THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1976–81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 2nd November, 1976.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.10 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, LL.M., (Deputy Speaker); Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc. LL.D.; Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Labour, Welfare, Youth Affairs and Sport); Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A., (Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning); Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B., (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs); Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Leader of the Opposition); Hon. H. deB. FORDE, S.C., M.A., LL.B., (Attorney General and Minister of External Affairs); Dr. R. B. CADDLE; Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD, M.A.; Mr. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M.; Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, LL.M., (Lond.); Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, (Minister of Health and National Insurance); Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. G. ODLE, (Chairman of Committees); Mr. V. L. JOHNSON, B.A., M.A.; Mr. B. M. TAITT, M.A.; Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Mr. L. L. SISNETT and Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, M.Sc., (Econ.)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY CLERK OF PARLIAMENT

Mr. CLERK: I announce the absence of His Honour the Speaker.

Prayers were read.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR THE DEPUTY SPEAKER

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform this Hon. Chamber that I have received a communication from the Secretary to the Cabinet, and that communication I will read to the House.

No. M.P. 0027 Vol. XIX/

From: Secretary to the Cabinet

To: Clerk of Parliament

Date: 2nd November, 1976

Administration of the oath of allegiance to Mr. R. St.C. Weekes, M.P.

Further to my memorandum No. 0027 Vol.XIX of 14th September 1976 notifying you of the persons elected in the General Elections 1976, I am to inform you that His Excellency the Acting Governor-General today administered the oath of allegiance to Mr. R. St.C. Weekes, elected member for the constituency of St. Philip South.

F. M. B.
Secretary to the Cabinet.

I now therefore invite the hon. Member to take his seat in this Chamber.

Mr. WEEKES entered the Chamber and took his seat, accompanied by Hon. F. G. Smith.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of Tuesday, 26th October, 1976 are before you for your confirmation, and unless there are any objections or alterations the Minutes will be confirmed. There being no objections or alterations the Minutes are duly confirmed.

PAPERS PRESENTED

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to lay the Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 7) Order, 1976.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of $21,593 out of the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1976–77, Part I – Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1976–77, No. 19, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Airport Service Charge Act, Cap. 59 of the Laws of Barbados, and Mr. Deputy Speaker, leave will be asked of the House to deal with this Bill in all its stages today.
12.20 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Airport Service Charge Act, Cap. 59.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Airport Service Charge Act, Cap. 59, be now read a first time.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Labour Clauses (Public Contracts) Act, Cap. 349 be now read a first time.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

NOTICE OF MOTIONS FOR THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE ON MATTERS OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If I can clarify the position on this particular matter, I have received two letters: one from the hon. member for Christ Church East, and another from the hon. member for St. John. Both matters deal with essentially the same subject matter. I have checked with the staff of Parliament, and it appears that the letter sent by the hon. member for Christ Church East arrived here first in time. The relevant Standing Order does not allow more than one motion of the type which is about to be moved to be moved at the same time. My ruling, therefore, is that the member for Christ Church East may proceed with his motion.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In accordance with Standing Order 18, I beg leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the threat to the security of the duly elected and the lawfully constituted Government of this country. I give notice that on that occasion I propose to deal with the following Resolution:

And Whereas the Prime Minister has drawn to the attention of the country the existence of a plot to overthrow the lawfully constituted and duly elected Government of Barbados.

And Whereas this disclosure has caused considerable public anxiety and disquiet.

Be It Resolved that this House condemn this threat to the constitutional procedure and to the democratic institution of this country.

And Be It Further Resolved that this House pledges its full support to the Government to take whatever measures are necessary to deal with this situation.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of this Honourable Chamber that the hon. member's motion be dealt with?

Hon. MEMBERS: Aye.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The motion moved by the hon. member for Christ Church East will be dealt with in accordance with the Standing Orders.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN OF BARBADOS

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in moving this Resolution, I think it is incumbent on me to explain to this Honourable House that the Town and Country Planning Act Cap. 240 called the submission of a Physical Development Plan to the appropriate Minister, the publication of that Plan, and the subsequent introduction of the Plan in the House for the approval of this Honourable House.

On the 8th July, 1970, the then Minister had before him the Development Plan. I believe that this Plan had been completed almost two years prior to that date by the Town and Country Planning Department, and the Chief Town Planner had performed his duties in accordance with the provisions of the Act. It has taken six years since that date before the Plan has come before this Chamber, and I think hon. members who have taken the opportunity to have looked at the contents of the Plan may well be satisfied that events have overtaken some of the proposals set out in the Plan itself, and to this extent the Plan can only be offered to the House and, indeed, to the country as containing general guidelines which the Town and Country Planning Act will, in future, be administered.

I want to say at the outset of this debate that it is the intention of this Government, very shortly, to introduce into this Chamber, in accordance with the existing legislation, amendments to the Plan to reflect events which have occurred subsequent to 1970 and also to reflect this Government's considered opinion on the amendments which have become necessary particularly in the light of the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party.

I should explain that a Public Inquiry was held by Mr. Justice Williams and his findings were submitted to the Minister and to the Cabinet, and, eventually, it was decided to revise the Plan and to omit from the Plan various matters pertaining to the Spine Road and that is, perhaps, the biggest modification of the Plan as now submitted for the approval of this House.

The history of this Plan is in many ways similar to the history of other Physical Development Plans in other countries. I will concede that it is very difficult to have a Plan which is up to date at the date, or at the point and time, in which it is committed to the House. On the other hand, I would be less than candid if I did not say that there has been an undue delay on the part of the former Government in dealing with matters pertaining to Town and Country Planning and in bringing a Physical Development Plan before the Chamber of this House. When I sat on the other side, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I frequently made reference to this delay and underlined the serious problems that it was causing in the country. In my view, everything that I have seen since convinces me that the strictures which I made in the Opposition were fully justified.

12.30 p.m.

I regret to have to inform this House that on assuming the responsibility for Town and Country Planning I found outstanding some 67 odd applications – people who had appealed against the decision of the Chief Town Planner, and some of these appeals have been outstanding since 1967.

I have set up a series of panels and have requested that they act with all speed in hearing these applications. I wish to repeat for the benefit of the Honourable House that some of these appeals have been outstanding since 1967, which is almost nine years. Being myself a lawyer I have always said that justice delayed is justice denied, and understandably some of the persons may feel that they have not had justice done to them. As long as I am in charge of the Portfolio I undertake to the House to see that applications are speedily dealt with particularly in view of the publication of this Plan, and also to ensure that appeals are as readily dealt with as possible. I have directed that we should revert to the system whereby the Minister was advised before he gave a decision on the review by an independent panel constituted of a person with the necessary qualifications and two other members – I have asked that their reasons for decisions should be made known to the Minister, and I have proposed as a matter of public policy, wherever the Minister refuses an application on review, to make known the reasons for so doing.

It should be the principle of administrative justice in this country which it has not been in

my experience in relation to this Act, in the last nine years, that persons should be aware of the reasons why it is felt that they should be refused a particular application, and that wherever we use criteria in these circumstances that they should be based on the interest of the public at large and they should not be on an ad hoc basis. I have also had an opportunity of reviewing the Physical Development Plan, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to look at the effect which delay had had on the developments in Barbados as a whole, and I would like to say that it seems to me a great pity that the Plan was not approved by the House earlier and probably reviewed already because some of the ad hoc decisions taken might have been corrected.

It is an undoubted fact that in the last ten years we have lost agriculture something in the region of 12,000 acres of agricultural land. This is of great concern to this Government and of course it should be of great concern to the country as a whole. We are looking at the question of the use of agricultural land, and at the appropriate time we will be making a statement on the policy to be followed.

I would now like to say however that for the future I have directed the Town Planner not to grant any permission for the sub-division of agricultural lands and particularly plantations lands unless the matter is specifically referred to the Ministry. I would hope that the country would recognise that once valuable land passed into concrete and stone it is unlikely that it will ever revert to proper use for feeding the country and for ensuring our development agriculturally.

If I may explain for the benefit of hon. members to some degree the purpose of the Plan, I can do no better than to draw their attention to the explanatory notes which have been written by the Chief Town Planner, and I think he set out quite clearly not only the history of the Plan but the reason why it is necessary to include certain assumptions concerning land use in this country. Those are set out in his notes and I draw them to the attention of hon. members. And how are we to regard the Plan? I said at the outset and I emphasise that the Plan is a guide. Some people believe that once the Physical Development Plan has been approved, that no use other than the use set out in the plan is the use which can be followed. It is not really the rigidity of this rule which will be followed, if I may say that in this way. The Plan does permit compatible uses and although there may be a primary use in one area, it will be the intention to permit compatible uses so that in several ways we will not delay the development of the country. On the other hand, we do not intend to permit incompatible uses, and to that extent, as I said before, I would wish the public to understand the nature of planning and the function of planning, and many people particularly in a small country – I must ask the public to desist from the public relations efforts which have been made in the past to influence persons to give decisions based on personal considerations.

Government Departments as well will be asked to conform with the Plan, and of course they should now have sufficient guidance as to the type of development which will be permitted in the future. Town and Country Planning is the continuous process. Any physical development plan must be constantly adjusted and refined in the light of changes which inevitably occur from time to time. We will take a fresh look at the Plan in the light of our long range perspective and I can state that this work is well advanced in the Department, and indeed I am expecting the Report to be submitted to me shortly. These processes are necessary if we are to make available again in a short time for the approval of Parliament the review of the Plan.
12.40 p.m.

I anticipate that hon. members will of course particularly be disturbed by the provision of statements in the plan such as this one which says that there was no need for a sewage plant. I cite that as an example of our sewage, I cite that as an example of 1970 to show in what way the plan may be outmoded, but I was faced as Minister with either ignoring the work which had been done on the Plan and starting from scratch or bringing the plan readily to the House and coming as soon as possible before the House with a review of the plan. I have taken the latter decision and I believe that in this I would have the support of people who are knowledgeable on town and country planning matters. I will give the House the assurance that shortly, I hope within the first year of Parliament, to introduce a review plan to the House.

I will take this opportunity, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to thank the public agencies who provided expert assistance, and to thank the officers of the town and country planning department both past and present who have contributed to producing the physical development plan for Barbados. I believe we have built up during the years a certain amount of technical expertise in the town and country planning department and that the efficiency of

the department can be improved if the town planners are allowed to act on a professional basis and without too much political involvement or intervention. Because of this I have submitted to Cabinet and have had Cabinet approval and I now inform this House that the Cabinet Committee which dealt with applications dealing with town and country planning has been dismantled and it is proposed in future to let the town and country planning department work in the way it was intended by this Parliament to work. The Chief Town Planner would be allowed, after consultation with all relevant bodies to process an application and to give his decision. The decision will be subject to review from the Prime Minister in case there is an appeal.

The Minister will with Cabinet's approval from time to time be issuing directions as a matter of policy. I have already issued two such directions. I have informed the House about my direction in relation to the future sub-division of agricultural land in this country, and I intend to keep the existing legislation dealing with the proliferation of petrol service stations in force to ensure in view of the Government's plan for a National Petroleum Corporation, that there is no economic warfare among the oil companies getting a toe hold for the expansion of their selling and marketing at this moment, and the present existing legislation, Statutory Instrument, will be extended for a further period. It was due to lapse, I believe, early in 1977 and it would be extended until 1980, and I give notice of this to the House so that not only the House but the public itself might be aware of this. I consider it unnecessary to maintain the other limitations which were placed on the powers of the Chief Town Planner, and I have therefore recommended to Cabinet and had Cabinet's acceptance that these limitations should now be revoked, but after consultation with all the Ministries, particularly the Ministry of Agriculture and of course the Ministry of Finance, I will issue such further instructions as are necessary to ensure that the Town Planning Act works properly.

I also propose to bring to the House and to seek the House's approval, urgent amendments to the Act, and I might disclose that already the Department is engaged in that exercise of looking at the amendments which will be necessary to see that the Act functions properly.

I do not think I should sit down without saying that in the past various strictures were levelled against people who work in the town and country planning department. Whether these allegations were justified or unjustified I would not discuss at this moment, nor do I need one to come to any enquiry on this matter, but I have made it quite clear to the administration that I will not be condoning people in the town and country planning office doing outside work unless they have specific permission from the Public Service Commission, and this in my view will probably get rid of several of the allegations concerning people paying money to persons at the department. Certainly as long as I am the Minister I intend to defend the civil servants as strongly as I can once they do their duty and once they recognise that they must show all signs of integrity in the discharge of their duty without political favours and without personal favours, and I intend where the Civil Servants working within those guidelines have made mistakes to accept as some Ministers are known in the last Government to accept any responsibility for any errors that they might have negligently or unwittingly committed. But I will not as a Minister and in public life condone any acts in the Civil Service or otherwise which will give some credibility to stories concerning corruption or rip offs, and it is because of this that I made it my duty before bringing the plan to the House to talk to the members of the Department and to assure them that wherever possible they will obtain the stoutest of defence from their Minister provided of course they work within guidelines which I believe are proper guidelines for the operation of public servants and public officials and persons in the country's day to day life.

I therefore have much pleasure in moving that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to second that and to reserve the right to speak at a later stage.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we on this side would like to compliment the Minister for the quick way in which he brought this Plan to the House, because from the way things have been going in the past, it is quite likely that this would have seen the fate of some of the other things which have either been suspended, eliminated or made the subject of enquiries in this country. I should also like to state quite clearly that we wish him well in the implementation of his policies consequent upon the introduction of this Plan to the House. It is a plan which has been drawn up by the Democratic Labour Party, and it was our intention some time this year to introduce this plan to the House, but it is now his responsibility and we recognise it.

It is very easy to make accusations about cutting up agricultural land, but in going through this plan I would like to draw the hon. member's

attention to page 16, paragraph 5.102 to a statement which reads: "The agricultural potential of Barbados is limited by the nature of the soil, the pattern of natural rainfall, the distribution of good irrigation water, and the availability of land."As we go through reading this particular section, you find that a lot of what has been described as agricultural land, when you apply these criteria cannot rightly be described any longer as agricultural land. Therefore while people would have their own interpretations of what is agricultural land, you will find that as a result of these different interpretations of what is agricultural land, there are bound to be differences about whether or not a particular area of land should be permitted to go into development or be retained as agricultural land.

However, when you look at the whole plan and you see the various features of it and recognise what is intended to be achieved by this plan, one has to bear in mind that in a country where land is already very small, there must be some difficulty in apportioning land to the various services which are required by the people of this country.
12.50 p.m.

If they were to build the schools, the roads and all the other things which are required by the people of Barbados, including the two new towns or cities which have been promised, it is quite likely that at some stage they are going to impinge upon what has been described or accepted as agricultural land. Bearing in mind also, Sir, that a long time has passed by since this Plan was first drawn up, it is likely that in the very near future we will have to have a revised Plan or a new Plan, because the most this can serve, as the hon. member rightly pointed out, is as a guide. Much of the criteria upon which this has been constructed has been altered, if not completely changed, due to the way in which developments and many other changes have gone about in Barbados, and while the basic difference upon which this has been formulated is no longer with us, one has to be very careful in applying this Plan in Barbados, or sticking to the tenets of this Plan in Barbados, bearing in mind that the conditions under which this Plan was first formulated are no longer the same in 1976. Therefore, in applying this Plan one must make some adaptation to take into consideration all the changes which have taken place in Barbados prior to the initial drawing up of this Plan.

We on this side would like to assure the Hon. Minister that we welcome the introduction of this Plan. It has been drawn up by the Democratic Labour Party, and we are happy to see that he has no quarrel with the Plan, because bearing in mind the past strictures which have been made by the hon. member when he was on this side, it is quite likely that he might have found grounds for destroying or criticising the Plan left by us. We would support the implementation of the Plan as far as possible and we wish him the best of luck in the future in implementing the Plan and in getting the revised Plan before the House of Assembly in the shortest possible time, bearing in mind the difficulties which we have to encounter in Barbados in getting certain things done. Many of the difficulties which have been encountered over this Plan have been due to the fact that we have had a number of Chief Town Planners, each of whom wanted to leave his imprint upon the features of the Plan, we have had a number of Ministers of Home Affairs, each of whom wanted to do likewise, and then there were other problems of staffing within the Town Planning Office which went a far way in making it difficult to complete the Plan in as short as possible a time as most of us in the House of Assembly and most people involved in land development in Barbados would have liked. If he can overcome those difficulties which were a feature of the past years, there is every reason to believe that the Hon. Minister will be best placed to produce a Plan far more quickly than we have produced.

In addition one has to point out that in producing something for the first time in Barbados there are always a lot of problems to be encountered because people usually have a dislike for change, especially rapid change. Now that a Plan has been produced it is obvious that it will be a lot easier and a lot more quicker to produce a revised Plan, or a second Plan, so we do not expect to see the long delay around a second Plan as we have seen with the formulation of the first Plan. I would point out again that we welcome the Plan and we are glad to see the rapidity with which the Hon. Minister has brought it in when we take into consideration the recent events which have been going on in this country, and we are glad to note that this Plan has not suffered the fate of rejection, suspended animation or the subject of an enquiry for the benefit of the public.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, my contribution to this debate will be a relatively short one, but I consider that it has some importance particularly to the area which I have the honour to represent, the constituency of St. Lucy. You would not be aware, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I am sure that those hon. members of this Chamber who are fortunate to be here

again would recall that ever since I entered this Chamber in 1971 I did not let slip an opportunity to make a contribution, and indeed to call for the development of the rural areas of Barbados.

In examining this Plan which, as the principal speaker on this side has indicated, was prepared by the last Government, one will see very clearly that the Plan enumerates a policy that has pinpointed a number of areas in the rural areas of this country for developmental purposes. I notice specifically that the area of Nesfield in St. Lucy was one area which has been pinpointed for developmental purposes. This is important and not only because as I have indicated an area in St. Lucy has been pinpointed as an area for developmental purposes, but I am of the firm view that there is need for a decentralisation of all kinds of economic, social and cultural activities in Barbados, and the Physical Development Plan makes provision for this.

When you examine the pattern of development which was taking place, you will see very clearly that there was an over-concentration in the urban and suburban areas, concentration in housing, concentration in industrial life and concentration in social activities. You will also recognise from the plans which the Democratic Labour Party had that it was the intention to accelerate the decentralisation process in the area of health and in the area of the provision of job opportunities throughout this country. I think that it is useful now that the Plan is before this Chamber for us to get ahead with this decentralisation and with the development of the areas which have been designated in the Plan as areas for developmental purposes.

What is slightly bothering to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and this is of course the subject of a question which I asked my colleague to raise for me in this Chamber last week, is really what is the intention of the present Government as far as the Nesfield area is concerned, because from information which I am getting the distinct impression that it is the Government's intention to abandon Nesfield as an area for developmental purposes as indicated in this Physical Development Plan. I recognise that the Hon. Minister, the member for Christ Church West, in his introductory remarks indicated that there will be certain amendments in the light of the Barbados Labour Party's Manifesto. I have had the opportunity to look into the Manifesto and I see no specific mention being made of the constituency of St. Lucy, and I am really wondering if this is part of the amendments, if it is the intention of the Government to abandon this area for developmental purposes.

I think that we have got to recognise that Barbados in spite of the fact that it is of small land size, nevertheless there are people living in rural areas who experience a number of difficulties, difficulties from the point of view of the lack of employment opportunities, difficulties from the point of view of the lack of social and community life, difficulties from the point of view of housing.

1.00 p.m.

It is, therefore, incumbent on the Government, since the Government has the responsibility of everybody in Barbados, to ensure that the pattern of development is changed rapidly and changed in such a way as would enable the people in the rural areas of Barbados to feel that they are part and parcel of this country, and that all attention, or part of the attention, is not directed towards particular areas in Barbados. It is for this reason, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I have found it necessary to raise this vital area and to re-emphasize the urgent need for the development of the rural areas in Barbados.

As I have said, this has been clearly stated in this Physical Development Plan, and I would hope that now the Plan is made public this is an indication that we will see some efforts being intensified at ensuring that the people who live in the rural parts of Barbados, and particularly in St. Lucy, are given an opportunity to be involved more fully and more totally in the life of this country, the economic life, the social life, and the community life which is evident in other areas of Barbados.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Before the Minister rises, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Seconder of the motion reserved the right to speak. There are just one or two points which I wish to draw to the attention of the House. The Minister said that there were 67 appeals outstanding since 1967, and the Minister should also state that there are over 800 applications made to the Town and Country Planning Office every year, and from 1967 to 1976 there would be over, probably in the period of nine years, 7,000 applications on the average made to the Town and Country Planning Office. Now, in those 67 applications which he said were outstanding, a lot of those applications were outstanding in respect of which the Chief Town Planner would have written to the applicants asking for further information and would have received no reply.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I think the hon. member has missed the point. I am not saying that there are 67 applications. I said that there were 67 appeals outstanding.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am dealing with the appeals. I do not think that up to the time when I was responsible for the office there were any number of applications outstanding. Invariably the Town Planner would write to an applicant and ask for an extension of time in order that Area Inspectors may to and make the necessary investigations. There were 67 appeals, but in respect of these appeals I said applications. Well, every appeal connotes an application at the bottom of it, because it would never get to the appeal stage unless it went to the court of first instance. But in respect of these appeals, frequently the appeals were abandoned by not being pursued, and there were some appeals which were before the kind of tribunal which the Minister now says that he wishes to reintroduce. Our experience from those tribunals, and they were not people who were selected on the basis of any affiliation or anything like that, but because of their legal knowledge and so on.

I think there were three committees which we had dealing with appeals. The members of the panels of the committees were frequently engaged in their own legal work and frequently did not convene, or were not convened by the appropriate Public Officer, to hear the appeals, and we had to take over a large number of these and deal with them. I cannot remember whether the member for Christ Church West himself was a member of the Appeals Committee. I think he has been appearing on behalf of the appellants in some cases. Where you get 67 appeals outstanding, some of them from 1967, if those people who had filed these appeals were interested in pursuing the subject matter of the appeals, I am sure there would have been dealt with, as far as I am concerned, up to the time when I was responsible up to September for the Town Planning Office.

No outstanding appeals which were alive – when I say alive, I mean still being pursued – had been brought to my attention for over a period of two years. There were no outstanding appeals that I knew about. Had there been any outstanding appeals which were alive and which were being pursued by the applicants they would have been dealt with, but I am aware that there were appeals in which hearings had been undertaken by the members of the various panels and they have not submitted their findings to the appropriate Ministry. I just wanted to clear that up.

There are over 800 applications a year. As far as I am concerned, a lot of these applications could be dealt with at a very low level, because the Town Planning Office, ever since the Development Plan was being formulated between 1968 to 1970, has been more concerned with development control in preventing people from doing what the law says they should not do than with real planning. This is one of the observations – I would not like to call them strictures – which I would like to make about the Town Planning Office. Ever since we had a Mr. Stevens when he was dealing with the Physical Development Plan and the United Nations Expert, there seemed to have abandoned the whole idea of planning, and were formulating new ideas and devoted themselves entirely to development control. As a result of this emphasis on development control, people have come to look at the Town Planning Office as an institution which is there to prevent them from exercising their freedom to deal with their property as they would like to deal with it. Now, if you believe in planning you must have certain restrictions when people try to deal with their property. There is a well known doctrine of equity that you should so use your property as not to harm other people. You should use it in a way not to restrict the development of the community as such.

When I turn to the question of agricultural land, I should like to set the record straight on this. The country went through a period of low rainfall between 1967 and 1975 in which during this whole period we have had fairly low sugar production. The falling off of sugar production has not been due to any policy on the part of the Government of putting agricultural land out of production. I wish to make this abundantly clear.

1.10 p.m.

As a result of the low production in the marginal areas – the low rainfall areas – many cane farmers and many plantations found it unprofitable. They were losing money. As a matter of fact, there was a large number of plantations in the low rainfall areas where the people were alienating or transferring ownership because they were indebted to the commercial banks and saw no way of getting out of it. The Government of Barbados pursued no policy. Planters themselves who made applications – the planters are the people who made application for the sub-division of land because they found it unprofitable to continue their farming. At no stage did the Government of Barbados suggest to any plantation owner that they should stop growing sugar cane or other agricultural crops.

There has been a programme of diversification of agriculture but diversification of agriculture could only succeed where you either have irrigation or you have a good distribution of rainfall; and if there were 12,000 acres of agricultural land which went out of production the best incentive that you can get to make that 12,000 acres or any part of it come back into agricultural production would be for Providence to provide a good rainfall distribution for two or three years and you would see how many people would go back into agricultural production.

What I think we ought to have, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is some method of ensuring that where the land becomes unproductive because of the low rainfall regime and it is sub-divided into small – and the minimum holding which was by Resolution of this House was two acres and we subsequently changed that to four acres – that there should be some kind of policing of the land to ensure that it continues in agricultural production and does not lie down until somebody is ready to build a house on it and to rail it around; but you see that is very easy to say, that we are going to bring land back into agricultural production which has been sub-divided but if the Government had a task force of people who were willing to go to work on the land of the owners who unwilling, reluctant or unable to pursue agriculture on those smaller holdings, then we could say that we are going to bring it back into agricultural production; but as a result of the better prices that prevailed in 1974–75 a lot of people started planting back up land that had been lying fallow for some period of time. So the best incentive is for us to ensure proper prices for the agricultural products and even people who are living on rab land will probably bring in some mould and try to cultivate a few garden beds, if they were getting proper prices. In the same way that the shortage of cane cutters was overcome by proper wages being paid to people – and then we did not have to import any foreign labour during the last session as far as I remember – the best incentive is to guarantee to the people who are producing agricultural products, proper prices for their commodities.

So I just want to make it clear that we had set up a committee so that no one person in either a Chief Town Planner or a single Minister could decide on his own, or to change the use of agricultural land, and many applications for the change of use of agricultural land into building development and for even smaller agricultural holdings were turned down by the Cabinet Committee which I set up some three years ago and I do not think there has been any abuse of agricultural land insofar as random applications for the change of use for other purposes are concerned; and all of those applications were up-to-date and more were refused than were granted without fear and without favour. So that there would be some people who would be dissatisfied, but one can be assured, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the refusal was not on the grounds of any political affiliation or anything like that.

When you have one person making a decision there is an opportunity for the system to be abused but when you have the Permanent Secretary, the Chief Town Planner and five or six Ministers sitting down closely scrutinizing every single application, I respectfully submit that there could be no abuse and no land alienated which should have been in agricultural production. I am sure that if we somehow or the other, apart from our endeavours in the field of the European Economic Community prices insofar as other agricultural products are concerned – that we pursue a policy of ensuring that proper prices were paid to the farmers no matter what size of lot people may be holding whether it is a two-acre lot or a plantation, that we would see a lot of agricultural land come back into production.

The Plan itself, of course, clearly defines what areas should be reserved for industrial purposes, what areas for commercial purposes, and what area should be delineated and retained for agricultural purposes; but I should also like to explain independent of the Plan, that there is still a highly detailed plan for the parish of St. Philip and a highly detailed plan for Christ Church where the land on the southern side of the road travelling east along Enterprise is allowed for development with the land on the northern side of the road having been retained for small farming except very small lots which are being allowed for infilling where these lots are standing between two existing structures.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am most amazed at the manner in which the three last speakers on the opposite side have spoken. I was more than surprised to hear the hon. member for St. John speaking on the question of agriculture and the failure of people to utilize the land. He said that we were getting no rain for a long period of time. I hope I quote him correctly as saying sometime between 1967 and somewhere in 1976. The reason why agriculture went into the doldrums is not because of any lack of rainfall; we have had a lack of rainfall throughout our history. It

was purely because of the policy as enunciated by the other side that was responsible for the attitude of the people of this country to agriculture.

Agriculture was regarded as an area that people should despise and an area that should be shunned. The hon. member for St. John referred in his speech to the Government not encouraging the development or cutting up of the land and rather the planters were making applications for the development of the land. The planters made application but who decided the applications? Did the planters themselves or the powers that be? The past Government stands totally condemned by this generation and would be totally condemned by history for their policy or lack of policy with respect to agriculture and the cutting up of very valuable and fertile land.

1.20 p.m.

I was amazed at the speech made by the hon. member for St. Michael North Central when he talked about the type of lands that we throw out of agricultural production, for while he may be regarded as a person who will have occasional flights into the uncertain, we certainly expect occasionally to hear him make a few pronouncements from which we will draw some experience, but when we hear him talk about the type of land that we throw out, we have to bear in mind that there are areas like Belle Plantation and Cane Garden in St. Michael, Lowlands in Christ Church and Frere Pilgrim, Sandford in St. Philip, Blowers in St. James and very high-yielding plantations like those that the Government allowed to be thrown out, one has got to wonder if as the former Prime Minister and hon. member for St. John said he would like to see the day when there would be no cane blades, there was a serious attempt on the part of the last administration to make sure that not only would there be no cane blades, but Mr. Deputy Speaker, there would be no agriculture at all.

The hon. member for St. Lucy in his kind appeal to this side with respect to the area of Nesfield seems to have forgotten that this Development Plan was ready since 1970. It is certainly surprising that we who have come into power less than two months ago have seen the wisdom and justification of introducing this plan, but you with your flaunted wisdom and desire to move the country forward have done nothing whatever to make sure that this plan was put on the Statute Book. We on this side, despite the efforts to depressurise us and destabilise us are prepared to make sure that we remain on level ground and do the people's work. I am amazed that the hon. member for St. Lucy did not see it necessary at the time when he was a solid member of the last Government to prod them into action to bring this legislation into being.

We on this side do not consider it to be the best thing we can offer at this time. The hon. introducer of the Resolution has made it clear that we will have to introduce amendments from time to time and we certainly will have to; but it is better to have something than to have nothing at all. The country must have some course to charter. We must show them something; we have got to produce something. The type of arrangement which existed in the past cannot exist any longer in this enlightened day. The country expects better from us; the country expects us to take enlightened initiative where there was never any on the other side, and therefore we have got to start somewhere. If you have produced a plan which you have laboured for over six years to produce and we decide to give it some birth since you have had problems in the birth, do not be unhappy. We have brought it not because we believe it is the best thing to be offered, but because we feel that the waters were too unchartered and therefore we have got to give the people guidelines somewhere, and that is why we are asking that this should go through. But make no mistake about it, we will not be sitting on our laurels as far as this is concerned because we want to make sure that the type of arrangements which were adopted in the past where Ministers were the be-alls and end-alls, the alphas and the omegas will not be so any longer during this dispensation. We are going to make sure that the system of political patronage in the past is brought to an end, and where you put men into positions to do certain jobs, men you feel you should trust, they must carry out their duties, and we should see that they carry out these duties well, and if you put a person to be Chief Town Planner, let him function as such and not as the yard boy of the Minister responsible for that department. We will not regard any person in the Civil Service to be an army of occupation, but as a group of people dedicated to the cause of the country and willing and ready to serve. That is what we are going to do and that is our position here this afternoon and will be characterised for the whole period of our administration, not for five years but for many five years.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have great plesure in supporting this Resolution, and of course I do not think I need to ask the other side to support this because no doubt they would be happy to think that we have done what they have forgotten and failed to do.

Hon. F. G. SMITH and Mr. WEEKES rose.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Both hon. members cannot be standing at the same time. The Leader of the Opposition first caught my eye.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Opposition is not really opposing this measure and we said so. The Right hon. member for St. John made, I think, a good contribution to this debate, with a statesmanlike approach, but I would have thought that the Minister of Communications and Works who was a real estate agent would have saved his fire for Order No. 2 on the Order Paper. Can he tell this Honourable House how many estates or agricultural land he cut up when he was a real estate agent? Let us start facing facts.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is out of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am not out of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My ruling is that you are out of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: What I am saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that he had an interest, and under the Rules you will find that if you have an interest you have to declare it. He is talking about the plan and criticising the Government as if he did not contribute himself to cutting up agricultural land for profits. *(Aside.)* I am not quarrelling with his right, but for the way he castigated the Opposition, when as a real estate agent he advertised agricultural land for sale because he was making a profit, and he has come in criticising the Government that set up a Cabinet Committee to deal with this matter. I do not like this hypocrisy.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have not criticised the Government. Up to now the Leader of the Opposition has not realised he is in Opposition.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: That is a point, but what I am saying is that he should have saved his fire for the Bill under his command since he contributed to this bad system of cutting up agricultural land. Do you mean you have a conscience one way and then you can profit in another way? He should not have got into this debate, and that is what I want this House to start understanding that you speak with one side of your mouth....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member would give way, I want to draw his attention to Standing Order No. 28(10) which reads:

"No reference may be made in debate to the character or conduct of any person except in his official or public capacity."

My ruling is that no reference is to be made to the hon. member in his capacity as an estate agent.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: If that is your ruling, I agree with it.

Do you mean I cannot say that you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, happen to be an attorney-at-law? Can I say that the Minister of Communications was a real estate agent before he became a Minister?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You would be referring to his conduct except in his official capacity. That is my ruling.
1.30 p.m.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: What I am saying is that in the course of his functioning he must have sold agricultural land for development, or he must have sold land during the period for development. Is that his conduct? Carrying out his profession is his conduct? To say I defended a case is my conduct?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you questioning the ruling which I have made?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Far be it from me to question your ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well then will you desist from making references to the hon. member in the character or conduct of his profession?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: What I am saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that a person who has made his profession from cutting up land, agricultural land, who has sold land and made profit from land should be the last person to comment on a Government's action which is primarily concerned with the development of Barbados. If anybody has read any of the reports over the last few years one will discover that we have had a series of bad rainfall. The first thing he says as Minister responsible for providing water is that Barbados has not had bad rainfall between 1967 and the 1970s. In other words, he has not even looked at the reports in the Ministry for which he is

responsible. I do not know if he is still selling land for development, but he certainly has not looked at the reports to find that Barbados passed through for that period severe droughts which depleted the water resources of this country and you cannot have agriculture – and I am sorry that the Minister of Agriculture is not on his left – you cannot have agriculture unless you get a certain amount of rainfall. It is so obvious that it would not take a Solomon to understand, but I got annoyed when I found that the hon. member for St. Andrew can castigate a Government when he by his actions also took part in the fragmentation, if he cares to call it that, of Barbados.

That is all I want to say; you keep out of it and save your fire for something under your portfolio. Keep your hands clean.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is not a debate in which I had intended to intervene. Not even the speech of the Leader of the Opposition which I think is based in some singularly ill-considered logic would have prompted me to say anything about this matter, although in defence of the Minister of Communications and Works and indeed for his information I will say that in the ten years I have been in this House I do not think I have ever heard a speech which attacked any Minister for his professional conduct before he became a Minister in quite that way. I have never, for example, heard in the Estimates when a Minister voted in favour of the Prisons vote anybody saying "but you were a lawyer once and used to defend people, and so how can you vote in favour of the Prisons vote or speak on it," and if the Leader of the Opposition reflects for a moment he will realise that his logic amounts to no more than that, but I will leave that.

The true complaint about the cutting up of the estates can possibly be answered in terms of ten years of bad rainfall, because for 300 years Barbados has been having periods of bad rainfall. We have been going through droughts and years of good rainfall ever since we have had agriculture. We have had long passages of estates in marginal areas going out of cultivation temporarily, we have had many passages of estates being cut up in St. Lucy which is an area of arid land. Over perhaps 200 years ago the estates in St. Lucy began to be cut up. The Prime Minister from St. Lucy, the hon. member for St. John, the former Prime Minister who used to occupy this seat, has often I believe outside the House spoken of his descent from the landed gentry. In so far as he has descended from the landed gentry in St. Lucy he will be only aware that that was perhaps the first parish of Barbados to suffer the division of big plantations into small holdings, but this went on always against a background that some day rainfall would return, sugar would become more profitable, agriculture as a whole would be restored to a position of viability, and therefore people did not reduce the estates to conditions that they could not again be restored to agriculture.

This all changed about ten years ago when it become apparent – a little less than ten years ago – that the then Government was willing to allow divisions of agricultural land into parcels so small that no longer would it be possible to return that land to viable agriculture should conditions favouring agriculture once again come. Hon. Members have perhaps forgotten that the first two acre estate in modern times was Sandford, that Sandford had to survive as a plantation of between 300 and 400 acres for 300 years. The owners of Sandford, the Smith family, no longer wished to pursue agriculture at Sandford, they accordingly put it up for sale. There is a great traffic in plantations in Barbados. Apart from the two or three large absentee owned plantations, Drax Hall being the most notable example owned by the same family for 300 years, and Nicholas Abbey being owned by the same family since 1811, the Belle being owned perhaps until recently for 300 years by an absentee family, Kendal being owned by an absentee family; apart from these examples you will find hardly any plantation in Barbados whose ownership has remained in the same family since 1890. You will find most plantations changed hands every generation. This has always been a pattern, and the Smith family was no exception, having bought some time ago, having now sought to sell, and these plantations fell into the hands not of other persons who were going to take their losses and wait to make their profits but of persons, a Mr. Davis and a Mr. DaCosta Edwards, who wished to make a quick profit, so Mr. Edwards although he was a member of the Government did not scruple – and I use the word quite deliberately – to be a pioneer in the reducing of a plantation to uneconomic lots, the two acre lots, and the purchases at Sandford have shown quite clearly that they were bought for housing development and not for agricultural development.

As I have often heard the Minister of Agriculture say in here, they were bought by people who wished to put up a large house, have a half acre of lawn and a paddock for their children to have horses. I do not know if this applies necessarily to a large number of the lots

at Sandford, but it is well known that this was the purpose, and the same person, Mr. Edwards, then proceeded although Minister of Agriculture and holding a position in the Cabinet, to buy other plantations and these plantations were in due course cut up and sold in small, and I would suggest, largely uneconomic lots. At the very Sandford other members of the Government, Mr. Philip Greaves, formed a company and purchased a number of the parcels from Mr. Edwards.
1.40 p.m.

It is not difficult to us, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to think that these arguments about bad rainfall and uneconomic conditions tend to have a little less weight when you see that those who bought the plantations received very favourable conditions from the Town Planner and the Cabinet, and were allowed to cut these plantations up at great profits. When you buy a plantation at $1,500 an acre, and you sell it in 2-acre lots for $15,000 for the 2 acres without having to put in roads or services, then you will appreciate that you will make a very large profit. We, therefore, on this side must be forgiven if we discount the argument about bad rainfall and the owners could no longer make the canes pay.

We believe that the whole 2-acre and 4-acre lots, the 2 acres particularly, were arranged so as to give quick profits to persons who, no matter if the rain had been pouring down buckets a drop during planting time stopping precisely on the 15th January to allow the canes to be harvested, would yet have cut the plantations up and sold them. We do not think that the arguments about rainfall meant anything whatsoever to Mr. Joy Edwards. Well, the cudgel was taken up after Mr. Edwards' pioneering work in this direction by a group of persons who in other times might, perhaps, upon buying plantations, would have run them in canes.

First of all, we had persons connected with banks which had advanced money to Mr. Edwards to deal – *(Asides.)* I must speak without interruption, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I will deal with Waterhall later. I was saying that we had persons connected with banks which had advanced money to Mr. Edwards to deal with his plantation. These persons are Mr. Hal Kirton and Mr. David Cozier of Barclays Bank and the First National City Bank respectively. I will not deal so much with Mr. Kirton, but it is noticeable that these persons, who were the financiers of the politicians, decided to go into business on their own account. Mr. Cozier can now write letters to the newspaper indicating that he is the owner of the Belle where applications for subdivisions have been approved of Waterford. His in-laws are the owners of Edghill and Cane Garden St. Thomas. Other persons associated with him, Mr. Gray Wilkie, a man who, as a Solicitor, has received immense favour from the Democratic Labour Party in its last days in power. All of these persons then came together in another round of subdivision of estates. Kneils, Cane Garden, Hopewell. For Hopewell, perhaps no subdivision order has been passed yet. You have the Belle, Sturgess. You have Dr. Peter Ward who went to Canada with Mr. Joy Edwards to buy cows. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: He went with Mr. Bolden, too.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will hon. members please do not indulge in cross talk.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am hearing it in heckling from the other side, and it is alleged that they went with the present Minister of Agriculture. I would point out that the present Minister of Agriculture bought no cows, has no herd of cows sold to him by special favour because it was represented that he was a purchasing agent for the Government. He has never applied, as far as I know, for Town Planning permission to cut up a plantation. It shows you the difference in character and calibre; it shows you the moral integrity of the man who nobody will dare get up from his chair and on his feet make these allegations, but will make them for – (Asides.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Members must not indulge in cross talk, and must not speak unless they are standing.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I look at Cane Garden and Edghill plantations in St. Thomas and I realise that they are adjacent to Vaucluse Plantation, and that Vaucluse Plantation continues to make a profit; when I see that Hopewell right next to Cane Garden, which has not been cut up, continues to be farmed profitably in cane with a steady rainfall throughout the drought time even of 40 ins or 50 ins a year, well adequate to maintain a cane crop, it is impossible to convince me that the consideration for Edghill and Cane Garden being cut up is purely the consideration that they are no longer economic and viable as plantations. Instead I look at Mr. Packer, who lives at Cane Garden House, making his vehicles available to Mr. Happy Bryan and covering them with the Democratic Labour Party stickers during

the election campaign, and giving Mr. Happy Bryan $6,000 during the last week of the campaign and accusation that neither of them has ever denied, and giving his foremen instructions to do everything they can to get Tom Adams out of the House. I look at that and not at rainfall.

When I look at land bought from the Dowding Estates, who have, perhaps, become disgusted over a period of years with attempting to be honest cane growers; when I look at land bought from them at relatively small amounts of money being contracted to be sold to the Barbados Marketing Corporation at $20 000 an acre; when I look at that, I cannot be told about rainfall. When I look at that I see corruption. That is what I see. That land was bought at less than $800 an acre. Those are the things that I see. When I see that the Belle, the source of the water supply for the parish of St. Michael and the City of Bridgetown is given to Mr. David Cozier with permission to put the health of every Barbadian at risk by development there against the advice of the Ministry of Agriculture, the Waterworks and everybody who is responsible, I do not see rainfall. I could never see bad crops. I do not see that at all, Sir. This is why, perhaps, in the fullness of time this Government will deal with these things.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have risen to deal with that point and with that point only, but before I sit down I would particularly like to congratulate the Attorney General for the speed with which he has brought his intellectual powers to bear on the Town Planning legislation, the Town Planning particulars, and the Physical Development Plan of this Island. I have been very proud to be in Cabinet and know that within a month he first brought to the Cabinet a Cabinet Paper dealing comprehensively with Town Planning topics, and within another couple of weeks was prepared to come down with the Physical Development Plan with all of the guide lines which the Town Planner would require in order to carry out our Party's policy. I think the whole House should congratulate him and do so in the passing of this Resolution.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it seems that all hon. members who wish to speak on this debate have spoken, and I would take the opportunity, very briefly, to reply. I am much indebted to hon. members for contributing to the debate and for any encomiums which have been handed out. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would, in the first place, like to reply to the hon. member for St. Lucy. He raised a specific point as to whether development in St. Lucy was going to be curtailed because of the fact that there was no specific reference in the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party to a specific development in the parish of St. Lucy. I can assure the hon. member that the guiding principles which my Party and this Government adopt is to decentralise services as much as possible, and to ensure that Barbadians as a whole will benefit from any economic boon or, in fact, development in the country.

As a matter of fact at page 6 of the Barbados Labour Party's Manifesto, one would see that the Party makes this point in no uncertain terms. I can assure him that we will not be abandoning St. Lucy. We are, like the Opposition, political animals as well, and our instinct tells us that we can knock him out. We, therefore, intend to carry out developments in that area to show that, despite the fact that the parish had voted for the Democratic Labour Party for several years, it was only under the Barbados Labour Party that they would have had the benefit of rapid development of the northern parish.

1.50 p.m.

I give him this assurance; it may not be much assurance; it may be an assurance that he will see activity but he may not be the receiver of the benefits flowing from that activity in the years to come.

I must also reply to the point made by the hon. member for St. John, and I think he has forgotten and I am here being fair to him – forgotten many of the things that were written on the file dealing with Town Planning. The last time any attempt was made to hear an appeal was in 1971 – some five years ago. Between 1971 and 1976 no Minister of Government including the hon. member for St. John made any attempt to set up any panel to adjudicate on these matters; and furthermore not only were people reactivating applications on which there has been purported decisions by the Cabinet Committee but there were also outstanding appeals in which we have letters from the appellant asking what has happened to their cases. In some instances no replies were forthcoming from the Ministry including the Ministry of Finance and Planning, on these matters.

I specifically would like to refer to an appeal by the Barbados Workers Union which has been outstanding for over five years in relation to permission to develop their building at the corner of Nelson Street and Fairchild Street. That is one that springs to mind; and it seems to me that, as

I said when I was in Opposition, that the Town Planning Legislation suffered from the fact that it was placed in that Ministry and was moved from Ministry to Ministry. I recall that the hon. member for St. Michael North Central did try for the brief period he was allowed to remain as Minister of Home Affairs to get things moving, and the only problem with the hon. member for St. Michael North Central is that he seemed whenever he got into a Ministry to stir up activity and obviously that came over to his party as though he was stirring up upheaval, and there was some confusion in their minds as to whether he should stay there or not; but certainly other than the period when he tried to reactivate the Ministry in this respect, I respectfully have to disagree with the hon. member about his summations of the reasons for the delay in hearing these appeals.

I had suggested to the hon. member for St. John when he held the Ministry that it would have been better to set up an administrative tribunal to deal with all of these quasi-judicial matters, and the then hon. member for St. Michael West, the heavy roller, was placed on me to roll me into the ground, and I remember specifically his speech that lawyers were always looking to draw large fees rather than looking at the substance of the suggestion; and the stricture I made then is one that the hon. member for St. John has only now come to see the light of day in Opposition, and there is probably a strong reason why he should remain in Opposition for the next twenty years so that he could see the light of day. *(Aside).*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The point I made then was that.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of privilege. All afternoon we have had the gallery clapping whenever the Government makes a point. What are we going on with in this Honourable Chamber? A matter of privilege. Whenever the Government makes a point. I am not criticising you, Sir, but I do not know whether they are paid hecklers or what, but we cannot run Parliament this way. Every time somebody makes a point or jive at the Opposition you are going to hear applause from the Gallery. This is not a bull-fighting show. Even today the newspaper has in an article about this type of behaviour from the Gallery. It has got to stop.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member may continue to speak.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: What I am submitting is that as a matter of principle what we should look at is the establishment of some proper administrative tribunal, and I wish to assure the hon. member that both as the principal legal adviser to the Government and in other capacities I will give some consideration to the manner in which we can improve the system of hearing appeals by these quasi-judicial bodies and improve the system of administrative justice.

So far as agricultural land is concerned I regret I cannot agree with the point of view which the hon. member for St. John has brought to bear on this question.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the hon. member going to be much longer?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I would be about five minutes longer. I am fully aware that there were many instances in which the technical adviser both in the field of agriculture and other respects had recommended to the Cabinet Committee not to give permission for subdivision; and the House will recall, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that before the Belle subdivision took place I used the opportunity of a debate on a supplementary Estimate to draw to the attention of the then Minister the necessity for giving permission for subdivision in the Belle and I have good reasons to believe that several individual members of the Government party did not approve of the subdivision of the Belle.

It seems to me that what the Honourable Prime Minister has said is correct; too many of these subdivisions of plantations were done not because of the fact that there was a rainfall shortage or indeed a shortage of small holdings for the small man who wishes a two-acre or four-acre lot to pursue genuine agriculture. The party card, allegiance to the party, shouting the party's slogan were obviously conditions thought of. I do not want to go too much into this aspect of the matter but certainly I cannot see any responsible Government allowing the Belle, Bagatelle, in particular, Blowers, Cane Garden, all of which have been stated to be very good agricultural land by the technical experts, going out of agriculture in the way that it was allowed to do.

The hon. member for St. John must take some blame for this because it is not simply a question of planters making applications for subdivision and the Government responding. The Government had a duty to lead in this field, and agriculture is still the highest employer of labour and is still the greatest earner of foreign exchange

in this country, and the then Minister of Finance must have been aware of these conditions. I am sorry I cannot accept his submission on this but I can give him the assurance that no matter how many planters apply in future, they will have to recognise that there will be no indiscriminate subdivision of agricultural land in Barbados as long as we are in power. I have no special pleas to make and the plantocracy must get that straight too.
2.00 p.m.

I have no special pleas to make and the plantocracy must get that straight too.

I wish there was something to reply to in the speech of the Leader of the Opposition but when he does make a speech worthy of note, it will give me great pleasure to reply to any points of substance he may make. I regret on this occasion I cannot.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The time now being 2.05 p.m., this sitting is suspended until 2.45 p.m.

On Resumption :

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

MOTION OF PRIVILEGE

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before the business of the House commences, I should like to raise a matter of privilege.

I can quite understand in the early days after a general election that there is some enthusiasm on the part of supporters of both sides, and we the Parliamentarians have often been accused, perhaps with some justification, of being bad behaved and not setting a proper code of conduct. I have never subscribed to that view because I have never felt that Parliament was a Sunday School, and what is even more and what the public does not understand is that even although in here we may tease each other and try to score political points over each other, yet basically to those of us who understand our role in the community we are all friends. When we go into the dining room we share drinks together, we crack jokes with each other, and except with one or two exceptions, we as members of Parliament although basically with different conceptions and different approaches determine the best and try to do what is best in the interest of our country as we conceive it from our various political points of view.

I can understand the Gallery when a point is scored either by this side of the House or by that side seeing some enthusiasm, but then if this is allowed to continue you will turn Parliament into an arena in which persons are prepared to applaud or to congratulate their own gladiators as used to happen in Rome. This is not a gladiatorial contest or bull fight, because we are all, I think, committed to serving the best interest of Barbados, and we who are democrats are prepared to abide by the decision of the people as they elect their representatives and their Government. What I would like to see if you agree, and of course you are a servant of this Honourable Chamber, is for you to issue a warning that even although they may find some remark jocular that they try to restrain themselves in the expression of their appreciation or disapproval of any particular remark or any particular speech.

I do not think it is beyond our Barbadian people to understand and it is no sense the press asking us the Members to behave and to conduct ourselves with dignity when they themselves who are witnessing the passing of legislation in this House are not prepared themselves to exercise the self-discipline which they are asking us to exercise. We are all human, and I would like to assure the public that any remark or any comment they hear in this Chamber is certainly not generated from my point of view by animosity, hate or political dislike, but is part of the political game.

We have been remarkably free from political fights that we read of in Italy or the throwing of ink stands or books that we read of from time to time in more volatile parliaments. After all we have had to fight a campaign and had to pass through gruelling times to get into Parliament, and perhaps regrettably we have to say some things about each other from time to time short of the laws of libel and very often within the laws of libel, but this is another indication that we as members of Parliament are prepared to give and take and to appreciate the circumstances under which we have endeavoured to get into Parliament. I do not think they mean badly or it is a question of showing partisanship, but I would like to tell them that they must help us to contribute to the good behaviour and dignity of Parliament for which we all aspire and to which

many of us fall short. I do not think it is beyond our Barbadian public to enjoy a joke in Parliament, but they should try not to express it because if that is allowed, we are all human too, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and if I find a remark from one of my opponents is getting applause like the boxer who gets one in, then the human tendency is that in whatever is said and done we all like to be admired and thought highly of, and we are tempted regrettably to continue the type of behaviour inside the well of this House which could earn for us an applause outside the well of the House, and so all our endeavours, our attempts and pious hopes for raising the standard of living cannot be achieved unless we as Parliamentarians know from those who listen to us that they are prepared to exercise the self-discipline which they themselves ask us to exercise.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think my colleagues on the other side really want this type of applause. They have gained the applause by winning the election, they are the new Government of this country, I think they well share with me the view that they do not need the applause of the Gallery. They have already had the votes of the people; they do not want the applause now, and I think they are as concerned as I am in having in this Chamber, within limits, the type of conduct which can only enure to the benefit and to the dignity of this Honourable Chamber.

I do not want to have any long debate because I think I am expressing the views of the whole House that we would like the public to smile as broadly as possible and within limits to show their appreciation, but at the same time not to, by their applause or clapping or loud laughter, disturb the functioning of this House. We are to blame. I am not exonerating myself, and I do hope that the new comers to this Chamber will not emulate or rival some of the older members of this House. I see the front bench with only one oldster. I am not calling any names, but in all seriousness I hope that no debate will ever take place in this Chamber without the public being present; they have a right to be present and I hope that no debate will ever take place in this Chamber without the public of Barbados, the citizens of our country, having the right to listen, and all I ask you, Sir, on behalf of the entire House is to issue a warning and ask them just to restrain themselves since this matter certainly has been the cause of comment elsewhere. Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, surely I could not allow a matter of this nature to pass without expressing my sentiments also. In 1966 when I first came into this Chamber, I recall hearing shouts from persons sitting in the Gallery at that time. The now Opposition was in Government, but there is a long history behind the conduct of some persons in the Gallery. I do not think the public are well aware of the Standing Order, and that is important. When a person is ignorant of something, you cannot condemn him. The Standing Order makes it very clear, and I think it is Standing Order No. 77(5), that strangers must be silent during debates and must at all times conduct themselves in a fit and proper manner.

Many years ago when I first came into this Chamber to listen to the debates as a school boy, I recall that you could not attempt to walk too hard. You could not even keep noise with your shoes. Every single person in the Chamber at that time was silent, but it came about in 1961 – this is important – when the now Opposition which was at that time led by the member for St. John.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I would not like to take you up on this "honourable" thing. I am not going to challenge your ruling, but you must forgive me when I refer to a member as a member. There is nothing in the Standing Orders, and I plan to draw this to the attention of Mr. Speaker, which says that I have to address anyone in here as "honourable member". He must be addressed as the member for the constituency of So-and-So. For that matter I may even refer to the Leader of the Opposition as the honourable and gallant member, if you want to look at it in that manner, because as long as he has served in the Armed Forces you must refer to the person as "honourable and gallant member" or to a lawyer as the "honourable and Learned member." There is nothing in the Standing Orders or in May's. It is only a practice and I know you would like to institute some of these old time practices; but when I am in the heat of debate I am not going to refer to hon. members as "hon. members". If it comes to my mouth at the time I will say it, but there is nothing in the Standing Orders and the Speaker on the last occasion in here drew this to hon. members' attention.

However, to come back to the point which the Leader of the Opposition raised, this is way back in 1961 when the present Government was not in power. I recall coming here. At that time the Chair was on the other side and when the member for St. John got up and scored what appeared to be a few points against the then Opposition, the Gallery applauded and the present Marshal of the House carried out his duties by going to the Gallery, raising his hands

and drawing to the attention of the public that there should be order, and the member for St. John got on the floor of this House and treated the present Marshal of the House with scant respect, thus taking the power out of the hands of the Marshal of the House.
3.00 p.m.

It started back in 1961 like so many bad things in this country started since 1961 and it is now the Government, we on this side, who are prepared to put an end to this because the people in no uncertain terms in the month of September gave us that mandate and if we become unpopular by taking certain measures we have to so as to raise the dignity and level of debate and bring to the attention of the Gallery what is their position.

I know "Slims", for argument's sake, in the last Session would come in here and behave badly and we on the Opposition benches were the first to draw the attention of the Speaker to it and have him sent out of the House, and he is a loyal supporter of this Government. That I know, so it shows that we took the lead when we were in the Opposition, but the then Prime Minister condoned that type of behaviour as he has condoned bad behaviour all his political life and still continues to do it. That is the whole problem.

I therefore support the views of the Leader of the Opposition but I would not like the public to feel that we are stopping them from coming in here. No, not when they elected us, they can come here to hear the business being conducted, but I should also draw to this august Assembly's attention that people are much more conscious of what is going on now politically. They are much more politically aware, they are involved in the everyday running of politics, so much that there are some people who do not believe there is a change in Government, and as time goes on it will be difficult for some people to say "Sir Grantley Adams International Airport." I do not know how the member for St. John when he is flying his plane is going to get through to the tower when he hears Grantley Adams International Airport.

This is the type of conduct as set by the members of the House of Assembly which is going to be heard when you have this kind of thing as to the pattern of behaviour by politicians generally. I do not mind a few dog-eared jokers around here who do not understand what is going on, who by accident are alive, furthermore being around. I said "people" I am not speaking about people in Parliament, a few dog-eared jokers, nuisances, some of them.

I support my colleague on this side, but I believe that the Debates Committee must go about this the right way. Maybe there can be signs placed stating that there should be silence in the Gallery, because some day the shoe is going to be on the other foot and if we condone this type of behaviour now, my colleagues who are younger than I am now, because some of them refer to me as an old stager at the age of 47. I do not know what could be old about me at this stage, there is no part of me old, no way. You see, Sir, it is all right for some people to look at the snow on the roof, but there is also fire in the oven. I have lived between the fifties and I am living between the 18 year olds now, so I would not like my colleagues, the younger members, though we have inherited this type of behaviour, and I am quite sure they are all going to join with all of us hand in hand to make sure that the public when they come in here behave. They surely enjoy when their representatives score points on each other, but I support the view that there must be a certain amount of control. Of course I am told that there are plans for the entire Parliament where the Gallery is going to be larger, I do not know how soon, this is what I have been told since 1966, that the Gallery will be much larger. You have people downstairs fighting, and it hurts me to hear and see people down there queueing up, fighting to get in here, and sometimes there is still room upstairs.

All of these things we are looking into. Many years ago you used to see them fighting to go to a picture, so it shows how aware they are of what is going on in the country. They are fighting to come into this Chamber to listen to their parties score points on each other, and that is what we are here for and that is what we are going to do, so I would like to assure you, Mr. Deputy Speaker – I know the Leader of the Opposition is a good old scout and he is not to inveigle you into giving any stern warning to the Gallery and then put you in any awkward position, now let me warn you on that also, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No one will put this hon. member in any awkward position.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I know you are the best in the west, but in the meantime you also know that you have a few more years here to face the public. The position is that the Leader of the Opposition is a good old-time boxer, and I am not saying that is his intention, but in the meantime should you fall into something of that nature I am only warning the Chair.

The sentiments expressed on both sides of the House I believe the public when they come in

here would understand. They are our supporters and we love them more than you love them, we are aware of that, that is why we are here after fifteen years in the wilderness. We got knocked down three times and won the fourth time. He who falls and rises again is better than he who always rises. I did not go to school too long, so you must excuse me, I picked up these things along the way, so I get tangled up with them. It is not my fault that I did not go to school too long, I am in here with everybody now. That is important.

However, Sir, I think the sentiments expressed by the Leader of the Opposition I believe my colleagues and the Prime Minister, even in his absence, I feel quite sure that we all should look into a matter of this nature, and I am quite sure that the public themselves expect a certain stand by us and they will respect us, and we in turn should respect them, and I believe that we can use some form of notice. In the House of Commons if you have a cold you cannot go in, they have guards and all these things. We do not need these things, though if we are not careful they will creep in. You have to watch certain movements in recent hours which you will hear about later.

With those few remarks I sincerely hope that the public will understand that we are with them because they have been with us, but they must also understand that we look forward to them and they look forward to us to set the standards in the country.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have allowed this matter to be dealt with at this stage because it is a matter of some importance. The question of the dignity of this Hon. Chamber resides not only on this side of the Bar but also on the other side, and I am quite sure that the remainder of the relevant Standing Order will have the desired effect. Further than that the Debates Committee will deal with this in detail.

It is now Question Time. Are there any questions? Then it is Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: At the conclusion of Private Members' Business on the last occasion the hon. member for St. Michael South West was speaking.

Mr. TAITT: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. As I remember, when the hour had come I was making the point that the removal of the 5% sales tax was not in itself of any benefit to the revenue of this island, because far from the things having changed, far from items becoming cheaper, they have become more expensive, and during the course of last week I have had the opportunity to go out into the market places and to do a little bit of research on some of these items.

3.10 p.m.

Now, if you would look, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in at least one supermarket, I know, you would find, for example, that an item like Comet Matches, which used to cost 49 cents now cost 82 cents. A brand of toilet paper for 48 cents is now 75 cents. Large Nescafe has moved from $5.40 to $6.98. Salt is now 16 cents a pound. Soap powder that was $1.28 is now $1.68. Bisodal, to mention one of the medicaments, has moved from $10.40 to $11.16. Squezy from $1.40 to $1.55. But not only in the supermarkets, Sir, in one store in Bridgetown crimplene that used to be sold at $18.00 a yard is now $22.50 a yard.

I will move to another area and I find, for example, that a school blouse that used to cost $6.00 plus 30 cents tax, now costs $7.25 with no tax. A shirtjac that used to sell at $17.00 now sell at $23.00. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I could go on and on to list a number of things such as toothpaste.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I think, in the interest of the entire country's economy, if the hon. member will name the supermarkets that he has visited, I am quite sure that the Minister would make sure that the Price Control Inspectors visit these supermarkets. I would like him to name the supermarkets, and I am quite sure that my colleague, the Minister in Charge, would go to those supermarkets himself.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sure that the hon. member would not wish to make my speech for me. As I was saying, Sir, I could tell you of toothpaste that was sold at 96 cents that is now $1.46. I could go on, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I think the point is well made, and persons in this community have already started to understand what they will be in for. The sales tax has been abolished, but the tax system has not been abolished.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I spoke last time about certain rates that had been increased at the Port, and there were some persons who wondered of them. I managed to acquire a copy of a letter dated 8th October, 1976, Circular No. 22/1976, which says in effect:

"I am to inform you that the Cabinet has agreed to the following adjustments to Clause 15 of the Tariff Book" and, for example, as I said for cargo inwards the present rate per ton or part thereof $15.00 has now gone to $19.50

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Will the hon. member explain to this House that this Government had approved those, and we merely confirmed what they had done? The hon. member must not try to mislead this House.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The hon. member must make the letter from which he is reading a document of the House. That is within our power.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no need for all of the heat that has generated. I will gladly make it a document of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I assume that you, like me, did not hear the loud aside which questioned my honesty.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I definitely did not.

Mr. TAITT: I did not understand the stupid statement that it was decided by us and they brought it. Look at how many other things were decided by the Government that they did not bring.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If the hon. member wishes to start using words like "stupidity", I can trade them with him, but I am asking Your Honour to ask the hon. member to be parliamentary, at least, in his language, if he does not understand that. I am asking that it be withdrawn.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I said I did not understand the stupid statement. If you deem that that is unparliamentary, I will withdraw it. I did not cast any aspersions on the stupidity, or otherwise, of any hon. member.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member will give way for a moment, Standing Order 28(5) says:

> "It shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting language about members of the House."

My ruling is to say that a member of the House has made a stupid statement, which I interpret your statement to be, is unparliamentary and that the words ought to be withdrawn.

Mr. TAITT: I withdraw them, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, sooner or later, the Ministers on the otherside are going to have to get accustomed to my speaking, so they might as well get accustomed to it now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: So long as it is parliamentary, I will allow it.

Mr. TAITT: It will be parliamentary, Sir. In passing, Sir, I will refer to the statement made by the hon. member for St. Michael West, who said that we had done the country a favour in giving the union a full-time representative. I merely say in passing, that while it might be desirable for the hon. member to make the point, it is also a loss to this country that we can have a parliament in which such a distinguished son of Barbados does not serve.

I have stated elsewhere, and I am convinced, as my colleague on this side has indicated, that the Minister of Finance will, at some time soon, have to bring an emergency budget. I do not believe that he will wish to visit it upon the people before Christmas, and so, Mr. Deputy Speaker, soon after the Christmas rush is finished I am sure we can expect an emergency budget, because if, in fact, there will not be a deficit on current account in the vicinity of between $70 million and $110 million, there is not likely to be any. It is well known that they will have to find a way to raise the money. Later on, of course, we are going to be discussing ways and means of finding the money.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I must draw to Your Honour's attention that there is a relevant Standing Order which says that members must not read their speeches, and I draw to your attention that the member, who is on his feet, is reading his speech and not only looking at notes. I draw to your attention that members shall not read speeches in here.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In deference to the Hon. Minister, it is not my view that the hon. member is reading his speech. Perhaps I should remind the hon. member that he has only about two more minutes left.

Mr. TAITT: What? Mr. Deputy Speaker, with all due respect, Sir, when I last spoke, I spoke for at the maximum seven minutes.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member take his seat.

Mr. SIMMONS: Is he questioning your ruling, Sir?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member will take his seat, I will check the time with the Clerk. The records show that the hon. member for St. Michael South West spoke for 21 minutes on the last occasion. He has already spoken for 20 minutes. I have allowed about ten minutes for interruption, and my ruling is that the hon. member has two more minutes left in which to speak.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot question your ruling on this, but in the two minutes left, what I can state is that a lot has been said, and I will read from the Throne Speech.
3.20 p.m.

My Government has taken steps to eliminate the necessity for almost one quarter of the import licences previously required to be applied for. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I lay claim that that is not accurate, Sir. I have here Statutory Instrument 1976, No. 190; and Statutory Instrument 1976, No. 205. In them, No. 190 which was the Statutory Instrument which we had in the Government, there were 182 items listed in the second schedule. A total of 166 items in the new one still remain unlicensed. There are in fact only 16 items which I can find, and Sir, there was the removal of the first Schedule.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If I may interrupt the hon. member for just a moment. It has been drawn to my attention that in fact you had spoken for nine minutes last time instead of the twenty one minutes which I, on notice of the record, said you had spoken for. So that you may continue speaking until twenty five minutes to four.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is clear to me that in this House of Assembly I am not going to be given the privileges and the rights to speak, and Mr. Deputy Speaker, I shall not continue. I am finished.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker,.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Order. If the hon. member for St. Joseph will sit for a moment. The hon. member for St. Michael South West is grossly out of order. This Honourable Chair as presently constituted will not prevent any hon. member from speaking for the allotted time, and the record translated to me suggested to me that you had spoken for twenty one minutes on the previous occasion. When the error was corrected I pointed out that you had in fact spoken for nine minutes. The remarks which you have just made are grossly improper and they will be withdrawn.

Mr. TAITT: I mean no disrespect to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I withdraw the remarks.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you very much.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that you can appreciate that if an hon. member knows within himself – Mr. Deputy Speaker, I crave your indulgence. If an hon. member knows within himself what his real position is, and through a series of errors his position appears to him to be misunderstood, it is not unreasonable for that member to feel in some way his position is being misunderstood.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is right; but you must never translate that into an allegation of partiality on the part of the Chair.

Mr. TAITT: It was not intended, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you very much.

Mr. TAITT: It is the attitude which was displayed by the front bench generally speaking, on the other side. But.....

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This is now grossly unfair. The front bench had nothing to do with the ruling between the Chair and the Clerk at the Table, and if the member cannot behave properly, let him withdraw it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No point of order. The hon. member for St. Michael South West has already withdrawn the remark.

Mr. TAITT: That is about the tenth bogus point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The licences.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I must draw it to your attention. The member said his speech was concluded, and my colleague here

got up on his feet to address the Chamber. Now is he making another speech, Sir? I ask for Your Honour's ruling. He said he was finished; he took his seat and my colleague on my right got up to address the Chamber. He cannot now speak again. He does not understand what this is all about.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member for St. James would take his seat. It appears that there was an error in the time allotted to the hon. member. My ruling is that he be allowed to continue to speak until twenty five minutes to four.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: We are not questioning your ruling.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My ruling is that in the circumstances of the error the hon. member for St. Michael South West be allowed to speak until twenty five minutes to four.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: We are not challenging your ruling, Sir. I will be the last person to do that, but when you allow him the time to.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My ruling is that the hon. member for St. Michael South West be allowed to speak until twenty five minutes to four.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, just clear me up on one point. I hear the hon. member say quite clearly he was finished, he would not speak anymore, and I stood up. You asked me to give way to make him withdraw a statement. Are you saying he must still continue after I have stood on my feet?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In the circumstances of the mix-up about times that is my ruling.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I take it I will get a few minutes for interruptions, Sir. Mr. Deputy Speaker, among the items which they have removed from licences is lamb. They have removed lamb from licence; lamb is one of the items imported into this country which competes with chicken and pork. Lamb, Sir, was put on licence because the Ministry of Finance deemed it to be part of the quantitatively restricted items. They have taken it off licence. They have taken certain cereals off licence. In this day in 1976 when I hear the Minister talking about feeding this country when we have a balance of payments problems, you can imagine, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that they will allow items which have been designated by the Food and Drug Administration in the United States to be without nutritious value, to come into this country freely.

Another item, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is soups in cans – I want to quote the correct thing, Sir. They have taken soups and broth in liquid, solid or powdered form, off licence; and food preparations containing rice. Mr. Deputy Speaker, they are telling me that in this day in 1976 that it is desirable for persons to import into this country soups and broths in cans. Persons who work in the hotel industry get an opportunity to work cutting up the vegetables, the same vegetables which the Minister of agriculture will talk about growing in Barbados. Those vegetables – 57 varieties of vegetable soups will be allowed into Barbados free without any control by anybody.

There are others, Sir, but I do not wish to waste time telling them about things which they obviously have no intention hearing. Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is interesting about some of these items that have been removed from licence is that these are items which when I used to be there, certain merchants indicated that these items should be removed from licence. I dare suppose Sir that their valued advice has been taken.
3.30 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is one other item in the Throne Speech to which I would like to draw attention. I am told that the Government intends to amalgamate the foreign service exercise especially in North America. I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister, and I hope the Minister will take the point, that the basic reason for having representation overseas for Barbadians is economic, and that they have someone to go to, someone to represent them in times of trouble and it is vital that you do not let any false sense of economy confuse the question of representation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, representation at the consular level is completely different in character and nature from representation at the United Nations. That again is completely different in nature from representation at Washington, and I would suggest to the Minister that any attempt to compress the representation in an attempt to get what might be termed false economy will only result in inadequate representation of Barbadians overseas. A lot of persons who do not necessarily understand these things have stated that what is required is to amalgamate. An insight into the

representation of Barbadians overseas will bring to the attention of the Minister that you cannot do promotion for industrial development and tourism within the same context as representation at the United Nations. And, Sir, on the question of security, I heard the hon. member for St. James during this debate say that if the Airline Cubana had not come into this country in the first place we would not have had the problem.

I merely say in passing that that hon. member must have forgotten that it was he who indicated that all Barbados needs or all he needed or his party needed was a blue print from Forbes Burnham. He has conveniently forgotten that he wanted to have a blue print. I go further. I believe in 1966 when this country had Independence Celebrations that members of that party indicated that it was sad that Fidel Castro had not been invited to the Independence Celebrations.

M.. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member's time has expired.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is surprising how some people have got the ability to manufacture statements and things when they full well know that the statements they make are inaccurate. It is indeed part of the plot of some of the members on that side to try to discredit the legally constituted Government of Barbados, and in an effort to turn the people's minds against those of us who under heavy strain are trying to bring this country into a viable economic unit will go to all ends to mislead the public at large. The hon. member for St. Michael South West in an effort to defend his past actions is seeking to draw out of the Government what we know. They have been persistently calling on this Government and the Minister of Finance to come down and make a statement about the financial position of the country. They have quoted figures of deficits of between $30 million and $70 million, but I believe the public of Barbados is wise enough to know that a political party which took office on 2nd September, 1976, could not have put a country in a deficit of that sum of money irrespective of how they started to spend. They know full well how they spent the people's money, but they would seek to put the blame on members of this political party, but I would like the general public to know and understand that the person responsible for the increase in prices in Barbados today is none other that the hon. member for St. Michael South West, the member who has just sat down, because it is he who signed and caused to be published the latest Order existing in Barbados today dealing with the increases in prices, the very prices he now says have risen.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, the Hon. Minister is misleading this House. He says that I am responsible for the latest order published in Barbados today. I think that he ought to withdraw the remark because it is not true. An order was published recently of prices which appeared in the newspaper just a day or two ago, and that order was not signed by anybody on this side, and the items I have just called out are not price controlled.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the order to which he referred was published on polling day, 2nd September, and it came out on the 3rd, which deals with the commodities he spoke about in here today.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I quoted Statutory Instrument 76/205 which I have in my hand. If this is what he is referring to, it is signed by H. B. ST. John, Minister responsible for Trade. The hon. member cannot get up and do that.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is difficult for some people to understand what they have in their hands. I am dealing with the increase in prices which the hon. member spoke about. He goes so far as to talk about increases in Port charges being aided and abetted by the hon. member for St. Lucy, but that member is part and parcel of the team that must tell the public about the purchase of land at Mangrove and the $89,100 profit made. He should know and they should tell the public that the Trade Union wrote to the Government, in fact to Port Contractors, the people responsible for labour in the Port since March or April and are in the process of negotiating increased wages for Port workers, and as the custom has been you have to increase certain Port charges to take care of increased wages to be paid to the workers, because when the rates come in you cannot go and back charge on commodities which have already passed through the Port; but they are so dishonest that they would not tell the public that. The last Government was dealing with the matter and agreed that you had to increase Port charges at this stage to deal with any increase in wages which might be granted to Port workers, and that hon. member was part and parcel of the Cabinet that sat down on the decision.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Deputy Speaker, agreement between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Port and they are negotiating increased wages and this is the formula agreed upon.

Mr. GREAVES: I wonder what the Hon. Minister is talking about, because as he has indicated, negotiations have not even been completed, but we have new Port rates.
3.40 p.m.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Do you see how dishonest they can be, Mr. Deputy Speaker?

Mr. GREAVES: On a point of order, I hope you will see where the dishonesty is coming from.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, they speak about a retrograde step in removing the sales tax. Because the members on this side, the Government, have been able at an early stage to identify the waste which was being indulged in by the last Government, because of the shrewdness of the Minister of Finance, because of the efficiency which we have already brought to Government, the Minister of Finance is able to remove the 5% sales tax. But I go further, Mr. Deputy Speaker. When the hon. member seeks to say that prices in Bridgetown have risen he should tell the public several things. One, did the prices rise on commodities that were under price control? The answer is no. He said that prices were rising on other commodities, but I will tell him and the public of Barbados this, that I have found in the Ministry which was under the control of the last member where Price Control Officers had no directions, there was no policy as to what they should do, they had no time for reporting to work, no method of being checked, they used motor cars and went canvassing day after day, and this was the reason why the prices have risen. It is because of a system perpetrated by the last Minister of Trade who dealt with price control.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Minister is misleading the House. In the first place, none of the items which I called where prices have gone up is price controlled. They are all items on which there was a 5% sales tax and they are all items which had a certain price before the sales tax was removed and the price has gone up since the sales tax has been removed, but he does not understand that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is no point of order, a point of explanation.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I said, some people like to talk but do not understand. That is why I pointed out the system under which the Price Control Officers operated before, because my concept of Price Control Officers is that they should monitor prices from day to day and bring to the attention of the appropriate Ministry any exorbitant increase in prices which can not be justified, but he never controlled his Price Control Officers, he had no system laid down for them and therefore there was nothing they could do.

Now he talks about toothpaste which was sold at 96 cents but now has risen to $1.46. Toothpaste has been price controlled. He knows about the dispute between the international organisations over toothpaste, and I can say that at no time since this Government came into power has any price been effected on toothpaste, but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when you have something to hide you like to fly wild goose chase to see what will happen.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when he talks about removing things from licence he thinks that he is dealing with some of his colleagues on the other side, but this is only the beginning of things to come, because he has a lot more that I will tell him about shortly. The licences which were written off the book, as I call it, the things which were removed from licence – and I will only give you one example of what it meant – but as I said, because of the efficiency which we will bring to Government people will understand what Government means and not make believe Government as was run for the last 15 years. Now veal, tariff number 02.01, licences processed in this year alone were 90 and licences denied none; beef, 02.01.1, licences processed 752, licences denied, nil; lamb, 225 processed, none denied; salted beef and pork, licences processed 435, denied, none.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if he is going to read out that he should give the quantum of money, because there was a monetary system to see how much money was being spent for the particular item.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No point of order.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Dried peas and beans, licences applied for, 176, none denied; flour, licences applied for 369, denied, 4; soups, licences applied for 125, denied, 1; medicaments, licences processed 2,275, licences denied, none; unframed photographs, licences processed 77, licences denied, none. This is from January to September 1976, and I will go back for the rest when we come to the cement and tell you the balance you have to hide.

Brassieres and girdles, licences applied for 146, refused none. Out of a total between January and September 1976 from extra regional sources, 5,205 licences applied for, 11 refused. Can anybody tell me that I will waste the Government's time, the taxpayers' money and the efficiency of this country to process licences that were refused? But the answer is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you had to appear before the Minister in order to get a licence.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is a lie and he knows it is a lie. On a point of order, he is misleading this House, he cannot give you one example. It is a lie, a diabolical lie.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member for St. Michael South West please withdraw the words "that is a lie?" The words "that is a lie" must be withdrawn.

Mr. TAITT: I withdraw that. It is an untruth.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member for St. Michael South West understood what I said, I said he must withdraw the words "that is a lie." "That is an untruth" is exactly the same thing. Please withdraw those words.

Mr. TAITT: I withdraw that, Sir, the Hon. Minister is grossly misleading this House.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not know how much money was passed over and I do not intend to find out. I know I cannot find out, but I will go further. Further licences applied for from the First Schedule 3,752 licences, 33 refused. If you add between January and September, some 8,957 licences applied for and 44 refusals. Can you tell me that I can waste time with that sort of exercise?

3.50 p.m.

But as I said, when one man appeared before me and told me that the last Minister did him a very good favour to make him rich, What did I do? I chased him out of my office. *(Asides.)* You now want to know what is happening. Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is not all. Let us look at the licences in cement in which all of the importers applied for licences and only one man was granted a licence. Mr. Leo Leacock. On top of that the most fictitious charges that have ever been put into a pricing structure has been revealed, and I will soon reveal it to this country to let the public know where the money came from. *(Asides.)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. members must not speak unless they are on their feet.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: When the hon. member tried to tell this House that he kept lambs on licences because lambs competed with chicken and pork.....

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. He is misleading the House, and I challenge him to bring them in here. I challenge him and the whole group of them to bring them in here.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No point of order. Will the hon. member please take his seat!

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the public will now understand the threats against the Government of this country, because they cannot stop us that way. These things are being prepared by decent, honest and upright civil servants who have now understood that they have decent Ministers to deal with. He says that it competes with chicken and pork. Not one licence for veal was ever reviewed, and yet he is talking about competition with chicken and pork. My day, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is spent from morning until seven and eight o'clock at night with persons in Bridgetown, the little man and the big man, complaining about what used to happen in trade before. In the Throne Speech we saw what was happening.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Government of the day has put forward a policy which means certainty in operation. The public at large will know what is the rule and practice, and there shall be no more fiddling with Government funds; people getting rich overnight, and people who have their special friends to give special licences. When one looks through the total system of licences one sees, "Not granted this time." "Tell this man I say no." But one will find that somebody else on the same day gets a licence to bring in the total quantity.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. He cannot continue to mislead the House. Ask him if the Minister has ever signed a licence for anybody? No one has ever told anybody, "No. Not to this particular man." It is gross misleading of the House, Sir. He must produce the document, if he can prove it. He cannot do that, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no evidence before this Honourable Chamber that the Hon. Minister is misleading the House, and it

is grossly improper to ask the Chair to ask another hon. member any questions.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, my friends are trying to tell me that I must repeat the statement about Negro of class. I do not want to do that. He talks about warning the Minister of External Affairs about amalgamation. But let me tell you something, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Simply because you had a section of IDC controlled by that same member, and this was supposed to be outside the general run of Government business – the office in New York. The public of Barbados must know these things. There is one telex machine in the corner of the Consul General's Office doing nothing. There is another telex machine behind the lady, who is responsible for tourism, and doing nothing. The third telex machine is in the IDC office doing nothing, and the length of the building, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is as long as this room in Parliament. The Government and taxpayers of Barbados are seeing charges for telex machines doing nothing. The total sum of the business brought to Barbados cannot even justify the charges which have been approved by the last Minister of Trade. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is the public out there who wonders why taxes have gone so high.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I really regret having to get up on a point of elucidation. The Hon. Minister just said something about approved by the last Minister. He knows, or he should know, Sir, that that was the subject of a question put when they were in opposition, and it was answered in this Honourable House. It was declared that there are no charges for the telex machines, and he knows it. I wish he would stop misleading the House.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would only say that he would not understand the difference between charges and rental. The only problem is that the members on the front bench run Government according to the constitutional method of running Government; therefore, a Minister must approve certain things. If they never approved it, one can now see how they have been drawing money under false pretences. That is the reason why they drew money otherwise

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. I came in here a pauper, and I am going out a pauper. I have not drawn one cent from anybody.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member for St. Joseph continue.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I was a practising lawyer, I well remember the late Garfield Sargeant saying, "When a crisis comes, every rat breaks for himself." Just let me say this, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If we have inherited problems, or if we have problems, we inherited them from the Democratic Labour Party. I well remember coming back to Barbados in 1964, and hearing the long stories of the Democratic Labour Party holding political meetings outside of Government House and telling the people that they should not pay the rent for the Government houses in which they were living. I live to see in 1974 and early 1975 that members of the Democratic Labour Party appeared before the Chief Justice, who is now the Acting Governor General, with writs dating back to 1961 suing people in the housing areas for rent not paid. I saw people operating a motor truck and carrying the people's furniture down to the Central Police Station. Some of the furniture was left at the side of the road with mothers and children having nowhere to lay their heads, after they had been misled by the Democratic Labour Party.

I then remember the Hon. Errol Barrow, then Prime Minister and member for St. John, standing on this side, when we talked about having the Coast Guard amalgamated with the Harbour Police, and saying that he wanted no varicose-vein policemen in his Force. I well remember when we challenged him on the siting of the Coast Guard Station, and he said that was the best spot. I now know that that Government had been paying private enterprise to remove the sand that is now silting up the jetty of the Coast Guard. The Government was paying them to carry it away. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is where the hardship has come in this country. This is why the taxpayers of this country have had to sweat, and this is why on September 2 they cast a decisive vote for the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party, a document that will go down in history to show aspirations, not of the front bench, not of the total members on this side, but of the aspirations of the people of Barbados.

I well remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when they walked into this Chamber with the new tariff rates, when the then Government carried Barbados into Caricom, and did not have the common decency to debate the matter in the people's Parliament, and now they are complaining about the people in this Parliament. 4. p.m.

I well remember the member for St. John during the last financial debate shouting 'I see strangers' and I drew it to the attention of the

Chair that he had to get somebody to second him before he could put the people out of that gallery; and I well remember DaCosta Edwards who is now without a seat, clearing the people out of that gallery because they had set themselves too high above the people. Their profits were then fat, and as Sam Gibbs has said, the last gentleman who spoke is a nigger of class. He is a millionaire. He made him that; but this is the reason why they do not want us on this side...

Hon. F. G. SMITH: No, no, no, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We have to keep the debate different. You cannot talk about the last gentleman that spoke is a nigger of class and is a millionaire. Be fair. I do not think the Prime Minister would agree that that is a correct reference to anybody in here. The last gentleman who spoke, referring to the debate is a nigger of class – well, I never used the word 'nigger.' I say "Negro". I think the Prime Minister would agree that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is going a bit far, and I would ask that those words, Mr. Deputy Speaker, be withdrawn. You cannot refer to a member in this Chamber who has spoken as a nigger of class. I am not interested in if he is a millionaire or not. I think the expression is offensive in the extreme, and I can see it being said in the heat of the debate but I am asking that it be withdrawn as offensive and insulting, and unparliamentary too.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, on a point of order. The Minister did not say that the member is a nigger of class. I think the Leader of the Opposition did not understand what he said. He was reciting what Sam Gibbs, the merchant in Bridgetown said. Sam Gibbs the merchant said that the member there made him, Sam Gibbs rich and he is a real negro of class. That is what he said, unquote. That is all it is. That he allowed him to bring potatoes into Barbados and he became a millionaire overnight, and he is a negro of class. That is exactly what he said. That is all, Sir. Not that he is saying that he is a negro of class.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My ruling is that the word 'nigger' is offensive. The mere fact that an hon. member reports something said by somebody else does not make the use of the word 'nigger' parliamentary. Will the hon. member please withdraw the word 'nigger'.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I withdraw the word nigger. I myself would not say nigger. I would say he is a Negro of class.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What I objected to is the derogratory use of the word 'nigger'. You may use 'negro' if you wish.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I would say negro. Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker.

You see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are lots of documents I would have to disclose one by one, and I would say I do not want to make certain documents, documents of the House too early. All I would say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that we have to compliment the Government. What the member will find shortly is that far from prices rising, prices will come tumbling down, because the system of price control which has been used by him will not be used in this Ministry any longer. Certainly not. We will not need people to appear before us to ask for licences. Price control officers will know the rules of operation, and the question of quantitative restrictions when none has been granted, is just again another red herring across the trail.

If a question is down on the Order Paper I will answer the question in due course, and until that time the hon. member will have to sweat it out to find out exactly the answers which he will receive.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would just like some clarification on the exact position of this debate. I moved a motion in this House of which Your Honour is well aware. Then the member for St. Michael West moved what purports to be but what in my respectful submission, is not an amendment, in that you will have noticed from the Minutes of the House that he moved that my Resolution be amended as follows. He is not asking for the deletion of anything from mine; he has not done anything at all except to add that my Resolution be amended as follows Whereas, Whereas, Whereas, Be it resolved. So I want to know....

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If the Leader of the Opposition is worried and he is dealing with this matter of order, I do not really know what the Clerk put down in the Minutes about the amendment but it is clear that Your Honour will put the question in the proper form – that certain words be deleted and so on. It is clear Your Honour will deal with that; but if the hon. member is dealing with a matter of the order of speeches....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am dealing with the proper motion as amended, because he has not asked for the deletion. If you look at the confirmed Minutes and the Resolution as moved by the member for St. Michael West, he moves that my Resolution as it stood be amended as follows. Not by the deletion of the word after

'Note the speech' or words thereafter be deleted and his substituted. He has just asked that my Resolution be amended as follows, whereas, whereas, whereas, Be it resolved. So I can only assume, and I would like your ruling, that the motion as it stands is my motion plus his. I would like to know what you are going to delete, where you are going to start, when you are going to start; because he has not asked for it in the motion that is before this Honourable House, and therefore his motion can only be an addition to what has been moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I would like to know what you are going to delete., otherwise we are arguing at cross purposes.

What are you going to delete from mine, not asked for by the member for St. Michael West? Obviously there was an oversight on the Government's part that they should have asked that this House note the speech of the Governor General etc – all words thereafter be deleted and so and so be added. I would like to see the original copy because I am going by what the Minutes say – the Minutes which were confirmed in this Honourable House by the Speaker, and if you at this point could let the Opposition and the whole House know what is the correct motion moved by the member for St. Michael West and what is the correct amendment, then we would know what would be the order of speeches, etc. Therefore it is important because I am looking at the Minutes which show that the member for St. Michael West at no time asked for the deletion of any part of my motion, and if Your Honour wants to cut it up, you are the servant of the House and I will abide by the ruling but I would think it would be very out of place for a Speaker to look at a motion by an honourable member elected, and then decide I do not like these words, the member did not ask for it, I am going to chop out something out of here. It does not matter to me but I would like a ruling, otherwise the debate is going on ad nauseum because I am saying finally that as the amendment and the Minutes are confirmed the motion of the member for St. Michael West can only be an addition to the original motion, which I agree will make no sense, which I agree will be foolishness, but that as it is.

4.10 p.m.

That is as it is and that is as I understand it, and no hon. member on the Government side asked that the Minutes be altered, that the Ministers be changed, and if you would have a look at the motion by the hon. member for St. Michael West, perhaps you will know exactly where we stand, what words of my motion are being cut out and what is the exact position, and then we may have to recommit the Minutes and alter them because the Minutes show clearly and unequivocally that at no time did the hon. member for St. Michael West ask for the deletion of any words from the motion of the Leader of the Opposition, and therefore any amendment can only be added to it, and that the whole Resolution as moved by the Leader of the Opposition is amended by the addition of those words. That is all I would like to know. The Prime Minister seems to think that you have a knife that you can cut out what you like. I could not care less, but what I want to say is that we must know now what the words are that you are going to cut out from my motion, because the Ministers clearly show that no request was made to this House to amend, delete or anything from my motion.

I would like a ruling, and it is very important, because it is going to put you in a position where as a member of the governing party you have got to arbitrarily, because this is what it would be, on your own whim and fancy, say you do not like those words of the Leader of the Opposition and you will put a motion of your own. That is what it would amount to unless we at this point straighten out what is the proper motion as amended. What words did he ask to go or what is he asking to be added? The Minutes are accurate, I assume; they were confirmed and I want to know exactly where we stand and who will put in the words "BE IT RESOLVED", or who will add in and cut out. It is either out of order as a new motion or as it is worded in the Minutes, it forms part of mine unaltered, and we would just be voting on foolishness because it would be wrong for you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, without a request from the House for you to take your knife or your pencil or whatever you use to delete, to decide that you do not like this and you chop up a motion and fit in what the hon. member for St. Michael West may have intended. This is important. Let us look at the motion as amended. I am sure it must have slipped the Prime Minister or the lawyers on that side. He should have asked that my motion be amended as follows: by the deletion of the words from so-and-so to so-and-so, and that the following words be substituted. He did not ask that. The Minutes did not show it and therefore an amendment to my motion can only be an addition of his motion, or his motion is a new motion and therefore out of order. That is the point I am making.

Last week the Speaker stopped me four times when I tried to raise this point. He stopped the hon. member for St. Michael South

also, but thank heavens he is not here today and you as a lawyer can bring your commonsense and constitutional knowledge to bear on this matter, but it is important because I do not want my motion castrated, emasculated or truncated and therefore I want to know at this point what is my motion when you finish with it. *(Asides).* We will debate it all over again. I want to know what the motion is.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point. If the hon. member would check the appropriate Minutes he will see that the hon. member for St. Michael West in his Resolution asked that the original Resolution be amended to read as follows; and then it goes on to set out the manner in which the original Resolution ought to be amended. *(Asides)* If hon. members want to address this Chair, they can stand on their feet.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, do I take it then that we are addressing the Chair basically on an amendment which will be to delete all the words of the original motion and have the new motion stand instead?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is precisely the point I am making.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: And we could have agreed with this ten minutes ago? There is no hon. member on that side who has not spoken other than the hon. member for St. Philip North.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the hon. member proposing to address the Chair?

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am proposing to address the Chair.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I have a Resolution in my name and unless something has happened, I think I am the mover of the Resolution, so I have the right of reply to something which I moved in here, otherwise it has gone through the eddoes. I moved a Resolution and now I am being told it has gone through the eddoes, whereas the Rules say that the mover of the Resolution can speak again. I want to know where I stand. If you are ruling that I cannot do anything and that it has gone through the door, I will sit down; but I just want to know.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Has anybody told the hon. member that he cannot speak after me? As I understand it, the right of final reply resides with the hon. member for St. Michael West. I am merely replying on behalf of the front bench. The Leader of the Opposition is in the fortunate position of having a front bench which respects the Rules of the House and does not have to resort to stratagems to get the last word, nor indeed am I afraid for the last word of the Leader of the Opposition.

Now, Sir, the burden of this debate which was commenced in an unusual manner by the Opposition moving in effect a vote of censure upon the Throne Speech has seemed to me to rest upon the Government's economic policy. I appreciate that it is very difficult for an Opposition two weeks in office as Opposition after 15 years in Government to find suitable modes of criticism in speeches which they make at so early a stage against the newly elected Government. The Opposition is unable, I would have thought, to say that Barbados is in a bad way because obviously if Barbados is in a bad financial position, it is the Democratic Labour Party which has made it so. The Opposition is unable in the particular circumstances of this election and this assumption of office by the Barbados Labour Party to say that the Government is proposing a series of bad measures, they should have proposed these measures instead, because we have just gone through an election campaign in which the Democratic Labour Party proposed virtually no measures whatsoever for the salvation or even the good Government of Barbados, and it would hardly lie in their mouths at this stage to say that the St. Andrew's scheme is a bad scheme, they should have a St. Philip scheme instead, or that it is wrong to raise the school leaving age to 16, we should raise it to 15, 17 or 18 or whatever the fancy took them and they are to be commended at not in their speeches, either the one or two speeches which were made on the original motion and the majority of speeches which were made on the amendment attempting to say that the Government has bad measures or the Government has bad plans for the future of Barbados. They can only give leave to doubt the Government's plans for employment that is in their written script, or the Government's correctness in removing the tax that is in their speeches.

Now I have very seldom in my life heard any politician put up a case for taxing the people so eloquently as I have heard from speakers for the Democratic Labour Party on this occasion particularly the hon. member for St. Michael South with a fine disregard of the margin of twelve votes by which he was elected, with a fine disregard for the facts which he must have known as a member of the Cabinet

over a period of time. He has stood up forthrightly, faced the world, and told Barbados that the 5% sales tax is a good thing and that the removal of it is a bad thing. All those who have ears, let them take notice that the Democratic Labour Party thinks it was a bad thing when we took off the 5% sales tax.
4.20 p.m.

All those who have ears let them take notice that the Democratic Labour Party thinks it was a bad thing that we took off the 5% sales tax.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will give way, in my address to this Chamber on that matter I never said that the removal of the sales tax was a bad thing. I think the member for St. Thomas is misrepresenting what I said; I never said that it was a bad thing, nor did I put up any proposals for taxing the people of Barbados, I did not have that power.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point taken.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I understand the dilemma of the hon. member. It is an honest dilemma and I selected his speech because I thought that he tried to bridge the gap of that dilemma more efficiently than most, but he will recall the fate of people who sit on fences so long that the iron enters into their souls. On this particular occasion he tried to sit on the fence of not saying that we should not have off the 5% sales tax. I wonder how he would have voted if the removal of the 5% sales tax had come to a vote in the House; I wonder how the hon. member for St. Michael South West would have voted. I am beginning to think that we made a mistake in not bringing it to the House for the repeal of the full Act, because we would have destroyed a lot of hypocrisy, we would have made them put their money where their mouths lie, they would either have had to vote in favour of the 5% sales tax or they would not have had the opportunities to make the speeches which they have made on this Resolution. They have been put by us in our interest in abolishing the sales tax as soon as Parliament could meet in a position of favourable irresponsibility. In other words, they were able to attack the removal of the tax without having to support their case by a positive vote. If they feel that that is good politicking they are welcome to that view.

As far as I am concerned the Barbados Labour Party made the electoral pledge to remove the 5% sales tax, the tax brought in it was estimated $6 million per year, we are content to let the revenue suffer to that extent because we do not believe that the sales tax was imposed in Barbados in the original instance as a tax generating revenue for productive expenditure by Government, we do not believe it is a progressive tax.

I heard a good deal of economic nonsense talked by the hon. member for St. Michael South West. I do not want to give anybody lectures on taxation, least of all you, Sir, but it is an accepted fact that taxes which bear with equal hardship on all sections of a population are retrogressive in so far as they affect the poor more than they affect the rich, and a sales tax is one of those retrogressive taxes. To poor people the 5% sales tax initially meant and would still mean today perhaps a three or four percent reduction in their standard of living, because they cannot have the 5% margin that better off people would have in the way of travel and luxury which could be consumed by the sales tax.

We do not believe that the best approach to the budgetary problems of Barbados was by the imposition of a sales tax. I myself suffered from not having heard the list of items which have gone up in price since the 5% sales tax was removed. If the hon. member for St. Michael South West cares to pass them to me in a note or whatever I would be glad to study them if they are of any importance. If however this list of items and the arguments which they are used to support are of no greater value than his arguments used to oppose the free entry into Barbados of soup, a commodity which at no time this year he refused entry, despite his speech in here, I do not think that his argument, my argument or the public interest would be much served by reading the list.

I hear something about toothpaste. I recall that toothpaste was one of the items which were sought to be price controlled under the old regime. I am in bewilderment to hear that the removing of the 5% sales tax has resulted in a rise in price, but I will say this, shopkeepers change their prices everyday. You maybe able to buy a blouse in the Charming Lady Store 10% cheaper than you could before the 5% sales tax was removed. Some shops in Bridgetown sell particular appliances say at $75, the same appliance will be seen in another shop at $78, while in yet another shop at $82 less 10% for cash which would bring it down below the $75. Prices vary in Barbados even sometimes where they are price controlled and if the hon. member for St. Michael South West really imagines that the removal of the 5% sales tax has caused the prices to rise generally in Barbados I would only ask him to read the cost of living figures when they come out or take a few lessons in

elementary commerce. That is all I can say, I cannot say any more than that.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of elucidation. I believe the Hon. Prime Minister is correct in saying that he did not hear the list when he came in and therefore he might have missed the gravamen of my argument. The point had been made the previous day when I was speaking that the 5% sales tax, that the revenue from its removal had gone into the hands of the merchants. He may disagree with me but I do not think he wishes to go down the same road as his Minister who cannot in any way be said to be as *au fait* with these matters as he.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member for St. Michael South West has sat too long in the Cabinet presided over by a Chairman whose policy is to divide and rule. No hon. member on this front bench is going to be placed in the position of the Leader of the Opposition by this Prime Minister. The Minister of Agriculture dealt with the former Minister of Trade so effectively that I need swim in those waters no longer, except to say this. I do recall that it appeared in the newspapers that the 5% sales tax was not being taken off the items but the merchants were putting it into their own pockets. I remember some phrase like that appeared. You see, that would be accurate if it referred to an impost such as a customs duty, but the 5% sales tax was always added to the posted price of the item, therefore there was no room for the merchants to charge the same price as before and keep the 5%; they would have positively to put up the posted price of the item. That is the difference between a sales tax and a customs duty.

The argument of the hon. member appears in textbooks on Government finance which you have to be very careful when you reduce the duty that the merchants do not keep on charging the old price and pocketing the difference, but that cannot apply to a retail sales tax, because if blouses are marked $10.00, when you go and you buy those blouses, the bill says $10.00 and at the bottom 5% and you pay $10.50. What the hon. member is suggesting is that there has been a general increase by the merchants of their posted prices by 5% and this I am denying. I hole no brief for any merchants, but the prices that I am seeing, many of them are going down. I am seeing meat go down; I know that beef is at its cheapest for many many years in Barbados, I know the price of potatoes is very low. We are not hearing about these things.
4.30 p.m.

Potatoes were price controlled by the hon. member at such a level as occasioned Sam Gibbs to make the remark which Your Honour has ruled is unparliamentary.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: And which you will not repeat.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I was talking to Sam Gibbs up to last week, and he said, "What do you want me to do?" Up to last week I spoke to him at the Fountain Club in Cheapside.

Mr. WEEKES: On a point of order. Will the Hon. Prime Minister tell this ancient and Honourable House who is the Chairman of the Development Bank?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please continue with your speech.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I did not think that the ancient and hon. member has been away from our deliberations so long as to make it impossible for him to read. It is an unfortunate reflection on the quality of the Government over these years that it is assumed that positions such as Chairman of the Development Bank are given to persons only to be abused. Maybe, in the last Government this was so, but I have every confidence that the present holder of the position of Chairman of the Development Bank, who is a member of our Party, will bring a certain honesty and integrity which, perhaps, will confound all those such as the hon. member for St. Philip South when they see that there are to be no more Bath Plantation deals. At least he will never, as the previous Chairman did, when the Development Bank received advice that the Prime Minister's directions to guarantee the loan at Bath – the former Prime Minister's directions I am referring to – were *ultra vires* the Bank, I can assure you that Mr. David Seale will not vote in the first place to say yes carry out the directions, and then give a casting vote as well to break the law. I can assure all hon. members that that will not be done, and that there will be no Bath Plantation rackets. The Development Bank? Do hon. members really want to drive me down a different road now?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Inter American Development Bank has refused to make any

money available to the Barbados Development Bank as long as the Bath Plantation deal was in the books. Talking about Chairmen, when that double-dealing man gave two votes to create the Bath Plantation deal, and as a result deprived Barbados of Development Funds for a period of some years, it is only now that I am able to tell the House that the Inter American Development Bank is, again, prepared to make money available to the Barbados Development Bank now that we have got the corrupt Bath Plantation deal off of our books. They would give the Bank money under David Seale that they would not give under Bernstein and the hon. member for St. John. You must understand that. There are David Seale and Fred Gollop there, and the members who voted on the other side in the original Bath deal. We will get somewhere now.

Now, the Government at this time does not have any intention of introducing a supplementary budget as asked for by the former Minister of Education, the hon. member for St. Michael South. Let us get this clear in all our minds. The member for St. Michael South is, no doubt, fully aware of the financial irresponsibility of the former Government of which he was a member during the course of this year. I must say that I have thought it extremely strange coming from a member of a Cabinet which sat down and decided on the Parks and Beaches, or permitted the Parks and Beaches $1 million. How can it lie in the mouths of hon. members opposite to tell us, "We cannot afford to take off the sales tax, but we must vote $1.3 million." How can the hon. member for St. Michael South, who has sat in a Cabinet where virtually every department that was in close contact with the public had overspent its budget even four or five months of the voting of the Estimates: Highways and Transport, Parks and Beaches, Education, and so on, and yet we are going to be told that we are financially responsible for dealing with this.

Hon. members will have taken note of the circulated papers today that the Government intends to raise the travel tax at Seawell Airport. This is in substitution for the revenue from what we thought was an entirely bad tax. I would not anticipate it, Sir. It would be discussed either today or, perhaps, later in the week. We expect an increase in revenue from that. The abolition of the 5% sales tax appears to have had this effect: retail business particularly has been very poor in Barbados in the middle of this year and especially running up to and immediately after the elections. It appears that since the abolition of the sales tax retail business has boomed and employment has also increased very greatly in some parts of Roebuck Street and of Broad Street. The gentleman, Mr. David Seale, who was so much the *bete noir* or the *bete blanc* of the hon. member for St. Michael South West, for example, on my personal appeal has employed additional staff; various firms in Broad Street have also employed additional staff. All of this deals with some of the unemployment problems, and we are anticipating that the revenue will benefit both from the increased customs duties paid on the goods that are now being sold, and from the increased consumption possibility of persons who are now being employed, and who were not formerly being employed.

There are some signs, indeed, of a return in confidence which signs, I hope will not be betrayed by recent events – a return of confidence now that the political tensions of 1976 have settled down, and a Government has been elected which finds general favour with the public and in which the public, so far, has trust and attached to which, so far, there are no beliefs that when you put your money into the Government's hands by way of taxation that a lot of it will go out by way of corruption. These signs are all present, and we are anticipating a certain buoyancy in the economy, to use the phrase of a former occupant of this position. We are also expecting economies in expenditure. I have seen a very large list of properties which the Government has been negotiating. I have also received reports of an extremely disquieting nature relating to the purchase of some of the properties. These reports are being placed in the hands of the Police with a view to handing the papers to the Director of Public Prosecutions in due course.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hear people getting in here and saying, "If you find something against us, lock us up." I am glad to say that none of the reports apply to the three hon. members who I see in here at the present time. *(Asides.)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I have only this morning given instructions concerning the negotiations entered into with Cane Garden, Edghill Plantation for the purchase of property should be discontinued. That certain other

transactions should be investigated. A full investigation is going to be carried out into the ownership of Golden Mile and other organisations and corporations which, apparently, are shareholders in the land purchased by the Government, or agreed to be purchased by the Government for the Haywood Project. It is expected there will be many savings in this direction. Strict economies are being enforced at the Barbados Marketing Corporation.
4.40 p.m.

Strict economies are being enforced at the Barbados Marketing Corporation. I have refused to allow the vote of any supplementary funds for the Barbados Marketing Corporation until I have been entirely satisfied that its management, its structure, its marketing practices are in such condition as will make it reasonable for the Government to attempt yet another bailing out operation.

There have been one or two transactions which unfortunately I have been too late to stop. *(Mr. Taitt: Which?)* The hon. member for St. Michael South West asked, which. One for example was International Sea Foods. International Sea Foods was guaranteed $5 million of the Government's money against the advice of every financial expert of Government; against the direct guide lines laid down by international agencies for debt equity ratio – a complicated expression that merely means in the case of International Sea Foods, that you must not allow people with only $250,000 to borrow $5 million. The management of International Sea Foods then proceeded to get another loan from First National City Bank of $3 million. They proceeded to run up debts and overdrafts in the guaranteed loan and in the term loan approaching – and Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am actually afraid to repeat the words – $12 million. Twelve million dollars. We would have done better to have taken $1 million and use the interest to pay every employer of International Sea Foods for the period it has been running. One million dollars from the sugar levy has gone into International Sea Foods, and at the end of all of that, these shareholders Kyffin Simpson and Billie Fergusson who lost $11 million of the people's money were paid out in full for their shareholdings. Their shares were worth nothing and Kyffin Simpson was given $110,000 shortly before election date because there is no way he would have got it after. There is absolutely no way that money would have been paid after. I do not even know how to go into all these things; and I intend on another occasion perhaps to expand on these things even more.

All that I can say is.....*(Aside)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the.....

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before you say anything, may I move that Private Members' Business be extended for another half hour?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My ruling is that time for Private Members' Business has already expired.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders 16 and 20 so as to be in a position to accommodate members who would like to make a contribution to this debate, for another half hour.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, after all, we are running by rules. The rules clearly set out the time for Government Business, the time for Question Time, and for Private Members' Business. You have already ruled. If you want to suspend the Standing Orders or something to get through anything, provided I have reasonable notice – but the debate cannot finish this evening so therefore there is no sense in moving the Standing Orders. If there was a possibility of finishing – the Opposition is not going to allow you to prolong a debate which is going to be useless, because as I say, the debate cannot finish. *(Aside)*

When the Government was on that side, any time we asked to suspend Standing Orders or came in here to do something in all its stages, we used to hear a million and one criticisms – that we have come down with hasty legislation and what not. The boot is on the other foot. Now the time has come when you have to ask leave to go through a Bill in all its stages. You have to now learn. You were very unfair to the then Government. This Bill today is not going to be the first one. You are going to find that you will have to do something hurriedly and you have to ask the House to deal with it in all its stages.

If the debate would be finished, I could understand but Mr. Deputy Speaker, to suspend the Standing Orders at this hour with the Prime Minister speaking, I have a right to reply, the

member for St. Michael West has a right to speak; we cannot finish this evening. It is now five o'clock; we have two more Bills, we have the Port Bill, we have the Bill which the Prime Minister wants to get through in all its stages. We can go on till next Wednesday. What is the purpose? I would be the first one to agree if the debate could be finished now, and vote on the Resolution. I do not see the sense in suspending the Standing Orders at this point. The Prime Minister, he has to speak, I have half an hour, the other people will speak on the amendment, the member for St. Michael West has half an hour, and so on and so forth.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, regarding a motion for suspending the Standing Orders. It may have escaped hon. members' attention that there is a motion by the hon. member for Christ Church East, which starts at 6.30. It did strike me that being a quarter to five, that we are likely to finish – we are not going to finish the Airport Service Charge Act. It is going to take a lot of time, or, it may finish quickly. There is no half way measure about that. The Port charges did not strike me as being long. If hon. members think it will take from a quarter to five until half past six to finish those two, I believe we would withdraw the motion. If hon. members however think it will finish in shorter time, I would prefer to occupy this time. This is the first occasion on which I know that a Government wished to extend Private Members' Business and the Opposition wish to refuse it. *(Aside)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the motion to be withdrawn?

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am not the mover or the seconder, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. James.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, in the light of what the Prime Minister has said it would appear as if we could possibly – we hope we can get down to 6.30. I think we will have to make up the time somewhere along the road with my colleagues speaking. On that premise, Sir, I withdraw the motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The motion is withdrawn.

4.50 p.m.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now time for Government Business.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I now seek leave to deal with the Bill which was given notice of this morning in all its stages. That is the Bill to amend the Airport Service Charge Act, Cap. 59.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the boot is on the other foot and they now appreciate that very often you come to Parliament with legislation you want hurriedly done. They have only been in Parliament six weeks and already they have noticed that in Parliament the need occasionally arises where you have got to make the type of request that the hon. member has made. The Opposition is not opposing it.

AIRPORT SERVICE CHARGE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1976

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is a Bill to amend the Airport Service Charge Act.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, first I would like to offer my apologies to hon. members who have received this Bill rather later than Cabinet intended. Last Thursday at Cabinet it was decided that this Bill should commence on 15th November, 1976, and that it should be dealt with in all its stages today. However an additional amendment was necessary; this is the amendment which appears in section 3 of the present Bill to amend Section 4(1) of the principal Act, that is to reduce the percentage which the airlines would collect out of the new revenue, and this imposed certain delays and copies of the Bill were therefore not ready to be circulated to hon. members on time.

I am obliged to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition for his statesmanlike approach to this particular matter which is basically in my suggestion a very simple matter. It was decided earlier this year that one of the measures for raising revenue would be the introduction of a Travel Ticket Tax Act. This would have imposed a tax on the purchase of travel tickets in Barbados for travel to different parts of the world. This tax was reviewed in my office soon after the Barbados Labour Party Government took power and it was rejected for a number of reasons. First

of all it seemed to us to be a tax which would be very easy to evade. For all the protective provisions in the proposed legislation, it still struck us, and in this we were fortified by the opinions of many travel agents, that persons would seek to leave Barbados and go perhaps no further than St. Lucia, Antigua or Trinidad and find means to buy tickets for further travel and hope to evade any checks which would be made by virtue of the legislation when it was observed in their passports that they had gone further afield by one stratagem or another. Indeed as we came into power many and varied were the stratagems which we heard suggested, that your passport would show you had gone to Trinidad and then on to New York, and you would explain that your cousin Jean in Trinidad begged you to go to New York with her, paid for the ticket and you went.

The travel agents particularly were concerned at the difficulties which would be faced if this earlier legislation were sought to be enforced. But there was another more nationalistic reason, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for my rejecting this view in favour of a view which the financial advisers of Government had always held, that it was better to increase the Airport Service Charge. A travel ticket tax would necessarily have fallen for the most part on Barbadians. It is you and I who would have had to pay that tax and substantial amounts in many cases if we travelled. An increase in the Airport Service Charge falls principally on foreigners visiting Barbados, and we were advised and I believe that the size of an Airport Service Charge does not play an important part in the decision whether to visit a tourist resort or not. We were advised of this, we were told it does not appear in the travel literature as a disqualification for particular resorts, that when you want to leave them you have to pay a sum as you will now have to pay, say, to the United States $US 5. $US 5 is also not an unusual tax to have to pay at airports within the United States. I am informed that the taxes there vary from $3 to $5, and I am told that there are airports in the United States that have higher services charges than $US5. I therefore decided that it would be advisable to raise the tariff at the airport, now the Grantley Adams Airport, on persons leaving the island and that the revenue to be obtained therefrom would have to be an adequate substitution. The Cabinet decided this as long ago as 16th September, but we have considered the general financial position and a number of other matters before taking any further steps.

However, certain recent events have made it necessary for us to have a review of certain procedures at the airport which will inevitably increase expenditure and these procedures relate to security, not only in the security but as a useful by-product to the collection of this very tax.

At the time of the Cubana air disaster I went to the airport with the Permanent Secretary of the Security and Defence Division and immediately came to the conclusion that the most likely persons to have sabotaged the Cubana aircraft would have been disembarking passengers, and that they were likely to seek to leave Barbados again with some expedition. I accordingly gave instructions that a check be carried out on all outgoing passengers and that it should be done at once. These instructions were not carried out which perhaps is the reason why Hugo and alias Garcia were able to escape with such facility, and the reason given for not carrying them out was that no machinery existed. I thought this a very bad reflection on the ministerial direction of the Department of Civil Aviation prior to this day. I have even wondered why there is no proper check on the collection of departure cards. This has been raised in here over and over again. We hear that it hampers planning in Barbados because we do not have proper means of knowing how many people leave the island since the airlines are notoriously lax in collecting the departure charge and we suspect some of them are also lax in collecting the departure.
5.00 p.m.

I have therefore given instructions that out-going checks be instituted by Immigration Officers. Perhaps we will soon be able by the judicious employment of new staff to train a number of persons in the slightly different skills required for departure work as opposed to entry, but I have given these instructions. It will mean additional expense at Seawell Airport, and we think that an increased airport service charge is but a small price to pay for this increase in security, increase in certainty of taxation and increase in collection of vital statistics, namely the statistics of persons leaving the airport.

Since that time, and as a result of events to which reference will be made in the debate at half past six, I have been forced to institute other security measures. I have had to give instructions that at Seawell – I beg your pardon, Adams International Airport – no light aircraft will be allowed to leave the parking ramp to proceed across the runway to the Light Aeroplane Club hanger or the Aero-Services area until they have been searched by Immigration Officers and Customs Officials. I have had to give instructions

that no aircraft can cross the runway with more than one person in it. In other words, there will be no persons coming in really as passengers but masquerading as crew, there will be no persons allowed to stay in light aircraft by favour without passing through the Immigration Department and being taken over to the other side. These precautions, I think, will prove wise and necessary and useful to Barbados in the long run.

The circumstance of seeing an apparently unidentified aircraft parked at the ramp at Seawell at a time when there was a certain nervousness about what aircraft arriving at our airport might contain has prompted me also to give certain directions to the Comptroller of Customs as well as the Permanent Secretary to the Security and Defence Division. It is anticipated that the greater intensity of surveillance which we intend to keep on the non-airline aeroplanes, non-scheduled services, and indeed the non charter services, it is expected that this will necessitate an increase in staff employed, and therefore in the overall expenses at the airport. I therefore recommend this Bill and the principles contained therein to the House.

It is proposed to raise the airport service charge, better known as the departure tax, for travel within the Caribbean – and the Caribbean is widely defined, it is not only CARICOM – from $3.00 to $6.00, and it is proposed to raise the international departure tax from $5.00 Bds. to $10.00 Bds. These measures are estimated to be likely to result in an increased revenue of $1.6 million in a full year. We have only collected so far this year $461,000 to the end of September, that is, but we have had very good news of tourist bookings and airline bookings for the forthcoming season and we anticipate an increase in tourists, certainly for this winter season, and I have every confidence with the new administration of the Deputy Prime Minister that the summer season of 1977 will also be a boon season.

I may mention that we are also considering the extension of departure tax arrangements to the Bridgetown Port. Various matters are being considered in this regard and no doubt in the fulness of time fresh legislation will be brought before Parliament to deal with this particular matter of revenue raising.

On those grounds, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the fact that we are shifting the burden of increased travel taxes from the shoulders of Barbadians to the shoulders of foreigners, on the ground of the need for increased expenses at the airport to meet new security and other arrangements, I recommend this Bill, and I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I shall not be very long on this because this is going to be a series of tax measures from time to time which will bring Barbadians to their senses. This is only the first of a long series of tax bills and increases in tariffs and handling charges that Barbadians will have to pay.

Just one or two things here. When the Government now in power suggested that they were going to remove the 10% on airline tickets I am sure the unsuspecting public never dreamt that they were going to be hit in another way. Of course it was with jubilation that the removal was received by the public, but when the Government imposed a tax on airline tickets the travel agents were up in arms, and of course the Government during the election pledged to remove this 10% sales tax, and that sales tax, remember, was not on tickets bought within the Caribbean area, so that it did not affect CARICOM people who were going to St. Vincent, St. Lucia, within the area, it was passed on the idea that a person who can pay for an airline ticket to New York or London, Sydney or Adelaide could at least give the Government 10%, so that our CARICOM partners, the ladies who go down and put bananas and plantains on the schooners and fly up would not have to pay this 10% tax on airline tickets. But there was general jubilation that the Barbados Labour Party was going to wipe away this wicked tax imposed by the Democratic Labour Party, but what do we find in substitution? That the Government through the Minister of Finance is going to rake off CARICOM, or whoever you are, jumping it from $3.00 to $6.00. If it were the Democratic Labour Party you would hear that it is 100% increase, you would hear all sorts of things, but you are increasing it from $3.00 – I am not quarrelling with it, because you do not know heat, you do not know cold, you do not know good, you do not know bad, and the people of this country will learn all and then they will realise good from bad, but this is just a series of measures I think they have to learn. So that they will find that an increase from $3.00 to $6.00, and from $5.00 to $10.00, and I could imagine that if this measure similar to the measure introduced by the last Minister of Finance had come and they were on this side you would hear how they would have turned the whole House up that we were imposing a tax which is going to get $1.6 million from people.

Furthermore, he has warned you again, he is going to introduce another head tax at the Port. Well, let him come with it. Everybody going out, schooners, everybody travelling he is going to tax. He is finding novel ways now to bring to tax the people of this country. Of course, as I say, you have to know the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance to understand how his mind works, so he is now going to transfer it to the Port.
5.10 p.m.

What he has been getting on with and giving the impression now is that his financiers have advised him about this 10% on airline tickets. He is getting on as if Barbados is the first country that has this form of taxation. There are other countries that have the 10% on airline tickets. Other countries that have the ability and have travel agents, too. Other countries have people who operate the 10% on tickets, so when he comes now and pretends that Barbadians cannot work it, or that travel agents cannot work it, that is no credit to travel agents, or no credit to the intelligence of Barbadians because this system operates even in Jamaica and in other developed countries. It was introduced in the Budget in New Zealand. Do not come here and give the people the impression that it is something novel. You will see that in their last Budget the Minister of Finance introduced the same sales tax on airline tickets. You are telling me that it can work in New Zealand, Jamaica and other countries, but Barbadian travel agents and the Barbadian public cannot work it, or there are going to be novel ways of getting around it. That is no excuse.

Now, admit that, as Minister of Finance, you have fooled the people by saying that you were taking off the 10% one way, and you had to put it on another way in order to raise revenue. You do not want any excuse. There is a simple way and there is no magic. You are looking for money. Just as you surreptitiously and quietly increased the handling charges at the Port – *(Asides.)* I have a letter here from the Port Manager, and I am going to deal with it later on. There is an increase in the handling charges on items of transshipment. The Minister of Communications and Works does not know what is going on. I have a letter from the Port Manager which I am going to read here later on. The increase in the handling charges means that the price of things has gone up.

When you removed the sales tax, as the member for St. Michael West said, it would be $6 million in people's pockets, in the next breath on the 25th you have raised the tarriff on cargo from $15.00 to $19.50 a ton for transshipment. Do not come here pretending that you are doing something magically. You have taken off the 10% tax on tickets imposed by the former Minister of Finance, and you have put on an increase by 100% on the tax which people pay for cargo. You pretended that you had taken off the sales tax, but immediately from the 25th October in a letter written on the 8th by the Port Manager you increased the handling charges on transshipment, inward and outward cargo, by 33%. You are pretending that it is a novel way of taxation used by a new Minister of Finance on the pretence that he is easing the people one way because he is altering something that the DLP did, but imposing another tax. Now, what is the difference between the two Parties? We put on a sales tax. You took it off and increased the tariff. We put on a 10% on tickets. You took it off, but you increased by 100% the departure tax. Who is putting on cruel taxes on people?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are not opposing it. If he wants more money, he has to find it from some where. This is not the first, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I have said before. There is going to be a lot more coming down from time to time. This is only the thin edge of the wedge. The people will then begin to think that you have to suffer good and suffer bad to appreciate good. You have to have heat to know cold. You must have night to appreciate day. You must have light and darkness. When that period of purgatory has passed, then this Party will come back into its own as a good Party that did so much for the people of this country.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to make a short contribution to this debate. You will recall quite clearly that the impression which was conveyed during the campaign and, indeed, in the context of the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party which we have constantly to refer to makes reference to the system of taxation in this country, and one would have got the impression that the Barbados Labour Party, when it took control of the Government, would have done a lot to ease the tax burden of the people of this country, which they claim was excessive.

We have a situation where we have now seen that the Government is introducing yet another measure of taxation. Last week I think it was the former Minister of Health and Welfare who invited the Prime Minister to introduce a budget. Today we have heard the Prime Minister's reaction to that, but what more can one gather from a measure like this other than that it is a blatant attempt by the Government to introduce in a piecemeal manner budgetary proposals. In

short, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what we are witnessing here today is a clear attempt by the Government to impose taxation measures on people by this measure.

Now this will, obviously, mean that the cost of travelling will increase and those people who have to travel must understand that they will have to pay more as a result of this measure, as indeed the people of Barbados are now witnessing and experiencing by the various and devious methods which the Government is using to tax them one way or another. I do not want to go into the fallacious arguments which have been advanced to indicate that the removal of the sales tax has meant the lightening of the burden of taxation, or the lightening of the rise in the cost of living on the people generally. I am sure I will have an opportunity to do that next week, or whenever we are meeting again to discuss the amended Resolution. All of these are measures which are being used by Government to raise revenue, and measures which, when they were in Opposition, they indicated were burdensome and were not right and proper.

We see, today, that the Government has had to come to this House to indicate that it will be raising taxation in a particular area, as the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, by 100%. Raising the departure tax in the Caricom areas from $3 to $6, and outside of that area from $5 to $10. At the same time that this is going on one recognises – I am sure that the members on the other side have, indeed, the general public of Barbados, quite clearly see the serious rise in prices which has taken place in this country.

I just want to make a point, and to re-emphasise the point that rather than coming here with a budget when a proper look would be taken at the entire economic situation, the Government is escaping that responsibility by bringing down this piecemeal measure. I suppose by the end of the year we will have a concrete set of budgetary proposals, and then there would be no need for the budget because the Government, by this devious measure, would have been able to raise the revenue for the policies it wants to carry out.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would really like to reply to the statement made by the hon. member for St. Lucy. I think it was that distinguished statesman, Sir Grantley Adams, who said that people seem to have short memories, and although it is a generalisation, certainly, on this occasion it has been proven to be true. The hon. member should recall that the last Budget Statement before the dissolution of the last Parliament was made by the then Minister of Finance, and at that stage it was proposed to levy a tax on tickets for people travelling by air, and the way in which the tax was structured it would have fallen on Barbadians going outside the region and on Barbadians only. 5.20 p.m.

The hon. member should also recall that the Minister set up what he estimated would have been the revenue yielded from such a tax. Now in one breath we are being told that we are creating a deficit on current account. In the other breath we are being told that we are bringing increasing taxation by one hundred percent. The hon. member should know that the revenue yield from this measure will probably be slightly less than the revenue yield from the measure which his Government had intended to introduce in the House. The hon. member ought to recognize that in this case the revenue yield is not coming from the taxation of Barbadians alone but it will be a yield coming from a taxation of visitors to our shores, and in the context of the need to increase security at the airport, for the security of people who use these facilities, even if it had meant the increase for that reason, then I respectfully submit to this House it would have been justified.

I understand very well having sat on the Opposition benches the necessity for the Opposition to make speeches and to put forward a point of view which may look politically attractive and sometimes is politically attractive but the hon. member must concede that coming so soon after July or August this type of speech although appearing to be politically attractive is really substantially specious, because all we have done here in actual fact is to have come down with some of the taxation measures, which if you will recall the Budget Debate on which we said we will not oppose that particular measure of taxation, although the way in which it is done we may not have agreed with. We raised at that stage the fact that the way in which the tax was being structured it would have been harder perhaps to administer, and it would have been simpler to do it this way.

We disagreed with the sales tax and we said so. We did not disagree with the tax, for instance, on insurance companies, and indeed the then Minister of Finance when he replied said that he noted that we were not disagreeing with that, nor were we disagreeing with the relief of taxation being given by way of the 25% dividends credit on Corporation tax. That is a fact.

Let us be quite frank. The then Minister of Finance after he had given his figures said to the House that he was going to have $45 million o

deficit – that was his estimate – and at the time I think I remember him holding his head and mopping his brow and saying he did not know where he was going to get it from; that he would like to know where he was going to get it from. That is not a long time ago.

I am hearing strictures being levelled at this Government as though within six weeks we could bring the Millenium to the country; something that they had failed to do in fifteen years. These are the strictures I am hearing being levelled, and I wish we could. In the interest of Barbadians I wish we could immediately in six weeks have reversed the trend of policies to such an extent that we would be able to say to the country today, there is a lighter taxation, full employment, and the country is full steam ahead.

Honourable Members on the other side, particularly those who have had Ministerial office must recognize that a new Minister has to first reorient the policies in his department. You must recognize in all fairness to any Government, just as the Democratic Labour Party did in 1961, that some of the existing policies would be carried on. There is no Government in the world that has succeeded another Government, that has not carried on part of the administration, because part of the talk about how difficult it is to run a Government, and we were inexperienced – you are taking over a civil service system; every member must know that. I really have not found anything difficult yet. I might find security tight but I can handle that too; but I have not found anything difficult yet.

I would like to assure the hon. member that in due course he will have a financial statement made to the country, and I think that Barbadians will recognize that the next couple of years will call for us all to show a greater spirit of national unity. The elections are over. The Prime Minister in his first speech appealed to the nation for national unity. I am repeating that plea now as I may be forced to repeat it later; and I am appealing particularly to a member of the Union where the labour sector of our economy constitutes such an important if not the most important part of the economy. I am appealing to the hon. member to urge the Leaders of his Union to cooperate fully with this Government and I assure him that the Government will take all steps to increase the standard of living of all workers, and not only the union workers as exist in his particular union.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have one very simple point to make in answer to the Opposition. Prior to the dissolution of the last House when the then Airport ticket tax – or whatever it was called – was introduced a flat rate was purported to be put on the tax of 10% on the ticket. The present Bill on which I am speaking purports to increase for one area from $3 to $6 and for areas outside the Caribbean $5 to $10. The then Hon. Leader of the Opposition was veiled to some extent in his references to percentages when he alleged that we would not say now that in respect of these increases they are 100% increases, but when we were in the Opposition we would have alleged that they were 100% increases.

The point I want to make clear to this Assembly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that in the taxation methods of this Government you will find greater humanity and a greater sence of realism than was shown in the past Government. Let me explain these facts once and for all, Sir. If according to the previous Bill somebody bought an air ticket to America for $500 and had to pay 10% on that, it would have cost $550 on the cost of the ticket. That is an additional $50. Now, if you buy the same ticket you are being asked to pay $10. Immediately there is a saving of $40. It does not take any Solomon to make that clear to the general public. The saving is obvious to anybody with the slightest modicum of commonsense.

5.30 p.m.

It does not take any Solomon to make that conclusion. The saving is obvious to anybody with the slightest smattering of common sense. To say that the increse if 100% is technical. It is increased from $5 to $10 and from $3 to $6, but it is still substantially less than the imposition of 10% as a flat rate. That is all this is about, Sir, and does not need any debate.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this debate has gone on for a long time and I rise only to see if it is possible to clarify for the edification of the members on the other side what taxation policy is all about. Now the hon. member for St. Philip North has just indicated that if you bought a ticket for $500 and paid 10% it would have cost an additional $50 to travel to New York. What he forgot to mention was that in addition to the $50 it would have cost you $5 departure tax; so in effect it would have cost under the proposal of the Democratic Labour Party an additional $55 to get out of Barbados, and that is $55 on Barbadians travelling. Under the programme of this Government it is now costing you $10, and $10 from $55 leave $45 according to my arithmetic.

Now that addresses only one aspect of taxation policy. Taxation policy contrary to

popular belief is not merely an instrument of raising revenue because Government through the Central Bank can print money when it wants to raise revenue that way. Henry VIII and those fellows used to take the silver out of the dollar bills. It can be done by modern means by printing some more dollar bills and putting them into circulation. That is a means of raising revenue. The second aspect of taxation policy is to distribute the burden of carrying the Government. It is like carrying a heavy refrigerator upstairs. The man behind is helping to move it, but as soon as he starts to climb the stairs, the weight shifts backwards and he is carrying a heavier burden than the man in front. The taxation policy of the Barbados Labour Party is not to raise revenue in an irresponsible and inhumane fashion. The programme of the Barbados Labour Party Government is to raise taxation and at the same time to be conscious of its responsibility to its citizens and shift the burden of responsibility from falling unevenly upon them and placing it on people like North Americans who have money to spend and who can afford to bear the burden. That is the ethnic difference between our policy and theirs.

I do not know why it is necessary for us to come in here day after day and hear all kinds of spurious nonsense about the virtues of the Democratic Labour Party and the vices of the Barbados Labour Party. Wasn't it the Democratic Labour Party that imposed the 5% sale tax which is universally acknowledged as one of the most if not the most regressive taxation programmes available. It is regressive in that it taxes the poor at the same rate as it taxes the rich, and the Barbados Labour Party abolished it because it was fully conscious of the fact that it was an inequitable tax burden. Only places that cannot find any other means of raising revenue resort to sales tax. I heard the hon. member mention New York city. New York city has a 10% sales tax I believe, but Barbados is clearly not New York. When a man works in the Sanitation Department in New York he can earn $US16,000 a year and a man who works on a sanitation truck in Barbados is lucky to get away with $50 a week. That is the kind of inequity we are talking about. When a cook in New York can make $250 a week and a cook in Barbados is working for $35, that is the kind of thing they are talking about. So taxation policy must take these considerations into mind.

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central talked about my saying that the removal of the sales tax would put $6 million into the hands of the consumers in Barbados. That is essentially true in a pure economic sense. If they are not having to pay it means that they have it to dispense of as discretionary income. If the merchants raise prices from $1.50 to $3.00 according to the arithmetic of the hon. member for St. Michael South West, that does not look like a 5% addition to me. What we are trying to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that we are aware of our responsibility to the people of Barbados and in the final analysis they are going to love us for it.

Now the hon. member for St. Michael South Central talked about me a few minutes ago castrating his Resolution. I do not apologise if the wicket is taking some uneven bounces. It might be disturbing to the hon. member to realise that a little wet-behind-the-ears neophite in political business has upstaged him in this House, but in the future we will continue to demonstrate that the members on that side have begun to lose their reflexes and a modern day set of Holdens are now operating from the pavilion end.

I do not want to say an awful lot on this Bill before the House except that if it does anything at all, it demonstrates the freshness of approach on the part of the Barbados Labour Party on taxation policy, because something as obvious as the increase in departure tax excapes the attention of the former Minister of Finance, and he in his reckless disregard for the backs of the Barbadian taxpayers thought to impose a 10% tax on travel outside of Barbados. I would like to commend this Bill to the House and ask other hon. members who have to consider it not to let us waste the people's time by advancing spurious doctrines, but let us approach this thing with the responsibility that it merits.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that most of the members who have spoken on the other side have completely ignored the strictures which have been levelled by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. What the Leader of the Opposition was saying is that during the election period the members on the other side went about saying and indeed published in their manifesto that they intended to remove a series of taxes, but at no stage did they say that they were going to increase the handling charges at the Port, that they were going to impose a tax on travel in any form or any of the substitute activities that they now find themselves embarked upon. Specifically if I may, I want to quote from the document to which the hon. member for St. Michael South Central referred on taxation.

5.40 p.m.

On page 3 of that document which deals with taxation it was stated:

"The B.L.P. recognises that one effect of inflation has been to raise the level of taxation in Barbados, and will therefore:—

Amend the Income Tax Act to provide a higher level of allowances;

Abolish the 5% Sales Tax and the Trade Tax.

Restructure the Corporation Tax to remove the present disincentives to local investment.

Overhaul the system of indirect taxation to produce a uniform system which will simplify collection and reduce the incidence of tax evasion.

Provide tax incentives for economic development in rural areas.

Encourage, by means of incentives, greater local ownership in the tourist industry."

To replace all these magnificent gifts promised to the electorate, what did the hon. members on the other side and their colleagues state? That they would get additional money by raising non-tax revenue especially from sources outside Barbados.

"Steps will be taken to provide and extend tax-haven facilities for overseas investors whose businesses do not operate in Barbados. The strictest control will be instituted to ensure that this does not lead to the island becoming a shelter for criminal elements but, subject to this, such investors will be encouraged to deposit funds and form companies whose licensing and other fees can be expected to make substantial contributions to the revenue of the island.

Foreign-owned corporations which own land in Barbados will be taxed on such land at a higher rate than Barbadian owners."

And then the third ingenious device which was going to be resorted to to fill the gap or the bridge, the gap between expenditure and revenue to which the hon. member for Christ Church West referred, and to which I referred in my budget saying that the country could not afford increased expenditure at this stage, and the country could not afford to have any tax giveaways in this particular year because of the economic conditions which prevailed not only in Barbados but throughout the world, but no way was it suggested either during the so-called reply to the Budget Speech which restricted itself to making allegations against the conduct and characters of a former Minister of Government and others, no way did they say, "well, our solution to this problem is that we are going to increase the handling charges down at the Port of Bridgetown or the airport service charge at Seawell, as it then was, now Sir Grantley International Airport." Nowhere in any of the statements which were made was it ever suggested.

What I am emphasising at this stage, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that the critical gap between revenue and expenditure was known long before the Budget, it was known at the time of the Estimates when the Public Service Unions came for increases in salaries after 21 meetings, and the other side said we should have continued to negotiate, and they vaguely suggested that had they been in my position they would have granted much more generous increases than the Government had given and I asked where was the money coming from. The hon. member for Christ Church West did not, I would say, directly put forward as a matter of policy, but he generously suggested that if I had brought down a wealth tax, that is, count the savings of every Barbadian resident in the Savings Bank, his tax on property or a proportion of your property, that he himself would be the first person who would be willing to make his contribution in that regard.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir, I do not believe the hon. member has, since he has been out of power, taken the opportunity to read the records of that debate and correct himself on his interpretation of what I was saying. He tried to say then and he repeated it during the election in Christ Church West that I was going to tax the savings of everybody in the Savings Bank. I have told the hon. member, and I repeat now for his clarification, that I was talking about a capital gains tax and I specified then the people who came in here, took land and speculated on it and then disappeared, left the country. Read the records.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will now establish to the satisfaction of all intelligent people in this place that the hon. member could not have said so about foreigners coming in and a capital gains tax. He used the expression "wealth tax" and I have read the record. I read it out at

Hastings Rocks, and to prove that he did not mean foreigners, he did not sit at that stage, he was standing and he said that he would be the first person who would be willing to contribute part of his substance to such a tax if it were imposed, and I am saying that he did not say foreigners.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, the hon. member and I will tackle on this, because I remember that there was cross talk between the hon. member and myself and where the hon. member in those days in his so-called strength was challenging me as to whether if it fell on me if I would then give up a share of any wealth I had, I told him "sure, if the hon. member will in the interest of tax, that is, wealth, then of course we as a Government would consider it magnanimously."

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am afraid the Government would not get very much out of that, but I know that we would have got a specific amount and I thank the hon. member for his generosity, but the point that I was making at that stage was that it had nothing to do with foreigners at all. I am not saying that the member for Christ Church West was promulgating any policy of his Government, but I am saying that the only suggestion that came from that side as to the sources of revenue needed to pay civil servants' salaries, even without removing items of taxation like the 5% sales tax, was that a suggestion was made that you could have a wealth tax, which means that you take money from people's savings in the bank, and that they have to raise money to pay a portion of the value of their property into the Government, and this tax was at one time suggested by the Labour Party in England and they quickly had to drop it. I was surprised, not knowing the hon. member to be so socialistic minded, to hear these words coming from him.

The point I am making, Sir, is that the only proposal during the course of the debate that was made by any member on that side about sources of revenue, at no stage did they warn the public that in removing the sales tax that the prices of commodities far from going down would go up, though they were going to remove import licences, that they were going to increase the handling charges at the Port, which will be dealt with at a later stage, and it was going to be a great bonanza for the whole society. As a matter of fact, the only thing they did not promise was a total and complete abolition of taxation altogether. They promised them the earth, the sun, the moon and the stars.

I want to make my position clear. We are now hearing from the hon. member for St. Michael West that taxation has certain purposes. As a matter of fact, he said that it is not only revenue raising but its second aspect is to distribute the burden of Government. That must be the BIMAP doctrine. I never understood that the purpose of taxation was to distribute the burden of Government, I thought the policy which the Government would carry out for its expenditure patterns would be a redistribution of the wealth of the country and the principle of maximum social advantage, and if BIMAP does not consider Professor Sir Seymour Hicks a bourgeois economist you will find that clearly enunciated in Seymour Hicks on Government finance and the principle of maximum social advantage, but he is saying now that that is the purpose of taxation, but had he been here to listen to my speech, and I make no apology for it at all, when we discussed the imposition of the tax on airline tickets which as the Hon. Leader of the Oppostion has pointed out is a system that exists in most progressive countries, it has certain other fiscal implications particularly in respect of the balance of payments, and what I said at the time was this. It was not only a revenue raising measure but the country would be faced with a balance of payments situation sooner or later and therefore we would have to stop our conspicuous consumption and frivolous travelling. The expression which I used was "frivolous."
5.50 p.m.

Therefore, it is a disincentive to people who do not have to travel.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. I would like to ask the hon. member for St. John to explain how his tax proposed to discriminate between frivolous travel and serious travel?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is no point of order! The hon. member for St. John will, please, continue with his speech.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the hon. member comes to the Academy of Politics in George Street, he will learn a lot. We hold meetings on Wednesday nights. I am not here to teach anybody elementary economics. I do that on Wednesday nights. That is no point of order, and I want to go back and say that I make no apology. The tax was proposed to discriminate against Barbadians. It was not in favour of Barbadians or against

foreigners. It was a tax specifically for balance of payment purposes. When I say specifically, *inter alia,* amongst other things.

We are spending too much money on airline tickets for frivolous travel, and when the Airlines and the Air Transport Association get together in Montreal, or in other places, and put on 10% or 15% on air travel, nobody on the other side complains. No Barbadian who goes up to New York for a Birthnight Party and so on complains. I felt at the time that the Government, as other Governments have done, should impose a *pro rata* tax on airline travel tickets and I made it 10%. It did discriminate against the rich because a man who was travelling to England first class would have to pay $140 or $150 for the privilege of travelling first class to London, and the person who was travelling in the Caribbean as, say, Trinidad or St. Lucia, would not have to pay anything at all, and that was stated in my Budget.

Now, let us go back to the hon. member for St. Thomas and the Hon. Prime Minister in his justification. He seems to me to be the most scared person in the world. He has no reason to be afraid, but I think that the problems of running a Ministry of Finance are beyond him at the present moment and he is a bit confused. The hon. member says that he is going to check on all out-going passengers, and that there is no machinery existing for security of the Airport. I have made a note of all the things he said. He said that the Immigration Officers are now being instructed to check things, and that the increased tax which they are now imposing by this Bill will be a small price to pay for increased security. Now, what is this tax for? Is it a security tax, or is a tax to replace the money you have lost by rejecting the budgetary proposals and the Fiscal Statement which I made at the time when I delivered my speech in here? You did not get up and give any alternative methods of taxation to bridge the gap between revenue and expenditure, but you devoted your time exclusively to invectives and on attacks of Ministers over television as part of your election strategy. You come in here today to tell me something about paying for increased security.

I would just like the hon. member to know something. I think I know a little about travel; I think I know a little about aviation; I think I know a little about private aircraft. I wish to inform the hon. member that every single time a light aircraft lands in Barbados from overseas, whether I am flying it, or anybody else, every person in that aircraft has to go through Customs and Immigration. A Customs Guard is in the habit of coming out and inspecting every aeroplane. If I were flying an aircraft, I would insist on the Customs Guard checking it. When I was in charge of the Airport, I gave Customs Officers instructions that specifically, Ministers and their baggage should be subject to search if they wanted to do so, and that they should pay full duties on anything they brought into the country. Never let it be said that Government Ministers would abuse their position by trying to evade Customs duty, which the whole country requires in order to run the country.

As far as I am concerned, and I know that this occurs to every other light aircraft under 20,000 lbs., in weight that lands at Seawell, it has to taxi right up in front of the door, or the arrivals stall, and be inspected, and every person goes through the Customs and Immigration with Immigration Cards and so on. The difference is that after the Customs Guards and Customs Officers are satisfied, they will allow the passengers, whether Tropicar, or Air Calypso, or any other private aircraft, if they have left their transportation on the other side to be driven back over on the other side and get into their vehicles.

As a matter of fact, Sir, I think we have come to the stage where with the increase in traffic at the Grantley Adams International Airport – I do not know if I should apply the title "Sir" in front of it. I am not sure because I did not look at the sign. *(Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS : "Call it Adams.")* No, I am not going to call it any Adams, because I may be confusing two different people. I would be confusing chalk and cheese. It is Grantley Adams Airport, or Seawell Airport, for me. Next thing you would be deleting the Grantley and putting something else in front of it. I do not think that even the members on your side would agree to that and say that the House of Assembly agreed to call it Adams Airport. I see where you are heading. *(Asides.)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You would want even to obliterate the memory of your own illustrious ancestors in the process of time. You are trying to eliminate us now, but you will not succeed. *(Aside.)* You now know who you are dealing with. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to make the position clear. It is no excuse for the imposition of this tax, which you did not warn the electorate about. The electorate knew about the other tax. I make no apology that it would apply to the Barbadian with greater severity than it would apply to people who were travelling

from outside who had probably already paid tax in their country. I gave the public the respect of saying that we have to watch our balance of payments and, therefore, we should try to discourage unnecessary travel. It would have some revenue implications, but at the same time it would have balance of payments implications as well.

Now, are you going to tell me that the need for this arises out of the lack of security at Seawell Airport? What kind of nonsense is this? Do you have to pay this price for security? I think that all the hon. member for St. Michael South Central was saying is that you promised the earth and now you find, having sown the wind, that you are going to reap the whirlwind. You now have to turn around and make all kinds of impositions on people that they did not suspect. We had already done our Budget. We did not make the people any promise because we thought it would be dishonest, in a situation such as the one with which we were confronted in keeping with our other brethren in the Caribbean, to go promising people all kinds of things that we knew we could never fulfil.
6 p.m.

The hon. member for St. Thomas, the Minister of Finance said that he has very good news about the tourist season; in the same Budget speech he said that Barbadian tourism had gone to the dogs, that St. Lucia was on the upsurge; and now, a miracle has happened. Overnight they started flooding the Island with bookings just because..... *(Aside)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: There must be some ghoulish interest in seeing the site of the Cubana disaster. That is the only explanation I can give if their account is true. For the member to suggest now that in the past eight weeks all of a sudden the same tourism that he was running down – because the former Minister of Tourism was on that side – and now all of a sudden there is another Minister of Tourism a miracle has taken place. Well, if you can get Barbadians to beleive that, you would get them to believe anything. As a matter of fact, we are beginning to wonder if they would not believe anything at all because we are treated night after night – night after night they are being brainwashed on television, so much so that intelligent people.....*(Asides)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If hon. members wish to speak they must rise in their places.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, even in a programme dealing with horse racing we had to be regaled with the presence of the member for St. Philip North. The Government could not allow a programme on horse racing to go on unless a member of the.....

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of elucidation. All right; sit down; you let me deal with him.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member for St. Philip North please address the Chair?

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of eludication. When his Government was in power I went on television in August or before the August meeting and spoke on the same programme. It is only because I know about it and he doesn't know. Is he jealous now?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Is the hon. member saying that when my Government was in power, he went on that same programme? Well I would like to see one of the people on our side trying to get on any programme now.....*(Asides)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. If hon. members wish to address the Chair they will stand in their places. Will the hon. member for St. John please continue.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: It only demonstrates how generous this Government was. Too generous in its policy.

So now, we are being told that this tax represents a shift of the burden from the shoulders of Barbadians to the shoulders of foreigners. A shift. *(Aside)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member for St. James address the Chair if he wishes to speak, please.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The hon. member for St. John should take his seat. He should sit down now. He is now old and defunct.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member for St. James will please withdraw the words 'old and defunct.'

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I will withdraw them, Sir. He is only old.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I did not know that that was any criminal offence. Of course, we

know, Sir, he is the champion of the old people in Barbados.

Anyhow there is going to be a new category of crimes when the present Government is finished with us and being old is going to be one of them.

So the purpose of the tax is now to shift the burden from the shoulders of Barbadians to the shoulders of foreigners; and it was very interesting to hear the member for Christ Church West explain that they did not disagree with the tax on insurance companies. They did not disagree with the tax on insurance companies because the tax on insurance companies was on nearly all foreign companies. He also referred to the Corporation Tax, yet in their Manifesto which I just read out they specifically stated that they would restructure the Corporation Tax to remove the present disincentives. I really cannot understand the vague and indefinite language in which that was couched; so do not blame me for not understanding.....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of explanation, Mr. Deputy Speaker.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not want any explanation.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The point I made, Sir, and I am going to make it very briefly so that the member may understand despite the fact that he wants no explanation. I will help him. I can understand his problem, Sir. The point I was making is simply this, that I said that in reply to the Budget Speech the then Shadow Minister of Finance made the point that the tax credit being given in the corporation tax by way of review of the corporation tax was one with which the then Opposition was in favour of. That is all I said.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not make any comments. I do not know what he got up on his feet for.

The hon. member for Christ Church West ended up – everything now is an appeal. He is now appealing, that in the next couple of years, especially to trade union dealers to cooperate fully with the Government; but at the time of the increases for the public officers, when the public –what I call, and I make no apology for calling them the army of occupation – the public service unions who had already rested concession of over $20 million from me in my Ministry because of the rise in the cost of living between 1973 and now, with a further increase giving them an overall take of 50% increase in salaries, with unemployment in this country existing.

They were not concerned about unemployment then. They did not say that they would appeal to the leaders of the union, many of whom were closly attached to them although some of us did not know it at the time. They did not say anything about that at all. They said it was your job to raise money, give them more money, and now they are turning around to the legally appointed representative of the workingclass non-civil service public in this island and appealing to them not to ask for any money – because that is what it amounts to – on behalf of their workers.....

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The hon. member for St. John is seeking to assume two positions dependent on how it fits him because in his public broadcast immediately after losing office he himself admitted that he pampered to the trade unions and did not take account of the 10,000 unemployed youth who were in this country. So what is he talking about now? He himself admitted that he did not look at what the trade union was doing to him, and he pampered to those who were employed to give them more money and did not look at the unemployed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is no point of order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I never said that I pampered to any trade union. I said we have been too full of conventional wisdom in these economies by looking at the people who are employed and not at the people who have never had work at all, and I make no apology.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order. How with when he talked about people who came out to help him?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member for St. John please take his seat. Will the hon. member for St. Jospeh please take his seat. The point of order raised by the hon. member for St. Joseph is not a point of order. Honourable members must remember that points of order relate directly to breach of the Standing Orders. The hon. member for St. John may continue.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I really do not want to draw Your Honour's attention to breaches of the Standing Orders because Your

Honour will be kept very busy. I want to say this.....*(Aside.)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Joseph if he wishes to address the Chair must stand and must not attempt in any way while sitting to speak to the Chair.
6.10 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member for St. Michael West said the 5% tax was regressive. I do not know how discussion on the 5% tax crept into this debate, but they keep referring to the 5% tax. He admitted that in New York the sales tax was 10%. I have no recollection of having seen him there; I do not like the place anyhow; it is not my idea of a place of human habitation; but he lived there and I doubt that at any time during his sojourn in that far off country he made any representation on behalf of himself or any workingclass person to say that the 10% tax they have in New York is a regressive tax, but he comes back to Barbados and a 5% tax is regressive.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of explanation, I mentioned that the sales tax in New York was 10%, and I am finishing the quotation "where sanitation workers earn $16,000 a year."

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: And what about the students in New York University? Are they getting $15,000 too? And what about the Puerto Ricans, Barbadians who are on relief, and what about the unemployed who are in New York? To pick out sanitation workers or plumbers who are amongst the highest paid despite the lowliness of their calling and to say that is an example of the standard of living is nonsense.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a further point of elucidation.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member would give way for one moment, is the hon. member for St. John willing to give way?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: No, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member for St. Michael West please take his seat?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: He made a speech and I did not interrupt him.

Mr. JOHNSON: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker,....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the workers in New York on welfare...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is the point of order on which the hon. member has stood.

Mr. JOHNSON: The hon. member for St. John is misrepresenting me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No point of order. Please take your seat.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the tax which we are considering in this Bill, to return to our subject matter, is not only going to be doubled. Like my colleague, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I am not going to say that there is any magic in percentages. One hundred percent of one is only one, but to say that it is 100% increase, it is a 100% increase; but what is new now is that we have been promised an extension of this tax to the little people who get off schooners. I did not hear there was any problem with security down at the Careenage; there probably is, but the tax is going to be extended to people at the Port of Bridgetown, and if you read the definition of the Port of Bridgetown in the Act, it includes the Careenage, and it includes all the passengers who will be getting off luxury liners as well. Maybe it will be a good thing. But why weren't we told of this during the election? Why did the Shadow Minister of Finance as he then was, instead of restricting himself to a venomous attack against a former member of the Government, not deal with fiscal matters and say this is what they will do? They did not do that and now they are sowing the wind and we have to reap the whirlwind.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I shall not be very long on this, but I sat here and I thought I heard the hon. member for St. Michael West say – and I hope I am quoting him correctly – print money and put it into circulation, that is one way in which to raise revenue. I hope I am quoting him correctly.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, for a long time I wondered how and where this Government would raise revenue and now for the first time they have put it before the public of Barbados that they are prepared to print money. I think the Minister of Finance....

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is a deliberate misrepresentation of my position.

I take that statement ot be a reflecton on my motives when I was standing to address this Assembly. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I never at any point in my speech advocated the printing of momey by the Central Bank. I said there were two functions of taxation policy, first to raise revenue and secondly to distribute the burden of Government. I do not make any apologies for that statement. The hon. member for St. Michael South West I know has limitations when it comes to taxation policy, but he should still be able to understand a clear statement I made.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I request that the reporter read the record. I repeat that I heard the hon. member for St. Michael West say words to the effect that you could print money at the Central Bank and put into circulation. If he is saying he did not say that, let us hear what the official record says. Sir, it is time that the Government stop the carnival and get on with governing the country. It is time that the Minister of Finance of this country gets down to the realities of the economic situation in this country. It is time that the people of this country be given the facts, that they be made to understand the realities of the economic land financial situation of the country. No amount of hinding it in various little reichstag flies, no amount of attempting to confuse the issue by diversion will save the Government from the reality which they have to pay some time. I think they should be aware that the people in this country are beginning to wonder when they are going to get around to the serious business of running the country. They talk about printing money.

I think it is clear, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that within a relatively short time in this country we will have to have a devaluation of the Barbados dollar because if they continue to propose measures that will call for expenditure and they do not bring measures that will give serious revenue and that will attempt to curb the excessive spending by persons in the population, we are bound to run into the same kind of problem that we have seen in Britain. They cannot face the truth, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but if it is their intention to print money they should let the people of Barbados know that they are going to print money.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe the amendment to the Act deals with raising additional revenue for the Government and the country. There is nothing in what I have before me which speaks about spending money, and for all my years in Parliament since 1970 I have been told and the Rules of the House demand that a member must be relevant to deal with the issues before the Chamber, and I believe it is the duty of the presiding officer to bring to the attention of the speaker the issues before the House. There is nothing before the House which deals with spending money. We are dealing with raising revenue for the exchequer and this question of spending money is certainly an irrelevancy.
6.20 p.m.

I do not want to tell your Honour how to conduct the proceedings in this Chamber, but I believe that the records and with the historical aspect of this Chamber Your Honour should keep careful check on the debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael South West will please continue.

Mr. TAITT: I like you, Sir, have difficulty understanding what he says. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you are discussing a budgetary measure, budgetary measures have to do with the expenditure of money and the raising of revenue. Only a person who is totally devoid of any iota or even a scintilla of the understanding of budgetary measures could make that kind of intervention, but I fully understand your difficulty, Sir, if you have any, because I certainly have difficulty every time the hon. member gets up. I have difficulty understanding the language he uses and I have difficulty understanding the points he attempts to make, but that might be one of my problems, Sir.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is mutuality in a statement made by the hon. member. If he cannot understand ...

Mr. TAITT: I am not giving way, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When an hon. member rises on a point of elucidation he may only speak if the member then speaking gives way. Is the hon. member for St. Michael South West willing to give way?

Mr. TAITT: No, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Then the hon. member will please take his seat.

Mr. TAITT: I was saying, Sir.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Sir. There is mutual respect between the two members. If one cannot understand what is the

difference between revenue, budgetary proposals and expenditure, then I am sorry, we cannot understand each other.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No point of order.

Mr. TAITT: That was the 16th time he made no point of order. As I was saying, somebody is going to have to tell the people of this country the realities, and constantly coming to the people with a lot of rag-tag provisions and trying to divert the people from the realities of the economic situation in this country will no longer fool the people. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the election is over, they have won the Government, for God's sake they should get on with running it.

I rose because I could not understand that hon. members on that side could even begin to conceive of the printing of money in Barbados as a revenue earning measure. It is a fantastic concept and they friends, the merchants, ought to be told as early as possible what to expect in the not to distant future, and all the Barbadians who have a few dollars in the banks in this country ought to be told what to expect in the not too distant future. We have seen very slowly and very subtly the kind of measures they intend to bring in not only in the financial area, we are beginning to see it now in other areas, but the people of Barbados while they may be swift to accept certain propositions when they are first put forward sooner or later you have to come up with the nitty gritty of the situation, and the Minister of Finance is going to have to tell the people of this country at some point. He may delay it as long as he wishes, but he has to tell them at some point whether in fact the Barbados dollar which was left by the former Minister of Finance in a strong position, whether the respect which financial institutions around the world had for the Barbados economy will be continued, or whether in the not so distant future we are going to be running around out there wondering whether we can afford to buy something if it comes from outside of Barbados.

A country with a devalued currency is a country on the road to ruin. Witness the situation in Britain, Sir, where the latest information coming out from the Chancellor is that they intend to borrow, – if I may use the words which the hon. member for St. Thomas likes to use often – they intend to borrow massively. I think we may run into a position where Barbados will have to go instead of lending to its neighbours as it was able to do, despite the nonsense that was talked, but I hope it will not have to go cap in hand to our "friends" in Washington begging and asking them to aid us out of our difficulties. I have observed so far the fiscal policies coming from that Government, and so far as we have seen they are heading in that direction very fast.

And there is another point. There are some of them over there who have spoken on this matter who do not seem to understand the difference between fiscal policy and monetary policy. I believe that the Minister of Finance understands this sometimes, but I wish he would take time out to explain it to some of the persons who have essayed to speak on it. We in Barbados have been able despite one of the worst economic crises to hit the world, and it is written in the same document that they like to quote. Let them quote from the document of the Central Bank of Barbados, let them quote from the documents of the IADB, let them quote from the documents of the IMF, we in Barbados despite one of the worst economic crises to hit the western world were able to survive, and we were able to survive because we had the courage to face the realities in Barbados. We did not promise what we could not deliver, and this measure and the gravamen of the case made by my colleagues on this side is that this measure is only one in the armoury of misused promises which you have made to the population of this country.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member will please give way, the time is now 6.30. There is a motion before the House by the hon. member for Christ Church East to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance. According to the Standing Order, the time has now come when that matter is to be dealt with. I call on the hon. member for Christ Church East.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE TO DISCUSS A DEFINITE MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Deputy Speaker, pursuant to leave granted to me earlier in the day, I now beg to move the adjournment of the House to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely the threat to the security of the Government, the newly elected and lawfully constituted Government of Barbados.

It is an unusual step on my part and on the part of the House to be discussing on the

adjournment a definite matter of urgent public importance which arises from the disclosures made last evening in the course of a radio and television broadcast by the Hon. Prime Minister to the nation, and as the first speaker on this matter this afternoon I wish to appeal for restraint on all sides in the course of this discussion. I feel myself that we must be very careful not to be extravagant in the use of our language, bearing in mind that any reckless pronouncements here on the part of members who take part in this discussion may very well result in headlines overseas that misrepresent the true situation in the country and as a result dampen the investment climate and maim the prospects for the tourist season.

While I think that we ought to be concerned with that on one hand, I think on the other hand we have a clear responsibility both to ourselves and to the country to ensure that the facts so far as they are consistent with national security are made known and that we use this opportunity to restate our commitment to this country, both Parties, to certain shared fundamentals, and that we use this opportunity to focus anew on the need for vigilance and increased security in our country.

6.30 p.m.

Without seeking to quarrel with the manner in which the Hon. Prime Minister had dealt with this matter yesterday afternoon, I want to go on record as saying that, as far as I am concerned, members of this Government should try to restore the privacy of Parliament, and, except where public emergencies dictate, we should come to the House of Assembly and minutes after, if necessary, go on the radio. But it was a matter in his discretion and his judgment, and he is the custodian of the facts relating to security, and to that extent I do not quarrel.

It was of considerable concern to me when the last administration ran down the Parliament, and from that time the significance and privacy of Parliament was reduced. I think that as a matter of difference and style between these two administrations, we should on most occasions, except where dictated otherwise by circumstances of emergency, we should strive to come to Parliament first and go on the radio later.

Now, what are the facts as we know them? I can take the facts a little further than the Hon. Prime Minister has given them to us. It does appear as though one Sydney Burnett Alleyne, a notorious Barbadian, was arrested some days ago some where in the northern Leeward off Martinique, I am told, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a vessel armed with dynamite and weapons en route to Barbados. The first significant fact was that it was Sydney Burnett Alleyne. I do not have to remind this Honourable House about his connections with the last administration. He makes no bones about the fact that he is a long-standing friend of the former Prime Minister. He was a long-standing member of the Democratic Labour Party; he moved the Resolution for Independence within the ranks of the Democratic Labour Party, I am advised, in 1966; he was a close and long-standing friend of the former Attorney-General of this country, George Moe; he was a personal and close friend of our Ambassador to the United Nations, Waldo Ramsay, all of them prominent members of the Democratic Labour Party. Apart from what he has said to the Police that he was the head of an Action Group of the Democratic Labour Party, or words to that effect, it is clear to all Barbadians that he is a man who enjoyed the favours of the last administration and who was extremely close to the former Prime Minister to the point where, contrary to common sense, he was granted a Banking Licence in this country. I think that, before identifying any more of the known facts, and before going any further, I should make the point that it is a devastating commentary on the judgment of the former Prime Minister that he kept a man like Sydney Alleyne as his friend.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: At no time can anyone say that Sydney Burnett Alleyne is a friend of mine. I have a volume of correspondence extending over the year, to none of which I have replied in which Mr. Alleyne has persistently threatened my life and threatened to overthrow the Government. Nobody, except by a mere figment of imagination, could claim that Mr. Alleyne was a friend of mine. The hon. member said that he was going to be temporate in his language. I would, therefore, enjoin him not to make any statements that he cannot substantiate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No point of order!

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The second fact which, I think, we ought to identify is that Earl Glasgow, who was the Personal Aide of the former Prime Minister was the man at whose place and in whose company two men, one known as Herbert Virgo and the other as Gerio Cappadero, were found. It was Earl Glasgow in whose company, at one stage, these two men were found, who made arrangements for them

in Barbados regarding where they would live and so on, and who it is known was in contact with Sydney Alleyne. It was due to his contact with Sydney Alleyne that he knew that these two men were coming, and he would be called upon to put them up, and so on. These men had in their pockets a list of arms that were supposed to come into Barbados and which, apparently, they knew about.

I am advised that the list referred to rifles, machine guns, and so on. The point is that, again, not only Sydney Burnett Alleyne, a member of the Democratic Labour Party, and, perhaps, still is since we have not been advised that he has renounced membership ...

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sydney Burnett Alleyne was expelled from the Democratic Labour Party over five years ago.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: It is a pity that the hon. member for St. John, in his capacity as Leader of the Democratic Labour Party, did not ensure that he was put out of the conference two years ago. It is a pity that did not happen. The point is that with Glasgow and the role that he played in the last D.L.P. administration as Personal Aide to the former Prime Minister, and because of the known connection now between Glasgow, these two suspect characters and Sydney Alleyne, I think we can draw a safe inference that this plot, which has been revealed, had something to do with some members of the Democratic Labour Party now in opposition. I do not believe that all members knew about it, but I feel that the majority of the members knew about it. The evidence seems clear now that some members of the Democratic Labour Party knew about this plot and were engaged in it to some degree.

I think that we ought to make the point quite early that all of this arises, in my view, from the attitude that they brought to the administration in the last 15 years when they were in power. I always got the view that they regarded Barbados as an acre of land which they owned individually and collectively, and I have no doubt that they have not accepted the verdict of the electorate, and they regard the Barbados Labour Party Government as trespassers in the seat of office. All of this arises from their failure to appreciate that the people have overwhelmingly rejected them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the people have said that we ought to rule this country for as long as they see fit to allow us to rule. The failure of some persons on the other side, the failure of some persons in the bureaucracy in this country to recognise that reality will lead to considerable confusion in this country, and I think that hon. members on the other side will have the opportunity to get up in the course of this debate and not only renew your commitment to the two-party system and to certain shared fundamentals, I believe, but you will also let the country know you have regarded their verdict as final until the next round, and that you will not seek to reverse that verdict by any ultra constitutional techniques. The fact that members of this Opposition have been connected with this coup and with this conspiracy leads me to say a few things about the role of the Opposition. We in the Barbados Labour Party have ...
6.40 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. The hon. member said that members of the Opposition have been connected with this coup or this plot. I am suggesting, Sir, that the hon. member should be made to withdraw that statement because he is accusing members on this side of being connected with a criminal conspiracy – all the members of the Opposition. All I suggest, Sir, is that they get the Police to arrest the members who are so involved and charge them; not come in here to make vague statements like that. *(Asides)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order. The hon. member for St. John has raised a point of order that the hon. member for Christ Church East has referred to the Members of the Opposition in connection with a coup. The expression 'Opposition' in this Chamber to my mind means members sitting on that side. There is no evidence before this hon. Chamber that members sitting on that side are connected with the coup. The remarks will be withdrawn. My ruling is that the words will be withdrawn.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: I readily withdraw the remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker and I would like to explain to all hon. members that I was speaking in the context of the Democratic Labour Party Opposition and not the parliamentary Opposition, but nevertheless I think that we will all be concerned to make the record straight, and to that extent I refer to the Democratic Labour Party Opposition and not to the Parliamentary Opposition.

The point I was making, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that we in the Barbados Labour Party have made a significant and singular contribution to the development of the Parliamentary system of this country. From 1946 you may get our being in office, from the Bushe experiment right through to 1961 even though I concede for some period between 1946 and 1951 there was a Coalition Government in this country between the Barbados Labour Party and the National Congress, and after that we were in those years, 1946 – 1961 – we set an example in Government propriety, and in the period 1961 to 1976 we were in Opposition, and at all times we worked within a certain framework. We were never concerned even in the most difficult days in Opposition – we were never concerned to overthrow the Government by force or to encourage anybody so to do, or to allow anybody connected to us and with us either in the past or then to go in for any sort of activity of this sort; and I think that the Opposition has got to understand that they have a responsibility to maintain visible leadership. I am not so sure that it is visible at this time. They have a responsibility to reorganise themselves, to get rid of some of the dead wood and let new growth come forward.

They have all of that as part of their responsibility in Opposition; but it is not of their responsibility to interfere through ultra-constitutional means with the duly elected and the lawfully constituted Government of this country.

This debate, as I said earlier, gives first of all the Barbados Labour Party, we too on this side, an opportunity to renew our commitments to the two-party system or the multi-party system as you like, and to certain Parliamentary and Constitutional procedures. It gives you too on the other side, all you hon. members on the other side, an opportunity to disassociate yourselves with any coup or any attempt to overthrow the Government of this country; and in addition to that it causes us all to recognise that we are now living in a very difficult period and that the security of the country can no longer be lapsed or lethargied. It can no longer be taken for granted in a way that we have taken it for granted in the past, but the security of the country must be regarded as a serious matter deserving the most urgent consideration.

The two-party system as I understand it is a bulwark against chaos and disorder. It allows people who are frustrated and whose folks are disappointed, to get one Government out of office and put another, and that is what was done not too long ago. We have in the two-party system a mechanism for peaceful change, and I would like to think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that all hon. members of this House are committed to the use of that mechanism for changing Governments in this country.

I will not be much longer as my time is running out. As I understand it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have only twenty minutes under the Rule; but again I want to conclude by asking that members who speak in this debate conduct themselves with certain restraint. In my capacity as Chairman of IDC I am well aware of the fact that at this time Barbados is perhaps the most attractive place in the Caribbean for North American investors. Apart from the high standard of our infrastructural facilities it is regarded as a stable place where there is an absence of violence and where there is no likelihood of any pro-Cuba or any pro-Russian regime, and that has been found very attractive to North American businessmen.

I would not like any extravagant and wild statements to be made that may cause a misrepresentation of the true position in this country; but as I said earlier, I think we have a responsibility nevertheless to ourselves and to the country to discuss this matter as it is a serious matter that concerns us all. I think too we have a responsibility to ensure that Barbados remains an oasis of democracy in the widening desert of one-party state and proletarian regime and it is because of that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I am asking all hon. members to support the Resolution of which I gave notice earlier, which calls on this House to give full support to the Government to institute whatever measures are found necessary to combat the threat to established constitutional procedures and democratic institutions in this country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I now move that the Resolution of which I gave notice earlier, do now pass.

Mr. SISNETT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to second the motion and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, and members of this Honourable House of Assembly, this is a very sad occasion for me to hear such serious allegations being made in this Honourable House of Assembly. I was a member of the defunct National Congress party. I served as a vestryman of the parish of St.

Philip and subsequently after the abolition of the Vestry system I had the honour of serving as Chairman of the former Southern District Council for two consecutive terms.
6.50 p.m.

I later joined the Democratic Labour Party and this is my fourth term in this Assembly, and I must admit that the allegations which have been made in this House have me at this particular moment very despondent and worried. As far as I am aware, it does seem that these are only allegations and cannot be substantiated. Consequently I do hope that those who are involved regardless of their political affiliations be brought to justice.

It has always been my opinion that to become a member of this House is the highest honour in which one can be placed in this Island, and therefore to sit in here and to hear such statements made today makes me wonder where we are heading. Now we had an election. The Democratic Labour Party served this country well for three consecutive terms regardless of who appreciates it. I can vouch that they brought this Island from darkness into light and therefore it is my opinion that the former Government should be a Government for others to emulate and perhaps improve on in running the affairs of this country.

Now I want to let it go on record and to clear the air that with the exception of what I have read in the newspaper I am not involved in any plot to overthrow the legitimate Government.

When it comes to Mr. Sydney Alleyne, I want to state unequivocally that he has never been a friend of mine; I know nothing about him, I have never discussed any matter of importance with him, and therefore I would like the public to know that the electorate of this country have made their decision and I as a member of the Opposition am prepared to cooperate with the Government if the legislation which they introduced is for the benefit of the masses. I was not given a University training as the hon. member for St. Joseph and others, and therefore you will forgive me if my syntax is very poor; but I am here to speak the facts and to let us and the public know that I am a dedicated and loyal citizen of this country and I intend to abide by the laws of this country. I know nothing about a plot to overthrow the present Government; I would never associate myself with any plot to overthrow any Government and I doubt very much that any member on this side of the House would ever cherish such destructive thoughts, and therefore I repeat from the depths of my heart that I regret now I am coming to the evening of my days and having served my people for so many years to see how we as coloured people are trying to set forth what I call a bad example for the future generations of this country. It is our method of approach, it is the way in which we express ourselves in here that can assist in moulding the character of the youngsters of this country. Imagine them coming here today and hearing that some members of my party may be involved. It is a fact that the hon. member who made that statement was called on to withdraw it, and he did so.
7.00 p.m.

That is a consolation for me, but he had already made the statement and therefore those who are sitting in the Gallery will not go into the pros and cons of the matter but they will just spread propaganda that a member of the House of Assembly has made a statement. To hear that a plot has been organised by members of this Party to overthrow the present Government has me perturbed. I do feel that any other member of the Opposition who is a representative of any constituency should in no uncertain terms express himself fully and disassociate himself from this alleged plot. I have no doubt that from what we have been hearing it could be a legal matter and may end up in the law courts, and therefore we as members of the House of Assembly must be very careful in what we have to say here today, and I do hope that in the very near future all the facts of this alleged plot will be known to the public because I too would be very unhappy about my family who are domicile in this country and have nowhere else to go to live, and in some cases Peter pays for Paul.

I am therefore appealing to the members of my Party to explain to this House and to let it be known in no uncertain terms that they have no connection with Mr. Sidney Alleyne and that they are not associated with any plot to overthrow the present legitimate Government.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I view as Leader of the Opposition this Resolution with the utmost seriousness and to me it is not a question of being a laughing matter if it is proven and can stand up in a court of law that there does exist a plot, and I will deal with the fact that the evidence so far does not indicate any plot or attempted coup, and if the facts clearly establish that, then certainly it is a very serious matter and we

certainly should not be discussing it in this Chamber but it should be a matter before the Chief Justice or the courts of this land.

Over the weekend I heard news flashes to the effect that some ship with one Barbadian and one Canadian was arrested off Martinique carrying weapons. It was the first time I heard of any weapons in the area on board a vessel. Up to the time of the Prime Minister's broadcast I did not even know who the Barbadian was, because he did not even tell the public who this Barbadian was, although he did call the name of the former Personal Aide to the Prime Minister, Mr. Earl Glasgow. He did not, and he must have had the name of the Barbadian, who had been arrested. Just to go a little further, I think we all have read – and I am sorry I did not know about this because I would have brought the Nation newspaper in which this same man told people that he would overthrow the Democratic Labour Party, and he was on the front page of the Nation, and people will remember that, when he even threatened to overthrow us. We did not suggest it was at your instigation, he had the vision, he had troops, he could get mercenaries, he could capture Barbados in two weeks. All this he said to this public and I was very annoyed because it was glorifying schizophrenia. This is what it was, that this man because of his activities abroad he even said that he could overthrow the Democratic Labour Party just by snapping his finger. The Democratic Labour Party did not then suggest that it was the Barbados Labour Party behind it, because anybody who knows Sidney Alleyne knows his tendency to exaggerate, his tendency to pretend he knows people in high places, and Sidney Alleyne would attempt to become your friend whether you like it or not.

I have seen him in the dining room here, I have talked to him. I believe the member for St. Philip South has talked to him in the dining room, and what I am saying is, I am just dealing briefly with the man and I will deal with the evidence too to show that on the evidence as put forward by the Prime Minister there has been no evidence of any conspiracy by anybody to overthrow this Government, except in the minds of a schizophrenic who now may be in a gaol in Martinique. I will deal with it as a lawyer, not as a layman, I will bring my legal powers to bear on the evidence as issued by the Prime Minister.

To show the official Opposition's position, which I represent, I on my own initiative wrote a letter to the Prime Minister under confidential cover. I want it to be clearly understood, the confidence is mine not his, if he writes me a letter under confidential cover then I will keep it as a matter of confidence, but if I write him he has the right to breach that confidence. This is fair, I am not going to quarrel with that approach to it, but I wrote the Prime Minister this letter:

"1st November, 1976.

The Hon. Prime Minister,
Government Headquarters,
Bay Street,
St. Michael.

My dear Prime Minister,

I am more than perturbed at the news coming out of Martinique and Guadeloupe which seem to indicate that there is a conspiracy afoot to interfere with the democratic processes in Barbados by illegal or even violent means."

This is based purely on the news report, I do not get security reports, I do not get anything.

> "Let me assure you as Leader of the Opposition that you have my whole-hearted and complete support for any measures you may deem necessary to deal with subversion within or without Barbados whatever source it may arise."

7.10 p.m.

"I, however, only request that you take me into your confidence and inform me of the clandestine measures being taken to interfere unconstitutionally or otherwise with your right to rule as given to you by the people of Barbados on the 2nd September, 1976.

And I want to assure you that I am as firmly committed to the good government of this country as I know you must be.

Nothing must be permitted to sully our reputation or respect for parliamentary democracy.

I do hope you will take all measures necessary to ascertain the true facts and that you will on discovering them not hesitate to take the public into your confidence also, and let them know of all illegal or other nefarious attempts to disturb the peace and good government of our country."

I am,
Yours sincerely,
Frederick G. Smith,
Leader of the Opposition."

Now, this emanated from me in my official capacity as a member of a Party who is concerned with the two-party system.

I do not think there is anybody on this side who has not acknowledged and recognised the decision of the people. Naturally, you will realise that. I have been a Cabinet Minister for 10 years. Suddenly on the night of the 2nd I thanked heaven that I got in even by 20 votes, but at the same time my Party was not in the Government. Is there a human being who would not be personally disappointed not because of money or anything like that? If tomorrow something which you had experienced had happened to you overnight – there is not one of you, if you lost your seat in 1981 personally, or lost the Government, who would not be disappointed as a person at the decision given. It is human nature I am talking about. To say that the Government, or the Opposition, is not disappointed at not having captured the Government would be an untruth. We thought we had done enough for the people, and we thought we would have been returned.

Now, this Party has never met to discuss any attempt to destroy the Government over there. We have met within the context of the Parliamentary Group of the Executive to prepare ourselves for capturing the Government in 1981 by lawful and constitutional means, or whenever it can happen. As you know, the Prime Minister can make a decision at any time to call an election even before 1981. That is in accordance with the Constitution. The official position of the Opposition have always been that we are going to support the Government, and I have said so. We are going to criticise you in here, and we are going to allow you to do the things that you promised the people in this country. It is not a question now of every member jumping up and saying, "Not me. I am not in it." This is not a confession. You will confess to the Priest. The official position of the evidence is that we accept the verdict the people have given on the 2nd September, 1976. As you in the Opposition made it difficult for us to work, we will make it difficult for you, constitutionally, to work.

Now, the member for Christ Church East talked about restraint and he talked about headlines. If any damage was done to this country, it was done by the Prime Minister last night when he went on the air on the evidence which he produced and made that statement about the coup. In the *Trinidad Guardian* today the headlines are *"Adams Confirms Coup Attempt"*, *"Adams Confirms Coup Plot"*. The damage is already done. It is probably in the Canadian and American newspapers. On what evidence has the Prime Minister said that the Opposition is attempting to overthrow his Government? Let us now analyse the evidence step by step. Mr. Glasgow was the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister when he was in office. I had the privilege of reading the statement by Mr. Glasgow to the Police, and Mr. Glasgow has admitted that his friendship with Mr. Alleyne – *(Aside.)* You cannot tell me who must be my friend, regardless how notorious he may be.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have been blamed in here for saying the friends certain people have with criminal convictions already. You cannot tell me who my friends must be. Glasgow has as much right, notorious as Mr. Alleyne is, to remain Mr. Alleyne's friend. They were born in St. John, they lived in St. John. Unless Mr. Alleyne has done something to Mr. Glasgow, is it a crime to be a friend of Mr. Alleyne? He gave a statement to the Police in which he admitted that Mr. Alleyne got in touch with him; he told him that these two men needed rest and recreation.....

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Do I understand the Leader of the Opposition to say that it is not a crime to be the friend of Mr. Alleyne, when the Leader of his Party objected and called on the member for Christ Church East to show restraint when he said that he was a friend of his?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of personal explanation, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It was not that being anybody's friend that was a crime. It was a question of getting the records straight as to the facts. There are a lot of wealthy church-going people all over the world who are not friends of mine as well, and there are a lot of criminals who are not friends of mine. I was not suggesting that it was a crime to be anybody's friend. I was stating as a fact that I was not his friend. If I was not his friend he would not have written me about seventy threatening letters.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: This is the statement which Mr. Glasgow gave to the Police which should have been in the hands of the Prime Minister. Mr. Glasgow admits that Mr. Alleyne rang him. Alleyne told him that Virgo and Cappadero were coming here. He asked him what the price was for a beach house he was renting at Bath and he told him $15.00 a day. The men came in. I do not know how they slipped from the Airport. I would like to see

their Passports. The Immigration Officer must have given them time to stay here. I do not know if the Prime Minister is going to say that they slipped through, or dodged through, like the two Cubans who went back to Trinidad. The two went to a hotel called Abbeville. They must have told the Police at the Airport that they could be found there.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Mr. Glasgow in his statement to the Police got a message from these two people, in terms of what Mr. Sydney Alleyne had said, that they would rent the place. Mr. Glasgow went for them at the hotel and took them to the place. For one reason or another, security wise or otherwise, a broadcast was put out for these two people. It was the same Mr. Glasgow who notified Inspector Whittaker where these two men could be found. This is in the statement given to the Police which the Prime Minister should have, but because he was a former Assistant to the Ex-Prime Minister, the Ex-Prime Minister is being brought into a plot by association. This was not told to the public last night, but I have the statement. It was Glasgow who got in touch with the Police after the newsflash went out, and told them where these two men could be found on the beach at Bath.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the public now gets the idea that Mr. Glasgow is a cloak-and-dagger man, and so on. The man can make a piece of change; he made arrangements with the people; he knows nothing about them except that Alleyne says they are coming for rest and recreation, and he takes them to his house. When it is discovered by him that the Police wanted the two men, it was Glasgow who took the Police and showed them where the men were. The public should have been told that. Would a man involved in plot carry the Police to the very house? What is even worst now, if this is a plot, the Prime Minister has to tell the people of Barbados why he allowed these two criminals, who had come in to overthrow Barbados, to go through the door to wherever they came from.

There is a plot. You are telling the Public that it has reached the stage where your Government is going to be overthrown. You have Virgo and Cappadero, the two criminals, linking Glasgow and Alleyne. Why did the Prime Minister deport two men who were virtually in the plot on whom he claimed he found a list of arms and ammunition? Why did he send them out of the country instead of bringing a charge of conspiracy against them with person or persons unknown and get something before the courts? The plot to overthrow your Government is an offence. It is a conspiracy, and you can charge two of them for conspiring with persons unknown to do certain things. Far from that, the Prime Minister lets out all of the conspirators. Glasgow is here, and I do not know who is the other one.

7.20 p.m.

Far from that the Prime Minister lets out two of the conspirators out through the door. Glasgow is here. Alleyne is in Martinique. The two, Cappadero and Virgo deported voluntarily, escorted to the airport, and poor Glasgow who rents his beach house, on the invitation of his friend Mr. Alleyne – because he worked for the Prime Minister as Personal Aide, it is made a big thing. Now what plot is there from what the Prime Minister has told this nation? Where is the plot? One person is in Martinique, Virgo, Cappadero gone, we can explain how Glasgow rented his house. Is the letter in Glasgow's handwriting? Is it in the former Prime Minister's handwriting? Is it in the handwriting of any member of the Opposition? So if a man, assuming that these two were conspirators and you let them go, and you find on them arms which could tally with arms aboard the ship where you are sending a Police Inspector – do you mean then that Glasgow must know that these fellows had in their pockets a list of arms? Must he search them? Glasgow got his money and he told the Police so. Glasgow got his money when the Police searched the fellows, and they had $800. So that the plot boils itself down to this. Where is the evidence if you ever put this before a court, of a plot to overthrow the Barbados Labour Party? I am prepared to go along with the former Prime Minister. There is no correspondence flowing from Alleyne to Barrow, to Smith, to Sandiford, to Taitt, to anyone. There is no evidence of any correspondence connected with the overthrow of this Government from anybody in this Island connected with this plot to overthrow you. You have found no correspondence emanating from us to them. So where is the connection? I could not be a conspirator because I talk too much, so nobody will bring anything to me. I talk too much so I would not get to be any conspirator with anybody because I will tell you about the plot before it is known about. I admit that. That is one of my weaknesses, that I talk too much and before I tell you about the plot somebody would know and the Police would lock you up. That is my weakness.

Be that as it may, where is the evidence? I would like to ask the member for Christ Church East. As a lawyer and you had this flimsy thing

with this sort of evidence on a conspiracy to overthrow the Government, where are the links? Virgo and Cappadero are gone, one found with a piece of paper in his pocket. Can you prove that Glasgow knew it was there? Have you had any conversations with Glasgow discussing the overthrow? That is an important question. Alleyne is abroad; Glasgow is here. The Prime Minister will have to tell the public more than he is telling them. He is making a very serious accusation against us, and if it is not an attempt by him to daub us with this dirty brush and to try to destroy us for all time, he has got to give the public of Barbados more facts than he has hitherto given.

Where is the connection with anybody, opposition or otherwise? Has he got the correspondence? If so, he must read it, and if as he says the plot is already hatched, why did he let go the two main members of the conspiracy? Glasgow can be picked up at any time. Why did he let go Virgo and Cappadero? The public has got to stop listening to rumours and death by association. Any person who could be found guilty of this, of trying to overthrow the constituted Government of this country, properly elected, deserves to die; but at the same time we cannot kill them on evidence by association. We cannot kill them on evidence of distrust. You have got to provide the evidence on which you can establish that there exists a conspiracy; and in this case – I read it about four times – how can the Prime Minister, with the legal adviser of the eminence of the member for Christ Church West, with the Minister of Agriculture, – not the eminence but with the legal knowledge, with the eminence of the member for St. Philip North, with the eminence of the member for Christ Church East, prominent men in their own right; I think the member who has been rated as one of the best lawyers in the country, the member for Christ Church South Central, the leader of the House is out of the Island so I do not know if he had any part in anything to say in this; but can you really tell me that you can go to a nation and scare the public and send this abroad to every newspaper that is looking for sensationalism, that is looking for an opportunity to denigrate developing countries, and you can safely say that there is a plot in this country; a plot that could not as a lawyer would say, stand up to the light of day.

I would like to hear the Attorney General get up in this House and tell this House that on the evidence which the Prime Minister reveals to the public of Barbados, that any charge of a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of this country could stand before any Judge. You do not have to make a no-case submission; you do not have to reach that far. If I had this evidence given on oath, I would not ask any question. To cross examine a witness on that evidence would be a waste of the court's time. I would not ask anything. I would only take my seat and make a no-case submission when the Crown closes the case. Is this any evidence? I think the member for Christ Church East will agree that to make a serious allegation against the Democratic Labour Party which can go abroad, purely because as I have admitted there has been disappointment over here as there would be in any Government – I am sure he will agree that one should not make such a serious allegation. If Forde loses tonight do you think Forde will feel happy and drink and enjoy himself with champagne? He will be disappointed. If Carter loses tonight, he will not be very happy. We lost too. Once you are human there must be a certain degree of disappointment; but I do not like the Prime Minister giving the public the impression that we over here are attempting to destroy his Government because of a disappointment on September 2. That is why I personally welcome the opportunity as official Leader of the Opposition to assure him as far as in my power lies, that we are behind this country which gave us birth. As I said in this House, 'Breathes there a man with soul so dead who never to himself hath said this is my own my native land?' Or to use another quotation "Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori." It is a blessed thing to die for one's country.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member's time is up.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I thank you. I want categorically to deny Mr. Deputy Speaker, for the records and for posterity to know that the Democratic Labour Party of this country is not involved in any plot to overthrow the constituted and properly elected Government of the Barbados Labour Party.

7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not rising to speak, but I want to make it clear that I have come here to assist in this debate. If hon. members try to make this a debate between parties for partisan purposes, they will lose something. I am perfectly willing to answer what I have heard so far, but if hon. members want assistance, I would advise any other hon. member who has points he wishes to raise rather than points he wished to make or even if he has points to make that in the interest of all to make their

speeches now. I do counsel and urge this on hon. members. I am perfectly happy to reply in due course, but I think all of us would like this matter to be dealt with in a complete way. We do not want the debate to degenerate into a speech by me and then perhaps repeated explanations and elucidations before the reply by the hon. member for Christ Church East. I do not know what your ruling is on whether the hon. member for Christ Church East can delegate his right of reply to me, if hon. members prefer that. I daresay the hon. member would be happy to deal with it in this way; but I do not think this is a debate in which we can seek to do too much manoeuvring; it is not a conventional debate. I am quite willing to speak but I will sit to give anybody else who has points he may wish to raise the chance to say something.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does any other hon. member wish to speak?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, we are not clear on this side about the intervention which was made by the Hon. Prime Minister. Was he making a speech? I did not hear him say he was on a point of order, and furthermore we would like to know whether he is replying on behalf of the Government. This is not a motion which is critical of the Government. I am strictly on what should be a point of order, this is a real point of order on the order of debate where the person who made the motion is the person who is going to reply or whether the Prime Minister is going to reply on his behalf, because it would alter the position of other members who wish to speak in this matter, because we may get up and speak and then we find that there are two people replying to interventions which have been made on this side. I should like some elucidation of that before we continue.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: To continue my point of order,.... *(Asides)* I never said "point of order" but I assumed it would be understood by all who know parliamentary procedure because I certainly did not address my words to the subject matter of the debate. The hon. member for Christ Church East would wish that I reply to the debate and so would the Government wish that to happen?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Is the hon. member now so informing the mover of the motion that he would wish him to reply on his behalf?

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is my position, that the Hon. Prime Minister ought to reply.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I understand the hon. member has no alternative now but to accept.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: No, no. I am not like some members.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it appears that the first requirement in the intervention in this debate is to indicate that one has no connections with any plot, and for the record let me say that I and no member of the Democratic Labour Party that I know of has any connection with any plot to overthrow the Government by violent means.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when one listened to the Hon. Prime Minister in his broadcast, one realised that one is part of the democratic system that has been functioning for a very long time in Barbados, one became very concerned at the turn of language used by the Prime Minister in his broadcast. There were a number of alleges, there were references to statements that had been made in the foreign press, and the hon. member who introduced this Resolution said at one point that he wanted to keep Barbados an oasis of democratic Government in the widening desert of one-party and totalitarian states. I believe Mr. Deputy Speaker, that all Barbadians wish to keep Barbados free. I believe that the Leader of the Opposition only left you out of the list of luminaries because it did not occur to him, but I believe that you and I, Sir, have in common a certain youthfulness and we have participated in the economic, social, and political life of this country because we believe that we have a contribution to make to this country.

I, Sir, joined the Democratic Labour Party because I was convinced that the philosophy of that party has within its foundation the basis on which freedom and justice for all the people of this country will be won eventually. On 2nd September, the people of Barbados made decisions which were not altogether to the liking of the members of the Democratic Labour Party because the mere fact that we had participated in an election campaign meant that we wanted to win the Government. We wanted to win the Government because we believed that the policies which we would put forward, the policies which we would carry on were policies in keeping with the proper and orderly development of this country. We do not participate in politics merely for the sake of having power; we participate in politics, at least I did Mr. Deputy Speaker, because I believe that the children of Barbados must be able to

grow up in a society in which they can nurture their legitimate ambitions, in which they can fulfill their potentialities.

It was therefore a very disheartening experience to hear the Prime Minister of this country suggest that the Democratic Labour Party might have participated in some kind of illegitimate plot to overthrow by violent means the legitimate Government of this country.

Sir, I believe that you are familiar with the reichstag file. I am going to take into account what the hon. member who introduced this Resolution said, that we should be temperate in our language, but I think you are familiar with certain historical processes in the government of countries of the world. You are familiar with the reichstag file which was set by the Nazis in order that they could go to the rescue of the victims of the same fire, and the way in which they came to the rescue is now history, and some of the most dastardly acts committed by humans against other humans were committed in the name of the Nazis rescuing people from a fire, damnation and political degradation.
7.40 p.m.

There are some things that are very puzzling to me, Sir. I do not wish to believe that the Government of the day is so concerned with what might be termed its inability to govern that it would feel the need to divert the attention of the people. I do not wish to believe that, but if there were going to be a diversion, what would be a better way of diverting people's attention than the suggestion of the outpouring of facts, or alleged facts, to suggest that there was a conspiracy to do something that would be new in the history of Barbados? All Barbadians must have gone to sleep afraid when they heard the Prime Minister talk about treason, and if you saw the Prime Minister as he indicated what the penalty for treason was I saw two little children flinch as they looked at the Prime Minister's face as he promised to hang those persons who committed or participated in treason.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I may rise laughing at the deep emotion – on a point of order – at the deep and theatrical emotions of the hon. member for St. Michael South West, but he really must calm himself down. I never promised to hang anybody, I have never promised to hang anybody. I do not want to intervene in this, I am not the hangman, I am not the Judge and I do not intend to sit on the jury. The only people as far as I know who would be afraid of hanging are those people who do something you can get hanged for.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No point of order.

Mr. TAITT: Thank you, Sir.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, perhaps I did not make the point. He has said that I promised to hang somebody, and that is a reflection on my motives, Sir. He said I promised to hang somebody, accusing me of promising to commit a crime. I am not the public hangman, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have now made your point of order.

Mr. TAITT. Certainly, Sir, if I gave the impression that the Hon. Prime Minister is a hangman that was not my intention. I think you will agree that the Prime Minister does not look like a hangman, but, Sir, the point I was making was that the speech made by the Hon. Prime Minister of television – and I speak not out of any emotion but out of observation of children who watch television in this country and who see some of the things which are done on television – and I wondered how long will it be now, Sir, before we have to start worrying whether our telephones are tapped. I wish the Prime Minister to give an assurance to this Hon. House that no steps – or the Attorney General if he so desires – that members of the Democratic Labour Party and particularly members of the Opposition, are able to sleep at night in the full knowledge that their telephones are free from interference on any spurious or other concept about security in this country. *(Asides).* I can assure the hon. member who is making loud asides that so far as I know there was never any attempt on the part of the previous Government to impose any system of interfering with the privacy of persons in this country, and I go further, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, the hon. member is talking about telephone tapping. I can assure the hon. member the only evidence I have ever heard in this House about telephone tapping occurred when the hon. member for St. John was replying to the budget debate. He referred to a telephone conversation which took place.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of personal explanation.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If I may just rule on the point of order?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: He has made an aspersion against me and I wish to explain that the then shadow Minister of Finance telephoned

a gentleman by the name of Mr. King, and he telephoned other people to try to find out whether Mr. King had got Mr. Moe's house rented, and the information which was given to me was given by a person at the other end of a telephone line, and at no stage – if the hon. member goes and asks Mr. King he will find out that he divulged verbatim a conversation which took place – so I do not see how if you go and speak to somebody on the other end of a telephone line that a third person has to tap the telephone to find out what the conversation was. If it was between two members of the Barbados Labour Party I would understand.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you are familiar, because you have been involved in constitutional matters for a long time, with a certain pattern which begins to emerge early. It starts off with the suggestion that two or three are gathered together in a plot. It is followed by sieges and searches that usually in some other countries is preceded by legislation which gives the Government certain powers which in normal times no Government would dare to ask of any Legislature. You are familiar with these patterns and what I am saying is that it is my hope that this is not a pattern which the present Government is about to introduce in this country. It will only be a matter of time before we hear that somebody's place was searched because that person was suspected of taking documents or some such paraphernalia at their home. You are familiar with the pattern, and there are some people in Barbados who might not have understood or heard or lived under the kind of constant and immediate terror which dogs the lives of humans as they have to live under such a regime.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like an assurance from the Prime Minister that no such intention rests in the breast of himself or any of his Ministers or his Cabinet. I would like confirmation from the Prime Minister that this allegation of a plot is based only on his wish for good government in this country and is not a diversionary tactic to hound and persecute members of the Democratic Labour Party for the next five years. It may come to some people that this is outside the realm of possibility, but if one casts one's mind to certain countries even not so far from Barbados one has only to think of the state of terror in which people live, because one set of people who belong to one party feel nothing but hatred and contempt for another set of people who belong to another party. This country – and my friends from Jamaica will understand – but this coutnry could well become like Jamaica where one party gets into power, everybody belonging to the other party is summarily dismissed, everybody belonging to the other party runs into difficulties in their everyday lives, and soon after that persons belonging to the other party find themselves appearing before the law courts with a certain rapidity and a certain regularity.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, for fifteen years the Democratic Labour Party was in power in this country. Some of the most venemous, some of the most poisonous things were said during those fifteen years about the Democratic Labour Party, the Ministers of the Government of the Democratic Labour Party and members of the Democratic Labour Party. I go further. I reveal in this House for the record that when I served as a Minister in the Government my life was threatened no less than thirteen times. I reported three to the police and after a while when I was satisfied that my wife and children had got accustomed to the context of threats that it was a waste of time to report each threat.
7.50 p.m.

It is not easy to live under threat, whether that threat emanates from ordinary citizens, cranks, crackpots, or Governments. It is worst, though, when it comes from Governments because there is no way out and there is no answer. When you are declared an enemy of the Government, the people believe that the Government is all powerful, and when you have a Government of men and women other than a Government of law all morality disappears. People cease to function in their normal way. Indeed, they become humanised and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is my hope that the announcement made by the Prime Minister will not be the beginning of the first step or, indeed, an incursion into the area of Government by terror.

I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that all hon. members of this House wish to see the democratic process in practice. It is certainly my belief, and to the best of my knowledge it is the belief and conviction of the hon. members who sit on this side, and the honourable persons who serve with me in the Democratic Labour Party, that all they wish to do is to let the people know, and that will not be too long from now, how much they have been misled and, in due course, the Government will return where it belongs. In fact, I consider that if the Democratic Labour Party was going to overthrow the Government and had gone about it in such an inept way, that the Democratic Labour Party would not be worthy of serious consideration.

I know that once an Ambassador to the United Nations did make a statement, in a

moment of frivolity, that if you want to take over Barbados all you had to do was to get two men with six shooters and a yacht and you might be able to do that. He was making a point to illustrate – Oliver Jackman – how small Barbados is. But, Sir, if the reports which came out in the newspapers are accurate, they said that two men coming off an Island close to Martinique, or Guadeloupe, as I recollect, had 12 rifles, 2,000 rounds of ammunition, and 12 sticks of dynamite. Mr. Deputy Speaker, you cannot even dig a good well with 12 sticks of dynamite. Of course, that might be totally immaterial, because if the idea of a plot is there it is, perhaps, as dangerous as if there is a fullscale revolution. You know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that revolutions are started with ideas. But to use the language which has become the accepted language, the authors of the crime appeared to have been in the grasp of the authorities in Barbados. Unlike the other two who were not within their grasp, these two were within their grasp. How could they let them go and then make a statement which appears to me, as an ordinary Barbadian, to have been nothing more than an attempt to divert attention from more serious matters. I hope that this is not the only reason for the statement.

I say that if evidence is forthcoming, and if the Prime Minister has evidence of a plot against the Government – evidence that will stand up in court – I will support his total prosecution, and I hope the court will deal with any perpetrators of any crime against the legitimate Government of this country. Any treasonous activities should be treated with the full weight of the laws. If they have the evidence, it is their moral and legal duty to produce the evidence, to arrest the people, and to put them before the courts. We have an abiding faith in the courts in this country. It is my hope that the Government will not, through any action it takes, lead us to lose faith or come to think that we should lose faith in the judicial system and in justice in this country.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as every hon. member who has spoken on this matter already has indicated, this is a very serious matter which we are discussing here this evening. I would like to say that the duty and the desire of any opposition is to see that the Government is brought down, or that the Government is defeated. However, as far as the Democratic Labour Party is concerned, I am sure that we would not encourage or, indeed, tolerate any illegal plots to overthrow the Government of Barbados even although, as I said, we would like to see the Government brought down.

Now, what is of major concern to me in this matter is the statement which was made by the Prime Minister about his intention to seek through Parliament additional legislation and laws to crack down on subversion. What is bothersome to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is whether or not laws do not exist in Barbados to deal with subversion. My understanding of the situation and of the legal position is that there are on the Statute Book laws to deal with this whole question of subversion. If that is the case, then it would seem to me that the Government is rushing hurriedly into a situation to get to itself additional powers and laws the only intention of which would be to control the situation and, indeed, to give it further power to remain in the control of the Government of this country.

Now I think that we have to be very clear about what we are dealing with, because subversion has extremely wide implications. There is no way when, presumably, these additional laws are put on the Statute Book, that a number of people who have indicated their opposition to the present Government, can escape the claws of these laws, and I see an extremely dangerous situation developing. As has been said from this side of the Chamber, if there is enough evidence in the possession of the Prime Minister of the Government, then firm action should be taken.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we talk in terms of getting additional laws, I am of the firm view that these additional laws which the Government is seeking are laws for purposes other than subversion and in addition to this particular matter. It would seem to me as if this is a long range attempt by the Government to get on to itself additional power to deal with any forces of opposition which exist in this country.

Now, we have to examine this situation very carefully. Already there are laws which exist for searching but, as I understand it, a search cannot be carried out without a search warrant. We could very well find ourselves in a situation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where these measures which are being sought will be the kind of measures which would enable the Police, and presumably other people mentioned under the laws, to go unhampered into people's houses and to carry out whatever search they want. We could very well see a situation developing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where people can be arrested and put in prison on mere suspicion. We can very well have a situation developing where laws will be enacted to curtail public meetings and discussions which might be critical of the Government. *(Asides.)* In an asides the Hon. Attorney General made mention of the Public Order Act.

8.00 p.m.

The Public Order Act as he very well knows did not stop anybody from having public meetings. What it did was to indicate that a certain time of the night, it could be 11 o'clock, outside of election period, that public meetings should cease, but this does not prevent anybody from having a public meeting; but what I am saying Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that we could very well run into a situation where under these new laws that the Government says it is proposing or will be bringing down to this Parliament, that these might have the sort of situation where public meetings will be quite curtailed, and I feel that this will be a very dangerous way in which this country will be going, because it would be, in my opinion, a back-hand way of introducing a state of emergency. You do not call it a state of emergency but by the very methods, the legislative action which you will be taking would be the result of this kind of measures; and we have to be very careful.

The mover of this Resolution asked members in addressing themselves to this question, to be temporate in their language. I think he has already been as it were pulled up on a certain degree of intemperance in his language, but we have got to look at this matter very carefully. We have got to examine all of the pros and cons, and as has been indicated from this side, so far we see no reason for the kind of proposals and indeed for the kind of statement which the Prime Minister made in his broadcast last night, and the kind of statement which came from the mover of the Resolution. It is true that he did not throw any additional light on this particular matter except to directly associate the members of the Opposition with the plot, but he subsequently withdrew the remarks.

He indicated, as the member for St. Michael South West stated, that he would like to see Barbados remain an oasis of democratic Government in the widening desert of a one-party and totalitarian State, but if we are going to move into this situation where the Prime Minister and the Government will be coming to get additional legislation to give them additional powers, I am submitting to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we are moving very, very fast into this desert of one-party and totalitarian State which he indicated exists in various parts of the world. That is my analysis of the situation.

Now the Prime Minister in my view has a way of associating incidents and happenings, and it is passing strange that in his opening address to the nation last night he sough to associate this plot with the crash of the Cubana Airline, because he started out by saying some time around October 6, and then he mentioned the Cubana crash. This in my view, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and in my humble opinion was a direct attempt by the Prime Minister – and I am saying that if this was not his intention he should indicate this in no uncertain terms – this was a direct attempt by him to link members of the Democratic Labour Party with the crash of the Cubana Airline, otherwise there would be no other reason for him to mention that; and he has caused a considerable amount of concern in this country because of this.

About 6 o'clock this morning I received a telephone call from one of my constituents who was very concerned about this kind of association and who asked me what was the connection between the Democratic Labour Party and the crash of the Cubana Airline. I said I did not know what he was talking about, and he said he heard the Prime Minister with this on television last night. This is the kind of impression which people in this country have got. So that I would like to say that we have got to be very careful with what we do as far as this particular matter is concerned.

As the members on this side who have spoken already have indicated if there is evidence which can stand the test in a law court, then the Government has every right to take the people concerned before the law courts. I would want to reiterate a concern on this side relating to the fact that the Prime Minister and the security forces deported or allowed to be deported two people who the Prime Minister implied were conspirators in this plot. What is the reason for this? I cannot imagine a situate where you have people of whom you have evidence to connect them with the plot, and so the Government allows these people to leave the country. Is it something that you want to hide? Is it something that you do not consider that the public of Barbados or that the world at large should know about? I think that these are serious and very grave matter, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I therefore feel that when we come to discuss this important matter of security, we have to be very clear about what we are doing because when once this kind of legislation which the Prime Minister says that within a couple of days or within a couple of weeks he intends to seek approval to, gets on the Statute Book, it is going to be very difficult for an Opposition to live with. I am predicting that. This in my view is an attempt to deal with more fundamental issues in this society.

I do not believe that subversion is really the aim and the objective of any legislative measures

which the Prime Minister will be seeking. I believe it is more fundamental and more far reaching than that, and I see this as the way in which the Barbados Labour Party Government is seeking to perpetuate itself in office and I want to warn this House and the country about this kind of legislation and about this kind of action and about the way in which the Prime Minister sought to associate the Democratic Labour Party members with the crash of the Cubana Airline ....

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. Absolutely he must withdraw that, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I have tolerated his saying, in the interest of speed of the debate, that the motives of the Government in introducing legislation of suspect – although I am objecting to it now, I tolerated it when it was said – that we are not introducing it to deal with subversion, we are introducing it to maintain ourselves in power. I am objecting to that because it reflects on the motives of all members of the Government and I am objecting specifically to his saying that I tried to associate members of the Democratic Labour Party with the Cubana crash. Both of these statements are untrue and reflect on my motives, and I submit they are unparliamentary and should be withdrawn.
8.10 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Prime Minister has on a point of order asked that the hon. member for St. Lucy withdraw certain assertions. Standing Order No. 28(7) says "No Member may impute improper motives to another Member." In so far as those assertions of the hon. member for St. Lucy impute improper motives to the Hon. Prime Minister, my ruling is that they be withdrawn.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am saying that the Prime Minister in his address started out by saying that around the time of October 6 and the Cubana airline crash...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My ruling is that your statements are capable of having an interpretation that impute improper motives to hon. members of this House, and my ruling is that the remarks be withdrawn.

Mr. GREAVES: I am glad to hear the Prime Minister indicate that he does not have any improper motives.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you are withdrawing the remarks, will you please stand and withdraw them.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to withdraw the remarks. *(Asides)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: He has withdrawn them. Does any other hon. member wish to speak?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, my position in this matter is one of pivotal importance because I not only have been the former Leader of the Government of Barbados, but I am the President of the Democratic Labour Party which is the official Opposition Party in this country, and for a period of fifteen years I was Chairman of the Cabinet of Barbados, and by virtue of being Chairman of the Cabinet I was the Premier and then from 1966 onwards the Prime Minister of this country for a period of a further ten years approximately.

Last night I had the experience of listening to and watching the Prime Minister make a statement to the nation. Like many other people in Barbados at 7.30, if I happen to be watching television, I usually find a good book to read and switch off the television until some other programme of interest would be broadcast, because we have been regaled ever since the elections with the appearances of Ministers and Ministers and various people connected with the Government, and statements being made by Government Ministers every single night practically for the past eight weeks, frivolous statements, statements of Ministers saying that they did not know that so and so existed, and that they are surprised that so and so, statements which are in direct contradiction with some of the extravagant mouthings which were delivered during the election period by various speakers.

I was very concerned with what I say and what I heard last night and I am stressing what I saw and what I heard. There was a famous American comedian whose name has not been enshrined yet on the records of this House, by the name of Mr. Flip Wilson, and one of his famous quips was "what you see is what you get", and if what I saw last night is what the people of Barbados can expect to receive during the next five years, then this country is in for a very very rough time. It is not only what people say but it is how they say it, and I would just like to say that the hon. member when he is making a speech in here somehow or the other, we do not get the same unfavourable impression as we get when he is trying to impress the uninitiated over the public broadcasting media, particularly over the television service. There is something that the camera man does to his

character and to his face which creates a very unfavourable impression to those of us who have to view it. In here we can even detect sometimes a trace of a smile particularly when he knows he is not going to get away with something; so we do not mind because he does not come over badly inside here, but on television,...I am not surprised that the two young children to whom the hon. member for St. Michael South West referred should have been frightened out of their wits. I really do not want to say anything personal. I think it is unfortunate because the hon. member does not come over so badly inside here, but something is being done to him in order even to distort the beneficence of his features to which we are treated in the Chamber when we are with him face to face. Something is done by somebody perhaps who does not like him or maybe it is too much make-up or too many visits to the hair-dressing salon or something.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, I submit that the hon. member is being irrelevant. The physiognomy of the hon. member for St. Thomas is irrelevant to the debate. I thought the hon. member by now would have learnt how to stick to matters under discussion. I am submitting he is irrelevant. It is all right probably to make a passing reference, but for the next three minutes for him to discourse on people's faces and how they look is irrelevant.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please continue.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member for Christ Church East in his motion said that "Whereas the Prime Minister has drawn to the attention of the Country the existence of a plot to overthrow the lawfully constituted and duly elected Government of Barbados;" and I was drawing to the attention of hon. members how the Prime Minister drew it to the attention of the country, and I want to make certain comments and observations on this motion and on the statement made by the Prime Minister last night in his broadcast, and particularly because of my position I owe a duty to the members of my party, to the members of the Official Opposition and to the country to let the facts be known and the position of my party in the allegations, aspersions, innuendoes and insinuations which were made by the Prime Minister in the course of his statements.
8.20 p.m.

Now, the first thing I should like to draw to your attention, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is this, that he said that he was taking the nation into his confidence, and I want to say this, that if that is confidence then the confidence is not worthwhile sharing, because if you say there is a plot you should have evidence of a plot which should stand the test in the courts of law, and if he wanted to say by taking into his confidence that having discovered a plot that the Director of Public Prosecutions was taking steps against persons and therefore he could not say any more, that would be understandable, but he went on to say in the course of his remarks that he had the names of the persons. And that is significant is that we had to wait till today for the member for Christ Church East to even give the name of the prime mover or the author or the instigator of the plot, because that was not given last night. I wonder if the reason why the Prime Minister did not give that name or the names – I am coming to the other names in a moment – or anybody's name except the name of Mr. Earl Glasgow, against whom he did not say anything really defamatory, and as a lawyer, and on this side all of us who have had even a nodding acquaintance with law and took our own bar examinations, would know that he did not say anything defamatory, he merely smeared the character of Mr. Earl Glasgow by not making a full disclosure to the general public that it was Mr. Earl Glasgow that called the police, that it was Mr. Earl Glasgow that took.....

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, I did not smear Glasgow's name, I did not give full disclosures of what anybody said. I object to "smear".

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: What kind of confidence is that if you did not give a full disclousure? I do not see anything unparliamentary about "smear", I am saying that the statement he made of Mr. Earl Glasgow was therefore unnecessary since he did not introduce the names of the prime authors, because had he said that these people were guilty of a plot and then called their names, it is not like today when the member for Christ Church East can claim parliamentary privilege, or like the hon. member for St. Thomas and Prime Minister can claim parliamentary privilege now by probably calling everybody who has been associated with the former Government today, but last night not one single name was forthcoming. This is what the Prime Minister said last night, and I wish to serve notice right now that I am introducing an amendment to this motion, to which I will come in a moment.

"Just over a week ago," I am reading from today's Advocate-News in Barbados which I am prepared to make a document of the House, "I

hinted the existence of all of these matters, but recent activities have now made it necessary for me to take the entire nation into the confidence of the Government and let you know all the facts....." Listen to this carefully, Sir, all the facts; what facts, when a single name, except the name of Mr. Earl Glasgow, who he merely said went and picked up people and had them in his house. There is nothing defamatory about that, but it does put the gentleman in a very unfavourable light – "all the facts that can be disclosed at this stage." Do you mean that tonight you can disclose them because you have parliamentary privilege but last night you could not do what the member for Christ Church East did and say that Mr. Sidney Alleyne was the person in Martinique, so the public was left in the dark. What transpired between last night and tonight that made it possible for the member for Christ Church East, except the cloak of parliamentary privilege, to come in here and call somebody's name, and last night you in possession of all the facts could not disclose the facts? Because you were sheltering or waiting to shelter under parliamentary privilege?

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, I do not want to interrupt the hon. member, but it has been repeatedly decided that you cannot say of an hon. member that his conduct in making a speech in or out of Parliament is governed by his consideration for the rules of Parliamentary privilege, and I submit that is imputing an improper motive to me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the Hon. Prime Minister will assist me here, I did not quite hear everything that the hon. member was saying because I was speaking to the Clerk at the time.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: He suggested that I was waiting to call Sidney Alleyne's name in here when I would be sheltered by parliamentary privilege.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I asked a question. I asked what has happened between last night and tonight that has made it possible or will make it possible for him to call names, and made it possible for the member for Christ Church East to go further than he did last night and call somebody's name. I said that tonight you will be protected by parliamentary privilege, and if the facts were real facts, irrevocable facts, they should have been in the possession of the Director of Public Prosecutions.

I want to say here now, any member of my party including myself who is guilty of any conspiracy, the existing laws of Barbados according to the Hon. Prime Minister are so drastic that they even include the death penalty, so what more legislation does he want? Does he want to hold the hangings in the public square like they did in Vietnam, South Korea and places like that? It is the only thing now to make it more drastic for anyone who wants to introduce a police state. We have to be very very careful, and I want to make the position of the Leader of the Opposition clear.

We had a meeting between the Leader of the Opposition and the parliamentrary members here, and the Leader of the Opposition made it clear that when he said that he would support the Government with any measures that they took to stamp out any form of subversion that he meant under the existing Constitution of this island. The hon. members treat that as a joke. He is here, he has said it for himself and we are saying that we are not going to support any measure which is going to introduce under the guise of dealing with subversion for which we have no difficulty.

The person whose name was called by the member for Christ Church East today has written me probably no less than 16, 18 or 20 letters threatening to assassinate me because I was not doing in Barbados what he said should have been done, but I did not make any big hullabaloo about it, I never even reported the matter to the police. I have had other threats like other members probably on both sides by cranks, crackpots and lunatics and schizophrenics from time to time, and continually get them. I have been physically threatened by a member of the Senate called Mr. Truss right here on the premises, and a big picture was taken with him waving an offensive weapon in my face. Take no notice of that at all.

Let us get the position clear. I am saying that if the Prime Minister had all this evidence, and I want to reiterate a point which was made here by members on this side. Let us go back to the Cubana crash now, the reluctance of the Government of Barbados to have any jurisdiction or say in the matter, and I pointed out that according to international law the Government of Barbados had jurisdiction which the Prime Minister himself has not denied, which no lawyer in his right senses will deny, and he has only said the evidence was not sufficient, the newspapers which are now manipulated by the Government, the Advocate-News had the effrontery to say it was time to shut up, yet people want me to take my part in the Opposition for the running of parliamentary democracy in this country and

pointing out from time to time what are the laws, what are the legal rights and obligations of the citizens of this country, and the way in which they expect us to play our part. They want me to come in here and take part in a debate but if I make a statement that the public can examine they tell me I must shut up because it is embarrassing to the Government, but Carlos Andres Perez, the President of Venezuela was able to come out and say in no uncertain terms that there was sufficient evidence, and yesterday the same two persons over whom the Government of Barbados declined jurisdiction have been charged in Venezuela far from the scene, way outside the territorial waters, with the conspiracy.

Now, why do I mention that? This was a case in which the miscreants, or the alleged conspirators, were in another country. What the Government of Barbados had to do was to apply for extradition orders, but the Government of Barbados did not apply for any extradition orders, but in the instant case, according to the Prime Minister, Mr. Glasgow was seen in association with two persons who were conspirators, and the Prime Minister ensured that the two conspirators were safely out of the jurisdiction and beyond his reach before he made his public statement.
8.30 p.m.

Now, what kind of nonsense is that? Here is a case where the Immigration Authorities, who are the Police, go and arrest two people. It appears that they had not arrested them because of their change of residence and had not notified the Police. They were arresting them in connection with a plot for legislation, apparently, does not exist but will be introduced here to deal with plots. In 15 years I have never had a situation like this. All of the security matters have been brought to my attention and I did not come into the House and blow the roof off with them because somebody from the Barbados Labour Party may have been involved, and I refuse to say anything on that right now. At no time did I find it necessary for the good running of the Government of Barbados to try to smear anybody on the other side with any plots or anything like that.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir, if the hon. member will give way. The hon. member is obviously forgetting things as he gets older. If he would read various constitutional debates, including the constitutional debate for the independence of Barbados when he attacked vigorously the under forties and said how we were subversive as to overthrowing the Government – conspirators.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No point of order!

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I like the way the hon. member said that I said, "he attacked the under forties and said that we were conspirators." Conspiracy in that sense is used in a different sense from saying... *(Asides.)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member, please, continue his debate.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: If I am allowed to, Sir. On the front page it is said that somebody has arms to overthrow the Government. He has 12 rifles to overthrow a whole Government. The hon. member can quote from the debates at any time that he wants. It is all right. What I say I am responsible for. All I am saying is that in all of those years I have never found it necessary to go on television and say there was any plot or anything like that. Even if the Police, or the Security Liaison Officer, or the Security people, supplied me with information, I treated it for what it was worth and allowed them to deal with it. I am saying that if there is a plot to overthrow the Government of Barbados, after the Director of Public Prosecutions has taken the matter in hand, the Prime Minister is entitled to go on the radio or television, or to hold a public meeting, or to come in here and make a statement to the effect that the Security Forces have discovered certain matters which were placed in the hands of the Director of Public Prosecutions, and the public can set their minds at rest because the matters are being dealt with in the law courts of this Island. Instead of that, what did we get, Sir? I will continue to read:

> "At about the time of the Cubana air disaster our Security Forces reported to the Security Defence Division in my office that a certain Barbadian, notorious rather than just well-known, was engaging in a conspiracy to obtain an aircraft on a small West Indian Island in the northern Leewards to further a plot against the security of this Island. His conspirators were alleged to be two United States citizens."

The same ones that have been deported and put out of the reach of the tentacles of the law of Barbados. Those are my words, Sir. To quote the Prime Minister:

been encouraged by too many people when he was known to be a dangerous crackpot over a period of time. I am informed by the Defence and Security Division of the Prime Minister's office that on an earlier occasion this year or towards the end of last year, this Sydney Alleyne had become such a nuisance when he was going about, one member of Parliament had asked him to see me and another member of Parliament had asked him to see me. When the Police were exercising surveillance over Sydney Alleyne I am instructed by a civil servant that the hon. member for St. John, then the Minister for Security, gave orders that the Police should lay off Sydney Alleyne. Get up and deny that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The civil servant who told you that should come to me with that statement. That is absolutely untrue.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order. Will the hon. member for St. John please take his seat.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have never given any such instructions. Sir, this is a point of personal explanation. Am I entitled on a point of personal explanation to emphatically deny that I have ever given – we are going to hear a series of distortions and inventions, in the course of the next ten or fifteen minutes, but I want to emphatically deny that I have ever given any such instructions to anybody about anybody in Barbados even to lay off or to go on.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have made a point of explanation.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I make no apology for saying it and I am repeating that I believe that civil servant and I do not believe the hon. member for St. John; and I am looking around the House to see if he is in here. He was in here earlier. I do not now see him, but I will have much pleasure in instructing him tomorrow to put in writing the statement that it was the hon. member for St. John who told him to tell the Commissioner of Police to cease surveillance of Mr. Alleyne – if he wants all of that. He cannot go on and on and on believing it is my word against somebody else's and because I am such a person that my word has to be believed. I am saying that I happen to believe this public officer, and I am saying that all of this has led to the situation in which Sydney Alleyne has managed to put us in Barbados into the situation in which we now find ourselves.

Now what is this situation in which we have found ourselves in the last few days? What is the situation? We have been hearing about somebody who clearly has been recognized as Mr. Sydney Alleyne, and it is not just one of the mere sayings. We first of all get information that a Mr. Sydney Alleyne is conspiring with this Virgo, this Cappadero and two members of the former Government. Now we have heard something tonight in this House about evidence.

I am asking all hon. members, particularly the Hon. Leader of the Opposition who utters some very high sentiments. We are talking about security and everybody is saying if there is evidence, why don't you produce the evidence. Now suppose there is no evidence. Suppose you just get information that there is a plot; will you do nothing about it because there is no evidence? And suppose on top of that although there is no evidence things begin to fall into place suggesting that your information – there is a difference between information and evidence – that your information is correct; two names are given to you. You take some steps to deal with the owners of those two names; you then find that they have arrived in Barbados on a one-way ticket – that is how Virgo and Cappadero came here.
8.50 p.m.

Due to certain infelicities they got through immigration at Seawell Airport, they are taken by Mr. Glasgow to a house in St. John, they are found and a list of arms, 12 heavy machine guns, six light machine guns, ten grenade launchers, 150 grenades, 300 M16 rifles, 12 bazookas, is found written on the notepaper of the hotel where the Barbados delegation to the United Nations stayed under guard earlier in October, and this Barbados delegation to the United Nations had been specifically threatened by the same Sidney Alleyne to the effect that he was going to place a contract on the life of the Prime Minister so that my door in that same hotel was guarded day and night by a secret service man or woman, and I could not travel in New York without five or six secret service men in front and behind, because the F.B.I. took this so seriously. What now are we going to do when we reach Barbados?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I should just like to explain that there is a congressional law which says that all heads of state must be so guarded and when I went to the IMF in Washington a few years ago, it was the hon. member who poopooed the idea in this House – that is when my life was threatened for going to Israel – that I was just

trying to make a sensation, and now he is saying that the FBI took it seriously. It is not the duty of the FBI as he himself said; it is the duty of the US Treasury to look after heads of state.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member for St. John please take his seat?

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am trying not to be contentious. What would one want the Government to do? The only evidence that we have against any of these persons is the evidence of an informant abroad who informed that these matters are being planned. I myself think that the Defence Forces handled the matter of Virgo and Cappadero with some finesse. It is not a crime in Barbados to have a list of arms; it is not a crime to be in Mr. Glasgow's house. I will ask hon. members to consider carefully what they are saying when they ask what evidence do you have, and that if you have the evidence, do such and such a thing.

I carefully said in my statement that the co-conspirators with Sidney Alleyne were alleged to be these two men. I went out of my way to say that Mr. Glasgow and these two men have all made statements to the Police. I understand that in Mr. Glasgow's statement to the police he emphasised how his wife had told him to ring the police or something like that and he spoke to an Inspector. I believe that is true. (Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Why didn't you say that last night?) I did not say it last night because I was not discussing evidence on the television last night, nor will I in here now. I have said there were statements where there were statements; I have said there were allegations where there were allegations, and where there are certain people's names which have already become known to the public I have further made these names known. I did not make known the names of the two members of the Democratic Labour Party who were alleged to be co-conspirators, because they have neither come to the attention of the public openly by way of the newspaper or even to a small section of the public. I went so far in the avoidance of smears and will continue to stay in the avoidance of smears where that is concerned, because what members of the Opposition have to understand is that there has been great public disquiet over the last two days since the arrest in Martinique has been revealed. They are only hearing one side of the story. I am hearing a heart-broken story about two children who were frightened when I talked about hanging. When people telephone my wife to tell my wife that my two children were in danger of being kidnapped, please do not think that my wife then sat down and laughed it off; so do not think that your story about two children, meaning the hon. member for St. Michael South West, is an experience that you alone have had. When men come and tell me or tell the police that they overheard two men on Accra Beach saying there is an execution list with the hon. member for Christ Church West, the hon. member for Christ Church South Central and the hon. member for St. Thomas as being the three top names on the list, you must not think this whole matter is casual.

Speeches have been made in here tonight as if nothing had happened. You don't seem to understand that a yacht has been arrested in Martinique and Sidney Alleyne has been found on board, and on this yacht are a quantity of arms, and that a statement has been made by Sidney Alleyne saying that he is the head of the Action Group of the Democratic Labour Party, and that the importance to the public of this whole affair is the possibility that the Opposition Party is connected with it. This is not an ordinary plot by an idiot. This is a plot by a man representing himself to be an agent of the Democratic Labour Party, and I have therefore gone out of my way to give the Democratic Labour Party the opportunity of repudiating this man.

Let me deal with something before I pass on. The reason why I did not mention Sidney Alleyne's name on the television is that the possibilities envisaged in the debate in here may well come to pass, and I have no intention of allowing any lawyer to be able to get up and say at the trial of anybody in Barbados that he was tried by me on the television and convicted. I am not Mr. Burnham. I have no intention of committing contempt of court in all these circumstances. The Opposition and the public have to appreciate that it is not a casual plot by Sidney Alleyne unconnected with anything. When he talked about a Government of National Reconstruction, nobody had taken him seriously, but when he turns up with arms, and please do not think it is twelve rifles and 20 sticks of dynamite, and a foreign press says they are destined for Barbados to overthrow the newly elected Government of Tom Adams, what do we do? These statements appeared in the foreign press.

I was telephoned from Canada yesterday by the hon. member for Christ Church South Central who told me that the Canadian Press is carrying rumours of a coup in Barbados to remove the new Government and put in the

old, and that he has to talk to the travel trade. All these matters are at stake, and it is absolutely necessary in the circumstances for all sides in Parliament to make it clear that we believe in democratic institutions.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member would give way, the Moment of Interruption has arrived.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it being 9 o'clock and the moment of interruption, and since this debate is one of paramount importance, I beg to move that the debate be extended for an additional half an hour.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in spite of what the Clerks may be telling you, I am going to move that Standing Order No. 18(4) be suspended for the remainder of this sitting.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My ruling is that the motion to suspend the Standing Order should have been made before the Moment of Interruption, and cannot now be made.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, with great respect to Your Honour's ruling, there is a motion before the House and all you have to do is to put the motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My ruling is that the motion was made after the Moment of Interruption. My ruling is that we now resume Government Business.
9.00 p.m.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move that the first order of Government Business shall be the continuation of previous business.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am glad that you as a lawyer happen to be occupying the Chair. How can Private Members' Business on the Order Paper become Government Business by his moving it? What sort of Parliament are we running? The motion was made by the member for Christ Church East under Private Members' Business, because he is not a member of the Government, and they will get up by some motion, use their members, but do not let us make a laughing sport of Parliament. The Deputy Speaker is correct in that the motion has already lapsed and you cannot revive it by making it Government Business. It is just that I know you were not on the ball; use the Attorney General, you cannot get around this one, but a constitutional lawyer is presiding over this and you are wrong, you cannot do it so. I agree with the Prime Minister's endeavour in a debate like this to try to put as many facts as possible. I can see how hurt he may be, but he must be more alert. When we were over there you were a giant about the Standing Orders, but you got tricked today now, so take your lashes. Too late, too late shall be the cry.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael South West was speaking at 6.30 when the matter of public importance was being dealt with.

Mr. TAITT: Thank you, Sir. I had been speaking.....

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, let us get one or two things clear. First of all, a matter of urgent public importance has to come to a vote. That is the first point. The speeches may have to end at 9 o'clock, but it has to come to a vote, because the matter has ended. Do not let the Clerks mislead you; understand that.

The second point is this. Whether it comes to a vote at this time or not depends on a motion which I have moved. This is not a matter to be treated casually, with great respect, Sir. I have moved that the next order of Government Business be the continuation of the previous order. There is nothing in the Standing Orders that forbids such a motion, nor in my respectful submission – well, I am not going to argue, you said that the motion for the extension has to be put before the end – that is not true, never mind the Clerks again. Governments can suspend the Standing Orders at any time and set the order of business if the House agrees. Your only option, with great respect, on motions for suspension of the Standing Orders is to look after the rights of the minorities. Every member of the Opposition, except one member, has spoken and only one member of the Government has been able to complete his speech, so there is no question of the rights of minorities there.

I do not want to quarrel with the Chair, Sir, but the Chair in my respectful submission is being misled. Your only option, in my respectful submission, in motions on the suspension of Standing Orders is to protect the minority. Reference to the appropriate rule will convince Your Honour of that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the hon. member saying that there is a motion before the House?

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: First of all, I am saying that the motion on the matter of urgent public importance was not put. It has to be put to the vote anyhow. I am saying that. With great respect, there is not an hon. member on that side who has sat through one of these motions. Not one of them has been in the House while one of these motions was discussed; Mr. Brancker, the Clerk, was not here and I do not believe Mr. Boyce was either. The only hon. members I see in this House.....

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: As I look around I do not see off-hand any hon. member who has been in here, because I remember the last of these motions was moved by Mr. Elliott Mottley in 1969, and there is no rule that the time cannot be extended, there is no rule that the Standing Orders cannot be suspended out of time, there is no rule that you can refuse to take my motion that the instant order of Government Business be the last matter being discussed. These are matters of great and major importance, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the life of our country and they are not to be interrupted by trivialities.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not know if you want to hear me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, I do not wish to hear you.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: You are perfectly right.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I may draw Your Honour's attention to Standing Order 6(8), "A motion may be made by a Minister, after notice, at the commencement of public business, to the effect that the proceedings on any specified business be exempted from the provisions of this Order, and if such motion is agreed to, the business so specified shall not be interrupted at 9.00 p.m. and may be entered upon at any hour though opposed." When the Leader of the House, a Minister, made the motion, Your Honour should have entertained it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member will take his seat, I have already ruled that the motion ought to have been made before 9 o'clock. However, there is another motion before this Hon. House by the hon. member for St. Thomas in which he moves that the first Order of Government Business be the matter which was last before this Hon. Chamber. That is the motion before the House, that is the motion which has been seconded.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am opposing it and speaking on the motion. How can this be done? It was not introduced by a Minister. How can a motion introduced by a member, a back bencher, the hon. member for Christ Church East.....*(Asides)*.....I am speaking on the motion, so how can you tell him to rule when I have the right to speak? I am sorry, Sir, aren't you finished?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not finished, and I propose to put that second motion before this Hon. Chamber.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, what are we going in for? The Prime Minister, I agree, finds himself in a position in which he would like to talk a little more, but let him face realities. The Opposition is not objecting on the ground that we do not want to hear him, because so far I think he has exonerated the Democratic Labour Party. All I can gather from what he says is that he has been alerted and therefore his security will have to be tight. Nobody can quarrel with a Prime Minister for doing that. If he gets information of the slightest thing he has to put on security; there is no doubt about that, but without dealing with that matter I know he would like to have explained to this House, and perhaps use this medium, to the general public. When you look at rule 18, had this been done before, then what would happen would be that he could continue, but an interpretation of this shows that at the moment of interruption the motion lapsed.

9.10 p.m.

How can he revive a motion that is not before the House? What does the word "lapse" mean? It comes from Latin. It means that it slides; it has gone through *lapsus linguae*, a slip of the tongue. How can he get up and move a motion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that a motion which is no longer on the floor of the House can be the first Order of the Day under Government Business? Two things are wrong with that: One is

that Government Business can only be business introduced by a Minister. You cannot resurrect, or elevate, a back bencher. Can I get up and move that a motion moved under Private Members' Business becomes Government Business? Can any back bencher over there do a similar thing? There are two things wrong with it. One is that his motion cannot elevate a back bencher's motion into Government Business, and two there is no motion before the House that he can make the continuing Order of the Day. It has already lapsed, and it is a dangerous precedent. There is no harm in another motion coming up on a matter of public importance. Everybody saw a cat and mouse game going on here on this motion. At one time you could almost have put the question. It was a question of watching who was speaking next and so on. Nobody wants to rob the Government of the opportunity.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was looking for the Attorney General to speak, and other members. Do not give the impression that because all of us have spoken we took unfair advantage of you. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am submitting that you cannot, under the Standing Orders, put the motion as moved by the Prime Minister because there is no motion. If the word "lapse" stops you from extending the time "lapse" can only mean that it slides off the Order Paper, or it slides off the Business of the Day. You will have to run outside and find the motion, because it is sliding down the steps. You will have to go and find the motion that has slipped off the Order Paper and bring it back in here in order to make it the first Order of the Day. What sort of precedent are you going to set? If we have to meet again, then put it back on the Order Paper and give it full disclosure.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am glad that you are an LL.M. I am not even that. It is good to have intelligent people in high offices. Although there are lawyers on both sides, he can hold his own with any of them. I am asking the Prime Minister to understand that what is causing this debate now is the non-vigilance of all of us. I do not think that he had looked at the Rules to see that the motion at the point of interruption lapses. It clearly shows, too, that another mistake the Prime Minister is making is that you do not have to go to any vote. The Rules are clear. It says here:

> "At the moment of interruption, the motion for adjournment, if it has not previously been disposed of, shall lapse."

That does not mean it shall be voted on. All it means that when the time comes you will have to stop whoever is speaking.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. One cannot read the Rules in the Standing Orders without reference to other Rules. I invite Your Honour to look at Standing Order 6, because at the moment of interruption the business of the House must revert to Government's Business. it gives a Minister of Government the opportunity to move that the previous business be carried on. It is set out in Standing Order 6(8). When nine o'clock has been reached and the Leader of the House, who is a member of Government, moves a motion that motion has to be put to the vote before Your Honour or anybody else can talk. Dependent on the vote, Standing Order 6(8) tells you what to do.

At nine o'clock on the dot the moment of interruption occurs, and it is at that point that we refer to Government Business, and it is at that point that Your Honour must put the vote. The Leader of the Opposition must not mislead this House by quoting one Standing Order. He knows very well that after the Standing Orders had been agreed upon in Select Committee, the Cabinet decided to amend them, and they must now be read in conjunction with other Standing Orders. At the moment of interruption, which is nine o'clock, the House automatically reverts to the previous business, and a Minister of Government has the right to move a motion.

Now, a motion was moved by the Leader of the House and seconded by me. I believe, constitutionally, a second motion was also moved by the Prime Minister. The motion must be put to the vote for determination, and that is how I see it. Your Honour must put the two motions and get a vote on them, otherwise it is futile for anybody to select a Government, give them 17 seats, and then hear that they cannot move a motion and get a vote on it. We might as well go outside in the Market Square.

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

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If you will hear me now, Sir. The Clerks, perhaps, have not yet checked the matter. I am fairly aware of Standing Order 19 although, perhaps, in my heat I did not draw the interplay of Standing Order 18 and the suspended Standing Orders to Your Honour's attention, nor do I think to the Clerks. Standing Order 6 has been suspended. (Hon. MEMBERS: No.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the House has asked me, in the circumstances, to withdraw my motion to take this matter as a part of Government Business. If the House will give leave, I will withdraw it.

The Hon. Prime Minister is withdrawing his motion, and we will revert to Government Business. The hon. member for St. Michael South West, I think, was speaking at 6.30 p.m. when we started to deal with the matter of public importance.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that enough points have been made, and in the light of what has transpired since then, I do not propose to resume speaking on the Airport tax. I think that I have made the point, and I commend to the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance that he takes cognizance of the suggestion which I have made, and that he pays no attention to the suggestion that they should print money in Barbados as a form of revenue. *(Asides.)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If hon. members wish to address the Chair they should stand in their places.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Is there any other hon. member who wishes to speak? I propose to deal with the debate on the Airport Service charge. The hon. member for St. John said that Jamaica and New Zealand have travel taxes, and he defended having travel taxes. Of course, there is no reason why you cannot raise the Airport Service charge and have a travel tax as well. I would also indicate to you that Jamaica and New Zealand have travel taxes, but in Jamaica the travel tax is notoriously unworkable because Jamaica happens to be very close to both Puerto Rico and, particularly, Miami. Once you enter the United States no further stamp is made on your passport. It is well-known that there is widespread evasion of the travel tax in Jamaica by means of Jamaicans travelling to Miami and then buying tickets for onward travel to New York, or California, or wherever their destination happens to be.

In Barbados the same way of coming to this arrangement would be to travel to Puerto Rico, and then once in Puerto Rico, you buy a new ticket through to New York. Indeed, I believe that is often a cheaper way of travelling from Barbados, anyhow. Those are things that I will mention. New Zealand and its travel tax have a slightly different situation. New Zealand is a very isolated country, and people do not normally travel short distances. The nearest countries, I believe, to which New Zealanders normally travel are Australia and Fiji. They may travel to San Juan and places like that, but they travel to Australia and Fiji. Both of these places are relatively distant and, apparently, New Zealanders prefer to pay the whole tax.

The hon. member for St. John also spoke of most progressive nations having a travel tax. That is simply not true. *(Asides.)* I cannot hear myself talk for members on my right and that is the honest truth.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member for St. John said nowhere was it suggested in the debate on the Budget, and he dwelt a lot on the Budget Debate. He talked about accusations against Ministers. I am not aware that any Political Party in Barbados is in the habit of warning the electorate about taxes which it is going to impose. I think that we have to look very seriously at this conversation about the Budget Speech, because all the talk about the Budget Debate and referring to the Debate on August on taxes reflects the long-standing taruma that that debate with its revolutions about Mr. Sydney Alleyne and his activities have inflicted on the hon. member for St. John.
9.20 p.m.

It was in that debate that it was revealed that Mr. Sydney Alleyne had paid Mr. George Moe $5,000 plus, and Mr. Cameron Tudor $20,000; and ever since then *(Asides)* Do not let us worry our heads. If they are standing on the Standing Orders we will stand on them too.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Nobody is standing on the Standing Orders.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the hon. member for St. John is worried about the position of Mr. Sydney Alleyne *(Aside)* He had the opportunity to deal with it at a time when he was in charge of Defence and Security and everything else. The recent trouble which Mr. Alleyne has caused us would never have happened if the Prime Minister had not condoned George Moe's taking the $5,000 because once you hear there is a financial association between George Moe, Cameron Tudor and Sydney Alleyne and you hear Sydney Alleyne has arms in Martinique, we are prepared to believe that the Democratic Labour Party is supporting him. That is a thing you have to understand. That is why we have to look at a Sydney Alleyne conspiracy.

The former Prime Minister referred to this Airport charge. That is why you have to look at these conspiracies. That is why we have to put security at the Airport and have to carry on surveillance as members of the Democratic Labour Party at the airport – if you want to know. That is part of the reason for the Airport

Service Tax. *(Aside)* One member of Parliament, one former Senator, and one candidate, all three of us were there at the Airport, if you must know. You get in here and you annoy us and provoke us, we will give you some facts.

Now again the former Prime Minister, the hon. member for St. John talked about getting off the schooners, and tax at the Port; that we did not tell the electorate anything about the tax at the Port. Talking about schooners, let me tell you another piece of evidence. How do you expect us to act when we are informed by the owner of a vessel which plies to the careenage that he was asked by somebody to go and bring a cargo of fruit from St. Martin, St. Martin being the place where Sydney Alleyne and the other conspirators recently mentioned all met together along with others who have been named in this debate and who have been said to be smeared in this debate. How can we react when these things happen? These things may not be evidence on which one can be prosecuted but these are things which give rise to security problems of which the Minister for Security must take note and impose such measures as the Airport service charge and the Port service charge in order to deal effectively with these things.

We must have no security at the Airport. An hon. member who has just left the House, in a debate earlier in here today spoke of the Democratic Labour Party and so on, and he used these words talking about a change of Government, 'and that will not be too long from now when the Government returns,' and this is not the first time he said it in here but he said it outside. It is when statements like those are repeated – how the Barbados Labour Party will only be in power for a few months and the Democratic Labour Party will come back in? Those are the things that have occasioned public disquiet and caused us to have an airport service charge to provide more security at the airport; and we have heard it in a debate earlier in here from the hon. member for St. Michael South West. 'And that will not be too long from now when the Government returns,' meaning the Democratic Labour Party Government. Maybe it is only an expression but it is not the first time it has been made and it has come to the attention of the security forces of this Island and for their consideration. These are the factors which have led to the public disquiet which occasioned, perhaps, some of the measures which we had to take.

Now, in his speech on the airport service charge the hon. member for St. John also.....

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The hon. Prime Minister referred to the representative for St. Michael South West and suggested that my reference to the Democratic Labour Party recapturing the Government is somehow related to statements and the problem of security.
9.30 p.m.

The hon. member himself when he sat I believe in this chair as the Leader of the Opposition stated on a number of occasions that it was his clear intention to win the Government and to be Prime Minister, but we did not consider that a breach of security or a dangerous statement. We might have considered it to be an ambitious statement, and after fifteen years he has achieved it. I really did not think he would wait until I went outside to suggest I was involved.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I do not really know what that point was. What I was emphasising on was that the hon. member said that it will not be too long from now.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, I am objecting to the remarks. I think it casts an unfair aspersion. Two or three or five years could not be a long time. Let the hon. member withdraw the words and the clear inference, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Of what words is the hon. member complaining?

Mr. TAITT: I am complaining of the words which suggested that I might be somehow even remotely involved in any conspiracy or plot.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I withdraw any words which he suggests even remotely in any way that Sidney Alleyne trusted the hon. member to be involved in a plot, if that is what he wants.

Mr. TAITT: That is not it. I think you are fair, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Ask the hon. member to withdraw.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member as far as I am concerned has withdrawn the offending words.

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of elucidation, perhaps what the hon. member for St. Michael South West is alluding to is the statement that he made in here about two weeks ago that we

would be out of power by 1977 or 1978. That is what you must talk about.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No point of elucidation.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of personal explanation, the hon. member for St. Philip North seems to be suggesting that there is something immoral of illegal or unparliamentary in suggesting that they will so run down the Government in two years that the Democratic Labour Party will be in power.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: We must pull ourselves together now because if I may say so with great respect, the debate with the debate on security which I am telling you, Sir, is somewhat of a reflection on all of us from the Chair back down, was not allowed to proceed to a proper conclusion; part of it, if I may say so, was occasioned by interruptions which are.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is an hon. member standing on a point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, the last remark which the hon. member made about the Chair not allowing the matter to come to a proper conclusion is a reflection on you. I was asked to withdraw one in here because I was asked to sit down. It is a reflection on you and if you are going to get this bullying of the Chair because members do not like the integrity of the Chair or your ruling, it is wrong and to come from the Prime Minister is worse.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no bullying of this Chair. The hon. member for St. Thomas has said that the debate in relation tothe issue of the adjournment is a reflection on all hon. members from the Chair down. These remarks reflect adversely on the Chair and ought to be withdrawn.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am quite happy to withdraw them. This Prime Minister is happy to withdraw remarks such as that. He will never tell anybody about God giveth and God taketh away. That can be absolutely relied on. But nonetheless if I may say so with great respect I have heard people rise on points of personal explanation which is not a point of interruption recognized by the rules. I have heard people rise on points of elucidation and see the person refuse to give way and then rise on a point of order. I am drawing to Your Honour's attention that those who constantly act in breach of any Standing Order should be asked to leave or whatever. There have been too many interruptions by the hon. member for St. John today. We have been very tolerant because we have not wanted to do unto others as was done unto us. When we were in Opposition we suffered under the Chair; we suffered under the hon. member for St. John and we have gone very far in the other direction. There is no doubt about it. When I was speaking, I started to speak in the previous debate at 8.45 p.m. so that I could finish within the rules at 9 o'clock. I was interrupted six times on points which were not points of order and which absorbed the five minutes which were necessary for the debate to be finished. All these interruptions were by the hon. member for St. John; not one was in order. I have already been subjected to a number of interruptions in this winding up of a second reading debate.

Now we were regaled also in the debate on the Airport Service Charge by accusations that we are carrying on propaganda on C.B.C. and every night you see the Ministers on C.B.C. and they make these statements and so on. You heard something about tourism. I think that was in connection with my praise of the Hon. Minister of Tourism who is at present out of the Island. Am I to apologise because more tourists are planning to come to Barbados this year? Am I to say "sorrv, it is our fault, we must apologise to you that we are getting more tourist"? What else can be said about it? More tourists are coming through the airport, so we expect greater collections from the airport service charge. It is a fact. I do not know what has happened in the last eight weeks to make tourist bookings better than they were in the same eight weeks last year. All I know is that the Government has changed. Maybe it is not the effect of that cause but it is a fact, and I was careful to say that we have very hard winter bookings and under the enlightened administration of the present Minister of Tourism we are also expecting good summer bookings. But it appears that certain types of speeches can be too subtle. When you think that people will understand that you are saying the winter bookings are good, but do not claim too much for that, instead, look forward to summer when you are making a special push, people are still so obtuse that they cannot grasp the nuance. My father used to tell me never to be sarcastic in politics; never expect people to understand something. Say what you mean and don't think that anybody will see through what you are trying to imply, and I realise that even dealing with the hon. member who has been in here twenty-five years less the eighteen months when he lost his seat that you can be too subtle

reported to Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded in each case by the Hon. H. deB. FORDE, the Bill was read a third time and passed and cited as the AIRPORT SERVICE CHARGE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1976.

THE DEEP WATER HARBOUR (EXPANSION AND IMPROVEMENT) (EXEMPTION FROM DUTIES) BILL, 1976.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of this Bill. In doing so I am happy to think that my party is in power on this occasion to be associated with a matter of this nature, since it was some time in 1957, to be exact the 9th August, 1957, when an Act of a similar nature came into being under the Barbados Labour Party's administration. That we should have the fortune to be, again, associated with a Bill of this nature, bearing in mind the benefits which the country has derived as a result of the wonderful infrastructural work as done by the Barbados Labour Party in respect of the Deep Water Harbour, which was wrongly criticized at the time it was built, and which all its critics, eventually, came to appreciate as a wonderful piece of work for the great benefits which we came to enjoy by having it there.

The purpose of this Bill is clearly laid out, and I do not think I need to go into any full details on the matter. All it seeks to do is to give exemption to a number of things associated with the extension of the Deep Water Harbour. I just want to say, briefly, in passing that I did not want to introduce this particular element in the debate, since I would have occasion in my reply to say a number of things. I did not want to introduce it at this early stage, but I want to express my very deep regret and the regrets of this Government that the past Government did not see its way in the contract for the execution of the work at the Deep Water Harbour to make provision for small contractors in this Island to share in the benefits of the huge sums of money that will be put into the construction of such a harbour. One would have thought that, at least, some of the crumbs would have fallen off on some of the small people who do hauling in this Island.

10.15 a.m.

If one looked at the type of contract which the Government allowed to be carried out – and although these contracts were given in the first place to overseas contractors, or rather gave out some contracts to local people – no provision whatsoever was made in those sub-contracting clauses to take account of the small haulers in Barbados with their small single trucks and people with one or two trucks. It is rather surprising that the members on the other side who have for years boasted of their relationship with the small people did not in their dying days realize the need for giving support in their contracts to small people in this society.

On the Government benches at the time were two trade unionists. Fortunately the people in their wisdom saw the need to reduce the number of two; unfortunately one is still with us, but it certainly does not speak well for a society like ours, and bearing in mind the structural composition of the past Government, that they did not see the way to have Clauses put into contracts to make provision for small people who do hauling in this country. I regret that.

I do not propose to say anything more at this stage. The hon. Leader of the Opposition advised yesterday that I should hold my fire for this Bill. I want to advise him that I took his warning very seriously and have held my fire, and I want to assure him that if he makes any mistakes – I hope he will not – that this side will not fail to deal with him in the manner which he deserves. We are ready and prepared to deal with all matters as they arise and to deal with them in a very honest and fearless manner.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of this Bill.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to second this Bill, and as my colleague quite rightly said, for the Barbados Labour Party to have come into power at a time such as this now they are extending the Deep Water Harbour – I am quite sure that many Barbadians, I should say the older Barbadians – will always see the Deep Water Harbour as an economic feat of the Barbados Labour Party and the Government of that day. It was the vision of the late Sir Grantley Adams that is responsible for something of that nature, but I would have hoped that the Minister in introducing the second reading would have spoken a little more in depth in particular about the security of the Port. Now that is what I am concerned with.

After we spend all of these millions of dollars there, we have the ocean going vessels,

we have the yachts off Martinique, we have the yachts coming from all over the world, we have warships coming in; all of these things, Sir, the food at the Harbour, all of these things need protection; they need the full security of the Port and I would hope that the Minister for Defence would make sure that we have the tightests security at the Harbour.

Yesterday in the debate I recall the Leader of the Opposition saying that based on evidence which was produced in a matter with which he was dealing at the time all he would do would be to draw his fee and make a no-case submission. Well, if that is your attitude that you are going to walk about and draw people's money and go in the court.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the hon. member addressing the Chair?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If he..... *(Asides.)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: If you hold on the people's $20 bills without putting up some kind of defence.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member please deal with the matter before the House.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I am dealing with security of the Harbour. I am dealing with the Harbour and security but I am also dealing with what the Leader of the Opposition said; that he would take somebody's money, go into court, and make a case of no submission. I cannot agree with anybody doing that; but let me say this. I believe if I had that evidence which the introducer of that Resolution had I would make out a case for the security of the Port. He said there was not substantial evidence for the allegation.
10.25 a.m.

He said there was no substantial evidence to the allegations. I am going to put myself in the position of being a member of the jury. Evidence is quite clear that the security of Barbados is threatened and I am going to put the blame squarely on the shoulders of the hon. member for St. John. I am going to call a spade a spade. Mr. Earl Glasgow was the Personal Aide of the former Prime Minister of Barbados. Mr. Sidney Alleyne was an old time acquaintance from way back when the former Prime Minister represented him in the law courts. They were St. John boys together. He had an admiration for the former Prime Minister. I am dealing with the security of the Port because we are not to spend money there and then do not have the proper security. This is an old time acquaintance of the former Prime Minister – Mr. Alleyne, a Lodge boy. Mr. Alleyne had a long history. He knew the hon. member for St. John in England; he was a member of an Armed Force like the former Prime Minister, and so they have something in common. You have seen the former Prime Minister in his battle dress; you have heard of Mr. Sidney Alleyne as a General. Now, Mr. Alleyne did not join the Conservative Party; he did not join the Barbados Labour Party; he did not join the P.P.A. or the P.P.M. or the P.N.C. or the Congress Party; he joined the Democratic Labour Party because his old time acquaintance was head of that organisation. He went further. Mr. Alleyne came back to Barbados and took it upon himself to go to a conference of the Democratic Labour Party and moved a Resolution....

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of order, I wish to draw to Your Honour's attention Standing Order No. 28(2): "A Member must confine his speech to the subject under discussion, and may not introduce matter irrelevant thereto." I ask you to rule whether the speech of the hon. member conforms to that particular Standing Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My interpretation of the Standing Order is that the Officer presiding must within the Standing Orders allow hon. members a certain latitude. When the hon. member steps outside such latitude that I think he ought to confine himself to, I will rule, but at the moment in my view he has not done so and my ruling is that he may continue.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: It is very clear that the Barbados taxpayers are called upon to exempt certain taxes from the Port for the purpose of allowing the people to bring in their machinery and what they have to bring in. It is the bounden duty of any Government to protect that port, and to protect the taxpayers' money. I do not mind some of the jokers around the country. I know they do not want to hear this.

Mr. Sidney Alleyne then moved a Resolution at the Democratic Labour Party Conference in 1965 when the Government was seeking independence and a set of young men joined forces with the Barbados Labour Party in

opposing independence for Barbados alone. The Resolution read something like this:

"That those who are not in favour of independence for Barbados must be fed with acid, fire and bullets."

And the then Prime Minister and Chairman of the Democratic Labour Party did not get up and say a single word. He condoned that behaviour. That is not all. Now these are the nice people on the other side who are so concerned about the country. A former Minister of Education at a conference only two or three years ago said that he was going to depressurize and remove the Opposition. The former Minister of Education was then Chairman of the Democratic Labour Party. Now we have to be very concerned with such statements.

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of order,.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On what point has the hon. member risen?

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am rising on a point of explanation. I am a former Minister of Education and there was some reference to removing the Opposition, and I wish to make it clear to this House that I never made any such statement, and if that reference is a reference to me, I would like it clearly understood that I never made any such statement.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, the former Minister of Education is the Leader of the Opposition. That is the one I know about. I never saw the member who stood to his feet as a Minister of Education; so if that affects him, I do not know. I do not even know the constituency you represent. It seems as if you are in trouble with that statement. A former Minister of Education made a statement to that effect. We have to be very concerned with the country's security. If at that time in Government such statements can be made in this country and not one single person on the other side ever came out and said "no, we do not associate ourselves with that." We heard not a word. What we heard was, depressurise, deflate, cut you down, remove you, acid, fire and bullets. All the members on the other side were in that team.

Now I do not pay the Leader of the Opposition much attention. He is in the evening of his political years, so he is playing out his hand. It is immaterial. He cannot get in any plot with them because he cannot help talking and I know he will telephone me and say they plan to do so and so. He is that honest, so he cannot be in anything. I would like to salute him on the letter which he wrote, but then he came in here and reduced the whole debate, something of paramount importance, to that of a joke.

I want to say something about the former Prime Minister. It is an established fact and it is there for posterity that Mr. Earl Glasgow was the Personal Aide of the former Prime Minister of Barbados. Nobody can deny that man the right to associate with anybody at all, but I will tell you this; if you see him with John Dillinger you would be a bit suspicious. My suspicions are that Sidney Alleyne is an old time acquaintance of the hon. member for St. John. Earl Glasgow, is a person who if the former Prime Minister breathed or if he turned, walked by his side day by day, night by night. If he goes to St. Bartholemew with the boat to bring up fruits, he has to be there. If the aeroplane is going to the Bahamas, he has to be there. He is bound to take all the messages from the Alleyne Mercantile Bank. All that is the friendship that existed between Earl Glasgow and the former Prime Minister. I am sorry he is not here today. It striked me a bit strange that Mr. Alleyne some time ago in the Nation newspaper is reported to have said that he was going to overthrow the Government. The former Prime Minister said on the floor in here that his life was threatened and he received sixteen to eighteen letters from Mr. Alleyne. Now the Leader of the Opposition never received any threatening letters to the best of my knowledge, but the Prime Minister received, but he did not have to be worried about receiving threatening letters from Mr. Alleyne because he knew as far as he was concerned that Mr. Alleyne was a crank, but we do not know this. This is so strange.

In Martinique it is reported that there is a vessel en route to Barbados with arms aboard and that the Prime Minister's former Personal Aide had two people living in his place with ammunition inside the place; we had the bombing of the Cubana aircraft, the bombing of B.W.I.A., all these things just one after the other; so we have to think of our security. Let me tell you the security measures I would use. 10.35 p.m.

If I had occupied this seat for one day, I want this to go on record because I want this to be read in the debate when it goes to the public, but if I, as Lionel Craig, ever occupy that seat for one day I am going to have the member for St. John arrested on suspicion for questioning.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member for St. James will please withdraw those remarks.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: What remarks?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That you would have the hon. member for St. John arrested on suspicion for questioning.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: For questioning, on suspicion, Sir. If I am suspicious of an individual and his movements. I am no lawyer, I did not go to any law school, but in the interest of security and I am suspicious of any man's movements in this country – and this happens all over the world, they lock up Prime Ministers and Ministers of State – and the former Prime Minister must be made an example of on the premise that he has been associated with Mr. Alleyne, and if he was Mr. Alleyne's friend or his acquaintance he must have known that Mr. Alleyne is a notorious character, and he took it upon himself to establish Mr. Alleyne in a bank in Barbados known as the Alleyne Mercantile Bank. His documents were signed by E. W. Barrow.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. The Objects and Reasons of the particular Bill we are dealing with relate to the exemption from the payment of duties or taxes on certain articles imported into Barbados, and those particular items are listed in the Bill before us. I am again drawing to your attention Rule 28(2), "A member must confine his speech to the subject under discussion, and may not introduce matter irrelevant thereto." I know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you are not afraid to rule and I am certain you are not cowed into submission by any attacks about yesterday.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point of order. One of the functions of this Chair is to give latitude to hon. members. Just before the hon. member for St. Michael South stood on his point of order I was about to make the point that the hon. member for St. James was stepping outside the bounds of relevancy, and the Chair would be obliged if he would come back within the strict terms of the Bill before this Chamber.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, what you are actually saying is that I nearly got run out but I just got home in time, I put my bat down in time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you will remain within the crease there will be no problem.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: If I play one to Mid-on I will have to run a little single. I cannot remain within the crease all the time, Sir, I may have to come down to drive. What you could do is if I come down stump me.

Yes, Sir, in the interest of the security of the country, having spent all this money at the port and having had on this occasion examined a Bill of this nature with its Objects and Reasons clearly set out, the country's security must be so tight that any member whom the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance suspects would do anything at all to hamper or trespass upon the country's security should be brought to justice. I am going to say something which probably my great-grandchildren might not like to read. I heard the speeches from the other side yesterday; I am a poker player, that is my business and I know what is meant by bluffing and I know what is meant by seeing. I am not going to allow the other side to bluff me on this occasion.

It is clear you have no case, and if we are to protect the security and to step up any security measures of this country, the Leader of the Opposition cannot write one letter and then come in here and reduce a Resolution actually to nothing, making a joke of it for the sake of talking.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: In fairness to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker,.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On what is the Hon. Leader of the Opposition rising?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: He has told the House something that did not happen; that is all I am saying. He is misrepresenting me, saying that I reduced a Resolution to a joke by introducing a motion. I did not introduce any Resolution yesterday, the records of this House will show it.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I apologise for that. The Resolution that was introduced yesterday you tried to reduce to a joke. While speaking on it you attempted to reduce it to a joke. That is what I said.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not like to interrupt, but the amendment to the Resolution was introduced even after I had spoken. Let him get the facts, if he wants to abuse me do it, but at least tell the House the correct procedure. The member for St. John

moved and amendment and I had already spoken, so how could I reduce something that was not before the House when I spoke?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member will please take his seat. It is obvious that the point at issue is a point of interpretation between two hon. members. The hon. member for St. James should therefore continue to speak.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I was referring to the Resolution of the hon. member for Christ Church East and the Leader of the Opposition tried to make a joke of it. He said it was a no case submission. However, I am calling on the Minister of Communications and Works and on the Minister of Defence to carry out every single measure that lies within their power to take care of the port since we have to spend this amount of money there, and I am warning, not you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, my colleagues, that I have a neaky suspicion that things are a little hotter than the Prime Minister himself thinks they are. This is my feeling and I get this feeling because I know who I have been dealing with over the past ten years in here. I know what you call a sort of wild goose, mangoose gang in the Democratic Labour Party, the Young Democrats, Frank DaSilva, Sam Ashby, Bernstein, a wild animal gang. Then there is the silent guard now, but I believe, Sir, that the Minister of Finance is going to make sure that when we finish the harbour that the George Drummonds do not come in here with any duty free anything, or fruit and mangoes coming in and at the bottom machine guns and so on.

I have a sneaky belief that I am sitting on a powder keg in this country. They never expected to be out of power, they are not prepared to accept the verdict of the country and therefore they will do any and everything to destabilize the country. Let us face facts. They are not going to come in the port, the boats will not want to come into the port, so how would you know if somebody put something in a hatch? Investors are not going to come into Seawell.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no Seawell Airport in Barbados.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg your pardon, they are not going to come into the airport or the sea port, investors are going to run away and jobs are going to be few, then you place the whole onus on the Government that we did not create a situation for people to be employed when we promised this amount of jobs, so this is the plot behind the whole thing. Upset the thinking people of the country, have them concerned, have them worried, Barbados is not a favoured place now, you cannot risk to go there.

The Leader of the Opposition has something in common with the man called Sidney Alleyne. The Opposition Party has something in common with Sidney Alleyne who is an international gangster. That is the problem. The evidence is there, all over the years they have had something in common with this man, so today what is the position? A man who held a prestigious Ministry, the former Attorney General of Barbados, received money from a man who is now found on a boat with arms coming to Barbados. What no case submission are you talking about? If you on the other side brought the law I know you would arrest somebody right away, the way you feel about it. I know you fire a little gin and so on, but I know you are a very Christian person.
10.45 a.m.

I know you are a man of high christian traits. You will drink gin and play dominoes. I am like you. I shall have to protect our interest and to protect the Leader of the Opposition's taxes, your taxes, and all of the Barbadian taxpayers' money. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the bounden duty of this Government is to make sure that there is extra security measures carried out at the Port. Those whom we suspect should be held for questioning.

My contribution to this debate is that the Leader of the Opposition and the Government are all concerned about the security of the country. My firm belief is that we must take drastic measures and question any suspect, or anybody who has been friendly with Sydney Alleyne over the years. If Glasgow was not friendly with Sydney Alleyne, then Sydney Alleyne would not have written a letter to Glasgow telling him to put up two gangsters. Glasgow is friendly with the member for St. John, and we have to examine things carefully. You should arrest all of these people and then release them. If there is any evidence against them you should charge them. I am concerned with the security of the Port, Sir, and my contribution to the debate is to draw to the attention of this House and all members of this House that they should be as concerned about this matter as I am.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can quite appreciate the Government smarting

under what happened yesterday evening and, therefore, this is only an attempt by the Prime Minister, through the member for St. James, to rehash the debate and to bring out facts. This is all it is.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order. I do not object to hon. members on the other side saying things, because I can give and I can take. The hon. member is trying to convey to the House that the Prime Minister has asked me to do a job for him. I am not Sandiford, or Greaves, or Taitt.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please!

Hon. F. G. SMITH: There are certain things that the Prime Minister will not say himself. All Prime Ministers do this. They have their hatchet men.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was a former hatchet man of somebody, we have no hatchet men over here. I object to the word "hatchet" Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No point of order. Will the hon. member for St. James please take his seat.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: All I am saying is that the people in power have certain things to do that they do not like their names associated with, and they look around the party for persons who will do certain things. The Prime Minister, obviously, yesterday evening because he was cut short, did not feel too happy about it. I can see his indignation, and he has decided to use this measure today to bring out certain additional facts which he, probably, would like the public to know.

I shall not join the hon. member for St. James in going on with the security of this country. The Resolution has lapsed. I have given him my personal assurances of the official Opposition that we have no intention of plotting to overthrow the country. I am glad that this has happened to the extent that the Prime Minister, having now for the first time being in power, will now begin to see the multitudinous way in which he has to use his energies and vigilance in order to deal with the security of this country. When we were in the Government we had the same problem, except that Alleyne was talking. Now, Alleyne has gone further with a change of Government to prove that he is Colonel Alleyne or whatever he is.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Democratic Labour Party is not involved. Because one or two members of the Democratic Labour Party may have had association with Alleyne, they are not in the hierarchy of the party to the extent that they can plot. If tomorrow members of the Barbados Labour Party may know Sydney Alleyne – I do not mean the members of the Party in the House. If tomorrow Sydney Alleyne knew some of the people who voted for you and he got in touch with a Labour Party supporter, it does not necessarily mean that you all are involved. It is common sense. I could not come in here and seriously accuse the Parliamentary members, because you must have some of your people who know Sydney. Suppose Sydney had written to a member of the Barbados Labour Party and asked him to put up two people who Sydney knew, I could not, honestly, accuse anybody of plotting to do something with this country. This is where the Prime Minister went wrong, but I am not going into the security of it.

I am glad that the Attorney General and the Prime Minister, now that they are in the seats of power, can feel that running a country, however small, is not just an easy job. There are several facets to keeping our country safe and sound towards the good order of the Government, and once forewarned is to be forearmed. They now see the possibilities of crackpots taking steps. What would suit Sydney Alleyne better than to have a change of Government and to say that he is coming to Barbados with a few rifles? Sydney Alleyne says he is a Colonel; he can capture Barbados; he has mercenaries. If you know the man you will be certain that he is a schizophrenic. He is a crackpot; he likes publicity. When you talk about this guerilla leader wanting to attack Barbados overnight, Sydney Alleyne knows that there has been a change of Government – I do not know how he handles so much money – do not accuse the Opposition of that. He may know Glasgow who was with the Party.

I do not know what Glasgow did, but the mere fact that a man who was in the Party – he could have done it to a Labour Party man, and I would not have accused you. If you can show that any member here, or any member who runs the Democratic Labour Party, has had conversations or communications to the extent which indicate a desire to overthrow, then let the public know and I will support it. I cannot see that the mere fact that Alleyne knows Glasgow and Glasgow puts up two men at the request of Sydney automatically means that I should be daubed and my colleagues over here should be daubed. I do not think that is fair.

The member for St. James, of course, does not understand what law is; he is not a lawyer, and there is no crime in that. He thinks that what would sound good to people listening to you as a politician you could carry into a court of law. You have heard so much about corruption, and not one case has reached the law courts. Tar somebody first, and let the people see if the others that you say are corrupt can stand up in a court of law. What, from the point of view of the member for St. James, sounds like a good case, I think the lawyers over there will agree it is not a good case. If he has seven lawyers over there and he, as a layman, is going to say he can make out a case that can stand the light of day, he is certainly condemning the legal brains on that side. He says that he, as a layman, could get a conviction, but the eminent lawyers on that side, the member for Christ Church West and the member for Christ Church South Central, do not know how to get a conviction on evidence that he says is strong enough.

Of course, the member for St. James in the last session has said in this House that he wished for the death of the hon. member for St. John. Death to me is a final act, and if you wished his death – I remember objecting to it, and telling him that I could not hate anybody that badly to wish his death. If he wished his death to the extent that he would arrest him, it is merely a mild form of punishment compared to what the hon. member for St. James said. All he is doing is being consistent. All I say for my part is that I could not hate anybody on the Government bench that much that I could wish that a little toe nail of his could get stubbed.

Mr. SIMMONS: Perhaps the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would not countenance the death of any members here, but I do not think the same thing could be said for Mr. Cameron Tudor in relation to Mr. Lawson Bayley, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I will not go over the security aspect of this matter. I, as Leader of the Opposition, would counsel the Prime Minister that now that he is aware of the possibilities and the personal dangers to the security of our country, he should take every possible step inside and outside, or at the airport and seaport, to make sure that the things we have seen happen in other countries do not happen here. That is all I ask him. I wrote him a letter to that effect within the laws, without abridging human rights, sincere that during his term of office this country remains stable and that our reputation for good parliamentary Government and parliamentary democracy is in no way sullied or interfered with. He has my support on any measure doing anything he likes, within the confines of the law, to keep Barbados safe.
10.55 a.m.

It is only by those means that we can continue to prosper and develop. You have the wholehearted support of the Opposition. I am not going into the details of Sydney Alleyne. I have made my speech. I viewed it from the point of view of a lawyer yesterday. Of course, I have been in Government for ten years and I have been Attorney General for five, but (1) the Prime Minister is constrained in the amount of security information he can release, and (2) the evidence which he may have at his disposal, very often is information rather than evidence and therefore to that extent it is not evidence that he can completely rely upon in a court of law but at the same time it is information which any responsible Government must use in order to preserve the State of Barbados; and I will deal mainly with that, but on that type of evidence and in the absence of names and other information, to accuse a party of which I am a member of the executive, of which I have been the first Chairman and for which I am not the Leader of the Opposition, to accuse us of a plot, then I thought it was fair on evidence of that nature at this time, to speak.

Be that as it may, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill, despite what the Minister of Communications and Works said – he has rambled; he has been in politics for so long unsuccessfully that what he does is, when he gets a little chance he puts in a political plug. Well, I am glad to see that before my days in Parliament are over he has joined me in this Honourable Chamber. He has been going for a pretty long time, and he obviously feels that because of his long years of intention to get into here he seizes every opportunity to plug for his party. There is nothing wrong with that. He is entitled to do that, and if he plugs hard enough he may retain his seat in due course.

Every Government inherits from another Government. We inherited the Deep Water Harbour from you, you inherit the Community College. We inherited the Public Buildings and the House of Assembly. We did not build them. A lot of the things of the Conservatives that we condemn have been bequeathed to us; and as history moves on, generation after generation –

if we do not bequeath something to our future generations we would not have lived. The member for Christ Church West is going to bequeath to his children something that they did not acquire. This is part of a process of living. So when you make a big play of the Democratic Labour Party inheriting the Harbour and the Hospital, it is true, but you are also inheriting from us things which you did not build and which you will enhance, improve and add to. This is part of the democratic process and this is as it ought to be in any society that is developing. It is no big thing when we go back to ancient history in 1957; that is ancient history; but what I would like to impress upon the Minister of Communications and Works, is, that the Harbour is a vital aspect in the maintenance in the cost of living in Barbados at a certain level, and what is very important is – this Bill we would have had to introduce ourselves anyhow because this is part of the agreement and it is necessary; but what this Government has done – and I do not want them to tell me that we in the last Government approved it. The Harbour is a vital aspect in the controlling of prices in this country.

The Barbados Labour Party made a great play of the removal of the sales tax. The member for St. Michael West talked about $6 million in the hands of people as a result of the removal of the sales tax, but yet Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the 8th October, 1976 the Port manager acting could write a letter to Messrs DaCosta and Mussons, Plantations Trading Company Ltd., Booth Steamship Co. Ltd., H. B. Niblock and Co., Ltd., R. M. Jones and Co., Ltd., Harriman and Co., Ltd., West Indian Suppliers and Co., Ltd., K. D. Frost and Co., Ltd., Hanschell Inniss Ltd., C. F. Harrison and Co., Ltd., Schooner Owners Association, Messrs Jason Jones and Co., Messrs W. S. Monroe and Co., Eric Hassell and Co., Ltd., Barbados Employers Confederation and the Barbados Chamber of Commerce. I will read the letter, because there is no sense boasting of taking off a tax which I say you quite wrongly promised the people to take off, but you had to do it, and, this is the letter they wrote to them: Dear Sirs, Adjustment in Cargo Handling Rates. I am to inform you that the Cabinet – this is the 8th October not the 31st August. You have been in power for some time; and even when I hear the excuse that this was something that the last Government intended, the last Government intended the 10% on tickets and you changed it to an increase in Service charge of people leaving, so you have the right at all times to change; so if it is something bad and your party is the one that went through the country saying that the Democratic Labour Party caused the cost of living to rise, that we were killing the people with low wages and there was starvation on the increase – but I am going to read the letter. It starts out: I am to inform you that the Cabinet has agreed to the following adjustment in Clause 15 of the Tariff Book. Deep Water Harbour; cargo inward, present rate per ton or part thereof $15; proposed rate per ton or part thereof $19.50; cargo outward $14 per ton, proposed rate $18.50; direct delivery inward $12, increased to $15.50; direct delivery outward $11.20; increased to $14.80; trans-shipment $15.50; increased to $20; refrigerated cargo inwards $28.44, increased to $34.94; trans-shipment cargo frozen $73.74, increased to $78.24; trans-shipment cargo chilled $51.34, increased to $55.84.

11.05 a.m.

In the careenage, the present rate of cargo inwards is $12 per ton or part thereof, and this has been increased to $15.60. Paragraph 2 of the letter says:

"It is anticipated that the adjustments will take effect from the 25th October, 1976, and the necessary legislation will be forwarded to you as soon as it becomes available.

I should be grateful if you will bring the above to the attention of your principles.

Yours faithfully,

K. A. Hall
Acting Port Manager."

Now this is a Government that criticised us throughout the length and breadth of this country that we were responsible for the high cost of living, that we were responsible for all the evils in the society. What does this mean, Mr. Deputy Speaker? That whereas our Government did not put the 5% tax on food, and in the last Budget we removed it from medicines, everything coming through the Port is now being increased by this present Government. So that items have gone up; and then the Advocate, the dishonest paper, talks about corruption in town. They need not publish my name, photograph or report anything I say. They start out by saying in an editorial "Corruption in Town" and then they say the Government has not brought down any measures. The merchants are saying it has increased because handling charges have increased. This letter was written since 8th. If the Advocate was really interested in honest

reporting and they are a member of the Chamber of Commerce, they could have found out that the Government in power had increased handling charges, and instead of writing and blaming the merchants for the obvious increase which had to go on, they are saying that the Government has not brought down any measure or any legislation, and therefore it is a subtle deception on the people. I am sorry I did not bring the Advocate, but I would not dignify it by walking about with it in my briefcase. It is a dishonest paper. They say that when things should have dropped because of the sales tax, instead of dropping the things have increased, and the merchants were telling the people that they got off the sales tax, but the handling charges have gone up.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of elucidation, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition talked with forked so long this morning that I cannot sit any longer and listen to him. Is this the same Advocate-News which was in operation before 2nd September, 1976, that is being cursed and maligned in here with the hon. member saying he would not dignify it in his briefcase? It is like the same Sydney Alleyne they are disowning and crying down in here. This is the same Sidney Alleyne that got expelled from the Democratic Labour Party in 1971; so said the former Prime Minister.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member would please take her seat. That is no point of elucidation.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Yes; I must elucidate, Your Honour.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Are you trying to elucidate for me when you have not spoken on the Bill? What I am saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that the Advocate which is the apologist for the Government when people are complaining that the prices instead of coming down because of the removal of the sales tax are going up..... *(Asides)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will hon. members please not indulge in cross talk.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Toilet paper has gone up; cutrite paper, Koolaid, sanitary napkins, lux soap, drive soap have gone up. Even at the Pine Hill Dairy where a man used to pay $8.40 for a case of milk the price has gone to $11.40 now. The man came to me with a photostat copy of the bill. I have the photostat copy here (A Voice: That was decided in your Government.) You have to make independent decisions. You have been in power eight weeks.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would the Leader of the Opposition please address the chair.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am sorry, Sir. Sewing machines, everything has gone up; so it is no sense the Prime Minister saying it was decided. A letter was written in your regime and if you are saying we were wrong and that we oppressed the people, then you as Minister of Finance have a perfect right to change and alter it. This Bill is from Barbados Dairy Industries for two cases of evap. milk and the price is now $11.08 where previously it used to cost $8.40, and anybody who goes down in a supermarket.....

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, yesterday I brought to the attention of the House that what the members from that side complained about was done in their regime. That was quite clear when it was raised by another member of the House, and what I would like the Leader of the Opposition to know is that milk is a controlled item and could only be increased by an Order, and the order was signed by the hon. member for St. Michael South West a week before elections. No new orders have been signed to increase prices of commodities by anybody responsible for that portfolio in this Government. He must not mislead the Honourable Chamber.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Any person who goes into a supermarket to shop or look at commodities cannot but come out with an idea that since the Barbados Labour Party has been in power commodities have risen, and it is obvious that if you increase the handling charges then of course commodities must rise. Of course the merchants supported you in the last election and you have got to give them back by Christmas the money they spent on you. So I am not surprised they are making a kill. They have got to make back by December at least.....

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on points of order if they are points of order. I am objecting to that comment. Standing Order No. 28(5). It is a reflection on the motives of members on this side. To say that the Cabinet's commercial

policy is directed by the need to pay back the merchants what was spent on the Barbados Labour Party is to impute improper motives and indeed to use insulting language about it, – Rules (5) and (7) – and I object and it must be withdrawn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My ruling is that the statement by the Leader of the Opposition do infringe Standing Order #28(5) and (6) and must be withdrawn.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I withdraw, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The merchants supported the Barbados Labour Party and the merchants are expecting to get back by December what they have given to you in your campaign. Therefore when you look at the prices that are being charged to the consumer in the supermarkets and elsewhere, you will see that the merchants are likely to realise their hope and ambition. I shall not be long. Since the member for the City has gone out and did not want to hear me, I can sit down because if she was in here she would hear me for a long time. Be that as it may, I just wanted to draw to the attention of the public as I did yesterday with the Airport Service Charge Bill, that whereas the Government is pretending on the one hand to be willing to relieve the sales tax, reduce corporation tax, remove trade tax and all these other fringe benefits, yet I doubt if the public of Barbados knows that the Cabinet of the Barbados Labour Party has decided and instructed the Port Manager of these necessary increases. I am not saying that they are not necessary; I do not know. But if it is an open Government as you say, why not tell the people that for one reason or another you are forced to increase the handling charges at the Port? If as the Minister said yesterday negotiations are going on with the Union and that is the reason, and I would expect my colleague from the Trade Union to deal with that, tell the people if you find it is part of the agreement. I would like the Minister to tell me this now. Is it also part of the agreement, which you said we did not do – and I will deal with that aspect of it – with the bank that the handling charges must increase? If so, tell us and then there will be no argument.
11.15 a.m.

Is it part of the agreement with the bank that the handling charges must increase? If so, tell us, and then there will be no argument, because if it is so then we would have done it and I would sit down, so I want him to tell me where the increase in handling charges is in that Bill. Tell me what clause or part of the Bill says anything about this increase, an adjustment of the handling charges, either as he said yesterday to meet the demands of the Union, or as part and parcel of the agreement for the extension of the deep water harbour. If he had said that at the opening there would not be any argument, but he said that, he says he is going to save his fire for the last going down. I do not know, he has gone into the Ministry and he is very impressed with the harbour. He did not know what was going on, but he is not the only Minister who is impressed, I think he opposed it during the campaign but now he has seen it and toured it and he is impressed, so I agree with that. Already he is impressed, and they are going to be impressed with a lot of things that they did not know about too, but that is by the way.

But to say that you are going to draw up in a big contract that a one-truck man must get some work, he obviously does not know how big contracts are drawn up. To draw in a contract that a one-cart man or a donkey cart man must bring a load of stuff? What you do is, if you give out a contract however much money to a man to supply X number of stones or cement, and the man himself has not got trucks, he has to hire other trucks, but since the harbour is being built in Barbados everybody will get work. That was the whole idea of the Democratic Labour Party, to extend this to get work. Rock crushers, quarry diggers, so will you put in a contract of $20 million for the extension of the deep water harbour, "Clause 4. It is also agreed that a one-lorry man must help bring some stones from the country." Will you sub-contract to a million one-truck men? The very nature of the operation itself will force the suppliers or the big contractors to hire other men.

If he looks at the old contract that his Government had drawn up when they built the deep water harbour, can he tell me that they had in any one-truck men? Check and see when the hospital was built if you had in any one-truck or donkey cart man in any contract. Cite the clause and let me hear you had a one truck or donkey cart man in it. I want the Minister to cite that in the old port contracts there was any one truck man or donkey cart man – in those days you had donkey carts drawing stones – provided for. If a man has to supply so many tons or cubic yards of stuff and he has not got enough lorries himself he obviously will sub-contract by the very nature of the operation, so you do not have to put in a contract "Clause 4. They shall hire every one truck man from St. Andrew or wherever." I

think the thing is too big for the Minister, does he think he is hiring a minibus? You are not hiring a minibus, you are building a deep water harbour. If Quarry Products has to supply so many tons per day, Quarry Products, as they do now, if they have mould to move from a place they do not put in for a one truck man, if a man has a time limit he hires people.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir, am I to understand from the Leader of the Opposition that he is not interested in the small man? Is this his line?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am back in here through the small man, not the Belleville and George Street people, I am here through the Halls Road, Delamere Land and Carrington's Village people.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the Leader of the Opposition please continue with the debate?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: He is one person who said on the floor of this House that if it is one man interested in the small man it is the member for St. Michael South Central. He said so, but what I am saying is, the very nature of the operation will force small people to get work, so you do not have to put it in. It is not an oversight in the contract, because if that quarry owner or whoever is supplying the rocks and equipment has to meet the deadline, he himself by the very nature of it will sub-contract, and once there is the possibility for sub-contracting everybody, once the basic raw materials and stones are coming from Barbados, the one lorry man will get work. He will get work even in spite, as you say, of it not being in the contract. The one lorry man must get work perforce by the very nature of the operation, but I am telling you that no contracting firm has enough.

I would like him to tell me this finally, that his Government which he boasts about, built the old harbour. Is there a clause in that agreement for the donkey cart man or the one truck man? Because in 1957 you had donkey carts in proliferation. What I want you to tell me is, was there a clause – because you talk about 1957, so I assume you have read the contract of that day if it is available – but was there a clause making provision for any one truck man to build any harbour? Where there is a clause in the one for the hospital for any one truck man to build it you show me.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to speak for a very short time on one or two large and one very tiny topics. First of all, I think that pressing on the harbour and increases in the port charges, and relating them to the cost of living and talking fanciful nonsense to imply that these charges are necessary in order somehow to give the merchants an opportunity to recoup money is really wild politicking of the fanciest and the most imaginative sort. Barbados' harbour was established fifteen years ago under conditions when the port charges were by legislation required to do no more than to cover the costs. It is one of the few areas in the world where the law requires that excessive profits be not made at the port, and if as had happened over one period sums of money were made in the port in excess of what was needed to pay the reasonable charges of Port Contractors to pay wages and so on, those sums of money could not in the ordinary way have been distributed as profits.

Our harbour, I am informed, remains an area in the Caribbean where we are outstanding in efficiency and outstanding in the minimum level of contribution to inflation which port charges and handling charges do not make to the cost of living, and this will still be so even after this Bill has been passed. The harbour is going about a period of expansion. This Government is not only carrying out extensions which have been agreed over a long period of years but it is planning on-going development of the harbour up to the year 1991 which will take it to the northward of its present site. We are planning an associated development of areas contiguous to the harbour – I have already mentioned this in here but this would seem a more appropriate time to underline it – the areas of Brandon, the area to the west of the present Deacons Farm and the Government land at the Mental Hospital and Brighton, we are going to redevelop all these districts in conjunction with the physical harbour plan, and I think that the petty cavilling at the present time would be petty even it were supported by accurate facts. What are the facts on the rise in prices? It is very easy for one person in an Opposition of seven to get up and say that prices are rising because the sales tax has been abolished. That is patent nonsense.
11.25 a.m.

But the nonsense is compounded when the Leader of the Opposition gets up and says, "The public are complaining that prices are going up after the abolition of the sales tax." Who constitute the public? The other six members of the Opposition. In fact, I cannot even say six, because I have not heard the hon.

member for St. John and the hon. member for St. Michael North Central lend their voices to this matter. Talking about prices, we are hearing about the prices of toothpaste, of blouses, toilet paper and sanitary napkins going up. Members will not fail to know that the last two items, toilet paper and napkins, if they are going up they are going up for the obvious reason – they are going up as one of the prices we have to pay for Caricom, for importation from outside the region of these two items is being phased out since they are now Caricom products, and we have to expect the prices to rise. Toothpaste is now being produced in Jamaica. *(Asides.)* I am informed by the Minister of Consumer Affairs that that has not even risen.

Now, what I am looking at is that he took flour off licence, and the price goes down to 35 cents. He took peas off licence, and the price of split peas has gone down to 50 cents. I am looking at beef steak at $1.30, when we take beef off licence. These are what I am looking at. We will remove the necessary for a licence for basic foodstuffs for the people. Beef steak can be bought at $1.30, the lowest price I daresay for 10 years. Flour is 35 cents; potatoes 29 cents per pound; onions 38 cents per pound; two tins of luncheon meat for $1.00. These are the fall in prices – food for the people that has fallen since we have come into power. It is time that a couple of facts such as these be repeated in the newspapers and in here, rather than the nonsense of the hon. member for St. Michael South West. This is what we have to look at. We have to look at the fact that, when the new flour mill is established at this same port, we are hoping to reduce the price of flour by 8 cents or 10cents per pound.

Sir, in 1961 the Democratic Labour Party promised the people a flour mill, and it is only now it is coming. We have to look at the fact that we have not been content with the flour mill alone, which was there on the files, but we are looking at another most important food processing industry for the new Harbour which may result in a fall in price of one of Barbados' basic commodities, and will increase the job opportunities for the citizens of this Island. These are the things we have to look at, instead of carping and, apparently, saying untrue things about the increase in the price of toothpaste. These are the things that I would suggest have to be looked at in the larger context of a Bill such as this.

I cannot see how a former Government that presided over a studying of the cost of living in five years can come in here and talk about rises in prices when every single one that they can identify had its origin in the actions of the former Government. I cannot see or understand it. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to support this Bill, just as I am supporting the Minister in everything that he has said in introducing it.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, obviously, as a member of the Cabinet and as someone who has seen this Bill, I am going to support it. I want to say that I find, from time to time, in the course of Opposition politics as now being practised something very strange. This Bill had been introduced prior to the last Parliament, and because of the dissolution of the House it was held over and it is now being brought back before the House as it is a necessary Bill to speed up the harbour expansion.

I would have thought that, if the hon. member for St. Michael South Central had any matter to talk about, he would have been talking about the fact that once again, if he wanted to say this, we had continued with measures that we think would be in the interest of the country as a whole. Instead he has used the opportunity in order to launch his political broadside at the hon. member for St. Andrew, the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, who can well hold his own and need no defence from the front bench in this respect, but also to make certain statements of fact that, if left unchallenged, may go down to the public of Barbados as being the gospel preached without a proper explanation.

The contract which exists for the running of the Deep Water Harbour was entered into at the beginning of the opening of the Harbour, and has been revised from time to time. Two of the significant revisions occurred during the time that the Democratic Labour Party ran the Government of this country. One of the clauses put in by the Democratic Labour Party obligates the Government to increase the tariff charges whenever there is an increase, or an anticipated increase, in labour charges at the Port. That is an existing agreement that the Barbados Labour Party found on the 3rd September, 1976. It is not something that we have negotiated; so that if the hon. member is now complaining that we had to honour existing, legal and binding agreements, then he should have used his wisdom, from 1966 up to the present time, to ensure that his Government

did not accept that sort of obligation and saddle us with it. That is the first point I want to make.

The second point I want to make is that the union has been negotiating with the Port Contractors for some time concerning increased wages in the Port, and one of the union's terms will be that the wages are retroactive; therefore, we must have money to pay the increase of wages for workers which they deserve. Prior to our becoming the Government of the country the Democratic Labour Party, in exchanges of letters which the Hon. Minister, has indicated to Port Contractors and the Directorate that they will be consenting to an increase in the tariff charges to face the anticipated increase in wages and to cover the retroactivity of the agreement.

Now that is the submission that is put up to us from the files under the last Minister of Communications. All that has happened is that he did not have the opportunity to sign the Order, and this Minister finds himself signing an Order with a clear indication given by the past Government. Let us fact the position quite clearly. Probably the Opposition believes that some of us cannot read. One of the things I set out to do before I come into this house is to get as much information as possible on the facts. He is giving the impression now that there is a sudden increase in tariff charges because we want to pass on something to the merchants. I am going to deal with the merchant tariff a little more in detail than the Minister. Sir, I want to say that if the increase in charges is to facilitate the payment of workers' wages, had they even had the opportunity of signing it, I would not have been criticizing it at all on that ground.

The third point I want to make is the fact that the Port Contractors today is 100% Government owned, so that at any stage if there is any excessive profit it is possible to take the money and pass it back for the benefit of the Island as a whole. Let me make this point. That past Government, whilst it was the Government of the day, allowed Port Contractors Limited, before it was 100% Government owned, to pay out dividends to private people in this country in the region of 35%, and the private owners were then the very merchants BS&T and a series of others that they are talking about. Were they not putting dividends in the pockets of the very private merchants, and are we uncharitable to say that it was merely because they were paying for political service? Let us deal with facts, if they are putting up arguments point for point. It is all right to get up and make a lot of noise without analysing the position.

I want to deal with the argument about paying back workers. I think hon. members should be satisfied as to the three factorial positions that I have stated in this House. On that evidence it is not only politically unacceptable – I do not want to use an unparliamentary word – but it is politically childish to come into the House to make the House and the public believe that since the Barbados Labour Party came into power it is doing everything in its power to increase the cost of living, or to pay back merchants. The Democratic Labour Party has been ruling by merchants. I have seen this being enunciated on the platforms of Mr. Eric Sealy, obviously, well orchestrated by Dr. Richie Haynes and Mr. Cameron Tudor.
11.35 a.m.

Obviously, consistently they concentrated on this trend since the last election; and when we look at who were the famous men behind the Democratic Labour Party, men like Bernstein, Moses, Abed, Leo Leacock, Sam Gibbs – if they want to know a group of them. They had Frank DeSilva, the whole group of them, and part of the reason why the Democratic Labour Party lost the last election is because it had become a resting place for the merchants and people who wanted to make a quick dollar out of them; and a lot of them were not even first generation Barbadians. So do not let us come in here and fool people all of a sudden you are spreading abroad in international affairs that we are right wing; and I have never seen a more right wing Government than the Democratic Labour Party became in its last five years of Government in this country. Hamstrung by the question of guidance by the then Prime Minister. All of them; most of them Middle Easterners, Syrians, a group of people who had a closer ear to the party than people like the hon. member for St. Michael North Central or even the hon. member for St. Michael South. However, I do not want to be diverted over on this.

There are certain other measures that I would have thought I would have listened to the Opposition to talk about arising out of this. When I was in Opposition I said that it was necessary to have proper legislation controlling unfair dismissal in this country, and since the Barbados Labour Party has won the Government we are again witnessing even at the Port – a few employers feel that they are going to steal one on

us and start dismissing people. I want to make the position absolutely clear. As long as the Minister requests me or the Minister of Labour to bring down legislation in accordance with our Manifesto dealing with unfair dismissal I will give it the utmost priority to deal with people like Cargo Handlers Ltd., who have now taken to dismissing. I will deal with everyone of them – taking a person at the Port and giving them less than a week's notice in a system of unfair dismissal. I have raised it in Opposition and I am throwing it out again and I will draw it to the attention of the Ministers concerned, I am willing to pass the legislation that is in accordance with our Manifesto and our Throne Speech.

I have raised this question of this situation at the Port where there is one man who is supposed to be a retainer for several others and each employer is then claiming multiple employer and no severance position occurring. Now I want to say this to the Union in particular. We have been in power for about two months now; not even two months; and we are advising the union, as I know the Minister of Labour has had a chat with the Leader of the Barbados Workers Union – to make representations to us to put up their views and positions on unfair dismissal, and stopping this sort of thing happening. I do not know whether they made representations to the former Government but the fact remains that the former Government did nothing about it. I have known of complaint which I believe is going to go in to the union, of Cargo Handlers sending an oral notice to a man who has worked at the Port from 1937, to tell this gentleman that they do not want him any more, and he said put it in writing and they gave him less than a week's notice. But they believe that the gentleman and his family supported me in the last elections and this is politically getting back at me. They may well believe that, but I want to inform this House that any legislation to deal with that sort of thing from whatever quarter it comes, I will readily give my support to it, and indeed give my effort to get the position straightened.

Sir, I do not really want to start it that we are not in favour of workers. I have heard that being said as though all of a sudden we have been converted into being anti-worker and that sort of thing at the Port and otherwise. Let us be serious. I have had five years of Opposition in Opposition politics in constitutionally elected Government and you are going to hear that sort of thing, but if you analyse the actions and the conversations and the principles for which those of us over here stand nobody can be in doubt about our seriousness to protect workers' rights, and particularly at the Port where the Barbados Labour Party has always been fortunate despite the fact that the Union and the party split from each other, and we have retained total solidarity with the workers in the Port.

I want to let Cargo Handlers know what the position is clearly and squarely on this issue, and I hope they will get the message either through the Press or by having the decency to read the debate, or by somebody letting them know what the situation is.

I want to deal with another matter, Sir, that has been raised in the debate, that in this Bill we should also look at the question of security. As a person who is charged with law and order which impinges on questions of security I would always be known to intervene in any debate even dealing with security at the Port because if you are standing on responsibility it is the responsibility to take into consideration the overall situation; but I must confess that security questions cannot be treated lightly. It is obvious that the Harbour and the other areas of Barbados where ships can put in too easily, as well as at our airport, must now receive urgent treatment for top security measures. International terrorism knows no bounds, and not only international terrorism, but persons who are frustrated sometimes take the law into their hands in order to effect what they consider as swift changes. No matter whether the changes are justified or not justified I believe we must all say that whenever it can result in human life and revolutionary upheaval of a violent nature, it is necessary to ensure that this must not occur if there are reasonable alternatives and legitimate measures available; and for this reason I think that everybody ought to join with the Government in urging restraint on political aspirants and crackpots in approaching this whole question of security.

Some statement was made concerning Cubana and I think that on this I can say that the Harbour of Barbados at present extends for three nautical miles off our shores.

11.45 a.m.

The Government made it quite clear in the Throne Speech that it will be extending the territorial waters of Barbados for twelve miles and already within my department steps are being taken to draft the necessary legislation for Cabinet's approval. I want to make it clear that the evidence in my possession, despite what the hon. member for St. John may have seen popularly, discloses that the Cubana incident occurred outside the territorial waters of this country, and there is therefore no jurisdiction under the Offences Against the Person Act to try

the workers at the Bridgetown port and on the Barbados Workers' Union.

I want to say this, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition referred to a letter dated 8th October, 1976 in which it is clearly stated that the rates at the Bridgetown port are going to be increased, or were increased, with effect from 25th October. Negotiations between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Barbados Employers' Confederation on behalf of all the workers at the port are nowhere near conclusion. We have not as yet even completed a single aspect of the negotiations, but yet you find that there is this anticipation. Am I to understand that the increase which has been approved is the kind of increase which would attempt to limit the increase in wages which people would be expecting? I want to say this, and I am very serious about this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because when you examine the situation in its entirety you will see the point that I am making, because if the negotiations are not completed, even those of us who are negotiating the agreement do not know what the final settlement will be, do not even know what the cost of the final settlement will be, but already we see rates which are fixed here according to the argument which has been presented by the Government to take care of these increases, so that this seems to me to be more than strange.

I think what has happened, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that the Government has found itself in such a position that they have been forced to go ahead and increase the rates for handling cargo even before any final determination is made in this particular matter. We do not want, and indeed we are quite prepared to face the public on this matter, because if there is any attempt on the part of the Government to shift blame from themselves on to the workers at the Bridgetown port or to the Barbados Workers' Union generally, then this is something that we will continue to expose. I find it difficult in examining this matter – as I said, there are a number of fundamental issues in this when we talk in terms of negotiations – to examine a situation where you have private people who are handling cargo, private operators, and as I said, this has got to be established and recognised. People like DaCosta and Musson, Plantation Trading Company, the whole link of private companies which was read out by the Leader of the Opposition. I want to know what is the attitude of the Government on the whole question of profits which these private people make on this.

The same strictures that I will level against this Government are the strictures which I have levelled, and I would have levelled if my party were in power, on the whole question of the profit levels and the distribution of profits in this country, who got what and who are allowed under our system of economic arrangement to make the kind of profits which are being made in this country. I see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Chairman of Committees is part of this thing too, I did not realise that. The same strictures that I am levelling they know I would level against my party if it were in power, because I am concerned at the whole way in which the economic structure and the economic system in this country works. To give you a very simple example, there was stevedoring company, which no longer exists, by the name of H. B. King Stevedoring. For practical purposes it was a one man operation, and because of the kind of arrangements which existed, and which still exist, a person like him was allowed to make, I believe, millions of dollars, and before they were able to put on the strictures on the export of money from this country he was able to get most of his money out of this country, but I want to say that people ought to take a very serious look at the level of profits which are being made by these private operators, and if we are going to be talking in terms of trying to determine the way in which we are going to be able to handle the wage increases, as far as the Barbados Workers' Union is concerned, we are negotiating wages for workers, we do not give any advice as to how these increases must be made.

12.05 p.m.

It would seem to me that the Government must take a very hard look at the level of profits made by these people who are operating the cargo-handling business in the Bridgetown Port. If this is done, then you will see very clearly that the proposition may very well exist for the reduction in the proposed rate per ton for the handling of cargo. I am contending, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when we look at this very carefully we will see that there is a very clear case made out for the way in which these rates have been fixed.

Now, I heard the Hon. Attorney General refer to wild statements which he said came from this side of the Chamber. He said that the Throne Speech, which was read by His Excellency the Acting Governor-General on Wednesday, 6th October, 1976, contains the position of the Barbados Labour Party on the extension of the 3-mile limit to 12 miles.

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point, Mr. Deputy Speaker. He did not say that. He said that the Manifesto contained that. He went on to say elsewhere. *(Asides.)* Mr. Deputy Speaker, he was referring to our position on unfair dismissals. The new law for dismissals is not in the Manifesto, but it was represented by the Acting Governor General when he read the Throne Speech.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I really thought that a person like the hon. member for St. Philip North would have been able to make a distinction. I am really disappointed that he is going to intervene with the point that he has made. I am saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Hon. Attorney General said, in no uncertain terms, that the speech of the Acting Governor - General contains the position of the Barbados Labour Party on the extension of the 3-mile limit to 12 miles. I am saying that I have looked through that speech and I have not found it. If the Attorney General can show me where in the Throne Speech that is contained, then I would be happy to find it. If he says that he made an error and he meant the Manifesto, then we can check the records of the House. I stand by that because that is what I heard him say.

When he talks of wild statements and so on, maybe both sides are guilty of making wild statements from time to time. We have also heard the question of security raised in this matter. I do not think that there is anybody on this side who is against the question of having proper security at the Bridgetown Port, or anywhere at all in this country. Security is very important not only from the point of view of the threat which will exist in the absence of proper security of this country. Nobody would object to proper security being put into operation to ensure that the Government collects as much revenue as it possibly can, and that goods do not leave the Harbour without being properly accounted for and this sort of thing. Of course, we are in favour of proper security. What we object to, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is any attempt to link the Democratic Labour Party with any nefarious activities, or any of the misfortunes which seem to have visited this country since the Barbados Labour Party took control of the country.

We have heard in here, again, today one hon. member making a wild statement to link the Cubana airline crash with this whole matter of security with the Democratic Labour Party, and once more we heard the Prime Minister yesterday denying that he ever said anything like this. I would hope that the Prime Minister would urge the members of his Party to desist from this wild and this nasty kind of association. This is dishonest and bad. The hon. member for St. James is the worst.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member has finished his speech.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The hon. member said that the Prime Minister denied that. Not this Prime Minister. Maybe your Prime Minister, but not the Prime Minister of Barbados. You are getting mixed up with Prime Ministers.

Mr. GREAVES: Now, I understand the position clearly. The present Prime Minister of Barbados did not deny that he feels that there is a linkage between the Cubana airline crash, the Democratic Labour Party, and this security matter which has arisen. As far as this is concerned, I raised this question yesterday and I stated that the impression which the Prime Minister conveyed in his broadcast was that people got the impression from what he said when he started out: "Around the 6th October somewhere around the Cubana Airline Crash on the 6th October" that they had a direct link. I was telephoned by a person concerned who asked me about this association. That is the impression which the Prime Minister conveyed, whether it was done wittingly or unwittingly. We know about psychology, and we know how people's mind can be played on. The Prime Minister knows that, too.

Now, we have to be very clear about what we are talking. The member for St. James made the wild statement – it is not wild, because it was made in his typical fashion. He said, "If I were Prime Minister for one day, I would arrest the former Prime Minister on suspicion." Is this an indication of things to come? I spoke yesterday on this question of security, and what I anticipated would be the kind of measures that this Government would be bringing down. I thought of the whole question of arresting people without charging them and putting them in prison. We have already had some slight indication about what we can expect. I know that there are only seven members on this side, but we will extend it to all the citizens in Barbados. We have to be very careful in these very trying times. It is obvious to me that we are going through some very trying times in this country.

Now, I would advice, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on this question of security, that the Government in its zeal, or over zealousness, does not try to

scare people as has obviously been done. This is a matter which calls for a statesmanlike approach, and I am not as yet convinced that we have seen this kind of approach.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, naturally we on this side and on the back benches support this Bill with a view to ensuring that, as quickly as possible, the Harbour is extended not only as a vehicle for channelling employment, but also with a view to improving the physical facilities now existent at the Deep Water Harbour. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I shall speak only about the matter of security of the Ports of Barbados, which I see as directly relevant to this Bill. During the debate yesterday on the motion for the adjournment, the Leader of the Opposition took a completely different course of action from that which he has pursued today. It maybe that a night's rest is always invigorating for one of his years' experience, and he came back this morning with a better and more balanced perspective than he had yesterday evening after a very hard day.
12.15 p.m.

He came back this morning with a better and more valid perspective than he had yesterday evening after a hard day. I would say it is very interesting to notice the difference in the line of approach. Yesterday he said that the Prime Minister's speech on Monday evening resulted in a successful no-case submission from himself and his junior counsel. This morning he said that one could well understand the position of the Prime Minister yesterday, and it is no wonder, Sir, because the Prime Minister is necessarily constrained by top security matters and so could not give vent to all of the facts which exist, because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, surely the Prime Minister was careful to couch his language on Monday night to say that he would let the nation know all the facts that could be disclosed at that stage. He is still bound by official secrets; he is still bound by the overall interests of national security; that is why some of us in the Government party have not been told all of the facts concerning the events of the last week-end; and it has to be so. There must be a residual discretion vested in the Prime Minister and members of Government to deal with matters as they deem fit, even though the public interest calls for some disclosure. In other words, there cannot be total disclosure.

I do not know if the Leader of the Opposition in relation to security at the Port, whether he for example, would have wished the Prime Minister to say that the former personal aide to the former Prime Minister went to somebody who owns a boat which plies between Barbados and the other Islands and he told that person that he wanted to open a shop in Roebuck Street to sell fruit, and asked him if he would be willing to bring fruit for him from St. Martin, when at the same time it is alleged that fruit were found in the boat in Martinique among the arms – I do not know if he wanted to know that on the return two launches were intercepted by the Coast Guard on night patrol and that a number of things were tossed into the sea on the approach of the Coast Guard. I do not know if they want to know that a vessel that plies here is now being investigated for offences relating to security in another Island. Do you want the Prime Minister to tell you all those things? *(Asides)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. And will the hon. member please address the Chair.

Mr. SIMMONS: We have to take what is happening in this country in relation to the security of our Port seriously, and the Prime Minister must know the seriousness from intelligent sources; but when we look at the history of the Democratic Labour Party going back to 1971 we will recall that there was a bomb scare incident in Belleplaine at which the present Minister of Communications and Works could have lost his life, and the father of the member for St. George North could have lost his life. It was well known; I had the information and I gave it to the then Commissioner of Police, that members of the Democratic Labour Party were engaged in that and carried out the act.

When we understand that in 1971 at a meeting in St. John the former personal aide to the former Prime Minister, when the Member for St. Michael South East was on the platform, that former personal aide came through with a group of Democratic Labour Party supporters behind him and broke up the meeting. That is the type of person with whom we are dealing. *(Asides).* It is not just idle talk. What we are saying is that the member for St. John was counselled yesterday by the member for Christ Church East that he should have been more careful in his judgment of what is associated around him, but, the member for St. John held a Press conference yesterday and said he did not have a button with his face and that of the American Ambassador on it – and the button was shown on television last night and the Leader of the Opposition displayed the button yesterday. *(Asides)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. SIMMONS: All I have to say about the member for St. John is that I refuse to accept

anything that he says. I am satisfied, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the member for St. John is a liar of international prominence and repute.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member will please withdraw those words.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Deputy Speaker.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My ruling is that the words be withdrawn.

Mr. SIMMONS: I immediately withdraw the words without reservation since I am directed by you.
12.25 p.m.

I will immediately withdraw the words without reservation since I am directed by you, but I will say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the member for St. John who could allege that he saw the plane go down 1¼ miles off Barbados was subsequently contradicted by machines and technological equipment to prove it went down 4.8 miles off Barbados. His judgment is bad. His judgment on whether there was a button in circulation with his face on it and his name written on it is also bad.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, nobody is necessarily accusing certain members of the Opposition in Parliament of having any association with this plot, but we want to counsel the members of the Opposition to control their supporters especially people like Tony Miller who on the night when they lost the election wanted at D.L.P. headquarters to go down town and do bad, and he had to be restrained. It is this historical amalgamation of people on your side with violence. Now there is a person whose life is centred around violence in Sidney Burnett Alleyne. With the circumstantial evidence and direct evidence of having a boat plus arms and ammunition en route to Barbados, that would bring it to the urgent attention of the security forces that would necessitate the Prime Minister warning the country not only of what is impending but of what measures he must take, to use the language of the member for Christ Church East, as the custodian of our trust and as custodian of the national interest to protect this Island as a whole.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I said when I began that I was not going to be long, and I will only hope that the Government pay attention not only to the Deep Water Harbour and to Seawell Airport, but to places like Bath where a member of the D.L.P. slept in a house next to the two men Cappadero and Virgo the same night they were taken to the house down there, and places like the Crane and Consett Bay. I am not worried about the West Coast because the police down there have that covered nicely. Boats have been intercepted down there recently, but I am worried about other areas, the little bays like Baker Bay and Bottom Bay in St. Philip, places where people can come in, and my counsel to the Government is to take very stringent measures in respect of that aspect of the security. It may mean the employment of additional security forces, and if the Government in its planning finds it necessary to come to the House for an additional vote to increase the number of security forces to police vital points of this Island, I hope that we can have the assurance from the Opposition that they will give its blessing.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Senate is going to meet at 2.30 p.m. I would think it necessary therefore to have this matter postponed for further consideration so that we can allow the Senate to meet. I know the Reporters have also to work in the Senate.

I therefore beg to move that further consideration of this Bill be postponed.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 9th November, 1976 at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I submitted to you a motion of privilege earlier in the day and I have a right to discuss my motion of privilege. I want to know what is Your Honour's ruling on my motion of privilege.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have considered the matter of privilege and for a number of reasons I need time to consider the particular point. The matter raises issues fundamental to the powers of this House and it is not covered neither by the Standing Orders nor by the Parliamentary Privileges Act, and therefore instead of making a ruling which might not be in accordance with all the precedents to hand, I prefer to consider the matter and to defer my ruling on the question whether a *prima facie* breach of privilege has been made out until the meeting of this Chamber on the 9th November, if the question that this Honourable Chamber meets again on that date is carried.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 9th November, 1976 at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

12.30 p.m.