
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1981 – 86

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, December 11, 1984

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour C. L. Bolden, LL.B., (Speaker)

His Honour R. E. Brathwaite, (Deputy Speaker)

Hon. L. S. Craig, (Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Leader of the House)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams, Q.C., M.A., (Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning)

Hon. L. B. Brathwaite, (Minister of Housing and Lands)

Mr. J. G. Odle, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees)

Hon. L. R. Tull, Q.C., M.A., (Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs and Minister of Foreign Affairs)

Hon. DeL. O. Bradshaw, (Minister of Labour, Social Security, Sport and Community Services)

Mr. L. L. Sisnett, (Parliamentary Secretary)

Hon. A. Truss

Mr. O. S. Arthur, M.Sc., (Econ.)

Prayers were read by the Rev. D. Stapleton.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, December 4, 1984.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, December 4, 1984, be taken as read.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no observations or objections, let the Minutes stand confirmed.

Mr. L. A. WEEKES and Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN entered the Chamber and took their seats.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:

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

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:

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

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I do believe that if things run according to plan, we will probably have our Christmas recess from today. I would like to be able to do this Resolution in all its stages, and at this point I would like to inform you, Mr. Speaker, and members on the other side that I propose to do this later in the day.

I will ask the Clerk to have the appropriate documents circulated so that we could probably do this later this evening.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope you will have the necessary discussion with the Leader or Deputy Leader of the Opposition when either one is available.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I will have to determine who is the senior person on the other side, and that may depend on age, chronologically of course. I would think the honourable Member for St. Michael North West (Mr. L. A. Weekes) would be the appropriate person. After an hour or so and I do not see other Members on the other side, I may have to go into negotiation and discussion with the honourable Member.

I may add, Mr. Speaker, that there were documents circulated some time earlier this morning – I am led to believe this by the Clerk of the House – and I propose to do the appropriate measures during today's sitting.

Mr. B. M. TAITT, Dr. R. C. HAYNES, Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD, Mr. M. A. KING and Mr. P. M. GREAVES entered the Chamber and took their seats.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE BOARD (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1984

Order No. 1 was called – To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the National Health Service Board Act.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Sir, this amendment primarily comes out of discussions between the members of BAMP, which is supposed to be the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners, and the Government. It deals primarily with a situation whereby a medical practitioner may appeal to the Minister of Health against their refusal by the National Health Service Board on application from such medical practitioner for inclusion on the list of medical practitioners. We have had discussions with the Attorney General's Office, and we have been advised that under the National Health Service Board Act, there is no real legal basis upon which anything can be prescribed respecting applications for review by the Minister of decisions of the Board on connected matters, and it is in that light, Mr. Speaker, that we propose to amend the Bill.

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

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

Mr. L. A. WEEKES (St. Michael North West): Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a brief comment on this amendment, because I made a major speech on the National Health Service Board some time ago, and I would hardly want to go through the same procedure again on this amendment to the Health Service Board Act even before we have started the second phase of this programme. It is no surprise that this is the first amendment, because we have produced sound arguments which I now believe have suddenly convinced the Government that the approach at the time was not correct; but sometimes you get tired repeating the same argument over and over again.
12.25 p.m.

There is no need to place any more power into the Minister's hands in respect of the National Health Service Board Act. When you look at Clause 15 of the principal Act, you find that it makes it mandatory for the Board to determine complaints and specifies the penalties which the Board may impose on medical practitioners. And then we look at paragraph 10 of the First Schedule to the same Act, it also makes it mandatory for the Board to appoint committees, complaints and disciplinary, to determine the same matters that are explained in Clause 15. But at the same time, it does not specify the particular area of complaint, nor do the committees have power to impose fines which the Board must accept. Therefore, one takes it that the Board has full responsibility in this matter.

If you look a little further, you will find that Clause 12 demands that the Board submits its report annually, and Clause 14 gives the Minister power to direct matters directly to the Board, which suggests to me that the Board has ample powers to deal with these matters. Similarly, because the Minister appoints the Board and the Board has to report to the Minister, and the Board appoints the committees, it is clear that the Minister would have had maximum powers to deal with any matters that may arise.

This amendment seems to bring the Minister directly into disciplinary matters. I feel that those powers need not be vested in the Minister in a review sense, and if you want to compare other areas where you have a review Board, in most cases they are not concerned with disciplinary matters. The Town and Country Planning Office probably have a review board, but not to necessarily deal with disciplinary matters. This, to me, is placing the Minister in a very interesting position, which may involve some political involvement.

I think that during my speech on the National Health Service Board, I cautioned the Government not to allow the health services to be in any way improperly or badly directed through any sort of political involvement. The Board is a political Board, obviously, and the Minister is a politician. I do not believe that these powers ought to be vested in a Minister, especially in the light of the prevailing circumstances. I think one needs not go very far to remember the issue at the Lodge School, where, to some extent, you could see the problems.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would not allow the honourable Member to deal with any matter which is still sub judice. The honourable Member should be well aware of that situation.

Mr. L. A. WEEKES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The point is that there may be other areas in which you could probably find that the Minister's involvement at such level tends to defeat the very purpose one intends to achieve in a particular venture. I feel that, if for no other reason, the Minister should be without this power in view of the fact that we have other options open to us to deal with such matters.

One has got to look realistically at the situation in Barbados today. There is no doubt that you hear very often about Bs and Ds — and no Bs and no Ds. Because of that, we should let justice appear to be done as one would expect it to be done in the normal course of events. So I would suggest that the Government look at this matter again and try to evolve a system whereby in any reviews to be made in respect of the discipline of the medical practitioners, utmost caution should be taken to make sure that the service does not suffer in any way.

I feel that Government should be very cautious about introducing this particular amendment, and probably give it much more serious thought, in the light of what one could perceive may be a difficult situation if and when any of the problems I can think of arise. I would suggest, then, that the Review Board not be placed in the hands of the Minister, irrespective of who may be on that Board. I also want to draw to your attention to the fact that, like the committees of the Board, the Minister does not have to accept any advice that may be given, according to the amendment here, by that Board, no matter how competent it is. I feel that because of that, you should look for other areas to implement the National Health Service Board in a way that it can run very smoothly to the good health care of this country.

Mr. M. A. KING (Christ Church West Central): Mr. Speaker, I have one major concern about the Bill which is before us. It seems to me that one of the major purposes of this Bill is to enable the Board, with the approval of the Minister, to make regulations governing the pro-

cedures, which are to be taken in relation to review procedures of decisions made by the National Health Service Board.

That seems to me to assume that the Minister has a power to review decisions of the Board. When I look at the principal legislation relating to the establishment of the National Health Service Board, I can see nowhere in the main legislation any power which is given to the Minister to review decisions of the National Health Service Board. So it would seem to me that where we seek to provide in regulations for the procedures to be followed in relation to a review by the Minister of the decisions by the National Health Service Board, any regulations made thereunder would have to be *ultra vires*, because if the Act which is the basis.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that not the sort of argument which would have to be advanced in the committee stage when we are dealing with the amendment to the Bill?

Mr. M. A. KING: I thought it was a general principle, Mr. Speaker. The Bill is very short. That is all it is dealing with.

Mr. SPEAKER: The substance of the Bill differs considerably from the comparison which is being made between the various sections of the Bill and the proposed additions or deletions.

Mr. M. A. KING: It seems to me that if you are seeking to create regulations which deal with the concept of *ultra vires*, it is one which is wider than an issue which is to be dealt with in Committee stage only, and it goes to the very root of the legislation before us, and I would have thought that this is the appropriate place at which it should be done. But the point is made nonetheless. 12.35 p.m.

The question that the Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. L. R. TULL, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, my colleague, the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central, sought to make a point in the second reading and there was official intervention, but I did not hear any response from the Government. I think the point he is making is not only valid, but it is a substantive point to which the Government ought to at least advert.

It seems that in this Clause 2 we are seeking to amend the principal Act. In Clause 2(b), in this amending Bill, it says: "by adding after paragraph (j) of subsection (10) thereof the following:

'(k) respecting the review by the Minister of certain decisions of the Board;... "'

That presupposes that in the principal Act, which is being amended, the Minister has been given powers of review. Unless we on this side have been subject to a different Bill published elsewhere, we have searched the original Bill and we cannot find anywhere in that Bill where the Minister has the powers of review; nor indeed in this amending Bill, except by the very clause I have just read, if that can be so construed, can we find it in this Bill that the Minister has any powers of review.

It may very well be, as has happened in the past, that the Bill on the file says something different from the Bill that is printed, or indeed something different from the Bill that was passed in this Honourable Chamber, but I would submit, like my colleague, that it is impossible to give the functionary to whom the power is being delegated by this legislation an authority which is outside of the four corners of the Act itself.

Unless we all misunderstand the principles, which are fairly simple principles, of administrative law, unless we on this side are totally at sea — and I have no reason to believe that we are — then I would like the Minister to indicate if this is a new form of drafting, or if there is some way or manner in which this new approach to judicial review is going to be implemented. This is going to be ministerial review at a level which we have never seen before, because these powers are not given originally.

On previous occasions when we raised questions, we have been, if not maligned, at least repudiated, and therefore I would look to the Attorney General to explain what this means to us as simply as he can, so that we and the rest of Barbados will understand what precisely is being attempted with this amending clause.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I have listened very carefully to the point made by the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central. While he was speaking I was giving some consideration to the substance

of his intervention and I would at this stage like to move that further consideration of this Bill be postponed.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. L. R. TULL, seconded by Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the motion of Hon. L. R. TULL, seconded by Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE, further consideration of the Bill was postponed.

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir.....

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are two honourable Members on their feet.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I rise on a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I hear the point of order?

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: The point of order is that the Members on this side of the House came into the House today and found the papers for the matter which we are about to discuss on the table in front of them at their seats. We have not had opportunity or occasion to study the submissions in those papers, and I wish to make a protest about the way that we are treating public business.

12.45 p.m.

If the business of Parliament is to proceed on the basis of debate in terms of papers, documents, Resolutions or Orders circulated, it is understood that time should be given the Members in order to study the submissions. I regret that, in this particular case, there has been a derogation from that high principle. We wish to protest against that particular approach at this stage, whatever may be the factors.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday I said quite clearly that this would be done. I promised that, if possible, I would have papers in honourable Members' hands by Friday, but against the possibility of the Legal Department not being able to dot every "i" and cross every "t", I asked honourable Members if they wished me to outline the proposals. I

remember it was on the adjournment, and although a Minister may make a statement at any time, and, indeed, many matters are raised in the adjournment, I considered that Your Honour would very likely have stopped me from, in effect, moving a Resolution that was not before the House on a motion for adjournment.

I recited the principle upon which this Order was going to be brought. I mentioned the salaries of the judges. I read out the salaries of the fixed points which were affected. I said what salaries in the Police Force would also be affected. I said that ministerial salaries would be related to the salaries of Permanent Secretaries, as always. I said that the Deputy Clerks and Members of Parliament would be given the same salary as the regraded bottom point of the post of Administrative Officer 1, and I said what it was. I recited the regraded salaries of Your Honour and the Leader of the Opposition. I did all of this just against the eventually that the legal officers might not be able to complete their work on time.

I want to pay a tribute to the legal officers. They worked very hard over the weekend, and had to give some consideration to the appropriateness, and indeed the legality, of one or two of the arrangements. It was only yesterday that the Order was completed, because there had to be an intricate decision taken about the grading of a particular post between S.3 and S.4 and an amendment had to be made, which may even be reflected in the papers that have come out to Parliament, or perhaps, in a new page.

I understand what the honourable Member is saying, and I am glad that he had made his protest without seeking any consequential delay. I hope that he will accept my explanation of the matters which have given rise to his protest, and, indeed, accept that I agree with him that the business of Parliament should, at all times, be conducted in such a way to give Members ample time to study the documentation.

It is also, however, fair to point out that it seems to me that it has become the custom to bring Civil Establishment Orders on the very date that they are to be debated. I can recall in 1976 debating a Civil Establishment Order on the day that it was introduced and indeed, voting against it, if I remember correctly. I can remember that it happened at least three times since when changes in salaries were made. The reason is not that Government wants to hide anything from anybody. The reason is that these Orders are often very difficult to make and people have to work overtime for long periods.

The Permanent Secretary to the Prime Minister has been Permanent Secretary to the Prime Minister for some time, but he has only taken up the portfolio of Establishments within the last few months. I think that he has done wonders to master these details so quickly. There

are two other officers in the Ministry who have come to my private house and to hotels I have been staying in to try and do the people's work.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I do not understand. The Permanent Secretary whom he is talking about is an expert in these matters.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: He does not say that he was an expert before, he may be an expert now.

I can only regret that we have come so late, but I will try my best to explain as fully as I can any difficulties which arise. I hope that answers the honourable Member's protest.

To move the Resolution, Sir....

Mr. B. M. Taitt rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the honourable Member now want to comment on what I consider is now a debate arising out of a protest by the honourable Member for St. Michael South?

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): I am querying whether he had, in fact, embarked on the debate, or whether he was commenting on the protest of my colleague. My colleague spoke for me on the matter. I do not wish to add to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I deem it that the Honourable Prime Minister was replying to the protest made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South. Is it that you want to comment on anything that has been said in this?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir. My colleague has spoken and I think, has expressed the sentiments of all of us.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member may now proceed with the matter that is before the House.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, the matter of salaries of public officers is never easy, it has exceeded in difficulty only perhaps by the matter of salaries of parliamentarians, and we have been battling virtually for four years, since 1980, with a proper salary structure for civil servants, particularly civil servants at the top.

I am going to preface my remarks by pointing out that since 1972, public servants at the bottom of the pay scale have received salary increases totalling 163 per cent, and public servants at the top of the pay scale have received increases totalling 58.2 per cent. The differential ratio between a Permanent Secretary and the lowest paid workers in the Public Service has moved from the Permanent Secretary getting 9.74 times as much as the lowest paid worker in 1972-73 to the situation where, with the revised salaries of 1984, they got 5.83:1.

Asides

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The percentage figures I gave do not include the 1984 revision, but the ratio I gave does.

In the middle of all this, the Government has also had to deal with the residue of the colonial perquisites which still distort our salary scales in Barbados. We accept a lot of things in this country without recognising their origin. The origin of a housing allowance is that you had to pay officers to come out from England something towards helping them get a house in Barbados where they came to serve as colonial civil servants. When the English colonial civil servants were replaced, the Barbadian colonial civil servants insisted that they have the same conditions of service as those whose places they took so we had the anomaly of paying Permanent Secretaries and people at that level to live in their own houses, giving them a tax free allowance to do so. You then got pressures from others.

12.55 p.m.

All Governments, the previous as well as this, resisted the pressure from Ministers to give them a housing allowance as well, because there is no doubt that the tax free housing allowance plus the non-contributory pension for civil servants gave Permanent Secretaries a financial advantage over Ministers, however the scales may have appeared to be almost equal. But not only Permanent Secretaries, but persons lower down the scale began to ask for housing allowances, and indeed in 1980, I think it was, we found ourselves in a situation of having to make two scales, dividing the number of civil servants who from time immemorial had been graded together in terms of responsibility. They were all getting the same salary, but about half of them had managed to get a housing allowance and the other half had not. They are the two grades now S.5 and S.6. S.4, S.5 and S.6 are the affected grades. They went into S.4 and S.5 depending on whether they got housing allowances before or not, and honourable Members who look at the present scales will realise the distortion that these gratuitous factors introduced into salary fixing.

On top of all of this, the Government decided that it had to settle the matter of the emoluments of the Puisne Judges. Their emoluments have a constitutional importance because they cannot be reduced without a special Act of Parliament. Indeed I am not so sure that Parliament is competent to reduce the salary of a judge. The judges had been getting, on the face of it, the same salary as civil servants, but the civil servants housing allowances had come to be taxable, but the judges' housing allowances had not been taxable. This created advantages for the judges in one respect and disadvantages in another. On the one hand, the judges' non-taxable housing allowances meant that they had a few dollars

more in their pockets, but on the other hand, since the judges' housing allowances had been left in limbo for some time, it meant that their pensionable emoluments fell below those of civil servants, because the civil servants were paying tax on the housing allowance and being pensioned on it — in other words, it had become salary — while the judges were not paying tax and had slightly smaller allowances, so would have got smaller pensions. This resulted in a salary revision for judges, which they in the end accepted in view of the \$25 a week which other persons were given as a pay increase in 1982 at the time of economic stringency. So the judges have been getting a salary, I think, of \$62 400 per annum since April, 1982.

The Association of Permanent Secretaries, I may not have got the exact title, acting, I think, both through the Head of the Civil Service and through general representations, presented a paper to the Prime Minister pointing out that, until 1982, the salary of a Grade 1 Permanent Secretary and other related senior officers, including the Director of Public Prosecutions, the Chief Parliamentary Counsel and the Auditor General, was at the same level as a Puisne Judge, and they made a number of submissions relating to their having fallen well below the judges in terms of emoluments, both pensionable emoluments and perquisites of office. The judges no longer enjoyed a housing allowance, but in grossing up their housing allowances their tax free status had to be considered, and the judges, in view of ordinary increases, accepted this grossing up, plus, I think, some 8 per cent to cover them over a period of four years. At the time that this happened they had not had an increase for three years, so they got the increase and allowed it to carry on for one more year.

After much discussion, in the course of which I regret that I was not able to accede to a number of Permanent Secretaries' requests, the salary of a Permanent Secretary Grade I was agreed to be fixed at \$60 000 annually, which is a little less than the salary of a judge, and the salary of a Permanent Secretary Grade II and the allied grades at \$56 400. It is to be remembered that after five years Permanent Secretaries Grade II, graduate to Grade I and therefore the majority of Permanent Secretaries are being paid as Grade I officers.

Once accepted this proposal naturally made substantial waves throughout all the other fixed point grades. Already the gap between S.4 and S.5 was considered too large. Now, this was opening up a tremendous gap between S.1 and S.3. S.1 would have been \$60 000 and S.3 \$46 000. S.1 was regraded to \$54 060, so it was only \$8 000 more than S.4, but now it has gone up \$14 000 more. So we had to embark upon a general programme of changing all the fixed point scales. The result is before honourable Members in the shape of the papers that have been circulated, but we could not stop alone at the "S"

scales, because for some reason there is a tradition, which at first I had intended to break, but for reasons of convenience I have been persuaded to continue, that the bottom of the fixed point scales, that is the bottom of the senior persons — "S" basically stands for "senior" I suppose — is the same as the top of the persons who are on movable scales.

We had to make changes in the movable scales, and, therefore, civil servants right down to salary point Z.15 have had some upgrading, in some cases quite small, in some cases more substantial, made to their salaries. Z.15 is not a very big scale, but the point immediately below it is perhaps the biggest in the Civil Service. Z.16 occupies a full page in the Schedule of Personal Emoluments in listing the number of persons who are in it. From Z.15 and upwards are persons in promotional positions, and they have all had some changes. It goes right through the Service, but it can safely be said that all senior persons in the Civil Service will get small increases.

I have had to make specific changes in some scales. The scale of Z2-1 embraces only a few persons. The largest number of persons in that scale are medical registrars at the hospital; I think there are 17 of them. The other people are Deputy Principal Nursing Officer, Senior Tutor at the Mental Hospital, various chief nursing officials, Chief Public Health Inspector and so on, but also including Headteacher Grade I. I can see no point in having a scale so near the top in which people have to work for a year before they can get the extra money, particularly the position of Headteacher. That has been regraded and put on a fixed scale. Once you are a Headteacher Grade I, you will get a particular salary and not have to be on the scale for some time. So that scale has been abolished.

There were one or two anomalies relating to legal officers. There are two different grades of Assistant Registrar, and the Chief Marshall of the Courts was on the junior of the grades. After careful analysis of the responsibilities of the three posts, and after consideration that the holder of the senior post will not be affected by what is, in effect, a downward lengthening of the scale, I have decided to put all those posts on the same scale as Crown Counsel. That will explain some of the notes that you see in the back of this Order, all Z6-1.

At this stage, I want to say something about a report which appeared in today's Advocate-News from the National Union of Public Workers. The report is perfectly accurate. These are not the regradings with which we are engaged in negotiation with the National Union of Public Workers. These are regradings as a result of negotiating with the Permanent Secretaries, coming to a conclusion with them, and reshaping the scales according to the conclusion that was reached with the Permanent Secretaries. But it is important to note that in many

cases, particularly in respect of the Legal Department, and probably also in respect of the senior posts in medical departments, the increases will meet the proposals of the legal staff and of the National Union of Public Workers. Legal officers, who are asking to go up into a higher grade, will not need to go into the higher grade and cause more distortion to get the salaries they wanted, because the grades that they are now in will have had salary revisions that meet their demands. This, in my judgment, is also true of particular posts which, for a long time, Members of the Cabinet and I believe the general public have thought underpaid that is, headteachers of secondary and comprehensive schools, whose salaries will now go — before April 1984 their salaries were \$30 864 — to \$42 000. I think that that is a substantial increase — their 15 per cent plus their regrading. I think that we can now consider that we are paying headteachers of secondary schools a sum of money more in keeping with their responsibility for carrying on the education of our children.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Are we going to get piece too.)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The senior tutors at the Community College have also been looked after. Some of us may feel it is more worthwhile to have a Member's pay and be a senior tutor than be an officer of Parliament or a Minister. But these are incidentals which we hope will satisfy many persons who are seeking salary improvements, and who feel that they have been left behind in the general regrading and reshaping of posts.

In respect of the other posts that we are still discussing with the National Union of Public Workers, I am quite prepared to say that we intend to look favourably at the proposals for regrading legal assistants. These are people who have been trained, I think at the Community College, who have become quasi-professionals, have some knowledge and yet have not really had their conditions of service improved or given any incentive to improve themselves.

We are also looking at the professional grades at the Ministry of Transport and Works and related departments. It seems to me that if we pay doctors in the Government Service something like 30 per cent of salary extra in lieu of private practice, and we pay data processors a responsibility allowance or a scarcity allowance, whatever it is, we should consider something that we have not acceded to in the past, giving some sort of allowance to professional engineers and surveyors who are making it possible for the Government's construction programme to be carried out. Already, there is a clear shortage of such professional officers in Government.

To explain the Order in a little further detail, the reason why, generally throughout the Order, it will be observed that we are substituting the word S.5 for the word S.6 is that the old grades of S.5 and S.6 have been amalgamated. So nearly everybody who was below S.6 is going to be regraded one point, because the number of grades above him or her have been reduced by one and, therefore, you had to change the designation. One or two may not have been changed, but, in any given case, it will be found that there are good reasons. Even between S.3 and S.4 there are particular reasons for making particular changes.

At the bottom of the scale, as I have already explained, I am abolishing the scale of Z2-1, and having a new fixed point of S.9, and that is the reason for seeing the S.9 in the new scale.

I have taken the opportunity of regrading one or two persons on whose behalf their departments have put forward requests. We found, for example, that the Chief Price Control Officer was much undergraded, and opportunity has been taken to regrade his position. We have introduced a post of Deputy Chief Electoral Officer. I do not think that that appears. It should appear, I do not see it. If it is not there now, it will be there in the fullness of time, because there is nobody in the post. In effect, it will be a new post, but a very important one, I think, in the light of the transfer to the Electoral Boundaries Commission. I do not see it just at the moment, but it should be there.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Page 4 at the bottom.)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Honourable Members know the Order better than I do, although they only got it when they came into the House of Assembly and I have been working with it over a year and a half.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: We can read better than you. That is all.)
1.15 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The Chief Labour Officer has not been downgraded, the Chief Labour Officer's salary has remained the same. He is in a different grade.

(Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Downwards).

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I was reading the wrong Order. I was reading from an amended Order. I do thank honourable Members. I will respond to an aside I heard from the benches on the other side that the post of Chief Labour Officer has been downgraded. It has been left where it is for good reasons. There have been second thoughts over the grading of that post for some time.

That post was upgraded to S.3 some time ago, but it is really not considered that the responsibilities of that post are equal to the responsibilities of other posts at that grade. The post is substantively filled by an Acting Permanent Secretary, and opportunity was therefore taken, since it has no substantive appointed holder in it, to leave the salary where it is. The substantive holder will receive a personal allowance to make up the difference between the emoluments in due course, but we are restoring it to its proper grade, as far as we are concerned.

If honourable Members care to look at the Schedule of Personal Emoluments, they will see that the other persons in that grade are the Chief Engineer, Waterworks; Hospital Director, the Manager of the Public Investment Unit, the Registrar of Titles, the Principal of the Community College and the Airport Manager. Except for the Airport Manager, all are professional posts, posts held by quite senior professional administrators of the Government, and it does not seem to us that the Chief Labour Officer has any greater responsibility than the Chief Town Planner, the Commissioner of Land Tax, the Postmaster General, the Chief Electoral Officer, the Chief Supply Officer, the Principal of the Polytechnic, the Principal of Erdiston or the Chief Magistrate. We think that that is the proper grade, and opportunity has now been taken to restore the position to what it appears it should be. There is indeed a position even in that grade that crept up a little bit high, but one never knows what will happen in the fullness of time.

There is very little that I can add, Mr. Speaker, to the words of the Addendum, to the words of the Order, and to what I have said in my speech. I will take careful note of anything that honourable Members raise about the gradings, and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. J. G. ODLE: I beg to second that.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, one could not allow the comments of the Prime Minister to go without a comment, lest it be misunderstood that failure to comment is an indication of acceptance of all that he has said.

I regret that I am unable to deal with these matters in any substance, for the reasons which have already been given by my colleague, reasons which indicate that we were not, and are not, in a position to examine these grades in any detail. Notwithstanding what the honourable Member for Christ Church East (Hon. Dr. R. L. Cheltenham) has said from his seat, an honourable Member who you will recall had called for an entire revamping of the entire Civil Service, who would understand therefore that the relativities between one post and another require some examination before one can comment on them specifically and sensibly, I am saying for the Record

that I am unable to refute anything the Prime Minister has said based on these particular regradings, because I am literally not able to establish for myself whether what he is saying is valid or invalid.

I treat what he has said with some reserve, and even though one may be speaking *ex post facto* at some time in the future, one will reserve one's comments for that time. We take note, however, that he has suggested, for example, that the position of the Chief Labour Officer does not

Mr. SPEAKER: Before you get into that aspect of it, when this matter was raised there was a statement made from that side that there was protest. I never heard any application made that the matter be postponed to a later date. I believe it is contradictory of the position on that side now to make a statement that you have not had time to go through this.

I do not want it to appear as if the Members on the Government side was allowed to proceed with a matter when the Opposition was asking for time to proceed. I would be grateful if you would frame your statement in such a way as to reflect that position. As far as I am concerned, if any application had been made, I would have intervened to see how best it could have been dealt with, so I would be grateful if you would just frame your comments so as not to reflect adversely on the Chair.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I would wish the Record to show that in no way do I intend to reflect adversely on the Chair. What I am saying is that these are matters, if one is to speak on them sensibly, one would wish to be able to examine them in some detail. They are written in the English Language, generally speaking, and one could go through to see that there are no typographical errors, and one could go through to see what grades have been touched, and so on. That is not the same as examining them substantively.

I wish to absolve Your Honour from any blame whatsoever for the process of this debate. My colleague has spoken for me already, and I need not repeat what he has said. We take the position which has been advanced to us by the other side that they have the numbers. Our position is very straightforward on this.

To get back to the substantive matter, on the question of the Chief Labour Officer, I find that I can speak clearly in opposition to the Prime Minister's view that the Chief Labour Officer's position is *pari passu* with a number of the persons who he called out. I think that one of the problems in this country with the Labour Department is that neither the unions nor the Government, nor indeed perhaps the public, has sufficient and high enough regard for the Labour Department, and consequently the Chief Labour Officer. Here is an officer

whose basic responsibility is to mediate between warring factions, sometimes in situations that can bring the entire country to a standstill, and I would think that the requisite amount of status for that position ought not to require any debate at this stage in our development.

I think that what we must do in the fixing of posts is to ignore the individual who might hold a particular post at a particular time and deal with the status of the post rather than the rank of the individual who holds the post. I think it is an error that is made in Barbados in public affairs regularly, and as a result, what we had is that when the post is held by a certain individual it was moved to S.3, and now that that situation has changed, it appears to be moved to S.4. He might say that it is not a downgrading, but if one building has eight storeys and another building rises next to it with ten storeys, you might say that the eight-storey building has not been down-graded, but it is not at the same level as the ten storey building, so you may use whatever phrase you like. It is clear that the relative importance of the Chief Labour Officer *vis-a-vis* the other people has been reduced by the exercise which we are engaged in.
1.25 p.m.

Far be it from me to begrudge any of the professional officers in the public service of the ability to earn a decent living, and I take note of the fact that the Prime Minister says he is still engaging in an exercise of regradings for the other categories in the service, but I find it difficult to accept that whereas the other participants in the public sector have been told that they must be satisfied with a 15 per cent increase, by a process of "regrading" those at the top are finding themselves in some cases with 37 per cent, and in one or two cases in excess of 40 per cent, and in one case maybe as high as 50 per cent increases.

There are many people in this society who will view this exercise as going beyond the mere economic exercise for purposes of salaries. As I said, I am not in a position at this stage to take that view. I am in a position, however, to say that it is unfortunate that a regrading exercise should be carried out in a piece-meal fashion such that the totality in the Public Service cannot, at the same time, feel comfortable with the results.

The answer may be advanced that the Union of the Permanent Secretaries, as I have heard the Prime Minister called them, form a different set of negotiating roots from the National Union of Public Workers. But, in the final analysis, the regrading exercise ought not to be primarily an adversarial reaction between the Government and the unions. It ought to form part of the global policy of a Government that from time to time there would be periodic review of the system, and the machinery within the system would allow for such things as regrading.

In times such as Mr. Puisinelli and other persons brought out when we had a colonial service to do regrading and other exercises, regradings were undertaken not at the instigation of a union, but on the basis of a periodic review of the system. I think that once the unions are involved, it might be presumptuous to take the initiative before the unions do. And we have had evidence out of the Prime Minister's mouth that the unions themselves have indicated a desire for regrading. I am not satisfied that if a regrading exercise is going on at the lower levels, those at the higher levels would have been any worse off if they were given the same 15 per cent and 5 per cent and were made to wait, as the others have been made to wait, for a completion of the regrading exercise, because the Public Service in Barbados is too small for there to be any great leverage between those at the top and those at the bottom.

I think the philosophy of the Prime Minister and his party was very clearly outlined when he said at the very beginning that there was a time when the Permanent Secretaries had a salary scale that was 9.4 times higher than the lowest salary scale and that it had been reduced to 5.8 times, and that he thought that the differential should be restored. I remember turning to my colleague and asking if that party ceased to be a Socialist Party, because, as a Member of Socialist International, I would have thought that the Barbados Labour Party Administration would subscribe to the view that they wish to narrow the gap between the "haves" and the "have nots". But it may very well be that the Permanent Secretaries in Barbados, given the current economic situation, themselves fall into the category of the "have nots," and it may be a leverage between the "have nots 1" and "have nots 2".

Be that as it may, I am disappointed that they were not able to bring a full reclassification which would have given us an opportunity to examine it in some detail, and to see whether the claims made by the honourable Member who introduced this are, in fact, valid. As I said, I am not in a position to do that, either from the point of view of intimate examination of the details before us or from the point of view of comparisons between the upper ranks of the Civil Service and the lower ranks, who have been promised a review. The Prime Minister, however, did indicate that he is able to say that he will look favourably at a reclassification of the para-legal staff, if I understood him correctly, and I take that to mean that the quasi-legal and the quasi medical staff can look forward to a 40 per cent increase when they get their regrading as well.

I am disappointed, as I said, but in the final analysis people who are affected by this piece of legislation will be happy. They will be happy, perhaps, for a short while. Many of them will have to pay their land tax nevertheless, and a substantial part of this will be returned to

the Government by way of income tax, and in the final analysis, they will have had their new regradings. They would have had their new increases inadvertently or otherwise, because the Prime Minister speaks as if the 40 per cent increase which will show up here and there is quite inadvertently — it was for the regrading exercise more than for any change in salary.

I hope that as a result of these regradings, the Service as a whole will be more efficient. I am glad that the Legal officers are going to be put in their proper grades and that there will be

Asides

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Attorney General is saying to me that he wants more for them. But the point that I want to make is that, based on the statements which have been made on the floor of this House from time to time, it does seem as if the Attorney General's Department has suffered a specific difficulty where the more competent an officer becomes in a particular post, the least likely is he to be remunerated according to his skills. It is one of those phenomena which will occur when you have specialized people functioning in specialized positions. I know Your Honour will take the point I am making, that the more a legal draughtsman engages in his job, the more proficient he is likely to become, and I think the decision, if it has been made, and I have to take the Prime Minister at his word, to increase the emoluments of persons that are in their respective positions would be a good decision, if that is, in fact, what has happened.

I think that it is proper that not only legal draughtsmen and other people in the Attorney General's Chambers, but others who perform certain specific tasks, who, by virtue of their work, are unable to get increases because they have fixed salaries, be treated in a particular way. We would have to wait until the jury comes in, as it were, before we realize whether these offerings meet the requirements of the individuals and the public. I regret that I am unable to deal with the matter in detail, but I thought I could not let the opportunity pass without uttering a few general thoughts on the matter.
1.35 p.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to associate myself with the protest of the honourable Member for St. Michael South, and I proceed to participate in this debate under the most strenuous protest.

A very important matter is before the Honourable House, because here we see the implementation of a philosophical approach of rewards in the public sector touted around by persons who attribute magic skills to managerial sectors, often people arriving at that position by the efflux of time rather than particular skills.

(A VOICE: Effluxion of time.)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I would accept the correction from a junior member of the family.

Those persons, by a strange process of thought, advocate a philosophy that persons in the higher managerial positions in the public sector have been inadequately remunerated, and, as a consequence of that, the public sector has suffered over the years. But at the same time it is the same persons who advocate that persons in the lower income groups should be the victims of policies such as wage restraints and layoffs. I find it difficult to accept that monetary rewards can lead to higher performance by persons in the higher income groups, but that such monetary rewards do not have the same impact on the productivity of those in the lower income groups.

I think it is very important that we address ourselves to this particular issue, because I am fully aware that throughout Barbados, particularly in the public sector, there is a paucity of adequate managerial skills, particularly in the middle management and upper management positions, and we have to be very careful that we are not rewarding posts rather than individuals with skills who can utilise their reward in order to generate higher levels of productivity in the Public Service. I am absolutely sure that the Honourable Prime Minister would be aware of the many problems, the many cost to the Government and the many instances on which all the blame that we have to pour on the Government from time to time stem from inefficiencies at higher levels within the Public Service, and sometimes very costly inefficiencies.

When we talk about closing of the gap between the lower paid groups and the higher paid groups in the Public Service, I do not have any problem with that. So long as the lower paid groups are adequately rewarded and the higher paid groups are adequately rewarded, if the gap or the ratio between the lowest paid and the highest paid is reduced over a time, I can see no problem once there is a proper level of satisfaction and a proper level of productivity within the Public Service. But I am concerned that, throughout the entire public sector, we are not getting the levels of productivity which we could achieve in this country. Indeed, I am committed to the philosophy that the time has come in this country when we have to look very carefully at the extent of transfers from the private sector in Barbados to the public sector to meet these kinds of outlays. Unless the public sector is performing, I doubt very much whether, with the present shortage of managerial skills in the public sector, that will take place at any time in the foreseeable future.

On the question of housing allowances, I receive many calls from time to time about person who receive housing allowances and persons who do not. I believe

that, in the long term, the answer is going to be to abolish housing allowances for everybody and incorporate them in their salaries.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order: Perhaps the honourable member is reflecting on a vote of the House, because over the last three years that is exactly what we have done. All of the allowances have been abolished. This is the end of the process coming up now. These regradings are the ultimate result of the abolition of all housing allowances.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you very much. This is the kind of problem that you have when you do not have papers before you and you are suddenly faced with a bunch of papers that you have to study. It is not a problem for me though, because I am speaking of a general principle, and if the principle has been put into practice, then fair enough.

The honourable Member will, however, appreciate that this is the kind of thing that will require days of study and probably consultation with people within the Public Service in order to clearly understand what they mean in relation to the various departments. He has pointed out that it has been hard work, that it has taken months or years to produce this, and we are supposed to debate a matter like this, which has significant financial and significant social consequences in the long term, without having a chance to examine the details. This is no reflection on you, Mr. Speaker. That has been clearly established in the debates so far.

On the question of remuneration of the judges, I am happy to learn that the judges would be no worse off, and I hope that is correct. It was my understanding that under the original proposals, the judges would not have enjoyed the same advantages as they had under the previous arrangements. I do not have the figures in front of me and I have a new set of figures here, therefore I cannot compare. All I am hoping is that this is an improvement on what was offered to the judges, because I really believe that the Judiciary deserves the highest levels of rewards which this country can afford.

I think it is about time that we face up to a particular aspect of the Public Service. We have established a series of para-statal bodies which are supposed to perform certain functions, but nevertheless, ultimately they refer back and seek to relate salaries and what not to what is going on in the Public Service. But in the Public Service, I have always advocated that there should be a professional stream, and that the salaries of those professionals cannot in any way relate to the chief administrative officers or even the Ministers within the particular Ministries.

1.45 p.m.

I believe, for example, that there is a major shortage of accountants within the Public Service, and it must be a big problem for the Ministries, in particular the Ministry of Finance, not to have Chartered Accountants within the Public Service of Barbados in any significant numbers. But you cannot attract them as long as you stick to this idea that a Permanent Secretary must have a higher salary than a Chartered Accountant. That is absolute nonsense. There must be, in due course, a professional stream in the Public Service, whose salaries would have to relate to the salaries earned in the marketplace. It is simple, as far as I am concerned. If you need the services, and Heaven knows that you need them then, you just have to attract them.

How can you run an Income Tax Department in Barbados in the context of 1984 and not have qualified accountants inside there at the level of Chartered Accountants? When they go to audit the books of a major company in Bridgetown and are confronted with qualified accountants, at what level can they perform in relation to those people who have not only had the advantage of studying the audit over the years, but also have the benefit of higher qualifications and more experience in the private sector activity? Let us face it. You need these people. How are you going to recruit an actuary — I am quite sure that there must be a need for actuarial services within the Public Service — people of that kind of calibre, if you maintain this system whereby you will find that a Permanent Secretary, by virtue of the fact that he occupies that post, feels that he must have the highest salary, or that a Minister feels that nobody within his Ministry should have a higher salary than him. It is quite wrong. We are dealing in 1984, we are not in 1934 or 1924. Government has preempted a sizeable chunk of the productive effort of this society, and we have to make sure that that money is utilized in the most effective manner.

If you were to take the remuneration of medical consultants, senior consultants — I think the posts of senior consultants are largely abolished — and other consultants in the medical sector of the Public Service, you are immediately going to find a most extraordinary anomaly — you are going to find that under the National Health Service Board, if it ever comes on stream, a general practitioner, one year or two years qualified, could probably earn \$100 000 a year, whereas, a consultant, fifty-seven years old, would probably be earning less than \$40 000 a year. I have not looked at the exact figure, because I really have not had a chance to go through these Schedules here, but I doubt very much whether the figure would exceed that.

You are going to have two persons within the same service, the same economy, with one getting a salary of \$100 000 a year, and probably trained and tutored by the person to whom you would be paying less than

\$40 000 a year. Immediately, you are going to get conflict. What is happening here is that in one instance one is recognizing that you are dealing with scarce professional skills and that you are prepared to go somewhere towards meeting the market price in the one area, and in the second area, you are hamstrung by the constraints of the Public Service in being unable to reward a professional working within a Ministry with the level of salary that is consistent with his qualifications.

I think it could be a bit awkward.

I held a post for many years — I am still young, you know — about ten years ago, as Senior Consultant Physician at a public institution here, head of department. Looking at these salary scales now, I will earn more as a Member of Parliament than I would earn if I had continued to be a member of the QEH staff as Senior Consultant Physician and Head of the Department of Medicine.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: That is not true.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It is true!

(Hon. L. R. TULL: That is a diabolical lie.)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I believe that Senior Consultant comes under the 'S' grades.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You can still practice privately here. I am talking about your remuneration from the public purse.

(Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Senior Consultant is S6.)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: S6, as I see it here, is \$37 500.

(Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: They are asking for \$54 000.)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You may have to pay them over \$100 000, because I think you are going to have to negotiate with them on a different basis. Watch it. You are going to have to pay them about \$120 000 eventually. I tell you that. Although, if you agree to that — I cannot talk too hard — you should insist on fulltime service.

Mr. SPEAKER: If.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Let us continue, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the honourable Member wants to carry on a private debate, I believe he should do it outside of the Chamber.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No, Sir. I am speaking to you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: No. You are not. You are pointing across the Chamber.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I was pointing over there, but speaking over here.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would you please carry on.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The point I am making is that the salary of Senior Consultant or Consultant is some \$42 000, and I believe that would be totally taxable, whereas, as a Member of Parliament, it would be \$37 788.

(Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: \$23 000.)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: A substantial proportion is not taxable. In fact, you would be better off.

So therefore you have a situation here where the hospital is crying out for a corps of fulltime consultants whom you would have to pay some \$120 000 to \$130 000 each, if you are going to pay the general practitioners \$100 000. I would not be prepared, if I were a fulltime consultant, to provide consulting services to general practitioners who are earning more than me on a salary base. It would not make any sense.

We are now taxing people more and more for a Health Service. It means that we have to be able to deliver better quality health services to the people of the country, and you will never be able to upgrade the specialist, secondary and tertiary services within the Queen Elizabeth Hospital unless you have a fulltime corps of consultants to complement the university personnel within that institution. That means you have to pay people twice or probably three times as much as you would pay a Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Health.

I am not trying in any way to reflect on the administrative stream in the Public Service. All I am saying is that there are people who are needed in the Public Service who have scarce skills, and whose skills can be made available to the Public Service so that the many ventures that have been embarked on can work efficiently. You may find, for example, if you have proper accounting services from the day you start a project until the end and proper on-site evaluation of what is going on, not only would there be a lot less corruption, but the overruns that we have to pay for year after year would be eradicated, or at least reduced substantially.

1.55 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member must not do that. I am going to ask the honourable Member to take his seat if he persists with this sort of behaviour in the House.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: What kind of behaviour?

Mr. SPEAKER: We are debating an Establishment Order. I am not going to hear the honourable Member running off into other avenues. It is about time the honourable Member learns how to control himself.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I am talking of the savings that could be brought to Government if there was an adequate level of remuneration for a professional strain within the Public Service. I am debating the matter as a matter of principle, and I will be pointing out the areas where savings and efficiency can be achieved.

I do not know if it is true, I do not know if they are in the documents in front of me, but I saw a report in the Press to the effect that the Commissioner of Police will be receiving the same salary as the Chief of the Defence Force. If that were so, I think it may cause some problem in the Police Force. I believe that the Commissioner of Police has a greater and more continuing responsibility than the Chief of Defence, and my feeling is that the Commissioner of Police should enjoy a salary that is somewhat higher than that of the Head of the Defence Force. I move around the country a lot, and from those reports it seems to me to be the general feeling within the community at large — I will not go any further than that — that the Commissioner of Police should probably enjoy a higher level of remuneration.

You have to be very careful not to create any niggling problems between the Royal Barbados Police Force and the Defence Force. I am not saying that the Chief of the Defence Force does not deserve his salary. As a matter of fact, I have been strongly advised by two friends from other Third World countries that you must do nothing whatsoever to alienate the Chief of the Defence Force, because in times of stress you might need his services in order to mitigate any punishments that may be ordered to be inflicted against you. I have had two friends who have been beneficiaries of the good relationships they have had with the Chiefs of Defence in their own countries.

I think that ultimately we are going to have to address ourselves to another fundamental problem. Does it make sense pushing salaries up and up, particularly in the upper levels, when we know very well that a substantial proportion of those salaries will be pre-empted by the various forms of taxation? It would seem to me that a

wiser approach may be to seek some kind of arrangement with the unions in Barbados, and that the main thrust of Government should not be to be increasing salaries again and again with more and more taxes, but rather to be looking very much at the level of transfers out of the salaries received by individuals, and see whether, if they are not reduced and cannot be kept at a lower level, there will not be less and less demand for a continuing increase of salaries at the top.

It would be my judgement, and it is a point made by my colleague, the honourable Member for St. Michael West, that with the recent impositions a very substantial portion of these increases will be transferred out of the hands of the individuals before they receive them, and a further substantial proportion would be transferred from them the moment they have spent them. I believe that our main thrust in the future should probably be looking to see what is the real net amount of money that goes into the hands of an individual, what kind of savings he can generate from the wages which he has received, and to look very carefully at the tax structure and the transfers from the individual and see if we cannot halt this ever-growing, vicious circle of more and more taxes, more and more demands for higher salaries, and people getting worse and worse off every day. That is the kind of situation that you have, and you have to try and break that cycle at some point in time.

I share the regret of the honourable Member for St. Michael South, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and the honourable Member for St. Michael West, that we on this side have not been able during our contributions to deal with other matters which I am sure must lie within the scope of the debate, and lie buried in these figures which have been placed before us. I believe that the several services in Barbados would be affected either positively or negatively by these salary changes, but we are in no position to advise the Government in any meaningful way of those particular areas which might be hard hit.

I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It is regrettable that the Standing Orders of this House prevent one from complimenting the Chair, even on his attire. The Standing Orders are so strict.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I have noted the remarks made by honourable Members. The answer to the general point that the Order is very intricate and would take a long time to deal with, is that in the past eight years we have had Orders even more intricate than this, and in one or two cases honourable Members have had a long time to deal with them and they have not dealt with them. So I do not know that giving you a long time is going to make you talk any better. I do not think that I have heard the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central talk with any

greater depth on this subject on any occasion, whether he had longer notice of it or not.

The honourable Member's speech contained one or two things that I think are very sound. The Civil Service, I hope, will take note that the same points are made by both Government and Opposition, that it is not a monopoly of the Prime Minister writing on the files of Government to comment on the lack of productivity, or the system of promotion because it is somebody's turn, and that the Opposition are also prepared to get up on their feet and criticise the Civil Service in those terms. We did it when we were in Opposition and certainly we do it now that we are Ministers, although it might not be appropriate to do it on the floor of the House.

I do think there is a lot in what the honourable Member says, which is that Permanent Secretaries feel that they must get the biggest salaries in their department, but there are professional people who deserve more. I do not want to go into names of individuals, but there is at least one person paid from Government funds who gets a substantially higher salary than I do, higher I believe than the Governor-General. There is at least one that I can think of who as a result of these regradings will get the same as I do, and there are a number of others who get paid more than Ministers do, and none of these persons are Permanent Secretaries. They draw these salaries as a result of doing two jobs.

2.05 p.m.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The Civil Service rule is that if you are appointed in two positions, you get the salary of one and half of another.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Look at the Ministries I hold? I wish they would pay me for holding the Ministry of Immigration as well as the Ministry of Finance. I wish they would give me half the salary of the Minister of Immigration. I believe I am even acting as the Minister of Education at the moment. Am I not doing two jobs?

They get these salaries also as a result of personal allowances. There are a few of those, I cannot tell you how many, and they are paid only in very, very, specialized circumstances. They also get job allowances, and this applies virtually exclusively to professional people.

The doctors get an allowance in lieu of private practice. The data processing operators get a scarcity allowance or whatever you call it, and so on. The engineers, I believe, are allowed private practice and do not get anything in lieu. It has always been thought that if you

give the engineers a fee in lieu of private practice, they would still carry on their private practice, and I can think of at least one engineer who, having been put in a position where he would not have the same opportunities to carry on private practice, indicated to me that he was not able to build as many houses at the time as in the past, but by no means did he make me believe that he was not building a house or two professionally at weekends. But that is a different matter. Maybe the engineers will get an allowance.

Obviously when the National Health Service comes in, a large number of doctors will get salaries much higher than any we are talking about, and we will have to face the problem of the consultants at that time, exactly as the honourable Member has said. Indeed, that is one of the principal problems that I regard as the problems of the new phase. What will happen to the consultants is probably the first problem of the post-introduction period.

I do not pretend to abolish all the anomalies. I think that we are still going to meet some. The honourable Member for St. Michael West *sotto voce* drew attention to the position of the Chief Labour Officer. That is not the only anomaly at that level.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central drew attention to the position of the Commissioner of Police. I think the honourable Member is too solicitous of the Commissioner of Police's rewards. The honourable Member says that the Chief of Staff and the Commissioner of Police are graded at the same level, but the Commissioner of Police draws emoluments as Director of the Regional Police Training Institute, and, I am told, as a result of a meeting which I did not attend and which an earlier decision that had never quite been reached was confirmed, will draw emoluments in connection with the police part in the Regional Defence Scheme.

The Chief of Staff does not draw a Brigadier salary, because he is substantively only a Colonel. A Brigadier does not exist in our establishment. One would be, in fact, above the Commissioner of Police, but we have no such post. The post is a local rank and does not carry salary, if that is what was in the honourable Member's mind. He does not, because he is a Brigadier, get a S.1 salary compared with the Commissioner of Police, who is notionally a Colonel getting the S.2. That is not so. They both get S.2, but the Brigadier draws a salary from the Regional Defence Organization.

These are not by any means the only additional emoluments that officers get. The range of emoluments is wider than the Civil Establishment Order reveals. There is nothing surreptitious about it — it is all done properly via Cabinet decision after recommendations. And the fact is

that people do get emoluments beyond these which take their salaries beyond Permanent Secretaries and, in some cases beyond Ministers and beyond the Prime Minister.

I think that I have dealt with every point that honourable Members have made, Mr. Speaker, and I commend this Resolution to the House as a useful exercise in regrading and restructuring.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 3 o'clock this afternoon for lunch.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that.

The question that the sitting be suspended until 3 o'clock for lunch was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

2.15 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I have a late Notice Paper, and at this point I seek Your Honour's indulgence to give notice of three Resolutions.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member may proceed.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to vary the Schedule to the Governor-General (Conditions of Service) Act, Cap. 6, by increasing the annual salary payable to the Governor-General, with effect from 1st April, 1985.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$165 196 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1984-85, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1984-85, No. 21, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$131 268 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1984-85, Part II — Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1984-85, No. 22, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

I hope that we can do these three items in all their stages today, in the light that we would not be coming back until January if we can clear the Order Paper. I am quite sure that the Clerk will have the appropriate documents circulated for honourable Members on both sides to examine. I hope this would not be under any protest.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I really rise for the purposes of the Record to say that I really cannot respond to that statement. I am only going on what the Honourable Leader of the House has said.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: These can be held over. I simply said I would like to clear the Order Paper, but there is no problem. We can have a 1984 Christmas lunch or a 1985 Christmas lunch, but I do not think you will see a 1986 Christmas lunch in here.

Mr. SPEAKER: Can you tell me what we have next?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Order No. 5.

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

Order No. 5 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1984.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the Teachers Order is very similar to the Order which was passed before lunch.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

Order No. 3 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Senate and House of Assembly (Remuneration and Allowances of Members) Order, 1984.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): Mr. Speaker, this Resolution relates to the non-ministerial members of the two Houses of Parliament. Starting at the bottom, it is proposed that ordinary Members be put at the bottom point of the Administrative Officer I scale which has succeeded the old Assistant Secretary scale.

The Leader of the Opposition and the Speaker be regraded. The regrading in the case of the Leader of the Opposition is very substantial, but some years ago I did indicate to him that it is the Government's policy to put the Leader of the Opposition and the Speaker on the same grade. He had no objection. His comment was that MPs were getting enough, but Ministers should get a little more than Permanent Secretaries. This is some years ago, and I indicated to him then that in the fullness of time the Government hoped that the Speaker and the Leader of the Opposition would receive the same salaries as Ministers, but I would not feel it possible to recommend that to the House unless the post of Leader of the Opposition and the Speaker were full time posts. That, no doubt, can come at a later point. We regard the present relationship as being a proper one. I have forgotten exactly what it is. It is not eleven-twelfths, but it is a particular proportion. So the Leader of the Opposition is regraded. I believe that his increase is about \$1 500 a month.

The Chairman of Committees traditionally gets a higher salary than the Deputy Speaker because of the greater amount of attendance and the time he spends in the Chair, and the Deputy Speaker's salary is put at the top end of an Administrative Officer 1. So Members are at the bottom of the scale, the Deputy Speaker is ten points higher up at the top of the scale, and a relationship which has existed for as long as I have been in the House, and I believe before, between the salaries of the Deputy Speaker and the Leader of the Opposition have been preserved.

The Leader of the Opposition is given the same entertainment allowance as the Speaker of \$900 a month, and the Deputy Speaker gets a slightly larger entertainment allowance than the Chairman of Committees and ordinary Members. There is no proposal to change the travelling allowances which now appear as duty allowances and there is no increase proposed in those.

It is proposed that the President of the Senate is on the same grade as the Deputy Speaker, that is proposed, and there is a very modest increase for Senators from \$500 to \$600. It is really a very modest increase indeed, but I do not believe anybody goes into the Senate with the expectation of a salary. In fact, they do not get a salary. What they are paid is only basically an expense allowance. It is much less, for example, than Board Chairmen get. Honourable Members will perhaps have their own opinions on it. It seems to me that although a Senator does not have administrative responsibility such as a Board Chairman has, he has responsibility for attendance at the Senate more often than most Boards meet. These basically, may be regarded as proposals. I will listen to the arguments that honourable Members have about regratings that have been proposed

and the specific amount, although I must say that no matter what the honourable Members for St. Michael South and St. Michael West may propose, I do not propose to amend this to make what we think the Leader of the Opposition should get any less.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Speaker, I think this is an appropriate time to intervene in this particular debate. Earlier today I indicated the background against which we would be participating in this debate, and we are at a disadvantage because of the inadequacy of time to study these documents in detail. What I may say now, I say it against the background of malice towards none and hope, love and charity to all at this time of the year.

3.15 p.m.

This whole question of the remuneration of Members of Parliament has been fraught with dissention and controversy.....

(Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Hypocrisy.)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am hearing "hypocrisy" from over the other side. They would know about that. So I can add "hypocrisy" on their part, and as I proceed, maybe the hypocritical position may come out. It may emerge.

(Aside: Will! Will!)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: When we trace the historical background to this matter, I believe we would see that Members over the years have been less than charitable to one another, and less than charitable to the very important role that Parliament, as an institution, has to play in this country. That is reflected in the kinds of comments, observations and recriminations that have been made on each occasion that this matter of the remuneration for Members has come up.

I believe it must have been — speaking from memory — in 1946 that the House of Assembly passed a Loyal Address to the Governor asking that salaries be paid to Members of Parliament. Up to that particular time, Members were unpaid. In 1947, a Resolution did come before the House of Assembly to provide payment for the services which Members of Parliament provided in the public affairs of the country. It was a very bitter debate. Eventually, it was passed by the House of Assembly. But it was rejected, in an equally bitter debate, by the Legislative Council, as the Second Chamber was called at that time.

The matter emerged again in the following year, in 1949, and on that occasion there was also a bitter debate. But it was approved and therefore salaries were paid, for the first time, from around that particular time. There was some revision of the salaries again, I believe, in 1950, consequent upon the change in the constitutional position of this country at that time, and with the introduction of adult suffrage and the ministerial form of Government.

To the best of my recollection, salary increases then occurred in 1956, and there was recrimination and a bitter debate on that occasion. A ten year period elapsed between 1956 and 1966 before there was another revision of salaries for Members — a very bitter debate. I do not think I will read into the Record some of the things that were said in 1966 on this particular occasion, but some of these comments would be very revealing at this particular time.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You are batting like Kim Hughes, very feeble.)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: He makes a tonne though. He scores runs!

Laughter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Can we get on with this debate and leave out the cricket for the time being?

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am going to drop you.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: In 1968, another matter relating to Members came up, that was in the area of pensions for Members, and another very bitter debate ensued. For purposes of the Record, I think I can refer to some of the comments that were made, because sometimes you get some statements which are made and later on, you have to ask yourself, "Did I really say that? I am really ashamed of myself that I could have made such a statement! "

In relation to this whole question of salaries and pensions, the present Prime Minister committed himself to some words which I am certain on reflection he will now say, "Those words were said when in my fallow days when I was green in judgment." When these matters came up he said, on that occasion:

"I agree....."

Mr. SPEAKER: If the honourable Member is going to quote, I would be happy if he would inform this Honourable House from what he is quoting, with the appropriate references, so that if anybody wants to check it, they would know where to look.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Yes, Sir. I am quoting from the House of Assembly Debates, page 1485, and the Member for St. Thomas is speaking. He said that he agreed with the Pension Scheme Report by the Select Committee, but pensions should not apply to non-elected Ministers.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You have gone through the eddoes.)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I went through the eddoes at that time ! There was to be nothing for me at that time!

(Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Source?)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: That is a common adage that a normal primary school child knows.

(Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: I want the source.)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I will continue, Sir. He said he agreed with the Pension Scheme Report by the Select Committee but pensions should not apply to non-elected Ministers because:

"I do not subscribe to the idea....."

Listen to the phrase:

"....of further gilding the golden boys who are afraid to face the polls....."

(Hon. L. R. TULL: The Senators.)

Asides

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, can we have a debate and less cross talk.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD:

"who run away from the hustings and who will be chosen purely on favouritism,"

3.25 p.m.

This is what was said then of the Senators and the Ministers who were in the Senate. The Attorney General says he approves. He was in there at one stage; maybe he agrees that way now. I am just pointing out the kind of comments that have been made from time to time to show that, as it were, when we are on one side we may take one position and then when we get on the other side there may be some other position taken.

Mr. Speaker, that was 1966 and 1968. The next salaries revision for honourable Members was in 1973. I know one of my colleagues will address himself to this

particular matter, he has been researching the statements of the Barbados Labour Party on this matter, so I am not really going into what was said during that particular debate. But again it was a very bitter debate in which the then Opposition voted against the measure.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I rise on a point of order: The Member for St. Michael South said that the Opposition voted against it. That is not true. It was some of the Members of the Opposition, not all. I was in the Opposition then and my stand remains the same, just like yours. I want the money and I want to know when it is going to be paid.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. That may go down as a point of clarification or explanation.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: That is a point of obfuscation, Mr. Speaker, that cannot be a point of clarification. It is also a point of foolishness.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member cannot tell me how to rule, and I object to him introducing a point of foolishness in this debate. There is no such point.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I did not introduce it, Sir, it was the honourable Member for St. James North who introduced it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Michael South said it was a point of foolishness. There is no such Order in the Standing Orders of this House. Will the honourable Member continue his debate, please?

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, I was not introducing that into the debate, but now the honourable Member gets up and says he knows there was a difference on the Opposition benches on that occasion.

Asides

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure the Hansard Reporters are having problems recording this debate, with the numerous asides and all the cross talk that is going on. If you can conduct the debate in an orderly manner, it will be well recorded for posterity and for future quotations.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Yes, Sir.

That was a bitter debate and there was division. According to the Member for St. James North, there was division not only between Government and Opposition, but among the Opposition itself. The Leader of the Opposition stuck to his guns and he resisted pressure, as he said, from all sides. In 1973 he spoke about certain pressures and in 1976 he spoke about other kinds of pressures.

What I am really recounting here, is that on all of those occasions that we have debated this matter we have had differences and we have had recriminations, and in many instances the debate has been very bitter. Now today we are again looking at this question of salaries for Members of Parliament, and I have consistently gone on Record as indicating that it is not seemly that when we come to discuss the remuneration of Members of Parliament, there should appear to be an unholy squabble over these matters and an undignified scramble in which one side is trying to indicate that the proposals are reasonable and the other side is trying to indicate that there is an indecent raid upon the Treasury.

Somehow or other the methodology for arriving at the salaries which should be paid, the allowances and other perquisites of office, has tended to elude us, because we do not exercise enough thought about these matters. It is my view, and I have said it on occasions before and I repeat it now, that this House of Assembly should devise a mechanism whereby the salaries and allowances should be reviewed from time to time by a competent body established by the House itself, with the full knowledge of the House, if not concurrence, and set up by the House for the purpose of looking at the remuneration and allowances of Members.

I put forward that proposal again, and I wish to call for the establishment of a Members Remuneration and Allowances Review Tribunal which will sit to review the salaries and allowances paid to Members of Parliament, taking into account all of those considerations, including the increased cost of living, movements in the retail price index, the salaries that may be paid in other parts of the public sector and in the private sector, and whatever considerations should be brought to bear in determining what the allowances of Members of the House of Assembly should be. I believe we need such a body.

The body should be the competent body to study and to make recommendations in its report to this Honourable Chamber as to what the correspondences should be between the various positions held by Members inside the House of Assembly and those held by other persons in the Public Service. I do not believe that this is a matter which the political executive in this country should decide on its own without consultation with the Members of Parliament.

3.35 p.m.

Our system is one of parliamentary democracy. It is based on the Legislature, the Executive and the judiciary. If I restrict my comments to the relationships between the Executive and the Legislature, it is because the doctrine of separation of powers permits the judiciary a large measure of independence. But we do not have the same kind of independence and separation between the Executive and the Legislature.

The Legislature, the Parliament of this country, has a particular role and function to perform, because this is the body, whether we are on the Government side or on the Opposition side, that is made up of members from the various constituencies whose task is to approve the laws, to scrutinize the work of the Cabinet, the Executive, and also to look after the grievances of the people of this country in the several constituencies. When we come in here, we are not in here as the executives as such. We are in here as Members of Parliament, and it is entirely wrong that when it comes to matters of remuneration of Members of this Assembly, the decision should be taken by the political executive and that the legislature as a whole, the House of Assembly, is merely rubber-stamping the decisions taken elsewhere. That is as I see it, because what has happened over the years is that the position of Parliament has been eroded and that of the Executive has increased — and continues to increase.

Something is wrong with the procedure that we are adopting here, because we have a case in which the Members of Parliament are not and have not been privy to these particular proposals. I cannot speak for certain office holders; maybe they were consulted — I do not know. Maybe they were not. I have a reason to believe that they were not. At least when we were talking about the salary increases for the public servants, there were discussions held between the unions representing the workers and the bargaining body on behalf of the Government, so the representatives of the unions, and by that we must include the workers themselves, are deemed to have been privy to the negotiations that took place.

The National Union of Public Workers, the Barbados Workers' Union, the Teachers Unions and all of them had some kind of discussions. It is true that these discussions were truncated and then the salaries were legislated, but on the principle of collective bargaining, at least some concession was made towards the principle of collective bargaining and the representatives of the workers and the representatives of the Government sat down and talked for some period of time on these matters. But when it comes to the Members of Parliament, there is a different situation altogether. When it comes to Members of Parliament, there is no consultation in this particular matter, and something also has to be wrong with that particular principle.

The remuneration of the salaries of Members is a matter in which each Member has a peculiar position, so in these matters we do not apply any whip. Each Member speaks as he or she may be moved. The whip is off so each one of us out here who wishes to speak in this particular debate is free to speak as he may desire.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. What is this! The honourable Member continue with your debate. Order, please.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am glad you are calling for order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must remind Members of Standing Order 33, which says that a Member speaking should be heard in silence. The honourable Member for St. Michael South may now continue.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Thank you very much, Sir.

I want to make my position clear on this. I am not going to deal with the specific proposals that have been placed before us here today, but with the principle, that I believe that these particular matters should be dealt with in a most appropriate way with as much time as possible given for consideration.
3.45 p.m.

That leaves the whole question of the methodology and the approach, and on those particular grounds I have to object to the method by which these particular proposals have reached us for debate and discussion. I am calling for the establishment of a Members' Remuneration and Allowances Tribunal. I believe that some such body set up with the approval of the House would be the start for a proper analysis of these matters, and secondly, I will say that these matters must be done in the open. I think that in the spirit of what used to be called open Government, if we look at these matters in this particular regard, we will be on the way towards getting a proper mechanism for the discussion of salaries in this country.

However, I make no bones about my position on salaries. I believe that members of the Legislature as public servants should be paid a reasonable and decent salary and allowances, because they perform a most important function and role in this society. I believe that the proper relationships and correspondence should be established between offices in the Public Service in relation to the position of Members of Parliament, but I do not believe that that is a matter that should be settled by the fiat and dictate of the Executive. I believe it is a matter that should be discussed and settled after appropriate time for consideration by the Members of the House itself. Because these particular approaches have been breached, I find myself unable to support these measures as they stand.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Speaker, the principle underlying this particular matter before the House is one that can truly be couched in terms of integrity and morality in Government. In support of that argument, I would like to quote no better authority than the fine Italian hand of the author of the Barbados Labour Party Manifesto for the general elections of 1976, which is already a document of the House, and I refer to page 2 of that document headed under the bold

title "Integrity and Morality in Government". As a solemn pledge to this nation, the Barbados Labour Party, which has written one of the most sordid chapters in the political history of Barbados in respect of breaking promises for money-grabbing by its members, made this promise to the people of Barbados:

"As a matter of principle no salary increases will be voted by Members of the House of Assembly except after an independent review by a properly qualified outside body."

I started off by saying that it was a matter of integrity and morality. It was one of the few items that I publicly stated that I agreed with in the Barbados Labour Party Manifesto of 1976, having said so in 1976. After that, what did we get? The Government came in, appointed the Nicholls Commission, and on the floor of the House the same author of that particular paragraph completely ignored the recommendation of the Commission set up by the Government at that time, and proceeded to give themselves what I considered at the time very unusual increases.

I must vote against this Resolution on that ground in the first instance. They sold to the public a basic principle, a matter of morality and integrity in Government that they would never increase their salaries without a review by an outside independent body, and look what they are doing now!

I have some very strong views about the whole principle of remuneration of parliamentarians, but the principles are very simple. Firstly, I do not think that parliamentarians or Ministers derive their authority from the quantum of money that is paid, and it is a mistake to think that you have to maintain parity in salary with people with whom you have a constitutional and a lawful relationship in order to exercise your authority. It is a wrong concept.

Asides

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: If you want me to elaborate, I will elaborate. It is always said that a Minister cannot command respect of those whom he has to give instructions to unless he earns a higher salary. I say this is nonsense, because a Minister is there by constitutional and legislative instrument, and his role in Government is set out, whether he is paid a cent or not, so it is nothing to do with levels of remuneration. That is the first thing.

The second thing I want to say is that parliamentarians enjoy pension rights, to which they make a minimal contribution, far more substantial and on far better terms than any member of the Public Service, and it is wrong to compare the remuneration every time....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order: It was that Government of which the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) and the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) were members of the Cabinet, which was in power when the pension rights came in here, and Joy Edwards decided that that sort of thing was not happening in here.

Mr. SPEAKER: That was a point of explanation. Will the honourable Member now take his seat?
3.55 p.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am very.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Why do you curse Mr. Barrow like that?

Mr. SPEAKER: There are two Members on their feet.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Why do you curse Mr. Errol Barrow like that? You are an ungrateful man.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just a minute please. For the benefit of the.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Not the Leader of the Opposition, Sir. I do not mean that one.

Mr. SPEAKER: That now clarifies it. Would the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central please continue.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES and Mr. B. M. TAITT rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are two honourable Members on their feet.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member in his intervention indicated that the honourable Member for St. Michael West was a Member of the Cabinet at that time. I am the honourable Member for St. Michael West, and I was not a Member of the Cabinet before 1971.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a point of explanation.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am sorry about that, Sir. I apologise to you. But you have never opposed it since then either.

(Aside: He was not a member of the Party then.)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: That is true.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: For the first time, Sir, I am extremely glad for the intervention on a point of elucidation by the honourable Member for St. James North because it was for that particular reason, the generosity in relation to the pension rights of parliamentarians, of Ministers of Government and of Prime Ministers, that the former Prime Minister felt that there should be a significant moderation in salaries, because over time, that would have evened it up. I am very glad that he has made that point.

In the Third World, we have seen people getting involved in Government with no commitment other than raiding the public purse by one method or another. We have seen legions of political mercenaries emerge in small territories throughout the world, and it is my firm belief that, unless there is some moderation in monetary gains from political office in this country, ultimately, you are going to end up with a breed of politician who would do anything to remain in office, and would abandon every single political principle that forms the foundation of the Westminster model of democracy which we try to follow in this country as far as possible.

I have stated in the past that it is quite wrong to seek to compare what people can earn in private practice or outside of Government with what they can earn in Government. It is a very wrong principle at the level of the political directorate. I can see no logical basis in the reason for that. I have always supported the generous pension arrangements for Parliamentarians because they constitute an inducement to come into office and to get out of office — the fact that you can get your pension at a relatively young age and the fact that you can get a reasonable pension after only serving for a relatively short period — but I have never supported the principle of high salaries for politicians.

(Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Inducement.)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The inducement should work the other way around. The inducement to get out of office.

I have heard the honourable Member for St. James North say again and again in this House that he wants the best for himself and he sees no reason why he cannot have a Mercedes Benz. That is a reasonable statement, but if you want to live that kind of way, then you should not try to live that way out of public office. That is the point.

(Hon. L. R. TULL: You rip off your patients.)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The honourable Member for St. Michael Central (Mr. A. Truss) is a multimillionaire by repute. I do not know. But I am quite sure that he would not expect, now that he holds ministerial office,

to earn \$400 000 a month or whatever his normal remuneration is.

They say that my case is weakened. They walk around and say that I am a millionaire, and therefore when I speak.....

(Hon. L. R. TULL: You said so in here. You are a bragger, but he is a modest man.)

Aside

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I know you are a millionaire. If that is not so, after the proper evaluation, I am sure that the honourable Member for Christ Church East (Hon. Dr. R. L. Cheltenham) would be made an instant millionaire by the recent property valuations, although I gather that Sunset Crest was not as hard hit as the other areas. But do not take those evaluations too seriously and go and borrow money on the basis of those. You would be in a lot of trouble.

Enough is enough. I think that the Barbados Labour Party Government has been paid enough from the public purse already, and that there is no need to increase your salaries at this juncture.

I have a constituency that is clearly representative of Barbados. How can I come in here and vote for this kind of money for myself when I know that there are hundreds of people in Hall's Road and Delamere Land without a job and without a meal? How can I do that when I know that there are people in Highgate and people in the so-called 'white Pine' in Barbados who are having difficulty in meeting their mortgage payments because of redundancy in their jobs? It would be unconscionable.

This is not a case of whether I get political support on this matter, because I think that over time it would be borne out. I think we are going down the wrong line and we are acting on the wrong principles. Let us tell ourselves that there is a level of remuneration that is reasonable, because you know perfectly well that the salaries that are in here and the travelling allowances and what not only represent part of the total package to your ultimate remuneration. Some of you make a lot more money out of travelling and so on than you make out of your salaries and what not.

(Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I did not know there was money in there. You know more than me.)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I know that as a fact. Do not tell me. I know.

It is utterly disgraceful that some of us who represent, in some ways, the product of the poor in the

community, who have striven for years to try to put some morality and dignity into the manner in which we conduct ourselves privately and publicly, should find ourselves prosecuting ourselves before the public and demanding unreasonable remuneration because we have the power to do so.

Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. HAYNES) were ordered expunged from the Record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: There are some Third World countries, of which I am thoroughly ashamed of the way they conduct their affairs. They allow mercenary principles, banditry, to guide them in the way they raid the Treasuries of those countries. I will do everything to make sure that this does not happen in Barbados. I shall stand up and fight it. I shall fight it because I believe that it is wrong in principle, and I think that, ultimately, you are going to discover that even among your own ranks you may be creating a breed of people with no commitment to party or country, whose loyalty you cannot guarantee, and they might ultimately liquidate the few in the party that are committed to principles of good public management. It is a dangerous road along which we are treading.
4.05 p.m.

We have a situation in some countries where people get a travelling allowance and then turn around and drive Government cars. Would you believe that? People get a travelling allowance and every day you see them in Government cars — MP this or AP this and this kind of thing — and they collect free gas. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you will realise, from the very moral position I have always taken in public life, why I am justifiably angry when I see these things.

Tell me why a Minister of Government who does not have a constituency is entitled to a travelling allowance? To travel where? How is he entitled to a constituency allowance? How can a Minister of Government who has a constituency to look after and gets a travelling allowance, get the same travelling as another Minister who has no constituency? Do you see what begins to happen, Sir? You are going to find — you can get up and say what you like about what I said — those of you who have been elected in this Parliament, who have faced the polls, that this money reinforces prime ministerial authority in this country, and even erodes Cabinet authority. You are going to find that the Prime Minister will be able to use the inducements of this money in order to get who he wants to join that Cabinet, and this is going to be a major attraction. Remember what I said. The elected members of the Cabinet will find that they have no say, as has happened again and again. I speak with knowledge.

Take the Member for St. James North, who has been in Parliament for many years, who always alleges that I say things about his health. I never say anything about his health. If I were to say anything, I might say that he appears to me to be a burnt-out case, of non-acquiring, hereditary idiocy. I would not go beyond that. He is relatively impotent in the power making process of Barbados, and has been a member of this Parliament for many years. There are people who wield power within the Cabinet that he does not wield.

You thought you were number two or number three, but let me tell you that number two is now there. You are now number three. You watch the honourable Member for St. Michael Central. He will soon be number two. He is batting at number three at the moment and he will soon bat at number two. As a matter of fact, in the real decision making process he is number two.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: That demonstrates that we have all-rounders out here).

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is why the honourable Member for St. James North is finding himself in a position now where, in order to honourably get early access to his gratuity and pension, he wants to run in St. Michael South and be defeated.

These are my worries about these increases in salary. I do not think they are justified. It strikes a raw nerve, as far as I am concerned, in the context of Barbados of today, that with so much misery and deprivation in the community we should find ourselves even discussing increasing our salaries at this time. Not one of us in here misses a meal for lack of money, but many in every constituency in Barbados miss a meal from day to day. You go into the shops on a Sunday and you see mothers buying a quarter tin or a half tin of pilchards to feed a family of ten, and you are asking me to come in here and increase my salary? I cannot do it. Mr. Speaker, not only can I not do it, but I feel so strongly about it I cannot even continue any further.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM (Christ Church East): Mr. Speaker, the contribution of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) when viewed alongside the contribution made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) demonstrates a significant feature of the Democratic Labour Party, the division of opinion within their ranks at all levels, including their parliamentary ranks. The truth is that they have failed to get their act together, since they lost the 1976 election and long before, in a coherent and unified way, and what we are seeing today is the party once again speaking with dividing and different voices.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South has consistently supported salary increases, and his contribution today should not be seen as any departure from that position. He questions the methodology, and I will deal with that at a later stage, but generally he is in favour of the principle, and I may add that he is also in favour of the level of remuneration. There are those on this side, and I think on that side too, who would dispute that, claiming that he would want more for those falling in his position, the ordinary Members of Parliament.

The truth is, as has been said, these debates have always been characterised by emotional outbursts. I think that is the way we can describe the contribution made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. They have also been characterised over the years by a lot of irrationality, a lot of bitterness, and there are reasons for all of that.

In the first place, it has got to be recognised that up until relatively recently in this country, up until the late Forties, Members of Parliament did not receive any remuneration. For the most part only a certain type of person, either from the mercantile, the professional or the planter class, came to Parliament, and there was a notion then throughout the western world that public service was based on a principle of voluntarism — it was voluntary. Since then, there has been a growing feeling that people in public life should be rewarded for their service. For many years, there was a mixed principle in existence in this country and in many countries — the feeling that it was partly voluntary, it was partly for reward — and it is the conflict between these two principles — the reward principle and the principle of voluntarism — that has to a large extent led to a lot of the division of opinion and a lot of the bitterness that has characterised debates with respect to remuneration of parliamentarians not only in this country, but in many other countries in the western world.

There is another consideration that has always attended these debates, and it is the feeling in some circles that it is politically rewarding in terms of getting marks from the electorate to be seen to be objecting to salary increases. So a lot of parliamentarians over the years who felt in conscience that the remuneration was justified, have found themselves objecting to it, because they felt it was, in terms of sheer politics, a sensible thing to do. That is the hypocrisy principle.

4.15 p.m.

Perhaps the last honourable Member who spoke typifies that situation in some respects, because on the last occasion that we had a salaries debate in this House, he went outside, called in the Press, and indicated that

thereafter he would be giving his increase to members of his constituency. There was a big picture in the newspaper and a long write-up. I think the members of the Press who are here owe it to themselves and to the public to have investigated that particular matter to see how many times since then he distributed his salary to the members of his constituency. If they would do their homework on that matter, they would see who are the hypocrites, who are the ones in here who attempt to abuse them, and who are trying to deceive the members of the public. That is a matter to which you should pay attention.

I think it is accepted now, not only in this country, but virtually all over the world, that parliamentarians are public servants, and that they are entitled to be rewarded as all public servants are. We in the Barbados Labour Party have accepted that principle, and that is one of the principles that inform salary revision for parliamentarians as far as we are concerned. The Right Honourable Prime Minister has made it clear on several occasions over the last eight years that whenever the public servants get an increase, we too, as public servants in Parliament, would get an increase. He has always linked our increase to the increase of the Public Service. We have also always accepted the principle that the Ministers are entitled to have a level of remuneration modestly higher than that which the Permanent Secretaries get. Those are the principles that we have respected over many years in this Parliament.

It is a fact that in 1976, when we were campaigning for office, we said that we were prepared to submit this matter to an independent Review Commission, and the Nicholls Commission was established. I want to say something about that, which I think was very reflective of a small group of people in this society, particularly in the middle class, who would like to be politicians but are always knocking the parliamentarians. That Commission proceeded on every false premise conceivable. One dominant premise on which they proceeded was that parliamentarians only work on Tuesdays when they come to the House and that therefore we should be paid on a *per diem* basis for attendance at the House and for no more. The fact that from day to day we are called upon in a thousand ways to attend to the needs of our constituents was not at all taken into account. So in the end, we had to reject the findings of the body which we set up as consistent with our pledge to the electorate of this country, and thereafter, we as a Government, consistent with the principles which we had set forth, have set the increases every time that there has been a Public Service increase.

I should like to mention what took place in 1978 before the Nicholls Commission reported. It was felt that there was need for an increase and we set up an all party commission in this House to look at the increases, and a

very sad thing happened. The Opposition refused to sit on that all-party committee. But you had members of the Opposition who regularly sought us and begged that their special interests be taken account of in our report. They did not have the courage to serve on the committee or to make their views known publicly — though, in fairness to one of the members, he did speak publicly in favour of the increase — he is not now with us in the House — and they refused to participate. I feel that increases for parliamentarians is a matter that falls within our competence, and I have absolutely no doubt that we are capable of giving ourselves reasonable increases from time to time, consistent with the principles which we have set forth and which will meet with the approval of the vast majority of the electorate.

Ministerial leadership today is a major management responsibility. Nobody doubts that, and we on this side have nothing to be ashamed of because our Ministers come to work and work hard, and have a proud record of distinguished service. We work like hard-working professionals in this country, and we are entitled to be rewarded as such.

We contribute to our pensions.

(*Aside: How much?*)

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: About 5 per cent of my remuneration. Civil servants do not contribute to theirs. We have no security of tenure of office. They have. Our lives are enveloped with risks and uncertainty. No one ought to belittle the sacrifices that are involved in making a contribution at that level. As has often been said, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is a well-to-do man. He ought not to use that as a basis for informing his judgment on these matters, because there are a lot who are less fortunate and try to serve in the public interest, and many of them serve well, too. They are not all millionaires, as I heard the honourable Member is, and he ought to see it from their perspective. I think that rather than indulging in these negative comments about our public servants, parliamentarians, we, ought to rejoice in the fact that we have been able to attract people of high quality to the public life of this country, and I believe that, to some extent, the fact that there is a reasonable reward has contributed to that.

4.25 p.m.

I would like to remind honourable Members on the other side that they did not increase their salaries for many years and in the end left office in scandal and disgrace. Many men were seen fighting not in the public interest, but for the benefit of the enlargement of their own pockets. I think that you should learn something from that. You thought it was politically popular not to give yourselves an increase in salary, but to try to get money through your office. You will be well advised to

bear in mind that there may not be all on your side who are as well off as you are, and you ought to be less selfish....

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I rise on a point of order: Members over here, at least three of us on this side, were members of the Government which demitted office in 1976, and we are unaware that we were involved in any scandal and any disgrace. I believe that that is a reflection upon the Members who are sitting in this Chamber, and we ask the honourable Member to withdraw any imputation that there was scandal and disgrace attaching to the Government of which we were members.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that is an opinion of the honourable Member. I do not know of any rule of the Honourable House which says that an honourable Member cannot have his own opinion. As long as the words fall within what is acceptable in Parliament, I do not see how I can ask him to withdraw it. If you want at some later stage in the debate to refute the statement made on that side, you are free so to do.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, I was dealing with the party that then formed the Government. The fact that there are two or three survivors of that group in here now only goes to make the point. Where are the rest and why did they fall by the wayside? You must ask yourselves that.

The point I was making is that we ought to put the public life of this country on a sound footing. One of the ways of doing that is to ensure that people who serve are rewarded reasonably, and that is precisely what we have sought to do over the years since we have been in office. You may depart from that principle and fail to reward your public servants, parliamentarians, properly and drive them to get money in all sorts of illegitimate ways. A man who serves as a Minister of Government is entitled to do that without wondering or worrying as to where he is going to get money from to attend to some of the basics that go with that office and that rank. I believe that that is a proper principle, and I am happy to say publicly that I support these increases. I regard them as reasonable and I regard them as consistent with a principled position which we have long enunciated, that parliamentarians are public servants and that whenever the Public Service gets an increase, parliamentarians will get one too.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable to support the proposed increases, the last honourable Member who sat should use words like 'scandal' and 'disgrace' under the protection of Parliament, to describe all of those people who went out in the last Democratic Labour Party Administration.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not like the honourable Member's statement about "under protection of Parliament." The words "scandal and disgrace" have never been deemed unparliamentary. As far as rulings in this House are concerned, they are based on what is parliamentary or unparliamentary. A Member's opinion is his opinion, and anybody on either side of the House has got the right to refute any statement made.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I really did not think that an occasion for increases would have merited any debate from either side, since the Honourable Prime Minister on the last occasion enunciated the principle which I thought all of us had accepted and agreed to, and the principle was put forward very ably by the honourable Member who just sat, and that is that whenever public servants got increases, parliamentarians would get an increase. As a result, it was almost automatic that when the Public Service were given the 12½ per cent across the board, those of us who took the suggestion seriously, automatically figured that if there was any increase, it would have been 12½ per cent across the board, so I did not figure that there would be any need for this debate, since it would come to the House, a straight procedure, and Parliament having debated it on the last occasion, would have found it acceptable to most of us.

I think on this occasion, there is a gross mistiming. In all of these proposals put before us, the Prime Minister's is the closest one to that principle, in that my calculations show he is going to get 14.2 per cent. So I think we can almost ignore that. But when you look at it, the thing that I am basically against is that there is a situation where some of the lower paid workers in the Barbados Government, through their appropriate representative bodies, had made representations a long time for a regrading without success — senior civil servants, particularly the Permanent Secretaries, have made representations through their body, and the Honourable Prime Minister has made the cardinal error of bringing to this House those recommendations and implementing these recommendations before he sees it fit to look at the recommendations of the lower ranks.

4.35 p.m.

It is a cardinal mistake because those people in the lower ranks must assume that because there is a relativity between the senior civil servants and the Ministers, the Prime Minister saw fit to accept the arguments of the senior civil servants, which in my calculation shows the S1s have gone to 27.5 per cent, which, logically, would allow him to come and make the kind of statement that since there is a relativity, it is logical to carry through this relativity to the Ministers. The reverse could have been done and you could have carried out the regrading

at the bottom, say of 30 per cent for the School Meals workers.

Let us be practical. The Ministers are getting \$17 148 a year more. That represents more than what those School Meals workers are carrying home. Those School Meals workers have to buy food, they have to have shelter, clothing and transportation and they want to educate their children. Our lifestyles might be a little bit more expensive than theirs, but those are the necessities. What do you expect those School Meals workers to say? That it does not suit our purpose at this time to look at theirs because it would not affect us up the line. If you had done the reverse, one would not have had cause to enter into this debate.

I believe that parliamentarians have to be remunerated. But I cannot sit down here and allow it to be assumed that you can use that routine, because it suits the purpose of parliamentarians and Ministers, particularly when their case has been put before the senior civil servants. It is with that that I take issue.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of explanation, Sir: The honourable Member is mistaken in his time sequence. The NUPW agreed to a series of salary increases already knowing that the Permanent Secretaries and parliamentarians were going to get more. The regradings are subsequent to all that. The applications for regradings came at a much later stage than the representations made by the Permanent Secretaries. That is why they have not been dealt with yet.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: With respect to the legal officers, I believe that that came in in October. Certainly, I did not see them before October.

Mr. SPEAKER: There seems to be a practice during this debate to address remarks to individual Members. The Rule in this House is that comments on all debates are addressed to the Chair. I will not tolerate, as of now, Members addressing each other, or anybody other than the Chair. Please bear that in mind.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The point I am making is that the machinery set up and administered for this type of exercise would have had a lot better image if we had gone that route, because we have to be careful. We, as representatives of the people, must not give the impression that we expedite things that tend to benefit us and leave those that do not benefit us.

I am not getting involved in the percentage increases, because, as I said, I accept the principle that as soon as

the Civil Service salaries go up, ours go up as well. But here it is that the majority of the civil servants have got 12.5 per cent, but we have accepted some regradings that have seen Ministers and all of us in Parliament getting above the 12.5 per cent.

Asides.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: But that is exactly the argument I am putting forward, that the linkage with the Permanent Secretaries is what has allowed that to happen. My thesis is that this linkage should only come about when you have looked at the bottom and made sure that all of those were done. If you had a regrading of 30 per cent, you could say that you are looking at it impartially right through. But we cannot get away from the fact that, having done this, we have opened ourselves to the charge that we have got to the top quickly, because of the need to maintain parity between the Ministers. And the PSs having got 27.5 per cent, you now have to give the Ministers 24.2 per cent to retain that parity.

(Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: You should give them 100 per cent because the PSs do not give away any.)

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: That is the only reason why I have contributed to this debate. The timing of it is such that I cannot, at this time, having not seen what was done to the lower ranks, support the Order.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, this is about the fifth increase in salaries I am going to be involved in over a period of eighteen years in Parliament. I have fought four elections, 1966, 1971, 1976 and 1981, and on no occasion were salaries for Ministers of Parliament an issue with the public. I believe it was never an issue because John public is well aware of the fact that Members of Parliament should be paid – and they should be well paid.

The Member for St. Michael South, in his very, very weak delivery today, just making up time for the Record, said that he disagreed with the methodology. He has recommended to this Chamber that there should be a review committee – Is that what you want? – that would sit down with you on that side and determine what salaries there should be. The methodology is wrong, but the principle is right. You want the money, but the way in which it is handed to you, either in your right hand or left hand, is wrong, so you have recommended that there should be a review committee to determine this for the future.

I am going to make a suggestion now. I am going to move an amendment that a review committee be set up to give an increase to Members on the other side. Do not be involved in this present one, because this is going through today. Outside, I know that each of you has been asking how much back pay you are going to get and when, and you have been asking Mr. Cumberbatch if the cheque is already made out for you. You are entitled to that. I am asking the Cabinet Secretary how soon I am going to get mine. It is my money. I earned it, and I am the best person to spend it or keep it.

I hope that you would support the amendment that we in the Government are going to set up the review committee and recommend to you what salaries you are to get. It can be retroactive from whenever the review committee meets and reports. Do you agree with that? I will take my seat, because the methodology is wrong, and let you get up on the floor of the House and agree that you would support an amendment that a review committee be set up recommending what salary increase there shall be for Members of the Opposition. We are going to set up the committee and we have to report back to you. I want to be the Chairman, too.
4.45 p.m.

This is sheer hypocrisy. Whenever there is a salary increase in here, some of the Members on that side say how much the Prime Minister is getting, how much money a Member of Parliament should get, how scandalous it is, and that it is a raid on the public purse. What I cannot understand is why they draw the public funds. They would have to be part of the scandal. If we, the Members on this side, are raiding the Treasury, why does the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central not leave his money in the Treasury? Otherwise, he is part of that scandal. I think we have seen the Member for St. Michael South Central over a period of years being pompous, arrogant and being a mad nuisance.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: The honourable Member has accused me of being arrogant and pompous and has challenged me to leave my money in the Treasury. I give the Government the authority to keep my increase in the Treasury and not to pay me.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: It is amazing why we have to be in here arguing over ten cents. Why am I to be subjected to this nonsense over ten cents every time there is a salary increase? They come in here and keep a lot of noise about it, draw the money, spend the money — but vote against it! What sort of hypocrisy can that be? Any time I vote against a measure, you can rest assured I have absolutely nothing to do with that measure, whatever happens. The honourable Member for St. Michael

South Central is the chief architect of that type of hypocrisy displayed in this country. You only have to listen to the tapes of his public speeches on platforms, note the confusion he causes in his party ranks, know about the telephoning of people, the name talking of his colleagues and then the displaying of hypocrisy on the floor of this House. You do not believe in yourself.

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I do not believe in you).

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: How can you believe in me? I am sane, you are insane, so you cannot believe in me.

Sir, I regret that the approach of the Member for St. Michael South was so weak today. The Member for St. Philip North gave a little watered down talk, but you know you do not mean that. You know you want the money. We know each other. You know I know your people, your good friends. I know your girlfriends and you know mine, so we know what we are talking about. I know where a piece of change is needed. I will talk out your business, man, I do not like hypocrisy.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please address the Chair. I have not had any business with the honourable Member. I hope the honourable Member will address the Chair and bear in mind certain statements he had made to the Chair.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I think, Mr. Speaker, that we would have a drink on that increase at After Dark later in the evening. We can always discuss girlfriends there.

What I really cannot understand is why we are to have this battle among ourselves when John Public does not see this as an issue. It is only for the Record that you oppose a salary increase and the methodology. That is all.

We hear all this nonsense about Ilaro Court being too big. Of course, we used to talk about Culloden Farm too. Maybe that is Opposition politics. But you have not been able to get over your defeat from 1976. You thought you had something going now, but God moved in a mysterious way and St. Peter collapsed under your hand, so you are now dispirited, weak publicly disenchanted, looking for a toe hold, not knowing where to go, afraid that the Prime Minister may call a General Election, knowing that the public has its fullest confidence in this Government.

If I had to work out the seats, you cannot beat Mr. Speaker, you cannot beat me, you cannot beat the whole of this front bench. Can you beat the back bench? You are not going to win any Government, so do not talk about salaries. It is not an issue. Do you believe somebody will vote for the Member for St. Michael North (Mr. P. M. Greaves) again? A weak-looking, insignificant type of candidate? How can you? And the big boss that is sitting next to you? Yet we have to be killing ourselves

in here over a couple of dollars, when in the long run you spend it back in your constituency.

I am told that the Member for St. Michael West was at something called the Garden Land Bram, and he was hugged and kissed by the people, and all he was shouting out was "You know, I am not a Minister now, so I cannot buy a drink." So you are anxious to get the increase to buy a drink at the Garden Land Bram. So why the hypocrisy? What are we really debating? What are we really trying to prove? What is the issue? You do not pay any attention to the Member for St. Michael South Central. I think the Member for St. Michael West knows about him better than anybody else, except me, and his brother in law.

I will add my personal voice about a degree of discontent on this. Although the policy has been enunciated by the Government repeatedly on this, that we are to go along with the civil servants, I have never shared that view. I do not share the view that I am to get the same increase as any civil servant or any judge. I am standing by that. I think the matter was very well put by the Member for Christ Church East, the risk involved, the problems you have to face up to, not only going into a Ministry and sitting down and doing something, the everyday problems that you face up to with the people around you at least merit some consideration, because at the end of the day when each and every one of us leave this Chamber, and we have to leave some time, all the cheers you used to get are going to turn to jeers.

I have seen it with the late Sir Grantley Adams. He was referred to as Moses leading his people to the Promised Land, and then I heard him being heckled and brought to his knees publicly. He was a modest man, a man who really gave heart and soul to the country. I heard the Leader of the Opposition in here telling him, "old man, you do not know what is going on." I heard Joy Edwards telling him he would kick him in his backside. I heard all of that on the floor of this Chamber. He gave so much to this country and in turn received so little.

4.55 p.m.

There were men like Victor Vaughan, who died in St. Michael's Infirmary. I heard of Sir Ronald Mapp. I heard of a man called Patsy Springer making reference to him that after he was a Minister he was walking about selling hairpins. All of these are things that you should give thought to, and at the end of the day, what John Public is going to say about you or think about you. Are you going to expose us to corruption?

I believe that Barbadians should be justly proud of this country and its Parliament. There are some territories where Ministers can write a little note and send it to the Treasury and get money, or to the National Bank. Of

course, you would have to be chairman of that particular bank, you and Sidney Alleyne. Birds of a feather flock together.

You talked about mercenaries today — the Bishops and the Sidney Alleynes — you are involved in that gang. You abused the Prime Minister of this country for Bishop and Coard and you walked side by side, and hand in hand with Sidney Alleyne. That is the conduct of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, a man who wanted to see blood flow on the streets of this country.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You talked about my health? I am stronger than you. I can beat you any time and anywhere.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two honourable Members are on their feet. Both Members please take your seat.

Mr. SPEAKER stands.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the honourable Member rise?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The honourable Member.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the honourable Member rise?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have risen on a point of order and I have stated so three times now.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not able to hear when there is a conversation going on. Members must keep quiet. Did you say that you are on a point of order?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I now hear the point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The point of order is that the honourable Member has said that I walked hand in hand with someone who has been accused of treasonable conduct in this country. I want to make it clear that I have never met and I have never known Mr. Sidney Alleyne.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It is a point of order, Sir. It is treason you are talking about.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You sat down in the Drill Hall under the same roof with Sidney Alleyne when he said that there will be fire and brimstone and acid. You were part of it, and you told me yourself upstairs at the Green Dragon that some day we will see blood flow in this country. Are you talking about democracy and morals now? What morals can you have publicly or in here?

You talked about my colleague's business about his illness, on the public platform. You talked about me and you will talk about the honourable Member for St. John. That is your character.

Asides

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You are the brain man. That is what you are.

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing Order 33(6) says that Members must be heard in silence. As from now, that will be the case.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I am submitting that it is a breach of the Standing Orders of this House to refer to an honourable Member as a depraved person, and I am drawing this to your attention for your ruling, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not prepared to rule. I cannot hear when Members on both sides are shouting across the Chamber when there is a Member standing on his feet and speaking, and I want this shouting to stop now.

Each Member has a chance to make his speech or to get up if he finds that something has been said and draw it to the Speaker's attention, but with all this cross-talking, it is impossible for me to hear everything, or for the Hansard Reporters to get it down.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I believe that if there was a real active and strong Medical Association in this country that would take the appropriate steps to strip the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central from practising medicine in this country, he would have been easily stripped for divulging information on his clients. If you have done it to your brother-in-law, you would do it to whom you once said was your good friend. You told me that on more than one occasion that you are going to do it to the Leader of the Opposition, because you condemned him before and you condemned him again today, and I have no doubt that you will do it to your family some time. That is the level of character of the Member for St. Michael South Central, and that is why his attitude towards this Resolution is the one which he has displayed in here today.

He referred to Members as "money grabbers". I believe that some doctors, not all, are real, real money grabbers, like some lawyers. I know of a doctor who is a money grabber and, that is the Member for St Michael South Central. I can testify to that. He has been involved in real estate. He has been involved in one-armed bandits. He has been involved in drugs. You can name them. He has been involved in all of these things.

(Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central were ordered expunged from the Record by Mr. Speaker).

Mr. SPEAKER: I am saying once again that Members are asked to desist from this type of behaviour. We are getting nowhere in doing this. I want both sides to understand that it is very unparliamentary to behave in this manner.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Like the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, I do not challenge people to go outside and say things, because I am not in this nonsense about the Police. I would hold you and burst your mouth. If you went outside, or, as a matter of fact, if you went out in the Dining Hall, I would do it. You know that is not beyond me. I would do that to you and make you a public example. I do not care about the consequences. I am not like your brother-in-law that you can mess around.

The Member for St. Michael South Central made reference to Members on this side as "money grabbers", conveying that all the interest we have is to — I am coming outside, do not come back in here — sit down every day and try to pull the stuffing out of the people in this country. That is the accusation he made. That is the level of the debate. Whenever he has to get up in here and speak, he has to make some sort of allegation about the Members on this side, about their integrity, their common decency and their morals.

5.05 p.m.

I know as a Cabinet Minister that somewhere along the road this Government may have made a mistake unintentionally, as we are just human beings. We may think that we are doing the right thing in the interest of John Public and it turns out to be the wrong thing, like any Government any part of the world, and I believe that John Public can judge our mistakes, or they are satisfied that the mistakes made can be overlooked. But I know John Public does not believe, no matter how much the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central tries to push that, that this is a corrupt Government. They know better than that.

We have been through two elections and three by-elections in eight years, and the only Member I have heard

pushing that is the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. You may recall, Sir, that when you were Minister of Agriculture, you were accused on the floor of this House by the very honourable Member for something to do with some buffalos and feed from Roberts Manufacturing Company. You do not know what I am talking about! He accused you, but now you are sitting in that elevated office, he cannot say these things about you on the floor of the House. He talked a lot of nonsense about feed going from Roberts Manufacturing Company.

The first person who accused a Member of this Government of corruption is the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. Not even the honourable Member for St. John in the evening of his years, like when he is really swiping blind and talking about Menzies Chase for an hour and a half on a platform in 1984, trying to get Mrs. Leacock in the House and talking about "tonight is a funny day," not even he accused us of corruption. But all that you heard from the honourable Member on that occasion was that the Government is corrupt. Nobody paid him any attention because they know completely different from that.

I have seen many politicians who were only intransigent. John Public only has to get up one morning and decide he is no longer with you, and you have given all that you have to the country, which I believe you should give and probably ask for nothing in return. But every time that we have to bring down a salary increase for Members of Parliament, there is this defence by the Government and attack by the Opposition. On the one hand they are saying that it is not fair, the methodology is wrong — they find something to say — but in the meantime they push their hands out to the Clerk for their cheques. I do not believe in that.

I remember that when the Leader of the Opposition was Minister of Finance back in 1966, when I first came in here, he used to come down one day and say what the Ministers are going to get and what the Members of the Opposition should have, and there was a battle going on between Mr. Cameron Tudor and the then Speaker of the House, Sir Theodore Brancker, because they were cutting each other's throat. I was very junior at the time in here, and I was called upon by Sir Edwy Talma to have a word with Frank Walcott to ask him to talk to the now Leader of the Opposition to get a better increase for the Members of Parliament, because I was friendly with Frank Walcott at the time. I still have great respect for him. So what is the argument about \$2 000 a year more or something like that? That is what it works out to, if I am not mistaken.

My car seats get cut up, you get four flat tyres, you get your car scratched. You encouraged people down in St. Peter to turn over motor cars, led a big army in here against Speaker Burton Hinds, all these things you have

done in your short time in here — and almost brought out the riot squad with a big gang down here because you defied the ruling of the Speaker of the House. You feel proud and happy about that. If I were in a rum shop I would call you a hooligan, but I cannot call you that in here because it would be unparliamentary. That is the type of behaviour displayed by you. I have been sent out of this House on several occasions because I defied the Speaker and felt that I was right, but I never tried to break up this institution that you talk about, this august Chamber. You have paid people about here to curse Prime Ministers, their wives, judges, lawyers, doctors, families. All that you have contributed to public life in a short space of time. I would sum you up with one single word, but I cannot use it in here.

I am going to support this Resolution. You have a date with me anytime, inside or outside the Chamber, whenever you are ready.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I want to touch first on the question of the secretaries to the parliamentarians in here. I have noticed no Order made for them, and I hope that the Minister responsible for Finance and Establishments would consider very shortly bringing some Resolution to Parliament whereby these folks will be upgraded as well. I believe that many of them are concerned as to their future, and I believe that a number of them would also like to know when the time will come when National Insurance will be paid for them, and when they will have some permanence in their office. Since all public servants have been given some form of increase that they, too, should be looked at, and looked at with despatch, and I hope that before this session is brought to an end for the holiday, these unfortunate secretaries will also be looked at. Many of us have got to depend very much upon their assistance, and I want to applaud the Prime Minister and Minister responsible for Establishments for having, in the first place conceived the idea of secretaries to parliamentarians. They relieve a lot of us who are hard-pressed for time of the day-to-day duties which they now perform.

The question of salaries for parliamentarians always seems to be a matter which is charged with a lot of — I would not say hatred and spite, because I do not think it is that — scoring points one way or another. To some extent, I support the view — advanced by the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford). I do not know if the proposal is put forward in the very best of faith. I hope it has been, and I would hope that at some time in the future we might be able to rise above the heat and anger of all the discussion and see the need for Parliament itself to have a Committee that might be able to look at the salaries revision of Members of the House of Assembly. In the same way the Permanent

Secretaries can on their own volition have their own bargaining body to look at their own conditions of service, I do not think it should be beyond the law makers of this country for them to have the type of machinery set up whereby they can examine their own problems and work them out smoothly.

I sometimes ask my Cabinet colleagues when the time will ever come that we will have some body which would look at our affairs and be our bargaining agents, because in truth and in fact Members of Parliament and Ministers of Government have no such bargaining agency. We revile ourselves; we are our greatest enemies. We seek at all times to score cheap points over each other, not remembering that when we try to score these points one on the other, we are actually scoring them upon ourselves.
5.15 p.m.

I have sat in here from time to time and I have seen all types of salary increases for civil servants, judges and all types of people come in, and I have hardly heard a single word of disagreement, except for the fact that the salaries might not be graded right in one instance or another, as in the case with the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) who was arguing about the type of regrading with respect to the Chief Labour Officer. But as soon as something comes in for the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister, Ministers or parliamentarians, you hear all the noise in this world.

We stand out, I believe, as the single Parliament in the whole world where Members do not seem to have the courage occasionally to come in here and say how we feel about judgments of the Supreme Court or the other courts in this island. My view is that the judges are not sacred cows, and if we think that they are going wrong, we have a right to say that. We have to question the decisions if we think that they are wrong. We have a right to say if we think the judges are getting too much money.

I wonder why Members on the opposite benches should think that Members who have to give away one-half and sometimes two-thirds of what they get as net income to their constituents should not be paid. I wonder how many people in this country are aware that parliamentarians, Ministers, particularly, pay in some cases, more than 40 per cent of their income back in taxes to the Inland Revenue Department, and that while the income might look substantial on paper, in terms of what you receive in your hand, you get very little money compared with other people. No Minister of Government is able to conceal his earnings. The Cabinet Secretary is the first to take PAYE and other taxes out, and I believe the Administrative Officer of Parliament takes out the National Insurance and other taxes from the salaries of Members of Parliament.

If a constituent were living beside a millionaire and that constituent ran into trouble, he would never go to the millionaire next door to him as his neighbour — he would find his representative by the following morning. There are certain pressures like that which a parliamentarian must face from day to day that no other person in this country must face.

The judges of the Supreme Court enjoy a reasonable pay. I believe they should get more. I believe that a judge should be so well paid that he should not have to look over his shoulder about paying the butcher for a leg of meat. He should be able to do so without any problem. A judge should be so insulated from the day-to-day problems of the world that he should be able to sit on his bench in the court and be able to hand down — I am satisfied and persuaded beyond any shadow of a doubt that this has been so over the years — a judgment which is a proper and well considered judgment, irrespective of who comes before him.

Equally so, a Minister of Government should be able to meet with any person at all, no matter who that person is, and make a decision which, in his view, is in the best interest of the country. Are you going to suggest that he should be so inhibited by the ability to meet his commitments that whenever he looks at a man who comes to him who might be of substance, he has to look at him with one eye and keep the other eye in his pocket? I would hate ever in my life to be associated with any group of people who would be subjected to those conditions. I am happy to know that this Government has been able to cushion itself against all of those problems, and in the face of all the difficulties that we have been encountering, to continue to fly high and to conform to the manifesto pledges which we made in 1976, to which the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was referring.

There is one thing that he showed. We hardly ever refer to the manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party, because we do not find it to be a particularly worthy document. But what we think it is to our credit that whenever someone on the other side gets up, they find it convenient to refer to our document, the gospel according to the Barbados Labour Party. We set out in that manifesto the type of orderly system of Government which we consider that we should have in the event we took over the running of the affairs of this country. The people, on the basis of that documentation, have accorded us the running of this country, and, in my view, unless we let up very badly, they will continue to do so for many years to come.

The Honourable Member for Christ Church East (Hon Dr. R. L. Cheltenham), in referring to the manner in which the last Government went out of office, met

with some criticism from the other side when he said that some people "went out in disgrace". He was not generally attacking the Opposition as such, but we know that, as a result of a number of things and a number of scandals that took place during the period of office of the Democratic Labour Party, there was the Duffus Commission and the Hanschell Commission and they did not speak too highly of the DLP's Administration. Although no person was brought to justice, it cannot be said that they were exempted from the strictures of the Commissions that sat and pronounced upon their deeds or misdeeds. Therefore, it is always very important, in my view, and sensible that you should consider when people are in office and when people have to perform certain important functions, treating those people as reasonable as is possible.

We know that the people in the country do not call the politicians, the politicians go to them. The politicians expect to make certain sacrifices. There are some people in public life who reach the stage, as a result of the problems which they meet on coming into public life, where they consider it might be best to run. In my view, it is not in the best interest of anybody that they should run. So you should always treat, as best as possible, people who are called upon to serve in public office.

The honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin) compared Ministers of Government with people in the School Meals Service. I do not know what he is thinking, when a person who is a Minister of Government has to meet several commitments every day. I left my office this morning and the last thing I did was to give my secretary \$200 to buy two different gifts for Saturday weddings. I go to all that I am invited to, and I take gifts to them as well. Those of us who adopt that liberal attitude to our constituents understand what it means in the course of a month in terms of our spending. Some of us may be able to get away from doing it, but I am not the type who will run away from it. If you face it now, you do not have to face it at election time, so I do my duty at all times to the people.

This Resolution should not have evoked the type of discussion which went on here this afternoon. We are living in different times. In another year, governing will be more sophisticated, more intricate and more involved than it is today. The running of Government has moved forward at a pace that is unbelievable, compared with what it was when we came into office in 1976. The volume of work which was done and the number of projects we have executed make 1976 and before look like child's play.

5.25 p.m.

Ministers today are not Ministers who are playing. I am not saying that those in the past were playing either, but as the honourable Member for Christ Church

East said, we have today a group of hard-working people who make sure that they get to work on time. We have a very hard task master in the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister calls occasionally, at 8.30 a.m. to say he wants to speak to me. I sometimes wonder whether the Prime Minister really wants to speak to me at 8.30 in the morning or if he is checking to see if I really go into my office.

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: He is checking on you.)

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: It is a good thing to do. I do not quarrel with that, because I have a duty to perform. If you are being paid to perform a duty, you should be out there performing that duty.

I know of doctors who go to their offices at 6.30 and 7 o'clock. By doing that they will be richly rewarded in terms of compensation and patient satisfaction. Ministers should be equally prepared to go to their offices early and to work as hard as possible. And if you want parliamentarians who are going to be conscientious, parliamentarians who are going to perform their duties in a responsible manner, let us make no mistake about it, you have to pay them. We have still seen a situation in the Bahamas, although in the Bahamas politicians are well paid, and they do not have to pay taxes, where the public inquiry is revealing a lot of things which we should never allow to creep into public life in this country. It is important to remove ourselves from situations like those.

There was a time when the planter class and business people ran this country, when the decisions of this land were made at the cocktail tables and at the dining room tables, decisions not made in the interest of the broad masses of people in this country. With the coming into office of people who are committed to the plight and the improvement of the working class people, they have been able to examine the total possibility of the raising of income for the better improvement of the country, and therefore they have had to involve themselves in the levying of a number of tax measures. I hope that we will never reach the stage where we will have people who come into Parliament to make laws in their own interest, but you will have people who will come here even though committed to the country who will not come here purely because they come to legislate in their own behalf.

Mr. Speaker, when these matters come before us, we should look at them very critically. I feel that Ministers of Government who have constituencies should be given a constituency allowance, and I say this fully conscious of my responsibility. I am a constituency man, a people's man, and I am very close to my constituency. I have to go there on a daily basis, and I suppose to some extent that might answer one of the points which were made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South in relation to something which he read from Hansard.

I see the Prime Minister driving his own car in his constituency on several occasions, including official occasions. In England the Prime Minister gets a constituency allowance, and I feel that this is a matter we should look at. I do not think that Members who have constituencies to service should be ruled out of any consideration in that regard. In addition to the steady grind as a Minister and what you have to do in that regard, you still have your constituency to service, and I think that in examining ministerial increases and allowances, that aspect of it might well be looked at and considered.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: (St. Michael West Central): Mr. Speaker, I believe I have been in here on a number of occasions when this matter of parliamentary salaries has been discussed, and this is the first time that I am making my contribution to the debate.

In this House sit 27 persons, upon whom the honour has been conferred by their respective constituencies to represent them in what is the highest forum in this land. When the people have spoken and selected from all those who present themselves for consideration, when the people have selected that cadre of representatives, they have conferred an honour that in a lifetime only a very few people will have that opportunity to attain. That is not a matter that should be looked at without the proper consideration as to all that it entails. I therefore, am a little bit ashamed when I hear people on whom that honour has been conferred comparing themselves to School Meals workers, maids, and cane cutters without pausing to consider that, without any disrespect to those offices which I have just mentioned, there simply cannot be a comparison between the compensation levels of a Minister of Government and upon a labourer, and the reason should be obvious to any person who cares to be objective.

5.35 p.m.

When a judge is assigned to the bench, every society in the world understands the importance of that office, and therefore makes an attempt to assign to that office a salary commensurate with the responsibilities that that office carries, the esteem in which the office is held by the public at large, and the dignity which people expect the office holders to bear in respect of that particular office. When these matters, therefore, are considered, it should be obvious that a Minister of Government, or a judge, or a Senior Crown Counsel, or a Permanent Secretary, people in these offices which are relatively few in the whole spectrum of employment possibilities, offices which are set apart for particular compensation levels that go to signify the esteem that these offices are held in and the duties that are attached to them, should be well paid.

The business of maturity is not just the business of growing old, it is the business of fully understanding all

that society is about. When one is selected by the constituents to come in here, when the honour of ministerial responsibility or even just a back-bench office is conferred upon someone, when he becomes a Member of this august Assembly and he still seeks to flatter his constituents with the notion that he is representing them because he is seeking to drag down his salary, I do not think his esteem goes up in the eyes of his constituents — it goes down. I can never forget that at Whitehall corner in St. Michael, one day I heard some people up there discussing former members of the Cabinet, men who have now grown old, and they referred to one member and said, "You see him? Fancy this man was a Minister of Government and look what he has come to! All of them want shooting because you go up there and disgrace the office". He was speaking about the fact that this gentleman who served at a time when salary levels were relatively low, was not able after he had left that office to live in a style befitting that office, or one who had held that level of office, and when I look around and see men who were once in here on the front bench roaming around the streets looking lost and forlorn, I feel a pang of sorrow, because I believe that happens because of the level of hypocrisy that is inherent in some of us who sit in this Chamber.

When I was a boy, the offices of the Colonial Secretary, Governor and Member of Parliament were offices to which people looked up with awe. But when us native sons succeeded to that office, we did not succeed with a full appreciation of the kind of attitude the public held in respect of those particular office, and we have done more to damage them in the eyes of our constituents than anybody else.

I have never had a single constituent tell me that I earn too much money. Before I came into this Chamber, when I returned to Barbados in 1972, I returned earning more than any Government Minister was earning at that time and continued to earn more than any Government Minister, and I was in private enterprise. When you look around you see salesmen and managers at offices in Bridgetown earning more than Ministers, and this is not a fancy story, newspaper directors and editors who earn more than the front bench Ministers, and nobody bothers to say that they are earning too much, because they recognize that when a man succeeds to a certain office, either by academic training, preparation, or simply by an honour conferred on him by his fellows, he has to be compensated at a level that would signify the importance of that office that he holds. Why then is it necessary for us to come in here, like the Member for St. Philip North and the Member for St. Michael South, a distinguished Barbadian scholar, who, I am sure, were he not in here and he had chosen to go into the Public Service in some other stream, would be earning perhaps this level or more, and patronise our constituents by suggesting that Members of Parliament earn too much. Where is the

objectivity? Where is the sincerity? Why do we constantly parade ourselves time after time with the same old story?

I do not think it is necessary for us even to seek to justify this by saying that we have to give away money, because if a politician does not wish to give away money, he does not have to give it away. I do not think that we should advance that as a reason why we should be paid. We should be paid because we are Ministers of Government, and we should be paid a salary that signifies that people fully understand the responsibility that a Minister really carries.

A Minister is asked to hold responsibility for administering \$40 million, \$50 million or \$100 million; in the Ministry of Education, \$120 million. Do you mean to tell me that, in 1984, I have to sit in here and listen to people saying that when a man has that level of responsibility, to pay him \$60 000 a year is too much money? Members who advance that kind of argument, I submit, are not fit to sit in this Chamber, because they have a poor appreciation of their work. They do not belong in here. When a man can come in here and then turn around and say he is getting too much money, it means that he does not belong in here. He does not know the kind of value the public out there put on ministerial office. The fact that I spent \$1 000 only last week to buy toys for my constituents is beside the point. I chose to spend it, nobody commanded me to spend it, and it will be much more. By the end of the Christmas season I would have spent probably \$6 000 or \$7 000 in gifts. I chose to spend it, not that I have to because I am a Minister.
5.45 p.m.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South says I am making sport, because he obviously knows what I am talking about. Your constituents expect you to advance a little something, and in the spirit of Christmas and in the holiday cheer you have to, as they say, pass back a little something. That is part and parcel of Christmas. Some of us give more than others. But I am not dealing with that aspect of it.

I want to see if we cannot somewhere not too long from now reach a level of maturity that will allow us to recognize that we got in here out of 250 000 people. There are 27 of us in here out of 250 000 people, that is how many people are chosen to sit in this Chamber at any given five year period, and if you do not believe that that is an honour, you do not understand precisely what it means when 2 000 or 3 000 go to the polls and mark an "X" alongside your name and designate you as the person they want to represent them. And then you come in here and cheapen the office, talking about School Meals workers only getting \$700 a month. Why do you not elect to be paid like a School Meals worker? Tell the Clerk of Parliament that you only want \$700 a month and give back the rest to the Treasury if that is the level

you feel you should serve at. Do not come in here and drag down the whole institution of Parliament, making it a bread and fish Parliament. Let it be held in esteem.

When you see the Chief Justice of Barbados going by with a certain air about him, people recognise that that is the Chief Justice. This Island only has one, and you do not get to be Chief Justice by shooting dice in the street. You get to be Chief Justice of Barbados because of a certain level of service, a certain level of preparation, a certain measure of perceived integrity and a perception and a hope on the part of the people that you will administer the laws of this island fairly and fearlessly. That is a singular office held in very high esteem. Does anybody dare to cheapen it by paying the office holder \$12 000 a year?

One of the most revered offices in this island is the office adorned by Your Honour. Do we choose to cheapen it? It is throughout the Commonwealth an office that carries a great sense of history, an office of extremely high esteem. Do we choose to cheapen it by the kind of arguments that I have heard in here today?

The Prime Minister of Barbados, the first among us apart from His Excellency the Governor-General, what do we choose to do with him? I heard people talking about the fact that he drives in a Mercedes Benz. So does the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, so do so many other people in the island. Yet, some people in here seem to be saying that we should put him on a bicycle, and they believe that that is an honourable contribution. We destroy the symbols that make this society great. It is made great by the revered symbols.

Asides

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Why do you not go back outside? Whenever I look at you, I almost cry. A man like you, supposed to be a Barbados Scholar who went to Edinburgh, went through a whole process of academic training to get you ready to occupy a particularly high office in Barbados as a medical specialist, up to now has not obtained the graces that would go along with that kind of office. That just goes to show

Asides

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central must now desist from this behaviour. You have been interrupting the debates throughout the day and I will not tolerate it anymore.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: It is like throwing pearls before swine. You can take jewels and put upon swine — they still remain unfit to wear those jewels. I cannot understand why it is, if the honourable Member for St.

Michael South Central feels uncomfortable in here, he does not go back outside and continue in a sphere that gives him a higher level of comfort. Do not come in here and drag down this office and say that people are money-grabbers. How so?

It is unfortunate, I agree with the honourable Member for St. Michael South, that we have the responsibility of fixing our own salaries. Perhaps if some impartial persons who understood the importance of the office, could be commissioned to do this, what he described as a tribunal, that would be a more satisfactory arrangement. But I fear that, given the level of representation we have in here, some Members would still get up and seek to say that those of us who are being compensated for the services we perform are bandits. Why do you not go abroad and see how members of Congress are treated in the United States of America? Barbados is a poor country and I do not expect that we would be able to match that level of ostentation, I do not think it is even desirable, but at least these gentlemen recognise that in order to keep our institutions viable and alive, you have to attract people to them that would be able to continue to keep that dignity that is supposed to inhere in that office.

When the honourable Member was a youngster, when the Colonial Secretary was passing by, you started to quail in your boots, because the Colonial Secretary was a white man from England, more in his mind, I am sure, entitled to the respect that that office commanded. He was white, and therefore, by definition, you had to give him the honour. But, as I said, when we native sons succeed to that office, we turn around like wood ants, demean the office in the eyes of the public and then walk around and say that the public do not respect us. You do not deserve respect because you carry yourself like a clown, like a jackdaw in borrowed feathers, as opposed to walking with dignity and letting the people feel a sense of honour, that they have a man or woman, as the case might be, who understands the importance that they attach to that office.

When a man leaves his house and walks through thunder, rain and sun and stands up sometimes for hours at a voting booth to choose a man to represent them, and that man cannot appreciate that honour, he does not belong in here. I would like to hope that members will desist — I know the temptation is great — from seeking to impress others outside, not wanting to appear like rapists of the country's Treasury. But the people out there have put us here; they expect a certain level of behaviour from us and they expect us to carry ourselves in a way that befits the office.

Mr. Speaker, I will give you an example of how people perceive us. I was on my way to work when I was Minister of Labour one morning, and I was driving in

my Suzuki jeep with a canvas top. When I got to Culloiden Road, a gentleman in a car pulled up alongside me. I had on a suit. He said "wait, Vic Johnson" and I said "Hi, man." I thought the man was greeting me. He said, "All like you want killing. Look at you. Look at how you are driving about in a Suzuki jeep. Are you not ashamed? You are not fit to be any Minister!" That was an ordinary citizen. His perception was that a Minister of Government should travel in a certain style and he was disappointed to see me driving in a Suzuki. I still have the Suzuki jeep, and I will still drive it. But the point is that the public perception of their public officials is such that they expect us to behave in a manner that befits our office. They are disappointed when they hear us in here dragging the office down to a level of School Meals worker.

5.55 p.m.

I support the Resolution.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE (Christ Church West Central): Mr. Speaker, I regret very much I was not here to listen to the verbatim speech of my friend the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. I usually find his speech on this matter of great interest. Obviously, it is part of his preparation for what he considers to be future high office.

I think that one must bring a little bit of sanity to a discussion of parliamentarians' salary. It is probably very right that there should be a full public disclosure of the salaries earned by people in public life. In the case of parliamentarians and Ministers, that disclosure is total and extremely searching. It is not so, however, in respect of those of us who are remunerated either by way of self-employment or by employers other than a public institution or the Crown. So you do not hear any discussion being carried on anywhere in public or private about the earnings of top physician specialists, lawyers, bankers, insurance salesmen, directors of companies or manufacturers.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central and the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central please desist from this behaviour. I have spoken about it all afternoon. I am going to be very drastic if it continues.

(Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: I am sorry, Sir.)

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I apologize, Sir.)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I was telling you that you hear no discussion about the earnings of people in private enterprise. The argument may be advanced that some of them are not in public life, although some of them are in positions of trust, and,

therefore, there is not the same room for the hypocrisy that one finds when one comes to consider the earnings of parliamentarians.

Having been on the Opposition benches, having been a Minister of Government, and having now come back to the back bench, I believe that it gives me a perspective which is not open, perhaps, to some other Members in this House, even some of my former colleagues in the Cabinet who have not so far sat on the back bench. Let me begin by saying that if you took the Members of Parliament in the House who are not Ministers, I make bold to say that almost every one of us are better remunerated than Ministers. If you take the earnings of honourable Members in their private life, whether they are salaried employees or self-employed, like some of us, and you add to that our parliamentary salaries and allowances, then it will be seen that many of us, if not all of us, probably in the long run are earning more than a Minister's salary. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central must concede this point. It is a point that struck Your Honour and myself most forcibly after we left the Ministerial portfolio and came back to the House because, basically, the Member of Parliament with allowances probably gets about one half of what the Minister gets in salary and allowances. The Member of Parliament is allowed to proceed with his full time profession or occupation, and in that full time profession or occupation, he earns at least one half and in many cases more than Ministers. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central must admit this. He cannot seriously argue that a Minister is being grossly overpaid, having regard to his position, his workload and his responsibility.

(Aside: The risks.)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Yes, and to the risk to which he is exposed.

The honourable Member said that people who believe in democratic socialism should not want to widen the relevancies between those at the bottom and those at the top. The figures which are published by the United Nations organizations show that, in respect of salary scales, Barbados is much more stringent than several communist countries, including Cuba, within this hemisphere, and the Soviet Union. The differences between those at the top and those at the bottom in the communist system are wider than the differences between those at the top and those at the bottom in Barbados.

I am not necessarily putting forward a case for widening those differences. The conclusion which I want to draw, however, is that it has been shown that, throughout the years, the Government has consistently seen to it that you are not creating a special class of 'haves' in the society, ignoring the needs of the large numbers of 'have-

nots'. Indeed, the relativity has remained almost constant, other than when we, as the Government, came in in 1976 and did not allow Ministers' salaries to go ahead at the same pace as the other public servants' salaries. I always anticipated that the time would come when it had to catch up, and that then you would hear the sort of arguments which the honourable Member is advancing here.

There is another conclusion to be drawn from the fact that Barbados has such a favourable position in relativity. This has enabled us to have a society that is basically homogeneous, and it shows a certain amount of self-denial on the part of the people at the top in our society.

There is a third conclusion which I want to refer to. It is a very serious conclusion. I am going to argue it only in the context of Minister's salaries, because this is the Order before the House. It is that one has to be very careful in pursuing the philosophy of total equality in a society not to get to the stage where you completely kill incentive, productivity, initiative and managerial skills.

It is significant that a few days ago, the communist daily journal of Peking said that one had to look again at some of the tenets of communism and the doctrine of equality because of the danger that it was bringing about in the society. They had to acknowledge the managerial role and the method of remunerating people for responsibility in order to get a society that was a productive, efficient, well-run society.
6.05 p.m.

That is a very significant reversal. We have not yet begun to spell out the consequences of that for systems of Government in the Communist world vis-a-vis systems of Government in our world. What it means within our society is that, if we are not careful and we go on with the idea that we must not remunerate genuine initiative, genuine productivity, genuine responsibility, wherever it is — and it is not merely among parliamentarians — we will get a society that is apathetic and that is regressive rather than progressive.

There are several ways of doing this; one is by the level of remuneration, another is by the method of taxation, and a third is probably by the method of pension in the long run. There is no doubt that we are still a very heavily taxed area and that we reach our tax bands rather quickly. The increases that are given to top civil servants, to whom the Ministers are pegged, will result in 60 per cent of the increases going back into the Treasury. The honourable Member knows that. So when one is looking at a gross figure here, 60 per cent of whatever is voted in Parliament for Ministers is going to be paid back into the revenue, and you have to look at the net take home position finally of the persons you are remunerating. On

the other hand, the same does not go at certain tax band levels, and any fairness in this debate will recognise that this is so.

I did not hear any quarrel by any honourable Member when the revision of salaries of the Civil servants came before this House. In fact, if anything I heard a plea from the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) that there should have been a greater reclassification. If honourable Members accept that there must be some relationship and relativity between Ministers' salaries and those of top civil servants, I think that it is a little bit misleading to conduct this debate on the basis of percentages.

The honourable Member, speaking earlier in the debate — and I am not reflecting on that debate, Sir — said that if he were to accept the post of a consultant today at the QEH, he would expect a salary of something between \$120 000 to \$150 000.

Aside

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Let him go and read Hansard for earlier today.

I turned to the Prime Minister and said "you should take note of that". He went on to say *sotto voce* that the only thing would be that you would expect them to give a full day's work and they should not have private practice. That is what the honourable member said. If the honourable member considers that a proper level of remuneration for a top consultant at the QEH should be of the order of \$120 000 to \$150 000, acknowledging the taxation that will attach to this, the honourable Member must concede that Ministers are not overpaid.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation.

Mr. SPEAKER: To elucidate what? The honourable Member cannot elucidate something which the honourable Member has said. You have not said anything like that today.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I did, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Today?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Yes, Sir. He is referring to what I said today.

Mr. SPEAKER: If you did say it today, go ahead.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: What I did say was that because of the coming on stream of the National Health Service where general practitioners will probably be paid about \$104 000 when it is fully fledged, then you would expect a consultant at the hospital to be paid somewhere in the region of at least \$120 000.

I also said that in the context where I was making out a case for a professional stream in the Public Service, as distinct from the administrative stream, where special skills are required.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I understood quite clearly the context in which the honourable Member spoke. The honourable Member began by saying that there was a need for chartered accountants in the Inland Revenue Department and other sectors, that it was a mistake to feel that they should be paid at the same level as Permanent Secretaries, that there were people like top consultants whom the Government was underpaying and who should be paid more. The Prime Minister told him they were in grade S5, he looked and saw that they were in grade S5, and he cited the figure of \$54 000. I can give him verbatim what he said, but the gravamen of the honourable Member's submission was that a consultant at the QEH was painfully entitled to remuneration of between \$120 000 and \$150 000 full time, and he went on to say that they would not expect, if he were coming back to the QEH as a consultant, for him to get less than a figure of that order.

A Minister is full time, he is not part time like the honourable Member is part time, or like I am part time in this House. If you are a lawyer, like some of the Ministers on the front bench, you have to give up your practice, you destroy everything you have built during the years, and, as I have found, you have to fight to build it back when you go back. You have nothing you can set down for yourself, and it seems to me but reasonable that if the honourable Member believes that it is a reasonable remuneration for a full time consultant at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to draw \$150 000, the honourable Member cannot argue with any conscience that to remunerate a Minister, or a Permanent Secretary, or a Prime Minister at the level we propose in here is unreasonable in the context of Barbados.

Do you know what is the problem we are having in the society? That people with responsibility must not be remunerated. But any salesman who sells insurance can earn \$167 000, he can earn \$250 000, and you never hear a word about it. Any person who is running a shirt factory, who never got past a first grade school, who comes in the island as a has-been from somewhere like Guyana, can come in here and set up a shirt factory, use the resources of the national position and turn up and be making a quarter of a million dollars, driving around in the same Mercedes car, live in a big plantation house like some of the members of the Democratic Labour Party who live in plantation houses, and travel first class when sometimes I travel tourist class. You have some of them up by Lammings in your constituency, Sir.

The honourable Member sees nothing wrong with that in our society. He is not going to be disgusted

enough to ask them to resign office in his party. There is nothing wrong with that in the society.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member for St. Michael West who has now come in has probably now come to defend his friend, but I can speak from the perspective that I have sat as a Minister and I know what was the take home pay when I went into Government and what it is now. I am also speaking from the perspective that I carry out my profession and I earn from it, and I have an idea of what private sector persons, including self-employed people, earn.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member cannot grudge me if I get up at 3 o'clock and work, or if I have a greater knowledge of the law than some people.

The point is that I think we must stop giving the public the sort of attitude which the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is giving, that there is a tremendous raid on the Treasury. Let me in fairness say that on the political hustings I think each one of us at some stage has used that kind of argument, even if we are now in Government, and I am appealing to the political parties to get some understanding of a few things. It is a different argument if honourable Members are going to say that they do not agree with the methodology which is now being used, or the relativity which is being taken. If you want to tell me that you do not agree that we should peg them to civil servants salaries forever and ever, Amen, I understand; that you want an independent tribunal to tell you the same thing, I can understand that you are taking a point of logic. But once you have decided that your salaries are going to be pegged on a relativity to civil servant salaries, I believe that you must accept that there is nothing extraordinary in the level of salaries that you have seen here.

6.15 p.m.

I think that what the Government should do, without interfering with the privacy of individuals, is to commission a manpower study of the earnings of top people in different sectors in this community, not publishing any individual's salaries. I think the honourable Member would then be satisfied that parliamentarians are in no special class in this community, given their responsibilities. He would find out that Assistant Managers of banks earn more than Ministers, with their allowances and their perquisites. He will find out that Branch Managers of insurance companies do the same. He will find out that insurance salesmen are way above. He will find out that, by and large, several people in the manufacturing sector are in most ways above. He will also find out that in the professional class, most people are at

least equal to, and some way above, Ministers. I think that he would come to the fair conclusion — he is a man who is very rational when he wants to be and when he is not going after political clam — that in the context of Barbados, the cost of carrying 27 Members of Parliament and 13 Ministers at the level, given the Gross Domestic Product of this country and having regard to their responsibility, is not exceptional, and he could not put forward a proper case to say that it is otherwise.

I hope that Ministers would be rid of this fear of the public on matters of this nature. I think one has to be open to the public. What the public expects of us in public life and expects of its Ministers is that there will be service given for the remuneration paid, and the public wants to see that that work is effective, that we are widening the cake so that we can give to those at the bottom much more than they are at present given. I believe that the total cost to the Treasury of running Parliament and paying parliamentarians is less than one per cent of the Gross Domestic Product of this country. I wish I could say the same for some other countries. The honourable Member knows that.

This is one of my grouses. I hope that the Government, in due course, will give some consideration to relating pension not only to the office which you hold at the time, but to the length of service in this House. It cannot be correct that the Right Honourable Member for St. John, or the Honourable Leader of the House, who are the two most senior Members in this House, and then the Right Honourable Prime Minister, should find that their pensions depend on whether or not they held ministerial office at the particular time and that their length of Public Service is not counted. This is not a new thesis from me. The former honourable Member for St. Philip South Mr. Reynold Weekes, God bless him, gave faithfully of service to this House and to the nation, and I believe that if you look at the level of pension that he is getting today, having regard to the number of years of dedicated service he gave at the grass roots level, no one could seriously say that he was really properly remunerated.

I do not want to hear the argument that you have to do thirty-three and a half years as a civil servant and then you get your pension. If it is necessary, allow the basis of duration of service to count in the duration of pension as well. I have no quarrel with that so far as the Civil Service is concerned. Probably you can lengthen the period of service before you get full pension. But it seems to me a little unfair that older parliamentarians, like Mr. Weekes — and I am sure he does not want to be singled out — after having given 18 or 20 years in this House, should not have it counted.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central longs to have the crown upon his head, he longs

to be Prime Minister of the country. It is a very heavy responsibility. It is becoming increasingly a heavier responsibility. It has made the honourable Member for St. John aged more rapidly than one would have expected. I hope the Right Honourable Member for St. Thomas would not age too rapidly under the burden of office. Sometimes you do everything right, and for most of the people you do everything wrong when you have to take a harsh decision. Honourable Members must recognize this.

I do not believe that any one of us in the private sector, in self-employment, have the difficult decisions to take as consistently as the decisions call for by somebody holding the office of Prime Minister, or indeed holding the office of Minister. I do not know of any Bank Manager who is called upon to make up his mind on a matter of security and the sort of questions that I have seen confronting the Prime Minister of this country and the Ministers who have to make those decisions and would be paid in the manner in which some of the Ministers are paid.

I think we are fortunate in the country not to have had any scandals and any skeletons in the bosom of either political parties in these instances. The honourable Member knows that Barbados is today, and has been for some time, one of the best run countries in the world. You must pay for good management, whether it be from your civil servants or from the top political directorate. The honourable Member knows that. In the private sector the honourable Member remunerates a person with the qualification of a good manager, and outside the honourable Member's bipartisan stance, the honourable Member would admit that the Government is well run. He may say that he is capable of running it better, as we said of the Democratic Labour Party, and maybe his time will come, but he must not go around giving the impression that there are mercenaries over here — I think that is one of the words he used today — grabbing the public wealth.

If the honourable Member's party should regain power soon, I would have no quarrel with the fact of remunerating on a proper level whichever Member over there, whether it is the Right Honourable Member for St. John, the honourable Member for St. Michael South, the honourable Member for St. Michael West or the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, holds a high office in this country. I believe I have seen it all, and I believe that I can fairly say that I will have no quarrel with that, once they perform their jobs properly. I would quarrel about how they perform their jobs if I am not getting the productivity that I want.

6.25 p.m.

Can I seriously quarrel with a person in the position of any of those four honourable Members who would have to give up their profession? The honourable Member

for St. Michael West is in law and in consultancy management. Should he destroy everything and start again? Some of us do not have stores. The honourable Member knows that. The honourable Member knows that if he gives up his full-time practice, he is probably going to pass on 5 000, 6 000 or 7 000 patients, and he is not going to get back to that when he starts back until he has been at it for another five or six years. The honourable Member knows that when he is on in years, when he has landed in his fifties going to his sixties, as has happened to the Right Honourable Member for St. John, coming back in his sixties to the Bar, you have not got the same zest, you have not got the same strength, you have not got the same push to build up again. So it is a figment for people to keep saying that in these circumstances parliamentarians should not be properly remunerated.

In your own case, Mr. Speaker, the amount of time that you have to devote to debates in here, the time you have to devote to your constituency, for running the affairs of Parliament, to disrupting your life by going all over the world on conferences that people think are so great, must be considered.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central looks after his constituents, he tells me, well. I have never approached him at Christmas in order to give me some money to help with my household, but I am sure that there are several other persons, his constituents, that do that to him.

Sir, parliamentarians are totally exposed all the time. They are the greatest contributors to charity. They contribute more to charity than the normal person. This is one of the other aspects of salary. There is no honourable Member in this House who has been a parliamentarian for any length of time who can honestly say that he has not had all the time to be pulling their pockets to support charity, help individuals on a compassionate basis, fund scholarships, look after people in the sporting world and sign guarantees if we pay for them. The honourable Member does not consider that risk. That is part of the risk and sacrifice which is remunerated in the private sector by what is called "other collateral fringe benefits". The honourable Member knows that.

I will support this Resolution, and I am sure the people of Christ Church West will also support it.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the soundest point made, in my respectful opinion, is the point made by the honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin), that it is best to deal with all the persons in the lower salary grades first, lest you attract the accusation of looking after the people at the top and, inferentially, oneself. The fact is that agreement was reached with the Permanent Secretaries at the end of

last March or April about the same time as it was reached with the NUPW for the great mass of civil servants. We have been trying to deal with the other regradings, but we have not had applications until during the middle of the year. As I recall, I became aware of the extent of the applications for regrading only when I had a meeting with the NUPW after its elections, and I remember I put to them something which I am sure the Cabinet is glad they rejected, and when honourable Members opposite and Your Honour hear it, no doubt you will be glad they rejected it.

I actually put to them that since Permanent Secretaries were being regraded at a level higher than the increases given to the bottom, that they should not get the 5 per cent increase in the second year. I asked them why not regard regradings for Permanent Secretaries, and consequentially Ministers, as being a regrading for the whole two-year period, and not something that persons who had been regraded would receive. The NUPW told me no. I indicated to them that I would be going ahead with the regrading, and they said that, of course, they want consideration for the others and we understand it will take time. So I think, based on the fact that the NUPW knows that the Government is giving serious thought to the regradings for which they have applied, although there are many proposals with which we will not agree I am sure, they will not quarrel at the particular aspect of timing that the honourable Member has found dangerous, if we bear in mind that many of the proposals made on behalf of other civil servants deal with persons in the middle and upper grades who have benefited from the regradings that we have already passed and only a few deal with the lowest grades.

I really cannot remember anything between the School Meals workers and the welfare officers. I cannot recall any application for changes in salary levels between these points. If the honourable Member bears that in mind, he will see that coincidence of time for bringing these salaries is not too offensive.

I have listened to the debate, Mr. Speaker, and most of the debate has covered the entire subject of increases, although what is before the House is only the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, the Chairman of Committees, the Leader of the Opposition and private Members of the House. The Ministers' salaries have not come out yet. I therefore do not propose to speak at any great length about them in case there is another debate when that Resolution comes up.

I am not therefore going to deal at too great length with the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. Sufficient to say that I do not agree with him, I do not believe in his sincerity much as I do not believe that he has never met Sidney Alleyne. I cannot believe

that he thinks that Members of Parliament should not get increases merely because there is poverty in the society. Some societies tried this and all have rejected it. Israel had a most comprehensive attempt at equality of salaries in recent times. I am not speaking of Russian policy before Lenin introduced any fee in 1921; that only went on for a year or so and then had to be abandoned in disorder. Israel tried it and they found they could not get people to accept responsibility. There is still a place in society for the reward of merit and the reward of responsibility; there is still a place in society for paying salaries adequate to attract talent and capacity.

The entry of the honourable Member into politics has, in my opinion, deterred some decent people from coming forward, since they are afraid of the pitfalls of political life, in which the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central plays an important part. Having heard him, I was going to say that if I had to choose between people who crave money and people who crave power, I might choose people who crave money. But I realise that that would not be an apposite metaphor, because I think the honourable Member craves both money and power, or he craves money in his private life.

He has never been known as a forbearing charger of fees to persons, poor and rich people alike. He is the antithesis of socialist medicine. If he does not know this, in communist countries there is a very strong view that persons should not make large sums of money out of human suffering, and, therefore, the medical profession is not well paid in communist countries compared to certain sorts of manual labour. It is not at all well paid compared to the rewards of artistic or sporting merit, and indeed occupies quite a low position, generally, on the financial scale of earnings in the Soviet Union itself, where three quarters of the doctors are women, who are, in general, not as well paid as men, even in the socialist paradise.
6.35 p.m.

He is at the other antithesis. He, I think, represents what, to my mind, is worst in American society. I think that if there is one block in the American society, it is the cost of medical care and the determination with which the medical profession has been able to keep its earnings high, the determination to make money out of disease and suffering.

The honourable Member comes to the House regularly and attacks politicians for being money grabbers, to use his own phrase, for reaching at a dollar and for not exercising restraint in salary levels. Yet, he likes to contemplate consultants at the hospital who are making money out of people's sickness, catching people at their most vulnerable, at times when people will pay anything because they believe that their lives may thereby be saved. He can cynically say on the floor of the House that 80 per cent of all ailments which he sees would get between

if the person did not go to a doctor, and yet say that doctors should be paid twice as much as Ministers of Government who have to make day-to-day decisions which, ultimately, will be the governing principles as to whether somebody has to feed ten children on a half tin of pilchards or not. I quote that example because it is obviously so exaggerated an example as one in which we can put no trust.

The Rules of the House do not forbid us to quote statements that honourable Members make outside the House, and I am not going to quote at any length. I am only going to say that, however reasonable and sincere the honourable Member appears, I have to recall that from time to time I read transcripts and hear tapes of the honourable Member saying how I get paid more than Margaret Thatcher — a palpable falsehood — and reading out the names of sixteen or seventeen Members of Parliament who owe the Barbados National Bank \$1 000 000 or more, or half million dollars or more, or quarter million dollars or more, knowing that these statements are false. Ordinary common sense tells me that I must disbelieve him, as I say when he tells us that he tells us that he does not know Sidney Alleyne, and must disbelieve his sincerity.

I also know something about the honourable Member, his judgment and his intemperance of spirit when I hear that on a platform the honourable Member describes one of his former patients who suffers from some slight skin ailment — I refer to the Leader of the House — as “Slimy, poxy Lionel Craig”. I am very sorry that CBC did not broadcast that. Left to me, that should be broadcast every month in Barbados to tell people the kind of man that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is, to let people know what they are dealing with when they deal with that honourable gentleman over there. In the light of that, I think that none of us have to take very seriously what he says about the avariciousness of Members, or what he pretends to judge about the motives that the Government has in increasing Members’ salaries.

This Resolution deals with the non full-time Members of the House. It may be that some of the salaries are handsome for part-time work, but we have a cure for that. It is certainly true that a salary of \$23 436 rising to \$24 612 is not a high salary for a Member of Parliament part-time or not. When one thinks that the wife of a Member of Parliament works as a secretary in a quasi-statal organization in Barbados at a much higher salary than her husband, I really do not think that someone who has to put up with the platform politics of this country, as practised by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, can be arguably overpaid at less than \$2 000 per month.

Other honourable Members have spoken. The honourable Member for St. Michael West Central have

outlined some of the difficulties of being a Member of Parliament in this country. From time to time, when you attend Parliament, you are booed. Even though twenty-six of us are brave to come and face the boos, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, for all his bravery in talking about “poxy, slimy Lionel Craig” on the platform when nobody can reply, was the only Member of the Opposition to hide from the crowd when the honourable Member for St. Peter took his seat. Some of us are booed. Some of us have the knowledge that there are people trying to kill us, perhaps encouraged, for all I know paid. There is a statement on the police files — if the honourable Member wants to talk about warrants, I can talk about statements — about people saying they were paid to kill the Prime Minister by..... I go no further. Some of us have to put up with all that.

We have to put up with an extremely politicized society, small, in which, as I said once before in here and was misunderstood, it is uncomfortable sometimes to shop because of the crowd of well-wishers, and people who want to discuss politics with you, who make it difficult for you to carry out ordinary purchases as an ordinary citizen. We have not yet reached the stage where Ministers, far less Members of Parliament, have to be surrounded by security and insulated from the general public, but nonetheless, living in the public eye is a matter of strain for many people. It is a strain on the family life of many persons. It is a strain on the pockets of many persons. A member of Parliament dare not acquire money, lest he be accused by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central of being a millionaire. You cannot make an investment. You cannot own a motor car a little out of the ordinary without it being commented on. If you do not spend money, you are a miser. If you do spend money, they want to know where you get it from. All of this is part of life as a politician in Barbados.

Some of us like the life. Some of us are moved by a spirit of public service. Certainly some of us stay in public life as a result of the spirit of public service. Some of us are in it because it satisfies our inner cravings for power. We are driven by demonic forces well understood in psychiatric literature throughout the ages. The Latin and the Greek classics afford ample examples of persons driven by demonic forces until they end up either destroying themselves or the very country or people that they are there to serve. For whatever reason, people do come forward into public life.

I do not think that the salaries which I am recommending to the House today in this Resolution are unreasonable. They certainly cannot be described as a burden to the taxpayer. The entire package of Civil Service and parliamentary increases will result in a cost of no more than \$1.5 million, and out of that, some

40 per cent at average tax rates or marginal incomes of the persons concerned, is estimated to return to revenue. Certainly you cannot say that these proposals will be a burden on the taxpayers in a country where Government expenditure exceeds \$600 million. I recommend to the House that they pass this Resolution to bring into force the Senate and House of Assembly (Remuneration and Allowances of Members) Order, 1984.

6.45 p.m.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): Sir, most of what could possibly be said on this has, in my respectful submission, been said on the earlier Orders. I do not want to have any quarrel with the honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin), but I have not had, as far as I can judge, a 14 per cent or any different increase. My salary has not been regraded but revised.

I have yet again been put under some pressures, because when the Cabinet Paper was put to me to deal with these salaries, my note on it was that I was really not aware that the salary adjustments for the judges, Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister were the 1984 increases. I really hesitate to say this, but in the interest of honourable Members who do not wish me ill and members of the general public, who do not, I think, wish me ill, and Gladstone Holder, who I do not think wishes me ill either, in fact the salary of the Prime Minister has only been increased in the most technical way, in so far as if you added the Prime Minister's tax free emoluments to his taxable emoluments they may have come to a lesser sum than the April revision. But the Prime Minister's pay cheque at the end of the month is virtually the same as it was in the year 1980, although taxation has been reduced since then, and it would be less were it not by some odd circumstances, which I only discovered quite recently, I had gone on paying the \$25 a week increase all during this year, but the \$25 a week increase represents the difference between the take home pay of the Prime Minister in 1984 and the take home pay of the Prime Minister in 1980. The occupation of Ilaro Court is the rest of the increase. That is where the increase really lies, but that is only a small, personal and perhaps trivial point.

The judges, the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister have agreed, although this was not the premise on which their salaries were rearranged, that those salaries would stand as our 1984 increases.

The civil servants negotiated on the basis that the judges would get a new increase. It was unclear from the civil servants' memorandum what they would do when the judges got the new increase, but there was an inference to be drawn that they would then ask for a new regrading. In all the circumstances, I think it is reasonable to ask those of us who are highly paid members of society — His Excellency the Governor-General also, although we are not going to deal with his emoluments until next year — to retain the rearranged salaries for 1984, and that they share only in the 5 per cent increase which everybody is getting completely across the board in 1985.

That disposes of the top salaries. However, the entertainment allowances, which have not been raised for four and a half years, will now be raised. No change has been proposed in the travelling allowances.

The point about the Ministers has been made at length in the Civil Service Resolution, and remarks were made generally. They are put at the same level as the puisne Judges. Parliamentary Secretaries have long been underpaid, in my view. The comments made about pensions by the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) are as much comments on the under payment of Parliamentary Secretaries as on the pension provisions, and I do not think that their rearrangement is unreasonable. They will be getting less than the Leader of the Opposition or His Honour the Speaker, a situation which the Leader of the Opposition prior to 1976 was never allowed in his wildest dreams to think could happen, but I believe that their remuneration, although not generous or extravagant, is adequate for the function which they perform.

I will touch on the matter of pensions, which I did not deal with on a previous Resolution. We have already in the last five years increased the time it takes to earn a pension. The Press is full of reports every time parliamentarians improve their conditions of service. It is quite empty of any reports that parliamentarians voluntarily accepted a reduction in their terms of service, and there will always be members of the Press whose pencils are held in their hands, not writing, not paying any attention when something like this is said, or when the Government is speaking, but who pay active and great attention when the Opposition is speaking, who indeed is observed to rush out of the House as soon as their paymaster has sat down, if I am allowed to say that under the Rules of the House. There will always be people who see the things that they consider as bad and put the Government in bad light, but not perhaps the things that put the Government in a good light.

The fact is that when we came in there were three levels of pension, one of which could be earned after, if

I remember correctly, six years. So you got a situation where former Senator Leroy Brathwaite, who has never faced the electorate in his life, is getting a bigger pension than Mr. Frank Walcott, who had 32 years, and more consecutively, in the House of Assembly or the Senate. His pension is something like \$130 or \$150 a month.

There may very well be a case for going further than we have gone. As far as I remember, the qualification for a minimum pension now is ten years or two full sessions amounting to eight years or more, and to get a full pension is 15 years or three full sessions amounting to 12 years or more. Not that I have now been in the House eighteen years, but there may very well be a case for applying calculation principles as used in the Civil Service Act to Members of Parliament.

6.55 p.m.

I was very surprised at having suggested to me in a particular problem by an officer of a particular para-statal organisation, that Members of Parliament pension principles should be applied to that organization. Rather than having the public continue to think that Members of Parliament get exceptionally generous pensions, it really might be better to make our pensions conform a little more with accepted pension principles. Certainly, I think, we could re-open the whole question of the contributions and examine the relationship of parliamentary pensions and insurance pensions.

These are all matters which, perhaps, could all be taken up in the future. If they were to be taken up, I would like to think that the Democratic Labour Party, which has come full circle now from the arrogant days of 1978 when they expected to be back in power on the basis of playing big and spurning the Government when it sought the use of a Select committee and the co-operation; when it was grand enough to think that this Government would not be able to run the country unless it had Dems on the statutory corporations; when what we thought was a favour to them — they had the insolence to think so — and maybe we were also punished for our acute risks in thinking that we could do them favours — after these days of mutual punishment, although we have not been punished too severely, perhaps days of co-operation might arise and a Standing Committee of Parliament might very well evolve to examine the terms and conditions of Members in the service. Perhaps Parliament could amend the Debates Committee Act to give the Debates Committee some kind of responsibility for dealing with the service of members as well as the service of staff.

On this point, I should draw to Your Honour's attention, and the attention of the Clerk of Parliament, that the Minister responsible for Establishments has not been asked to approve any scheme of revised salaries for the officers from Parliament. I have expressed my support

for the Deputy Clerks of Parliament receiving the same salaries as Members at the bottom of the Administrative Officers grade. I have been canvassed, to put it no higher than that, for making the Clerkship of Parliament a full time job on the same salary scale as that of the Registrar of the Supreme Court, and the idea has found some favour put forward as a casual proposal, although I cannot commit myself to it until it is put forward properly and I see exactly what is involved.

I also think that those officers of Parliament, whose salaries would put them at the levels where there should be some regrading, should receive the regrading as soon as possible. But I want to say this, and I am absolutely, Mr. Speaker, not in any way criticizing the Barbados Workers' Union or seeking to canvass its members over its head, but the connection with the Barbados Workers' Union has brought nothing but trouble to the staff of Parliament. If they are going to stay as members of the Barbados Workers' Union, and continue to regard that body as its bargaining unit, the bargaining unit ought to realize that there are some differences in bargaining for the staff of Parliament and in bargaining for the port or the electric company, or wherever. First of all, we had a Clerk of Parliament who was also the Union Shop Steward, and who was dismissed from his service because of breach of confidentiality. Secondly, we had a situation where, because the Union has not come to any agreement for other public servants, it evidently cannot come to any agreement for the staff of Parliament.

The proposals for civil servants will, in the end, produce better conditions to the staff of Parliament than they are asking for through the union representatives. This is gratuitous, it is not anything that the union could have predicted, but the fact is that if the staff of Parliament were not being recalcitrant through its appointed representatives in its salaries negotiations, they would have got their money long ago. The Government's policy is not, in this case, to impose any settlement on the staff of Parliament. If they want to wait two, three or 5 years — as far as I am concerned, subject perhaps to the Clerk and Deputy Clerks, the views of Government is a matter of policy, and they can wait that length of time.

We have had to do this with other organizations. We had to do it with the BMC on one occasion, just break negotiations, pay our offer and wait on the union. If the staff of Parliament wants this, the Government is happy to do it. If it wants to agree at the standard Public Service salary agreement, equally the Government is happy to do this. If the staff wishes to wait, it is entirely up to the staff. I would point out, however, that waiting time has brought them right up to Christmas, and to that extent broken the Government's resolution that we wanted to settle all Public Service matters before the end of this year. I trust that with these few words to the staff, we can get these negotiations out of the way.

Mr. Speaker, I am not one of those people who say that I have never appeared in the House to move myself an increase in salary. On this occasion, however, I am moving myself no increase in salary, but an increase in entertainment allowance, and I am moving increases in salaries for Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I beg to second that.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great care to the debate that took place on the other Resolution, and I want to assure all honourable Members that where I stand on a matter of principle.....

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, it is now 7.05 p.m. and I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended until 7.45 p.m. this evening for dinner.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.
7.05 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Put the question, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, on each occasion that we have had debates on the salaries of Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries, there has been a considerable amount of debate in this Parliament. Unlike the Right Honourable Prime Minister, I believe that many of the views held by Members on the other side, though wrong, are probably sincere. They are sincere in their wrong-headedness about their approach to this whole matter of the remuneration of the Prime Minister, Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries. There is clearly a gulf between myself and them on that matter, a gulf that cannot be bridged, because we start off from fundamentally different approaches to the matter.

If you were to look at the salaries as proposed here, the total salary of the Prime Minister will amount to some \$115 200, of which \$30 000 would be entertainment allowance, which is free of income tax, and an official car. When that is converted into a taxable salary, to get its true value in relation to private sector personnel, you are talking about a considerable amount of

money well in excess of \$115 000. I presume that if the \$30 000 was not tax free, he would probably be paying 60 per cent on that, so you can see what figure \$30 000 is 60 per cent of and add that on to \$115 000, and then you arrive at the true figure for comparisons with other salaries within the community. Then, there can be no doubt that that salary is way out of line.

The same applies to the salary of the Deputy Prime Minister, which amounts to \$92 400. If you were to convert the tax free component of \$20 400 and an official car into taxable salary, you will see that you are probably talking about a considerable amount of money well in excess of \$92 400.

Other Ministers gross some \$81 864. Again when the tax free component of some \$25 000 is converted to taxable salary, you are talking about amounts well in excess of \$100 000, or nearly \$100 000, assuming that they would be paying the marginal rate of income tax.

I do not think that these salaries bear any relation to what exist in Barbados, and it is a very dangerous practice to try to relate the salaries paid in public office to politicians with those paid in the private sector. Recently, I have been looking very closely at the salary paid to senior officers in a few para-statal organisations, and there is one in particular where when you look at the salary and allowance and the perks of travel and the paraphernalia to maintain that particular office, you are probably talking about half a million dollars. When you look at all the other paraphernalia that surrounds the keeping and maintenance of the Prime Minister, you will see that there are vast sums of money being spent in that area, so we have to be very careful not to make these comparisons.

I believe that there are some businessmen in this country who could keep on travelling 26 weeks in the year, who may have the cash to do so and who may have an income from their businesses to do so. The problem is that if they proceeded to travel 26 weeks in the year first class and all that kind of thing, even if they have the money, they would not be able to pay the kind of attention to their business, and in a short period of time they would not have the money. So we have to be very clear that we are looking at the totality of expenses in relation to offices and not just look at the figures handed out here on a sheet of paper.

It is from this perspective that I am sure I am sincere in the positions that I take on these matters. I prefer to be guided by the lives of people like the late Sir Grantley Adams and of the Right Honourable Member for St. John, who have been able to make major contributions to this country with little or no concern for their personal rewards. I believe that that is the spirit that

should guide us all in public life, rather than the belief that because you hold a particular office, you should either be remunerated at a comparable level with public servants or the private sector.

In the same spirit, and with the same underlying principles, I believe that we should detach ourselves from Civil Service-type thinking in relation to the political directorate of this country. I am all in favour, and I said so in 1978, in 1980 and in 1982, and I will say so again now, of the pension arrangement for parliamentarians. I believe that they should be improved on. I believe that no parliamentarian who has served this country for any length of time, having served faithfully, should be allowed to live at a level below what one would consider reasonable, when he leaves office, and it is not beyond us to devise a pension system not necessarily related in the traditional manner to salaries as obtains in the Public Service.

I think there are different concepts and principles, that would have to apply to political office. In the Public Service a man gets a pension that is based on the highest salary he has had. I believe that you can work out an instrument for a politician where you can make sure that when he leaves office, his pension would not fall below a minimum level. I am committed to that, I feel strongly about that, and I feel that I would never like to see a situation arise in this country where money can be a determinant of whether one seeks to remain in office or not, because I can foresee the dire consequences of that, and I make no apologies for so saying.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) clearly did not hear the views that I had expressed very clearly on the questions of pensions. I even went so far as to point out that I would be very much in favour of incentives for leaving office rather than incentives to remain in office. So this gap is a gap of principle. It is a conceptual gap which I do not think can be narrowed, and each time we have this kind of Resolution before the House, I am prepared to make my contribution in the same spirit. I am prepared to stand up and be attacked all day, because I am not going to deviate on a matter which I can well foresee can lead us into serious problems in the future.

I think this whole question of relationships and relativities to the Public Service is a fundamentally false concept in respect of the remuneration of Parliamentarians, and I feel that some other principles have to be evolved. I also feel very strongly that what we are doing here in terms of remuneration of Ministers, Parliamentary Secretaries and the Prime Minister by seeking various allowances and such in order to ensure that they receive a given net income, because of the tax free component of it, is wrong. I believe that we should address ourselves to a wider problem, which relates to the fact that there

needs to be substantial tax cuts for people in these upper income levels so that you do not have to go through this kind of roundabout mechanism in order to ensure that a given income is arrived at, and this should apply to the Prime Minister, Ministers of Government and parliamentarians; in fact, the entire community.

7.55 p.m.

I think that Ministers put themselves in a bad light when, by devising and structuring their remuneration in this way, they are admitting in point of fact that the tax system is so punitive that the only way that they can get a reasonable net income, and pension in due course, is to divide up their salaries between taxable and non-taxable components. My view is that this matter should be simplified, and if you are seriously thinking of monetary rewards as an attraction for managerial personnel at any level in this country, I think you should focus on your punitive tax system, rather than be focussing on the levels of salaries paid, because it makes no sense in the long run for many people even receiving the higher salary.

Many people outside are concerned about the tax free element of remuneration of Ministers of Government because they see the Ministers as the persons who are ultimately responsible for the taxes that they have to pay. There are not many people who have tax free privileges attached to their income and they are justifiable in asking if the Ministers can devise this sort of arrangement for themselves, why can they not restructure the tax system in such a way that the net figure that they arrived at on their gross figure cannot apply to the entire community? That is a wider problem which I should address myself to in due course. Indeed, at the moment I do not think it is premature to say that one is looking very closely at having a multi-disciplinary approach to the total tax system in Barbados, with a view, in due course, to recommending to this House serious cuts at all levels of income tax in Barbados.

It has been said that you have to pay these salaries as an incentive against corruption. Again, I cannot accept that as an argument. If people are going to be corrupt, they are going to be corrupt — no matter what you pay them. Let us get that straight. Some of the biggest thieves in the world are some of the richest people in the world. We have seen, for example, in a neighbouring territory where politicians have traditionally been well rewarded, a saga of corruption that has been unprecedented as far as revelations are concerned in any Caribbean country. And when you look at the reports of the Commission of Enquiry, and you see the vast sums of money actually handled by politicians, not only through salary and legitimate emoluments but also through various forms of probable corruption, then you will see that the argument that a high salary insulates an individual from the temptation to get involved in corrupt practices is quite fallacious.

I think the reverse can work from time to time, because persons not accustomed to high levels of remuneration can find themselves in a situation where they over-extend themselves because of easy access to money, without having to go through the processes of training which many professional people may have to go through. They suddenly get a high income, have not developed the necessary kind of savings experience, and then the next thing you know they find themselves very over-extended. In other words, you can catapult people into a level of spending with which they are not accustomed and which eventually can lead them in further trouble, and in fact, can be a factor which has led them down the path of corruption. So I cannot buy the argument that high salaries represent any insulation against corruption.

I really cannot take the Right Honourable Member for St. Thomas too seriously when he says he does not believe in my sincerity. He does not believe that I have ever met Sidney Alleyne. Of course, he never believes that I have never met Maurice Bishop. In fact, he does not believe that I cannot do an abortion. I have never seen one done, as a matter of fact. The way your training is structured, you go right in a specialist line and you never get exposed to that kind of thing. These are facts of life, as difficult as it is to believe.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have never done one. I have never seen one done. It is as simple as that.

There was some talk of people charging high fees in private practice. To survive in Barbados, build up and maintain a practice, if your fees are not reasonable, you do not last too long. It is as simple as that. Those who last over time, whatever they are in, last because the structure is right and their results are good. As a matter of fact, I think that the constant tax on my profession by the Barbados Labour Party has served me in good stead, because what I find is that people often come to your office carrying four or five times as much money as what your fee really is. I never get a problem in getting paid for a first visit. I hope that the propaganda continues, and I shall do my best to continue it. It has always stood me in good stead when they say that I am a millionaire. I encourage that kind of thing, and I would even go so far as to encourage them now to start saying that I am a multi-millionaire. It serves you very well in politics.

I really believe that there is a basic obscenity relating to these increases, and I am sincere in what I say. I believe we are going down the wrong road. I believe that we need to look back a bit at the lives of those people who have served this country, particularly during the period 1935-1976, and see the kind of life

that they have been able to live. I believe that we can learn a lot from that.

You do not need money to establish yourself in this society at any level. It is your character that matters. It is not what people say your character is. It is your contact with people from day to day and their determination of what they feel about you that ultimately determines what happens to your position, negatively or positively, in this society.

I do not anticipate that the honourable Member for St. Thomas would give any due weight to questions of integrity when it comes to a matter of money, for the simple reason that I think that he is always blinded by cash in his consideration of matters before Parliament, whether dealing with taxation or otherwise. He is a cash man. He is not a man who understands the elements of wealth either in the public or private domain. He is the sort of man who can mislead the former Attorney General into believing that when he invited him to lunch in Brussels and did not have any money in his pocket and the former Attorney General had to pay, that that was the first time he had done that. But he has been doing that for the past thirty years!

8.05 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir: I would like to be able to think it is true. Somebody once told me, approvingly of Pierre Trudeau, a very similar story, and I believe the honourable Member may have got it from the same source. Unfortunately, I hate to disabuse him. So far as I know, the former Attorney General, the honourable Member for Christ Church West, and I have never been in Brussels together. I am sorry to spoil a beautiful story by proving what a liar the honourable Member is, but I cannot help it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think you can call an honourable Member a liar.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: All I can say is that the honourable Member for Christ Church West related a similar story to us here. I may be mistaken about Brussels, but he related the story that you had invited him somewhere. You were not here, but the story was related on the floor of this House, and I just smiled. I notice that the honourable Member did not deny that he had done it several times in the previous 25 years.

I believe I have made the point. It is quite clear that there is a difference of opinion. This is a difficult matter, and from the kind of emotions that I see generated in this debate today, and in previous debates, and the kind of discussion I recall that took place in a previous debate outside of Parliament among Members on both sides, I really believe that there is a genuine and funda-

mental difference, I certainly do not seek to exploit this for political gains, but I recognise the dangers.

I will invite the Right Honourable Minister of Finance, now that he is in his seat, to seriously reflect on what it actually cost to keep para-statal individuals that want pension provisions similar to those in Parliament. I will not call any names, because it might not be within the province of this debate, but you can think of certain financial institutions and other para-statal bodies, and examine carefully not only the up-front salary and perks, but see exactly what it costs the taxpayers of Barbados to keep those people in office, and ask yourself whether it can be justified. Then ask yourself the question whether or not those people might not be following the same kind of thinking which underlies the sort of presentations that I have heard today by yourself and other members on that side. This thing tends to mushroom. People tend to follow the examples of the political directorate, and I certainly believe that the time has long gone when the Minister of Finance really has to put his foot down in many of those areas, and we are talking about many millions of dollars.

When I attack this Resolution on these broad principles, I do so not only to focus attention on the total cost of maintenance of the political directorate of Barbados, but to make it known that there is also a management directorate outside of this where the same kind of thinking has seeped in and pervades those. It is that kind of thinking that would lead an individual to come to a Minister of Finance and suggest to him that he should have the same kind of pension rights as a Minister of Government.

I hope honourable Members understand what I am saying, that we are probably like many communist countries, as the honourable Member for Christ Church West mentioned today but in a different context. We are, in fact, creating an oligarchy in this country which is highly paid, which derives tremendous financial benefits at the expense of the rest of the community. There is a lot of bitterness in the private sector when they compare levels of remuneration, the hours that they have to put in, security of tenure of jobs, and also the absence of risks in the public sector. There are a lot of people in the private sector who would fully agree with me when I say that enough is enough.

I am not trying to deprive any honourable Member of the right to a reasonable life in the performance of his duties, in order to meet the demands of his family. I think that these are legitimate demands and that they should be met. What I am saying is that the kind of articulation of the reasons for these increases is exceedingly dangerous, and indeed has already created a climate in this country where people believe that because they can put on the label of management, trained or untrained,

producing or not producing, that that is an entitlement from the State of substantial rewards. As we continue to build up that kind of oligarchic structure within the State and the para-statal apparatus, we have to be very clear what we are dealing with.

I am arguing, and I am appealing, for a reversal of that kind of thinking, and I hope that the next time these matters are dealt with, one would see a salary that is reasonable within a completely altered tax structure, so that you can probably talk about parity, because you cannot really talk about parity between the Ministers and the private sector when there is protection for ministerial salaries of, in some cases, over 30 per cent. In the case of the Prime Minister it is just under 30 per cent, in the case of the Deputy Prime Minister it is about 28 per cent, and in the case of the Ministers it is about 40 per cent basically tax free, so you are not comparing like with like when you do that. I believe that this is going to strike a very raw nerve in a community that is very sensitive to the level of transfers from the individual to the public purse at the moment, and I would urge the Government, when they have finished with their venomous verbal attacks on me, when they can distinguish between the man and what he says, when they recognise that what I am saying has an important significance in terms of the overall management structure of this society, attitudes to management and attitudes to rewards to management, when these things are properly evaluated, to recognise that the warning signs I have been issuing since 1978 might well turn out to be correct.

They tell me that this issue is not an issue of electoral importance. That is not the yardstick by which I measure my presentation on this matter. It does not matter to me whether it is of electoral importance or not. What I am absolutely sure about is that if this attitude permeates that particular stratum in the society, in the long run it is going to be self-defeating.

8.15 p.m.

I will say no more on this particular matter at this time. I can assure you that since it is a gulf that cannot be bridged, I will be casting my vote against these salary increases. I believe that they are utterly unjustified, for the reasons which I have been careful to set out in my brief presentation here this evening.

Hon. L. R. TULL (St. George South): Mr. Speaker, I would have thought that the person perhaps who is least likely to be a moralist in this Parliament is the honourable Member who just sat down, but he preached all afternoon, as he does every time on the question of parliamentary salaries, in a vein that confounds us. There is nothing in his public life that has demonstrated that he believes what he says.

He talked about the type of damage to be done to a society through paying proper salaries to Members of Parliament. Earlier in the day we dealt with increase in salaries for public officers and he did not vote against that, but he intimates now that he would vote against salary increases for Ministers. It is that kind of duplicity that more represents the man than any of the past words that he has spoken.

The honourable Member strikes me as a drunken man who feels that he is the only one in the world who is sober — the rest of the world is drunk and he is the only one that is sober. There is nobody in this Parliament, from the time he has come in, who has agreed with his submission that members of Parliament should not be reasonably compensated. He used the word "reasonable" and he spoke and he spoke, but up to the time he sat down he has not given us any idea what he means by 'reasonable.'

Those of us who are trained in other disciplines believe that the test of reasonableness is an objective test, that it is the test of the average man, as the lawyers say, the man on the Clapham bus. The honourable Member is interested in something entirely subjective. He can in one breath make out a case why he should charge high fees — and I was surprised to hear him say that with such candour, that he charges high fees and it pays off —

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir: The honourable Member is misrepresenting what I said. I said that I charge high fees and people come with money and they can always pay the fee.

Mr. SPEAKER: A point of explanation!

Hon. L. R. TULL: It is a very poor explanation, Sir, because it does not represent what he said. He was trying to make out in his usual manner of boasting that, despite the fact that he charges high fees, he has a lot of patients coming to pay him.

He feels that he is entitled to charge high fees. That is his business. I do not quarrel about people charging in professions. What I do quarrel about is when they charge high fees and walk about and boast about it.

He made a statement about millionaires. I have sat down on the floor of this House on more than one occasion and heard the honourable Member boasting that he is a millionaire. I have not heard it from anybody else. I heard it from him here in this Chamber. That is a measure of the man.

Leopards do not change their spots, and today the honourable Member is no different than he was 30 years ago when I knew him, and it is more than 30 years. He is

the identical person. He strikes me as the kind of man who, as he boasts, is a millionaire, and does not want anybody else to make a living. I think he would be perfectly contented if honourable Members on that side — do not worry about us; we would never go near him — had to pick up their telephones and call him saying they are in trouble and asking him to help out. I think that would bring a great deal of joy to the honourable Member. That is the kind of fellow he is. His contributions to these debates, in my view, are not actuated by any feeling of public policy or any concern for the society that we live in. It is that somehow or the other he has climbed a ladder and he wants to kick it down before anybody else gets near it.

I do not want to go through the long litany of arguments for proper payment for public officers for anybody to suggest to me that I must get paid less than my Permanent Secretary. I do not care who says that these salaries should not be tied to Public Service salaries. I do not care who says that the Government should not bring them, or that it should set up a committee, or should not set up a committee. This honourable Member is saying that he does not believe that his Permanent Secretary should be paid more than he does. That is my principle and I am going to live by it. The honourable Member voted for the Civil Service increases and then said that the Ministers of Government should remain where they are, which is to say that a Permanent Secretary should work for 20 per cent more than his Minister. What nonsense is that? I do not believe that these are the kinds of arguments that would cut any ice on intelligent people in this country.

What I agree with — and, perhaps, it is the only thing he said that I agree with — is that you should not come into politics to make money, that high salaries should not be an incentive for people to come into public life. I do not expect that Ministers of Government should come into Government and expect that we are going to work for as much as the head of the Barbados Shipping and Trading, or the highest paid accountant or lawyer. I believe that there must be an element of sacrifice, but I do not believe that it has to be total sacrifice. We have to pay bills. I have two children to go into University shortly, and I am pulling my hair out over how I am going to raise the money to pay the fees. That is my problem, but for the honourable Member to suggest that somehow or the other, there is massive rape and raid on the Treasury by paying salaries that are approximately the same as those of senior officials in Government to me, is an insult to the intelligence of those who have to listen to it.

The honourable Member kept talking about the pensions for parliamentarians and relating them to pensions in the Civil Service. He talked about salaries and said there should be no relativity with the Civil Service.

When he got into the area of pensions, he wanted relativity with the civil servants. But there is a big difference between pensions for parliamentarians and pensions for civil servants. Civil servants do not contribute to their pensions. I, as a Minister of Government, contribute over \$200 a month towards my pension plan, but when it is put out by people like the honourable Member, the public would believe that somehow or the other.....
8.25 p.m.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I draw to your attention that this House may in fact not have a quorum.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk, will you please count the House?

The CLERK reported to Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please ring the Bell.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member may proceed.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, I was making the point that civil servants do not contribute to their pension. Parliamentarians do. I, as Minister of Government, contribute over \$200 a month to my parliamentary pension plan, and therefore it is a wickedness to spread it abroad that, somehow, Members of Parliament are getting some tremendous largesse from the taxpayers' estate without mentioning the amount of money they have to fork out monthly to their pension plan.

We hear of "transfer of payments", which is the new term they use for the imposts on your salary. They are not transferring them, they take them off the top, so I do not know what transfers they are. I paid the full hilt of the Transport Levy and the Health Levy, the whole lot. I pay, contrary to the belief among many people in this community, income tax. We have a lot of people in Barbados who believe that Ministers of Government and Members of Parliament do not pay income tax. A lot of people I meet believe that. It has to go on Record that I pay full income tax, like any other citizen in this country. There is a feeling that I do not pay duty on anything I buy and bring into the country. I have to pay tax like anybody else.

I had no intention of participating in this debate, because I really think it is a waste of time to spend a whole day debating whether Members of Parliament should get salaries that are in line with other public officers; not private sector people, but in line with people who are being paid from the public purse. But I could not help but be moved to speak when I heard the

honourable Member going on with this endless tirade and this waxing into a lot of piousness and concern for the community and the long term damage that this, according to him will do.

I do not believe that anybody in public life for the last 50 years has done more to create division, strife and discord in the social life of this country than the honourable Member. I have seen the honourable Member actually assault Parliament, a man who has gone out in the byways, held meetings and said how he is going to deal with the Speaker and disrupt the House and all that. I have heard the honourable Member, who talked about long term damage to the community, make the kind of speeches on public platforms that are of such a nature that I sit down in my Chambers and ponder over the words to determine whether it was not time that the Attorney General of Barbados prosecute somebody for sedition. We have not had that since the Constitution was amended in 1973 to give the Attorney General powers to do these prosecutions rather than the Director of Public Prosecutions. I really sit down and wonder at times whether some of the things I hear do not amount to conduct of such a kind as to subvert the peace and stability of this country. This is the honourable Member who gets in here and talks as if he is somehow a man on a moral plain and the rest of us are grubby, little money-grabbers trying to make a fast buck. It is unfair. I would not say it is unworthy of him. I believe that almost anything is worthy of him. He has demonstrated that time and again, but we cannot allow these things to go on the Record without confronting them.

The honourable Member earlier today said that a consultant physician at the hospital should get paid \$120,000 to \$150,000 a year. He said he was in such a post at the hospital ten years ago and that is what they would have to pay him, but he is complaining because Ministers of Government get paid \$62 400, less than half what he suggested.

The honourable Member said that we get a certain pay and get tax free allowances, and he threw it at us. This business of tax free allowances was introduced by the Democratic Labour Party in 1968 when it was the Government. The honourable Member was, by his own words, an important "big shot" in that administration, and he never fought against it. Now he throws it in our lap. These things nettle us.

The honourable Member complained about somebody using a Government vehicle. He said Ministers drive Government vehicles, without saying that when he was a Government employee working at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, he used to use Government equipment for his private patients, and if he challenges me, I will call out the names. What is the difference? When the honourable Member was working as a consultant at the hospital, he

was known to charge patients in the hospital fees as a private doctor, but now comes in here preaching morality.

I am not a man named Johnson. If the honourable Member wants me to say these things at the next public meeting out there, I will say them. I can say them in the yard tonight when we go downstairs; we will call names. He has to understand that if he has two friends in Barbados, I have 200, and that people say these things and that people walk in and hand you receipts.

I was walking through the train line that leads up to Carrington Village on the day of the by-election in 1978 and I was almost literally dragged into a house to an old man, I think he was blind, and handed receipts and heard complaints about these things. But I do not like to get into these little things, I am not like him, so I spoke to the man and forgot about that. So I would prefer to see the honourable Member get up in here and make his usual vitriolic speech about not paying them, because he alone wants money, and, as he says, he is comfortable, he does not have to work again. He says when there is a new National Health Service, he does not have to work any more. He is well cushioned, so nobody else must get a piece.

What disturbs me, however, is the lack of backbone of the other honourable Members on that side. That never happened to me, and I only ask God not to let that happen to me. You do not get up and say what you believe. I was hoping and expecting that honourable Members over there would get up and put him in his place once and for all. He is one man who tries to disrupt the harmony in the whole party. I wish he had me over there. We would fight like two bulls with locked horns, and we would see who has the most to offer in the end. Not a single honourable Member over there agrees with the foolishness that he has been talking in here today or any time there were salary increases. I challenge any of them to get up and tell me that they believe in all the drivel that has been falling out of the side of the mouth of the honourable Member all day. Every year we go through this foolishness and useless charade.
8.35 p.m.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) made a point which I think is quite valid, and which I will be prepared to support, that it is about time that this exercise be taken out of the present framework and put into one that can lead to less contention. I believe so because I think that it degrades people to have to get up and put a case for themselves. I am not good at that. I can make a strong case for other people, but I do not like getting up and making cases for myself. This Chamber has now become a place of "I am all right, Jack." People say how bright they are, how successful they are, how much money they have got and all that, but I am not good at that.

I think that, perhaps, the honourable Member for St. Michael South's proposal should be given greater consideration so that we could take these mundane things, of not as much consequence as the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central say they are, out of this present domain and put them in another arena, where we can go through these things with the good sense, judgment and dignity that is required for Parliamentarians in discussion of matters of this kind. So I want to give the honourable Member for St. Michael South the assurance that he has my support on that particular proposal. I speak for me. The people of St. George South told me that I can speak without reference to anybody else. I really want to hear some of the other Members over there speaking without reference to anybody else. That is a good proposal.

I should also like to think that the debate in respect of salaries and conditions of service of people in Parliament could be removed from the debate dealing with other people. It puts us in a rather invidious position, because, to tell the truth, I am not minded at the moment to make any criticisms of the judges or anybody related to that system. That will come another time because, as one honourable Member said in here today, they are not sacred cows, and there are one or two things that I would be moved to say at another time when we are dealing with an issue before Parliament that is related to that. But I should like to see these things removed from discussions on other persons.

Another thing which I should like is to see the Government abandon the defensiveness when it comes to these things. I have absolutely no intention of being defensive about how I get paid. If the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central wants to come up in Ellerton, St. George, or Workman's where he went to school and cannot even walk through now, or Green's, or Dash Valley, anywhere in my constituency, and hold a public debate with me on a street corner over salaries, he is welcome to come. I cannot ensure his safety, but I have no intention of being defensive in respect of parliamentary salaries. Far from being defensive, I think that what has been put up for Ministers of Government is a little bit of an insult to Ministers. You are paying me \$35 a month more than my Permanent Secretary and telling me that you are doing me a favour! Permanent Secretaries should be well paid, that is why I supported the increases for them in here today, but so should I.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes I work twenty hours a day, day and night. You finish work and then you are about from pillow to post. You go home at night, you have to sit down in front of a tape recorder and do a rough draft of a speech you have to deliver the next day, get up at six o'clock the next morning and play it back and try to transcribe it. You go in to work and work all day long, and in between that, constituents are phoning you and

telling you that their daughter wants a job, or their grandmother has not got a pension yet, or a brother just got arrested at Boarded Hall and needs bailing out. You have to go through all this kind of thing, but I hear the nonsense coming out of the mouth of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central just because he can go around Barbados and boast that he has \$3 million. I do not want \$3 million, but I want to make adequate provision for me and my family. I think that if it is nothing more than what you pay public officers, then it cannot be too much.

I have made my voice clear quite often to my colleagues. I tell them when I think that something was really going beyond the bounds of what is proper. I say without any equivocation that I am not supporting something, I do not think it is right. I do not live at anybody. I live at me; so I can say what I like, when I feel like; and when I see something going beyond the bounds of what is right, I say so.

But this, Sir? This? What is all this talk about? We heard it earlier about pay for professionals. I believe that the lawyers in my Chamber are underpaid. They need more money. Even with these increases, they need more. If you are to get a proper level of officials in this country, you have to pay for them.

I always say that generations of politicians in this country have done this country proud. All over the world, in developing countries, there is turmoil, chaos, social confrontation, starvation, poverty — the whole lot. Generations of politicians in this country have, with very little resources, established the type of political, economic and social system that makes this country carry a reputation far beyond its borders.

The honourable Member talked about corruption in a neighbouring territory. Do you hear that foolishness in Barbados? Politicians do not get the credit they deserve for fashioning the kind of society in which we live in this country, because they have a lot of power and they can use it for good or evil. The politicians over the years — and I am not talking about the Barbados Labour Party — Democratic Labour Party politicians over a period of a number of years, have maintained the kind of standard in this country that people can move on, that there can be social and economic progress, so that Barbados today, through their foresight, their wisdom and their policy, can boast of a standard of living way beyond its means and resources. But the honourable Member comes in here and tries to insult his colleagues and people on the other side.

I really had no intention of getting into this, in a sense, useless debate, because this will be done, whatever the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central says. He likes to say that I am a member of his

family. The facts and the law say otherwise, but if he wants good company, that is his business. If he wants to adopt me as a member of his family, I should like the honourable Member to take some advice from a family member then. The kind of reckless, wanton, irresponsible, self-opinionated, pompous and arrogant statements made by the honourable Member over and over again in Parliament and outside Parliament do nothing other than push us down in the estimation and opinion of decent thinking people in this community. If he has a little sense left — because sometimes I despair for him — he should take the advice of somebody who he wants to adopt as a member of his family.

As he said, "Enough is enough." Unless somebody can apply a brake on him — I do not think that I can — other people have tried and not succeeded — he will fall in the pit and probably take some of us with him. For the first time I throw in my plea for a little moderation in language, a little less excess of words, a little less recklessness in the expression of opinion, the way he abuses people and the disgusting things that the honourable Member says about people who have done him no harm, the way in which he assaults people's personal character for no good reason. If he wants to adopt me as a member of the family, he should take my words.

8.45 p.m.

I think that the proposals put before Parliament today for salaries for Members of Parliament have some flaws, and I would have liked to hear the members of the Opposition deal with those flaws in a constructive way to see where we can work something out. I do not believe that ordinary Members of Parliament get enough money. I do not believe that this money we are putting up today for ordinary Members of Parliament is enough for what we have to go through. I would have expected honourable Members, instead of listening to all this undiluted hogwash coming from one of their members, to put up a proper case based on sound argument for a proper remuneration for ordinary Members of Parliament, and I would have supported it. But you do not hear that. They let one man either mislead them or cow them into silence.

I do not know what we are coming to in this country. I am not accustomed to playing it that way. I do not understand what anybody is coming to when you cannot get up and say what you feel, but you have to look over your shoulder. The only people I have any intention of looking over my shoulder at before I speak, and that is when I am in a good mood, are the people of St. George South. When I am in a bad mood, I am not even looking over my shoulder at them.

The honourable Member talked about people in private practice. I think the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) also touched on that. Speaking for myself, if I want to go into private practice, I will go into private practice. There is nobody forcing me in any direction. I like what I am doing. I like representing the people of St. George South and I like staying in the Government, so I am not going back to private practice until I am ready.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member has one minute to tell us what he intends to do.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, one minute is so little that I cannot develop any further point. I can only say in conclusion that the debate has been very disappointing because the Opposition sought to fool people that these proposals represent a raid on the Treasury. It represents very little money in real terms. As the honourable Member himself said, 60 per cent of the few dollars, the extra six or seven thousand dollars proposed for each Minister, will go back to the Government in what he likes to classify as 'transfer payments', when all he means is taxes and other imposts.

I have no difficulty at all in supporting this proposal before Parliament, and I am willing to go and debate it on the public television, radio or street corner with the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, so that, finally, somebody will be able to show him up for what he really is.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW (St. Michael South East): Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) in making his contribution referred to Members on this side as 'money grabbers' and the like, but what is amazing about the same honourable Member is that he asks us to behold the man and what he said. This is the honourable gentleman, who poses around in a \$100 000 motor car and is a millionaire, and who likes a lot of money. Yet he is asking this House to behold him!

If this country is to take examples from someone, certainly the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central will not be the person from whom they would take an example. He should sit down and take a leaf from the books of his less wealthy colleagues, who are very humble and who understand what it is to pull their pockets and give their constituents some money, and then regret that they did it. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central can boast that he can put his hand in his pocket and pull out a few thousand dollars and throw around in his constituency, so he is not interested in whether his colleagues get an increase in pay.

I have spoken to them and I know that they want the piece of change, especially as Christmas is coming up.

But, you see, the honourable Member is kind of clever. He does not want to see any one of his colleagues in an economically handsome position. He wants to have the upper hand over them, like the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) whom he has in his pocket, so anything that is dealing with enhancing the position of the honourable Members to put them in a competitive position even within his party, he is going to oppose. I hope the honourable Member for St. Michael West will understand what is going on.

I support the honourable Members from that side. I think the honourable Member for St. George South (Hon. L. R. Tull) has said that all honourable Members over there have expressed the feeling that they should get a piece more change. I told them they should get up and ask to have an amendment and I will go along with them, but it is a matter for them if they allow the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central to take them along that course.

What really is amusing is that the honourable Members should look at the seat of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and see that it is vacant. They understand that at the conference held earlier this year he pointed his finger at them and told them that they were not worthy of holding office, because they did not keep their commitment of pledging and giving the money to charity. He said that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was the only one, and that wrote off the honourable Member for St. Michael West and the whole lot of them, once and for all.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir: For the Record I wish to draw to Your Honour's attention that on the occasion of the last salaries revision I wrote a letter to the Clerk of Parliament instructing the Clerk of Parliament to deal with the increase and donate it to three charities that were specified. I say that for the Record so that the honourable Member would know that I did make that commitment.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Is it information, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: A point of explanation.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Sir, is the honourable Member referring to the \$25 a week? I am not referring to that. I am referring to the fact that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition told his colleagues, including the honourable Member, that they were not worthy of holding office within his party because they let down the people and he was ashamed of them. That is why he is sitting in the seat he is sitting in now. He cannot hold office in that party as long as the honourable Member is around.
8.55 p.m.

How could they really expect the public to take them seriously when they went in Independence Square and told the public that they are going to give their salaries to charity. I want you to get up in this Honourable Chamber and say to which charitable organization you have contributed your salaries. You cannot say it. That is why the honourable Member for St. John.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The honourable Member is misleading the House. I wrote a letter to Parliament, which is now a document of Parliament, and I invite Your Honour to get the letter and read it so that the honourable Member would hear the three charities to which I donated the money. I do not care who said what. It is here in the Record. It was not \$25 a week either. I would like the Record read.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: He should not quarrel with me, Mr. Speaker. He should quarrel with the Leader of his party who beat him, who humiliated him.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is talking about "tax free". Nobody knows how much the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central earns. I know how they pad up their income tax returns, and I know that the honourable Member, like a lot of doctors, do not declare their true earnings. You never know that, they know how to get around it, so do not come with this thing about "tax free". Honourable Members, especially Ministers and Members of this Government, pay income tax from the salaries which they receive.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order: Sir, I draw to Your Honour's attention that the honourable Member said that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, like a lot of other doctors, does not declare the correct income. I submit that what the honourable Member has said about the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is indicative that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is at variance with the law, and I submit that that is unparliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not rule so. I do not see it that way.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Very well, Sir. As Your Honour wishes.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is that we have got to be very realistic about this matter, because there are some Members on the back benches of this Chamber who make more money than a Minister. A Minister is a full time officer and he is not allowed to make money outside. He cannot get

involved in any other occupation, and that point must be made. There are Members, like the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, who earn lots more than a Minister. He should not be the person to come in here to talk about the salary of a Minister.

He does not want to see the Honourable Prime Minister driving a Mercedes like him. He feels he should be the most powerful man in Barbados forever. But we in this country understand that he was not, he is not, and should never be regarded as the most powerful man in this country.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) recently made a donation to one of his basketball clubs of \$1 200. That is a lot of money for any member of Parliament, especially a backbencher, to contribute to a sporting organization. I contribute one month's salary to sporting organizations in my constituency. Do you really think that the people of St. Michael South East are going to be annoyed that I get an increase? I am sure they are going to be glad, because they know that any increase I get is going to reflect in increased contributions for sport in my constituency.

We have our constituents at heart, and this is a point that we have to make. We are not selfish. It is not a question of greed. We donate and give freely to our constituents and make contributions to charitable organizations, unlike honourable Members who talk about it but do not put their hands in their pockets and pull out the money when the time comes.

We believe that the country regards us as honest politicians and honest Ministers, and we believe that we should be paid proper and decent salaries so as to deter us from falling prey to bribes and corruption. We know that the public feels that this Government is a model of honesty, and nothing honourable Members on that side say will change the view of the public.

The salaries increase are not going to cause any howl in the society. It has never been an issue on the political platforms. If honourable Members on that side want to make it an issue now or at any time on the platform, they should say to the public and put it in their manifesto that whenever they get into power, they are going to return to the level of salary in 1976. But they come in here and they vote "no," but when the time comes for drawing, you see them out there asking the gentleman in charge of the salaries how soon they are going to get the piece of change, and how much it is. I heard them today. I was speaking to the gentleman and I could not get in a word because the honourable Members were butting him down. They wanted to know how soon they would get the piece of change, because "they have it owed out already." So I do not

understand this sort of hypocritical stance by honourable Members. Let us face up to it.

The increase falls a little short for backbenchers, but I want honourable Members, like my colleague from St. George North (Mr. J. G. Odle), to get up and say that and do not be carried along by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. He is just taking you for a ride. Leave him out. Let him stay there.

Do not let us forget Peanuts Morrison. He belongs to their side. They laughed at him because he was a Minister and has nothing. Victor Vaughan died in the almshouse and Mottley, who represented St. Philip at one time, died in the old people's home in the Pine. I do not want to see people who have made a contribution in the prime of their life, many sacrifices, in their later years to be begging, crawling, being spat on and living in that sort of humiliating condition. I have made my contribution, and I feel that I am entitled, like all other Members in here who have discharged their duties honourably and faithfully to this country, to retire on an adequate pension so as to say I have made my contribution.

I am sure the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central understands this, but I know what is going through his head. Every Tuesday he passes up Bay Street and looks at Government Headquarters, and tells people that is where he wants to be. He is thirsty for power. He sees a Mercedes pass and he feels it is his. That is why he is going to quarrel about salaries. It is not really the salaries of Ministers — he is jealous of the Prime Minister. Say that. You would do anything for power. That is what has motivated your contribution today.

You need to be told where to get off, and I am going to be on you, because I know what you have been telling me. You want to keep your colleagues in perpetual servitude so that you can rule the roost over them. You must have the upper hand financially, and you must strip them and outsmart all of them. I am going to warn them because I am going to tell them some of the things you told me.

Let us understand that this debate is not about salaries, because the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is not interested in that. If you get him in close conversation, he will tell you that the salaries are genuine and that is what he feels that the Ministers and parliamentarians should be paid, if not more. But jealousy is behind the whole background of his contribution.
9.05 p.m.

I support this Resolution, and I hope that, in due course, the debate on salaries and matters pertaining to salaries will not be a separate debate but rather linked to a complete and comprehensive Resolution that will take into consideration the increases of all persons to be paid out of the Treasury. I think that would settle once

and for all this debate on Public Service salaries, and not when it comes to parliamentarians, use us as whipping-boys. It is not fair to the electorate.

Let us say this to the Opposition members. The public does not care anything about you. St. Peter told you that. They will vote Barbados Labour Party because it is a party they see a future in. So you sit down there and warm your seats. You had better watch yourselves because I am not so sure that the benches over there will have as many next time. And to the honourable member for St. Michael South Central, I want a few old people's houses to repair, and I know that I have a Senator who is going along with me and I know what we are going to do. Four hundred votes is not too much. I took off a 1 200 majority, and I am capable of erasing that little 400 you have got. You had better watch yourselves when I am coming around the corner.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, earlier today I gave notice of a Resolution and I indicated to the House that I would like to do this Resolution today. It is for the purpose of purchasing fire tenders and vehicles for the Fire Service. I think that you and all honourable Members would appreciate that, with the coming harvesting of our sugar and the spate of fires which we have had over the past months, this is a relatively important Resolution. In the light that we are not coming back before January 8, I would ask honourable Members on both sides, since we have already circulated the documents, to let us do this Resolution this evening.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no objections, leave will be granted to proceed with the Resolution at this time.

Since I hear no comments, I presume Members would let us quickly despatch this Resolution.

RESOLUTION TO BORROW £466 720 FROM THE CROWN AGENTS

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): Sir, money was voted in the Estimates for the purchase of vehicles for the Fire Department and for the Police Department. As far as I recall, the money for the Fire Department is for a tender, and I think a tall turntable to be able to look over the buildings in the city of Bridgetown and get over them when there are fires.

We know that there have been fires in Bridgetown recently. Up to last night the House of Assembly itself was set on fire, which people may not know, and I understand that an arrest has been made. Although I know you must not comment on judicial matters, I want to know how somebody who has faced the courts for burning

down places, and is currently on bail for other offences of arson, could be granted bail after he was seen setting fire to the House of Assembly, which I understand happened today. I hope the Attorney General will look into this. I believe that after bail has been granted, that is a judicial act and can be criticized in here.

I certainly have been a potential victim of somebody that came in here to set me on fire after having set other people on fire. He was then on bail for having set another person on fire, and he stood up in front of me with a bottle of gasoline in his pocket to burn me. This is a different person, but the two, together, were charged for burning the Holiday Inn.

I really wonder at persons who do not understand that these arson sicknesses are likely to be repeated. I do not want to criticise judicial acts even by magistrates, but this is one that I really believe the Attorney General should look at.

I do not want to usurp the place of the Attorney General, but on some occasion, I think when this very matter before the House was being explained, the Chief Fire Officer explained to me at the appropriate committee that you do not so much need tall ladders to deal with the tall buildings; you need them to be able to overlook the densely packed buildings so that you can attack fires from above.

The other vehicles embraced in this matter are a number of motor vehicles for the police. I cannot remember how many cars will be bought. We went into this at some length. The local agents could have produced motor cars slightly more cheaply than the Crown Agents, but the Crown Agents offered a deal by which they would lend the Government £466 720 to pay for the vehicles on instalment, and their price for the vehicles also included a spare parts package and some special equipment for the police vehicles. I do not think the Attorney General would wish me to say what the special equipment is, but one of the reasons why the vehicles are a little more expensive than they would be being acquired locally is that they are being specially equipped in Britain in a way that would not be so easy for non-Government organisations to get them done.

We agreed at the Ministry of Finance that this would be the best way of financing it, even although money is in the Estimates, and I hope that all honourable Members, in the interest of better policing and better fire service operations, will support the Resolution. It is a Resolution to borrow money from the Crown Agents to pay for a vehicles package which they are putting together for us in Britain for the Fire Service and the Police, and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South): Mr. Speaker, I understand that this particular piece of equipment was very necessary to fight fires in the Bridgetown

area. Some time ago I raised the question as to whether or not we were equipped in Barbados to really investigate cases of arson. My understanding is that there are new sophisticated methods, chemical and otherwise, used to help determine the origins of fires and to get to the root of cases which might well be cases of arson, but that the facilities in Barbados are limited. It would seem to me that from the spate of fires that have been taking place in Barbados recently, and with the reasonable suspicion among the police and the fire officers that some of these cases might well have been cases of arson, I wonder whether or not some attention should not be paid towards upgrading the capacity of our investigative officers in Barbados to identify the causes of fire with particular reference to arson.

9.15 p.m.

I understand that this also relates to the attitude of the insurers in respect of settlement of claims, and whether or not the insurers are not too ready to settle claims in certain circumstances. I even gather that in one particular circumstance, an interim settlement was made even before there was a police certificate to the effect that it was not a case of arson. I believe that if these cases are cases of arson, then the matter really needs to be dealt with; otherwise, sooner or later, there is going to be a major disaster in this country. It seems to me to be highly extraordinary that you can be getting repeated fires in Barbados all of a sudden. I suspect that some of these cases may well be cases of arson, and we are not getting to the bottom of it.

I wonder whether the Minister of Finance can let us know whether there is a fixed rate of exchange in relation to this loan. I distinctly recall that, not so long ago, we approved a Resolution which fixed the exchange rate at Bds. \$2.70 to the pound sterling, and I did not notice it until after the Resolution was passed. It may have been higher than Bds. \$2.70. When you look at the rate at which it was fixed and the probable rate of exchange between the Barbados dollar and the pound, and you balance that out against the interest rate, then, in fact, you are paying much more to service the loan because of the fixed rate of exchange at the time of the loan.

I wonder whether this particular loan is borrowed at a fixed rate up front or whether it will be repayable at the going rate at the time when the instalments become due, because that can make a significant difference. In that particular instance, the rate of exchange, as incorporated in the Resolution, was well above what the bankers and the international community project as the likely change in the exchange rate between the pound sterling and the US dollar. If the honourable Minister of Finance has the information, as to what is the rate of exchange, whether it is fixed up front or whether it would be determined at the time of payment, I would like to hear it. I think that this information is important

to the House, because it might affect, one way or another, the cost of the borrowing.

Hon. L. R. TULL (St. George South): Mr. Speaker, I can give a little bit more information as to how the money will be spent. We are going to be buying one turntable, seven Land Rovers, two Leyland coaches and nine Ford motor cars out of this money for the Fire Department and the Police Department.

In respect to the conditions of the loan, the loan will be repaid in ten half yearly instalments. It is a sterling loan, and the interest is 10.35 per cent per annum. The exchange rate will obviously, since it is a sterling loan, be the rate of sterling at the time we pay.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Order No. 1, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: This matter was postponed for further consideration, Sir, and the House was in Committee at that time.

I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. J. G. ODLE: The House is in Committee.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL (St. George South): Mr. Chairman, in respect of Clause 2, there are a number of amendments here that I am moving. I have given Members on the other side a copy of the proposed amendments.

I beg to move that Clause 2, as amended in terms of the circularized list of amendments, do now stand part.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. M. A. KING (Christ Church West Central): Mr. Chairman, I have seen the amendment, which does deal with the problem which I raised earlier. It does give the Minister the power to review a decision of the Board. It sets out for the purpose of any such review that he may appoint suitably qualified persons to assist him in the determination of the matter in which a review is sought.

The only thing which concerns me about the power which is given is that in relation to matters of discipline in relation to a medical practitioner, the question may be raised as to the appropriateness of a review board dealing with appeals, so to speak, from a Board which has made a determination in matters of this nature. I am not always very happy with review committees of this kind dealing with appeals in matters which can be so important as discipline of medical practitioners, which may involve even removing them from the register and preventing them from exercising a right to practice. I am always much happier if in cases of this kind, appeals do eventually lie in the Supreme Court, where the medical practitioner would have a right of redress. I think that the better course for dealing with reviews of decisions of the National Health Service Board, particularly where the matter of discipline of medical practitioners is concerned and where the whole question of the future of medical practice is concerned, would be to provide for a system of appeals through the court rather than to go through any review tribunal.
9.25 p.m.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, most of what the honourable Member said escaped me because he was whispering, so I did not hear it all. I should point out that the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners is the organisation that wrote the Minister of Health and requested that there be another tier of appeal, that the Board's decision should not be final. They wanted the Minister himself to be in a position to review the decisions of the Board. So this comes out of a direct request of the doctors themselves.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, in response to the honourable Member, I note he said he did not hear what I said. The point I am making is that my concern is that a final arbiter in the whole question of review should not necessarily be a review tribunal, but I would be much happier if the courts, perhaps a judge in chambers, might be the final arbiter in matters of this kind. I know that in appeals from other administrative tribunals, appeals may be made to judges in chambers, where their decision is the final decision in the matter.

The honourable Member for St. George South spoke about consultation with medical practitioners on having a second tier of appeal. I would have no objection to a review committee reviewing the decisions of the Board, if from that review committee there exists a right of appeal to the courts. I would be much happier with that, and what I am saying is that perhaps the whole procedure for appeals to the review committee might be short-circuited by providing for a direct appeal to the court. I have no objection to a review by a review committee with a final right of appeal to the court, particularly in matters of discipline where it may affect the life and livelihood of medical practitioners.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): It is always difficult when you have these things at the last minute to really deal with them in the detail you would like, but this is a very important amendment here.

As I understand it, when a medical practitioner is contracted to participate in the medical scheme by the Medical Board, any complaint that falls within the professional area, that is, the person complains that he has not been adequately treated, would be forwarded to the Complaints Committee of the Medical Council, and then the disciplinary procedures of the Medical Council will flow from there. Under that area there is the right of appeal to a judge in chambers, although I was never happy that the appeal process should stop there. It is so in the case of doctors, but in the case of the disciplinary Committee of the legal profession: The legal profession, as far as I recall, has the full rights of appeal to the full judicial process, even to the Privy Council, because it involves their right to a livelihood.

There is another aspect to this. I presume that the complaints which will be handled by the Board will be essentially non-professional matters, matters relating more to things of a contractual nature between the general practitioner and the Board, and that this process here relates to that. The problem here is the way how the law is framed — it just says complaints against participating medical practitioners. The substantive Act says that the Board may, if it is satisfied that the participating medical practitioner has committed an act that is prejudicial to the efficient delivery of general practice services, censure the participating medical practitioner, impose a fine, report the action complained of to the Medical Council. I would believe that on any matter of a professional nature, (c) would be the route it would take. Under that system may be a final right of appeal to a judge in chambers under the Medical Council Act.

From my experience of the National Health Service in Britain, there are a whole series of complaints, once you get a third party participating in the delivery of medical care, and by a third party I mean you have a doctor and a patient, and now you have the interposition of a Board. There are a series of steps under the National Health Service in Britain that gives the general practitioner the right to appeal to the courts of the United Kingdom. This is important for a variety of reasons. In a small place like Barbados, if you have a full-fledged National Health Service and all the general practitioners are involved in that National Health Service, eventually, when you can have a situation where a man can be deprived of his right to be employed by the Board — I presume this is what would happen, unless there is a matter that goes through the Complaints Committee of the Medical Council — since the whole system would be nationalised in a small community, you are virtually

not *de jure* but *de facto* depriving him of his right to practise in Barbados. He would not be able to make a living, particularly a young doctor coming into the service without an established clientele, and this would happen eventually.

I am willing to support the contention of my colleague that because of the realities of the situation, an individual should have that right to appeal to the courts. I know the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) was the person who pointed out to me some time ago that the General Medical Council Act was deficient in that it did not allow appeal beyond a judge in chambers. What is happening here now is that your right of appeal is in fact stopping with this review committee, which is couched in very vague language — “may appoint a suitably qualified person to assist him in determination.”

I feel this should be more specific, and I feel that for the protection of the individual doctors in the kind of society in which they are functioning, it is very important that that avenue should be opened to the doctor. I speak with the background of some experience in Barbados.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable Member will give way, we can short circuit a lot of time by my answering the question on which he is going on at great length.
9.35 p.m.

The court is not excluded, or a person is not excluded from access to the court after this. The Supreme Court has an inherent right to review any administrative action that is *ultra vires*, so it need not to be put into the Act itself.

I would have thought that after 1984, which is not only the year of George Orwell, but the year in which the Government has been to court on two matters in the Ministry of Education and the court as given decisions against the Government, it is common knowledge that one has final access to the courts in all of these matters. It need not be written in the Act, because the lawyers understand that there is an inherent right of access to the courts to review administrative action that is *ultra vires* or improper.

Asides.

Hon. L. R. TULL: He is asking if I am right, Sir. I studied at the feet of H. W. R. Wade, the leading exponent on administrative law in the whole world, and he is asking if I am right?

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, the only flaw I see in the argument of the Honourable Attorney-General is when he says that the court has an inherent right to

review acts which are *ultra vires*. We are not concerned here with acts which are *ultra vires*. We are concerned with acts which are very much *intra vires*, where the committee acts and acts properly within the terms of the Act, but where you want to review, and where the courts are being called upon to review, a decision of a committee which is properly made within the context of the powers which the committee has. So the act need not be *ultra vires*.

If what my learned friend is saying is that the court has the right to review decisions of tribunals by virtue, perhaps, of the Administrative Tribunals Act, maybe that is a matter which is possible, but which I have not looked at as yet. But I am not dealing with the *ultra vires* situation.

Hon. L. R. TULL: That is not the law they taught me at Oxford. If the action is *intra vires* and there is no unreasonableness, why should there be access to the courts? If administrative action is unreasonable, there is an automatic right of a person to judicial review. That is how I learnt it over twenty years ago, and that is my clear recollection.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not a lawyer, but I am a little confused. Why is it that in all of the other Acts with which I am familiar, particularly the ones relating to the legal and medical professions, especially disciplinary procedures, there is stated within the Acts a line of appeal in the one case to a Judge in chambers and in the other case to the full judicial process. Unless there is some legislation that has taken place in Barbados since the passage of those two Acts, I would like to know why it is omitted from this and stated clearly within the Act itself that there is a right of appeal either to a judge in chambers as in the case of all the other Acts.

I presume that if an individual feels he is wronged, he could go to the courts and sue the tribunal or somebody. But it would seem to me to be a very untidy arrangement where you have one side of the disciplinary process within the medical profession being handled in one way, and an individual who is aggrieved under this system then would have to initiate this legal proceeding, I presume, like any other aggrieved citizen, I suppose. Something seems to me to be wrong here. I am pretty familiar with this type of legislation, the legal and medical ones, and it is written in the Acts.

Mr. M. A. KING: Let us assume that you have a situation where a review committee is reviewing a decision of the Board and the review committee, acting within the terms of reference, makes a decision which may have some legal implication, but which is wrong in law. That decision, according to my understanding, need not be *ultra vires*. That is not what I call an *ultra vires* decision,

because you have sometimes where the Magistrates Court, even the Supreme Courts, make decisions which are wrong in law, but where there is a right of appeal to a higher court, and the basis of the appeal is not because the lower court acted *ultra vires*, but because the decision of the lower court was wrong in law.

That is the situation which I am contemplating, where a review tribunal perhaps makes a decision which is wrong in law and you need a further right of appeal to a judge to have the legal issue determined. I am not dealing with the question of the *vires* of the matter, whether the tribunal has the right to deal with it or not. That is a completely different issue, and an issue which can, without doubt, be covered by the judicial review of administrative law, as we understand it, about which the learned Attorney General spoke when we dealt with the review of action by administrative tribunals which are *ultra vires*.

We are dealing essentially with the situation where the tribunals have the power, but they have made an error in law. I think that in those circumstances the proper thing is to provide and ensure that there is a right of appeal to the Court.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I cannot go further. I have said what I know. I do not really deal with health matters. I have a file in my hand so that is it. The original Bill was passed and the Opposition did not take the point when there was no review at all.

Asides

Hon. L. R. TULL: I looked in the file and I do not see any record of that. I see that the review by the Minister was requested by the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners. Further, members of that very association are members of the Board.

I still stand on the point I made, the basic tenet of law, that the courts have the right to do a judicial review of action that is *ultra vires*. Further, I do not accept the contention that a person would not be allowed to do his work. I believe the law says that a person will be taken off the list, and that means the list of doctors working under the National Health Scheme, but that does not prevent him from working in private practice.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The point I am making is that if a person was taken off the list in Scotland, he could move down west and get a job if there is a contractual difficulty between he himself and his employing council. In the context of Barbados, if a general practitioner is taken off the list, what is he going to do? You can say that he can go and open private practice on the following day, but there is no market for his services in Barbados. That is why I am trying to say that although he is not

de jure prevented from practising, the *de facto* situation can result in a situation in a place like Barbados where he either has to leave Barbados and practice elsewhere, or he would find it very difficult to make a living. The removal of his name from that list has almost as serious an implication as being struck off the list in terms of his capacity to function in a full-fledged National Health Service.

I hope the honourable Member has taken the point that I have made. It is a different situation because of the fact that we have a small country and there is only one geographical area. That would be his position in Barbados as distinct from a practitioner in the United Kingdom or in a larger country.

9.45 p.m.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 3 was called and passed.

On motion of Hon. L. R. TULL seconded by Hon. V. L. JOHNSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee with amendment, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. L. R. TULL seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Mr. Speaker, this brings us to the end of today's sitting and also the final sitting for the year.

We rise, Mr. Speaker, as we look forward to a happy Christmas, and it is my fervent wish and prayer that, for the nation, the world in 1985 will be a better place for each one of us to live in.

As far as the work in Parliament during the year was concerned, it has been very interesting. It has had its historical events, and debates were fierce with no quarter given and none asked. If I had to sum up the productivity of the Government, I would say it was an easy 100 per cent pass. My colleagues gave me, in my capacity as Leader of the House, their fullest support, and one outstanding thing which I would be failing in my duty if I did not make mention of, is that we have been able to work during the year at all times because the Government was able to form a quorum. I thank my colleagues for the support and the co-operation they gave me, and the members of the staff of the House, for all they have done.

You, Mr. Speaker, came into the new role of Speaker of the House. Much has been said about your conduct as Speaker, and no doubt you have lived up so far to that reputation in the highest office which you now hold.

To Members on the other side, we have had our differences of opinion, but at the end of the day there was a degree of satisfaction on both sides. I sincerely hope that that working spirit will prevail in the coming year.

To the Clerks at the Table, the Hansard Reporters, the Press, the police and all members of the staff, I thank them for a job well done.

It is therefore my duty to wish you and your family, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition and his family, Members and their families, the Clerks at the Table and their families, the Hansard Reporters and the supporting staff of Parliament, a happy holiday, and I sincerely hope that the New Year will bring the benefits which we as Barbadians can be justly proud of.

With those few remarks, Sir, as we rise at the end of the final sitting for this year, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, January 8, 1985, at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South). Mr. Speaker, speaking on the adjournment, I wish to reciprocate the words spoken by the Leader of the House. This is a season of peace, joy and happiness, and the message is one of rebirth, and I would take this opportunity to extend the compliments of the season to the Prime Minister, the Leader of the House, the Government front bench and back bench, all my other colleagues on this side, and above all to you, Mr. Speaker, so resplendent today in your regalia, to all members of the staff of Parliament and all those who have assisted in any way to continue our work for the development and promotion of democracy in this country.

I cannot quite agree with the scoring given by the Leader of the House to the Government. I heard him say something about 100 per cent. That is a kind of self-assessment which I will not go into at this stage. I do not think he is in the field of education, so he will have to allow some person like me to score the Government on this one, but I will refrain from giving any marks. I would not say what my score is. What I will tell him and promise him is that we will have an enjoyable Christmas holiday and that when we return, he will find that this

Opposition will be as constructive as it has been throughout the year, and that it will be ready. Wherever there is occasion for the scrutiny of the Government, we will keep the Government on their toes for the good progress and development of this country.

I wish all Members and all those who have been associated with Parliament the best for the season and also a happy New Year.

Mr. SPEAKER: On my behalf, I would like to extend season's greetings to Members on both sides of the House, to staff of Parliament and to all those who have contributed to the smooth working of the Assembly during the year.

9.55 p.m.

I must say how grateful I am for the co-operation which has been given to me by Members on both sides of the House, and I hope and pray that we will all have a very joyous Christmas. We look forward to the coming new year, and I hope that we shall continue in the co-operative vein which has been evident throughout this year.

The question that the House do now stand adjourned until Tuesday, January 8, 1985 at 12.00 o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the sitting accordingly.

9.58 p.m.

CONTENTS**MINUTES**

Confirmation of the Minutes of the meeting of
Tuesday, December 4, 1984 1670

PAPERS LAID

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW 1670

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

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG 1670, 1684

Resolution to approve the borrowing of the
sum of £466 720 from the Crown Agents for
Overseas Governments and Administrations for
the supply of equipment for the Police Depart-
ment and the Fire Service.

Resolution to vary the Schedule to the
Governor-General (Conditions of Service) Act,
Cap. 6, by increasing the annual salary payable
to the Governor-General, with effect from
1st April, 1985.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$165 196 from
the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the
disposal of the Government to supplement the
Estimates 1984-85, Part I - Current, as
shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1984-
85, No. 21, which form the Schedule to the
Resolution.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$131 268
from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at
the disposal of the Government to supplement
the Estimates 1984-85, Part II - Capital, as
shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1984-
85, No. 22, which form the Schedule to the
Resolution.

Suspension of Standing Orders 1671

ORDERS OF THE DAY**GOVERNMENT BUSINESS**

NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE BOARD (AMEND-
MENT) ACT 1984 1671

Mr. Craig, 1671; Mr. Weekes, 1671; Mr. King,
1672, 1725, 1726; Mr. Taitt, 1673; Mr. Tull,

1673, 1725, 1726, 1727; Dr. Haynes, 1726,
1727.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMEND-
MENT) (NO. 3) ORDER 1984 1673

Mr. Adams, 1673, 1674, 1683; Mr. Sandiford,
1673; Mr. Taitt, 1674, 1677; Dr. Haynes,
1679.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (TEACHERS) (AMEND-
MENT) (NO. 2) ORDER 1984 1685

SENATE AND HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
(REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES
OF MEMBERS) ORDER 1984 1685

Mr. Adams, 1685, 1695, 1708; Mr. Sandiford,
1686, 1694; Mr. Craig, 1687, 1690, 1695;
Dr. Haynes, 1689; Mr. Taitt, 1690; Dr.
Cheltenham, 1692; Mr. Franklin, 1694; Mr.
L. B. Brathwaite, 1699; Mr. Johnson, 1702;
Mr. Forde, 1704.

MINISTERS AND PARLIAMENTARY
SECRETARIES (REMUNERATION AND
ALLOWANCES) ORDER 1984 1711

Mr. Adams, 1711, 1715; Dr. Haynes, 1713;
Mr. Tull, 1716; Mr. Bradshaw, 1721; Mr.
Taitt, 1722.

BORROWING OF £466 720 FROM CROWN
AGENTS FOR SUPPLY OF EQUIPMENT
FOR FIRE DEPARTMENT AND POLICE
DEPARTMENT 1723

Mr. Adams, 1723; Dr. Haynes, 1724; Mr.
Tull, 1725.

SUSPENSION 1684, 1713

ADJOURNMENT 1728

Mr. Craig, 1728; Mr. Sandiford, 1728; Mr.
Speaker, 1729.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ADAMS, Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. (St. Thomas)
BOLDEN, His Honour C. L. (Speaker) (St. Joseph)
BRADSHAW, Hon. DeL. O. (St. Michael South East)
BRATHWAITE, Hon. L. B. (St. Andrew)
CHELTENHAM, Hon. Dr. R. L. (Christ Church East)
CRAIG, Hon. L. S. (St. James North)
FORDE, Hon. H. deB. (Christ Church West)
FRANKLIN, W. O. (St. Philip North)
HAYNES, Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central)

JOHNSON, Hon. V. L. (St. Michael West Central)

KING, M. A. (Christ Church West Central)

SANDIFORD, L. E. (St. Michael South)

TAITT, B. M. (St. Michael West)

TULL, Hon. L. R. (St. George South)

WEEKES, L. A. (St. Michael North West)