$15 000 threshold below which the worker does not pay any income tax. After these negotiations are settled in the second year, a maid would, in fact, be paying a tax on seven dollars with her take-home pay. In the second year she also experiences an increase in NIS contribution. I say that simply to tell you that even from this example here you can see that a maid who did not pay taxes at the start of this negotiation would be paying in minor taxes by the time she gets her increase in the second year of this negotiation. If the maid who did not pay before is paying taxes, by the time these negotiations are settled you can understand what would happen to the individual who is already paying taxes by the time she gets her increases.

Government knows only too well that these wage settlements cannot cost any \$50.4 million because by the time Government takes its share of the pie it would have reduced the overall cost of the negotiation to about \$33 million. If you say to John Public that these negotiations are indeed going to cost \$50 million, there is a big hue and cry and a dance because that is heavy money. But that is not heavy money when you compare it to the wastage that has occurred in Barbados over the last seven years, the wastage at Warrens to the magnitude of \$40 million, the wastage at Greenland to the magnitude of \$35 million, the wastage in the GEMS project in excess of \$100 million, the wastage at

Southern Meats in excess of \$7 million, the wastage at BADMC, the wastage at Cubiertos, the South Coast Sewerage Project. I can go on and on and list in excess of \$200 million that this Administration has squandered over the last seven years.

To tell me that you could not have afforded to give the workers of Barbados an additional sum less than \$10 million, in fact, it would have translated into a quarter of one per cent which would have translated into less than \$3 million to \$4 million more, in which case, you would still have received 25 per cent of that so that the net effect would have been that Government's decision to just meet the unions at six per cent would have been effectively a \$2 million or \$3 million more package. I cannot see how it could not afford that.

I am not getting into any personality discussions here at all. In fact, my intention in this debate is to do what I was requested to do last week, go deep into the numbers and the figures and the economic analysis. I do hope that the person who requested that and who demonstrated earlier this morning that he was not very comfortable in that arena would appreciate the essence of my discussion or the fact that I have lifted this debate to another level.

12.25 p.m.

Sir, let us look at it in a deeper way. There are some individuals that we can look at, if we look at a special grade teacher who has an annual salary of about \$26 930.40 and has a basic allowance of \$15 000 that all Barbadians are entitled to, it means that the taxable income of that individual would be \$11 930.40 per year and taxes paid on that would be \$2 982.60. Now, the thing to note here is that you cannot simply analyse that increase by itself, because every time you increase the salary of this individual, there is going to be an increase in the average tax rate of the individual. In short, the person pays more tax, as a consequence of his increased income, and, therefore, the average rate of tax will change.

Sir, you have then to understand that the increase in taxation paid by the individual, would be accompanied by an increased level of inflation, so what is done in the literature is that you take an expression which is one minus the average tax rate, over one minus the marginal tax rate, times the rate of inflation, and on that basis, you make a determination as to what should have been the justifiable increase for the individual.

Sir, if I use that expression, since I have been asked to do an economic analysis and use figures in a very deep way, I would go on to say then that if we anticipated or expected inflation in Barbados to be about approximately 3 per cent per year then, in a simplistic way, it would be 6 per cent inflation over a two-year period.

Then, when you compound that by the measure that I just expressed, the actual impact would have been roughly a 7.2 per cent increase for the worker. So that even though the inflation would only be 6 per cent, when you do make the comparison or multiply it by that expression which I spoke of earlier, the increase in salary should be of the magnitude of 7.2 per cent to keep that individual in his previous position.

Now, that certainly has not been considered in these negotiations because, had they been considered, the outcome might be something substantially different. It is important to note that the Government can afford to pay the increase in salaries requested. That is, the 6 per cent requested by the unions of Barbados.

Asides.

SENATOR C. A. MASCOLL: There has been an agreement. I do not know because I was not there so I will look forward to a later presentation to understand where the differences came. Certainly, I can say, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that in Barbados to say that inflation would be about 6 per cent over a two-year period, is reasonable.

Sir, let me explain why there is even difficulty in understanding that and I said this on numerous occasions. That is, since the introduction of the Value Added Tax (VAT), the Retail Price Index has woefully underestimated the increases in prices in Barbados. This is because the Retail Price Index which was done as far back as 1994 has not captured the structural shift in consumption, and it has also not captured the impact that the VAT has on services in Barbados.

Sir, when we constructed the Retail Price Index in the early 1990s, there was no VAT and when we looked at the fact that a VAT has now been imposed on all services in Barbados, there is a need for a revision of the Retail Price Index to capture the impact of prices in services.

Asides.

SENATOR C. A. MASCOLL: I will ignore the asides since they are basically hot air.

The question is that every time a lady visits a salon to get her hair done or to get a manicure, there is VAT added. There is a VAT on all services now in Barbados, whether you rent cars or services. There never used to be a VAT on legal services, accounting or other services, so that in Barbados for the first time after 1997 there was, in fact, the imposition of a VAT on services; and that is the major difference the VAT made.

Aside.

SENATOR C. A. MASCOLL: Of course, there were other taxes before. There was a Consumption Tax and a Stamp Duty but they were imposed only on goods and at the port of entry in Barbados. What happened in Barbados is that for the first time, we actually taxed something called local value added. So when a can of corned beef leaves the Port and is transported, and then stored and the store owner has a loan, there is interest, then there is security and there is air-conditioning, then all the other added value. It means that for the first time in Barbados a tax was imposed on local value added. This is a fact that has been missed by this Administration. It explains why even in the aftermath of the measures taken in the latter part of 1997, when a basket was chosen to be relieved of VAT, that food prices in Barbados still continued to rise substantially.

In fact, of all the categories of the Retail Price Index, food prices have risen fastest since 1994, in spite of the fact that there was a basket of items selected for zero rating. Nobody can dispute that and the most important part of that...

Asides.

SENATOR C. A. MASCOLL: It comes from the data.

The most important part of that is that according to the Retail Price Index, the average household spends about 40 per cent of its income on food and beverages. Then, on rent and housing, you spend about 18 per cent of the expenditure. So, in actual fact when you analyse increases in prices in Barbados, you will see that in the area of food, Barbados' prices have indeed risen fairly substantially. I can demonstrate that by way of the numbers but I would spare some of the Senators that opportunity to be pressured by such data, as was evidenced in the earlier presentation. The person on the Other Side in the earlier presentation struggled to present 0.5 per cent, .25 per cent, one quarter of 1 per cent and was heard last week to be saying that he enjoys data and figures.

I would not, however, go that route. Mr. President, there are other measures that could have been considered in the wage negotiation process. We have been hearing for a long time that there is a need for a productivity bonus in Barbados. I cannot see it happening within the next decade or two, where Barbados would be able to measure productivity in the public service. What I can see, is that the Government which has promised in its 1999 Manifesto to raise the threshold for taxes from \$15 000 to \$25 000, not one thing has happened so far and, indeed, I do not have a copy of that document with me but the Government of Barbados promised to systematically increase the standard allowance from \$15 000 to \$25 000 over their period in office. But that has not occurred and I say that because that is important.

I discussed earlier what happened to Barbadians in the absence of making the adjustments to the threshold. That is, we have a situation in which average Barbadians will, even as a result of this negotiation, experience an increase in the taxes that they pay and, therefore, the overall increase to them would not be what appears to be and the Government, in fact, was able to say this in a document that it produced. 12.35 p.m.

Sir, the evidence is very much there to demonstrate. Now, Mr. President, I will go on to discuss a number of issues which should have been dealt with, as I have said, pretty effectively in this debate but have not been. I do not accept that because the economy is in recession that Government is losing its capacity to pay. I do not accept that and I can demonstrate that again. Now the two things are separate and distinct. The growth or the lack of growth in the Barbados economy is rooted in the existing behaviour of tourism, the performance of the sugar industry, lack of performance in the manufacturing sector and in the international business sector. In spite of the so called declines that we have seen over the last five or six quarters and when you look at the Central Bank Annual Report, this Report is not suggesting any major decline in Government's revenue performance. It has not suggested that there has been any major decline in Government's revenue performance.

Sir, one could expect that if the economy goes into recession and I am not sure about that, because we get information on the performance of the economy a year later, one could expect that there could be some undermining of the base because the Value Added Tax is imposed on the level of expenditure in the economy. As I said, Sir, we have to wait an entire year.

Sir, I remember back in 1999 making comments about the economy being under pressure as a result of what one could see in the Ways and Means Account...

Aside.

SENATOR C. A. MASCOLL: As a result, the Prime Minister admitted only a year after that, in fact, the economy had gone into a state of turbulence. I am talking about 1999 when he said that the economy went into a state of turbulence in the third quarter of 1999 and that happened a year later. We were hearing that the economy was performing last year and then we heard nine months later, yes, we were in recession prior to 9/11. Now I will have to wait for the next year or so to find out what is the true state of the Barbados economy at this point. I do not know if the Other Side knows it or if the unions were told the truth, I do know they were played a very serious trick in this whole negotiation process.

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: Mr. President, Sir, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is imputing improper motives about the Prime Minister when he said that he does not know if the unions and other persons were told the truth. He is implying, Sir, that the Prime Minister had lied.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator, I think you used the word "trick" which is clearly an unparliamentary word. I am not sure to whom you referred specifically but to the extent that it was in reference to any particular person in either House, I would ask that that be withdrawn.

SENATOR C. A. MASCOLL: Sir, I withdraw. I do not even recall the context in which I used it. But the thing about it is that we will have to wait for another nine months or so to know what is happening with the Barbados economy at this stage. Suffice it to say, Sir, that we are in a state of turbulence. In fact, we are now supposed to be in recession. I would wish for the Government to be able to tell the people of Barbados what is the extent of the recession. I was arguing the point before the point of order that the Government is in a position where it can still pay because Government was able to derive as much as \$250 million more in revenue as a result of VAT than it anticipated over the last two or three years

Aside.

SENATOR C. A. MASCOLL: Sir, I am happy to hear in an *Aside* that it was five years ago that Government got in excess of \$250 million in revenue than it had anticipated from VAT. I am now hearing that it was five years ago at the time when the Democratic Labour Party indicated that it was so. They said that was untrue but now there is an admission from the Other Side that, in fact, the Value Added Tax did yield substantially more for Government than it had anticipated during that 1998-99 period. That is another revelation by this Administration. This Administration has a way of revealing facts to the people years after or months after when, in fact, an issue might have died down.

Sir, the Government is indeed very much in a position to pay Government workers of Barbados an additional \$2 million or \$3 million which is what the one-quarter of one per cent would be. That is the point that has to be made. This Administration could find all kinds of money to spend in all kinds of places without justification, but it now finds it extremely difficult to give the workers of Barbados an additional \$2 million or \$3 million more that they are asking for when in actual fact they deserve it.

Sir, when you look at the figures that were quoted by the presenter on the Other Side, he suggested by way of the figures that the real spending power of the average

Barbadian has declined over the last four or five years. The figures indicated that...

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: Mr. President, the Honourable Member seems to be over analysing himself because there is nowhere in my presentation that I even implied that such a thing occurred. I would like him to be more specific or otherwise withdraw that statement. I did not say that and you are misleading the House.

SENATOR C. A. MASCOLL: In the earlier negotiations, the presenter in this debate quoted figures that suggested inflation and the rate of increase in wages that suggested that the rate of increase in prices in Barbados outstripped the rate of increase in wages over the last four or five years. He did demonstrate that. The evidence is clear that he did. Mr. President, there is no doubt... let me just quote some figures for you, Sir.
12.45 p.m.

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: On a point of order. The Honourable Member is claiming and alleging that I made such a claim. I did not. What I said was that the wage increases in the public service have far outstripped the inflation period by 7.45 per cent at the bottom of the salary scale and 6.45 per cent at the top. If that is his conclusion he can say so but he should not say that was my submission.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I do not think you can admonish the Senator while on his feet. You can explain what you have said and I will, therefore, treat that as a point of elucidation. Senator Mascoll, please continue.

SENATOR C. A. MASCOLL: The evidence did indicate that he had, in fact, shown to the people of Barbados that the increase in salaries did not outstrip the increase in inflation over the last four to five years in Barbados. I think that will be shown very clearly in a presentation that will be delivered later to this August Chamber.

Sir, the issue regarding the degree of income tax recovery of the Government, I have earlier said that because of the nature of the wage structure in Barbados an individual could find himself in a position where increases in salaries translate into increases in taxation.

I want to deal with an issue. I know some of my colleagues feel that we should not visit these kinds of things. I heard a lot about an eight per cent cut and what it did. I am going to quote some information to demonstrate to the people of Barbados that the allegations of an eight per cent cut translating into a 25 per cent reduction in discretionary income is untrue.

In several instances during that period, dependent on where one was in the salary scale when the salaries of Barbadians were adjusted, several individuals in the service and across statutory boards actually experienced an increase in take home pay. I made it my business as a Senior Economist at the Central Bank to walk around and show to many persons in the Central Bank that an eight per cent reduction in salaries transmitted to more take home pay for many workers at the Central Bank of Barbados. It is very easy to demonstrate because several individuals who were in the 40 per cent tax category fell back to the 25 per cent tax category at the Central Bank after they got their eight per cent reduction.

There were several persons who were at the threshold. The threshold in Barbados is when one earns approximately \$39 000 per year. There was the situation when \$15 000 is subtracted. That constitutes \$24 000 upon which 25 per cent tax is paid. However, there were several instances in the Central Bank where persons who were working for over \$42 000 per year, when they received their reduction of 8 per cent, brought them down below the band. At the same time, the unemployment levy was reduced from 4.25 per cent to less than 2 per cent at the time that and other levies were also adjusted. Therefore, several individuals during that period took home more money because of the adjustment in the levies during 1991 to 1992 period.

Asides.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Please let the Senator be heard.

SENATOR C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. President, they can stop talking about the eight per cent cut because the Government of Barbados, through this Administration, has seen to it that the then Prime Minister of Barbados was honoured for his role in the management of the affairs of Barbados during the 1990s. Barbadians believe the then Prime Minister acted in the interest of Barbados by staving off the devaluation of the dollar. When the history is written, one can rest assured the then Prime Minister would be seen in this light.

Mr. President, at the time when workers at the Central Bank and statutory boards were paying unemployment levies, the permanent worker in Government never paid an unemployment levy. Therefore, when the unemployment levies were removed, it redounded to the benefit of public sector workers in statutory boards. It did not happen to the public sector workers in the mainstream civil service because they do not pay unemployment levy. As a consequence of that, plus the reduction in taxes, several workers within the public service who were working within statutory boards took more money home.

Mr. President, the evidence is there to show. The truth is that the history of Barbados has to be written to

demonstrate fully what has happened to Barbados during that early period. Sir, the DLP has nothing to be ashamed of. The DLP should have been defending the causes of the people of Barbados during that early 1990 period. They have to be like me, willing to get up and preach the gospel according to what happened in those early years because it was done in the interest of the people of Barbados. Sir, this Government is now finding it fit not to give the workers an additional \$2 million or \$3 million they have asked for but can take all kinds of money and waste it on all kinds of projects.

Mr. President, I must confess to you. I am very sad to hear the Prime Minister of Barbados has refused to meet the NUPW and the BUT where they could have met because there is no real difference between 5¾ per cent and 6 per cent for the Government of Barbados, and to have the major public sector union crying out over this is unnecessary. I would like to hear the defence that anybody is going to bring. Why would one have the major public sector union crying out like this when they could have been given the \$2 million or \$3 million they had requested?

I know that the initial percentage put on the table by most people at that time was 10 per cent and that the unions had adjusted downwards in light of what happened in the aftermath of 11th September, 2001. They came down to something much closer to the 6 per cent. I feel somehow they could have had a much easier settlement by adjusting from 5.75 per cent to the 6 per cent that was asked and I cannot see it being a question of affordability.

Sir, the public sector workers in Barbados are the ones who have suffered most during the early 1990s. There is no doubt about it.
12.55 p.m.

Sir, over the years the public sector workers received the following:

1994	4.5 per cent
1995	2.3 per cent
1996	2.5 per cent
1997	2.8 per cent
1998	4.2 per cent
1999	2.5 per cent
2000	3.1 per cent

Sir, when you look at the role that the public sector workers play in this overall process, could they not have been given the additional \$3 million?

Sir, the 8 per cent cut caused most public sector workers to suffer but an 8 per cent cut along with the unemployment levy adjustment did not cause the same kind of hardship in the statutory boards of Barbados. Perhaps Honourable Members on the Other Side need to do research to understand the point.

Sir, we need to be more compassionate with the public sector workers. You cannot be proud that the retail price index underestimates prices in Barbados. The goodly Senator in this Chamber who praises himself for having been my teacher would know that the price index underestimates prices.

Asides.

SENATOR C. A. MASCOLL: He also knows that because of the implementation of VAT on services that were not taxed before, that the retail price index is inadequate for measuring prices in Barbados at this stage. He must know that you cannot simply use the retail price index to determine wage settlements in Barbados until the retail price index is revised.

He also knows that the Government took up a foolish formula. It took real GDP which is nominal GDP divided by price, got a percentage change called real GDP and nominal GDP, the same thing, and then added the change in the price. The Government then assumed that nominal GDP increases at the same rate as wages and that the wages of Barbados in the public sector should increase by two things: real GDP growth plus inflation.

Mr. President, these things are not easy to explain to John Public but they composed real GDP into its two component parts, made a heroic assumption about nominal GDP, assumed that it will grow at the same rate as wages and then said that we should accept that real GDP plus inflation should be the two indicators to use.

The Government knows that in this current environment with recession that real GDP has not grown and that it is negative so as a consequence workers cannot expect any increase when you look at real GDP because the economy has suddenly gone into recession and is now negative. The Government also knows that the retail price index continues to underestimate prices in Barbados and, therefore, it is not a fair indicator and, as a consequence of that, the heroic assumptions made by Government have escaped most people.

Mr. President, this is not fair to the workers of Barbados. If they were to take away the political compass from their actions, they would be guided by their conscience and not by the political expectations that they hope to achieve. The public sector workers have carried the load

and strain in the Barbados economy since early 1990s and now there is the opportunity to give them some reward, they should be given it.

It has been admitted that Government was able to get an additional \$270 million from VAT and yet could not see it fit to pass on some of the benefit to the public sector workers in Barbados but are now asking them to hold strain now that the economy is in so-called recession. When the economy was buoyant, Government took the excesses and squandered them on the Urban Development Commission, the Rural Development Commission and all kinds of initiatives were distributed to individuals; but could not see it fit to distribute some of those excess funds and largesse to the good public sector citizens of Barbados who must now carry the brunt of the burden of adjustment again. Sir, this really cannot be fair.

Mr. President, in those days we knew the fiscal deficit and foreign reserves were in trouble. The public sector workers were asked to make the adjustment in the interest of the people of Barbados to prevent devaluation of the currency and to make the fiscal deficit look good. Almost 3 000 persons were sent home but those who remained were not given the opportunity to benefit from the good that occurred in the succeeding six years subsequent to that period.

Mr. President, if you accept that there were less public sector workers from 1991 to 1996 and that the goods and services being delivered by the public sector were not compromised, it means that those who remained in the employment of the public sector were working harder, putting in more effort, were more productive and, as a consequence, should have benefited from the excesses that occurred in the Barbados economy in the post-VAT era. Sir, I am speaking from the heart because I cannot see how there is a situation where the contribution of the public sector workers is recognised and you are embarking on public sector reform but could not give these workers the opportunity to benefit from the economy when there is that opportunity to benefit.

Mr. President, the question is: Do we feel that we are giving the public sector workers of Barbados a fair deal as a consequence of these measures? Sir, the answer to that question is "No". I am not going to accept that the current economic recession is sufficient to explain why public sector workers could not have received the additional one quarter of one per cent which they requested in recent negotiations.
1.05 p.m.

I am also saying that while Barbados' economy is in recession it is not yet in crisis. I have said that repeatedly. There is a difference between recession and crisis. A

recession occurs because of a reduction in GDP over successive quarters. If the Barbados economy was in crisis, we would have problems on our foreign reserve side as well.

Asides.

SENATOR C. A. MASCOLL: I am saying that there is no need to panic. Sir, the Government has borrowed \$150 million in 1999, \$200 million in the year 2000 and \$300 million in 2001. So, over the last three years, you borrowed \$650 million and put it in the foreign reserve pool at the Central Bank of Barbados. That is not the full extent of the borrowing because that is only the private borrowing. I am not talking about the IADB, World Bank and other institutional borrowing because that would take you to almost \$1 billion over the last three years.

Sir, the economy cannot yet be in crisis. It is in recession. I have said repeatedly that the economy is not yet in crisis. It is in recession.

Asides.

SENATOR C. A. MASCOLL: We cannot say when it would get there because we do not know when it will get there.

I am saying that it does not undermine the ability of the Government to pay at this stage and the Government can afford to pay at this stage. The Government's fiscal position could have afforded to give workers in Barbados the additional \$2 million – \$4 million that they have requested because they can afford to pay it. It is unbelievable that in today's Barbados, workers have once again been denied, having been the persons who carried the burden of the adjustment in the early 1990s period.

It is truly heartless that a Prime Minister who could have had these kinds of excessive funds and revenue available to him could have refused to give public sector workers what they justly deserve.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator, I ask you to withdraw the word heartless. You can say that you disagree. I am asking you to rephrase that because it is in the nature of a personal attack.

SENATOR C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. President, I withdraw the remark but there is definitely a need for a conscience and I am saying that we have not seen that in this Administration.

Mr. President, when I look at the question of methodology for salary increases, I am not satisfied that we are adequately measuring inflation in Barbados because of the inadequacy of the retail price index. I am not blaming any union for that. I am blaming the Administration for not

having revisited the retail price index to what is necessary and that should have been done.

I am also saying that this Administration promised to adjust allowances and it has not done that. The \$15 000 in allowances that were supposed to be adjusted and it has not happened. We were supposed to have experienced a \$15 000 to \$25 000 increase in the threshold and that has not occurred.

I am also saying that given that we have not been able to measure productivity in the public service, we have a situation in which we will never be able to see the benefit of additional effort on the part of workers in the public sector.

I am saying that Government has the ability to pay its workers because the request is only \$2 million – \$4 million more than they have requested and they should have received it. They have done enough over the last eight years in Barbados to receive what they requested in the recent negotiation.

I am saying that the cost that has been allocated by Government of \$50.4 million for these negotiations over the two-year period is incorrect. It is \$33.3 million and it is because of the fact that when workers receive an increase in salary, they will also increase their taxes paid and Government is going to get back approximately 25 per cent of what they paid out.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Would you please wind up, Senator Mascoll.

SENATOR C. A. MASCOLL: Sir, the lowest paid worker in the public service gets \$14 253 per year. As a result of these increases they would be paying taxes in the second year. Therefore, it means that every public sector worker in Barbados will be paying taxes and as a result of that you can assume that at least 25 per cent of all the increases will go back to Government. Therefore, your cost of negotiation is not \$50.4 million. The Government owes it to the public of Barbados to say that, and they have not said it.

I am also saying that as a consequence of that tax adjustment along with inflation, the public sector workers of Barbados deserve more and they should be given more. They have made too much of a sacrifice and I cannot support the measure before us.

Mr. President, I thank you.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

SENATOR THE HON. J. X. WALCOTT: Mr. President, I beg to move that this Sitting be suspended until 2.15 p.m. today.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to and Mr. PRESIDENT suspended the Sitting accordingly.
1.15 p.m.

RESUMPTION

Mr. PRESIDENT: This Sitting is resumed.

SENATOR B. R. COLLYMORE: Mr. President, let me say that there is nothing to vote against on the papers that have been presented and if I were a politician I would avoid voting against them.

Since 1961, I have been directly involved in most of the 16 occasions that there have been salary revisions, inclusive of 1961. In 1961, when there was a colonial service, it was the first occasion on which a body of public officers refused to accept a revision of pay. Indeed, as those of us who were around would recall, it was an election year and the police refused to accept and the Government went down with the others and left the police out. The new Government in 1962 fulfilled a promise that they had made to the police that they would set up a new committee to look at police pay. This was done. Police pay not only was it marginally higher than what was given to the rest of the public service but there was an element of regrading in what was the outcome.

Since that time, I recall four other occasions when there had been no agreement with all of the trade unions. Perhaps the worst was in 1976, again an election year when there was agreement with no trade union whatsoever. In 1978, the teachers in the BSTU did not agree to the salary revision. I think that it was in 1982 that there was no agreement from some of the unions and again in 1988 when we all thought there was agreement and one union said they had not agreed.

The point I want to make is that all prime ministers, with possibly the exception of Mr. St. John who did not have the opportunity, have had to go down and legislate salaries without having full agreement from trade unions. In 1972 and 1973 when there seemed that there would be no agreement, an arrangement was entered into with the trade unions for what was called an interim pay and although the salary revision was due from the first of April 1972 there was no salary revision but an interim pay was given to all public servants and that interim pay was made pensionable and the salary revision took effect April 1, 1973 when the interim pay was absorbed as part of the increase.

The fact that all salaries have to be legislated cannot be denied and I recall a Prime Minister who used to make a big thing about that – “When you tell me I am legislating salaries that is what I have to do.” The point I want to dismiss is any notion which could probably be based on political considerations that a Government could do

otherwise than reach the stage where it must give effect to some revision of salaries without having total approval or concurrence from trade unions. As I said, in 1961, it was the police and subsequently there were others. In 1988 it was also the NUPW.

Now, salaries and wages are approved by Parliament and form part of the draw-downs on the Consolidated Fund and, therefore, they must be legislated at all times. One point I need to make and this is the first occasion, although I was involved with 1961, I was a beneficiary of the '48 revision and the '52 revision, the point is that this is the first occasion that it has taken so long to reach this point.

I would have thought normally that a government would be conscious of the implications for cash flow and expenditure to delay the settlement, meaning the legislation of salaries revision, to the extent that there must now be 16 months of back pay. Sixteen months of back pay represents some implication for the cash flow of any organisation. It is probably not just a coincidence that last week at this same time we were discussing an increase in the Local Loans Act and that, I presume, will ensure that there will be cash available to meet this outlay.

I am not too persuaded that in every respect the decision taken and the amounts and percentage given represent a fair deal, and I will come to that. The cost of the civil service is, I hope, represented in the figure which the presenter gave of \$50 million, the average I take it per year for the two years. I am assuming 2001-2002, 2002-2003 the average is \$50.4 million. I hope this represents the total cost of what is involved because a lot of organisations whose salary comes from the public treasury are not represented in any of these documents which we have here today because there are a substantial number of statutory boards whose...

Aside.

SENATOR B. R. COLLYMORE: I note that because of the absorption of all employees into what is called the civil establishment there has been no particular measure to cover what used to be called casual and unestablished staff. I presume, therefore, that all of these people have now been absorbed into the civil establishment. If they have not been, then I thought there would be some measure to ensure that there is legislative authority to pay them the increased pay. I presume, Mr. President, that sometime later there will be supplementaries which will come to the other Chamber for paying of the increased salaries and wages to those elements that are not involved in the legislation before us.

I do not think that I can make a point in this debate without drawing to the attention of the Chamber the disparity of treatment that has been meted out to 8 000 Government pensioners. Government pensioners, as I told this Chamber some time ago, 50 per cent of them at that time were not

even getting \$500 a month as pensions. Although your measure seems to make a special provision for those who retired prior to 1976, I will tell you that the information I have shows that quite a few thousand of Government pensioners have never benefited from National Insurance and they should be treated differently from other pensioners, not just \$5 more.

I have a friend who retired 29 years ago at a middle level in the public service and with all the increases that have been given since he retired, the cost of living addition, his total take home is marginally above \$500. Worst of all, a very close relative of his was seriously ill a few weeks ago and after six weeks of waiting to get a CAT scan at QEH he was unable to do so. We were told that the machine was not working. He tried the private sector and they could not give an immediate appointment. On a total income of \$576 and with the assistance of friends and relatives, he had to transport that very ill person to Trinidad a Saturday morning to get a CAT scan. The person came back up Saturday afternoon and the results were available for the doctor by Monday. The point I am making, with such a small pension there are demands on people who are in the category of pensioners that are not different from the demands of people who are better off.
2.25 p.m.

It therefore baffles me why we continue to give increases to pensioners, one year after all the others have got their increases. If you tell me that it is justified to give an increase in travelling allowance and entertainment to somebody who has entertained already, and travelled already from April 2001 and, therefore, you still go back and give that person the requisite increases, I think the case is greater for pensioners who have to live totally – not just on entertainment and travel, they cannot do that – on some increase from the effective date of the increase for other persons benefiting from these measures.

I believe the presenter said that normally a pension increase is worth about two-thirds of what is given to a serving officer. If that is so, the case is even stronger for the increase to be given from 1st April, 2001. I am making no particular accusation but we continue to treat pensioners differently from all other people. I say that there are 8 000 Government pensioners, and the organisation which I have the honour to represent has 7 000 members, the majority of whom are a form of Government pensioner. I would say that when we make 10 000, you may see a different organisation.

I think these are things to consider especially in our present situation when people are living longer. My friend is not unique, poor fellow, he is a pharmacist but he still tries to make ends meet. I know one who is 96 years old, another who is 100 years old, and these people have no other means, certainly in two of the three cases of subsistence. Therefore, we should be a little more kindhearted to what

one should consider as those people who have given the brunt of their labour for the same Government – and Government is a continuing process – as servicing officers.

Sir, returning to history, when I became a permanent secretary in 1971, my salary was \$1 140 a month. Under these measures, the permanent secretary's salary is over \$8 000 a month from the 1st April this year. In 1971, the permanent secretary was earning eleven times the wages of a maid. From 1990 that has been reduced to 5.5 times the salary of the maid, before taxation. After taxation, it is more like 4.5. I am saying that there were social adjustments over the years to this question of salary. Unless we think that because \$8 000 in relation to the present salary is small, as I said it is only 5.5 times before taxes, I think we should be careful and therefore the system of granting overall percentages, as has been done on this occasion, will ensure that there will be no further narrowing of the gap. If you do not encourage the people at the top and ensure that they could see what is happening with their efforts, then it will have a worse effect on the running of the present system.

Sir, regarding the pensions, I believe that the Minister in making the presentation, said that one of the measures contemplated as an extension of a salary revision, was to provide for compensation of five times the annual salary of a person in service, who was unfortunately killed on the job, as a payout to the estate of such a person. I have no quarrel with this, except that I would like to draw attention to the fact that existing pension legislation provides for the dependents of such a person to get a pension, the widow for life, or until she remarries and the children for so long as they are under the age of 18; but there is provision for them to get a pension.

Sir, a pension is more sustenance to people who are in that unfortunate position, than one large outlay. I have no quarrel with that, if that is additional, because the same estate will be eligible for a gratuity which would be equal to what the person would have earned, if they had retired instead of having been killed. I will add to that, the fact that there is already a provision for a pension of the dependents, who are the people that one would be looking after. Therefore, in arriving at these decisions, I would hope that due account is taken of what exists in law already and that although it might be innovative, it is not as great as it may sound. Pensions are more important to people who are left behind than a lump sum payment to an estate.

Sir, all of us were regaled once again, with great information about Public Sector Reform, performance appraisal, job evaluation exercise, *et cetera*. My own experience is that Public Sector Reform is so much an outgoing exercise that you cannot speak of it in the terms of accomplishment so quickly.

I wish you luck with job evaluations. I made a forecast in 1999 that it would take four years to complete a job evaluation in the public sector and that even after it has been done, implementation will be fraught with difficulties because there must be total consultation with the organisations accredited to represent public officers.

My advice is that job evaluations are going to be costly to a public sector that is already quite costly. It may be necessary but do not place too much store on this job evaluation exercise. The Minister also spoke about having a Public Service Act. I have no faith that any miracles would be achieved by having a Public Service Act. I have had the opportunity to participate in a human resource exercise in the Commonwealth of Dominica in 1994 and they have this Act which I understand has been the basis of the present Government's proposal to institute such an Act.
2.35 p.m.

I would like to talk about Dominica and about what has been achieved. Laws are necessary and are important to good governance. Laws of themselves do not work miracles and there is so much that could be done by good industrial relationship. So much could be done about the process of consultation, as we have seen in protocols, that to legislate will affect harmfully that process of consultation of which I speak.

Sir, all in all, my great concern has been the lack of equality of treatment for pensioners and I think it would be in the Government's good interest to revisit this matter as soon as possible. I cannot promise I will not be constantly harping on this issue here and in other fora. It is a situation that has worsened over the years. I am speaking of that 50 per cent of us, the 4 000 persons who are living on the breadline and who cannot have national insurance payments of any sort. They have not contributed and, therefore, cannot receive contributory pension. It is important that a sensible study be made on the position and plight of pensioners, not only public service pensioners but generally. If one sets a national poverty level of \$171 per week and persons are getting less than that, then there is a case for a serious examination, either of providing more cash or other benefits of the kind.

We have embarked on representation that the telephones of persons who now benefit from electricity and water payments, should be included as a payment by Government. BARTEL has agreed, in writing, to give a discount, once the Government can meet part of the charge. This is only in respect of local calls. If there is a fixed rate, then it is not difficult to manage. The telephone company is prepared, once the new commission agrees, to give special discounts to persons in that category.

Sir, this is just as important as giving more money. Giving more money sometimes gets into the hands of wrong

people. A case came to my attention recently of a person who had died for nine months and cheques were still being sent out. Due to the fact that someone who works in the Treasury and had been to the funeral was able to see the cheques going out, that person was able to arrest that situation there.

Sir, I make a special plea that the question of the older persons in society and, in this instance, the question of the Government pensioners, many of whom are far below the poverty level in terms of the total income that is available to them for disposal, would be visited – and not next year when another salary revision is due.

Sir, this is what I find disturbing. I might offend my trade union friends by saying perhaps the day has come for us not to have biannual salary revisions. Therefore, constantly giving pay increases in the way it is now done, is probably putting us in more difficulty economically than we are at present.

With those few words, I thank you.

SENATOR C. LeR. TROTMAN: Thank you, Mr. President. I wish to contribute to this Debate and to support the Resolution that is before the Chamber. However, before doing so, permit me to thank all those persons who publicly spoke in congratulation to me on the occasion of my appointment to become the Chairperson of the Workers' Group of the International Labour Organisation. To those who did not get the opportunity to say that in so many words but who, in fact, indicated in one forum or another during the course of the day and before, to express my sincerest appreciation and to indicate that I have accepted your congratulations, not for myself, because I did not go seeking the office but for my organisations, the Barbados Workers Union, the Congress of Trade Unions and Staff Associations of Barbados, my country and, indeed, all people of this region who ought to be able to take satisfaction from the fact that for the first time in the history of the island, someone other than a Caucasian is being elevated to this position.

May I take a further opportunity to ask those who are still in touch with the Master to hold on for me, to give me the benefit of your prayers and encouragement because we have to succeed and to show that someone from a developing country can bear the mantle which was previously carried by Europeans only.

Sir, the business before us is one to which I wish to speak at very great length but limited by time as I am, I will not be able to speak to all of the issues which present themselves. Therefore, you must permit me to speak particularly to process.

Sir, wages settlements have nothing to do with mathematics. They do not relate to any public

pronouncements one can make because they are conducted privately between two parties or among multi-parties. Therefore, from hindsight what we might be able to say is not possible, either within the corridors that might be surrounding the negotiating chamber, or at the negotiating table itself.

I go beyond this to suggest that those persons who would seek to be leaders in this country or in any country should have, as a first demand, a requirement to do a study in negotiations; not necessarily wages negotiations but in negotiations and in conflict resolution.

I say that, not to vaunt trade union leaders in the positions that we may have, or not to denigrate any one, certainly not to speak about anything that might be taking place in this House today but rather to make the public appeal that people should understand it is very easy to argue about anything; to argue about whether Brian Lara should have or have not gotten out; to argue about whether Pedro Collins had more or fewer wickets. It is easier to disagree as to who should constitute the leadership of the team, *et cetera*. It is extraordinarily difficult to reach an agreement on anything.

It is difficult for people at any level to recognise the strands which can and must be pulled together to be the basis of concord. Whether there is a domestic dispute, on the field of sport, a political dispute within a political party or a dispute over a settlement of wages between employers and workers, it is very easy to be able to point the finger and to show where either the employer or the worker is wrong. It is very difficult to reach that point where we realise those areas which separate us and which we have tried to narrow are no longer available for further discussion and that the time has come to reach a settlement.

2.45 p.m.

In the case of the recent negotiations, the particular difficulty that I speak about has been compounded by some unfortunate pronouncements which have taken place around the country. During the by-election in 2001 statements were made on one Side of an economy in collapse and on the Other Side party faithfuls presented a picture of absolute buoyancy within the economy. One Minister said that only 80 people in the hotel industry had been laid off for the entire year when he had to know that more than 80 people in one hotel alone had lost their jobs.

In those circumstances, trade union leaders like myself found it very difficult to be able to persuade rank and file union people and other union leaders that the position which we were trying to guide was not a position based on hard reality when there was every indication that there was another side being presented.

The lesson here is that one needs to be particularly careful and one also has to be careful how one presents material because, sooner or later, what we say or do today may come back tomorrow to haunt us.

We have had some problems that were part of the difficulty leading to the protraction of the negotiations that Senator Collymore spoke to and fairness would demand we say that the Government has been trying to accommodate us and hence the length of time of the negotiations. I also agree that two-year negotiations cannot run for 16 months and we have reached the stage where two-year settlements have to be looked at very seriously especially where increments are involved.

We have finished wages but we have the problem of some of the outstanding conditions and although Senator Murray has put on the table some proposals which the Government has for the trade unions, they must be recognised as proposals because they have not yet come to CTUSAB and although they may look good, we have to examine them to see whether we are in agreement with them. I am sorry Senator Murray has presented them to this forum rather than waiting to present them after we have reached agreement on them. I feel disappointed that Government has made that tremendous lapse in its *modus operandi*.

I also wish to make the point that those persons and parties that have had difficulties in relating to the negotiations of public statements of extraordinary buoyancy of the economy would have to include the BUT and the National Union of Public Workers. Sir, the President of the BUT was present at all of the local caucuses and has participated quite noticeably and honourably. Any disagreement which she had was not put forward in any disruptive sense and, indeed, she and her colleagues always made it clear that the final decision would rest with the membership.

I, therefore, feel that Miss Whittaker should not be barracked, as in fact I recognise she has been, as not wanting to reach an agreement. We might have to blame the BUT decision-making process but not the President of the BUT because she has been President only for two terms. The BUT did not reach agreement in 2001, 1999, 1997 nor 1995. They did not reach agreement in 1991 nor 1989 and I could go further backwards and make the point that she was not the President, the Secretary or a leader for more than four years.

Mr. President, the public of Barbados should be aware that the National Union of Public Workers at the level of the General Secretary and the leadership of the Congress of Trade Unions and Staff Associations shared information openly and totally on the matter of these negotiations and it should not be perceived by any party in this country that there has been a difference in position regarding these negotiations by any of the trade unions involved.

Indeed, Mr. President, I have with me purely by accident a letter written by me to my counterpart in the

National Union of Public Workers, Mr. Joseph Goddard on May 24, 2002, which I am prepared to make a document of this Honourable Chamber. It reads:

“Dear Joe

Re: Public Sector Negotiations

You may recall that on 1 May, 2002 Patrick Frost, Hartley Reid, you and I discussed the long, drawn-out negotiations taking place in the public sector, and that we all agreed that our constituents needed to have a conclusion without further delay.

I indicated then that my most recent understanding was that the Prime Minister would direct that an improved offer be made of 3% plus 2¾% if that would effect a settlement. You and the others were agreed that this should constitute the basis for settlement, with the further provision that the flexibility allowance matter involving the Police should also be resolved.

I write to report that, following a meeting of the CTUSAB Executive on Tuesday 21 May 2002, I was directed to proceed along the lines I have described above. Regrettably, neither you nor any other delegated officer of the National Union of Public Workers was present. I have taken the action and preparations are being made for a meeting with the Ministry of Civil Service when the matter will be discussed and an understanding arrived at. CTUSAB members will receive a formal report and will be asked to take the matter to their constituents for ratification.

My thanks to you for your positive contribution during the meeting of 1 May meeting.

Faternally

LEROY TROTMAN

President”.

Mr. President, this establishes a number of things which the public of Barbados might not have known, one being that there has been full ventilation of all the issues, that there was a clear understanding by all of us regarding what is possible and not possible and I had a clear indication from everybody that I should proceed along a certain route. Therefore, the suggestion which one might wish to draw that there is an individual element within the negotiations that has taken a unilateral position is far from being consistent with the facts.

I hope it is clearly understood that there has been no unilateral behaviour or approach and that there has been full canvassing of these matters.

The decision was known to all and was understood to be reasonable by all especially since some of my colleagues were able to receive from me a report of the stage that we have reached in Barbados in the hotel industry for example, after one year of negotiations where we have no dollars or cents on the table and are still negotiating. We have to reach an agreement and we all know that whatever the politicians say on political platforms that we have a particular problem. 2.55 p.m.

Mr. President, we should examine the positions of the partners to see exactly what it is that we have been talking about. When negotiations were commenced sometime back in July 2001, the Government put 4½ percent on the table over a two-year period without determining at that stage how it was to be divided. In such circumstances if one studies an offer, it would be important for interest groups to read what that offer was saying. Was it a signal by the Government that it was making an offer from a full purse or was it an offer of a wish to settle quickly but close to the offer that was made?

We have taken various approaches in this country to the negotiation table over the years and more than anybody else Senator Collymore might remember the days when trade unions asked for 50 per cent, knowing that they were going to leave the negotiating room with 7 or 8 per cent. Sir, after some twenty-five years or so we realised that was nonsense. It was catering to all walks of people without explaining to them the need to cater to their needs. Ever since we have started building labour colleges and trying to train people and causing everybody to understand elements within the economics of negotiations. We have moved closer to positions where we ourselves as workers seek to demand something as close as possible to what we believe that we can argue for and will get. We try to encourage Governments to put proposals on the table that are meaningful and that can be the basis for negotiations.

Sir, when Senator Collymore was Chief Establishment Officer, he might remember some of those days. After his retirement, we had occasions where we had a 1/4 or 1 per cent offer on the table and we indicated that we could not start from those positions. This offer that was made was one which had to be examined very fully and we had to try to understand what it was before the workers and their leaders. The inexperienced may have misunderstood but those of us with more experience tried to interpret and to advise that we thought that here was an expression of a desire to reach a settlement quickly.

I believe that particular advice would have been taken generally had it not been for those reports I have told you about, Mr. President, and the wild claims in those reports of an overflowing treasury. The reality is that, we were seeing evidence to the contrary and as leaders we knew that there was no overflowing treasury.

Sir, no one should blame the rank and filers among the workers in any of the unions for holding on to Government's pronouncements which have had promises of increased benefits. Even though the evidence of your eyes may tell you that something is not so, if somebody comes along and tells you that it is and you are satisfied that you want it to be so, then our basic instincts would lead us to want to grab the unreal even though the real is there and it tells us something else. That is why Esau is still a very great man especially in this story about the dog, the bone and the water.

Sir, whereas rank and filers may feel genuinely and may be praised and complimented for wanting to grab more, union leaders, such as we are, have to be much more careful and we have to be governed by practical considerations, and that is what CTUSAB has tried to do.

We have to research the claim that the employer makes and not merely believe any pronouncements made on a soap box in a by-election and we have to research our own claims. We have to take care to ensure that there is sustainability in the eventual settlement that is determined, because the trade union has or must have a vested interest in the continued viability of its bipartite associates in collective bargaining.

Sir, pardon me, but an attorney may enter into a case and can deal with that case today without having to bother about what happens tomorrow because he has a case for today. He can represent you, Sir, in a suit where your wife is the other party and then tomorrow he can represent your wife where you and your wife are having another dispute. That is what an attorney can do and nobody can say that he is wrong, but a trade union is a continuous association. Sir, because of the continuity of the nature of that association, that trade union and its leader must have an ongoing relationship to ensure that there is viability and continuity and that the relationship continues beyond the settlement for that day or for that occasion. Sir, a settlement today does not mean that the company is supposed to go out of business. It means that the company must be available tomorrow, two or ten years later to provide more employment, settlements and to improve conditions.

Mr. President, by the very nature of the mandate of the trade union there is a requirement for the trade union to establish a research department to ensure that practical considerations are brought into any collective bargaining in such a manner, that we are able to direct our members. After all, they pay dues to be directed and to be directed properly.

Sir, the trade union movement has been trying in its submission, in its modifications and in its advice to its membership, to bear in mind that responsibility for viability of the establishment. We have the benefit in doing so of having been able to negotiate to have two nominees serve on

the Central Bank of Barbados Research and Think Tank Committee. That is a Committee that looks at the economy and that is able to examine what the researchers at the Central Bank come up with and to discuss those matters before the Central Bank makes its quarterly pronouncements. We are in a position, on a quarterly basis, to understand what is happening in the performance of the economy and those people have the requirement to report to CTUSAB. They are not there in their individual rights. They are there as representatives of the trade union movement.

3.05 p.m.

Those researchers plus our own research department would tell you that on the basis of hard and practical understanding of what is happening in this economy that a five per cent settlement in the public service was reasonable and that anything beyond five per cent should be directly attributable to the skill of the negotiator.

I have said, Sir, that it is vital for us to know where to settle in any set of negotiations. In May, we had reached the stage where the Government was offering five per cent and had now make it clear that that meant three per cent in Year One and two per cent in Year Two. After careful study and examination of the issues, including what had happened in the United States of America, we agreed to modify our position in the trade union movement to seven per cent. Everyone was clear that in putting that seven per cent on the table we were seeking a six per cent settlement.

Everyone was on board with that approach. For reasons best known to itself, the Government decided that it did not wish to go public as making an offer as high as six per cent and so we had significant negotiations between May and this moment. The one quarter of one per cent that separates us cannot be said by Government, to my view, to represent an inability to pay. Indeed, the Government never at any stage put forward that as an argument. It did put forward the view that the Government had responsibilities which it can best speak to where a six per cent would, as a public matter, not be in its best interests at this time.

Whether we believed that position and accepted it or not, we had to seek to get the best we could and we were able to get five and one half and then to improve to five and three-quarters of one per cent. It is at this point that we invited our constituents or the affiliates of CTUSAB to make a very critical decision and that brings you back, Mr. President, to what I said before, that one needs to know when to stop disagreeing and when to agree.

We had to decide the cost of reaching an agreement and put that alongside the cost of not reaching an agreement. In any collective bargaining exercise that equation remains constantly before us, what is the price we pay for reaching an agreement at this point and how does one compare that with

the price that we pay for not reaching an agreement at that time. As I advised my colleagues, we had to raise two questions first and then deal with each one.

The first question is: was this a matter of principle, was this a matter where a fundamental right of an individual or a country or a group of persons was being challenged and, therefore, whatever the cost we had to fight to secure it. The answer was: it is not a fundamental right, it is an interest, an attempt to get something more than there was before, something more than 5½ per cent, something more than 5¾ per cent. Where it comes down to such a matter of interest, then the second question has to be answered. What is the cost of agreeing versus the cost of not agreeing?

Our colleagues tried to anticipate their constituents as we asked them to make a determination. We do not agree with the Government and nobody did. We do not agree with the Government, so what should we do? We should have a protest, then? We should have a two-day strike, then? We should write a strong letter, then? We should go on strike for a week or two weeks, then? Or have a big march? But we would be striking, Mr. President, for what for some people is \$3.50 a month, 80 cents a week. That is what we are talking about in many instances. If we were to go out on a demonstration for two days and we lost those two days pay, as we would be entitled to do, would we reach an agreement that satisfies our constituents? Would we have been satisfied that our constituents would be happy with us? The answer that most of us arrived at is that our constituents did not want us to go that extra mile and, therefore, we tried to do the next best thing. If we do not manage to reach an agreement at six why do we not try to use whatever difference there is between the employer and ourselves and transfer that outstanding demand into other benefits that we might be able to have?

Therefore, we brought forward the question of flexibility for police allowances which was not part of the original settlement. We brought forward the matter of pensions. We brought forward the matter of injury on the jobs although we have not finalised the discretion. We brought forward the matter of part-time work and we have a number of other conditions of employment which are clearly understood to be of major priority and significance and which have to be addressed as a matter of urgency.

We are of the view that when you put those together that one-quarter of one per cent which represented the difference has been swallowed up in the settlement in a manner that gives integrity to the effort of all the trade unions.

I must say in the moments remaining to me, Sir, that I am unhappy that we have not been able to get full agreement by all the parties but I do not think it is true to

make out a case that because one union has more public sector workers than others that it is more representative, because the CTUSAB negotiates across the entire public service for all levels of public workers, in all occupations and in all trades in the public service and, therefore, is the representative body of public servants in this country. One must not make the error of getting mixed up with numbers and the comprehensiveness of numbers.

Although there has not been the possibility for what I had hoped would have taken place I am much of the view that CTUSAB has done what it ought to have done. I have no difficulty with understanding that this is a fair settlement and I am pleased to support it.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. President, I believe that the contribution we just heard should be compulsory listening or reading for every single person in this society. It was one that was delivered with reason and it clearly reflected why Senator Trotman is now chairperson of the Workers Group of the ILO and I want to begin my presentation by placing on record my own personal congratulations to Senator Trotman. It could not have been given to a finer person. He has always in his capacity of leadership within the trade union movement in Barbados demonstrated the highest level of professionalism and, indeed, it came out this afternoon in his presentation and the very sober and reasoned way he went through negotiations, allowing Barbadians to understand the process, what actually goes into negotiations and why from time to time coming out of a negotiation you might not get exactly what it is you want but, indeed, you look for a conclusion and a resolution that is satisfactory in a general sense across the board. That is what negotiations are all about. He is right. I think lots of us need to understand the process of negotiating and conflict resolution and I trust and hope that my good friend, Senator Mascoll, would have heeded the call of Senator Trotman to say, look, leadership requires people to understand what conflict resolution is all about.

3.15 p.m.

Mr. President, as I said, I am very happy that Senator Trotman has now assumed the Chairmanship of the Workers Group and I must say that over the years, I have had the good privilege of sitting on his right hand, when I was very much involved in the unions as a negotiator. Then, I sat across the table again, from the other side negotiating with Senator Trotman and he has always shown the level of maturity, understanding and high level of professionalism that one would expect from a person holding that high office.

May I say to you, Senator Trotman, indeed, like all Barbadians, I feel deeply honoured to know the position that you hold today and I know you will assume it with all the vigour that you have always shown in your entire life.

Mr. President, the Resolution before us, as Senator Trotman said, is one where one has to look across the board, to understand what it is that you want to achieve and what will guide the final result and outcome. We have heard a lot today from Senator Mascoll and as a matter of fact, after today, I understand that people like myself and Senator Trotman, will have to go back to the drawing board with the understanding that we have missed something when we have been negotiating in the past.

Senator Mascoll said that oftentimes when you negotiate downward salaries, the net result is positive for the individuals, so I believe that is one thing that has escaped us. I have always known people to want, at the end of negotiations, to have larger gross salaries, even if we all say that the tax man will take his share.

Mr. President, this is not surprising because one of the things that will forever stick in the craw of the Democratic Labour Party, has been the experience of 1991. I often wonder how it was that they were going to begin some kind of feeding process and outreach programme or find some way of trying to reach the public, to explain what and why they did what they did and how they can begin to get the confidence of civil servants.

We have seen a leader of the Democratic Labour Party, at one point in time, referring to that group as an "army of occupation". We will never forget that and then we saw another leader of the Democratic Labour Party, at a different point in time, treating those same civil servants, as if they were an army of occupation. Sir, one person spoke about it and the other person behaved in a manner that said to the civil servants you are, indeed, an army of occupation.

Sir, Senator Mascoll comes in here today and he tries to justify some position. It was like an outreach programme, trying to reach the hearts of the civil servants by saying that the Government could have paid. Sir, do you know what is amazing and Senator Mascoll has to begin to understand this because he has assumed leadership in the Democratic Labour Party, that one of the things you have to do is to understand that when you say something today, it may very well come back to haunt you tomorrow.

Last week, we were in this Honourable Chamber and Senator Mascoll was speaking on another matter, and he said to Barbadians that things were very bad and, in truth and in fact, Barbados was at the point where we now need to do some restructuring, as we did in 1991. He equated it to that time. Now, if one can assume, and it will just be only a person who really does not understand what is going on, that if what he was saying last week is true, he comes back today and says that the Government can afford to pay the extra .25 per cent. Last week things were bad in Senator Mascoll's estimation. Today, they are good. He said that the economy

is not in crisis, it is in recession but not in crisis and, therefore, as a consequence they can pay the .25 per cent.

Mr. President, I will say that in my almost 30 years involvement at one level or the other in industrial relations and negotiations, and I can say this without fear of contradiction, I have never come across a situation where .25 of a per cent has caused negotiations to break down. Maybe, Senator Trotman, whose memory is better than my own and whose experience would also be different, through all the years that he has been involved, might be able to point me to an occasion that he could remember, where .25 of a per cent would have caused a breakdown in negotiations. I do not know of it and all the signals coming from Senator Trotman suggest to me that, like me, he is also unaware of that experience.

Sir, a Government sits down with the unions, seeks to reach an agreement but not an agreement that speaks only to increases in wages because, as Senator Trotman will tell you and from my own experience, conditions of service are sometimes more important to a worker than an extra 1 per cent or 2 per cent.

Sir, for a person who is working on/off in temporary employment, and you say to him that coming out of these set of negotiations, one of the things that we will try and seek to do with your employer is to see that you get permanent employment. This worker will simply say to you, if that is the cost to me now in terms of one or two percentage points, I would love very much to have permanent employment, because it matters for all the reasons advanced today by the person who piloted this Resolution, Senator Murray.

Sir, the unions would have understood from the very outset that it is one thing to talk about what the Government is prepared to give in terms of an increase, but also equally important, were the conditions of service and the changes to conditions of service that would have also had an equal impact on the public servants.

Mr. President, I believe that if the Public Sector Reform is going to be meaningful or have impact in this country, we have to begin to look, as the Government has done, at the social cultural issues that impact people. You have a situation where a Government over the last eight years has sought to address other issues of public servants. We talk about increases in salaries, but in the Wage Bill of 1994/1995, the wages relating to the central administration stood at some \$.247 million. What Senator Mascoll will not tell you is that for 2001/2002, you are talking about \$.7 million. We are saying that the increase in wages to central administration, between 1994/1995 and 2001/2002, would have increased by 66.67 per cent and that is the level of increase in salaries across the civil service in that period of time.

Civil servants would have understood that when a Government was prepared to offer them 5.75 per cent, that they were not going to sit down for any union to tell them that it is going to look for 2.5 per cent, not at all. As a citizen, I agree with Senator Collymore but for a different reason. My experience when it comes to negotiations has been this. Anytime workers are unhappy about increases that they are going to be given coming out of a negotiation and you call a meeting, Mr. President, believe you me standing room only. However, Senator Trotman will tell you that workers also send some big signals to you when they are contented and want to move on. They equally vote with their feet by not turning up.

Anytime that you can get a union which represents 7,000 workers or more as it claims and you find that negotiations have reached a point where the union is saying to the workers that I want you to come and agree with me that we should continue to push for more or to accept and you cannot find 50 people to turn up out of 7,000, it is significant. It speaks volumes and what is even worse as if the union did not get the message, it called a second meeting and the numbers were no better. If that had a constitution which had said that you can only hold a meeting if you had a quorum, I believe all it would have said, "Look, go ahead. We have agreed." The workers would have stayed away and the leadership of the union would have got the message and we would not be sitting down today talking about a variance between Government's position, CTUSAB position or the other unions' position. Once again, it would have been an experience whereby Government and CTUSAB could have sat down and arrived at a position that was satisfactory to all sides.

In my own humble estimation, I will consider it as such because the mathematics was already put on how much the 2.5 per cent meant for some people as minimal as 80 cents. We have already heard from Senator Mascoll that really and truly what we need to do sometimes is to reduce peoples' salaries and that will bring up some people depending where you are on the scale. This is a position that the Barbados Labour Party will never take. Mr. President, I firmly believe within my heart that the civil servants who would have sat today and listened to Senator Mascoll who might have been in their cars listening to him or who might have been on the job or elsewhere would have been shocked to hear the explanation that was given as to how grateful people ought to have been in 1991 for somebody reducing their salary by 8 per cent to carry home more money. It is a kind of logic that escapes me. I believe that I will go home and try to internalize what was said. I might be able to get a better understanding. I doubt that will happen but to be honest it may be a headache. I would hope that the occasion will present itself where Senator Mascoll will be able to try to turn around that. He might be able to put a spin on it that escapes me now and possibly escapes all of us except

himself. I think that I saw Senator McClean smiling and I was saying to him across the table to let him speak, he is making sense to himself.

Mr. President, I do not want to trivialize this thing because this is serious business because civil servants have to understand that what Senator Mascoll was saying was, given the opportunity, the Democratic Labour Party would do it again. One sure good thing out of all of this is that this Barbados Labour Party Administration has put it beyond any simple majority. It is now in the Constitution. An amendment to the Constitution would have to be brought in order to tamper with it again.

Mr. President, I am saying that the civil servants understood what Government was seeking to do. The electorate is an intelligent electorate. That is why they make certain decisions. The civil servants make up a very integral and important part of that electorate. They did not turn up to the meetings that were called. They were doing so for very good reasons because they are not living in any far off land. They are here in Barbados and they understand what Government has been doing. They understand the economy sometimes better than we think and they appreciate that this Administration has not just been sitting around the table talking about money. This Administration has been dealing with the conditions of service for workers across the Public Service over the last eight years in particular.

Mr. President, I explained the position as far as salaries are concerned. The mere fact is that an effort was made by this Administration to make people's jobs permanent and to ensure that people can enjoy a pension. You will notice that in 1997-1998 Government was spending some \$80.7 million on pensions. For 2001-2002 that is moving to \$109.9 million. I am saying, Sir, that it is not just a question of salaries. It is a question of security of tenure, pensions and all the other allowances that have been improved upon by this Administration. I also note that consideration is being given to the whole question of ensuring that a person has a right in law to a pension. In essence, Mr. President, this Administration is looking at the conditions of workers and the environment in which people work to ensure that the Public Sector Reform is working. If you tune in to that station which is called WIIFM – What's In It For Me? – you will find that people listen to that station very well. You have to deal with their environment and conditions as well as you move ahead to try to change the culture within the Public Service. All I am saying is that coming out of these sets of negotiations, Sir, I want to congratulate CTUSAB. Certainly, despite the difficulties Government face and I am always amused when I hear Senator Mascoll talk about the fact that this Administration was never prepared to say that the economy was not doing as good as in previous years. From time to time Senator Murray has had to remind Senator Mascoll in this Honourable Chamber that last year in July

before September 11, the Prime Minister made it very clear that he was going back on the economy and making sure that those critical sectors were going to be given special attention to ensure that any slippage that was taking place would be corrected.

3.35 p.m.

Mr. President, no one could have anticipated September 11 2001, but if there is one thing this Administration cannot be accused of, that is doing nothing. We all recognise when there is difficulty, we will do whatever is necessary to ensure this economy continues to move from strength to strength. There will be hiccups from time to time as in anything but it is the way that, as a Government, we deal with it and the kind of leadership that is given.

Sir, I am very heartened that this BLP Administration can still give public sector workers increases to the level of 5.75 per cent and all the other associated increases and adjustments. Sir, as Senator Trotman did indicate to us, there are other issues still being discussed as a result of the negotiations for 2001 to 2003 that, in themselves, have an impact on overall costs.

One of the things we always learn in negotiations is that every proposal being put forward, indeed, has a cost as well. In fact, at this point in time, there are other things at which a decision has not been finally reached. Again, the .25 per cent that we are talking about will simply be inconsequential.

May I say to Senator Murray who was in the other capacity dealing with establishment, his Ministry ought to be congratulated. CTUSAB ought to be congratulated.

Mr. President, I am very happy to be associated with this legislation. I thank you.

SENATOR Mrs. P. E. RICKINSON: Mr. President, I rise to support this Resolution. Before doing so, I would like to offer congratulations to Senator Trotman on his new appointment and for his able leadership as head of Congress of Trade Unions and Staff Associations of Barbados (CTUSAB) of which the Nurses and Nursing Assistants Association of Barbados (NNAAB) is a member. It is a very vibrant and vocal Association that provides representation for its members at all levels. We were fortunate and very happy to be part of the negotiation which was ably led by Senator Trotman. We did agree with the proposals put forward.

In addition to these proposals I would like to speak to the progress of which Senator Murray made mention. I would like to congratulate his Ministry for making that but also to bring to his attention other areas he may need to look at regarding flexibility time.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Dame Patricia Symmonds will take the Chair at this time.

Senator Dame PATRICIA SYMMONDS took the Chair.

SENATOR Mrs. P. E. RICKINSON: Thank you, Madam Deputy President.

Madam Deputy President, although congratulating the Ministry of the Civil Service, there are other areas that still require attention. One of the pressing areas relates to the flexibility allowance, for which we congratulate the Ministry for introducing.

Unfortunately, it was only introduced for the Queen Elizabeth and Psychiatric Hospitals. There are other Government institutions that need to have this flexibility allowance, namely the Geriatric and District Hospitals, where we have a number of nurses doing double shifts, not only because of the overall shortage of nurses but when persons do not turn up for duty.

Madam Deputy President, one will find that in the rural areas those health aides will have to work the one to nine shift and if there is no one there to change that shift, they would then have to work night duty so that those older persons could be taken care of. Therefore, these health aides need to be given the flexibility allowance because they do accept the responsibility for being in charge of wards when no one else is available to look after those persons who have built this nation.

Another area is public holidays, where part-time teachers have been given public holidays but, unfortunately, nurses do not have all the public holidays. If they work the holiday it will be given, other than that they do not get it. It is given as a day off, which is wrong and should be extended to our nursing personnel as a condition of service.

Another issue is the laundry and washing allowances. We have been trying to get those allowances for the nurses at the Geriatric Hospital but it is said they have a laundry. Sir, that laundry is for the patients and not the staff. We are now having problems where some of the nurses at the Christ Church District Hospital are being transferred to St. Lucy. What is happening is that some of the nurses who used to get a laundry allowance at Christ Church are being transferred to St. Lucy and will no longer be getting it at St. Lucy. This lessens their condition of service and there is a need to look at these areas which are causing problems.

I would like to give credit to the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Health who has promised to have monthly meetings with all the associations and trade unions. He has already had one meeting with us at which NAAB was present with the transfer on the closure of the Christ Church District Hospital. He has promised faithfully that he will call

us together to have monthly meetings. I think this is a step in the right direction where issues could be brought up at these meetings and dealt with internally rather than looking as though one is trying to negotiate in public. This will augur well to the healthy development of our nation.

Madam Deputy President, the introduction of the Smart Stream system of payment is an excellent innovation but at the Psychiatric Hospital, there are still nurses who are not being paid for periods of three months. I am not blaming the Smart Stream system but the managers in these institutions because they would not forward the documents to Services Commission so that they could be sent back to the Treasury for the workers to be paid.

Madam Deputy President, we all know how much we look forward to our salaries in order to pay our bills but many of these nurses are having their electricity cut off simply because the managers would not forward the necessary information for them to be paid. Anyone who has a conscience would make sure his workers are paid.

Madam Deputy President, as we hear compensation for death, we also need compensation for injury. In nursing, the nurses have to lift patients and they suffer all sorts of back problems. Some of these nurses cannot carry out their marital or household duties. Very often, they are just pushed aside and/or sent home medically unfit. We need to look more at the injury on the job in particular as it relates to nursing. 3.45 p.m.

Regarding the new job evaluation and performance review, I am anxious to have a look at the document that is being developed because when the National Productivity Board was formed, I held the first workshop in the early 1990s in order to develop a tool for performance review. Unfortunately, I left the organisation and I do not know what happened to it so I would like to have a look at the document to see if they are suitable to nursing or if they need to be adapted to suit the nurses' situation and give some input.

As far as the temporary services for pensionable persons are concerned, it is a good innovation because we still have a lot of people acting in senior positions and luckily they have been able to go home at the higher pension even though they were not appointed. For example, if you are acting as a senior sister for three years, you will go home on the pension of a senior sister whereas before you had to revert to the lower salary and not benefit from the acting allowance.

Mr. President, I have been vocal throughout the year on the nurses' behalf and they are benefiting now even though there is still a lot to benefit from. I will support the Schedule of the various salaries but I would like the Ministry

of Civil Service to have a look at certain positions which I have mentioned before and which still exist in the Civil Establishment Order.

For example, Health Aides at Z38-30 will get higher salaries than people who are senior to them and Nursing Assistants start at Z33 even though Health Aides are not qualified but the Nursing Assistants pursue one-year of training and are qualified.

Another anomaly is the Nursing Assistant I gets more money than the Staff Nurse and according to the Nurses and Midwives Act, a Nursing Assistant must work under the supervision of a Staff Nurse. Therefore, a Nursing Assistant should not get more money than the Staff Nurse who is her supervisor, according to the laws of Barbados. For example, a Nursing Assistant I is in a salary scale of Z27-20 whereas the Staff Nurse, her supervisor, starts at Z23 to Z11. This needs to be changed so that these anomalies no longer exist.

Sir, I am also looking forward to the job evaluation so that salary can be corrected because of the great divergence in salary. For example, the Chief Education Officer gets \$2 453.22 more monthly than the Chief Nursing Officer. A principal of a secondary school gets \$906.09 monthly more than the Chief Nursing Officer who is responsible for all nursing. The principal of a secondary school gets \$1 381 monthly more than the Matron of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Sir, this is not right and I sincerely hope that the job evaluation will correct these gross anomalies and put the nursing personnel in their rightful positions.

Asides.

SENATOR Mrs. P. E. RICKINSON: I do not think we should look at personalities in the post. If the person is there and they cannot do the job, another job should be found for the person. The post should not be penalised because nursing is at the crossroads, is in crisis. Nurses are leaving the country in droves and we have to do something to stop the haemorrhage of nursing in Barbados. Sir, it is the Chief Nursing Officer who advises the Minister, who is the Leader of the Senate, on nursing matters.

Madam Deputy President, as the Leader of Government Business has accepted, nurses have been attracted overseas which shows that our public service has a lot to offer particularly where nurses are concerned. Our psychiatric trained and other trained nurses are running institutions and wards in the United Kingdom. We keep losing our young staff nurses to the United Kingdom who have been trained to take over here but suddenly they go to the United Kingdom and in less than five months they become sisters. Whereas in Barbados you have to work 20 years to be appointed as a sister or you may go home and never be appointed as a sister so we need to open avenues for our nurses. Sir, this is not difficult because it has been submitted by me in the Minority Report of the Haynes Commission.

The whole structure with the clinical pathways and the avenues where nurses could be promoted has been submitted by me and I am asking the Ministry of Health to have a look at them and see if we can get nursing moving in Barbados. I do not know what is stopping it from moving but we need to start developing our health services.

Madam Deputy President, I support this increase in salaries and I sincerely hope that the other 53 conditions of services submitted by NAAB will get a hearing from the Ministry of Civil Service sooner or later, so that nursing personnel will have improved conditions of service.

Madam Deputy President, some people are getting uniforms but the Health Aides, the lowest paid workers have to buy their own uniforms. This is not fair because cleaners, orderlies, nurses and sisters are given uniforms so why is it that the health aides are expected to take their menial salary to purchase uniforms?

I would also like to see a committee set up to interview people sent for training simply because of what is happening in the nursing services. Some people have to give sexual favours to officers, buy gin for them or take part of their salary in this year 2002 and give to persons so that they can be chosen to be sent for further training or keep their job as a substitute. Sir, it is disgraceful.
3.55 p.m.

I have talked about it on several occasions and it is still happening. Some of the officers tell them that if they keep their legs crossed they would have to stay at home and get nothing to do. I understand that years ago this used to happen in the cane fields when people were cutting the sugar cane, but it is happening right here in Barbados with our lowest paid workers. It is happening with the health aides and the untrained nursing assistants. It is happening to women and some of them are married women who are exploited. I have not heard too much about the men.

When some of these women who have qualifications go for an interview, I am told that the person interviewing them would tickle the palm of their hand, which means that they want to have sexual favours and if they refuse they do not get the job. This is something that we need to urgently look at and put a stop to it immediately. One way of doing this is to set up a committee comprising persons from the health personnel, the community and the relevant institution to interview people so that we can have substitute nurses and to give nurses the opportunity to have access to further training.

This is nothing new, the Standard of Nursing for the Commonwealth Caribbean sets out who should be on this committee. I think that the time has come for us to institute

such measures to prevent our young women from being exploited, taken advantage of or not being given the opportunity to further their training.

Madam Deputy President, I support this Resolution.

SENATOR LeR. H. McCLEAN: Madam Deputy President, first, let me join in congratulating Senator Trotman on his recent appointment. One can clearly see why he continues to ascend in the international labour arena based on the kinds of statements that he has made here today. His comments with respect to the involvement of the other unions clearly demonstrate a high level of leadership skill. Like a true leader, he stood up for those persons that he leads, and that is the other members of the trade union movement who are being pilloried by Government at this point in time.

I would like to congratulate Senator Trotman on his appointment and wish him every success in his undertakings.

MADAM DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator McClean, I think that the word "pilloried" is too strong. Could you temper it, please. I do not think that it is accurate.

Asides.

SENATOR LeR. H. McCLEAN: I withdraw the term, Madam Deputy President.

Madam Deputy President, with respect to the Civil Establishment Bill which is before us today, I would hope to see the day when we do not have to debate matters such as this in the format and the context in which we have today.

I believe that the time must come when there is some clear formula for determining salary increases which would be agreed on in principle by both the workers representatives and Government. I am aware that Senator Trotman said that it is not only about arithmetic. I agree that there must be the social and economic considerations which can come into play and which can determine what kinds of increases public servants should have and we will be able to discuss these matters in a manner which would prevent us from saying some of the things that we are forced to say in these debates.

Madam Deputy President, there has been talk about the period 1991/1992. I think that the present Administration, while they are always very sensitive when persons have to mention any of their short-comings, they are always quick to pull you to the present. However, when it suits them, they can dwell in the past forever. This matter of 1991/1992, I think that it is unfortunate that the persons who were charged with the responsibility of defending the Government's action at that time, in my view, did not do so adequately. Sir, one needs to put to rest many of the unfounded accusations

which are made about the last Administration.

Madam Deputy President, the Government of the day wants to take credit whenever the economy is doing well and they would say that it is because of the genius of the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance that the economy is doing well. From the moment that you have any difficulty in the economy they say, "Oh it has nothing to do with us" and there are external factors. It is that kind of duplicity one needs to be careful with.

MADAM DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator, that word "duplicity" is unparliamentary and pejorative. Could you withdraw it, please?

SENATOR LeR. H. McCLEAN: Madam Deputy President, to the best of my knowledge, the word "duplicity", as some of the attorneys would know...

Asides.

MADAM DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator McClean, to the best of your knowledge is not indicative of whether it is right or wrong. I have asked that you withdraw it.

Asides.

4.05 p.m

SENATOR LeR. H. McCLEAN: Madam Deputy President, I withdraw the term, but I also know that there is an expression which is used when in a law court an attorney wants to argue two positions in the same case. To the best of my knowledge, if you check a dictionary, you would see that the term that is given to that kind of approach is called a duplicity.

SENATOR K. D. SYMMONDS: On a point of order. The Honourable Senator is misleading the Chamber. The term "duplicity" as used in the law courts is really a term of art and it cannot be so loosely defined as is attempted to be done now by Senator McClean.

SENATOR LeR. H. McCLEAN: I would challenge anybody to go and pick up a dictionary and check the word. Madam Acting President, I would suggest that the young Senator checks a dictionary rather than relying on what he has heard.

The Barbados Labour Party continues to dwell on the matter of 1991-92 and, as one Senator said today, it shows that the Democratic Labour Party cared nothing about the civil servants. That is the position they are putting, but the economy of Barbados is now in recession and it is being

blamed on a single event, September 11. Everything has gone wrong because of 911, forgetting that in that period of 1991 the whole world was in recession and there was a war going on in the Gulf. People forget about this. People were in fear that the world was on the brink of a Third World War because of the Gulf War. Nobody remembers the great mobilisation of military forces that was going on around us and nobody was doing anything in the world in terms of economic development in 1991.

MADAM DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I am a bit puzzled to know exactly the relationship between that and the civil service establishment.

Mr. President resumed the Chair.

SENATOR LeR. H. McCLEAN: Mr. President, as I was saying, the whole world was in recession. All of the major economies were in recession in 1991 as a result of the war in the Gulf that was going on and the people thought they were on the brink of a Third World War and, indeed, had it not been that the leadership of the Soviet Union had been neutered at the time, perhaps Saddam would have had more military help and we would have been in greater trouble at the time. Whereas the members of the Government continue to talk about all of these things that are going on and that everything was local. This is where the point I am making links to this debate, because in leading out of this debate Senator Murray made the point that whatever happened in 1991-92 was home-grown and said that there was no relevance whatsoever to what was going on in the rest of the world.

Whenever anything that is happening is good, this Government wants to take credit, but as soon as there is a hiccup, somebody else has to take responsibility. You cannot have it both ways. Mr. President, I am saying that whatever is happening in the Barbados economy now is the responsibility of the Government of Barbados. What is happening now is also home-grown.

Mr. President, this debate on the Civil Establishment Order, indeed the whole debate on what will happen to civil servants' salaries, has brought out some very worrying statements. We have had attacks launched on the leaders of trade unions in this country, merely because they disagreed with Government's position. To the best of my knowledge, this is still a democracy. People have a right to speak whenever they choose on the issues with which they are concerned.

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: Mr. President, on a point of order, the Honourable Member is misleading the Chamber. I, as one who piloted this Bill and made certain observations on what happened in some of the unions, could in no way be construed as attacking the trade

union leadership because it disagreed with Government. It is uncharitable. It is untrue, and that is not the position. We merely reflected what had happened with the membership of the unions and the leadership.

SENATOR LeR. H. McCLEAN: Mr. President, because a trade union leader disagrees with an initiative taken by Government, that person is accused of taking a political position as if they are not entitled to take a political position.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Are you suggesting that attacks were made in this Chamber? Is that your suggestion?

SENATOR LeR. H. McCLEAN: Mr. President, in leading off, Senator Murray referred to the political leanings of the leader of the Barbados Union of Teachers.

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: Mr. President, again the Honourable Member continues to mislead the Chamber. I do not know if he is so severely rattled by the horror of 1991 that he cannot think straight. The point is that I did not say so. I made some observations that some persons have said it might be construed as political but I never attacked and talked about the political leadership of the BUT. That is too well known for me to have to state the obvious.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Can we move on, Senator McClean.

SENATOR LeR. H. McCLEAN: That went over my head. Mr. President, the leader of the BUT has every right to be critical of Government if she so chooses, regardless of what political organisation. She has been attacked not only by members on that side but she has also been attacked by the Prime Minister of this country about political leanings.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator, Senator Murray has said that he has not attacked the person whose name you mentioned in this Chamber. I do not recall hearing that. I have suggested that you move on. I am not aware that any other Honourable Members of the Senate made any such comment. Please let the debate proceed and at the kind of level to which the Senate has become accustomed.

SENATOR LeR. H. McCLEAN: Mr. President, I served as vice president of the Barbados Union of Teachers for three years and during that time I know that that union has always approached any salary negotiations as a matter of principle and, therefore, there is no president who can go out there and take a personal line or a personal position on any salary negotiation because the Barbados Union of Teachers is made up of people of every political persuasion. You cannot go out there as a president of the Barbados Union of Teachers and carry a political line. You have to take the position of the union membership.

I would also like to remind Honourable Members of the fact that in 1976 there was a political position taken by a union leader at the time called O'Brien Trotman. He took a political position and he was rewarded right after the general election.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator McClean, I am not going to permit you to proceed along those lines. I would ask you to let us keep personalities out of this debate. This is my ruling and please continue bearing that in mind.

SENATOR LeR. H. McCLEAN: Mr. President, I would like to say that when Government wants to attack persons based on the positions they are taking they must also remember what other persons did at other points in time. 4.15 p.m.

Mr. President, I respect your ruling but I would just like to advise the Honourable Senators that they cannot frighten me off this position.

We have the point of inflation as it relates to wage increases. It is interesting that when I saw the figures on inflation, it occurred to me that perhaps, if I plotted a graph to show the relationship, my explanation would be a lot clearer. It is interesting that in the years 1997/1998, when inflation was about 4.5 per cent or thereabouts, there was a salary increase of over 6 per cent, both at the top and the bottom. In fact, the last time there was any difference between the top and the bottom, was in the years 1995/1996 when they were about 2.5 per cent at the top and 3.5 at the bottom. Then, in the years 1996-1997, it merged and they have moved together ever since then. Then, in the years 1998/1999, it dropped from over 6 per cent down to 3 per cent.

It is interesting that the years 1997/1998 increase, was just before the 1999 election, because the election was in January 1999. Immediately after the election, the next increase dropped from the over 6 per cent to 3 per cent. Then, it went back up to 4 per cent and in the year 2000, it was back down below 3 per cent. It is now back to 3 per cent and next year it would be down to 2.5 per cent. While inflation in the year 2000 was about the same as the increase, inflation would be about 3.5 per cent this year, which is above the increase, and possibly about 4 per cent or 4.5 per cent next year.

Sir, there is no difficulty in determining this because one is aware of the fact that the impact of taxation, and the fact that with the downturn in the economy, many of the persons providing goods and services will increase their prices in order to compensate for the reduction in the level of business that they are conducting, so prices will go up. Therefore, one can expect that there will be an increase in the rate of inflation this year and next year but, already the workers are locked into the 3 per cent and the 2.5 per cent.

SENATOR C. LeR. TROTMAN: Mr. President, I hate to do this, because I do not like interrupting Honourable Senators, but the Honourable Senator misleads this Senate on two counts. Firstly, is that he is giving the impression that the Government grants increases but the trade unions have fought over all the years for settlements. We do fight but we do not always get what we want. Secondly, we negotiate on a historical basis. We negotiate after the cost of living and we do catch up. Therefore, for the Senator to put that out, is to suggest that the trade unions have, in fact, not been doing a proper job. I apologise for having to do this, but I cannot permit you to put the trade unions in a bad light.

SENATOR LeR. H. McCLEAN: Mr. President, I certainly have no intention of putting the trade unions in a bad light and I take the point that Senator Trotman is making. I have no such intention because I am a trade unionist first and foremost. I have no difficulty in bowing to his assessment but certainly that is not my intention. I am well aware of the fight that the trade unions must put up, particularly when they are dealing with the Barbados Labour Party Government, so I have no difficulty in giving way to that point.

Sir, the point I am making is that while the trade unions have to fight and do fight, the fact remains that the Government still has to make a decision on where they will end the negotiations, as they have done now. It is strange that there is always this sort of relationship between important electoral events and the changes in the salaries of the workers, as happens with most other things in this country at this point in time.

Sir, as I heard Senator Trotman say before, when we look at the fact that while the Government's decision not to pay the increase of .25 per cent is no indication of the Government's inability to pay – I have not heard anybody on the Other Side dispute that it is not the result of the Government's inability to pay the .25 per cent – then, what is the problem? Why is the Government unwilling to pay the .25 per cent, if it is not because of the inability to pay. Has it got anything to do with the recent visit of an IMF team to this country?

Asides.

SENATOR LeR. H. McCLEAN: Has it got anything to do with the fact that maybe at the first sign of difficulties in the economy, the Government is quietly trying to appease the International Monetary Fund or any other agency? One has to ask that question because the point of the matter is, as Senator Mascoll said, it is not the .25 per cent but the fact that the Government does not want to go to 6 per cent. Perhaps the figure of 6 per cent is the problem and not the .25 per cent.

Sir, in a situation where this country is building its foreign reserves purely on the basis of borrowing, then obviously, persons in the international arena might be asking, how it is that you have to rely on borrowing to shore up your foreign reserves but yet you want to pay public servants 6 per cent. When we consider the position that has been taken by these institutions over the years with respect to the level of wages and salaries – because the first thing that they go after is a reduction in the Government expenditure, and the main area of Government's expenditure is wages and salaries, so that is the first thing that will be attacked – one has to ask the question again, whether or not there was any discussion with respect to the level of salary increases for the public servants during the recent visit of the IMF officials.

Senator Williams made a point, probably the only point he made in his presentation, about the increase in the Wages and Salaries Bill. He made a great song and dance about over \$700 million being paid over a period of time in salary increases.

4.25 p.m.

Mr. President, one has to ask the question, why is there this great increase in salaries? It is not because of any large increases that were agreed to in salary negotiations. It is because in recent years we have had a number of things happening. One is that the casual persons have been made permanent and, obviously, Government wants to take credit and say they have made these casual persons permanent, yet Government want to moan because it has to pay increased salaries. One follows the other.

Secondly, Sir, in order to compensate for the reduction in employment in the private sector, Government has been employing a lot of people in those sectors. Therefore, while absorbing the increased number in the public sector, there will be an increase in the wages bill. These are some of the difficulties with which Government finds itself now facing. If they are going to pad the labour force in order to make the employment figures look good...

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: Mr. President, the Honourable Member has to know that using the term "padding" the labour force has an unsavoury meaning attached to it. It is not healthy. It is objectionable and I would beg him to withdraw it.

SENATOR LeR. H. McCLEAN: Mr. President, these increases in the numbers of the labour force obviously impose some problems for Government. Perhaps we need to get this economy to the state where the productive sectors are working.

Government has been raking in a lot of money on VAT because inflation increases mean prices are increasing, therefore, more money is being spent, even if one is not

receiving the same in goods and services. As a result of the productive sectors not working – manufacturing is about dead; tourism is in a serious state of decline when other countries are now realising an increase in their tourism; agriculture which apparently is almost completely dead, particularly the sugar industry. Therefore, if any of the productive sectors are not working, then persons cannot be employed in the private sector and, therefore, Government has to employ those persons because Government wants to be able to show off good unemployment figures.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: On a point of order. The Honourable Senator is misleading the Senate.

Sir, figures will show that the proportion of persons employed in the public sector in relation to the total work force has not increased over the past few years. In the last six to seven years there were approximately 25 000 persons working and the public sector has only increased by approximately 2 000. Therefore, to say the public sector was being "padded" is to go against the facts and the Honourable Senator is misleading this Chamber.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Please proceed. No point of order. Senator Barker, you will have an opportunity to address the Chamber.

SENATOR LeR. H. McCLEAN: I thank you, Sir. I wanted to remind Senators that the figures went from 20 000 to 27 000.

Mr. President, I would hope one day these matters could be discussed in a different form and format rather than the way in which it is being approached now. Sir, I hope we will come around to understand what is happening in the year 2002. If we take a serious look at what is happening, we will recognise this is a 10-year cycle. Obviously there is something fundamentally wrong with our economy if every 10 years we are going to find ourselves edging into an economic crisis. Sir, it has happened in 1971, 1981, 2001. We need to do something to address the basic structure of our economy if one is going to avoid having to go through this exercise every 10 years.

Sir, coming out of the 1991/1992 situation, there were certain measures being put in place which, fortunately for us, saved us from a devaluation of the Barbados dollar and set the ground work for a restructured economy. Even though the present Government did not build on that ground work in the way they should have and proceeded with further restructuring of the economy, we were still able to enjoy 8 years of continuous growth. Therefore, this shows that if we put enough thought into what we are doing in terms of the restructuring of the economy, we will be able to get out of these peaks and troughs that we are currently

experiencing. If, as always is the case, Members of Government would resist the temptation to shoot the messenger and to deal with the problem, perhaps we will have a stronger economy.

Mr. President, whereas one cannot oppose any increase in salaries for public servants, and I would take the advice of the Honourable Senator Collymore, there is no way I would vote against an increase in salaries for public servants.

Sir, I would hope Government would see it fit to address some of the deeper problems we have in this society. I have seen where Government is now proposing to have a compensation for public servants who have gotten killed in the line of duty. Sir, what about the measures to reduce the possibility of those public servants being killed in line of duty? In fact, measures to reduce the level of fear that exists in this country as a result of the crime and violence that is taking place.

Government has boasted about the number of persons appointed in other Government departments. What about the increase in the number of policemen for which both the former and present Commissioners of Police have been calling? One can increase the number of Personal Assistants to Ministers. I have seen the list of persons working in the Prime Minister's Office, which seems to be getting longer. They can increase the number of postmen and all kinds of persons employed ...

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator, I cannot increase your time. You have one minute left.

SENATOR LeR. H. McCLEAN: Thank you, Sir. One can increase the number of persons in all departments. I would hope they see it fit to increase the number of persons in the Police Force so that they can deal with this monster of crime that exists in this country. Also that Government would take some measures which would reduce some of the social pressures that lead to that increase in crime. I thank you, Sir.

SENATOR Miss J. C. ODLE: Thank you, Mr. President.

I would wish to start first by adding my few words of congratulation to those already stated in this Chamber to Senator Trotman on his appointment to the Committee in the International Labour Organisation.

I believe this has come about because of what I will refer to as "the masterful way" Senator Trotman handles negotiations and conflict resolutions. One of the things he has stated earlier today is that anyone seeking leadership, the first order of business should be a study in negotiations and

conflict resolution. Sir, I take that to heart and would heed the Senator's words.

Sir, I must say the Senator is an individual who could put fear in any one's bosom. He is so articulate in his way of doing things that one could almost feel defenceless. I hold him somewhat in awe and look forward to the day when I am able to emulate the position of groups on behalf of Barbadians, with the same flair and style as the Honourable Senator.

Sir, I want to make a few comments on the item before us. It is massive in its construct and has been very carefully negotiated and orchestrated by the various entities having responsibilities for bringing such an item to this Chamber. I commend all groups who have made their contribution in this regard.

One of the previous speakers, I believe it was Senator Mascoll, spoke about this Administration having no conscience. I want to remind him that this Administration in dealing with the affairs of this country, whom we have been elected to serve have more than a conscience. Sir, one of the early initiatives of this Administration was to amend the Constitution which prohibits any changes in salaries to the detriment of public servants. This was occasioned because of the attack on public servants by the cutting of eight per cent of their salaries.
4.35 p.m.

This Administration has sought to increase salaries each and every time there is negotiation. At no time was there no increase in the salaries of workers in Barbados in the public sector over the last seven years. I feel this is important because when we talk about salaries we talk about individuals' ability to manage their household. Sir, we need to talk about salaries against the background of building self-esteem so that an individual is inclined to give of his or her best at all times and if that individual is comfortable, an administration should not seek to disenfranchise him or her.

The question was also asked why we should pay taxes but, Sir, the more you earn, the more taxes you should pay. I look forward to the day when everybody is earning more and, therefore, making it possible to pay more taxes.

Reference has been made to the salaries of maids and the comparison was also made between the higher paid workers and lower paid workers. I wish to speak about this category of worker. It is a fact that in excess of 70 per cent of women are heads of households. I am aware that predominantly women are maids because in Barbados maid work seemed to have been relegated to women only. This represents individuals who have to take their earnings, satisfy an entire family and stretch that dollar as far as it can go.

I believe that some consideration should be given to legislation which would see maids work for not less than a certain amount. I know there is the feeling that when a salary is legislated that is the only salary that individual may get but there are other entities in Barbados which have minimum charges. So, for the work of maids and low grade workers there should be a "not less than" position as well.

Sir, I am well aware that people take advantage of maids. A previous Senator spoke about the things women have to do in order to keep their jobs and even though it is low-paid work, they still have to "offer up themselves". I am aware that this happens in the lives of maids and, Sir, it must be stopped.

I know this might sound like a digression from salaries but the same comment was made on the floor of this Chamber about nurses and I believe that no individual, male or female, should have to use their body to keep a job or in addition to the salary they receive. Sir, I am making a call for a minimum wage for this category of worker.

On the other side of the coin, I want to suggest that the work of a maid must be seen for what it is worth. Everyone who has this category of worker in their environment must recognise the value because those of us whose lives are filled with many interests need help at home and the person who provides this help is valuable to us and should be seen in this way. We should make sure they are paid significantly and commensurate with the work they do.

Senator Collymore spoke at length about pensioners and I laud and agree 100 per cent with what he said. Although I am far away from being a pensioner, if we keep moving in this direction, by the time most of us in this Chamber get to pensionable age, we can also be beneficiaries. He said there are about 8 000 people collecting Government pensions and made reference to the fact that in seven years BARP has 7 000 members. I want to commend the Administration for making sure that pensioners receive an increment each time there is a negotiation.

I recall when this administration took office, one of the first things it did was to increase pensions. Old people were singing our praises because there were no increases in pension for many years before that but the Barbados Labour Party in 1994 was able to provide this increase for them. Sir, every time there is a negotiation, it is essential that that category of individual who would have some of the same pressures as those of us who are working and drawing a salary and who may have the fortitude and energy, because we are young, to do more than one job, may be put in a more comfortable financial position.

4.45 p.m.

I also want to touch briefly on teachers. I know that Dame Patricia will handle this area in great detail but I have

to say that the teaching profession is one which many men have not ventured into in recent times. As recently as last week at my alma mater, Foundation School, it was said that they wished that they had more male teachers. We know that in studies that were done in the past on the issue of male marginalisation, the rationale for fewer men entering the teaching service was that salaries were not attracting males to the profession.

I believe that these increases today should go towards encouraging young men as well to get involved in the teaching service and to make their contribution at that level in terms of the development of the young minds in Barbados so that there would be a balance in terms of the delivery of education. I believe it can only redound to our benefit.

I would wish to commend the Administration especially when they are doing things that are democratic, proper and have at its centre the improvement of the quality of life of the people of this country.

Sir, the police and prison workers are in line for amendments to their benefits. This is a category of worker who works under extreme stress. We want to have people who feel that while they are executing the job that they set out to do, that they can do it to the best of their ability. We all know that if stress is an issue you cannot perform to your optimum.

Sir, as you go through life, you meet all kinds of people and you hope that one day you may be able to make a difference in their lives. I have a friend who works in one of the services that I described earlier, who calls me at least once a week. Whenever he calls me and there is something wrong I can hear it in his voice. It is sad when you think that someone who has to execute his work needs someone to lean on.

Mr. President, I wonder if within the realm of the service there is not the possibility to create a rotation of duty. For example, people who operate a computer daily would have some challenge. I wonder if it is not possible for persons who work within the prison and the police service to be taken off the frontline at times and put in another area periodically. I believe that system would have a tremendous impact on the quality of the human resource and the way these individuals are able to function in their role so that they would not be constantly under pressure.

Sir, we all know that it was the final straw that broke the camel's back. I do not believe that we do not want in the public service to break under the weight. They are human beings like all of us and have a tremendous role and responsibility to play in the security and development of our nation. I believe that wherever possible, where there is stress, confrontation, threats to security and safety, these types and classes of officers should have some opportunity to rotate in their duties.

I am fully in support of the Resolution before us and as the years go by and we are given the opportunity by the people to execute the business and affairs of this nation that we continue to always put at the forefront conditions that would redound to the benefit of the individuals who, as the public servants of this country – and I quote from “Going Public” an extract from the Deputy Governor of the Central Bank of Barbados:

“The public service of a country exists to facilitate the country’s efforts to achieve those goals that the government (and people) of a country considers being important, and, to the extent possible, to prevent the occurrence of events of their consequences that the country (and the people) consider undesirable.”

Sir, I must “big up” the civil servants, to use the vernacular so to speak, in continuing their charge and wherever possible execute the highest level of professionalism in a manner that is beneficial to all Barbadians.

I thank you, Sir.

SENATOR Dame PATRICIA SYMMONDS: Mr. President, I wish to say that I am very please to support this Resolution. Although I wish to avoid repetition, I most certainly would like to congratulate the Government, especially the Minister of Finance, on the wise management and sagacious leadership which has enabled Government to give increases in a time of recession.

The trade union movement also deserves praise. It has for many years given dignity, respect and comfort to the working class, locally, regionally and internationally and there is a maturity with which the trade unions here in Barbados approach things. I do wish to refer to the Barbados Workers Union in particular. There is the concept of what is best for Barbados and that means worker, employer and Government.

Mr. President, I also have to say that the Barbados Secondary Teachers Union, with which I have been long associated, has shown an understanding of the reasons why a settlement has to be reached and where and why it was reached.

Heartiest congratulations are due to Senator Leroy Trotman for his statesmanlike approach to the resolving of an issue which recognised Government’s position on the one hand and on the other sought to satisfy the workers and their needs and also sought to find the point with which both sides would be comfortable.

There has been unreasonableness displayed by some members of CTUSAB as a whole. Senator Murray has elaborated on the many important improvements that have

taken place in the public service under this administration and this has to be taken into account.

Mr. President, it is not total sweetness and light since, to use a cliché, “no organisation is perfect” but, on the whole, we are fortunate in our civil service and the workers deserve the increase. When you reach a settlement, Mr. President, it boils down to a judgement, a judgement based on what is satisfactory. It also hinges on the judgement of astute leadership and that has been displayed.

Therefore, I wholeheartedly support the Resolution.

Thank you, Mr. President.
4.55 p.m.

SENATOR THE REV. L. W. B. ROCK: Mr. President, I rise to make a brief contribution to this very interesting debate which has been going on. I want to commence at the point at which Senator Murray exhorted us to see the proposed remunerations not solely in terms of the finances but to see them in terms of the persons who serve this country faithfully every day. I would want to associate myself with him and others in praise of the public service for the service which is rendered to this community.

I would also like to embrace the opportunity of remembering those – and we have been challenged to remember the pensioners – the persons who served this country faithfully in the past and who have brought to the public service professionalism which has enabled us to be where we are in terms of the quality of service rendered.

We can be justly proud of our public service and it is important that not only the Senate but the community in general acknowledge the service rendered by those persons who daily must deal with the public at different levels and exercise patience and tolerance and seek to help people as they face them in the several and varying areas of responsibility.

I think, however, Sir, that while we praise them, we need also to put in place urgently and I know Senator Murray has reminded us of public sector reform but there must be an urgency in upgrading and improving the quality of service so that our public service can be relevant to the present times and to the demands which are being made at this time.

I want to bring to attention and I am sure that many of us are aware of certain weaknesses in the service which need to be addressed with some urgency. I refer, Sir, to the delays that some people experience in the public service. We have been made aware for instance of what has happened in the Town and Country Planning Department. We have been made aware of complaints which persons have had to make

with respect to the delays in the payment of unemployment in the NIS and other areas of the public service where there is a need to upgrade the quality of services so that our citizens will benefit from the speed of handling things.

There is one particular area which I am sure this Chamber is not unaware of, and I refer to the experience with some persons who are temporarily employed in the public service with respect to the long delays in being paid. This has been drawn to my attention and in talking to persons within the service I am told that this is not a new experience, it is something that has been going on for a long time. I think that what is important in terms of the quality of service is the satisfaction which people receive, not only in the time that is taken to pay their salaries but also whatever can be done to motivate persons and to make them feel that the service which they render is valued.

I wish that urgent attention be taken in this particular area where temporary workers will not have to work for months in some instances and not receive their salaries because they have to live. Since this has been going on for such a long time I see no reason why steps should not be taken to address it very urgently.

I feel also that in addition to the remunerations that more attention has to be paid to the environment in which people work. We have had in the not too distant past the incident in the Registry where persons because of faulty air conditioning have had to go on strike. The environment in which people work is very important in terms of the safety that they feel and how they are motivated to give of their best. While it is true that efforts are being made to provide and enhance those conditions, I believe that there is an urgency about it and more care needs to be exhibited in terms of providing conditions which are healthy and conducive to work.

The other point that I would like to make has to do with the observation made about those unions which could not reach accord with those that were in accord with the proposals. There is a sense in which some may lament and regret that all the unions did not agree. I believe, Sir, that it is a very healthy sign in the society that within a democracy there is that freedom for people to feel that they can disagree, stand on principle and not be made to feel that they are traitors. I am not suggesting that this is what is being construed here. Certainly, it is not.

In the context in which we live, every effort and everything that states very positively that we live in a democracy where there is freedom for disagreement contributes to the health of the society in respect to the democratic way of life which we have embraced. I think that this is important for us and I am glad that I live in Barbados in a democratic state where organisations and institutions have that freedom to disagree, to stand on their principles and I believe that rather than being a sign of people being

adversarial in their response I think that it is good for our society because we need not only to talk about democracy but to see that democracy at work.

With these few comments, I support this Resolution.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Mr. President, I rise to support this Resolution which is to give effect to an agreement reached between Government and CTUSAB with regard to public officers' salaries and wages and I want to join others in congratulating the CTUSAB leader for his elevation. I want to say it is not only a personal honour but it does credit to the whole nation. We know that he is going to operate in such a way that this island will get the credit.

Sir, the question of the emoluments to public servants has to be important to any government. Wages and salaries represent about 35 per cent of government expenditure. Therefore, any movement in wages and salaries would have an effect on government expenditure and by extension on the economy as a whole. We know that from our own experiences, and all of us have lived through some bad experiences, that if there is a tremendous increase in government expenditure it can have serious effect on the rest of the economy. Government has to ensure that at all times it keeps the reins on expenditure because we saw what happened in the late eighties when government expenditure was allowed to run away and we all paid for it a couple of years later.

Government has another objective. It has to make sure that the level of employment within the economy is such that it leads to social cohesion and social progress and stability. That is why the Government must be highly commended when at the onset of the crisis of September last year it stated categorically that it will not shed any public sector jobs, that it would ride out the crisis without losing a single public sector job.

5.05 p.m.

Sir, it shows that the Prime Minister had the boldness and the implicit faith in not only the labour movement but in the people of Barbados, and he can depend on them to be reasonable and to take into account the national good. He could not make that statement if he knew that he had a union leader to deal with, which would make exorbitant demands upon him and would end up with him having to eat his words, as it were.

Sir, the Prime Minister has confidence in the trade union movement. I am sure that it is reciprocated and that is why I believe they were able to come to an agreement, after much debate and soul searching. Obviously, we could all say that it should have been higher, but there are one or two things we must note. Higher wages would obviously result in high expenses for the Government and at the same time, would send a signal to the remainder of the economy and encourage them to do things which are not sustainable.

If the wage settlements are too high, it becomes unsustainable and it could result in the very thing that we want to avoid, that is, job losses.

Sir, I am particularly pleased that in spite of the difficulties we had in the last nine months from September last year, our unemployment rate has not increased significantly. Sir, it is very important to note that in the midst of the crisis, we are still, because of the partnership between the Government, the labour movement and the employers – the tripartite arrangement – managing to ride out the crisis without significant losses of jobs. This is very important, especially in a small economy like ours, when we saw the effects job losses had on families and on the aspirations and lives of people.

We have to do everything in our power to avoid any such repetitions. It is a political imperative, economic imperative and a social imperative that we do everything in our power to ensure stability in the job market. If it means taking a less percentage point, in order to maintain job security, it is a sacrifice that any right-thinking person would say, “Yes, I would work towards a better day but in the circumstances, I have to ensure that the national good takes place”. As I said before, the preservation of jobs has to be the important item on the national agenda.

Sir, it is good to note that over the past eight years, the private sector has led in the creation of jobs. Contrary to what the Senators for the Democratic Labour Party are saying, over the past several years, we have had over 28 000 jobs created in Barbados. The number of employees moved from around 100 000 in 1993 to 128 000 last year and that is found in the publication of the Central Bank. In the year 2001, we had 128 000 persons employed. We have created 28 000 jobs since the year 1993. Of those 28 000 jobs, about 3 000 or 4 000 were created in the public sector, so to say that there has been padding and all that, as we heard some Honourable Senator say, and to say that the public sector is creating all the jobs, is to fly in the face of the information.

The private sector contributed to the reduction in employment, to avoid the public sector having to carry all the weight. The public sector has its share. There are about 3 000 or 4 000 more jobs in the public service but the bulk of employment was created in the private sector.

I heard Senators making that point on many occasions and I cannot seem to get them to read the information. It is here in black and white, so it is not my information. It is the information put out by independent sources indicating that we have managed the economy in such a way that there has been current expansion in the private sector and they are the ones that are creating the impressive job opportunities that are in this country.

We cannot do so, if we allow our production cost to escalate. We have to be very careful about our production

cost and that is why this Government has sought to reduce energy prices, which is a major component of production cost. We have ensured that the pay raises of the workers of this country, especially public workers, over the past seven years, have been always a point or two above the rate of inflation, so that is a matter of historical record.

There were one or two occasions when the rate of inflation was higher than wage settlement and the following year that was corrected. For example, in 1996, the inflation rate was 4 per cent and the wage settlement was 3 per cent, but the following year, when the inflation rate was 4.7 per cent, the wage settlement was 6.25 per cent, so that more or less compensated. Sir, the unions always go back and look at what was the rate of inflation since the last agreement, and look at the historical information and base their claim and settlement on the rate of inflation that was there for the last year or two.

The workers, especially the public workers have always managed to be a step or two above the rate of inflation and, given the fact that a lot of the public sector workers work on the incremental system, it means that they have had an improvement in their standard of living and, Sir, that is important. Once the level of settlement is above the rate of inflation, given the other incentives within the public service, the workers have managed to increase their standard of living.

Sir, if in this day and age, the workers are getting an increase which keeps them at their same standard of living, that is to be highly commended. In these difficult times for that to happen, it is a tribute to all of us that we are putting our hands to the plough to make sure that the economic state is in good order.

We are not asking the workers to suffer a cut in their standard of living. We are ensuring that there is a small improvement in their standard of living at the same time, not compromising the national economy, given the perilous times that we are experiencing.

Sir, the question of whether or not the Government can afford \$2 million or \$3 million, is not really the point. The point is, what are the national objectives and what signal would we be sending to the remainder of the economy, because do not forget, a lot of employers look at the wage settlements in the public service as a guide to how they should handle their workers. The Government has to make sure that it is always sending the correct signal to the rest of the economy. As I said before, we have to be always mindful of the fact that wage cost is a significant component of overall production, whether it is the tourism sector, the manufacturing sector or whatever sector. Again, we have to be very careful that we send the correct signals to the remainder of the economy.

5.15 p.m.

There is no sense in giving a 20 per cent increase if within the next two years the person does not have a job. All of these things the negotiators on both sides have to bear in mind and come to an agreement. I share Senator Trotman's sadness in spite of the dialogue of hearing a word like "manipulation" and other terms which are unfortunate. I do not think that the union leaders in Barbados can be manipulated. They have been through the horn pipe and they have dealt with so many things.

In the final analysis, the workers of Barbados have got to learn to stick together. There may be differences but in the final analysis the workers have no friends but themselves, as it were, and they have to fight as a unit in order to ensure that the progress which we have made as a nation since the 1940's and 1950's is not compromised. The same force that drove us together in those days should keep us together now, especially since we are facing some very serious challenges from international situations. The workers need to stick together in the face of globalization because there is a different character to the whole labour/employee relationship. I call on all labour leaders to recognize the time in which we are living and to pull together and I speak, Sir, as a former union leader myself. I know that there is an urgent need for this kind of relationship to develop and flourish.

Sir, there is also the point about the tax settlement. The Prime Minister is on record as saying that there is going to be tax reform in Barbados. That is a matter of record. He said that recently and things are being put in place. Of course, we only do things after consultation with the wider society. We are having consultation on the whole question of tax reform and pension reform, which is dear to us, especially members of BARP.

This question of tax reform is seriously attracting our attention. We have had studies done on these issues and we are about to invite the public to make recommendations. At the end of the day we will come up with something which is sensible and workable which will redound to the benefit of all Barbadians. We know that we stick to our manifesto pledges. We make promises and we perform.

Sir, I share Senator Collymore's concern for the pensioners who have retired now for quite a few years. Their plight is not the best and I feel that as a society we have to be concerned when any one sector is not doing as well as it should. It is something that I know will come up with the whole pension reform.

Sir, I commend these measures to the House. They have my support because they put aside their personal feelings to work for the good of this country. I feel that at the end of the day the country as a whole will benefit from the consensus that has been reached between the workers through their representatives and the Government. I believe that the Public Service of Barbados will respond positively

to this and continue to give us the good work to which we have all become accustomed.

I thank you, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Laurie.

SENATOR C. K. LAURIE: Mr. President, just a very brief intervention. When I heard about tax reform and pension reform, it reminded me that we also have public sector reform. We have heard of that since 1994 and I have not seen anything happening. Only today, I went into a public office to collect a form and there were twenty people ahead of me in the queue and I had to stand for half an hour in order to get a form. Is this Public Sector Reform? Can you imagine the Prime Minister said that I am going to give \$250 000 to the Barbados Agricultural Society for institutional strengthening? We have gone to the Ministry of Agriculture and a senior public servant there said that if the Prime Minister said that he should not have said it. If he did say it, he did not mean it. I could not believe my ears that a public servant could say what the Prime Minister is saying is rubbish. This is nonsense and not one cent of that amount has been disbursed.

Sir, nobody is going to grudge the public service an increase. However, we should have some kind of answer. Well, you get an increase. What are you doing to improve the service to the people of Barbados? It is still at a very unacceptable level.

I had an opportunity last week in Belize to work with the Ministry of Agriculture. I have never seen a Ministry of any sort in Barbados like what I have seen in Belize. These are people working together and the whole atmosphere was good. I went there at 6.30 p.m. one afternoon and there were Heads of Departments still at their desk in a cheerful mood and seeing that the farmer is the client. That is such a refreshing change. Sir, most of the time I get the impression here in our Ministry of Agriculture that they see themselves as policemen. They make sure that the farmer cannot get one thing more. There may be one or two dishonest farmers who may try to get an incentive that is not due to them. But think of the other 98 per cent who are trying their best.

You go there and take a bill and then there is the bureaucracy of the thing. They say that they cannot pay it because it has to go somewhere else. They cannot seem to sit down and work out a simple formula for doing things efficiently. I do not think that we should stand for this and we have to do something about it. The politicians are saying things. The Prime Minister in his Budget Speech gave incentives to agriculture and I was the first person to get up and say that this is fantastic. The morale of the farmers is very low. The Agricultural Development Fund came through last year in Parliament and opened officially in December last year and not one cent has been disbursed.
5.25 p.m.

Mr. President, when one sees this form, one would have to have a degree in agriculture in order to get it filled out to make the application. This is nonsense and there is no way one could tell them it is. They say this is the way they have created it, a person either uses it to apply or that person does not receive any of the benefits. This is not acceptable. I thank you.

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: Mr. President, I rise to conclude what I do consider to be a most enthralling debate, and for several reasons. There are a number of issues to which I would like to deal with before I get into the throes of the debate and the presentations by various Members.

Sir, I would like to assure Senator Rock that, regarding the issue of temporary workers not being paid for months, it has nothing to do with the lack of finance to pay them. Unfortunately, there are some persons in the public service who do not manage their time or duties very well and who do not do the necessary paper work in order to allow persons to be paid on time. Sir, it is the method by which some persons administer the system and we are working very hard to correct that situation.

Senator Barker has already dealt with the issue of employment in the public sector. I want to assure him and the others that people are not just being employed willy-nilly in the public sector but temporary workers applications have to go before the Ministry of Civil Service justifying that application. A recommendation is then sent to the Office of the Prime Minister, where it is either approved or disapproved, depending on the merits of the case. Therefore, Sir, there is a tight control on the creation of jobs.

Senator Laurie's seeming frustration with the Ministry of Agriculture is not typical with the public service. There are persons at Government Headquarters who work every day and late into the nights. We still have a production team. I would think if there is a quarrel with us regarding that alleged confrontation with a senior public officer, he should put it in writing, addressed to the Prime Minister to see that it does not just end there.

Sir, on the other hand, the Prime Minister has said those who want to spend the public's funds have to be accountable. There has to be accountability and transparency because it is the public's purse and therefore, cannot be dispensed or dispersed of willy-nilly.

Sir, Senator Rickinson raised a number of concerns regarding flexibility and laundry allowances pertaining to nurses. I would like to assure her that I have taken special note of these issues and will see what can be done to rectify them as soon as possible. Senator Rickinson should also make her protestations known to the Ministry of Health which could then begin the proper procedure for their rectification.

Sir, this debate was memorable for a number of reasons, for a number of the speeches made. It was memorable in the case of Senator Trotman who brought a great deal of calm and rationality to the debate. Senator Trotman was able to defuse the politics of the situation. In my judgement, he was able to reinstate a great deal of reassurance and to instil confidence in the trade union movement of Barbados when he gave a historical record as to how negotiations and settlement have been arrived at. It must mean a great deal to society to restore the faith and trust of persons in the integrity of the trade union movement. It has further justified in our eyes the high regard in which he is being held internationally. No wonder he has been able to succeed in those international arenas that we have commended him for earlier today.

Sir, Senator Trotman has made some memorable quotes of which I would like to repeat for the record. One of them that we should regard quite fondly is when he said "...wages settlements have nothing to do with mathematics..." That is a very pithy statement and helps to explain the fact that figures cannot just be juggled, especially by those persons who think they have been well schooled in economic analyses.

Senator Trotman also said "...one needs to know when to stop disagreeing..." That is a very sound statement. I think there is a great deal of wisdom in it for us to remember, employ, analyse and assess situations.

Sir, overall his contributions have lifted the debate to a much higher standard. In fact, it was truly statesmanlike and for that, I wish to commend him.

Sir, unfortunately, I cannot say the same thing of Senator Mascoll. His, is memorable for a number of different reasons. As I listened to Senator Mascoll, I recalled something my mother would have said. She would make statements to the effect, "he or she bright but duh ain't shining." I think that is a Bajanism that says a great deal about it.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator, I would wish that you reflect on the context of the Senator's Speech rather than on his personal character or...

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: Sir, I assure you that was only meant based on his presentation. It has nothing to do with him personally. We are both Combermerians and have high regard for each other.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am reassured.

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: I think, Sir, one of the things I would remember most in this Debate of Senator Mascoll's contribution, is a statement he made when he said "...in spite of the eight per cent pay cut, workers took home more pay than before the adjustments..." I think that is a gem which I will treasure forever and to

which I will make constant reference. It is so illuminating that I shall not just let it die a natural death. I shall have to give the author great credit for it whenever I speak about it.

Sir, at this time in the Crop Over tents, I know some persons will say that he should be a comedian but I would not say that but I think it is a very revealing statement. Another revealing statement is when he goes on to say "...the DLP has nothing to be ashamed about its 1991 management of the economy and all that ensued thereafter..."

Sir, this reminded me of a statement made by the DLP some time ago that if they had to cut salaries, they would do it all over again. This was said with no sense of remorse or regret. The DLP Administration has never yet come to the public and said they are sorry for doing what they had done. Sir, I think that is something that will always stand clearly in the minds of, not only myself, but of the public. They cannot be assured that once again, they would not be subjected to a systematic and cruel cut of their livelihood and their competence in themselves and in the economy.

Sir, it also reminded me of that famous quote in Rio when he said "...to build, one must first destroy..." and, therefore, you cut, but then make better by giving more. This is really deep economic analysis that I am still trying to grapple with and hope some day I would come to fathom it.

Sir, we, on this Side, are very appreciative of the support that was given to the measure. We have taken careful notes of the worthwhile suggestions, recommendations and observations made. I have the greatest pleasure in begging that this Resolution do now pass.

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

ORDER NO. 4 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE
CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (TEACHERS)
(AMENDMENT) ORDER, 2002

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: Mr. President, I beg to move that the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 2002, do now pass.

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

ORDER NO. 5 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (PART-TIME
OFFICERS) ORDER, 2002

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: Mr. President, I beg to move that the above-named Order be now passed.

The question was put and agreed to.

ORDER NO. 6 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE MINISTERS AND PARLIAMENTARY
SECRETARIES (REMUNERATION AND
ALLOWANCES) ORDER, 2002

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: Mr. President, I beg to move that the above-named Order be now passed.

SENATOR B. R. COLLYMORE: Mr. President, it seems from the Schedule to the Resolution that Parliamentary Secretaries are not getting 5.75 per cent increase in salary and maybe the Minister can tell us if there are special circumstances.

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: Mr. President, as far as I know this merely represents a repositioning of the level of Parliamentary Secretary *vis-a-vis* those of Deputy Permanent Secretary. In the past they were overshadowed by the Deputy Permanent Secretaries who reported to the Parliamentary Secretary and this is meant to correct that anomalous situation.

The question was put and agreed to.

ORDER NO. 7 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE
SENATE AND HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY (RE-
MUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES OF
MEMBERS) ORDER, 2002

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: Mr. President, I beg to move that the above-named Order be now passed.

The question was put and agreed to.

ORDER NO. 8 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE RATES
OF SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES APPLICABLE TO
THE POST OF PERSONAL ASSISTANT TO THE
PRIME MINISTER, EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO
THE PRIME MINISTER, THE PRESS SECRE-
TARY AND EXECUTIVE PERSONAL SECRE-
TARY AS SET OUT IN THE FIRST SCHE-
DULE TO THE RESOLUTION AND THE
RATES OF SALARIES APPLICABLE
TO THE POST OF CLERICAL ASSIS-
TANT TO THE PRIME MINISTER
AS SET OUT IN THE
SECOND SCHEDULE

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: Mr. President, I beg to move that the above-named Order be now passed.

The question was put and agreed to.

ORDER NO. 9 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE RATES OF SALARY AND ALLOWANCES APPLICABLE TO THE POSTS OF PERSONAL ASSISTANTS TO MINISTERS AS SET OUT IN THE SCHEDULE

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: Mr. President, I beg to move that the above-named Order be now passed.

SENATOR C. LeR. TROTMAN: Mr. President, I beg to move that the Schedule be amended at Part 2 to read April 1, 2002.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. President, I beg to second that.

The question that the Resolution be amended to read April 1, 2002 was put and agreed to.

ORDER NO. 10 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE PAYMENT OF AN INCREASED OF COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE TO GOVERNMENT PENSIONERS

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: Mr. President, I beg to move that the above-named Order be now passed.

The question was put and agreed to.

ORDER NO. 11 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 3(2) OF THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL (CONDITIONS OF SERVICE) ACT, CAP. 6 THE AMENDMENT OF THE SCHEDULE TO THAT ACT BY DELETING PARAGRAPH 1 THEREOF AND SUBSTITUTING PARAGRAPH 1 AS CONTAINED IN THE SCHEDULE TO THIS RESOLUTION

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: Mr. President, I beg to move that the above-named Order be now passed.

The question was put and agreed to.

ORDER NO. 12 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE JUDGES (REMUNERATION AND PENSIONS) (CONDITIONS OF SERVICES AND ALLOWANCES) (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS, 2002

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: Mr. President, I beg to move that the above-named Order be now passed.

The question was put and agreed to.

ORDER NO. 9 (recommitted) – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE RATES OF SALARY AND ALLOWANCES APPLICABLE TO THE POSTS OF PERSONAL ASSISTANTS TO MINISTERS AS SET OUT IN THE SCHEDULE

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: Mr. President, the date on this Resolution is a typographical error and should read 2002.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The Senator is explaining that our documentation has a typographical error. It should have come from the Other Place bearing the correct date of 2002. I would like to get a consensus from all Honourable Members that it should now read the year 2002.

I now rule that the Resolution be now passed.
5.45 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. J. X. WALCOTT: Mr. President, I beg to move that the Senate do now adjourn *sine die*.

SENATOR B. R. COLLYMORE: Mr. President, I want to speak to the adjournment. During the course of the debate I agree with Senators who said that it was noble and proper but there is only one little matter which we now cannot go into discussion on because we do not want to deny anybody an adjustment.

I think that if there is any substantial variation being made in any legislation or any level of remuneration that it is the responsibility of the Government and the officer making the presentation to draw that to the attention of this Honourable Chamber so that Members may be properly guided.

In one of the Resolutions before us, it is now clear that an adjustment other than the accepted level of 5.75 per cent was made to apply. Though I do not wish to begrudge an adjustment to anyone, I do not think that this House has been properly served by not being given prior notice and being allowed to debate the matter. I hope that an appropriate response would be made and I hope that this would not be repeated.

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: Mr. President, I take the Honourable Member's protestations and observations to heart. I must point out that information was circulated to all Members.

Asides.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I will have speeches and not dialogue. Any other Senator who would wish to speak, I now permit to do so.

SENATOR C. LeR. TROTMAN: Mr. President, I think that if there is a major change in conditions unrelated to the norm which was 6.75 per cent, that the Senate should have been apprised of this. To enter a change in salary from April 1, 2002, when the increase was 2.75 per cent, a change that is nearly 50 per cent, I think should be explained as a regrading of some sort and an explanation given to the House.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Perhaps, Senator Collymore could explain the specific Resolution to which you refer.

SENATOR B. R. COLLYMORE: Sir, I am speaking of the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remunerations and Allowances) Order, 2002, the second part of the Schedule Page 3. On Page 2, for the year 2001, the salary of the Parliamentary Secretary is \$66 432 whilst with effect from April 1, 2002, it jumps to \$97 008. That represents approximately \$2 000 a year less than a Minister. I think that an explanation should be given to this. This is most unusual, Sir.

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: Mr. President, I have to make it clear that the information was circulated to all Honourable Members and I made it clear at the outset of the debate that we would be debating all the Resolutions at the same time. I would have thought then that during appropriate time of the debate Members would have made their observations.

Sir, there can be no thought of any slip through when a document had been properly circulated ahead of time to all Members. It was there for all Members to see.

Sir, for sometime Parliamentary Secretaries have been paid at the S5 level, which is lower than the Permanent Secretaries. It was thought that this level was unrealistically low and, therefore, it was proposed that effective April 1, 2002, the salary will be regraded to the same level of Permanent Secretary, S1. The document reflects that decision in the sense that it reflects the change in salary.

Asides.

SENATOR B. R. COLLYMORE: Sir, I raised with the Minister, before the Resolution was passed, the matter that struck me most forcefully. I asked him how is it that the salary increased to \$97 008 and the Minister did not give this kind of explanation.

Mr. PRESIDENT: We are on the motion of adjournment and this is not a full-scale debate. Senator McClean you can make a brief intervention.

SENATOR LeR. H. McCLEAN: Mr. President, we came here to discuss certain Civil Establishment matters and we thought that these other matters were merely formalities, in that they all reflect the same level of increases. I would believe that in good faith, the Honourable Member should have pointed out to Members...

Mr. PRESIDENT: You cannot suggest that there is a breach of good faith.

SENATOR LeR. H. McCLEAN: I will withdraw that, Sir.

I believe that it would have been better if the Honourable Minister had pointed out to members that in one of these items there was deviation from the 5.75 per cent increase that we were discussing. It was generally accepted that all of the revisions would be at the same level. I think that the Honourable Member should have brought that to the attention of Members and I do not think that was very gracious.

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: Mr. President, all I can say is that the other Members have not done their homework.

Asides.

SENATOR THE HON. G. S. H. MURRAY: Let me repeat myself. I explained at the beginning of the debate that we would be debating all of the Resolutions at the same time and, therefore, the debate was open for any comment to be made on any Resolution.

The question that the Senate be adjourned sine die was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
5.55 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Parliament Buildings on Wednesday, 3rd July, 2002 at 11.00 a.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR
THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PRESIDENT 1

PAPERS

Senator the Hon. J. X. WALCOTT 1

1. Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 2002.
2. Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 2002.
3. Civil Establishment (Part-Time Officers) (Amendment) Order, 2002.
4. Judges (Remuneration and Pensions) (Conditions of Service Allowances) (Amendment) Regulations, 2002.
5. Ombudsman (Salary) Order, 2002.
6. Parliament (Administration) (Salaries) Order, 2002.
7. Judges (Salaries) Order, 2002.
8. Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances) Order, 2002.
9. Senate and House of Assembly (Remuneration and Allowances of Members) Order, 2002.
10. Value Added Tax (Refund) (Malcolm Grimes) Order, 2002.

MOTIONS RELATING TO THE SITTING

Senator the Hon. J. X. WALCOTT 2

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Senator the Hon. J. X. WALCOTT 2

1. Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 2002.
2. Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 2002.

3. Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Part-Time Officers) Order, 2002.

4. Resolution to approve the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances) Order, 2002.

5. Resolution to approve the Senate and House of Assembly (Remuneration and Allowances of Members) Order, 2002.

6. Resolution to approve the rates of salaries and allowances applicable to the post of Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister, Executive Assistant to the Prime Minister, the Press Secretary and Executive Personal Secretary as set out in the First Schedule to the Resolution and the rates of salaries applicable to the post of Clerical Assistant to the Prime Minister as set out in the Second Schedule.

7. Resolution to approve the rates of salary and allowances applicable to the posts of Personal Assistants to Ministers as set out in the Schedule.

8. Resolution to approve the payment of an increased Cost of Living Allowance to government pensioners.

9. Resolution to approve in accordance with Section 3(2) of the Governor-General (Conditions of Service) Act, Cap. 6 the amendment of the Schedule to that Act by deleting paragraph 1 thereof and substituting paragraph 1 as contained in the Schedule to this Resolution.

10. Resolution to approve the Judges (Remuneration and Pensions) (Conditions of Service and Allowances) (Amendment) Regulations, 2002.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR
THE PRESIDENT (Recommitted)

Mr. PRESIDENT 2

PUBLIC BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 3 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE
CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL)
(AMENDMENT) ORDER, 2002 2

Senator the Hon. G. S. H. Murray, 2, 38; Senator C. A. Mascoll, 9; Senator B. R. Collymore, 16; Senator C. LeR. Trotman, 19; Senator J. E. D. Williams, 23; Senator Mrs. P. E. Rickinson, 25; Senator LeR. H. McClean, 28; Senator Miss J. C. Odle, 32; Senator Dame Patricia Symmonds, 34;

Senator Rev. L. W. B. Rock, 34; Senator T. E. Barker, 35; Senator C. K. Laurie, 37.

ORDER NO. 4 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (TEACHERS) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 2002 39

Senator the Hon. G. S. H. Murray, 39.

ORDER NO. 5 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (PART-TIME OFFICERS) ORDER, 2002 39

Senator the Hon. G. S. H. Murray, 39.

ORDER NO. 6 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE MINISTERS AND PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES (REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES) ORDER, 2002 39

Senator the Hon. G. S. H. Murray, 39.

ORDER NO. 7 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY (REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES OF MEMBERS) ORDER, 2002 39

Senator the Hon. G. S. H. Murray, 39.

ORDER NO. 8 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE RATES OF SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES APPLICABLE TO THE POSTS OF PERSONAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRIME MINISTER, EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO THE PRIME MINISTER, THE PRESS SECRETARY AND EXECUTIVE PERSONAL SECRETARY AS SET OUT IN THE FIRST SCHEDULE HERETO WITH EFFECT FROM THE DATES SHOWN IN THE FIRST SCHEDULE 39

Senator the Hon. G. S. H. Murray, 39.

ORDER NO. 9 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE RATES OF SALARY AND ALLOWANCES APPLICABLE TO THE POSTS OF PERSONAL ASSISTANTS TO MINISTERS AS SET OUT IN THE SCHEDULE 40

Senator the Hon. G. S. H. Murray, 40.

ORDER NO. 10 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE PAYMENT OF AN INCREASED COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE TO GOVERNMENT PENSIONERS 40

Senator the Hon. G. S. H. Murray, 40.

ORDER NO. 11 – RESOLUTION IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 3(2) OF THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL (CONDITIONS OF SERVICE) ACT, CAP. 6 OF THE SCHEDULE TO THAT ACT BE AMENDED BY DELETING PARAGRAPH 1 THEREOF AND SUBMITTING PARAGRAPH 1 AS CONTAINED IN THE SCHEDULE TO THIS RESOLUTION 40

Senator the Hon. G. S. H. Murray, 40.

ORDER NO. 12 – RESOLUTION THAT THE JUDGES (REMUNERATION AND PENSIONS) (CONDITIONS OF SERVICE AND ALLOWANCES) (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS, 2002 40

Senator the Hon. G. S. H. Murray, 40.

ORDER NO. 9 – (Recommitted) 40

Senator the Hon. G. S. H. Murray, 40;
Mr. President, 40.

SUSPENSION 16

ADJOURNMENT 40

Senator the Hon. J. X. Walcott, 40; Senator B. R. Collymore, 40; Senator the Hon. G. S. H. Murray, 40; Senator C. LeR. Trotman, 41; Senator LeR. H. McClean, 41.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

BARKER, Senator T. E.
COLLYMORE, Senator B. R.
GOLLOP, His Honour Senator Sir Fred
LAURIE, Senator C. K.
MASCOLL, Senator C. A.
MCCLEAN, Senator LeR. H.
MURRAY, Senator the Hon. G. S. H.
ODLE, Senator Miss J. C.
RICKINSON, Senator Mrs. P. E.
ROCK, Senator Rev. L. W. B.
SYMMONDS, Senator Dame Patricia
TROTMAN, Senator C. LeR.
WALCOTT, Senator the Hon. J. X.
WILLIAMS, Senator J. E. D.