

---

# THE SENATE DEBATES

## (UNOFFICIAL REPORT)

---

PARLIAMENT 2003 – 2008

---

### THE SENATE

*Thursday, August 4, 2005*

*Senate 36, sequence 05, 11.00 a.m.*

#### RESUMPTION

Mr. PRESIDENT: This Sitting is resumed.

ORDER NO. 2 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE  
THE BORROWING OF THE SUM OF \$5 000 000 IN  
THE CURRENCY OF THE UNITED STATES OF  
AMERICA FROM FIRSTCARIBBEAN

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR THE FINANCING

AND PROCUREMENT OF VEHICLES AND

EQUIPMENT FOR THE SANITATION

SERVICE AUTHORITY.

Senator the Hon. E.R. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, the Resolution before us is seeking permission for the Government to borrow US\$5 000 000 for the purpose of purchasing vehicles and equipment for the Sanitation Service Authority. It is proposed to borrow this sum of money from the FirstCaribbean International Bank, having looked at a number of other possibilities and has set out in the Schedule to the Resolution before us, the following terms:

A seven-year repayment period, by quarterly installments. An interest rate of 150 basis points over the three months US LIBOR rate. The loan is to be drawn down in three tranches of \$2.5 million each. There is an arrangement fee and there is a commitment fee, which is a quarter per cent per annum of the undrawn portion of the

facility, commencing 180 days after the date of the borrower's acceptance of the offer for finance.

On the basis of the latest information which I have seen, in relation to the three months rate, at present the interest rate is approximately 5 per cent but that will change, depending on how the three-month rate changes from time to time.

The Sanitation Authority, as all of us know, has a responsibility for the collection and disposal of refuse, cleaning the streets of Bridgetown and the environs, the operation of public baths and conveniences and the administration of the five public cemeteries.

The Sanitation Authority is entirely funded by the Government. It raises a small amount of revenue from burial certificate fees, and the collection of commercial refuse, which is paid into the Consolidated Fund and there is an item of expenditure raised to support the functioning of the Sanitation Authority. At the moment it is approximately \$27 million.

Sir, for purposes of administration, the Authority has divided the island into four geographical districts. The Southern Area, which comprises the parishes of St. John, St. Philip, St. George and Christ Church and they make up 17 routes. The St. Michael East area, which comprises a section of the parish of St. Michael and a part of Christ Church, making up 13 routes. The St. Michael West comprises a section of St. Michael, which has 15 routes. The Northern area, comprises the parishes of St. James, St. Peter, St. Lucy, St. Thomas, St. Andrew and St. Joseph, which has 13 routes. They have broken up the island into these geographical areas so as to give them a better opportunity to properly manage the garbage disposal system.

Sir, over the years, the institution had a number of challenges, largely because of inadequate equipment and the fact that the vehicles have a useful life of about seven

years, because of the nature of the work in which they are engaged, unusual wear and tear on the equipment, the type of activities the equipment is involved in and so on, and the Sanitation Authority has suffered several problems from the breakdown of the equipment, inadequate replacement arrangements and so on.

In spite of those challenges, I do not think any of us can do other than to say that over the years, the Sanitation Authority has done an outstanding job in dealing with, what in my view is an extraordinary amount of garbage and refuse that we produce. I am amazed to hear that every day, the Sanitation Authority takes to the Mangrove Landfill, 700 tonnes of garbage. When the General Manager told me that, I asked him to repeat it and he pointed out to me that not so long ago, there used to be about 500 tonnes.

I am sure that everyone in here would agree with me when I say that is an extraordinary amount and we have really reached the stage, where we need to proceed without unnecessary delay, on the issue of sorting our garbage and separating and all of the other things that would allow us to reduce the amount of garbage which the Authority would have to take daily to the landfill.

*Senate 36, sequence 05, 11:10:14*

*Thursday, August 04, 2005*

SENATOR the Hon. E. R. GRIFFITH: The Sanitation Service Authority has four sites which it has to manage. In addition to the Mangrove Landfill, the Sanitation Service Authority operates a bulky waste site at Bagatelle, St. Thomas, where metal and such materials are disposed of, an asbestos site at Rock Hall, St. Philip and the site at Lonesome Hill, St. Peter where it takes blood and things from the slaughter houses.

Mr. President, all of know that there have been problems at the Mangrove Landfill from time to time but the Sanitation Service Authority has been able to bring significant improvements to the management of that facility. Sir, even though there is an occasional odour one has to admit that in recent years the situation has been a vast improvement over what it used to be because it is being managed in a very satisfactory manner at the moment. The cemeteries are fairly well-kept and projects are being implemented to improve their upkeep.

The Sanitation Service Authority now finds itself with a new task where it has to deploy people along the highways to take up the litter which our citizens are throwing on the highways without a worry. Mr. President, if you pass along our major highways from time to time you would notice a number of bags with litter neatly tied. That now takes up some of the resources of the Sanitation

Service Authority when we as responsible citizens ought to operate in a different manner.

Mr. President, the unfortunate thing about this is that since the Sanitation Service Authority started to provide that service the litter has increased as if people were there waiting for somebody to come behind them to take it up and have now decided to throw more things out of their car windows or bring the packages from home a few miles away from their district and dump it.

Mr. President, as responsible citizens, we really have to change our attitudes when it comes to the question of garbage disposal and things of that nature. Yes, the Sanitation Service Authority does a good job but it puts an unnecessary strain on them and takes them away from their major areas of activities.

Mr. President, in spite of all of these problems, the Sanitation Service Authority still continues to do a good job. Even recently when they were experiencing problems with the old trucks which they have, they had back ups in certain districts. The management of the Sanitation Service Authority put in place a programme to try to deal with that situation by changing the working hours and putting on additional shifts.

At the present moment, the Sanitation Service Authority has under its control a number of vehicles but in order to do a proper job it needs to have at least 35 vehicles working at any one time. Within recent times the Sanitation Service Authority was well below that number, in fact they presently have 26 vehicles which are functioning well and they are having repairs done to a number of others to bring them back into use. Mr. President, with the 26 vehicles that are working and with the rearrangement of their programme by starting early on mornings and putting on some extra shifts on certain routes they have been able to bring that situation, which a few months ago was in chaos, into an orderly fashion and have improved the collection of garbage and refuse significantly.

Mr. President, the proposal before us is seeking to provide them with financial resources that will allow them to purchase some new equipment. I have been advised by the management of the organisation that some of the equipment is already on its way and will be arriving in Barbados some time soon and hopefully early in September they would have all of the equipment.

Mr. President, I say equipment because it is more than vehicles that are being purchased. A number of vehicles, compactors and other trucks, are being purchased, but they will also be other types of equipment that would allow them to take care of all of the activities for which are responsible. This will give them the opportunity to bring their fleet beyond the minimum that they would require and

will put them in a position to continue to improve their collection and disposal of garbage.

Mr. President, I would still like to appeal to those who could help the Sanitation Service Authority, to take greater care of the type of garbage which they put out for collection. I used to live in another place at some point in time and I always had to remark about the operation of the Sanitation Service Authority there. I knew the day on which the truck would come to collect normal garbage. However, I dare not put out in that garbage any card boxes, bottles, newspapers or anything like that. I took my bottles to designated sites and put them in the Skip or whatever piece of equipment was placed there on that site for the collection of bottles because I could not put them in the garbage. If I did that, they would be put back there and just the normal garbage would be taken away.

Mr. President, I also knew the day on which the truck would come for card boxes. I had to flatten them and prepare them in a certain manner and put them there and the truck would come and collect those. I could not put them out with the normal garbage, they were collected separately.

Mr. President, I was advised by the General Manager of the Sanitation Service Authority that they tried that not so long ago in Swan Street, where they asked people to put out the card boxes in a certain manner and not to mix them with the garbage and so on. He said to me, and this does not surprise me, that in the first week everything went quite well but by the second week people were back to their old habits and the workers of the Sanitation Service Authority were having more difficulties with them for asking them to do these things in a particular manner to facilitate the collection and disposal of the garbage, then if they were stopping them from functioning.

Mr. President, that is because we have become fairly indiscipline in many respects of our life in this country. We always have a reason why we should not try to do things in a better way.

*Senate 36 Sequence 6*

11.20 a.m.

*Thursday, August 04, 2005*

SENATOR the Hon. E. R. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, we are always very quick to know what others should do, when it comes to dealing with situations, but when we are called upon to play our part, to make our contributions, we always have excuses as to why we should not do them. It is time that we learn to take on our responsibility in relation to the disposing of garbage, et cetera.

I trust that as the Sanitation Service Authority seeks to improve its operations, that the members of the respective communities will play their part, by shouldering their responsibilities and reducing the amount of garbage that has to be taken to the landfill on a daily basis, which is said to be approximately 700 tons. If that were gold we were producing, I would be happy because 700 tons is such a large amount that I am sure we would be making much profit from this venture.

Sir, of course, there is much money to be made out of the garbage but I think that the Sanitation Service Authority having to collect 700 tons of garbage daily to transport to the landfill is too much.

Mr. President, this would not be the first time that the Authority would be purchasing equipment, as it has always been doing so, but I want to make reference to a particular issue, because from time to time I hear complaints being made about a number of things. Sir, as usual, the Authority went out and invited a number of tenders for the supply of this equipment, including persons with whom it had dealt in the past, and ended up selecting one of the companies that tendered.

Mr. President, there was a company from which the Authorities had bought equipment in the past, which apparently felt that on this occasion, the Authority should have accepted their tender. When that did not happen, there was then the usual complaints.

Mr. President, I wish to state very carefully, that having checked all the information provided to me by the Authority, it suggests a number of things. The last set of equipment, particularly vehicles which the Authority had purchased from that company, left the Authority with several problems. Sir, within six months, the Authority had significant problems with the rear end or the differentials as they are known. What the Authority found out was then when they had approached the company, it had no backup services here to assist them in solving this problem. They then turned to the agent here for that type of equipment, who, quite rightly said that it was not their concern. Therefore, officials from the Authority had to make their way to London to deal with the suppliers, although representatives from that company were there, but in the final analysis, the Authority had to seek its own solution to the problem.

Sir, there were a number of other issues in relation to that company and, therefore, having been bitten once, the Authority became twice shy and decided that they would draw on their past experience in making an assessment as to whom they would do business with at this time. They then chose a local company that has after-sale services. Sir, because of the poor after-sale services that they had encountered on the last occasion, they are now determined

not to go that route again. Therefore, having weighed all the factors, the Authority, in my view, had made the correct decision, and in this regard I have to support them.

Mr. President, as I have already said, the equipment is needed to allow the Authority to get its fleet back to an appropriate level that will permit it to execute its responsibilities properly, and I believe that all Senators will support it because of their desire to see the Authority functioning properly and because they acknowledge it will not be able to do so without the appropriate equipment.

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

SENATOR F. J. STUART: Mr. President, I am indebted to the Honourable Senator for the information which he has shared with the Senate in his introductory remarks.

Mr. President, the Sanitation Service Authority has rendered inestimable service to the people of Barbados over the last 30 years. It was established by an Act of Parliament which came into effect on March 01, 1975, at the tail-end of the administration of the Democratic Labour Party and over the last 30 years, has served this country well. Its functions as set out in the Act are:

(a) to remove refuse from any premises as authorised by the Minister;

(b) to sweep, cleanse and water streets;

(c) to provide and maintain in a sanitary condition, suitable places, buildings and appliances for the deposit, disposal, or destruction of refuse;

(d) to provide and maintain public baths and public sanitary conveniences; and

(e) to provide and maintain cemeteries, burial grounds and crematorium.

Mr. President, in the discharge of its functions over the last 30 years, it has to be conceded that the Authority has made commendable effort. Sir, over the last 18 to 24 months, complaints have begun to surface about the performance of the Authority, because when a Government begins to fail, even at the level of the collection of garbage, it is necessarily a cause for popular concern. These very basic functions had been carried out routinely by the Authority over the years but over the last 18 to 24 months, the people of Barbados have had just cause to complain at the irregularity and the inconsistency with which these functions were being met by the Authority.

11.30 a.m.

*Wednesday, August 4, 2005*

SENATOR F.J. STUART: Sir, recently in a visit to Emmerton in the city of Bridgetown, the Minister of Finance pleaded guilty to every count in the indictment read by the public in respect of the functioning of the authority. He said that the poor performance of the authority in recent times was his fault and that the Minister of Finance had not made available to the authority the funds needed to carry out its statutory functions.

Sir, Senator Griffith in his speech made it clear that the equipment and particularly vehicles usually have a life of seven years. It is my view that if a Government knows this, that proper foresightful planning should lead it to make proper preparation for the replacement of vehicles needed by so important a statutory authority whose functions are ultimately linked to the maintenance of good health and environmental standards in Barbados.

Mr. President, as it turns out, even in this area, the Government has failed. Today, it comes before the Senate with a Resolution to borrow US\$5 million to finance the purchase of vehicle and equipment for the authority.

Mr. President, I share the concerns of the Leader of Government Business about the expanded function of the authority because there is in Barbados today, a fairly casual approach to the disposal of garbage. In fact, we are very indisciplined in that area and routinely as you drive behind a vehicle, some passenger will throw a parcel through the window on to the highway, sometime a box from Kentucky, Chefette or something else and go merrily along. It then falls to the unfortunate person who works in the Sanitation Services Authority to clean up that kind of mess.

Mr. President, we have discussed in this country taking a strong statutory, parliamentary stance on this whole business of littering. I do not think we have walked the walk as much as we have talked the talk. Sir, the stage has to be reached where as a country, we have to take a firm stance against the practitioners against this kind of indiscipline. I am in total agreement with Senator Griffith that we have to confront this issue and confront this type of indiscipline.

Mr. President, there are inefficiencies at the Sanitation Services Authority which has led to complaints in recent times. I think it is an axiom of public administration that wherever there are inefficiencies somebody, somewhere is benefitting from it. I think the most cryptic part of the speech made by Senator Griffith was the area in which we need the most clarity, who buys vehicles for the authority, what are the terms on which these vehicles are bought and what are the after sale arrangements in respect of these vehicles.

Mr. President, Senator Griffith is quite right that there is a lot of talk going around in this area. I had hoped that in his speech when he touched on this issue that at last we were going to get some solid information on the basis of which we could make an informed judgement but, Senator Griffith carefully skirted that issue.

Mr. President, I suspect that speculation would continue and the whispers will continue as well. We can only hope that the fact that Senator Griffith raised it all and the fact that Opposition is taking cognisance of the fact that it has been raised, would give cause to any persons who think that supplying the Sanitation Services Authority is some fruitful avenue for undisguised profiteering.

Mr. President, Senator Griffith also drew attention to the fact that 700 tons of garbage is collected daily and carried to the Mangrove Landfill which is a massive amount of garbage. Senator Griffith also made mention of the fact that there were some management problems at the Mangrove Landfill but that there were largely brought under control although from time to time there is a little stench here and there.

Mr. President, I had hoped in this speech here today that the goodly Leader of Government Business in this Chamber would have updated us on the status and the state of readiness of the landfill at Greenland which has been in existence for some considerable time and on which we can get nothing concrete in terms of a way forward from this Government.

Mr. President, I do not even know if anybody can say with any certainty what is the cost of that landfill lying idle at Greenland in the parish of St. Andrew. It was built against the advice of local experts. It was built against the advice of people who know the area and in spite of the fact that the Scotland District Association formed a company and went to court in an attempt to halt the process of the Government in that regard. Sir, in defiance of all that, I am given to understand that \$40 million lie idle at Greenland but this Government has refused to account to the people for it. We cannot get any indication as to when this landfill is going to be opened and the expenditure on it be justified. We do not know and we are no wiser after the speech of Senator Griffith today.

Mr. President, I want to call on the Government to break its silence on this issue because we cannot continue to have so many millions of dollars lying down when we complain of having garbage disposal problems in Barbados. We were solemnly assured that the people of Arch Hall would have been relieved of the incubus that Mount Stinkeroo was supposed to be.

S36/11:40

## Sequence 8

Thursday, August 4, 2005

SENATOR F.J. STUART: I would have been relieved of the incubus that 'Mount Stinkeroo' was supposed to be. Far from being relieved, Mangrove has been expanded by this regime and the people of Barbados need to know where do we go from here in respect of the future of Mangrove and the landfill at Greenland.

Sir, having said all of that, I do not think that an authority that has served Barbados as well as the Sanitation Service Authority has over the last thirty years, should be enmeshed in this kind of controversy and, therefore, made to suffer starvation of funds which it so badly needs to return to its former days of efficiency in the discharge of its functions. Therefore, we on this side are minded to support this Resolution, but we do so in the hope that the Government will make clear to the people of Barbados, soon rather than later, what is the national policy on the issue of the disposal of garbage. More particularly, what role will Mangrove, the controversial project at Mangrove, play in the elaboration of this policy?

We support the Resolution and look forward to some clear answers from the Government in respect of this issue.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Sir Alan Fields.

SENATOR Sir, Allan FIELDS: Mr. President, I rise to support this Resolution in its entirety. Nobody can suggest for a moment that the Sanitation Service Authority should not be properly equipped to carry out its mandate, which it has been doing and doing well. I think it is absolutely true to say that overall the Sanitation Service Authority has done an outstanding job, without question. It is also true to say that in recent times the situation at Mangrove has improved tremendously.

Mr. President, the Minister stated that in recent times the disposal of garbage has increased from 500 tonnes to 700 tonnes; we live in a society that is increasingly a 'throw away society'; do not fix or repair things, we throw them away and buy new things. Sir, this 700 tonnes will inevitably increase, whether it is

Greenland or Mangrove, that is not the solution. We can continue to find places in Barbados where we can dump garbage legally but, again, that is not a long-term solution.

Sir, I think it is inappropriate to suggest that we are an indisciplined society and, therefore, we cannot separate garbage when it is being collected. I think we should

recognise that separating garbage is the only way forward and we need to do something with this so-called indisciplined society.

Sir, I once heard in this Chamber, and I have not heard anybody refute it, that there is no current law on the statute books penalising people who toss garbage from vehicles, whether it is true I do not know. If it is, that is an issue that should be looked at.

Mr. President, at the end of the day, what is garbage? We have about seven different types of plastic, only three types concern us at this time, that is Pep, the popular soft drink bottle; HDPE, which is used to manufacture bottles that refrigerate juices and drinks and the plastic bags. There is paper, glass, metal, hazardous material in batteries, tyres, combustible material and offal. Almost anything separated can be put to better use.

In the context of Pep bottles - I am associated very closely with a company that processes over 18 million Pep bottles a year manufacturing a useful end product of at is a 'roof' and 'shingle'. In two months, the Pep bottles recycled would fill every nook and cranny in this building. Yet, despite significant overtures to the Government, we have not been facilitated with what we were promised, that is some diversionary credit for diverting this product from the landfill.

This company has, in the last four years since it began operation, lost over \$6 million but we continue to fund the company because we believe, as a responsible company producing the Pep bottle product, that we have to make sure that the landscape of Barbados is not littered with the conversion into a useful end product. Unless there is more encouragement to the private sector, the garbage disposal question will never be answered.

Sir, there is a company in Barbados, as far as I know, that recycles newspapers into bedding for chickens and things of that nature. There is a lot of combustible material that does not get on site; between Southern Meats and a place St. Peter the offal is recycled. Metal has a commercial value if it is separated. Banks Breweries takes all the glass it produces, breaks it up and ships it overseas. That can easily be extended to glass and wine bottles from hotels and other venues where a significant amount of glass can be collected easily. Again, it has to be done at a cost. If the private sector can relieve the Government from the responsibility of creating dumping sites for these materials, then some diversionary credit must be made available to encourage them to continue to do well and not at a loss.

Mr. President, I put it to you that there should be a more holistic approach to the collection and disposal of garbage in this country. It should be done sooner rather than later. We cannot turn a blind eye to it and say, yes, we

are going to have garbage collection trucks; we are going to collect garbage and dispose of it. There has to be additional work to separate it into its useful end product; All material for recycling should be processed and the non cycled material, where possible, there should be an arrangement with the Barbados Light and Power Company, similar to that of the French Caribbean where the garbage is burnt and the energy generated into electricity.

Mr. President, I thank you very much and I am obliged to you. I fully support this Bill.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Chandler.

SENATOR Dr. F. L. CHANDLER: Mr. President, I rise to support the Resolution to purchase additional equipment and vehicles for the Sanitation Services Authority. I do not think anyone can deny the importance of the Sanitation Services Authority. There only has to be a slight glitch in their operations and we see the havoc which results. Of course, there is the matter of our health.

Sir, I do not think that we fully realise the importance of the workers who do this job. Most of us have become so impersonal and uncaring that we have no contact whatsoever with our sanitation workers, neither do we show them the appreciation. We just take them for granted until the system breaks down.

Sir, although the final disposal of garbage is the responsibility of Government, I think that each of us must take responsibility for our surroundings and not expect Government to do everything. I think this was mentioned by other Honourable Senators.

For example, we should not litter. We should bury our dead pets, not throw them in the road. We should properly dispose of large items like mattresses rather than throwing them by the side of the road. It is our responsibility to look after our own space rather than creating additional work for the Government and the Sanitation Services Authority.

There are many ways for the Government to improve the handling of solid waste because it is their responsibility at the national level. For example, the introduction and strict implementation of litter laws, which Honourable Senators have mentioned. I understand that in Bermuda there is a fine of US\$1 000 for littering and there are no ifs and buts about it. I think that part of it is important. If that were introduced in Barbados, the job of garbage collections would be made easier.

11.50 a.m.

Sequence 9

Thursday, August 04, 2005

Senate 36, sequence 10, 11.50 a.m.

Senator Dr. F.L. CHANDLER: If that were introduced here, the job of garbage collection would be made much easier but, of course, we would say that is not our culture and we cannot do it but if we went to Bermuda, we would do it quickly enough.

Mr. President, Barbadians are untidy generally, even if we do not like to admit it, Sir. As someone said to me recently, we have progressed economically but not socially, in that you now see people driving BMWs and throwing litter through the windows.

Garbage separation in every household - by that I mean separation of glass into different colours, plastic, aluminum, et cetera, in different colour coded containers to be collected on separate days - is another area which is critical and needs to be introduced immediately. The Honourable Minister mentioned this and I look forward to seeing when it actually happens. We cannot allow people to say that they are not doing it and they will have to be penalised if they do not. This would provide an opportunity for entrepreneurs to become involved in recycling businesses.

Why are we so different from anyone else? Again, to use the Bermuda example, I understand that if you do not separate your garbage, you run the risk of being on national television, where photographers come to your house, take photographs of your house and garbage and you would see it on television. The Honourable Minister has also given his experience in another country where the separation works. You do not have any question on whether or not you do it and you have to do it, Sir.

This culture of separation must be inculcated in children at an early age. I heard someone say a while ago that they went to visit their family in Singapore and every day after lunch a gentleman would drink a beer. He would notice that his 3-year-old grandchild would be hovering and watching him and asking him if he was finished. He could not understand why, so he finally asked why, and the child said that it is because that can has to go into the yellow box. Therefore, from the age of three, that child knew about garbage separation.

Sir, contrast that with what happened in my neighbourhood recently, when I spoke to a child who was dropping a drink bottle in the middle of the road in front of my house. When I asked him to move it, all he did was to kick it a little further up the road, pass my house. Therefore, you see that we have a lot of work to do with the children.

Mr. President, there are so many waste products, the recycling of which could be turned into businesses that I cannot understand why no real positive steps have been taken to assist those interested in recycling, so that the garbage going to the landfill is reduced. I think that Senator Sir Allan Fields alluded to this, Sir.

There is glass which can be shipped. I think this can be done now in a small way at certain times with different types of glass. Colours need to be separated. The glass needs to be ground and stockpiled to be shipped to world markets and not just regional markets. Apparently, it is used in road surfacing and incorporated into concrete curbs.

There is plastic some of which, as Sir Allan said, is being used to make roof tiles but there are many more uses. These plastic bottles can also be ground, stockpiled and sent overseas. There is metal which is being recycled in a small way but more could be done.

Sir, with all of these ventures, the recycler needs assistance to keep his business going or at least to get it on a sound footing. Instead of spending money to bury this material in the ground on the island, as the Government is doing now, why does the Government not consider using the same money to pay a diversion credit, as Sir Allan also mentioned, to those entrepreneurs who would be getting it off the island or to be used in a productive process.

I would also like to know how the environmental levy is being spent. I would have thought that the reason for the environmental levy would have been to assist with ways to solve the garbage problem. Could some of this not be used to assist the recyclers whom, I think, are making an excellent effort?

Whatever happened to the dumping of old vehicles at sea to create reefs? Was there any technical problem? Why was this stopped? Instead of them being dumped in the sea to make reefs, we see vehicle graveyards all over the island.

There are cardboard, paper and other organic waste which constitute about 48 per cent of the landfill materials. This can be turned into compost. It would be of great benefit to sugar cane fields and might help us to obtain yields like what are obtained in Brazil. I know the Minister of Agriculture would like to see these yields increased. Foreign exchange for fertilisers would also be reduced.

I know that trials have been done with this compost in agriculture. The results have been very encouraging and funds were being sought from the Research and Development Fund to take it further, but as far as I can see, this died a natural death or an unnatural death. I do not know which, Sir.

There is a company shredding paper for export by another company but this company only shreds about 10 per cent of waste paper from businesses and from the Government departments. Apparently, most Government departments are using the two incinerators at the sea port and the airport to burn this paper. Why should this be allowed? Should the Government Departments be setting an example by recycling this paper and, obviously then, assisting the business?

There are vehicle tyres which can be ground to produce a surface material for roads, a mulch for gardens, doormats, et cetera.

There is a need to look at regulations currently in place which say that used cooking oil from cruise ships cannot enter Barbados. What really are the dangers involved? Has anybody said if there are any dangers, or have they only made that rule and are sticking to it blindly? This oil could provide valuable raw material for a company now producing a renewable fuel called bio-diesel, which could replace some of the diesel derived from fossil fuels that we currently import. We need to examine these regulations and see if we need to change them.

In my opinion, a tax incentive should be given to individuals to purchase home compostures. Sir, from my experience, these work well. I had one for many years. I do not have time to look after it in the way that it should be looked after. I never add anything to it and I never turn the compost. I do not do anything and yet it has never overflowed and I get beautiful looking compost, which I use to propagate plants. This would divert a considerable portion of the organic waste from the landfill.

With regard to the choice of a solid waste management system, as far as I can see, successive administrations have been 'pussyfooting' around this issue for too long. Sir, hopefully, a sensible decision would be made and implemented. We have had a number of proposals for incinerators, using various technology, including high-tech systems, with scrubbing the smoke et cetera, and systems using the energy for electricity.

There have been numerous proposals for various composting facilities from the traditional window types to digesters, producing methane for electricity, as well as compost. As far as I understand, the Government has employees who have considerable experience in these matters and could easily advise on the best method to choose but it seems that politics and bureaucracy are standing in the way, and the situation remains in limbo.

With regard to the present situation at the Sanitation Service Authority, there is evidence again of poor planning and, as usual, we are acting in response to a crisis. Why a few vehicles are not replaced every year? Why is proper

preventive maintenance not carried out on the vehicles on a regular basis, so that they will last longer and work more efficiently?

One gets the impression from reports in the media that it has suddenly been realised that spare parts should be stocked. This seems ridiculous to me. I would have thought that would have been normal.

Mr. President, I support the Resolution since sanitation is important to our health and, therefore, adequate garbage collection must be provided to the country.

*Senate 36, sequence 10, 12:00:12*

*Thursday, August 04, 2005*

SENATOR Dr. F. L. CHANDLER: Mr. President, I hope that sensible decisions would be made on the wider solid waste management issue before we have a crisis much more serious than the prison crisis on our hands.

I thank you.

Senator R. O. MARVILLE: Mr. President, I rise to support the acquisition of funds for the removal of refuse. I do this in spite of the fact that I think that what we are doing here is chasing after crisis after crisis.

I listened to the Honourable Minister outlined a proposal and he made a good point about the work done by the Sanitation Service Authority, which I would like to endorse. I think that the sanitation workers are some of the most productive people we have on this island and I would recommend as a serious continued effort that each year at least once a year we make it a point, perhaps at Christmas time when we dispose of most refuse, to go out and give them a personal present. I think it is something that they really deserve and it is something that we should get into.

Mr. President, often in this august Chamber we look at things in a partisan manner. A course of action is justified because a party says so or a party does not say so or what have you. I do not join with those who would have us divided into two camps, I think we are at least three sides here and sometimes four or five. On this issue I would be prepared to put myself in a camp that is very different from what has been said even up to this point. I believe that it is incumbent on those of us who have some authority to use that authority not only to make comfortable decisions but most of all not to avoid taking the tough decisions.

Mr. President, one tough decision would be a Refuse Disposal and Conversion Bill, which comprehensively addresses the matter of what we call garbage and waste. It

would impose severe penalties on illegal or improper disposal of litter, refuse or what have you. It would impose a system of separation, with properly colour-coded utensils or containers that keep paper, broken glass and plastics, which we seem to have in such enormous quantities at this time.

Mr. President, we should also encourage the use of conversion. In nature there is nothing such as waste. One bit of so-called waste is converted by some other micro organism or major organism and becomes food for something else. Even the air we breathe out as carbon dioxide is taken in by plants, which use the carbon element of it to build their bulk, what we call wood, and then return to us oxygen, which we can breathe again. We should therefore look at waste disposal as a matter of waste conversion. There are some people doing things in small ways and I think we should encourage them and build up.

Mr. President, Senator Chandler referred to the matter of bio-diesel. In the United States of America there is a man who takes the used oils from hotels and so on and is converting it into diesel. Nothing is required to use that diesel for burning either in plants like our electricity corporation or in vehicles. The only difference he notices is that less toxic gas is emitted from the vehicles and there is a more pleasant smell as well. He controls the costing of this diesel. A gallon of his diesel cost 70 cents as distinct from the \$1.70 for the diesel acquired from fossil fuel. We should therefore definitely look at this as a process.

I have noticed that in recent times both the Arawak Cement Plant and the Barbados Light and Power Company Limited have become interested in waste oils from vehicles and they have been burning this as a source of energy. It is cheaper and it is much more reliable a way than throwing this stuff into the ground where it is likely to become involved with our drinking water. We still insist on dumping together into some hold in the ground, batteries, old television sets and all the mixture of other refuse that I suggested that we could separate and reuse.

The InterAmerican Development Bank (IDB) put an offer of \$10 million for a project for refuse disposal. About five years ago there was a group that had a marvellous opportunity and a marvellous idea. The group which included the late and very distinguished environmentalist Dr. Colin Hutson and just about anybody from any company that was interested in the environment, had put together plans for refuse separation and for using the applicable materials. They also had plans for extracting methane and for composting. There were also plans to crush glass and other hard materials into bits for building roads. The energy acquired from the high burning toxic materials was to be transferred to the electric grid. There was to be cooperation with an international company which had all the technology for doing these things. The group

was ultimately ignored, so we are back to the question of 'Mount Stinkeroo' and how big Mangrove Landfill is going to become and so on and so forth.

The Minister said if the 700 tons were gold, garbage is gold, it is merely a question of recycling it, converting it and making use of it in ways that we do not constantly have to burden our environment with these nasty bits of disposal. I am reminded that a few years ago hardly anybody wore seatbelts in Barbados. A seatbelt law was introduced and now you would hardly ever find anybody driving without a seatbelt. The fine is considerable and it is a very effective deterrent. Therefore, I think we ought to look at refuse disposal in this way.

I should point out that the question of separating waste and converting it is not only the preserve of developed countries like Canada and Sweden, where incidentally it is remarkable how easily it is done. There are places all over a city where you could throw your glass and take your paper et cetera, and people do this. They do not throw it on the roads like we do here. It is no good saying we are indisciplined, discipline can be enforced. This is not an area where you are going to beat anybody or do anything inhuman, this is where you are going to hit them where it hurts most, in the pocket. Fundamentally, if we do not do something about the situation now it is going to come back to hurt us all where it hurts most, in our health, as a result of our drinking water and other diseases that may be fostered. Mr. President, I would like to see Government spend some money on public education beginning at the primary level. If we are going to save this environment, we have to begin with the very youngest.

*Senate 36 Sequence 11*

12.10 p.m.

*Thursday, August 04, 2005*

SENATOR R. O. MARVILLE: Mr. President, I would like to see some clear effort to clean up our gullies, where I gather even disposal companies have been illegally dumping for the last several years. Sir, I am not talking about the Sanitation Service Authority, I am talking about companies that are contracted to move items such as old television sets, beds, et cetera, for a sum.

Mr. President, you will observe that I have not mentioned tourism or visitors, my reason is clear. We have changed dumping sites once the smell would become a nuisance to visitors on our golf course. I believe that if we have any serious self-respect, we would recognise that the smell has been offensive to the local population for sometime and that on the basis of that alone, something ought to be done about it. We should not wait until there is a crisis. Sir, this is one crisis from which, if it reaches

appropriately high proportions, we will not be able to emerge.

I thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR Dr. D. S. LOWE: Mr. President, I believe that it has been so far established in this debate that the Sanitation Service Authority and its workers have to be accorded with a depth of gratitude that is commensurate with the yeoman service which they have provided to this country for many years.

We, on this side, have no difficulty with supporting the effort to bring more money to bear on the operations of the Sanitation Service Authority, particularly because we believe that once one looks at matters relating to the quality of life, one would have to give very critical consideration to what is happening in the country, relative to the collection and disposal of solid waste.

Mr. President, let me begin by saying that there seems to be a lack of vision and policy direction, as it relates to the further development of what we see becoming of solid waste management of our country. Indeed we boast of so many different areas of development that are moving us into a developed country status, but there are some basic things on which I like to focus, because when I move around the country, I like to hear what people are saying about the things in this country that bother them.

Mr. President, when one moves around the communities and listens to people talking about the things that bother them, things that cause them great distress, one of the things emerging is the matter of solid waste collection and to a lesser extent, solid waste disposal.

The Honourable Senator, who has just taken his seat, has indicated that he was not placing too much emphasis on tourism, because it is clear that when it suits the Government to clear the air for developers, they rush to do so, and for obvious reasons. Therefore, we do not find ourselves in the corridors of criticism when it comes to Government's attempt to bring investors into the country, but I believe that the ordinary citizens of this country, still want to know that when Government acts, that, at the heart of what it does, there is a pivotal concern about how we in this country live, we, who are the descendants of those who have worked hard to make this country what it is at present.

Mr. President, I know that you must travel around the country from time to time. We have just come out of a wonderful festive season and I am sure that you would have taken in some of the sites and sounds. If you did not, I regret that you did not.

MR. PRESIDENT: I did not see you on Spring Garden.

SENATOR Dr. D. S. LOWE: I was looking for you too, Sir.

Mr. President, as I moved around the country, there is something that is becoming more so of a trend than an incident in this country, and that is mounds of garbage that are sitting in the different corridors of this country, sometimes for weeks, uncollected. Therefore, people are beginning to wonder why, especially since there is this tremendous tourism thrust in this country that continues to attract any numbers of individuals from across the globe, one would think that one of the priorities of the State would be to pay attention to keeping Barbados clean and healthy.

Mr. President, I am not finding that to be the case and perhaps the reason is that there has been no real driving policy focus to inform us as to what direction we must take, in terms of looking at the whole matter of solid waste management in this country. Of course, the Honourable Leader of Government Business indicated that the weight of solid waste produced in Barbados is escalating and persistently so, I might add. Therefore, where are we today? What drives the whole process of the involvement of the Sanitation Service Authority?

Mr. President, the Sanitation Service Authority is housed in the Ministry of Health, and I believe that if we were to look at a continuum, one might want to suspect that the problems in the Ministry of Health, perhaps are also plaguing the problems at the Sanitation Service Authority.

Sir, just recently the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was cited for the inappropriate disposal of medical waste. This is the Ministry that happens to drive the Sanitation Service Authority, yet we parade around here, in the precincts of this most august Chamber and talk about those persons in the communities who are not doing their part, in terms of helping us in keeping Barbados clean, relative to their practices of the disposal of their garbage.

Sir, life happens by example and if, on the one hand, those who ought to be leading us by example are engaging in practices that are not commensurate with the expectation of the society, then we must expect that those at the bottom may find it an excusable act to do the things that they ought not to be doing, relative to the disposal of garbage.

Sir, I would like to begin by suggesting that as I observe Sanitation Service Authority workers in this country, I must say that they are some of the most efficient and effective workers in the Public Service, relative to the maintenance of the natural environments of the country because I see them, from time to time...

Mr. President, I would like to be able to give them gifts at the end of the year too, Senator Marville, but unfortunately we have not even been considered in the

capacity to give gifts. Sir, as an incentive, I would like to be in a position where we could reward these men and women who do such tremendous service for what they do, to make us comfortable. At the end of the day, the ultimate measure for me is continuing to preserve the quality of life of every Barbadian in this society. Sir, that is compromised because of the lack of efficiency that drives the Sanitation Service Authority and I cannot understand why one would want to invest in a vehicle that has a lifespan of seven years.

Sir, I would like to point out that there has been no breakdown of how the US\$5 million would be spent and the State has a habit of bringing issues to the Honourable Chamber and not telling us how the money is going to be spent. Therefore, in such circumstances, I would like to suggest to the Honourable Minister that at some time, an itemised list should be generated, so that, as we go forward, we could measure whether or not these monies are meeting the target set out by the Sanitation Service Authority.

12.20 p.m.

*Wednesday, August 4, 2005*

SENATOR Dr. D.S. LOWE: so that we could measure as we go forward whether or not these monies are meeting the target set out by the authority. Sir, the truth is that anybody can come for \$5 million, say it is for equipment et cetera and at the end of the day we do not know how many trucks are going to be bought nor what type of equipments would be invested in. Mr. President, it seems to me that the most critical need today relative to the collection of garbage is providing trucks that work. There is a graveyard of truck out there and I want to know how they are going to dispose of them. Sir, every day trucks are broken down on the road, not unlike some of the buses of the Transport Board. I would suggest that part of the money be spent in a preventative maintenance programme that services these vehicles on a consistent basis where the lifespan can be extended from seven to ten years. We have to make sure that the vehicles are new ones and not reconditioned ones. The equipment should work so that taxpayers can look back and see the investment work to their benefit. This is critical in the process so that the vision and the policy direction must look at how we manage the equipment and process and how we manage the workers, keep them involved and motivated.

Mr. President, the vision must also take into account where we are going with solid waste management. Sir, let us make the first stop at Greenland. I would like the Government to really tell us what is going on at Greenland. Incidentally, Mr. President, my journeys around the country took me through Cleeland which, as you would know, you come through the junction at Shorey Village, go up Cleeland Hill back to Farley Hill. Mr. President, if you

pass Greenland, you would realise that it has now been turned into a fantastic, mysterious forest where the entrance and exit have now been overtaken by bush. By the way, Sir, since the saga at Greenland started, they burnt 12 high power lights there every single night. If you want to see them you can go to Mount Hill or you can see them from where I live in Gregg Farm. You would see a circle of light burning every night at Greenland.

Mr. President, anyone who has any familiarity with the area of St. Andrew would know that building the landfill in Greenland was not a good idea. Rugged, an old man from Shorey Village, fought arduously to advise the Government not to spend \$80 million at Greenland. Sir, the truth of the matter is that to this day, the Government has not given us any accounting statement as to how much money was spent but not an ounce of garbage is there except for the refuse of vermin.

Mr. President, it is important that we know what is happening because if we are now here for \$5 million to buy trucks and Government has already spent so much money at Greenland, why should we be in this case now? It is about efficiency and trying to create a society where Government sets an example for the people in the society relative efficiency and accountability.

Mr. President, since there is so much dispute to the figure, we want to know how much money was spent in Greenland and when would the taxpayer get the full benefit of the creation of that monstrosity in Greenland, St. Andrew. If we are now being asked to give full support for the injection of this money, which is understandable, we would like to know if we are putting bad money on a bad system. I do not want to believe this but I think it is important for the Government to tell the people of Barbados now that we are dealing with a matter of the Sanitation Services Authority to have something to say because the Honourable Leader of Government Business did not make a single reference to the disposal of garbage as it relates to the situation at Greenland.

Mr. President, if we are talking about vision and policy direction, then we are talking about Government doing research, making informed decisions, looking at international and global trends relative to the development in solid waste management. Sir, when Government chooses to ask the taxpayers to give money for whatever purpose, it should be able to say in no uncertain terms what the research says and what is the international trend. The Government should say where it is prepared to go so that we are prepared to put this money behind the Sanitation Services Authority.

Mr. President, I have said earlier that the workers do a tremendous amount of work and in some cases go through hardship to make sure they do what is necessary to

assist with the whole matter of keeping Barbados clean. If we are going to hold the public responsible for keeping Barbados clean and for adopting good solid waste disposal practices, then we have to start by leading the way in keeping Barbados healthy.

Mr. President, I recall in December 2002, five months before the General Election that an edit was issued that encouraged residents to put out their old fridges, stoves and everything they had to dispose. They were told to place them by the road side and they would be collected. Sir, people in Parish Land, Silver Sands and Sayers Court brought out their items, placed them by the side of the road but, Sir, some of that stuff is still sitting by the side of the road today. When I enquired why it was still sitting by the side of the road, I was told that the bulk waste collection vehicle had broken down and that there was only one vehicle.

Mr. President, on the heels of a festive season when people would have wanted their surrounding to be pristine, you had them being advised to bring out refuse like old galvanise sheets, bed and so on to sit in the corridors of their neighbours which, to this day, has not been collected.

Mr. President, for some people this is a joke because, in their neighbourhood, they are being taken care but the average man does not have the luxury of making a phone call to have these items picked up or pay to have them picked up. Sir, I speak of ordinary men and women and when I come to this Chamber, I try to reflect the concern of ordinary men and women who may not otherwise have a voice, not even on the call-in programme who cannot pay for the Bill because it costs too much money.

Mr. President, those who sit in the lap of comfort will squirm and want to interrupt me but the experiences of these persons cause people to lose faith in the political system. Sir, if mundane things cannot be done with some measure of haste, then they begin to question whether or not the political system they choose to govern them...

S36/12:30

*Sequence 13*

*Thursday, August 4, 2005*

SENATOR Dr. D.S. LOWE: ...cannot be done with some measure of haste when they begin to question whether the political system which they choose to govern them is truly supporting their interest. That is the nexus between the problems of the people, the political system and the lost of faith in politicians.

Sir, there are some people who never worry about anybody losing faith in them because they would never

face the Polls and they know why. There are functionaries in the corridors of Government who help make policies in this country; help issue commitments to the public and at the end of the day, the man who must sit in his backyard facing the same difficulties they experienced for five years, without assistance. The system must work. I have great faith in our democracy but I am beginning to question whether those who are vanguards of democracy understand the importance of keeping the people's faith. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will hear of that as this day progresses. So, we must lead the way.

Sir, I was driving through St. John. I started in Christ Church, went through St. Philip and came around the borders of the country. Mr. President, this happened on Monday, Kadooment Day. I was following a vehicle with an ML registration, owned by the Government; I think that certain arms of the public service was resting on that day. We can get in here, pompersett and try to evade the truth but I would speak it even if I have to sound my echoes above the emptiness of any other echoes that emanate at this time.

Mr. President, I cannot afford to have a convertible vehicle, but if I were driving a convertible vehicle, I would have probably got into an accident from the garbage that was thrown out of the vehicle while it in motion. I wished I had a camera that I could have taken a picture of what was emanating from a vehicle owned by the Government.

Sir, when we start to talk about education in Barbados and lecturing small man in the neighbourhood that he should not do this or that, we have to ask ourselves if we are leading in the process. How do you expect a youngster from a neighbourhood, where the garbage is not collected sometimes for four weeks, a month, and his neighbourhood is coloured with all types of garbage scattered by dogs, on his way to Bridgetown to take care and make sure he keeps Bridgetown clean? He is going to ask you who is keeping up by him clean.

Mr. President, it seems to me that we have gone so far into the lap of luxury and comfort that we forget the rudiments of how people think and why they behave the way they do. I am saying that we have a case now, where there is no timely collection of garbage in this country for the most part, perhaps, with the exception of some areas. Sir, on my way down to this Honourable Senate, today mounds of garbage, just sitting for over there two weeks, have not been collected.

Sir, I am not going to blame the workers, for without the use of equipment and the vehicles that are in working order, they cannot put the refuse on their backs, as well intentioned as they may be.

Mr. President, somebody would say, do not mind him, that is not true; but they live in another area, where, perhaps, the garbage truck collects frequently; however, the areas that I am speaking about have non inconsistent garbage collections.

Mr. President, do you know what happens? When we talk about keeping Barbados healthy and clean, do you realise garbage sitting in a neighbourhood for an unappreciable amount of time, encourages rodents in search of food; even stray dogs come in search of a meal. Mr. President, do you realise the strain on the neighbourhood from the unhealthy conditions that emerges, but we deny this reality.

Mr. President, I am telling you that I have seen it with my eyes. Perhaps, some of us who are involved in making policy need to get out from our comfort zones, drive around this country to see the unbearable conditions some Barbadians have to live; then return to the Barbados Labour Party and inform them of the need to go out and check what is happening between itself and the people who had enough confidence in them to put them in office. Those things are important.

Sir, I am not here to send any message to anybody in particular, but I am saying that I believe that every citizen of this country has the right to live in a situation where the Government delivers what it has to deliver. I am passionate about this. You have an infestation of rats who no longer inhabit the canes because a lot of the cane districts have been turned into housing districts. Therefore, they are roaming. We are creating this specter in the society. Honourable Minister, get the trucks on the road; please keep them well serviced and well nourished. Please inform the Government that they are people who are being tortured because of this unkempt situation. Let them know that tourists do not come to Barbados, get off the ship and tour no further. They go on tours all over the country and the unsanitary conditions that I am screaming about are part of the sights and memories they carry back to their homeland. If tourism is our business nobody I do not see how any person can begin to query it. How can it happen? It seems to me that the general concern of every citizen in this country, policy maker or no, is to ensure that Barbados is a place livable for all of our citizens, young, old, disabled and the visitor. Therefore, Government has an obligation to ensure that this problem is fixed forthwith.

Mr. President, finally, we need to look at the whole issue of education and awareness. If we are going to change people's behaviour we have to ask ourselves why people behave the way they do. Changing a behaviour is like treating a symptom without understanding the problem. I remember growing up as a boy, when I walk the streets and the old Headmaster passed, I had to stand up at attention to give observance to his rank in the society. That

was also true when the Priest or the Police Officer passed. Those were days when Barbados was different but Barbados was also a nice place.

Sir, I remember the days when an infraction in the social code committed by me or any other person my age, would be reported. I also remember many times, Monday morning after some bad behaviour on Friday evening after school, at Assembly at St. Saviour's Primary School, the Headmaster would call you up and tell you exactly what you did and then venture to give you a public flogging. I had many of those. I would not deny that.

*Asides.*

SENATOR Dr. D.S. LOWE: Mr. President, I believe very firmly that a man's past is, perhaps, the best possible script for his future. One of the reasons why some adults are so untoward today, is because they have deserted their past and they forget the lessons learnt from those days.

I am saying that the values of the society were workable then and they can be workable today. What is happening between the governed and those who govern is that those who govern are given rules and laws, which they are preaching to the society but they have some hesitance relative to following the same rules. Therefore, I am suggesting that if we want the society to practice certain virtues, like that ML registration vehicle that I saw on Monday disposing garbage through the air while moving, then we have to begin to tell our people what they must do and to be prepared to show them how to do what needs to be done. There need to be some anti littering practices and anti littering education.

12.40 p.m.

*Sequence 14*

*Thursday, August 04, 2005*

*Senate 36, sequence 15, 12.40 p.m.*

Senator Dr. D.S. LOWE: One of the Honourable Members talked about getting it as early as in the primary schools and using the churches and community groups as part of the educational process to help get across the message.

There needs to be information put in the public domain about garbage separation. We have all said that and we all agree on that but we have to get Corporate Barbados to help encourage this particular action by encouraging people to separate their garbage because there is no incentive now in the community to do this. When you separate your garbage, what happens? One part goes to one

part of the landfill and the other part goes to the other part of the landfill.

When we talk about garbage separation, we must have manufacturing options and other kinds of options that people can use. The other thing is that Corporate Barbados has to become involved in encouraging the use of more biodegradable materials so that when people go to the supermarkets and so on, when they collect a bag, they know that it is within the domain of educational process, relative to disposal. Therefore, the business houses and Corporate Barbados have to become part of the process.

Mr. President, I will close on this. I have always said that we should never persecute people for success but we should continue to nag them until they bring their success to bear on the total society.

Mr. President, I thank you, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Husbands.

Senator Miss. S.C.V. HUSBANDS: Thank you, Mr. President.

I was listening enthralled to the learned Senator Lowe taking at length about the situation in Barbados and the situation pertaining to the disposal of garbage. If one did not allow oneself to get carried away by the rhetoric, one would not have visions of the entire countryside, every house infested with rats and garbage spilling all out on the street and, obviously, the spectre of severe illnesses beginning to rise in one's mind.

I had a drive in the country just yesterday and it was quite educational. I did not see the extreme conditions described by my learned friend, Senator Lowe. Therefore, one has to bear reality in mind when one is listening and not get carried away by rhetoric and passion.

Mr. President, the whole matter of waste management in an ongoing concern for any nation. Therefore, any nation, certainly as small as Barbados has many challenges in terms of managing waste disposal, especially when you have a population that is continuously advancing, in terms of its economic development, where people's disposable income keeps increasing. As a result, they continue to purchase more and more goods and services. This disposal of the packaging, end product and the item that has been changed, keeps growing larger and larger.

Sir, as was mentioned today, the average intake at the dump is approximately 700 tonnes a day and to my knowledge, that number has not significantly decreased, rather, the number is increasing. This says to me that the Sanitation Service Authority continues to do its job as

effectively as it can, but the needs of the society are outstripping the removal of 700 tonnes.

This means that in Barbados what we are seeing increasingly is that as sanitation and waste management calls for more than just the collection of garbage and disposing of it, it means that the resources then pertaining to the Sanitation Authority and other units responsible for the management of waste, continue to be spread thin.

Therefore, what we are seeking to do today in terms of the provision of funds to enable the Sanitation Service Authority to add, not only trucks of different types for different types of functions but other necessary pieces of equipment that will help it to do its job. Our anticipation is that we would see an improvement in the collection of garbage and the management of waste in our country.

It has been alluded to by a number of Senators already and I would not regurgitate all that was said but, a number of persons have raised the issue, which you hear from Barbadians from all walks of life that the level of wastage and indiscipline in our country is such, as to cause embarrassment to us as a developed nation. Sir, for people who are as educated as we are, with the social advancements that we have, we are actually regressing, in terms of how we keep around us, and the way in which we dispose of our garbage.

I grew up in a village where I do not remember seeing a sanitation truck at that time. When I was a child, on mornings I would wake up to the sound of my grandmother sweeping outside. I would see other women in the village sweeping outside and by 7 o'clock on mornings that village was clean. They did not have the kinds of disposal systems that we have today and Barbadians were a cleaner people, a more responsible people, and a more focused people at that time.

Today, we have a community that indulges in just throwing away things, without regard for its impact. What we have is a society that has not been able to make the transition to a society that uses a great deal of plastic, so much more than it ever used before. Therefore, there are a number of things I feel we need to put in place, in order to help with waste management in our country and to improve on the disposal of garbage.

One of the things is waste management education and this is something that cannot be started too early. At the level of our schools, in our communities and in the business community, it is necessary that a waste education programme is started to help each citizen to reconnect with their responsibility, in terms of how they dispose of their garbage.

How can we go about doing something like that? One of the things that I have been very encouraged about is the number of Barbadians who have gone to study things like the environment. They would be qualified as environmental experts, who are full of ideas, knowledge and new information that can help a small nation like ours seek to preserve its environment, and manage and control its waste.

I feel that at the Ministry of Education, we should have an environmental expert attached to the Ministry, if that is not already the case, and these persons should be used to develop and devise educational programmes that are suited and tailored to meet the individual needs of children, and that are linked to the reality of how the Barbadian population operates, so that we could begin to start programmes that help.

I have been very encouraged when I went to exhibitions because I have noticed that in schools children have started doing environmental programmes. They are encouraged to look at clean-up and good practices and this is a start. I think it needs to go further and it needs to be translated from the school into the communities and from the communities into businesses.

I want to congratulate the private sector for engaging in a number of initiatives which seek to help, in terms of management of the environment, reducing waste and keeping a green society. A number of them would have been mentioned earlier by Senator Chandler and Senator Fields and I want to just add a few more, which I think are extremely important.

Mr. President, when I was in Guyana, there is a company there that is specialising in collecting scrap metal and re-exporting it, Sir, I was saying to my Guyanese friends that perhaps that person should look at expanding that programme throughout the Caribbean as a CSME project because the whole disposal of things like our fridges, stoves, old cars, iron or whatever is something that is of great concern.

Certainly, when you look at the number of second-hand cars on the road, the disposal of those relics when those are finished with, is going to be a major concern to the country. Therefore, the scrap metal and re-shipping, I think, we want to encourage and promote as much as possible.

The paper materials and the recycling of bottles have been mentioned already and the composting. I want to congratulate two young entrepreneurs for the work that they have been doing in terms of the private sector offering certain services to the community and helping us with the disposal of things that will contaminate our environment.

I was very pleased to read in the newspaper about the fuel being made from used cooking oil. I think we need to look to see how we can assist that gentleman with appropriate financing, and technical support to be able to take that idea and move it, and grow it to a level where it can have a significant impact on what is happening in Barbados, in terms of the disposal of oil and the provision of a new fuel that would be cleaner for the environment.

*Senate 36, sequence 15, 12:50:14*

*Thursday, August 04, 2005*

SENATOR Miss S. C. V. HUSBANDS: I think of another entrepreneur who has a distribution company who has taken on the challenge of bringing into Barbados biodegradable garbage bags.

Mr. President, I am a transition child, I come from the old and kind of walk into the new and sometimes I forget that the bag is biodegradable and may put something into a bag and then when I go back for it the bag would be totally disintegrated, and I am like what happened, forgetting that it was a biodegradable bag.

Mr. President, this is extremely important and I know that this would have a positive long-term impact on the disposal of plastic within our country because that is of a concern, therefore, I want to congratulate that entrepreneur on the introduction of biodegradable garbage bags within Barbados.

Mr. President, we have a number of very environmentally conscious companies in Barbados. We have hotels that are seeking the Green Globe certification that are looking at how they are going to manage their waste and water and reduce the demand on the environment. A number of our hotels have been successful and I want to congratulate them on those efforts because it is that kind of example in our society that goes a long way to showing others that these are some of the things that we can do in order to preserve our environment and in order to manage our waste.

Mr. President, there was some dialogue about what are some of the things Government is doing in relation to waste management and managing our environment properly. When you listen, you get the feeling as though nothing is being done and that there is no policy, but I want to encourage and comfort those who have a concern, that Government does have a policy and that things are being done to manage the whole matter of our environment and waste. For example, the sewerage project, which has been ongoing for a number of years, is a mammoth undertaking and it has tremendous cost. All of this is part of that system. For us that is a very important thing that would

help to protect our marine environment, our water supply and to appropriately dispose of garbage.

Mr. President, we live in an imperfect world, we have imperfect situations and from time to time we will have problems. The problem is not whether we have the problems but whether we can fix them and can learn from them and take our operations to a higher level. Therefore, I want to congratulate the Government on the effort that is being made to manage these particular areas.

Mr. President, another area that is of concern for me is dumping in the gullies. This is very distressful because Barbados has over 400 miles of gullies, which are places of beauty and there are places that a lot of Barbadians have never have the privilege of seeing. Today what we have is a situation where unscrupulous persons, who do not wish to operate at a responsible level are using these gullies for the disposal of whatsoever is inconvenient around them.

Mr. President, this has been a major concern to the Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment and she has outlined the fact that one of the things they want to do is to be able to put in place a policy for the beautification and clean up of the gullies. They have commissioned a gully eco-system management study, which is targeted towards identifying sustainable management options for managing these natural beautiful features in our Barbadian landscape and to take that resource and turn it into leisure and nature-based tourism activities rather than just a dumping ground.

The cost that would be attached for the implementation of such a study to look at what we can do to put systems in place for the management of our gullies eco-system is approximately \$1.3 million. This means that we have to look at things like educating people to alter their poor environmental management practices, at rehabilitation in the form of the removal of waste accumulation and at reforestation and other activities supportive of eco-system rejuvenation. All of these are things that will assist Barbados in the management of its gullies eco-system, but without the education of the Barbadian population it is not going to work.

Mr. President, what I want to share now is what I believe we need to do in terms of educating the average Barbadian. I am very distressed when I see people in Barbados, whether it is in town or wherever, not just throwing things out of the bus window or the car window but perched on a wall eating lunch and there is a garbage bin no more than ten feet away and they literally dumped and leave the ends of their lunch right there, never stopping to think that they should put it in the garbage bin that was visible right next to them. You see this with the young, the old and with people you do not expect to see engaging in this very nasty practice of littering.

Mr. President, when you talk to Bajans about littering they have a very bad habit of telling you that they are finding something for the Sanitation Service Authority to do, as though the Sanitation Service Authority has no work, and they are looking for work for extra people, therefore they need work to do. All of this have put enormous strain on the resources of the Sanitation Service Authority and on their time to be able to deal with critical matters. They have to be cleaning up behind Barbadians who have no better sense in terms of how they manage their garbage.

Mr. President, I am always shocked at the amount of litter that is left behind on Spring Garden after Kadooment Day and Bridgetown Market. I want to congratulate the staff of Sanitation Service Authority for the tremendous work they do in a short space of time in cleaning all of that litter from the entire Kadooment route.

Mr. President, what we have in Barbados, which I think it is part of this 'mash up and buy back' culture, is that there is no regard for cost. It is this mentality that it does not matter what we do that somehow Government would find the money, so we litter and dirty the place and then we quarrel when the litter is not picked up not understanding that we are behaving in an irresponsible manner and raising the cost of the management of our own health by these types of practices. Mr. President, as an individual, I feel very uncomfortable, having learned about the separation of garbage and understanding the problems that we have in the environment, that we have a situation where we have not done that as yet in Barbados. Sir, I would love to see it because I would like to see our garbage better managed. I think that it is something that we need to start introducing and we need to look at a policy that we can seek to put it in place.

Mr. President, I think that there are things that we can do that could help to alleviate some of the problems with illegal dumping and the practices of Barbadians. We have fines for dumping. I think one of the things that we need is more stringent enforcement of the fines for dumping. I also think that we probably need to have a special project looking at catching persons who illegally dump throughout our country because I believe that if we could fined a couple of people that it would act as a deterrent to others who would want to behave in an irresponsible manner.

Mr. President, there are a number of companies that transport waste. If you have some waste around your home, you have soil, you tore down a building or you have old things or what have you, there are businesses and individuals who would call these companies whose job it is to pay them to dispose of this waste. I am saying that all of those companies should be licensed. I feel that each of those companies should be made to give an account as to

where they are taking that particular garbage. I think that should be inspected and if a company cannot account for the amount of waste they pick up versus where they say they have dumped it, they should be fined. If we could do that, we would stop a lot of the illegal dumping by a lot of these companies and truckers that take the waste from business houses and households and dump it in an illegal manner, without regard and pocket the money and then we have to find money to clean it up when they are finished only for them to come and do it again. I feel that is one of the things that we could do to hold companies that transport that material responsible for what they do.

*Senate 36 Sequence 16*

1.00 p.m.

*Thursday, August 04, 2005*

SENATOR Miss S. V. HUSBANDS: Mr. President, I feel that what we are here attempting to do, which is furnishing the Sanitation Service Authority with more material, is but one step that we could take in terms of our waste management. As I said, I see it as something that is broader and greater. I think the whole thing about education is going to be important and that it has to start from young. I also think that the people in our communities must not ignore the business community in this area of waste management and that we have to have an extensive drive in helping Barbadians to understand that what they need to do.

Mr. President, I think too that we have to sit and have discussions as to how we could meaningfully manage the issue of waste management. I think it would take time and though there are fines for illegal dumping, et cetera, it is not as easy to police as that of driving without a seatbelt, but it still has to be policed. I think what we have to aim for is not simply matters of fines or of the policing but to re-educate the hearts and minds of Barbadians so that we could change their living habits. I think that if we do that, then we do not have to wait until there is a big pile up of garbage in some areas where somebody may not have seen nor visited for years because some people may not know it is there, but because they have it internalised as a part of their natural behavior, we would not have so much illegal dumping.

Mr. President, I want to encourage every Barbadian to begin to take responsibility and to behave as a responsible citizen and better manage their garbage.

Mr. President, I thank you.

Her Honour SENATOR DAME PATRICIA SYMMONDS: Mr. President, I am going to be very brief but I feel it necessary to clear up some points that have

been made by some of my fellow Senators on both sides of this Honourable Chamber, one which has to do with education.

Mr. President, I want to say, first of all, that on the whole, our schools are kept clean and that they have always been cleaned, and that teachers are always making the effort to have children aware of the importance of a clean beautiful environment. In this regard, they are supported by the Ministry of Education.

Mr. President, presently there are clean-up days in the schools, particularly in the primary schools. There are also healthy lifestyle days. Interestingly, and perhaps ironically though, in the schools, students are taught about recycling but they complain that when they go out into the wider world, they do not have the opportunities to practise that recycling which they were taught. I think that is something that those responsible for sanitation and the environment could think of. There is also an environment part on the curriculum of secondary schools. There is a whole module that deals with the environment and maintaining a healthy environment.

Mr. President, therefore, where public education is concerned, it is not being neglected in the schools. Sir, children do have a way sometimes of trying to teach their elders and perhaps they could be encouraged even more to remind adults, in a respectful way, that parent should not throw garbage out discriminately, et cetera, and in a way, shape their parents and other adults into doing what they know is right.

I think in Barbados, unfortunately, that some people think narrowly of their homes and immediate environments in keeping them clean. A healthy environment too can be a matter of patriotism and nationalism, where our national colours can be used when praising the young people. I, too, am in defence of them. Perhaps we can remember that in this area, the young are not so much to be blamed and that they are trying to do what is right.

Mr. President, I can say that at the school where I have taught and then headed, that having gotten the idea from another private secondary school, school children came to me and suggested that they could be made responsible for the day-to-day collection of garbage in their form rooms. A number of parents objected but on the whole the children enjoyed it and the idea caught on. The important thing was that the children realised that they were responsible partly for keeping the school clean and that it was not just a matter of having persons there to do the cleaning and that they should simply throw things around.

Mr. President, I know there are negative aspects, not to do with the school, which have been spoken about, but I

think that it was important and incumbent on me that I say that the fault lies not with the schools, and not with education within the schools. I think that in a way it will be our self salvation and that it will help, not go back perhaps to the old time days, but it will help to make adults more conscious of what it means for an island to be healthy, clean and beautiful.

Mr. President, I thank you.

#### SUSPENSION

SENATOR the Hon. E. R. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, I beg to move that this Honourable Senate do now suspend until 2.10 p.m.

*The question that the Honourable Senate do now suspend until 2.10 p.m. was put to the Senate and agreed to and MR. PRESIDENT suspended the Senate accordingly. S:No.36(17)1.07 p.m.*

Wednesday, July 20, 2005

#### RESUMPTION

MR. PRESIDENT: This Sitting is resumed. Senator Gooding-Edghill.

SENATOR G.P.I. EDGHILL-GOODING: Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I too rise to support before the Senate in the name of the Sanitation Services Authority. I also want to commend the work of the Sanitation Services Authority and in so doing join other member of this Senate who have supported the work. Sir, it is necessary to go on record to make the point that the Resolution speaks to the sum of \$5 million and to make the point that the sum has been allocated for the purchase of vehicles and other equipment.

Mr. President, Senator made the point that he was not sure but for clarity and for the record, it is worth the side of the Government to make the point that the \$10 million will be used to purchase vehicles and equipment. It is anticipated that 12 large and medium compactors, dumpers, tipper truck and mobile servicing equipment. Essentially, this will be used to service the truck of the Sanitation Services Authority. Sir, whenever there are difficulties the mobile response unit will be in a position to reduce downtime by administering repairs. There will also be the purchase of excavators, a transmission jack, a tractor loader and I could go on an on.

Mr. President, it is untrue for the Opposition to believe that this money will not be used to purchase other equipment because it is to be used to purchase trucks and

other equipment for the Sanitation Services Authority. It is also important to note that the Sanitation Services Authority will be purchasing new equipment. The question was asked as to whether or not the equipment would be used or reconditioned. I well remember elsewhere that there was the opinion that the Transport Board was purchase used or reconditioned vehicle but that is not true. Sir, I want to briefly explain the process. Whenever equipment of this magnitude is to be purchase, as in the case of the Sanitation Services Authority, you have a situation where a company manufacturing the chassis and another company specialises in building the body. Therefore, it is untrue for anyone to suggest to the public of Barbados that the Sanitation Services Authority is in the business of purchasing reconditioned or used vehicles.

Mr. President, I am aware that on occasions you would have individuals from the Board and management visiting the entities responsible for the manufacture of the vehicle to inspect them to ensure that they are manufactured at the highest manufacturing quality. Sir, I want to put that to rest.

Mr. President, I also want to compliment the Sanitation Services Authority in respect of a fleet replacement policy. Sir, like the Transport Board, the Sanitation Services Authority is now moving in a direction where you would no longer have to purchase vehicles in one large tranche but would have an opportunity where there is a fleet replacement policy to determine the replacement requirement at a given time in order to top-up the fleet. Mr. President, we should not doubt that this is in place because they have now put in place a fleet replacement policy.

Mr. President, this is in contrast to what happen in the reign of the Democratic Labour Party. If Senator Lowe wants us to go back, we can go back and recite the history. When the Democratic Labour Party was voted out of office in 1994, there were few garbage trucks. The Government of Barbados, in a short space of time, had to purchase a number of vehicles to top-up the requirements of the Sanitation Services Authority and this was so for most entities out there as well.

Mr. President, there is a cost attached to these services in Barbados so we cannot expect that Government would top-up all the requirements for any one entity at a given time. There has to be a phased approach to it because we have to manage our financial position as well.

Mr. President, I want to make another point about the life span of the vehicles. There should be no misunderstanding because some vehicles have a life span of five, seven or ten years but we must take it in the context that in Barbados, particularly under the existing condition, and because vehicles work so hard that there would be

situations where the life span might be shortened. Sir, some trucks at the Sanitation Services Authority are more than ten years old and still on the road. I do not want Senator Lowe to give the public the impression that Government is involved in purchasing vehicles that are not withstanding the test of their life span.

S36/14:20

*Sequence 19*

*Thursday, August 4, 2005*

SENATOR I.G.P. GOODING-EDGHILL: ..the life-span that the Government is involved in purchasing vehicles and they are not withstanding the test of their life-span, that is not true.

Sir, I served elsewhere and I can tell you...

SENATOR Dr. D.S. LOWE: On a point of order. I believe it was the Leader of Government Business who suggested that the life-span of these vehicles was seven years. I suggest that the Honourable Senator should listen carefully.

SENATOR I.G.P. GOODING-EDGHILL: Mr. President, it would be untrue for the Democratic Labour Party Senator, Senator Lowe, to give the public the impression that the Government is purchasing vehicles that are maintaining their estimated life or value. That is not true.

It is important to commend the Sanitation Services Authority for domestic collection and the Highway Cleaning Programme. If someone outside of Barbados heard Senator Lowe and was probably thinking of vacationing in Barbados, he would not be encouraged to visit Barbados. Senator Lowe's statement is not true.

Mr. President, we have a Highway Programme where the faithful staff and members of the Sanitation Services Authority remove debris along the Highways of Barbados those hard-working men and women of the Sanitation Services Authority work very long hours, early in the morning and late into the night. We have that situation. We have the most recent situation on Kadooment Day, August 1, 2005, where there were mounds of litter along the Spring Garden Highway. The following morning the streets were cleaned. There was no debris or litter. I do not want Senator Lowe or any other Honourable Member to give the public the impression that Barbadians are falling over mountains and piles of garbage. It is not true and I want it to be recorded.

Sir, I conclude by making the point that I believe the time has come for us to initiate a review of the Labour

Agreement at the Sanitation Services Authority. It is necessary to increase flexibility. I hope that the National Union of Public Workers and the Management of the Sanitation Services Authority would get together and reform the existing collective agreement, in an attempt to create a more flexible environment, that would lend to greater efficiency and service throughout Barbados.

Sir, on that note, I want to compliment the Sanitation Services Authority on an outstanding job. Once again, I want to reiterate my support for the Resolution, which is for the purpose of purchasing vehicles and equipment. Once the Sanitation Services Authority is in receipt of the equipment, there will be greater efficiency and satisfaction throughout Barbados.

Mr. President, we rely predominantly on tourism and its earning. It is true to say that an increasing number of visitors come to our shores. Therefore, we have the responsibility to keep Barbados clean and sanitary. This sum would go a long way maintaining Barbados as a premier destination, ensuring that the domestic refuse collection is enhanced across all communities in Barbados.

I pledge my support to this Resolution.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Grant.

SENATOR R.W. GRANT: Mr. President, in my very brief contribution, I also wish to commend the Management and Staff of the Sanitation Services Authority for the good work that they have been doing, given the challenges they have faced at times with equipment. I am sure, as other Senators on this side have indicated, this US\$5 million will go a long way in assisting the Sanitation Services Authority with its work.

Sir, workers at the Sanitation Services Authority start as early as 3 O'clock in the morning and many of them work overtime. A few months ago when there were a number of complaints about the collection of garbage, the Sanitation Services Authority gave a commitment and in a very determined way sought to ensure that all of those challenges were dealt with. I want to commend them for the good work they have been doing.

Mr. President, I must confess to you that when I listen to Senator Dr. Lowe and he spoke about the pile up of garbage and the manner in which Barbados looks, I could not recognise that Barbados. I must say that I also frequent some of the areas that Senator Dr. Lowe spoke of.

Sir, it reminds me of the words of the Irish dramatist and literary critic, George Bernard Shaw, who said, we must always think about things and we must think about things as there are, not as they are said to be. The Sanitation Services Authority is working hard and they are

committed to ensuring that they keep Barbados as a clean environment. There are challenges but certainly not the way they have been described by Senator Dr. Lowe.

Sir, Senator Dr. Chandler queried why 'used cooking oil' could not be utilised in Barbados. Barbados is part of the International Maritime Organisation. There is a Convention known as MARPOL. That Convention deals with the prevention of pollution of the marine environment. There are six Annexes to that Convention. One of the Annexes deals specifically with substances in packaged forms. Under that Annex, the disposal of used cooking oil would fall. Therefore, we have to ensure that we adhere to the Conventions that we are party to. As I indicated, Barbados is party to the MARPOL Convention and the disposal of any used material from cruise ships have to be disposed in a specific way. We do not have facilities to deal with that, so we ensure that we comply with our commitment under these Conventions.

Mr. President, with those brief words, I wish to give my support to this Resolution.

I thank you.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Griffith.

SENATOR HON. E.R. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, I wish to thank Honourable Senators for their contribution on this issue. I will be very brief in my remarks but I just want to touch on a few issues.

First, I wish to assure Senator Stuart that in the not so distant he will hear all that he needs to hear about Greenland. The Ministry which is responsible for that matter will shortly be making its position known, including the results of a number of studies, which are now in progress, on the use of composting material at Mangrove and elsewhere. Then, everything will be known.

On the issue of cooking oil, that project, which involves a youngster, came out of the programme, promoted by the National Science and Technology Unit, with the schools. The gentleman received an award and to a large measure his success is as a result of the work of that Unit. It is not that the Government is unaware of the project.

Sir, it is interesting to hear about bringing cooking oil from elsewhere and nothing about using the cooking oil that we have here. Some people make these things sound as though they are big money earning issues.

14.30 p.m.

Sequence 20

Thursday, August 04, 2005

Senate 36, sequence 21, 2.30 p.m.

Senator the Hon. E.G. GRIFFITH: Sir, some people make these things sound as if they are big money making issues. If they are so big money making issues why are the persons in the private sector not taking them on? Why always there must be a dependence on the Government now for a subsidy?

Sir, Senator Chandler was at pains to say that she has a composure at home and she did not say that she got any subsidy. Therefore, I would ask her to tell the others how she has been able to do it without the subsidy that they could follow suit. Why must the Government always have to provide a subsidy for persons to do these things if they are so feasible? Sir, that is all I would say on those.

The issue of the purchase of the equipment and the persons who tendered for the procurement opportunity is one I would just speak to briefly. There were four companies that made bids and what I can say with great certainty is that the bid which was accepted from the local company is 35 per cent less than the package that was offered by the company that was making the murmurs.

Sir, apart from their bad after sales record, they wanted the Government to accept a bid that was 35 per cent higher than another company's bid, which has a good sales record. The truth is that while people tend to think that persons in the Government service are foolish people, every fool has his sense and I have discovered that, so in this particular case, the commonsense prevailed and the Government has secured a package that is more in its interest.

Mr. President, I now ask that this Resolution do now pass.

*The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.*

ORDER NO. 3 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) ORDER, 2005.

Senator J.E.D. WILLIAMS: Mr. President, as I speak to this particular Resolution, I want to propose that I make a comprehensive presentation that will cover all the other related Resolutions before us this afternoon, which have resulted from the job evaluation exercise and the recommendations contained therefrom.

Mr. President, from time to time, organisations are required to review the jobs that fall within their hierarchy of jobs to ensure that relativity remains and is maintained and, indeed, where anomalies are clearly identified that they are addressed.

This whole question of job evaluation within the public service is nothing new. We have had job evaluation exercises within the public service taking place since 1949. There was another one in 1968. We also had one in 1975 and before the 2000 one, there was one in 1989, to which I will refer because coming out of that particular review, there were some difficulties where the actual results were not really accepted by the stakeholders.

Sir, having explained that we have had a number of job evaluation exercises over the years, it was as far back as 1998 that the Ministry of the Civil Service indicated that the Government had intended to conduct a service wide job evaluation exercise. As you would recognise since 1989 and particularly after the 1994 period, there were a number of jobs were added to the public service, particularly between 1994 and 2000. Therefore, the Ministry of the Civil Service had sought to have external funding secured to support the job evaluation exercise that was conceptualised.

However, after some period of time, we recognised that it would have been difficult for us to secure the funding in the time that it was needed. Therefore, it was in 2000, Cabinet agreed that the job evaluation exercise would be conducted and paid from local resources.

The project itself, Mr. President, was divided into two phases. There was what was referred to as a diagnostic phase and then there were also the development and the implementation phase.

Sir, some of the reasons that led to the actual exercise itself, as I initially explained, had to do with the fact that a number of jobs were created within the public service between 1994 and 2000 and they had to, of course, be placed within the hierarchy of jobs at the time. As well as the fact that the job requirements within the service continued to change, even in terms of the number of professionals that were required within the service, there were a number of professionals being recruited as well and they had to be placed within the structure itself.

The nature of jobs had changed over time, both in terms of the complexities of the job and the responsibilities of the job. Sir, that warranted some periodic assessment, in terms of their value to the organisation. Failure to do so to my mind, would have impacted on the actual job relations and the actual work climate.

It is true to say and I think it could be understood by anyone, that if you are working in an organisation and you believe that what you are called upon to do, in terms of the skills required for your job, the responsibility that you hold, the complexity of the job, the work environment within which you work and so on, if a person believes that he or she is not paid their worth, after a while that in itself

becomes a problem. It is for the organisation to evaluate that job and when the time comes, all jobs to make sure that there is consistency and there is a clear determination of the value of each job, from the highest to the lowest.

Mr. President, there was also a lack of confidence expressed by a number of the stakeholders, with respect to the results that emanated from the 1989 job classification exercise that was done. The results, I must confess, Sir, were viewed with tremendous scepticism by many of the stakeholders, and that led to a number of requests for adjustments to specific jobs and groups of jobs within the service. Those requests came from the trade unions, the staff associations and even the individuals themselves.

There was also another element of it and that was the fact that there was at the time no acceptable written set of standards in place, designed to govern the placement of jobs within the job hierarchy. As I mentioned, there was a situation where professionals were coming into the public service and you had to place them somewhere within the structure. The best way of doing that would be to have a system that would clearly evaluate the worth of that job and pay the persons for their worth of the job. In other words, we are talking about equal pay for work of equal value.

*Senate 36, sequence 21, 14:40:14*

*Thursday, August 04, 2005*

SENATOR the Hon. J. E. D. WILLIAMS: The officials within the Ministry of the Civil Service felt that it was necessary to replace the qualitative methodology approach of assessing jobs that was used over the years, with a quantitative methodology approach, where at the end of it, the expectation is that the system that you end up with would be able to be held up to greater scrutiny and that there would be a feeling of fairness at the end of the day.

We all know that everyone has a feeling about the worth of his or her job. Within a job evaluation exercise everybody believes that his or her job would go up and that they would get more money and so on. If people believe that the system that you use is fair and that there is a fair determination of the worth of their job, it is more likely that at the end of the day it is going to be accepted. What had happened in the past, and I would speak a little to the idea of the classification system, is that the approaches previously used did not allow a specific and clinical analysis of each job to determine in a quantitative way the true worth of a particular job.

Mr. President, the two things to be remembered with respect to the quantitative approach and why you would find that companies and the various civil services across the world will try to shy away from this approach is that it

takes time, and I will speak to the length of time that the whole process took, and it is costly.

Mr. President, based on our experience and on the fact that at the end of the 1989 job evaluation exercise people felt unhappy and the results were not embraced by the stakeholders, the Ministry of the Civil Service felt that what we should do on this occasion is to move from the qualitative approach to the quantitative approach in terms of evaluating each job.

The unions, as well as the Congress of Trade Unions and Staff Associations of Barbados, continued to agitate to Government that such a comprehensive exercise ought to be undertaken since it was felt that the relative value among the different jobs of workers in the Public Service had changed, and the Ministry of the Civil Service became inundated with a large number of requests over a period of time for jobs and groups of jobs to be evaluated.

Mr. President, the job evaluation exercise is simply a systematic method of appraising the value of each job in relation to other jobs in terms of their value to an organisation. It is not about the individual who holds the job. Many people believe that you evaluate the person, but it is the actual job that the person performs that is evaluated. The job itself is defined as a set of tasks and responsibilities assigned by the organisation to an incumbent to perform for pay.

Mr. President, job evaluation must not be confused with the issue of performance management because people believe that you are also evaluating how an individual performs in the job, which is not the case. At the end of a year, once you have an appraisal system hopefully in place in your organisation you would use that to appraise how a person is doing but the job itself that the individual does is what is being assessed and evaluated through such an exercise. Therefore, the purpose of the exercise is to end up with a ranking of jobs based on their value to the organisation from the most valuable job to the least. That information is then used to help the organisation shape its policies and practices with respect to compensation.

Mr. President, I also would want at this point to indicate that a job evaluation exercise is never intended to be a situation where you end up with across-the-board increases because what you are doing is looking at what an individual is required to do, determine its value and if the person is being paid exactly what the job is worth then there is no change. If you determine that person's job scores higher and is worth more than what he or she is paid, then clearly there is a need for the job to be upgraded.

Similarly, you would find coming out of the exercise that no matter if an individual thinks that his job is worth that much more, there could be a situation where the job is

determined not to be worth what the person is paid and then you deal with that. The job is downgraded but then you have a way of dealing with a job that is determined as downgraded, and I will speak to that as well. These are the results coming out of the exercise itself. The higher value or the highest score that the job gets, it is expected that a higher pay would be attached to that job.

Mr. President, anomalies often exist where a job of higher value has a lower salary attached to it. Equally, there is one that has a lower value and sometimes they are often paid more. The main purpose therefore with respect to the exercise was to ensure that there was pay equity and that people were paid in accordance with the value assess of each particular job. Internal pay equity is simply equal pay for work of equal value.

In our case, we simply look at internal relativities. We did not go outside to compare jobs with respect to the private sector and the external market. In some organisations, particularly in the private sector, people do that because what you are basically trying to do is to retain the services of people within the organisation. People leave organisations for different reasons. It is clear to say that one of the reasons people leave organisations is for better conditions. There are some companies that will ensure that the remuneration and conditions of service that they give is comparable with those across the industry, so that in a sense it would be a disincentive for someone to simply say that they are going to leave and go with company X or company Y for the same thing.

Mr. President, the Civil Service pays better salaries between the middle grades to the lesser grades. However, it was recognised that what we offer with respect to the top level is not competitive, and we have to accept that is a reality. We are not in a position within the Civil Service to pay comparable salaries between the middle and the top grades for obvious reasons.

Mr. President, I indicated earlier that we had two phases to the job evaluation exercise. There was a diagnostic phase and a development and implementation phase. During the diagnostic phase the objective was basically to understand the root cause of the general dissatisfaction among the stakeholders, particularly as it related to the 1989 job evaluation exercise and the difficulty that people experienced with the system of classification, which was the present system. It was also intended to make recommendations on appropriate methodologies that could be used in conducting the valuation of jobs during phase II.

Mr. President, the approach that was taken included a number of interviews, workshops and contextual research. There was a feeling that one had to get feedback

from the people, if one were to understand what were the underlying causes.

Mr. President, some 50 stakeholders were interviewed. We had as many as 20 workshops, in which over 300 public sector employees participated. There was a slice across in terms of jobs from the top jobs to those at the bottom to make sure that at the end of the day we embrace all categories of workers.

*Senate 36 Sequence 22*

2.50 p.m.

*Thursday, August 04, 2005*

SENATOR the Hon. J. E. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. President, extensive research was done with respect to previous job evaluation exercises, not only in 1989 but the others to which I have referred. Sir, coming out of the diagnostic phase, there were a number of things that showed themselves up. In particular, the results showed that there was a lack of established policies, procedures and standards, and that against a backdrop of persons coming into the system and having to place them within the hierarchy of jobs, that there was the need for a system to be able to evaluate those jobs.

Mr. President, for example, coming out of this last exercise, what we have now is a system that we can use to evaluate a job. We can simply say that if we were to establish an individual in a position, that we can give the correct value and, therefore, the correct salary to that particular individual, and this is something that was lacking prior to this recent exercise. Sir, it was also felt that many of the issues, which emerged from that phase did not directly relate to job evaluation but that was the reality of it.

Mr. President, in terms of the methodology during the diagnostic phase, there was an attempt to evaluate jobs and to arrive at using a system which was either off-the-shelf or one that was developed. In that respect, a number of point factor systems were evaluated and at the end of it, four were reviewed to see if the Ministry of the Civil Service could have used those. There were also a number criteria set to determine whether or not any of those systems could have been satisfactory.

It was felt that those could have been capable of being reflected across a wider section of jobs across the service and that there ought to have been universally applicable. There was also a feeling that, at the end of the day, we ought not to adopt a system which might result in double accounting, as far as the elements that were taken into account when determining the work that the job entailed.

In terms of the factors to be identified as the compensatory factors, it was felt that they should be clear and comprehensive enough to cover the entire service. There was also a feeling that there must be a measure of scalability, where it was felt that one could look at the different factors and sub-factors and attach values to each one, so that at the end of the day, they would show consistency.

It was true that after careful analysis, it was felt that we could not have gone along with any off-the-shelf system and the consultants agreed that they would try to come up with a system which would have taken Barbados's situation into account. It was felt that the job evaluation system should be specific to the Barbados Civil Service, that it should consider all the issues and concerns expressed by the stakeholders during the diagnostic phase, that whatever system we adopt and develop should reflect the peculiarities of our culture, and that more importantly, it should involve the stakeholders in the design and validation of any process.

Mr. President, I earlier alluded to the fact that in the past, we had used the classification system, which is basically a qualitative system and in that respect, the entire job would be evaluated, instead of actually drilling down to look at the components that make up that job. Therefore, a value is determined for each job, so that, at the end of the day, you are measuring exactly what the persons does. The interesting thing is that with respect the classification system, you would find that large organisations using this job evaluation approach, are likely to be forced into categories in which they do not entirely match or fit. Therefore, this often leads to disagreement about the equity of the final value of a particular job and the job structure.

Mr. President, in terms of the quantitative method that we adopted, we came up with what are referred to as four universal factors which would cover any job. These factors are: skill, responsibility, effort, and working conditions. That allowed us, therefore, to look at each factor and determined a set of sub-factors. For example, with respect to skill, we were able to determine a number of requirements, such as formal education, on-the-job experience, communication skills, and the dexterity which was involved in the job.

In relation to the responsibilities, we were not only able to say that Mr. X or Miss Y has responsibility but we began to drill down and to look at that level of responsibility. We looked at the independence of action; at the consequence of error that falls to the individual; at the issue of confidentiality; at whether the individual has the responsibility for the health and safety of others; at whether the individual has responsibility for resources and how much of the resources of the organisation or in this case, within a particular department; at the responsibility for

ensuring compliance; at the numbers of employees under that individual's direction and social responsibility, among others.

In terms of effort, things such as task complexity, problem-solving, and the physical demand of the person, were taken into consideration.

In terms of working conditions, we looked at working conditions and at the stress involvement.

Mr. Speaker, therefore, we are basically saying that we are looking at the whole job, not in anyway clinically analysing the job in terms of its components but in this case, we are actually drilling down to determine exactly what someone does, so that we can measure and put a value and a rating to that particular job, so that, at the end of the day, we have a system that can with stand scrutiny because that is what it is about. At the end of the day, people are going to ask how has one arrived at certain decisions.

I am happy to say that there were discussions after the report has been submitted but generally speaking, people were satisfied that the process that had gone through in arrival at the end of the job evaluation exercise, was fair.

Mr. President, in terms of the product itself, the job evaluation exercise was executed under the aegis of the Ministry of the Civil Service, with the assistance of the Canadian firm, MNX International Consultant Services. They had a Strategy Committee that was headed by the Head of the Civil Service, but also included representatives from the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of the Civil Service, the Director of Public Sector Reform, the Congress of Trade Union and Staff Associations of Barbados (CTUSAB), as well as the National Union of Public Workers.

Mr. President, in terms of Phase II, the actual job evaluation exercise itself was undertaken by a 13-member committee, made up of five representatives nominated by the Congress of Trade Union and Staff Associations of Barbados (CTUSAB) including the National Union of Public Workers and four representative nominated by the Head of the Civil Service, along with four staff members from the Civil Service, which excluded Permanent Secretaries.

Mr. President, members of that committee underwent intensive training in the theory and practice of job evaluation exercise.

3.00 p.m.

Wednesday, July 20, 2005

SENATOR THE HON. J.E.D. WILLIAMS: the people who are actually involved in accessing the job must through a period of intensive training so that at the end of the day they are able to come up with the appropriate assessment of each job. These individuals also interview persons from all across the civil service from artisans through to Permanent Secretaries. At the end, after 20 months of intensive work, the exercise was completed in 2003 and the report submitted in September 2003. It resulted in recommendations that 3 000 posts should be upgraded and 200 posts should be downgraded. The major beneficiaries were the police, prisons, fire service and posts associated with the social services. Also, the higher ranks of the nursing profession, senior managers and professionals were also upgraded among others.

Mr. President, having received the report in September 2003, it was incumbent on the Ministry of Civil Service to sit down with unions and staff associations to discuss the report and where there were suggestions of things for review and where people believed they might have been anomalies, for those things to be addressed. Sir, coming out of those discussions, a case was put by CTUSAB that police constables at the top of the Parliament 21 grade for five years or more that some consideration ought to be given to those persons. At the end of it, it was agreed that those individuals who were at that point for five years or more would be given the difference between the P21 and P20 scale which resulted in approximately \$200 more per month for any officer who qualified.

Mr. President, may I say that the Police Association and CTUSAB were particularly pleased that the proposal was accepted and this has impacted a number of senior constables. There was also a request after the report was submitted that the staff nurses be looked at because there was a feeling that some staff nurses actually performed supervisory function and, therefore, that these persons be looked at differently. The view of the Ministry was that there was clear justification for creating more posts at the level of assistant rather than simply upgrading the posts of staff nurses.

Mr. President, there was no justification for upgrading beyond the assessment done but there was a clear indication that there was need to have more supervisory staff like sisters and the Ministry agreed with CTUSAB that an additional 20 posts of sisters would be provided in the Civil Establishment Order.

Mr. President, CTUSAB also sought to put a case for other groups such as medical record clerks and so on using the system we had adopted, there was no justification could be found to review or change the decisions which were taken. The National Union of Public Workers made several representations on behalf of other sectors including educational officers, car park attendants, home helpers,

administrative officer among others. Again, using the same approach and system used to evaluate each job, there was no justification found for changing the results except in the case of the home helpers where it was decided to restyle those posts as home care assistants so they were moved from C9 to C8. They were not totally happy, but at the end of the day, it was one that pleased the unions.

Mr. President, I must also comment on the fact that having gone through a period of approximately a year, the negotiating bodies, CTUSAB and the National Union of Public Workers had written the Ministry of Civil Service giving their approval to the implementation of the results with minor modifications.

Mr. President, they were issues about the date of implementation. There were also issues in relation to the impact on Ministers of the Crown, judges and how we were going to treat people whose jobs were downgraded. Before I speak to those issues, let me say that despite the fact that it was not directed work related, the opportunity was also taken to revise the policy with respect to the incremental credits for persons in the post of Z38 to Z24, persons who required four or more CXC General Proficiency Certificates. Prior to the implementation of the New Qualification Order in December 2001, a clerical officer was paid for possession of Ordinary Level and Advanced Level certificates above the stipulated one O'Level up to a maximum of nine increments, five for O'Levels and two for Advanced certificates. Therefore, an officer recruited with four O'Level certificates was paid Z35 in the scale Z38 to Z24. (15:08)

(15:09:41) a Minister was paid \$24 000 per annum and a Permanent Secretary was paid \$19 440. The salary of the Minister was approximately 23 per cent higher than that of a Permanent Secretary. They had an increase given in 1975 to Permanent Secretaries but none was given to Ministers

S36/15:10

Sequence 24

Thursday, August 4, 2005

SENATOR the Hon. J.E.D. WILLIAMS: An increase was given in 1975 to Permanent Secretaries, none was given to Ministers. At the end of it the Ministers worked for 13 per cent more than the Permanent Secretaries. In 1973, there was a 23 per cent differential; there was no application in 1975, of course, elections were due in 1976. Then elections were held in 1976 and between 1976 and 1978 an attempt was made to review and look at a system. How do you remove the cynicism, criticism and controversy associated with increases, that you would no longer see moving from 23 per cent, delaying the increase

because of upcoming elections and at the same time implement a progressive system that is applicable?

Sir, it is interesting that having used that approach until 1989/1990, at the time when the then Democratic Labour Party Administration sought to implement the recommendations from the salary review of 1989 in 1990, it took to Parliament only those increases that related to the public service. Increases for Ministers were not included at that point, but they were dealt with two months after the 1991 Elections. They did not make any magical attempt to justify it. They returned to the established procedure of 1978 to remind Parliament of a system which tied a Permanent Secretary's salary to that of a Minister. In fact, a Minister receives approximately 3 per cent more than the Permanent Secretary, which is equivalent to an increment.

Mr. President, there was tremendous discussion on whether the administration should continue with the link. To my mind, to delink would have been wrong. I do not believe that Parliamentarians should be the judges of their own cause. I do not believe that we should return to a system where Parliamentarians determine how much they receive.

Sir, we have a system that had been used since 1978 and that had been successful. To my mind it has served us well. I am happy to see that Government has agreed that the link should be maintained. How you treat the increase is another matter but the fact is, that linkage remains.

Mr. President, for those persons who may want to understand how you value the job of the Prime Minister, it is very simple. I said that the Minister's salary is linked to that of the Permanent Secretary with an extra 3 per cent, which is equivalent of an increment. The Minister's salary is also equal to 75 per cent of the Prime Minister's salary. The Deputy Prime Minister's salary is equal to 85 per cent of the Prime Minister's salary. I do not believe that there is anybody who would feel that a Prime Minister - let me not deal with it in terms of a Prime Minister, Ministers and Permanent Secretaries. Within the private sector there is no CEO who is going to work for the same salary as the people who report to him. There must be a differential. We are saying that a Minister's salary is simply 75 per cent of that of the Prime Minister's salary, so the computation is clear.

I must say that we had in 1973 a 23 per cent differential. I will show why I say that it is a very dangerous thing to go back to old days and for Parliament to be called upon to determine its own salaries. Between 1973 and 1978 the cost of living rose by 93 per cent, during that period the Parliamentarians' salaries were not addressed. Persons at the bottom of the scale were increased by 52 per cent. The Senior civil servant salaries increased by 20 per cent but there was no mechanism to

determine how much we were going to pay the Minister. Hence, Parliament sat and determined a procedure for the future, that has served this country well. I am happy to note that linkage continues and I hope that it will remain. I hope that Parliament will no longer revert to the situation where it becomes the judge of its own policy.

Mr. President, as for the 200 posts that were downgraded, there will be red-circled, that is, the persons who presently hold those positions will not suffer any reduction in pay. They will continue to be paid at that level, but clearly all new applicants for such a position, will be paid at the new rates.

Sir, I alluded earlier to the Judges, commenting that the job evaluation exercise did not deal specifically on this occasion with the remuneration for Judges. I must also say that over the past few years, as a result of representation made by those persons, the terms and condition of service of Judges have improved significantly. May I say that even the recommendation coming from the Consultants suggests that one should look at evaluating the Judges and compare their salaries independently. May be, one should also look at external comparisons of what Judges are paid in Barbados and what Judges are paid across the region.

In 1998, with regard to improved conditions, a special non taxable allowance that is also pensionable and was agreed. May I say that we will continue to look at the question of the Judges situation. They raised a number of additional matters for consideration, areas that they would like to see improved. We have recommendations from the Consultants that we will review progressively.

Sir, with respect to the job evaluation exercise as it relates to Parliamentarians, despite the fact that it did not encompass the Parliamentarians, it was decided that they should also benefit from the increase by the same percentage of the Ministers, costing \$180 000 annually. The actual cost resulting from the implementation arising from the job evaluation exercise will be in the amount of \$8.7 million. Based on the cost of the upgrading which is approximately \$7.7 million; the upgrade of Ministers' salaries is \$260 000; the new incremental policy where we mentioned those persons with four CXCs will cost \$600 000 and the increases to Parliamentarians will be \$180 000.

In terms of the implementation date, that was an issue...

15.20 p.m.

*Sequence 25*

*Thursday, August 04, 2005*

*Senate 36, sequence 26, 3.20 p.m.*

Senator the Hon. J.E.D. WILLIAMS: In terms of the implementation date - and as I said that was an issue - the process started as far back as 1999 and the exercise, Mr. President, was projected to take some two years. Eventually, it was started in 2000 and it took a little longer than expected because of the death of the original consultant.

However, the process was completed in 2003, when the report was submitted. We then had to discuss it with the unions to get the final sign-off and agreement and that took another year. As a result, the NUPW had requested an implementation date of April 1, 2004. CTUSAB had requested one of September 2003 and, in the end, we felt as though there should be a compromise on it and the implementation date of September 1, 2004 was agreed to, Sir.

The results of the exercise, Mr. President, are firmly grounded on the principle of internal pay equity, equal pay for work of equal value. It cannot be emphasized too much that the recommendations must be judged in this context only.

Before I go any further, Mr. President, I believe it is important that I speak to a few issues that are of importance because, the issue was raised before about the timing of the actual increase. As I said, the report was submitted in September of 2003. The discussions and agreement with the unions took us a year. If we were able at the time to have taken it to Parliament then, I guess one would argue that maybe, we would not have had the issues that we have today, surrounding the timing of it, Sir.

Mr. President, there were a number of positions put by some people that we should not pursue it any more, we should send it to a select committee, and we should only pay this group and not that group. I want to make the point, I have heard now that maybe the senior civil servants should not be given an increase.

I alluded to a lot of what happened over the years but there is one point I want to draw to the attention of this Honourable Chamber. In 1960, the differential between the salary of a permanent secretary, those at the top and the bottom was 15:1. Sir, by 1970, it moved to 10:1, and by 2003 it moved to 5.5:1. I said earlier that going back to the 1973 to 1977 period, there was a situation where those at the bottom received an increase of 55 per cent, while those at the top received 20 per cent. This was the kind of approach that we took because getting to 5.5:1 is only for one reason and that is, you gave the bottom more than the top.

My view is that if you decided you are going to give, for example, those at the middle down, and forget those from the middle up to the top, all that you are going to do is

to move that 5.5:1 down to, maybe, less than 5:1. What that says is that the person who is at the very bottom is slowly getting to the same salary as those at the top.

Mr. President, we can only just begin to imagine the kind of organisation or institution that you are creating, when there is no incentive for anybody to want to get a promotion. The promotion has greater responsibility and if with that responsibility, you cannot see a differential between your job and the person who is reporting to you, you really do not want it, and that is the reality of it, Sir.

Therefore, for those persons who are suggesting that you ought not to implement it for the top civil servants, understand clearly the damage that you are doing. I have already said to this Honourable Chamber that when it comes to the middle grades downwards, the public service pays better than the private sector. The challenge is only from the middle grades up. I have heard persons elsewhere advance the argument that what we need to do now is to continue this practice of giving the bottom more than the top and to abandon the concept of across the board increases but I want us to understand what the implications are of such action.

I have already spoken about the timing of the increase and why we are where we are, Sir. I have spoken about the linkage of salaries of parliamentarians to permanent secretaries, and about the fact that those between the top and the bottom continue to get compressed.

Sir, in the last few minutes I have, I want to deal with the last issue and that is the issue of wage restraint. There is a feeling that when it comes to job evaluation exercises during the period of wage restraint, they should not be applied. Suffice it to say, Mr. President, that is something which was also taken into account, even as far back as the very first Prices and Incomes Protocol that we had. It says that where increases are the result of job evaluation exercises or negotiated job enhancement exercises, wage restraint shall not be used artificially to suppress valid claims for increases in employee compensation.

I feel that if you use a system that determines that an individual's job is of higher worth and ought to be paid more, and then you decide arbitrarily you are not going to do it, I think that is a gross injustice. I can understand why the framers, going back from Protocol 1, would ensure that something like this is enshrined, so that people could not willy-nilly, after you go through an evaluation exercise, decide that you are not going to implement it, Sir.

I am coming to work. I have greater responsibility. I am required to have a greater level of skill to do my job. I perform with greater effort and a system that is supposed to

be fair, one that now moves from simply a qualitative kind of approach to a quantitative methodology, determines that my job is worth more and then, at the end of that, you just simply want to arbitrarily say that I should not get my true worth.

Mr. President, I think it is grossly unfair and I could imagine what would happen in a company, if an individual knew that he or she was assessed and the job is determined to worth more and not be remunerated. Can you imagine how that would spread throughout an organisation, and the type of discontent it would create? This is what some people are suggesting should happen and I really do not want any part of it, Sir.

I believe, Mr. President, that we have gone through an exercise that was thorough and fair, and can stand up to scrutiny. We all know about the inherent difficulties of previous job evaluation exercises and on this occasion, we have tried to move our approach and the methodology to arrive at an assessment of a higher level. I am not saying to this Honourable Chamber that it is 100 per cent foolproof but we have moved in the right direction to such an extent that at the end of the day, we could have received the kind of consensus and agreement that we got from the Staff Associations and the unions.

I believe, Mr. President, that the recommendations as submitted to this Honourable Chamber should be supported and with those remarks, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

*Senate 36, sequence 26, 15:30:32*

*Thursday, August 04, 2005*

SENATOR F. J. STUART: Mr. President, quite a bit of animated discussion, sometimes acrimonious discussion, has taken place in Barbados ever since notice of the Resolutions which are at present engaging the attention of this Chamber was given in the Other Place. That discussion has continued as Barbadians try to come to grips with the consequences that have flowed inexorably, it seems, from the job evaluation exercise to which Senator Williams has been referring.

Mr. President, job evaluation exercises are absolutely necessary from time to time as the content of particular posts changed. Since employment takes place in a dynamic and in many respects a developing environment, it is necessary that the content of the work that people do be evaluated from time to time, if distortions are to be avoided in the system and the ideal of what has been called in this report, internal pay equity, is achieved.

Mr. President, I should like to congratulate all those persons associated with what must have been a very

painstaking endeavour of carrying out this exercise. We have been told that it is the most comprehensive of such exercises ever to take place in Barbados. I believe that every job evaluation exercise that has taken place since 1949, would have described itself as the most comprehensive one to take place. I do not believe that the 1968 job evaluation exercise considered that it was inferior to the 1949 one. I do not believe that the 1975 one considered that it was inferior to those of 1968 and 1949, and certainly I do not believe that the 1989 one considered that it was inferior to any of those that have gone before.

Mr. President, when we are dealing with human effort we are dealing with the strivings of men to attain the ideal of social justice in a society. Of course, justice would mean nothing if it does not aim at giving every man his due. There has been a lot of discussion on this issue. As I have listened to the discussion, it has occurred to me that Barbadians who have been, as I said animatedly and in some cases acrimoniously, discussing this issue, have been little concerned with how well or how much better the average public servant is going to do as a result of the job evaluation exercise. The discussion has focussed on the other issue of the how well the political class, as it has now come to be called, will do as a result of this exercise. Every discussion to which I have listened tended to de-emphasize what would happen to particular job categories in the Public Service and tended to focus more on what for the people of this country is perhaps the central issue around this exercise, that is, how the political class is being treated or more accurately is treating itself.

Mr. President, the most cursory examination of the report seems to suggest that of the 28 000 jobs in the Public Service about 3 000 are going to be affected by this whole exercise. That is what one gleans from the report. The other inference one is forced to draw from the report is that it seems that a significant large number of people at the top will benefit from this job evaluation exercise.

Mr. President, I make those two points because I was around and I heard a lot of the discussion when the 1989 job evaluation exercise was done and it was precisely those two criticisms that one heard coming out of that evaluation exercise. That is, that too small a number of people benefited from the exercise and that the exercise favoured people at the top. Of course, in the forefront of the crusade for this issue and for that contention was the Barbados Labour Party, then in Opposition. Sir, the evaluation committee of that period was reviled by the Barbados Labour Party and the Government got its fair share of verbal blows from the then Opposition as well. Interestingly enough, because the same two issues have resurfaced, the criticisms being levelled at this report and the results of this report are no different.

Mr. President, as I have listened to the discussions and as I have listened to members of the Government defending themselves and how well they have been treated as a result of this exercise and as I reflected on what I heard in 1989 and well into the early 1990s, I reflected on the words of, I believe it was Shakespeare's Macbeth, who while debating with himself whether he should accept his wife's advice to commit a murder and to get a crown, said:

"...In these cases, we still have judgement here; that we but teach bloody instructions, which, being taught, return, to plague the inventor."

He went on, with dogmatic certitude, and dare I say with devastating finality, to say:

"This even-handed justice commends the ingredients of our poisoned chalice to our own lips."

*Senate 36 Sequence 27*

3.40 p.m.

*Thursday, August 04, 2005*

SENATOR F. J. STUART: Mr. President, I cannot help but think that as we debate this matter today, in the light of all the discussions and the defensive positions being taken up by this Government, that the ingredients of the poisoned chalice of the Barbados Labour Party, are being commended to its own lips.

Mr. President, this is not to say that I do not believe that parliamentarians should be paid. I think that the proper remuneration of parliamentarians flows inexorably from the fact that we have something, since the 1950s, called the universal adult suffrage. Sir, before that became the order of the day in Barbados and in other parts of the world, income and property qualifications not only determined who could have voted but who could have sat in these Chambers. What really happened was that the masses were excluded from the whole business of political decision-making because politics had very little to do with them. This was so because of the fact that men of income and men of property were the persons who occupied the seats in this Honourable Chamber called the Legislative Council and in the Other Place. There were persons who looked out for the interest of people like themselves because it was only people like themselves who voted.

Mr. President, once that piece of political architecture was smashed and the ordinary man and woman in this county had gotten the chance to vote and to chose his or her own representatives, it meant that poor men, who did not necessarily have any property and who did not command any great income, were able to come and to take

up positions in these Chambers, and to make demands on the behalf of the masses of this country.

I think that we have to make a fundamental decision with those people in Barbados, who believe that there is anything wrong with properly remunerating parliamentarians, they might give thought to whether they might want to see a return of the days when only wealthy people can afford to offer themselves to sit in the Parliament of this island. They might also want to ponder on the possible and most likely consequences of a return to that dingy age, where their interest would have been excluded from the consideration of those persons who sit in these Honourable Chambers.

Mr. President, my position on this is very clear. I will not get into any argument over whether or not parliamentarians should be properly remunerated because the alternatives are wholly unattractive to me. Therefore, when those alternatives were in place, progressive programmes such as free secondary education, free school meals, the passage of legislation to protect workers, holiday with pay legislation and the protection of wages legislation passed in the 1950s, were put on a back-burner, and the interest of men of money and men of property, were treated forefrontly. I really frown on that kind of politics and give my fullest support to representatives and representation coming from amongst the masses themselves.

Mr. President, having said that, I also need to make the point that we are not in politics, driven primarily by what we can get out of it. Mercifully, I think up to now, we have not fully forfeited the people's confidence in that regard, although I think recent developments surrounding this issue and this debate have brought us dangerously close to that. I do not know of any issue over the last 10 years that has so embittered the people of Barbados, as the one with which we are dealing here today, and it must give us pause. What are the people saying?

Mr. President, this Government has been in office from 1994 until present, which is 11 years in the month of September, 2005. When the late Right Excellent Errol Walton Barrow had spent 10 years in Government, he had introduced revolutionary changes in education, which touched every household in Barbados; he had taken a country into Independence, which touched every household as well; he had introduced a Social Security Scheme, where we are still the envy of people across the Caribbean; he had passed a Severance Payment Act to protect workers, that touched every household in Barbados, and one can go on and on at the achievements of that 10-year period.

Mr. President, one thing that is marvelous to relate is that he had never demanded as much from the people of Barbados as is being now demanded and for doing much more. For touching every household in this country with

policies that transformed the lives of ordinary men and women, he was contented, relatively speaking, with much less than what is being demanded of the people of Barbados today.

Mr. President, if I may to go the other period of 1976-1986, the Tom Adams/St. John period. That period saw the passage of the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act, which was not a perfect piece of legislation as it had caused a number of dislocations, but the reality is that it has changed lives across both urban and rural Barbados, and has created a number of problems. The point is that this legislation touched lives and people could not have claimed to be ignorant of the fact that it had been passed.

3.50 p.m.

*Wednesday, August 4, 2005*

SENATOR F.J. STUART: Also, a national Drug Service was put in place which touched lives all across the country. Sir, the Barbados Labour Party like to boast about this so why do I not humour them by making this point. A new impetus was given to what is now called the international business sector and, to this day, we discuss that sector with a certain level of excitement and enthusiasm. A grand highway that opened new vistas in Barbados in the face of harsh criticism, was put in place and Barbados has not been the same again.

Mr. President, between 1976 and 1986, to say nothing of the modern Central Bank of Barbados facility, also done in the face of harsh criticism, but these things happened, touched lives and changed them and the politicians of that dispensation demanded much less from the people of Barbados than is being demanded today.

Mr. Speaker, if the Government does not understand what it is that the people of Barbados is quarreling about, that is where the issue is. The people of Barbados are asking if we have to pay these people all his money, if these people feel entitled to go home with these vast gratuities and weighty pensions, what is it that they have to show us by way of achievement that we can boast about? Sir, they asked that question but no clear answers are forthcoming. When they asked for bread, the Government gave them stone, when they asked for fish, this Government gave them a serpent and when they asked for egg, this Government fed them with scorpion. There is nothing to show of any substance to the people of Barbados for the last 11 years. This is not to say that things have not happened. I am speaking about things that have touched the lives of ordinary people, transformed and transmuted them as well to higher levels of existence and development.

Madam President, there is nothing to which this Government can point and is demanding more from the

people of Barbados than any previous Government has demanded since the introduction of universal adult suffrage. I regret that the late Senator Collymore is not here today because I would have delighted in hearing his take on this most comprehensive job evaluation, the most comprehensive ever to have taken place in the history of the country. Sir, I would be delighted to hear his take on all this in the light of what would have been said in the period after the last exercise in 1989 and onwards.

Mr. President, I supposed in the immortal words of Alfred Lord Tennyson I might exclaim, Oh for the touch of a vanished hand, the sound of a voice that is still. Oh that Senator Collymore were here today!

Mr. President, if I may come to Report on this job evaluation exercise. As I understand it, the case of the Government is that there was in place since 1978, a principal of linkage between the salary of Ministers and those of the Permanent Secretaries, the linkage reflecting itself in a three percent difference, the equivalent of one increment, in favour of the Minister. As Senator Williams said in his introduction, that principle received the anointing of the Democratic Labour Party in Government in 1990.

Mr. President, we are told that what the Government is now doing is really no more than carrying through with that principle and, therefore, what is all the fuss about, they ask. They are saying and it has been said here again today and pray the Prices and Income Protocol in aid that we can be deaf to the litanies of the Governor of the Central Bank of Barbados for the time being because we have covered in the Protocol from 1993 with the first one signed by the Democratic Labour Party that job evaluation exercises and the consequences that flow therefrom are not to be interpreted in such a way as to prevent the beneficiaries of those exercises from getting their just deserves so we should ignore the Governor of the Central Bank of Barbados for the time being. Of course, scorn was heaped on the Opposition, particularly its leader when he said that he did not want to benefit from any increase at this time. He was called by all sorts of names and held up to national ridicule. They said, how preposterous for a Leader of the Opposition that increases in terms of Minister account for not more than \$280 000 per year and for ordinary parliamentarians no more that \$160 000, how can this be a national issue in a \$6 billion dollar economy. We were told in emphatic language that it was a non issue and a new phrase was added to the political vocabulary of Barbados “the path of ignoble ease”. It was said that the Opposition was taking the path of “ignoble ease” in talking about not wanting it and trying to play cheap politics because you are talking about \$280 000 if you are talking about Ministers and \$160 000 if you are talking about ordinary parliamentarians. He asked what was all of this in an economy of \$6 billion.

Mr. President, I have internalised all of this and I really think that the Government has to be answered on this. Sir, I do not really know if the Government has to be answered because I think the Government has already answered itself. The very person who talked about ‘the path of ignoble ease’ and who ridiculed the Opposition, the Right Honourable Prime Minister reported two days ago, and it was published yesterday, that from this paltry and puny sum of \$280 000 per year, he must make a sacrifice in the interest of the nation and that he would not be taking his.

*S36/16:00 Sequence 29*

*Thursday, August 4, 2005*

SENATOR F.J. STUART: In the interest of the nation, he will not be taking his. He said that he could not force it on his Ministers, but he hoped aloud that they would see the wisdom of following his example, as he followed the example of the Leader of the Opposition down the path of ignoble ease.

Mr. President, we have to be careful that the people of Barbados are not losing patience with this kind of histrionics in politics. You really cannot stand up two weeks ago and assert with all the conviction you could muster that there was nothing wrong with what you were doing; that there was everything right with it; those who were criticising it were bordering on unpatriotic and certainly on the politically absurd. Then, once public opinion indicated that your argument had not been taken, reversed yourself in the full glare of the public.

The people of Barbados would not have been angry about this. In fact, I think that announcement has only accentuated mass anger in the country. The people heard both sides of the argument and took a side as who they thought was right. The Government made it clear that this was the path that had to be taken; a principle was being followed and a plague on the House of Members of the Opposition for not wanting the Government to follow that principle.

Mr. President, Jose Marti, the Cuban writer in revolutionary, once said that a principle even from the depths of a cave is mightier than an army of many millions. This principle did not seem to be so mighty because it could be easily shunted once the winds of popular favour indicated that the people were against the Government.

What is the value of the announcement that the Honourable Prime Minister is not going to take his increase? It is not going to affect the pension he will be paid and it is not going to affect the enlarged gratuity from which he will benefit. So, what is all of this? This is political histrionics. This is an attempt to court what I call

cheap support and popularity no longer available among the masses of the people of Barbados for they have now seen fully through this regime and are finished with it. Sir, a man said to me last night in Six Roads, and he captured this better than I could ever have imagined it could have been captured, he said I do not know what it is that has died but what I know is, the political vultures are swooping down to feed on the carrion. That is how he put it. The Government is on its way out and is now making sure that it takes care of itself as it disappears into the midnight.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Stuart, I hate to interrupt you. I want to be sure that you are not imputing improper motives to any Member of either House. The Rules are fairly specific on this.

SENATOR F.J. STUART: Sir, I do not so intend. I really do not think that there is any malice coming from the decision makers on this matter. I am just trying to get the facts and to look at the consequences that flow from the facts. There is no intention to impute any improper motives to any Honourable Member of this Chamber or of any other. Sir, we are all in this together and we aim at the highest standards. It just happens that, as St. Paul said, "The good we would we do not, and the evil we would not that we do. Oh wretched man that I am, who should save me from the body of this death."

*Asides.*

SENATOR F.J. STUART: Mr. President, this job evaluation exercise has made certain recommendations in respect of the pay structures to various categories of people in the public service. The one that concerns me, given the thrust and direction of my speech, is the recommendation that relates to persons in the category of the Permanent Secretary, to whose salaries those of the Members of Parliament are linked. Those in the S1 scale, I have learnt more about the public service from reading this Report than I have ever known how to analyse these scales and so on. This Report, at Appendix, for persons in the S1 scale recommends an annual salary \$112 000. The Resolution we are discussion here today does not limit itself, unfortunate, to that \$112 000 recommended in the Report. The Cabinet made a decision. The decision could only be made at the Cabinet level that is why these Resolutions are before this Chamber today.

In the face of the recommendation that Permanent Secretaries should get \$112 000, the S1 scale, the recommendation before the Chamber today is that from September 1, 2004, they will be paid \$117 666.96 and from April 1, 2005 they will be paid \$121 196.88. In other words, nearly \$18 000 more per annum than is recommended in the Job Evaluation Exercise Phase 2 Final Report.

Mr. President, if it is true that this link between the political class, as they have come to be called, and the Permanent Secretary is so sacred and if it is true that the Government, Honourable Members of the Barbados Labour Party, are committed to a path other than the path of ignoble ease, one would have thought that they would have found the recommendation of...

S36: 16.10

*Sequence 30*

*Thursday, August 04, 2005*

*Senate 36, sequence 31, 4.10 p.m.*

Senator F.J. STUART: ...one would have thought that they would have found the recommendation of the Committee, so far as S1 scales are concerned to be more attractive than increasing that figure from \$112 000 to \$121 196 88.

Sir, obviously, the higher the sum of money a permanent secretary receives, the 3 per cent differential between the permanent secretary and the Minister is bound to be more significant. There is a fundamental difference, a distinct difference between getting 3 per cent more than \$112 000 and getting 3 per cent more than \$121 196 88.

There are issues like these that are occasioning the people of Barbados profound disquiet because they do not believe - and I listen to them - that the Government has been coming as straight as they might on this issue. In fact, they may have been proven right because of the readiness of Government Members, led by the Leader of the Government, to retreat from his previous position that this was a principle to which everybody was adhering and that those who were opposing it, were just pursuing the path of ignoble ease.

Mr. President, I do not have to deliver any lengthy speech in this Chamber today. I really am very glad for those public servants who have benefited from the evaluation exercise. These things are necessary. Nineteen years separated the 1949 one from the 1968 one. Seven years separated the 1975 one from the 1968 one, and fourteen years separated the 1975 one from the 1989 one and now, sixteen years separate these two. There will be other evaluation exercises in the future, and they will generate their own discussion.

Sir, the issue for the people of Barbados is why do Members of this Government believe that they are entitled to demand more from the Treasury by way of remuneration, than more distinguished predecessors, who have had more to show for their efforts over the same time frame than the present regime.

If when people in this country go to a bus stop, they can get public transport whenever they want it, or in a timely fashion, they really would not care how much money our Parliamentarians are working for, Sir.

If when they go to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, they can get treatment with dispatch, courtesy and with a level of efficiency that departs markedly from that described by the Minister of Health that people are abrasive and ill-mannered to one another and that is what the society has now become, they would not be bothering about how much money any Minister is getting, Sir.

If they could get their garbage picked up in a timely fashion, if they could get the Minister of Finance to release funds for the Sanitation Service Authority in a timely fashion, so that they could get their garbage collected in an equally timely fashion, they would not care what any Minister of Government is working for or whether there is any 3 per cent differential between what a permanent secretary gets and what a Minister of Government gets, Sir.

If the average Barbadian who wants a house or a house spot could go to the National Housing Corporation and be assured that in a respectable time that house or house spot would be made available to him or her, Mr. President, do you really think Barbadians would waste their time calling in on a call-in programme or bestirring themselves on the streets arguing about what a parliamentarian works for, Sir.

If they could get this Government to account to them for the massive expenditure at Greenland, they would not care anything about this, Sir. This would just be another nine-day's wonder if, it as long as nine days because it may not even be that long.

Mr. President, once their needs are being satisfied and once they could see what they are getting out of the political system, that would be enough to satisfy them. Sir, with all of these unresolved issues and with pressures mounting in their personal lives, they see their political directorate taking care of themselves in a way that certainly makes it appear as though they are preparing to go and, they do not understand why they should have to live on small, sometimes very puny wages and salaries and pensions, while those who profess to serve them are doing so spectacularly well.

Therefore, let the position of the Democratic Labour Party be clearly understood. We accept the principle of 1978. We concede that we anointed it in 1991. We accept that there should be a continued link between the permanent secretary and the Ministers of Government. We find no fault with any of that but we ask, with the people of Barbados, what is it that this particular Government has to show that could give it the confidence or the temerity even

to look the people of this country in the face and demand more.

Sir, not one policy initiative has permeated this society to touch the lives of ordinary people in a transforming kind of way. Nothing. Catch phrases and slogans, removing a little kink here, only to create another one there, but nothing of policy value that the average man in the Ivy, in the Bay Land, in March Field St. Philip or anywhere else can say that look, I will never forget this Barbados Labour Party's administration, this is what it has done for me and I will be forever hereafter grateful and glad.

They were able to say it about the Democratic Labour Party's administration between 1961 and 1976. They were able to say it about the Barbados Labour Party's administration between 1976 and 1986 but this present administration, in health, in education, in agriculture, in labour, in social transformation, wherever you look, all you can see, Mr. President, is a catalog of failures by this regime, barely holding itself together and the real losers in all of this are the ordinary man and woman in Barbados.

Sir, that man in the gas station last night may well have been right. Something is dead or dying and the vultures are hovering for the carrion. I want to make my position clear. I am sure I am making my colleague's position clear as well that this Resolution, so far as it affects Parliamentarians, will not have the Opposition's support. A Division will be called for and we will be saying, no, because, like the people of Barbados, we cannot see or we do not know what it is we are rewarding this regime for, after 11 years in office.

Mr. President, I am going to take my seat. Thank you, Sir.

*Senate 36, sequence 31, 16:20:14*

*Thursday, August 04, 2005*

SENATOR F. J. STUART: Mr. President, I am going to take my seat because I do not make long speeches if I do not have to. For me, this issue is very clear. I am not at war with the job evaluation exercise. I am satisfied that those who bestirred themselves and put their energies and talents at the disposal of the country to get this report and its predecessor ready have rendered yeomen service to the people of Barbados and they should be congratulated.

Their recommendation for the S1 scale was not accepted by the Cabinet, that is the Cabinet's right. However, we should not give the people of Barbados the impression that what we were discussing here today is the result of any report submitted to the Government. The figures in the S1 scale in the Resolution before the House

are not the figures contained in this report. This is therefore Government figures of permanent secretaries salaries and on the basis of those salaries, a three per cent in favour of ministers is to be calculated.

Mr. President, I have read unfortunately ministers of the Crown complaining about how hard they have to work and what sacrifices they have to make, and some even showing their pay slip and that kind of thing. Mr. President, I am sure that you are familiar with the principle of the law of Tort, *volenti non fit injuria*, you cannot complain if you willingly expose yourself to a risk. It does not help the argument any to enter politics, to know what the risks are and then to complain about the sacrifices you have to make. It does not help it either to compare yourself with people in the private sector.

Mr. President, one of these discussions was taking place in Britain recently, when it was claimed that the British Prime Minister was perhaps the lowest paid Prime Minister in Europe. When his £192 000 per year salary was contrasted with what CEOs in the private sector were earning, the question that was asked was not whether he was working for too little but whether the CEOs in the private sector were working for too much and to what extent could the public sector pattern itself as it were on what was going on in the private sector. There are two different categories and we have to make peace with that. There are benefits to working in the private sector and there are benefits to working in the public sector and people make their choices.

Mr. President, it falls ill from the mouth of any politician, having offered himself to the public as a servant, willing to make the sacrifices that attend that offering, to then complain that he or she is not getting enough. There are too many people in Barbados at the lowest rungs of the ladder who have convinced themselves that they will never get enough but they have to continue to live.

Mr. President, it is my view that the example being set by the Government on this issue is one that undermines popular faith in those persons in public life and that will cause this Government to lose the confidence of the public hereafter. I do not see how after all the strange gymnastics this regime can recover from the crisis of trust, in which it is has now placed itself, as a result of what is happening in Barbados over the last three weeks.

Mr. President, we in the Democratic Labour Party stand firm on this issue. We think the people have been duped in respect of that relationship between permanent secretaries salaries and the salaries of ministers of the Crown and we will not be supporting the Resolution on a matter of principle. If this is called the path of ignoble ease, we are happy to be on that path on this issue.

I am obliged to you, Mr. President.

SENATOR Sir JOHN STANLEY GODDARD: Mr. President, we all know and have been discussing for a while these pay increases which were recently announced which have been highly controversial. As Senator Stuart has said, I cannot think of any issue that has captured the public imagination or interest as much as this one has. Many consider the timing of the announcement insensitive in view of the work being done by the Governor of the Central Bank of Barbados in highlighting the need for wage restraint.

Mr. President, as is to be expected, this debate has become very much embroiled in partisan politics. The Government, as is to be expected, has stoutly defended its position without dissent I may say, while the members of the other side have vigorously opposed it. Of course there have been much debate in the media, on the call-in programmes, which I try to listen to keep my ear to the ground, discussions on the radio and discussions even on the television, so the public is fully aware of the level of this controversy.

Mr. President, I have asked myself why is it that this issue has risen to such a high level of controversy and after reflecting on it I think that it is really reflecting an accumulation of frustrations that the taxpayers are experiencing in this island. Not one of these frustrations would be sufficient to ignite public debate as this issue has but collectively the accumulation of all have certainly had that effect and I will try to do a few in no particular order.

Mr. President, there is dissatisfaction with the conditions of many of our roads. I can relate to that dissatisfaction because two weeks ago driving home at night, I hit a pothole and a tyre on which I had travelled less than 5 000 miles, thankfully it did not burst, the walls bulged and I had to replace it the next day. The garbage had been discussed extensively here today.

*Senate 36 Sequence 32*

4.30 p.m.

*Thursday, August 04, 2005*

SENATOR Sir JOHN STANLEY GODDARD: Mr. President, I agree with what has been said, the sanitation workers do a very good job, but we need to give them the tools to be able to get the job done. Only today it has been decided that new equipment will be purchased to assist them but until that equipment arrives and is functioning, we can still see garbage being piled up in various parts of the island. I can think of one road I take every day, that being Cox Hill, St. Phillip, where there is a pile of garbage on that road.

As has already been mentioned, the situation at the Greenland Landfill has remained a mystery until today, when some indication was given that shortly announcements will be made by the Minister of Health. We have heard nothing about Greenland, yet we know that millions of dollars have been spent there.

Mr. President, another frustration that we are facing is this so-called ZR culture. ZR drivers do as they like, stop where they like, pick up and put down passengers where they like and play whatever music they want, which is, I understand to be in violation of the law, and yet we expect school children to go to school and concentrate, having travelled in these vans with this dub music pounding in their heads. There is also frustration over public transportation. The vehicles may be there but it seems to me that there is no consistent programme of preventative maintenance. Therefore, there is not a sufficient number of buses on the roads, at any given time, to carry the public to work and back home.

Mr. President, another frustration is the question of water. How often do we hear announcements on the radio about burst mains and that tanker trucks will be coming along to supply persons with water. When persons collect water from these trucks, sometimes they would not have any more water supplied to them for the next two or three days. We sometimes hear too that a pumping station has broken down for lack of a part, which has to be imported.

Mr. President, another frustration is that of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. We look at this hospital as something of which we all want to be proud of because it has the potential to be good, but today we are not gauging potential, we are gauging performance. Therefore, the performance of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is not up to what we expect from a leading hospital which is serving Barbados and the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States.

Another frustration is the talk about Constitution Reform. The report of that Commission has been in for some years now, but we still do not know what will be its path of progress. We have heard talk about the Referendum. That has gone on the back burner or off the stove altogether.

Mr. President, I am only trying to illustrate, as best as I can, that these are a litany of woes that affect the lives of the ordinary taxpayer. As I said, no one would trigger tremendous anger but accumulating all of them together, one can understand why these Resolutions have created such an interest.

Mr. President, with much fanfare, the Public Accounts Committee was restructured and announced, yet it has not met for months. Let me confess, I am a Member of that Committee. It started investigating a situation at the

Urban Development Commission in the Ministry of Social Transformation but that investigation has stopped. Therefore, as a Member of that Committee, I do not know why it has stopped, and there are other Honourable Members here and I do not know if they know why.

Mr. President, the final frustration I want to touch on, which has been referred here today by several speakers, is the growing indiscipline in this society. We cannot continue sweeping that under the carpet and say it is not so. We live here and we see manifestations of it, in the schools and in the wider society. We see the increasing coarseness in dress, speech and behavior. Sir, we as Barbadians are not proud of that. I am not proud to be saying this, but I have to say it as I see it and that is how I see it.

Mr. President, fortunately there has been some respite from this controversy over the past week because of celebration of the CropOver Festival. It is a very important festival because it celebrates the development of our culture since 1834, the year of Emancipation. I have always supported and will continue to support this festival and have always and will always encourage my children and grandchildren to participate but that they must always maintain their self-respect. I always remind them that cheap popularity has no real or lasting value.

Mr. President, I watched the Grand Kadooment on television and I enjoyed it. I think the standard of behavior this year is the best I have seen so far, and I thank God for that, but there are still too many incidents where people seem to lose control.

Mr. President, coming to the determination of the pay increases, as we have been told today, the same process that was previously applied has been applied again this year. As I understand it, it is as a result of a careful analysis and not just making arbitrary awards. I cannot help but make comparisons with equivalent positions in the private sector, as that is where I have worked all my life.

Mr. President, from the middle scale down, I think the levels of pay in the public sector are higher, as has been said by Senator Williams but at the higher levels, the pay of senior executives and professionals in the private sector are generally higher than that in the public sector.

Mr. President, I cannot help but mention the levels of remuneration of which Government executives in certain countries abroad, especially in Sub-Sahara Africa, avail themselves. I am making no comparison with the situation in Barbados but it is good to know what can happen when there is not eternal vigilance on checks and balances. Some former dictators in Africa have plundered the treasuries in their countries, not for millions of dollars, but for billions of dollars.

Mr. President, this is information worthwhile noting and if anyone is interested they can go on the internet and search Transparency International, where, every year a listing is made. One will see who the real crooks are in Government and in what countries. Thankfully, Barbados is not included. I think we have a lot to be proud about, about the integrity of our public servants over the years and over different administrations. As a Barbadian, I am proud to say that.

Mr. President, what were the justification for the pay increases? I think they can be justified by means of an objective review and an independent analysis of the data that was reviewed. I want to compliment the Honourable Prime Minister on his recent admonition to senior public servants on compliance with laws and regulations, where they can be more transparency, trust, honesty and accountability in the public sector.

We, the electorate, assume it but the Leader of Government has to keep reminding members of the Public Service, that it is expected of them. I refer to the Financial Administration and Audit Act, where, every year, the Auditor-General highlights breaches of that Act, by persons in the various departments of Government.

4.40 p.m.

*Wednesday, August 4, 2005*

Sir JOHN STANLEY GODDARD: Sir, every year the Auditor-General highlights breaches of that Act by persons in various departments of Government. Sir, his job is to report to Parliament but it does not seem to me that any remedial is ever taken by those in authority to deal with serious reporting violations and misdemeanors.

Mr. President, no one misdemeanor involves a colossal amount of money but it is the frequency and the quantum in terms of transactions. Sir, there is no excuse for it. The Public Accounts Committee has a very important role to play but it has not met for months. The Leader of the Opposition in the Other Place is the Chairman of that Committee and I am calling on him to let the members of the Committee know why we have not met and for us to meet as soon as possible. Sir, the public expects the Public Accounts Committee to function.

Mr. President, from the day it was reconstituted and announced with much fanfare but nothing has happened for months and that is not good enough. Sir, what is the expectation of the public of these increases we are discussing today?

Mr. President, the first justification is the increase of pay for all Minister will be manifested in higher levels of performance by them. Sir, this is not to say that they are not

performing because many of them are performing well but some less well. Sir, the public expects them all to perform well and that the list of frustrations which I listed in the beginning of my presentation would be dealt with. They cannot all be resolved overnight but the public remains frustrated to think that these things are hanging out there and, as far as they are concerned, little or nothing is being done to deal with them.

Mr. President, what is the public's view of the Government? I was reflecting on this. The taxpayers understand that the Government is the largest business in Barbados with over 28, 000 employees which is a high percentage of the total workforce. The Prime Minister is the head of Government, the equivalent of the Managing Director or the Chief Executive Officer in the private sector. He presides over Cabinet consisting of the Ministers appointed by him which is the equivalent to a board of Executive Directors in the private sector. He has the authority to appoint, transfer and remove Ministers from the office at any time. While all members of the Cabinet share a collective responsibility, the ultimate responsibility for leadership and management resides with the Prime Minister alone. Sir, the Prime Minister has a very heavy responsibility.

Mr. President, while I am talking about management and leadership. Very often we use these terms interchangeable but they are not the same thing. They are different yet related functions and are of equal importance. Sir, more emphasis is usually placed on management because management results are more easily measured.

Mr. President, allow me to share with you the definition of my favour management guru, Peter Druchan, who I have referred to previously in this Chamber. He defines management as getting the right things done. This involves knowing what are the right thing, not guessing at them but studying the situation, the economic landscape, your strengths, your weaknesses and determining what are the right things. It does not end there, Sir, you must get these things done. You should not ask for another consultant or another report but for action to get the right things done.

Mr. President, leadership is equally important. Sir, leadership is the lifting of a man's vision to higher sights, the raising of a man's performance to a higher standard, the building of a man's personality beyond its normal limitation and this applies to men and women equally. Sir, this definition of leadership applies to all leaders in every sphere of human activity.

Mr. President, I want now to come to the announcement of the Prime Minister made on television on August 2, 2005, that he would be making a gift of his pay increase of \$33 000 per year to the Treasury for as long as

he is Prime Minister. Sir, to me, that announcement was commendable but most surprising. In my opinion, his announcement would have had far greater significance and impact had it been made in the Other Place when the Resolution was first being debated there and which was strongly defended by him and other Ministers without exception.

Mr. President, his announcement came after Standards & Poors had publicly announced their concern over the unsatisfactory level of trade deficit and national debt. They indicated that corrective measures need to be taken promptly or that our credit rating would have to be lowered. Mr. President, I cannot read the mind of the Prime Minister or second-guess his motive but it would seem to me that the timing of his announcement and the time of the release by Standards & Poors were connected. The release influenced him to make the announcement which took the whole nation, without exception, by surprised because, as he said, he had discussed it with no one.

Mr. President, what are the challenges now. I think the challenges facing the Prime Minister is to introduce swiftly, as he has promised, appropriate corrective actions to reduced Barbados' unsustainable current account deficit. The second challenge is to all members of Cabinet to raise their levels of management and leadership performance to justify that they truly merit the new and higher level of remuneration that they have been properly granted. Sir, whether or not they choose to keep their pay increases or give it back to the Treasury, like the Prime Minister had done, is a decision that they must make but people will not judge them on those decisions but on the higher level of performances.

Mr. President, I think that members of the Cabinet deserve an increase and I support the Resolution.

#### SUSPENSION

SENATOR THE HON. E.R. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, I beg to move that this Sitting be suspended until 5.10 p.m. p.m. today.

*The question was put to the Senate and agreed to and Mr. PRESIDENT suspended the Sitting accordingly.*

S36/16:50

Sequence 34

Thursday, August 4, 2005

#### RESUMPTION

Mr. PRESIDENT: This Sitting is resumed. Senator Dean Crichlow.

SENATOR the Very Rev. H.E. CHRICHLOW: Mr. President and Members of the Senate I always enjoy listening to my friend, the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate, and his literary references and Latin quotation but I find it difficult to understand how he could accept the principle of 1978, the pay of the Ministers in relation to the Permanent Secretaries and can congratulate those who worked so hard to produce this excellent report and yet vote against this Resolution. He based his argument on the fact that people are rewarded for what they do. Those in the past, and he mentioned the late Errol Walton Barrow and Tom Adams, but he does not find anything that the present Government has done. He asked what are we rewarding this Government for?

Sir, I take objection to that question because I do not think that people are rewarded for what they have done. If a person has a job he has to be paid, whether he does a lot or a little. I am not passing any judgement on this Government. I am just saying that his logic seems to escape me. He traced the history of Parliament and he showed that in Colonial times, Honourable Members of the Other Place and the predecessor to this Honourable Chamber passed laws that benefitted themselves because they were the planter and merchant class. He also agreed that when the system changed, many poor people thought of politics as a career and they had to be paid.

Having accepted that, the matter of evaluation and so on, ought to be automatic, so to speak. I do support the Resolution that the evaluation should be accepted by Parliament. I must say that I was most embarrassed when it was reported on the television that the Prime Minister had decided to give back his increase after ridiculing the Leader of the Opposition for doing so. I find that very inconsistent at the level of leadership, second from the highest leadership in this country.

Mr. President, I expected to do a...

17.20 p.m.

Sequence 35

Thursday, August 04, 2005

Senate 36, sequence 36, 5.20 p.m.

Senator the Very Rev. H. E. CRICHLOW: I expected that to do a roundabout turn like that, without apologising to the Leader of the Opposition or explaining to people, to me does not make sense. It shows that there is a lot of confusion going on and we have to be very careful because the other countries are watching Barbados as well, and they expect our leadership to be consistent. It is difficult to defend that kind of action.

Mr. President, I know that nowadays we cannot do without the call-in programmes but I think we have to be very careful how much we take from the call-in programmes. A lot of people talk but they really do not talk from factual knowledge. How many of the people who have spoken on this matter on the call-in programmes have had the opportunity to read this document, for example? How many people who talked about the big salaries of the Ministers realise that, those same people working in private enterprise, could be making a lot more money? How many of them know, for example, that in 1960, the person at the top received 15 times more than the person at the bottom in the public service, and that in 2003, that 15:1 ratio was reduced to 5:1, as Senator the Honourable John Williams reminded us. If they knew that, what would be their response?

We have decided for a democratic society and in this kind of arrangement, we are bound to get differences in salaries. The opposite of it is that the commanding heights of the economy are owned by Government and people work for little or nothing but they are supported by that Government and that was the Marxist way of doing things. Therefore, the kind of equality that people think of, for example, where some people say that I should not be getting \$200 a week or \$800 a month when somebody else is getting \$15 000 a month, you cannot say that in a democratic society. Do you want the kind of communist society where everybody works for the State and the State provides housing and everything else? This is what was tried and failed, and over 25 million lives were lost in that experiment.

Therefore, we have to accept that we are living in a free society and they are people depending on our skill, knowledge and experience. People will work for much more than many of us do. I take the point which Senator Stuart made that Politics should be seen as a kind of vocation, just as the Priesthood. People tell us that we are foolish to work for nothing when we could make so much money doing other things.

Sir, Politics it is a job and it does not call for the amount of sacrifice, I think that the Priesthood would call for but even nowadays with the younger Priest, the idea of sacrifice is not very popular. It was popular when I was a young priest but these are different days and the young Priest as soon as they come in, they are thinking of pensions and so on and thinking of getting home after they retire. We just gave ourselves to the Church and forgot all about that, only to be shocked when we came to ten or fifteen years before retirement and we have to scamper to find somewhere to live.

Mr. President, people in the public sector work hard. I spent three months in the Civil Service after I left school, so I had a little of it but it is not true that people in the

public sector do nothing. The higher up you go in the public sector, the longer are your working hours and the responsibilities are much greater.

I do not see why we should squabble about the salaries that permanent secretaries and ministers receive. We have accepted the principle that there is a 3 per cent increase for the Ministers of Government in relation to permanent secretaries and, I think, we should continue that until we find a better principle.

We cannot accept that principle and at the same time think that some Ministers should be paid for work that you can see and others should not, Sir. You cannot judge work like that and as Senator Stuart reminded us, when Prime Minister Adams was building the ABC Highway, he was harshly criticised for doing so and this happens in every administration. The Opposition would say it is their job to oppose and so, they oppose most of what is going on because it is their job to oppose.

I think we should not play around with the principle that we accepted since 1978 and which we have not changed. You cannot just move the goal post in the middle of the game. If we need a new principle on which to base the salaries of Ministers, then we should start discussing it and then let our experts handle it because the Ministers themselves had no input in this report, so I really think it is unfair.

*Senate 36, sequence 36, 17:30:14*

*Thursday, August 04, 2005*

SENATOR the Very Reverend H. E. CRICHLAW: Mr. President, we should listen to the views that are expressed on the call-in programmes but we have to be very careful how we treat them. I think that the Leader of Government Business in the Senate is usually very worried about all of the incorrect views he hears expressed on the call-in programme. Some of them are very wrong and nobody corrects them, so people think that this is what is the case. I think that something should be done about the call-in programmes. What I mean is that the correct answers should be given but not by the ministers themselves. The moderators themselves would not know. If you are taking calls on all subjects, then a moderator would not know. I think moderators ought to say that they will get the facts for them and so on.

Sir, at one time only people who were knowledgeable in a particular field could be heard on the air but we have opened the airwaves to everybody and people who have not even thought of the subject feel that their opinion is worth as much as one who has studied for years in this particular field and who is qualified to speak.

Mr. President, the thing is that a lot of people believe them. This is obvious in my own field, but it is a free society and it does not matter. As a matter of fact it seems to me that the less you know about a subject the better it is for those who listen. When it happens like this people who have really studied the subject and have worked at it for years and have a lot of experience decide that it is no good correcting that foolishness and so on and people are just allowed to believe the nonsense that they hear. I am not saying that everything on the call-in programmes is nonsense. I am saying that we have to be very careful, especially those of us who lead, what we do and how we use information received on the call-in programmes. If we have the time to listen to them we should listen but I do not think that policy should be decided on what we hear. We are only hearing a few people in the first place and sometimes there are the same people.

Mr. President, Barbados is a rumour society and Barbadians believe rumour more than truth. If Jesus had come today in Barbados the same thing that happened to him would happen again. People would have chosen Barabbas to him because people have more in common with Barabbas than with Jesus.

*Asides.*

SENATOR the Very Reverend H. E. CRICHLAW: Barbados is a very strange society. Sometimes when I hear some of you speak I wonder whether we are talking about the same Barbados because I know that the people in Barbados are not as nice as some of us have painted. The countryside is beautiful but when it comes to the people you really do not trust yourself to people. Jesus never trusted himself to people, he knew them too well. The same people that shouted hosanna on Palm Sunday, shouted crucify him on Good Friday. So I just want to warn Senators not to take everything they hear on the call-in programmes very seriously. Public opinion is like that. They can listen to it and if they hear something that they think could be helpful to their project or policy, they could use it but do not be worried about criticism all the time. We are very good at pulling each other down.

I think that one has to be consistent and accept the principle that was used in 1978 and followed in all the other evaluations and we should support this Resolution but we should also be careful how as leaders we make about turns that confused people. I do not know if anybody could describe the state of Barbados right now as far as this whole issue is concerned because people were shouting all the time the Government this, the ministers getting too much money and so on. The Prime Minister then comes along and says that he is doing the same thing as the Leader of the Opposition, so that means that the Leader of the Opposition was right in the first place because that is what

it would mean, but I feel that we should stick to the principle outlined and we should accept this report.

Mr. President, I support this resolution fully.

I thank you.

SENATOR Sir ROY TROTMAN: Mr. President, I am led to understand that we are going to be dealing with items Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 together insofar as the discussions are concerned. Mr. President, that being so, I would crave your indulgence to make a statement which covers them all.

Mr. President, I want to say up front that if Senator Stuart is correct and if the Government has deliberately, and then it would have to be maliciously, misguided us into looking at a figure today that is different from the position of the recommendation, then I would have to join with him in a division which he would call for. I would like to be able to recognise that this is not so bearing in mind that this is a report of 2003, which was subject to some adjustments over the period but I have not heard any comments from the Government's representatives clarifying the issue for the benefit of the public. I am led to believe that since that should come at the point when the error, if there was an error, had been made that Senator Stuart is in fact correct and therefore as I said before I would have to join him.

*Senate 36 Sequence 37*

5.40 p.m.

*Thursday, August 04, 2005*

SENATOR the Hon. J. E. D. WILLIAMS: On a point of order. Mr. President, I was deliberately not seeking to correct Senator Stuart. In my wind-up speech, I was going to make the point that today is a very sad day. I believe that the explanation I wanted to give goes beyond the point that he was making because this issue of, for example, the Prime Minister getting in excess of 21 per cent, because of an adjustment that was made by Government, is not correct.

Mr. President, the salaries that are quoted in the report, were the salaries at September 01, 2003. Subsequent to 2003, there was an application of a 3 per cent in 2004 and a 3 per cent in 2005. The figures that came before this Parliament could not have been the same because those figures would have already been applied. I think it is wrong. I think the Press ought to apologise for carrying false information because had they checked, they would have recognised that it was not so, neither should Senator Stuart ought to have come here to mislead this Honourable Chamber.

Mr. President, as I said, it is because Senator Sir Roy has made the point that I did not get up but I had every intention in my response, to speak fully to the matter, and I will continue to do.

SENATOR F. J. STUART: Mr. President, on a point of elucidation, I have before me a document which I have got from the Government, which, at Appendix 4, said Recommended Changes to Existing Pay Structures. I made reference to documentary evidence which is at my disposal. Senator Trotman is correct, if this evidence has been subject to some kind of a change, I am not supposed to know that. I am relying on documentary evidence which is at my disposal.

SENATOR the Hon. J. E. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. President, the document from which he has quoted, is dated September 17th, 2003, and it contains the salaries at that point in time. There was no application of any increases because as you know, the negotiations were completed after that. This document could have only included salaries that were applicable at September, 2003.

SENATOR F. J. STUART: Mr. President, I will conclude at this point. I thank you.

SENATOR SIR ROY TROTMAN: Mr. President, I am obliged to Senator Williams for his speech. I am about to say that frequently when I have to speak to matters of such significance and I do what I think I have to do, that is to speak, first of all, with the national interest in mind, I find rather regrettably that sometimes there is a certain anger in the area of some commentators, some of which I understand but I would ask you, Sir, to weigh what I say, to analyse carefully what it is that I speak to, and then to make a judgment. In such a situation, where I appear to be wrong, then I am prepared to accept that I deserve the full weight of the punishment of my judges.

I do not speak from this position because I hope to become a beneficiary. I am neither at the level of Permanent Secretary or Deputy Permanent Secretary, nor do I believe that Members of Parliament, Honourable Senators or Personal Assistants, are covered by any of the provisions within the job evaluation and, therefore, for my part, I will be seeking to divide the Honourable House on Resolutions 6 and 7, and hope that in the same way that I was prepared to join Senator Stuart and his colleagues, that they would join with me when that moment comes.

Mr. President, there have been some very interesting things which have been said and which I would wish to comment on, in the time allotted to me. One major question has to do with what was raised by Senator Dean Crichlow, where he speaks about making comparisons within a democratic society.

Sir, though I have loved and respected him for so many years, I beg to differ with him because I believe that much depends upon what society intends to do for the people in that particular community. If Senator Crichlow is referring to totally a capitalist society, in which naked greed is able to run the gamut of the society, then, by all means, we can allow for one person to get \$200 per week, while, in his words, another person gets \$15 000 per month.

Mr. President, I am sure that Senator Crichlow was not referring to that but was merely asking us to be cautious. If, on the other hand, we believe, though we may not be totally Marxist but we are socialist in our orientation, that even in the year 2005, the social conscience of Barbados, should determined that we ought still to be concerned with what is required to make a man or woman live in relative comfort, if we believe that we have to cater to those who are vulnerable and who are not able to help themselves in the same way as the more robust members of the community can help themselves, then I think that we have to be able to appreciate that our task of helping to engineer society has not finished and that it will not be finished even in the end times. Therefore, we will have the ongoing task of trying to reorient society in such a way that those percentages to which we speak, will have to be addressed from time to time.

Mr. President, when we speak to those percentages and ratios, I want us to bear one very important thing in mind, and that is the truism taught to me by my revered predecessor in office, Sir Frank Walcott, where he spoke about 100 per cent of 1 being 1. When one speaks of a ratio of 15:1, when the wage of a Permanent Secretary or the Minister was \$3 000, and then seeks to compare that with the ratio when the salary is \$100 000 per year, we are talking about a different base and, therefore, it is misleading and erroneous for us to say that we should talk only in terms of what is the ratio.

SENATOR The Very Reverend H. CRICHLLOW: On a point of order. I used two ratios to show that the society had moved from the ratio of 15:1, to that of 5:1, and that people would have to remember that the society has not remained static all this time, but that the society is becoming conscious of this large gap between the haves and the have-nots.

MR. PRESIDENT: Senator, we have to be careful not to make a speech. I will treat that as a point of elucidation. I think you have cleared that up.

SENATOR SIR ROY TROTMAN: Mr. President, my friend Senator Dean Crichlow, has done himself a grave injustice because I was not referring to him but to the Honourable Leader of Government Business and to what Senator Williams had to say. Therefore, I beg to be excused

by Senator Crichlow, if he thought I was referring to any comments which he had made.

5.50 p.m.

*Wednesday, August 4, 2005*

SENATOR SIR ROY TROTMAN: Sir, I was getting to the substance of the presenter and making the observation that the trade union movement cannot just simply accept that it is fine to have a difference of 15 to 1, 12 to 1, 5 to 1 or any other ratio unless we understand what it means in real terms and unless we understand the purchasing power of what the money we talk about can do. Mr. President, for the man or the woman at the bottom of the economic ladder there is no discretionary income. If there is discretionary income, it certainly does not come from.... but from another source. On the other hand, for the person at the top, at the level of Permanent Secretary or Minister, there ought to be discretionary spending. Sir, in passing I have said to Senator Fields that I do not refer to the private sector. Mr. President, in essence, I am endeavouring to say that we still have to bear in mind the importance that comes from there being any exercise in which dollars are presented in such a way as to give the impression that one set of people are particular graced by God to having a certain type of bounty and that another set of people are set aside into the garden to eat grass.

Mr. President, the trade union movement for which I have the honour from time to time to speak did in fact call for a job evaluation. We called for the evaluation because we were of the view that the jobs had undergone significant change over a period of time. Sir, other Senators have spoken to the subject and I would not wish to have to go over it again because I do not disagree with the basis they used.

Mr. President, we did not call for a job evaluation for politicians. I want to make that point very clear. The politicians at the level of Ministers took a decision which was based on 1978. I will not challenge that here but would speak to it later.

Sir, job evaluations are never easy because there is no force on earth that you or I could find, Mr. President, by which to compute the force of any person's genes in that person's estimation. We all have possibility to look from time to time at what we do, what we are, what we get and in few cases would we get an answer that we are underworked and overpaid nor do we ask anybody to feel that way.

Mr. President, when it comes to the public service we have further problems because of the large number of jobs and persons. Sir, because there are 28 000 persons, there are bound to be persons who are working in routine

jobs which are way below the level of their competence and ability and for those people, it is difficult for anybody to say that what you get is what you deserve because the person has every right to an expectation of a better of what he or she has. Mr. President, when you have to tell the person that we do not pay him for what he has in his head or at his finger but for the job we ask him to do, you only cause somebody else to become alienated and frustrated.

Mr. President, that is part of the problem we understood in the public service and part of what we thought we should do. When, therefore, we said that we should have a job evaluation in which there should be external comparison, we were of the view that by having external comparison, whether Senator Williams is right or not in saying that the bottom half in the earning ladder earns more than the private sector, that external comparison would have provided the transparency which is required in these exercises. (17:55)

Mr. President, that inadequate understanding of the exercise has staggered on some weakness, which they are within the public sector for which I will not blame any individual Minister or individual political Party but which seems to be part of the sickness in public sector appointments, promotions and other progression within the public sector. Sir, I am talking about the level of nepotism in appointments and promotion.

S36/17:60

*Sequence 39*

*Thursday, August 4, 2005*

SENATOR Sir Roy TROTMAN: I am talking about the level of nepotism in appointments and promotions. I am talking about the level of favouritism in the level of tasks and otherwise; the degree of supersession which takes place ever so often, particularly in Statutory Boards and the extent of discrimination if you have the courage to challenge decisions. It seems that because we do not possibly capture these matters in a job evaluation exercise, that the way must be clear now for the Government to accept this repeat call for the establishment of a Permanent Public Service Commission with appropriate legal support to be involved in appointments, promotions and discipline within the public service.

Mr. President, I said that the possibility for the full level of transparency has been denied because of the failure of the Government and the Consultants to go towards external comparisons. We have to say this, bearing in mind that Government is or should be a model employer.

Sir, we have recognised that further rationalisation is required if this exercise is going to meet with what the

Consultants have said should be the ultimate in terms of bringing Barbados fully in line with an exercise of true job evaluation. We also have to recognise that the Consultants' position on inadequacy of information is not one that we can swallow. Having noted that they have called for the new external comparison, we should be careful when we are making further appointments, whom we will select.

Sir, I note that they have said when this thing should take place. They believe it is a political decision and I take it that political position would be set in motion by submissions from the trade union movement. Quite naturally, it would be our responsibility to rise to the challenge.

Mr. President, I think we should note as well that the Report makes reference to the Judges. In another place I heard that the Judges came in for some fairly stern treatment, but I think they made a special pleading for assessment based on a set of criteria which were different from what they wanted to have applied elsewhere. I think that any body of persons who wish to have an evaluation made for themselves ought to be able to make such a presentation, and that should be respected in much the same way as I believe that the position made by the Barbados Community College and the Samuel Jackman Polytechnic where they have moved onto the level where in some cases they are preparing people for the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science Degrees. That is part of the exercise which the Ministry of the Civil Service has failed up to now to deal with and which has to be dealt with a certain degree of urgency.

Sir, I come to what I was called up, I believe in some public areas, to comment on. The political dimension of this exercise. Quite naturally it would not be proper for me to speak to the other matters I have spoken to without wanting to have a comment regarding the position of Ministers, Prime Minister and others.

Mr. President, there has been this big debate and I have spoken frankly regarding what the facts are in this matter. I said in essence, speaking for some of my colleagues in the labour movement, that there is a historical detail that speaks to the position of the linkage of Ministers and Prime Minister to the matter of the level of salaries at Permanent Secretary level. I do not think when that decision was made, it was done so very fantastically as Senator Williams has presented with 75 and 85 per cent and those ratios, although I do accept the level of the value of an increment. Shakespeare was credited with several words of wisdom long after he had passed on. I believe were he to come back and see some of the analyses that have been made about his writings, he would wonder who the person is that they are speaking of.

Sir, it is alright to have those analyses. It is good to hear it and it sounds good. I am not going to challenge it because the reality is, there has been a historical position.

Sir, having said that there has been a historical position, the trade union has not said that it has to be the position that obtains from the same dates and times as other people. I happen also to run an institution and I do not seek from my colleagues any support of the same kind and at the same time as others. In the twelve or thirteen years that I have been General Secretary I have allowed them to impose an increase on me only once. I do not ask anybody else to do it nor do I say that is necessarily right because it does not necessarily deal with a level of worth that the person have or does not have.

Mr. President, we appointed to the need that there is a need for some wage-setting mechanism, and I come back to Senator Dean Crichtlow to say that I think that politicians are suicidal. I mean that figuratively. I know that I cannot go outside and say so but I mean it figuratively, in that they take positions when they are standing in the Parliament that they find difficult to reverse when they stand on the other side of a given room, that is suicidal.

Mr. President, one of the areas that I think is particularly important is the area of wage setting. We heard how the workman is worthy of a higher salary but there has to be some mechanism taken outside of the realm of control of the Parliamentarians themselves that would help us to be able to fix a level of remuneration that can be put before the people as satisfactory and relevant in all of the circumstances.

Sir, we were unaware that the Government was doing this. If we were aware that they were doing it we would have advice that there was another approach to use but the fact is, they have a basis for doing it.

Mr. President, there are options which presented themselves. They could have decided this is what there was but they would put back the Resolution of the matter for a period, a day, a year, as an administration, they could suspend or take. What I do not think they can do is to insist that they are going to take it and then insist vehemently that they are not going to take it. I think that is wishy-washy and I think it has to be said.

Sir, it disappoints the people of Barbados to find that we have a situation before us where we are no longer able to believe that a reasoned position, which has been put forward presumably as the absolute position, is thereafter indicated by the very parties, by their behaviour, to be the complete opposite of what it was supposed to be. We have to say wherever we are and whoever is the person involved. When that person is the Prime Minister, it becomes all the more culpable and disappointing. This has to be understood

by this Government to bethe beginning of a situation that is going to have a particularly difficult insidious and unpleasant future, for hereinafter anybody else who tries to write, as they would perceive it, the position is going to be faced with this about turn- I cannot call it a right about turn, it would have to be more about face.

Sir, we have to understand what it means and we have to understand, as Senator Stuart said earlier, that...

18.10 p.m.

*Sequence 40*

*Thursday, August 04, 2005*

*Senate 36, sequence 41, 6.10 p.m.*

Senator Sir Roy TROTMAN: We have to understand what it means and we have to understand as Senator Stuart said earlier, that the public is perceptive and even if the public did not understand, the public heard him, and what in the final analysis has been addressed. It was not as though having thought about it, the Government decided that we were not going to take it, Sir. It is taken and it is applied, so although it does not apply at the moment month by month, it applies to the future, to the gratuity and the pension in a way that no other worker in Barbados has that application.

The further position, one which the public must be concerned about is one which I believe those who are Bible readers would remember, where the man went to the Master and the Master said, I would come, and he said no Master, you do not come, just say the word, I have servants too. When I say to a member of my staff, Senator Goddard would you come to see me please. He knows that I mean, Senator Goddard, drop whatever you are doing and get yourself in front of me right away.

*Asides.*

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Sir Roy, your time is just about up. Please wind up.

Senator Sir Roy TROTMAN: Thank you, Sir, I will.

When the Prime Minister says that he cannot tell the others but he would suggest that they do what they know to be right. The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away. Sir, let me say in winding up that it cannot be wrong for the trade union to accept truth, even if we may agree with it, Sir. We cannot be wrong for arguing for better levels of pay workers, especially for those at the bottom of the economic ladder.

We should, however recognise that this has been an exercise where Ministers might be justified, where the Prime Minister might be justified, but where we have to understand that there is no job evaluation that was done for Members of Parliament, Senators or Assistants to Ministers or Prime Ministers and I should be seeking to divide the Senate on those two Resolutions.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Eastmond.

Senator the Hon. Miss L.V. EASTMOND: Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise in support of the Resolutions before us and I think that it is important to point out exactly what the Resolutions are about, Sir. They are actually six Resolutions, which arose out of a job evaluation that was conducted in Barbados.

The discussion of this job evaluation, unfortunately, started in circumstances where it seemed as though, I would not say there was a deliberate attempt, but there seemed to have been a reckless disregard for whether or not the public was misled in the circumstances.

For example, in the first newspaper story that was published, the impression that was given, certainly to the public is that one Thursday, a group of politicians sat in Government Headquarters and decided that they would give themselves a raise in salary. They would include their top civil servants because they really do not do any work, and they need to give the top civil servants some money as well, so that they would continue to be faithful to them. It started from there and after that, from what I could hear from the public discourse, it would seem as though the attempt to mislead the public was a success.

Sir, when you look at the job evaluation report, and I want to assure the public that there is actually a report. They can believe this because Senator Trotman referred to it and Senator Stuart referred to it, so there was actually a job evaluation and there was a report.

We invited consultants from Canada to come and engage in the job evaluation exercise. This is an important point because even though we are an Independent country, we talk about self-determination, our people and our pride, we know that it still helps to bring a man from Canada to do some work for us and we know that it adds validity to everything that we do, so we got a consultant from Canada to come to help with the job evaluation.

Sir, it is here and when you look at the organisational structure of how it was set up, because there are those who would like to give the Barbados public the impression that despite the organisational structure that you had, a politician of some sort, stretched his or her long

hand into the process and told these individuals what to do, Sir.

It is an organisational chart that includes a Steering Committee. These are real people that certain members of the Democratic Labour Party would like to undermine because if one is saying that these individuals did not carry out this job evaluation with the integrity that we know these people have, well then, we have a problem.

The P.S. Ministry of Finance, the P.S. Civil Service, the Director of the Office of Public Sector Reform, a Job Evaluation Task Force, Richard Durant, Andrew Gittens, the Job Evaluation Committee, Sylvester Welch, Dennis Clarke, Juliet Agard, Gail Atkins, Matthew Farley, Marion Howard, Hartley Reid, Bentley Skeet, these are people that were involved in the exercise that many of you in here know and many of you who can hear me also know these people. I believe that these are men and women of integrity.

I also believe that these are individuals who certainly would not allow any politician of any colour, description or persuasion to tell them how to act, in a job evaluation exercise. We like to speak in general terms when it suits us but I believe that in certain circumstances, we have to call names so that the public can understand who was involved in this process. People, generally speaking, in the Barbadian community that we have a great deal of respect for were involved in the job evaluation.

They were not a whole set of people that we do not know anything about and I am sure that these individuals would not want to hear that we are trying to give the impression that principles, which they agreed upon in the job evaluation are somehow flawed. It makes me wonder what exactly is it that the Democratic Labour Party is voting against in these Resolutions.

Sir, coming out of the job evaluation, let me tell you what they are voting against. They are voting against the fact that an artisan is now going to move up in the scale. They are voting against a tractor operator at the Sanitation Service Authority...

*Senate 36, sequence 41, 18:20:10*

*Thursday, August 04, 2005*

SENATOR F. J. STUART: On a point of order. Mr. President, Senator Eastmond must not mislead the Senate. The Democratic Labour Party has indicated no such thing. When the time comes for the vote to be taken, the public would hear what it is that we are voting against. I do not want Senator Eastmond to arrogate to herself the right to secondguess the Democratic Labour Party on this issue, she is misleading the Senate.

SENATOR the Hon. Miss L. V. EASTMOND: Mr. President, if the Democratic Labour Party is not going to support the job evaluation exercise they would be voting against a cashier at the Barbados Agricultural Development and Management Corporation, a nursery assistant, an electrician and an operator 1, getting some kind of increase in salary.

SENATOR F. J. STUART: On a point of order. Senator Eastmond must not mislead the Senate. The Democratic Labour Party through its principal spokesman has not said that it is voting against the job evaluation exercise. Senator Eastmond is misleading the Senate.

Mr. PRESIDENT: All I would ask, in reference to that, is that you would leave out the ad hominem remarks about an empty speech.

SENATOR the Hon. Miss L. V. EASTMOND: Any one who is not going to support the job evaluation exercise will not be supporting a nursing officer or a sister, a preschool educator, a sound technician, a light technician, a butler and a children attendant at the Child Care Board getting an increase salary. What is it that individuals who do not support the job evaluation exercise have against these ordinary men and women of Barbados. Sir, the trade union movement in Barbados and the Government of Barbados determined that it was about time that they bring some equity to the entire process in order to ensure that we have a system in place where as the report said, if one read it, that we are seeking to ensure we have a new system where jobs in the Civil Service are fairly valued in relation to each other.

Unfortunately, we are seeking to do the right thing and there are those who would argue, that in terms of public relations, we did not go about it in the right way. Mr. President, that may be so, but the truth is that in Government one finds oneself in different times. Usually Government went about its business, it did the right thing and as long as it did the right thing that was okay. In these days now we will have to set aside budgets apparently in order to make sure that our public relations is the best. I feel that is a waste of money, but apparently that is what we have to do in order that we do not get individuals who would seek to mislead the public.

Mr. President, Senator Stuart spoke of the poisoned chalice and about the poisoned chalice coming back to the Barbados Labour Party. I have said to other people, and this did not originate with me, this came from one of those inspirational books which I read recently, that when bad things happen to you over and over again, as bad things happened to politicians over and over again, when it comes to the issue of salaries, it means that you have not learnt your lesson. So despite the fact that Senator Stuart spoke about the poisoned chalice apparently Senator Stuart is

putting himself in a position when either he or somebody else from that side will have to take a sip from the poisoned chalice.

Mr. President, we have not learnt anything because I believe, as Senator Trotman alluded to that some of us, not necessarily in here, have this suicidal bent that in order to oppose and to come across to the public in a certain way that we must forget principles.

Mr. President, there is absolutely no way that I could ever vote against this job evaluation exercise and the consequences after understanding what it was meant to do.

Mr. President, I have worked in the Civil Service and I know that there are certain individuals whose responsibilities have changed over the years because the economy has changed. Therefore, there are certain posts that will take on greater responsibility and there are certain posts that in this day and age you would require them to do more, for example, the Data Processing Department which was there for a number of years. Certainly, with the onslaught of information technology and E-government, obviously a department like that would have more to do and we have to take those matters into account. So this was a genuine exercise on the part of the Government and the trade union movement to seek to ensure that individuals in particular positions are remunerated in a way that is appropriate.

Mr. President, as the report points out, it does not have anything to do with the individual or with performance. The job evaluation exercise is not about performance. The Ministry of the Civil Service and the Office of Public Sector Reform are already working on systems for performance evaluation. Sir, when it comes to politicians there is a tried and true method of evaluating politicians. They have approximately five years to show what they could do and if they do not perform, people could deal with them.

Mr. President, Senator Stuart spent a long time talking about the people are asking this question and that question and how are the ministers and politicians going to answer in terms of performance. He asked the question: What has the Barbados Labour Party done in the last 11 years? Mr. President, the Democratic Labour Party put that question to the public in 2003 and the people answered. I do not know if Senator Stuart has forgotten that already. I know that is a moment that Senator Stuart might wish to forget for himself personally, but he must not take it like that because I too was in the same boat and I have not forgotten. He must not have a convenient memory.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Please speak to the Chair.

SENATOR the Hon. Miss L. V. EASTMOND: Yes, Mr. President. One must not have a convenient memory, one must remember these things.

Mr. President, we as ministers will have to answer that question again. If it is that the public of Barbados believes that five years is too long to wait to ask the question again, we could actually amend the Constitution. If we think we have a better system than that, we can put a different system in place. It is absolutely and entirely up to the people of Barbados.

*Senate 36 Sequence 42*

6.30 p.m.

*Thursday, August 04, 2005*

SENATOR the Hon. Miss L. V. EASTMOND: Mr. President, I believe that where a Government and running a county is concerned, one would imagine that one would have to give any administration a period of time, and we have determined that five years is a reasonable period of time for them to perform. Afterwards, a decision is made about their performance. Therefore, the job evaluation exercise and issues of salaries increases are not about performance, it is simply about a job evaluation exercise. Therefore, I am hoping that those persons who are willing to reason, will take what I have said into account.

Mr. President, an issue has been raised in terms of the relativity between salaries and I think it is important that we always have to be reasonable and follow principles. Sir, I would challenge anyone who would argue that if they were to open a shop tomorrow and decided to employ someone who is going to be responsible for the purchasing, stocking the shop, making sure that the water and electricity bills are paid, making sure that they order the correct merchandise and supervises the cashier and the shelves packers... Does anyone imagine that anybody opening this shop would seek to pay that person with that level of responsibility exactly the same wages as the others? If that is so, that person with that level of responsibility would eventually question why should he or she take on such responsibility, while receiving the same salary as the others.

Sir, that is the reason why there are differentials in salaries and I think instinctively people know this is the case and that it does not necessarily have to do with physical hard labour, but that, at the end of the day, it has to do with the responsibility.

Mr. President, instead of thinking these things through and being honest, we try to give the impression that even though one has greater responsibility that, for some reason, that person should get the same salary or one

that is very close to it, as the person who does not have that level of responsibility. Sir, everybody in Barbados knows this as a principle.

Mr. President, the issue of the job evaluation exercise and the issue of wage restraint are issues that have been raised. I noticed that while speaking, many individuals spoke to the salary increases and not to the job evaluation exercise. The salary increases are as a direct outcome of the job evaluation exercise. Sir, this is a difficult point to make and I hope individual would understand it but for example, there can be an individual working in a job evaluation exercise and has a greater responsibility than that of a junior who has half the responsibility of that individual, and in a situation where that individual with the greater responsibility is making \$100 more than his junior.

Mr. President, the job evaluation exercise is meant to bring equity and fairness. If the circumstances in which we are living at the moment are considered to be difficult, would not that individual who believes that he is being treated unfairly by being paid \$100 more than a junior who does not have such equal responsibility, be even more disgruntled in such circumstances? Do you believe that person would feel so aggrieved, that he or she might not perform as he or she should? I think that these are precisely the circumstances in which a job evaluation exercise is appropriate and that the person is asking to be treated fairly for the work that he or she is doing. I can see nothing that is unreasonable about that.

Mr. President, there are other issues that have arisen, such as whether or not Ministers and politicians deserve any money at all. I have heard so many negative comments about politicians and people who come to public life, that I am not so sure that a whole generation of individuals who would come to public life have not been turned off by the whole process and by all that has been said by individuals on the call-in programmes and by some individuals in public life who should know better. As I have said, I certainly would not be one to persuade them to come to public life, as it is a personal decision that would have to be made.

Mr. President, when the issue of job evaluation exercise and salary first came up, I met an individual who laughed at me, who had always wondered why it is that I would have given up what I was doing to come to do this. That person was of the view that I would have never found myself in circumstances where I would have to be arguing about salaries. I want to make it clear that I am not doing that. One would never hear me argue in this Place or anywhere else that I deserve more money. I have never done it in the past and I will not do it now.

I remember doing my "A" levels at Harrison College. I also went to school at Foundation School, and the master came up to me and asked what I was thinking of doing. The truth is that I loved Geography so much, that I wanted to be a meteorologist, but somehow talking to the master at that time, I said to him that I want to do something where I can be independent, and having come out of Arts, there were not many options. Therefore, I became a lawyer and I am grateful to the people of Barbados for having educated me to that level, which has put me in a privileged position. It has also put me in a position where I will never argue that I should get any more money from anybody. Instead, I would leave and find something else, if I feel that I am not appropriately rewarded. Whoever is employing me can see what I do. If they think I am worth more, they will pay me more. I might ask for a promotion or an increase but I will not beg for it. And I am not going to start begging here.

Mr. President, I suppose there might be a good reason why I am here and with the fullness of time, that reason might be revealed to all of us but we are yet to see what it is.

Mr. President, I cannot help but being in full agreement with the job evaluation exercise.

6.40 p.m.

*Wednesday, August 4, 2005*

SENATOR the Hon. Miss LYNETTE EASTMOND: whether or not individuals want to put their salaries into a fund into their constituency or not or if they want to give it back to the Treasury, that is up to them. I want to say publicly that there is no conflict in mind between supporting the principles within the job evaluation examining the worth of a particular position and allocating the appropriate salary and then, as a gesture, also stating that I will not accept that salary increase at this time. Sir, in my mind, I have absolutely no difficulty in taking those two positions. In mind, there is a conflict when you say you do not want it but then want to put it into a fund for your constituency. Mr. President, that is laughable because all of us, at some point, take money out of our pockets to put into our constituency.

MR. PRESIDENT: Senator, would you please wind up.

SENATOR the Hon. Miss LYNETTE EASTMOND: Mr. President, I do not want to get personal but Dr. Estwick spoke about me in connection to the salary and I have to speak about him.

MR. PRESIDENT: Senator, is this necessary?

SENATOR the Hon. Miss LYNETTE EASTMOND: Sir, it was in connection to the salary increase. There is a notion that in these circumstances, individuals would not have a personal position on matters such as this even though it affects them. I have said before, that you would never find me arguing for more money but I believe that as politicians, we must lead but also that we must serve. I know it is a sacrifice for many people but I have made the decision because I believe that serving my country was one of the noblest things an individual could do. I would like to request of the public that as Barbadians we begin to see ourselves and politicians with the appropriate respect. Sir, I am a lawyer and politician, a combination would generate a great deal of dislike. Mr. President, we have to evolve as a nation and civilised people. We have to ensure when we have these debates about job evaluation and politicians that we do not seek to pull down a class of people that grew out of the bowels of the same people who seek to criticise them as though they did not come from the same villages and communities. Sir, we must desist from that.

Mr. President, I thank you for your indulgence.

MR. PRESIDENT: Senator Sir Allan Fields.

SENATOR A.C. FIELDS: Mr. President, I would be very brief because it is difficult to go over ground that has been already covered most eloquently both in the Other Place and in this House. I will try on a topic that concerns me a bit. I want to say at the outset that I rise to support the Resolution. I am saddened at the manner in which a transparency exercise, independently conducted with input from the trade union movement has terminated into an exercise in political grandstanding.

Mr. President, it saddened me even more that this Resolution has taken so long to reach this Honourable House. Maybe today, the debate should have been on why an exercise that took three years to be executed has sat around for two years before it reached this House. Sir, it is an exercise that everybody seems to think is a valuable one, and if this Resolution passes, as I am sure it would, we are delaying a commitment to give the public servants of this country a proper grading and salary for more than two years. Mr. President, I find this difficult to understand and, as I said before, that is where the debate should have been focused rather than debate the matters which were debated today.

Mr. President, the public service has ceased to attract top graduates primarily due to the salary level discrepancy between the public and private sector especially at the higher levels. It is difficult for statutory corporations such as National Insurance Board to attract and retain top professionals such as lawyers to come near to satisfying their requirements employ under contract but even this does not work because benefits such as medical and

pension eludes them and they soon leave for more lucrative position as entrepreneurs in the world of work in the private sector.

Mr. President, Prime Minister Arthur articulated very clearly the transparent process and the significant amount of work which took place in re-accessing the responsibilities of the entire public sector with inputs of the trade union movement before arriving at any recommendations for regrading or adjusting the scales.

Sir, to suggest that this is somehow wrong after the work done over two years to adjust the salaries of many people, not only at the top of the civil services but persons such as the police and nurses of this country bearing in mind the report in the Press today which suggested that the number of nurses leaving to go overseas are increasing annually.

Mr. President, it is true that the Governor of the Central Bank of Barbados has made a call for wage restraint. It is also true that Barbados is a high cost country in which to do business but we have a social safety net that is second to none in the Caribbean and it has to be paid for. Sir, the memory of some people can be conveniently short because the early 90s was the first Protocol which called for a wage freeze at that time and many employees across Barbados still has negotiated wage increases directly linked to increased productivity. I say this without fear of being contradicted by anyone in this Chamber.

Mr. President, during this time of crisis, the private sector had to significantly increase productivity in order to survive and the crisis may be described as a necessary catalyst. Sir, the Government needs to look more closely at productivity in the public sector, especially at the lower levels at the same time that public sector reform is taking place. Mr. President, with increased productivity, driving down overtime and casual employment, the overall wage bill may not go up despite the individual increases that are being given and, I am sure, being (18:48)

all of us collectively would have to demonstrate to moderate our spending on foreign goods and producing more so that our balance of payments does not get out of hand.

Mr. President, in closing after this brief intervention, I hope that it would not take three years for the backpay to be made assuming that this Resolution gets the support it deserves and is passed today.

Mr. President, I am much obliged.

S36/18:50

Sequence 44

Thursday, August 4, 2005

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Dr. Lowe.

SENATOR Dr. D.S. LOWE: Mr. President, I rise to lend my voice to this debate and certainly to congratulate my colleague on what I consider to be an outstanding presentation, in making representation of the view of the Democratic Labour Party on this particular matter.

I had to ask myself why I came into politics. Sir, I came into politics to serve my country and I am proud to be part of this political culture where anyone, once given the opportunity, can rise to a station in life where they can become a servant of the very people they seek to represent.

Mr. President, I have a difficulty with politicians who for convenience, seek to bash constituents because constituents, according to them, come begging. Their way of justifying their right to increases, is to lambast constituents for seeking the service which they promised. I think that is wrong and every politician who has done this, owes the public an apology.

I recall clearly a certain politician lamenting the fact that people constantly ask for this and that as their needs just appear. The problem is as a result of politicians establishing relationships between themselves and constituents by offering tokens based on what they can afford and cannot afford, usually during the time of election. They create a kind of political culture, then all of a sudden they return, when it is convenient, to lambast the same persons who have elected them to serve. It is wrong.

As a matter of fact, it borders on political immorality and it is practice that we should not encourage in this country.

Mr. President, as far as the debate is concerned, I heard the media being lambasted and I heard the Democratic Labour Party being lambasted for attempting to mislead the public. I wonder why there is even the possibility of misleading, when the Government was advised by the same Consultancy group, to engage in a series of communication activities, to ensure that the public would be thoroughly informed about this particular job evaluation exercise.

Sir, I have been trying my best to comb through the Report and under Appendix A, which is entitled Tactical Plan, there are a number of recommendations, including the appointment of a Communication Lead, a person who takes charge of communication, publish a series of key messages, brochures and primary distribution; a series of articles for challenge to change, a series of speeches by senior politicians and civil service officials. It even includes, in No.6, 'Giggard and Boo' as part of that process.

Sir, the truth is, most Barbadians would say to you that they first heard of this particular exercise when it landed in the Parliament of Barbados. The Press cannot be held responsible for that, neither can the Democratic Labour Party be held responsible. I would truly like the Minister responsible for launching this particular Resolution in this Chamber, to tell us why that kind of communication was not done and was not applied in a manner to thoroughly inform the public about the process, the Protocols, the expected outcomes and consequences. I think that is a fair question and I am quite sure that my esteem colleague would provide us with the answer.

Sir, the Democratic Labour Party, through its chief spokesperson in this chamber, never criticised or condemned the job evaluation exercise process. As a matter of fact, I listened keenly and I understood Honourable Senator Stuart to be saying that we have no difficulty with the process. I have a few questions because Honourable Senator Williams compared it as a quantitative versus qualitative exercise. I believe it has both elements for it is very difficult to quantify behaviour. There are elements in this Bill that specifically address measures with behavioural patterns.

Sir, for example, skills, responsibility, effort and work conditions are a cadre of measures, included in the process, to achieve the outcomes that were intended. I am unable to quantify social responsibility, the physical work environment or stress. I am just making the point that there are two elements in this process, interfacing, that resulted in the report that is now before this Honorable Chamber.

Mr. President, I understand the effort, to try to establish in an evaluation exercise process job worth. I have a difficulty with moving from job worth to salary increase if you are not considering job performance. Is job performance an important measure when you are looking at compensation issues? If you are establishing the worth of a job, you are establishing a review over job rank, as it applies to job requirements, so how do you move from a comprehensive analysis on the regrading of jobs to the regrading of salaries?

Sir, it is my understanding, from reading this report, that the Consultants made it extremely clear that the job evaluation process and compensation review were not one and the same. As a matter of fact, it was noted that one and the other should be undertaken separately. I am quite sure that the Honourable Senator will enlighten us as to how the Government moved from simply following a job evaluation process to arriving at remuneration considerations.

Sir, in the Report, at Page 3, it says that a successful transition, from the old system to the new one, depends on how effectively the various stakeholders can differentiate between job evaluation and job compensation. They must

be tackled separately. I am just seeking a clarification from the Honourable Minister who is leading this particular debate on that matter.

Mr. President, this debate started at the Other Place reviewing issues relating to job evaluation and remuneration. Sir, you would agree that the Government states very clearly its position. It stated as a fact that this job evaluation process resulted in the increase. First of all it argued linking versus delinking, we have no difficulty with that. The Government also argued that it was the right thing to do when the question of politicians salaries arose. The Government, through the Leader of Business, at the time, the Honourable Prime Minister, made it very clear that he was not prepared to travel on this path of ignoble ease and condemned the Leader of the Opposition for having taken that path.

Mr. President, I would like to draw the Chamber's attention to some of the positions that the Government stated. This is not simply a question any longer of whether it is the right time to give politicians the level of increase that they are seeking, and some have argued that they rightfully deserve. This has now become a question of public trust, whether the public of Barbados, can accept the words of the Honourable Prime Minister of Barbados as words they can take to the bank, if you will. Obviously, on one hand the Honourable Prime Minister states a position on this matter and then as though, my colleague called it histrionics but I would call it political wizardry, it is okay to lambast another Honourable Member of Parliament on a matter when that Honourable Member on behalf of his political Party states a position, as clear as possible. At the same time the Honourable Prime Minister can go back to the public and say, Oh, by the way, I am now on the path of ignoble ease.

S36: 19.00

*Sequence 45*

*Thursday, August 04, 2005*

*Senate 36, sequence 46, 7.00 p.m.*

Senator Dr. D.S. LOWE: Sir, although my colleague calls it histrionics, I would call it political wizardry, as though it is okay to lambaste another Member of Parliament on a matter, where that Member of Parliament, on the behalf of his political party, states a position as clear as you can possibly know or hear, and then, at the same time, Mr. President, the Prime Minister can go back to the public and say, by the way, I am now on the path of ignoble ease because I am going to give back mine.

If, Mr. President, the Leader of this nation cannot be responsible enough to state a position and live by the

position, especially when he attributes condemnation to another person who states a divergent position.

Aside.

Senator Dr. D.S. LOWE: Mr. President, I do not understand why Members of the Barbados Labour Party have such a difficulty in accepting that the Democratic Labour Party has its right to put forward its position and that they have to constantly try to antagonise the Members of the Democratic Labour Party for putting forward positions that they believe. We do not antagonise them for their position. Our job in this Chamber is to make sure that we give the public the position of the Democratic Labour Party, the Opposition party, and we make no excuse for doing so, Sir. If we have a position that is divergent from the views of the Government, we would state that position and no one could tell us to do otherwise.

Therefore, we believe clearly that the Prime Minister led this country down a path that was not ignoble ease at first, and stated a position. He said that it was the right time for this and to justify the right time, he said that the country is in a better economic position than it was in the 1990s, when the same thing was contemplated.

Mr. President, we are not disputing that, except that at a time when we were trying to celebrate Emancipation and establish the unveiling of a monument, the same Prime Minister came to the public and said, but you know something, I did not realise things were so bad because I am now realising that I will have to give back my money too.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, I do not know if it was triggered by the Standard and Poor's report or what contributed to the change of heart but I would like to know what did, Sir. I believe that the country wants to know too because there are hundreds, perhaps thousands of Barbados Labour Party supporters out there who are absolutely angry at the actions of the Prime Minister and they want explanations.

I am hoping, I have every confidence in the Leader of this particular debate for the Government that he would give us an exposé on what might have shaped the thinking of the Prime Minister in making such a decision on that matter.

It was further noted, Mr. President, that the people should hold strain. We have been hearing this for weeks, perhaps for months in this country, while Ministers of Government are enjoying the bounty. I heard one Minister of Government made a pontiff plea to the public as to why he needs the increases. He said he has to pay bills and so on.

Mr. President, we can get in here and say what we wish to say, but the people out there know the facts and we know that while some are crying for struggling and for suffering that they are others...

Aside.

Senator Dr. D.S. LOWE: Sir, it happens in politics the world over that one politician comes and cries and says he needs more money and at the same time, if you go in certain places, you would see that they own million dollar houses and others own houses in excess of \$700 000 on ridges.

Sir, ordinary people like gas station workers, security guards and others, who struggle every single day in this country to make ends meet have no wherewithal to ask for more, because the job evaluation does not even cover them, in the first place and, secondly, the present administration is still holding on bringing minimum wage legislation to these Chambers and to this country.

They are asking why should we become children of suffering, Mr. President, while Members of Government live as the sons and daughters of plenty. This is what the people are asking and I want to ask the same because, Mr. President, from time to time, I experience my own struggles in making ends meet and they did not even give me any consideration in this Chamber.

Mr. President, in a way I am happy because we can vigorously contend on the matters related to this particular debate, but I am making the point that we make a contribution to this country. I am proud to do so, Sir, but I do not think it is fair to average Barbadians that a politician can lambast constituents for asking and begging. Sir, do you know why people beg? We have created a culture of mendicancy in this country and it cannot be denied.

Mr. President, I think that if you create a certain kind of political socialisation, within the context of the social conditions of the country, you should expect people to live by the rules you set. Perhaps, this is going to be a good lesson for a lot of politicians in this country.

Mr. President, the Prime Minister made the point that this was the right time for this particular increase because the country was enjoying \$2 billion of foreign reserves but it has been adjusted downwards, as I understand it, but it is an issue. The Prime Minister did not seem to be fully aware of the seriousness of the economic circumstances in the country at this time. We must always give equal pay for equal work and, Mr. President, I agree with the Prime Minister on that particular point.

Mr. President, no one can argue that the man or woman who works in the service station, or the man or

woman who protects the public interest through security work is not providing a valuable service and does not require some consideration in a rise of remuneration.

Mr. President, it is very difficult to understand how anyone could ask us why we would not support this Bill. I will tell them why. One of the reasons this Bill will not be supported by the Democratic Labour Party is because too many hard-working Barbadians have been left outside of the net.

In this country, we believe that not only those at the top should benefit from any considerations of the State but that those at the bottom. This is why we always contemplate the fact that there is a gap between the haves and the have-nots. We seek very earnestly to close the gap but this particular situation does nothing to bring the gap closer because there are still those at the bottom who are not going to benefit at all from this, Sir.

I believe, Mr. President, that if you are looking at improving quality of life, the quality of life of every Barbadian is worth improving. While there may be some methodological or theoretical constraints within this particular system, the State needs to do more to ensure that those persons who put out the same energy or more energy than politicians, those persons who make contributions as valuable as the political class, those persons who get up in the morning must send their children to school, must ensure that they are fed and clothed and safe, those people deserve something more in this country.

I am not amused by anyone, Mr. President, who would want to carry an argument that all is well, because the system of job evaluation has dictated, as is being argued that these people at the top, out of 28 000 people, a handful of persons should benefit and the others at the bottom get nothing. Mr. President, I think that smacks our whole philosophy in the face, for if we are socially democratic, it means that we have to bring along every single member of the society.

Therefore, the Prime Minister of Barbados made his case. He said it is a matter of principle and it is the principle we fight for, Sir.

*Senate 36, sequence 46, 19:10:14*

*Thursday, August 04, 2005*

SENATOR Dr. D. S. LOWE: How could you ever convince any Barbadian again that there is a principle at stake that is worth not only arguing for but condemning other politicians trying to suggest that other politicians do not have any economic instinct and in the same breath go out to the same public and the matter for which you condemn another, you yourself have now adopted.

Mr. President, it reminds me of a piece of scripture where there was one in the business of trying to point out people's sins, and the good Master said, why worry about the spec in a man's eye when yours is fully decorated with a log. There are many people who see the sins of other people but do not seem to see the sins of themselves. I would want to advise that when the Honourable Prime Minister speaks to this country again that he speaks to the people about what he did to the people a couple of weeks ago. The people want to know why is the time right now versus when the Government has so much at its disposal. Why did the salary increases not come before, especially since it took the Government over two years to bring this particular measure to the House.

Mr. President, when the Government had money, when the Honourable Prime Minister boasted in this country about eight years of successive growth, when the VAT yielded more than was anticipated and when there was money to throw into Eastry House, Greenland and the GEMS of Barbados and on and on, why was it not appropriate then to engage in this process that we are now engaged in. After all the Government had enough money but obviously the timing was off, for some strange reason. Why is it that the time is right now when there are so many people out there who are constantly asking to be a part of the success of this country?

Mr. President, the years of plenty have now turned into years of famine. The country was fortunate that it got eight years of plenty because those years come in sevens. This country is going through a period and I want to see who are the ones that will continue to benefit and who are the ones that will continue to struggle in this country.

Mr. President, at the end of the day we have to be realistic. It is not about winning an election as some people think it is. A lot of persons could postpone the political action of the citizens of this country to five years, but it should be the case where politicians can be recalled for negligence because when you look at the work of some politicians in their respective constituencies and now for them to get an increase on top of what they already earn, some constituents think it is ludicrous. I do not mean the song or the group, it is ridiculous. However, we cannot say anything because the masses are the ones responsible for generating the pay for politicians, so how could they come and lambaste the public when their livelihood depends upon us.

Mr. President, in case you are not aware, some Barbadian politicians are living well in this country or as my grandmother would say, they are living 'weller than well' but you would not know it because some of them do not have the nerve to show it although nowadays they are building castles. Mr. President, the Government of Barbados owes the people explanations, especially in those

locations where persons are observing the behaviour of politicians who are now crying for more and more.

Sir, some time ago the Honourable Prime Minister lamented the fact that the society is becoming a 'gimme society'. At the time when the Prime Minister made that comment, he was describing ordinary people in Barbados who wanted everything. Is it not irony, Mr. President, that the ones at the end of the 'gimme society' are the same ones who criticise the public for being overtaken by greed and wanting everything now and wanting to go to heaven and not wanting to die. Mr. President, some people would get to heaven for good deeds and some people would get to heaven because of martyrdom and perhaps in the not so distant future they would be some political martyrdom in this country.

Mr. President, I am much obliged.

SENATOR the Hon. E. R. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, I have no intention of being very long because I think that we have had a very long and interesting discussion on this matter, but I could not allow this opportunity to pass without making a small contribution.

Mr. President, I have no intention of arguing with anybody as to whether I should be paid or not, I, like Senator Eastmond, have never done it. I worked most of my life for nothing in the Public Service and was rewarded on most occasions by curse from the community who on this occasion are sparing the public servants simply because they are focussing on the politicians. Were it not for that, I am sure that they would be cursing the permanent secretaries as the people at the top who are getting everything and the people at the bottom getting nothing.

Mr. President, I have no intention of getting involved in any discussion about whether I should be paid or not or whether I work or not. Surprisingly, people who do not have any means of evaluating my contribution daily know whether I work or not. I go to work every day at 8 o'clock without fear and seldom leave before 6 o'clock. I do not see any of these people who know whether I work or not by the ministry but they know that I do not work. That is the kind of situation in which one finds oneself and there is no point arguing with anybody about it because that is how they want to respond to the issue and that is how they will respond because it serves some people's political interest at this point in time to focus on ministries.

Mr. President, the issue before us did not originate with any attempt to evaluate the contribution or otherwise of ministries, it arose out of an attempt to evaluate positions in the Public Service and to try to make sure that a system is established that can be used in the future that will allow a scientific approach to the placing of jobs within the job ladder.

Mr. President, I worked in the Public Service for 41 years and I have seen many job evaluations done in my time. Like, Senator Stuart, I am sorry that the late Senator Collymore is not present but for different reasons. Mr. President, when I became a Permanent Secretary there had two grades, S2 and S1. I became Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Finance, the only ministry in which I worked as a Permanent Secretary, one of the hardest working ministries in this country, and a ministry that requires all types of skills. Many nights I work on the job until 3 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. President, I was placed in the S2 scale. No rationale was presented to me as to why I had to be at S2 while somebody else was in S1. I was told I had to work for ten years before I move up to S1. I was a Permanent Secretary for 13 years so I would have made it to S1.

Mr. President, what happened along the way was that a colleague of mine who was appointed as a Permanent Secretary elsewhere after me was about to retire before me and I suddenly look into the Gazette and saw that he was moved up to S1 because he was somebody's friend and when I wrote and ask why he has gone up to S1 when I was appointed before him, I then discover that his friend wanted to make sure that he went home at the S1 salary scale so that his gratuity and pension would be at that level. Mr. President, I then said that I have to go up to S1 as well because I should have gone up before him.

*Senate 36 Sequence 47*

7.20 p.m.

*Thursday, August 04, 2005*

SENATOR the Hon. E. R. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, to this present day, it was never done. Eventually S2 salary scale was abolished and everybody moved up to S1. That is how I got to S1. Therefore, when people tell me that all these efforts before were so great...

Mr. President, I must disagree with Senator Stuart. I accept what he said that, that is that everybody who were involved in these exercises would have said that job evaluation exercise was the best, but I can say that prior to this occasion, there was no effort to establish criteria and to set standards with which people could have at least looked at and disagreed. I never knew why I was put in S2 salary scale, while others were put in S1.

I had other experiences with positions in the Public Service where, on going into the Ministry of the Civil Service, if you were known and were somebody's friend, your salary would have been put at a certain salary scale. That happened to me when I made out the case for the post of Chief Budget Analysis. Therefore, I can tell you of cases

where willy-nilly decisions were taken of cases at different levels, which is one of the reasons we ended up with a lot of this confusion. There is then the other issue of posts being described by name in the same way across the Public Service. There is a post called Director of Finance and Economic Affairs. There are then other people called directors, but they do not have the same level of responsibility and, therefore, a situation would arise where there would be people saying that they are directors and should be paid certain salaries.

Sir, these are issues that create enormous problems in the Public Service and, therefore, if a system is not put in place to deal with these problems, as this system is attempting to do, we would have more problems.

Mr. President, in spite of any deficiencies in this system, and there will always be deficiencies, there will always be room for improvements. I have accepted what the consultants have said, which is that there is need to continue the process and to keep upgrading those processes, et cetera, but there is the need to have a set of criteria where one can look at and can come to a determination of the value of the particular job to the organisation.

Mr. President, fortunately I have not heard anybody on this occasion saying that the Permanent Secretaries should not get increases. I have always argued that Permanent Secretaries are the administrative heads of the Ministries. The point is that having studied Organisational Theory and Behaviour for a number of years, I have not as yet found any organisation, whether it be trade union, Government or the private sector, where the top or head of the organisation gets the same salary at the person at the bottom, as there has always been a differential. And that is how it should be because of differences in the levels in responsibility.

Mr. President, the point I am making is that in every organisation there has to be some recognition of the degree of responsibility which is attached to the particular post. This exercise, therefore, seeks to make sure that jobs are given their particular worth within the system. I certainly have no difficulty with the exercise as it relates to the public servants, and in this case I do not stand to benefit because I have left the Public Service some time ago. Therefore, I am fully in support of this.

Sir, the issue on which people have focused is whether the Ministers, whose salaries, since 1978, have traditionally been pegged at 3 per cent above that of the Permanent Secretaries, should stand to get that increase. I stand to benefit and I am not going to engage in any argument or discussion with anybody as to whether or not I should get that 3 per cent increase. If people take the view that I should not be paid and that what I now get should be

taken away, I will make my decision as to whether or not I will continue, and that will be my choice. Mr. President, I am sure that those persons who argue that, know well within themselves that what they say is only for political purposes.

I do not see any problems or difficulty with persons who support the principle of the pegging and who then decide what they will do with the increase. If persons want to give it away, that is their privilege.

Mr. President, I am fully in support of all of the Resolutions that are before us, because while it is a fact that the job evaluation exercise did not include the political class, as they are now being described, these adjustments flow from the decisions in that evaluation. Therefore, as long as the Permanent Secretaries salaries are set at a particular level, you have to decide whether the usual approach of the peg of the 3 per cent above that will continue. That is a decision which the Government made, which is represented in the Resolution before us. There were then a number of other adjustments affecting other persons as a result of these changes. I am in support of all of them and pledge my support to these Resolutions.

SENATOR the Hon. J. E. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. President, I want to begin by commending all persons who spoke to this Resolution today. I think we had a wide and varied debate, and there are a number of issues to which I need to respond. First, I want to say to Sir Roy that the point he made about the ratio of 5.5:1 is a point that I too understand. It is a reflection that, over the years, an effort was made and an argument put during the negotiation over that long and extended period, that one had to do something special and different for persons at the bottom, vis-a-vis, persons at the top. Therefore, for anyone to suggest that, in truth and in fact, there is something inherently wrong with what was done, would be to go back and to open negotiations, which was not the intention. Therefore, one cannot ignore the fact that at one point in time, there was a ratio of 15:1 and that it is down to 5.5:1 and you continue in that direction, it speaks for itself.

I think I might appreciate the point he was making but nonetheless recognise that there must be a differential between those who have responsibility and those who have lesser responsibility. Generally speaking, in terms of Sir Roy's contribution, I take the points that he made. He also spoke of the historical linkage between the Minister's salaries and that of Permanent Secretaries.

Mr. President, today Senator Stuart sought to give this Honourable Chamber and the public of Barbados the impression that the Evaluation Committee, having made certain recommendations based on the scores received coming out of the exercise, that the information which was sent to Cabinet and then brought to Parliament was

different from what they have recommended in their report of 17th September, 2003.

7.30 p.m.

*Wednesday, August 4, 2005*

SENATOR THE HON. J.E.D. WILLIAMS: that the information which was sent to Cabinet and then brought to Parliament was different from what they recommended in their Report of September 17, 2003. I think it is unfortunate because every time the media makes reference of it, they speak about 22 per cent that was given to the Prime Minister as a result of the job evaluation exercise. The percentage increase to the salaries of Ministers was no different from that of the Permanent Secretaries. It was the same 15 per cent with the exception of the three per cent that was added in the differential which was always there. The 22 per cent is the accumulation of those three 3% percent for 2004/2005 and 2005/2006 that were applied. This is how information can be taken and simply say that while on one hand, some people were given 15 per cent but the Prime Minister and Ministers got 22 per cent. Sir, when we receive information, we must be able to attach a certain veracity to that information. Of course, it is for the Opposition when it wants to put a certain kind of spin but it is for the media to get it right.

Mr. President, today I heard Senator Stuart in this Honourable Chamber spoke about how much the Right Excellent Errol Walton Barrow was prepared to sacrifice at the top when he was Prime Minister. I decided that I would check the facts. I am saying to this Honourable House that in 1973, Ministers used to get salaries which were 23 per cent higher than those of Permanent Secretaries. Sir, at the time I did not check how much the Prime Minister used to get vis-a-vis the Permanent Secretaries. The basis salary of the Prime Minister was \$33 600 per annum but the salary of the Permanent Secretary was \$19 440. In other words, the salary of the Prime Minister was 62.6 per cent higher than that of a Permanent Secretary. Sir, I am not being told that we have a Prime Minister who is asking for more, in relative terms, than what the Right Excellent Errol Walton Barrow was prepared to accept in 1973. Sir, what are the facts? The basis salary of the Prime Minister is now \$166 462 and that of the Permanent Secretary is \$121,196 which works out to 37.3 per cent.

Mr. President, I am being told that the Right Excellent Errol Walton Barrow used to be magnanimous enough because what he used to receive was significantly less than anybody used to receive but that people are now prepared to do differently.

Mr. President, on one hand, a man's salary was 62.3 per cent higher than that of a Permanent Secretary but, today the Prime Minister only works for 37.3 per cent more

than a Permanent Secretary yet I am being told that people want more than what they are due and are prepared to give themselves more than 20 per cent when, in truth and in fact, this is not so because it was the application of increases for two years. Sir, this is what the country has come to and Senator Stuart wrapped his total presentation around something that was not true.

SENATOR F.J. STUART: Mr. President, on a point of elucidation. I really have to respond to Senator Williams. Before I left my office this morning to come to this Chamber, I telephoned the department of Government which I thought would give me the most reliable information on issues relating to the salaries of Permanent Secretaries as a basis for determining what my arguments would be in relation to what the political class was being paid. Sir, today, about 10.30 a.m., I was told by a department of Government which I thought should know that the present salary of a Permanent Secretary is \$104,980.56 per annum, that they get travel of \$779.00 per month and entertainment allowance of \$904.00 monthly and a telephone allowance of \$31.00 monthly.

MR. PRESIDENT: Senator, your point therefore, is that you spoke from information which you received.

SENATOR F.J. STUART: Mr. President, that is correct. Thank you very much, Sir.

SENATOR THE HON. J.E.D. WILLIAMS: Mr. President, earlier today, I made the point that the report of \$112 000 plus for Permanent Secretaries was done of September 17, 2003. We were made today to understand that people came to Parliament with figures different from what was contained in the report. Sir, there is always the belief that somebody wants to finger spin, that you sit as a group and say that \$112 000 is going forward.. (19:37)

so that people would know what it is all about. Mr. President, I am saying to you that brochures were printed which explained what was job evaluation, why it was necessary to do it, the objectives and so on. Sir, articles were placed within the Challenge for Change magazine pertaining to the same matters and officers appeared on television and radio and printed in both the Advocate-News and the Nation Newspapers but I am now being told that all that communication was totally ignored.

S36/19:40

Sequence 49

Thursday, August 04, 2005

Senate 36, sequence 51, 7.50 p.m.

Senator the Hon. J.E.D. WILLIAMS: Mr. President, I truly commend this Resolution to all Members of the Senate and I beg that this Resolution do now pass.

*The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.*

ORDER NO. 4 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (TEACHERS) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 2005.

Senator the Hon. J.E.D. WILLIAMS: Mr. President, I indicated at the outset that I was making one comprehensive speech to cover all the other Resolutions and so I move that this Resolution do now pass.

*The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.*

ORDER NO. 5 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE MINISTERS AND PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES (REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES) ORDER, 2005.

Senator the Hon. J.E.D. WILLIAMS: Mr. President, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

*The question was put to the Senate.*

A Division has been called for:

Mr. PRESIDENT: A division has been called and I ask the Clerk to conduct the Division.

The bell was rung.

Ayes: Senator the Hon. E.R. GRIFFITH, Senator the Hon. Miss L.V. EASTMOND, Senator the Hon. J.E.D. WILLIAMS, Senator T.E. BARKER, Senator R.W. GRANT, Senator Miss S.C.V. HUSBANDS, Senator Miss P.E. PARRIS, Senator I.G.P. GOODING-EDGHILL, Senator G.P.B. NICHOLLS, Her Honour Senator Dame Patricia SYMMONDS, Senator A. C. FIELDS, Senator the Very Rev. H. E. CRICHLLOW, Senator Sir JOHN S. GODDARD, Senator Sir Roy TROTMAN - 14.

Noes: Senator F.J. STUART, Senator Dr. D.S. LOWE - 2.

CLERK: Mr. President, 14 Senators voted Aye, two Senators voted, No.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The result of the Division is as follows:

Fourteen Honourable Senators voted for the Resolution. Two Honourable Senators voted against. The Resolution is therefore passed.

ORDER NO. 6 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY (REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES – OF MEMBERS) ORDER, 2005.

Senator the Hon. J.E.D. WILLIAMS: Mr. President, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

*The question was put to the Senate.*

A Division has been called for:

Mr. PRESIDENT: A division has been called and I ask the Clerk to conduct the Division.

The bell was rung.

Ayes: Senator the Hon. E.R. GRIFFITH, Senator the Hon. Miss L.V. EASTMOND, Senator the Hon. J.E.D. WILLIAMS, Senator T.E. BARKER, Senator R.W. GRANT, Senator Miss. S.C.V. HUSBANDS, Senator Miss P.E. PARRIS, Senator I.G.P. GOODING-EDGHILL, Senator G.P.B. NICHOLLS, Her Honour Senator Dame Patricia SYMMONDS, Senator A. C. FIELDS, Senator the Very Rev. H. E. CRICHLLOW, Senator Sir JOHN S. GODDARD - 13.

Noes: Senator F.J. STUART, Senator Dr. D.S. LOWE, Senator Sir Roy TROTMAN - 3.

CLERK: Mr. President, 13 Honourable Senators voted Aye, three Honourable Senators voted, No.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The result of the Division is as follows:

Thirteen Honourable Senators voted for the Resolution. Three Honourable Senators voted against. The Resolution is therefore passed.

ORDER NO. 7 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE RATE OF SALARY AND ALLOWANCES APPLICABLE TO THE POST OF PERSONAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRIME MINISTER.

Senator the Hon. J.E.D. WILLIAMS: Mr. President, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

*The question was put to the Senate.*

A Division has been called for:

Mr. PRESIDENT: A Division has been called for.

Ayes: Senator the Hon. E.R. GRIFFITH, Senator the Hon. Miss L.V. EASTMOND, Senator the Hon. J.E.D. WILLIAMS, Senator T.E. BARKER, Senator R.W. GRANT, Senator Miss. S.C.V. HUSBANDS, Senator Miss

P.E. PARRIS, Senator I.G.P. GOODING-EDGHILL, Senator G.P.B. NICHOLLS, Her Honour Senator Dame Patricia SYMMONDS, Senator A. C. FIELDS, Senator the Very Rev. H. E. CRICHLLOW, Senator Sir JOHN S. GODDARD - 13.

Noes: Senator F.J. STUART, Senator Dr. D.S. LOWE, Senator Sir Roy TROTMAN - 3.

CLERK: Mr. President, 13 Senators voted Aye, three Senators voted, No.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The result of the Division is as follows:

Thirteen Honourable Senators voted for the Resolution. Three Honourable Senators voted against. The Resolution is therefore passed.

ORDER NO. 8 – RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE SCHEDULE TO THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL (CONDITIONS OF SERVICE) – ACT, CAP. 6.

Senator the Hon. J.E.D. WILLIAMS: Mr. President, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass and agreed to.

*The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.*

ADJOURNMENT

Senator Hon. E.R. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, I beg to move that the Senate be adjourned sine die.

*The question that the Senate be adjourned sine die was put to the Senate and agreed to and Mr. PRESIDENT adjourned the Senate accordingly.*

*Senate 36, sequence 51, 19:57:29*

## CONTENTS

## RESUMPTION

## INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR THE FINANCING

## AND PROCUREMENT OF VEHICLES AND

## EQUIPMENT FOR THE SANITATION

## SERVICE AUTHORITY.

**SENATOR the Hon. E. R. GRIFFITH.....1**

Senator F. J. Stuart, 4, 5; Senator Sir, Allan Fields, 5;  
 Senator Dr. F. L. Chandler, 6, 7, 8; Senator R. O.  
 Marville, 8, 9; Senator Dr. D.S. Lowe, 10, 11, 12, 13;  
 Senator Miss. S.C.V. Husbands, 14, 15, 17; Her Honour  
 Senator Dame Patricia Symmonds, 17.

## RESUMPTION

Senator G.P.I. Edghill-Gooding, 18; Senator I.G.P.  
 Gooding-Edghill, 19; Senator Dr. D.S. Lowe, 19; Senator  
 R.W. Grant, 19; Senator the Hon. E. R. Griffith, 20.

**ORDER NO. 3 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE  
 CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) ORDER,  
 2005.....20**

Senator the Hon. J.E.D. Williams, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26;  
 Senator F. J. Stuart, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32; Senator Sir  
 John Stanley Goddard, 33, 35.

## RESUMPTION

## ORDER NO. 3 (resumed)

Senator the Very Rev. H.E. Chrichlow, 36; Senator the  
 Very Rev. H. E. Crichlow, 36; Senator the Very Reverend  
 H. E. Crichlow, 37, 38, 39; Senator Sir Roy Trotman, 38,  
 39, 40, 42; Senator the Hon. J.E.D. Williams, 38, 39, 52,  
 53; Senator F. J. Stuart, 39, 43, 53; Senator the Hon. Miss  
 L. V. Eastmond, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46; Senator A.C. Fields,  
 46; Senator Dr. D.S. Lowe, 47, 48, 49; Senator the Hon.  
 E. R. Griffith, 50, 51.

**ORDER NO. 4 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE  
 CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (TEACHERS)  
 (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 2005.....53**

Senator the Hon. J.E.D. Williams, 53.

**ORDER NO. 5 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE  
 MINISTERS AND PARLIAMENTARY  
 SECRETARIES (REMUNERATION AND  
 ALLOWANCES) ORDER, 2005.....53**

Senator the Hon. J.E.D. Williams, 53; Clerk, 53.

**ORDER NO. 6 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE  
 SENATE AND HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
 (REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES – OF  
 MEMBERS) ORDER, 2005.....54**

Senator the Hon. J.E.D. Williams, 54; Clerk, 54.

**ORDER NO. 7 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE  
 RATE OF SALARY AND ALLOWANCES  
 APPLICABLE TO THE POST OF PERSONAL  
 ASSISTANT TO THE PRIME MINISTER.....54**

Senator the Hon. J.E.D. Williams, 54; Clerk, 54.

**ORDER NO. 8 – RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE  
 SCHEDULE TO THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL  
 (CONDITIONS OF SERVICE) – ACT, CAP. 6.....54**

Senator the Hon. J.E.D. Williams, 54.

**SUSPENSIONS.....18, 36.**
**ADJOURNMENT.....54**

Senator the Hon. E. R. Griffith, 54.

## SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

**CHANDLER, Senator Dr. F. L.**  
**CHRICLOW, Senator the Very Rev. H.E.**  
**CLERK,**  
**CRICLOW, Senator the Very Rev. H. E.**  
**CRICLOW, Senator the Very Reverend H. E.**  
**EASTMOND, Senator the Hon. Miss L. V.**  
**EDGHILL-GOODING, Senator G.P.I.**  
**FIELDS, Senator A.C.**  
**FIELDS, Senator Sir, Allan**  
**GODDARD, Senator Sir JOHN STANLEY**  
**GOODING-EDGHILL, Senator I.G.P.**  
**GRANT, Senator R.W.**  
**GRIFFITH, Senator the Hon. E. R.**  
**HUSBANDS, Senator Miss. S.C.V.**  
**LOWE, Senator Dr. D.S.**  
**MARVILLE, Senator R. O.**  
**STUART, Senator F. J.**  
**SYMMONDS, Her Honour SENATOR DAME**  
**PATRICIA**  
**TROTMAN, Senator SIR ROY**  
**WILLIAMS, Senator the Hon. J.E.D.**

**DISCLAIMER.** This transcript was prepared with the assistance of artificial intelligence tools and is provided for reference only. It has not been reviewed, verified or approved by the Hansard Department of the Parliament of Barbados and does not constitute an official parliamentary record. It may contain errors or omissions, including inaccuracies in wording or speaker identification. For authoritative quotations or confirmation of proceedings, consult the official Hansard record when available.

---

**EDITORIAL NOTES — NOT PART OF THE REPORT**


---

*Prepared with the transcript; for checking against the recording and the Minutes.*

**EDITORIAL QUERIES**

*Points noted while preparing this report from the edited transcript. The text has not been altered except where stated.*

**Q1. Masthead.** The session is not stated in the source, so no session line is printed.

**Q2. Opening.** The source begins with a take-slip timed 11.00 a.m., the heading ‘RESUMPTION’ and Mr. President’s words ‘This Sitting is resumed.’; the earlier part of the Sitting and the PRESENT list are not in the source, and the title of Order No. 2 is broken across a paragraph and four heading lines. Printed as in the source.

**Q3. Take-slips, about 12.20 p.m., 1.07 p.m., 3.00 p.m. and 7.30 p.m..** Four take-slips are dated ‘Wednesday, August 4, 2005’ or ‘Wednesday, July 20, 2005’; the others, and the heading, give Thursday, 4th August, 2005. Printed as in the source.

**Q4. Order No. 2, Senator the Hon. E. R. Griffith.** The loan of US\$5 000 000 is said to be ‘drawn down in three tranches of \$2.5 million each’, which would total \$7.5 million. Printed as in the source.

**Q5. Take-slips about 12.20 p.m. and 7.30 p.m..** At these changes of reporter a few words are typed twice: Senator Dr. D. S. Lowe’s ‘so that we could measure as we go forward whether or not these monies are meeting the target set out by the’ and Senator the Hon. J. E. D. Williams’ ‘that the information which was sent to Cabinet and then brought to Parliament was different from what they recommended’. Both are printed as in the source.

**Q6. Speech labels.** Several names appear in different forms: ‘SENATOR G.P.I. EDGHILL-GOODING’ and ‘SENATOR I.G.P. GOODING-EDGHILL’; ‘SENATOR Sir, Allan FIELDS’ (Mr. President calls him ‘Senator Sir Alan Fields’) and ‘SENATOR A.C. FIELDS’; ‘SENATOR the Very Rev. H.E. CHRICHLOW’ and ‘CRICHLOW’; and ‘Senator the Hon. E.G. GRIFFITH’ for Senator E. R. Griffith. Printed as in the source.

**Q7. Order No. 3, Senator F. J. Stuart, take-slip Sequence 31.** A figure is printed as ‘from \$112 000 to \$121 196 88’. Printed as in the source.

**DEBATE SUMMARY**

*(Editorial summary — not part of the record.)*

The record of the Senate’s Sitting of Thursday, 4th August, 2005 opens at about 11.00 a.m. with the resumption of the Sitting, Mr. President in the Chair, on Order No. 2, a Resolution to approve the borrowing of US\$5 000 000 from FirstCaribbean International Bank to finance vehicles and equipment for the Sanitation Service Authority. Senator the Hon. E. R. Griffith set out the terms (a seven-year repayment by quarterly instalments at 150 basis points over the three-month US LIBOR rate, then about 5 per cent) and described the Authority’s duties, its funding by the Government, and the four sites it manages, including the Mangrove Landfill and a bulky waste site at Bagatelle.

The Leader of the Opposition, Senator F. J. Stuart, recalled that the Authority had been established in 1975, said the Minister of Finance had admitted its poor performance during a visit to Emmerton, and asked about the Greenland landfill. Senators Sir Allan Fields, Dr. F. L. Chandler, R. O. Marville, Miss S. C. V. Husbands, Her Honour Dame Patricia Symmonds and R. W. Grant supported the loan and praised the sanitation workers; Senator Chandler urged sensible decisions on solid waste before a crisis, and Senator Marville spoke of chasing ‘crisis after crisis’ and of dumping in gullies. Senator Dr. D. S. Lowe asked for an itemised list of how the US\$5 million would be spent and questioned buying vehicles with a seven-year lifespan; after the luncheon suspension Senator I. G. P. Gooding-Edghill replied that some trucks were more than ten years old and still on the road. Senator Griffith wound up, saying that a statement on Greenland would be made shortly, and the Resolution was agreed to.

Senator the Hon. J. E. D. Williams then made one presentation covering Orders Nos. 3 to 8, beginning with the Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) Order, 2005, which arose from the job evaluation exercise. He said a 13-member committee, including five CTUSAB nominees, had worked for 20 months; its report of September 2003 recommended that 3 000 posts be upgraded and 200 downgraded, with the police, prisons and fire service among the main beneficiaries. He explained the history of linking Ministers’ and Permanent Secretaries’ salaries and the choice of implementation date.

Senator Stuart accepted that parliamentarians should be properly paid but contested the increases to the top salaries, citing a Government document on the Permanent Secretaries’ scale. Senator Sir John Stanley Goddard spoke of the public controversy and the Auditor-General’s repeated reports of breaches. After a suspension until 5.10 p.m., Senator the Very Rev. H. E. Crichlow criticised Senator Stuart’s position; Senator Sir Roy Trotman spoke of nepotism, favouritism and supersession in the public

service; and Senator the Hon. Miss L. V. Eastmond said that those who opposed the exercise would be voting against nurses and others, drawing points of order from Senator Stuart. Senators A. C. Fields, Dr. Lowe and Griffith also spoke, and in reply Senator Williams said the Ministers' increase was the same 15 per cent as that of Permanent Secretaries, with the customary three per cent differential, rather than 22 per cent.

Order No. 3 and Order No. 4, the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 2005, were agreed to. Divisions were called on the next three: the

Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances) Order, 2005 passed by 14 votes to 2 (Senators Stuart and Lowe), and the Senate and House of Assembly (Remuneration and Allowances of Members) Order, 2005 and the Resolution on the salary and allowances of the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister each passed by 13 votes to 3, Senator Sir Roy Trotman joining the Noes. Order No. 8, amending the Schedule to the Governor-General (Conditions of Service) Act, Cap. 6, was agreed to, and on the motion of Senator Griffith the Senate was adjourned sine die.