THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 24th January, 1978.

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

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, J.P., (Speaker); Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc., LL.D.; Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Labour and Community Services); Rt. 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); Dr. R. B. CADDLE; Mr. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M.; Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, LL.M.; Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, (Minister of Health and National Insurance); Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. G. ODLE, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. M. C. C. WARD; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Caribbean Affairs, External Trade, Industry and Tourism and Leader of the House); Mr. V. L. JOHNSON, M.A.; Mr. B. M. TAITT, M.A.; Hon. L. R. TULL, M.A., (Minister of Education and Culture); Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Mr. L. L. SISNETT; Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, M.Sc. and His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, LL.M., (Deputy Speaker).

Prayers were read.

Mr. SANDIFORD entered the House and took his seat.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of Tuesday, 17th January 1978.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the Minutes have been circulated and subject to any alterations or corrections, I beg to move that these Minutes be confirmed.

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

There being no objection the Minutes were confirmed.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE entered the Chamber and took his seat.

DOCUMENTS LAID

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1978.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the Statement of Instruments adopted at the 62nd Session of the International Labour Conference, in October, 1976.

Also the International Labour Conference Conventions Nos. 145, 146, 147, and Recommendations Nos. 153, 154 and 155.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the Report and Accounts of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank as at 30th June, 1977.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to lay the following:

Loan Contract between the Inter-American Development Bank and Barbados re the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic Institute.

Agreement for Non-reimbursable Technical Co-operation between Barbados and the Inter-American Development Bank relating to the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic.

Loan Contract between Barbados and the Inter-American Development Bank re the Student Revolving Loan Fund Programme.

NOTICES

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1978."

I also beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of $18,204 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1977–78, Part I – Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1977–78, No. 27, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, as a result of discussions which I have been holding with representatives of the Barbados Light & Power Co. Ltd., the Board of Directors of the Company have decided not to proceed with the issue of ordinary shares at a price of $6.25 per share which was previously approved by the Public Utilities Board. Instead, and in recognition of the company's urgent need for capital for expansion, Government has offered, and the company has agreed, to take up through the National Insurance Board, 300,000 ordinary shares at the par value of $5.00 per share. In addition, the Company has proposed the issue of 200,000 ordinary shares at the par value on the local market and has approached the Public Utilities Board for the necessary permission. Government has indicated to the company that it considers this an excellent proposal and accordingly it fully supports the application to the Public Utilities Board. These shares will be sold to the Barbadian public, with existing shareholders of the company being given priority.

In addition, Government has indicated to the company that it fully endorses the issue of 500,000 redeemable preference shares at $5.00 each with a guaranteed dividend of 10% in this context, I would like to encourage all insurance companies resident in Barbados to fully support the issue of the preferred stock. In the budgetary proposals of April 1977, Government announced its intention of requiring the 'technical reserves' of the insurers to be invested locally in a manner to be prescribed, A Bill which will implement this measure will shortly be presented to Parliament but I should like to take this opportunity of emphasising that investment of the funds of resident insurance companies in the shares of Public Utilities is fully in keeping with the policy of local investment of the technical reserves. Indeed, Government recognises that investment opportunities such as this are essential if the insurance industry is adequately to conform to this aspect of Government's policy.

It is therefore, hoped that the representatives of all insurance companies operating in Barbados will take appropriate advantage of this issue of preferred stock to invest some of the savings which has been generated by their operations in the country in such a vital sector of the Barbadian economy.

12.25 p.m.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Government Business.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Order No. 1.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 is the instant Order of the Day.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of the sum of money for the service of the Island.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1977–78 No. 26

Order No. 1 was called – A Resolution to grant the sum of $222,880 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1977–78 Part I – Current, as shown in the supplementary Estimates 1977–78. No. 26, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND COMMUNITY SERVICES – HEAD 19(1) – DIRECTION AND POLICY FORMULATION

Item 3 – Other Personal Allowances – $650.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, Item 1 seeks the passage of this Committee of the sum of $600 for the

purpose of supplementing the Estimates due to the vacation leave of the Permanent Secretary. In keeping with the General Orders it was quite natural to get someone to act as Permanent Secretary in his absence and, therefore, this will supplement the original provision of $6,800.

I beg to move that Item 1 do now pass. If there is any question which the hon. gentlemen on the other side would like to ask, I am quite happy to answer them.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, this is just for the record. I think the Hon. Minister said $600, but the document says $650. I do not know if he is amending it.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: It is $650, I beg your pardon.

The question that Head 19(1) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 19(3) – Welfare.

Item 4 – Utilities – $1,030 – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, so far as this Item is concerned, there was an oversight in the provision of $600. This amount is needed to meet the cost of electricity and water, etc., at Country Road. It is now estimated that the vote was not adequate and, therefore, we seek this amount in order to pay the necessary bills. I do not think this needs much explanation. I foreshadow that this is going to be a rather interesting debate, Mr. Chairman, as we go on for reasons which I-unless I anticipate the Opposition. However, I believe that we are going to get down to the meat of the subject in one or two other Items.

I, therefore, beg to move that Item 4 do now pass.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will someone second that.

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman. this Item here relates to electricity and water in relation to the Welfare Department, and I would like to refer to these two areas; the provision of electricity and water, as they relate to the old age pensioners in this country. Mr. Chairman, this is a problem. I do not know whether the Minister is anticipating what I have to say or what I am going to say, if this is what he was talking about, but this country, not least of all the old age pensioners in this country, all remember quite well a very large promise by the Barbados Labour Party Government that it would meet the facility bills of old age pensioners who were not in a position to meet those bills. This is a development, which started before the present Government came into power, that in certain cases when need was established the electricity and water rate bills of deserving cases were met by the Government. The present Government elaborated on this and erected this into a policy or a plank of their Manifesto. We have been seeing recently a large number of complaints, which have even reached the columns of the Press, where pensioners have been complaining that they have not been receiving the promised payments of these bills.

I do not want to go into this matter in any detail at this stage, but I am wondering if the Minister would respond to this particular Item and let us know what policies he has established in relation to meeting the water and utility bills of these old age pensioners who find it extremely difficult in their old age to live a comfortable life because some of the amenities of life are not available to them, or rather they are unable to meet the cost of providing these amenities in the evening of their days.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, page 12 of the Barbados Labour Party's 1976 Programme made it very clear in a laid-out 5-year Programme – I do not know if members on the other side like some of the people seem to think that as soon as the 4th, 5th, 6th, or 7th September had gone in 1976 that the Barbados Labour Party would have transformed the country overnight. This is a very cheap argument which I am hearing from over there. It says very clearly that we would carry further what appeared to have been a measure implemented by the other side when they were in office. All that you had going when they were in power, Sir, was that in time if a deserving pensioner, as the hon. member who has just sat down said, was in dire need of having his bills paid that would be done.
12.35 p.m.

We went further and said in our programme that we would ensure full implementation of the proposal to pay water rates and electricity bills for old age pensioners.

The hon. member talked about something reaching the columns of the newspaper. I am confident he has received letters from old age pensioners during his term of office in the Ministry of Health. The person who wrote the letter to the Press came to my office complaining about not being able to pay water rates and electricity, but on investigation it was discovered that the man owned two houses on which he was asking to have the water rates and electricity paid. That is the story. So when you talk about reaching the columns of the Press, from the time I read the matter I knew this. The man wrote you because he is a regular visitor to the Welfare Department; I know the gentleman very well.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, would the Minister admit that there is more than

one complaint from more than one old age pensioner reaching us?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Maybe there are, but from my office I have not received any other complaint. You specifically mentioned columns of the Press. That is the chief argument for implementing water rates and electricity. But do not worry yourself, it is going to be done.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Item do now pass.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I would not say the Government is not seeking to implement in one, two or three years anything in its Manifesto; but I am saying that Government has its priorities completely wrong. Here are old people who are dying to have their water rates and electricity paid. How then can Government justify taking up money to buy an old, burnt out boat for fishes to swim about in and people to play and dive in when money for old age pensioners cannot be met? If Government feel that the Parks and Beaches Commission and the burnt out ship are priorities, then okay; but a Government that is really concerned with old people should get its priorities straight, and the amount of money to pay light and water rate for old age pensioners would not come to the $160,000 to buy a burnt out ship for dolphins and sharks to sport themselves in the salty brine.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I wish once again to give the Leader of the Opposition factual information, because it seems that recently facts escape him. In the first place the Government salvaged the burnt out ship which was the "Stavronikita" and received for its services as far as the cargo was concerned, the sum of $60,000. The boat was up for sale in circumstances where the Government had to make its claim for salvaging the wreck as opposed to the cargo. The net amount of that sale would mean that out of the $60,000 recovered part for salvage about $40,000 would be for services rendered by the Port Department. Government would then get at least half of the remaining $20,000. So it was not $160,000 to begin with and the Leader of the Opposition should make sure of his facts before he tries to score cheap political points.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: If you were an open Government as you always say, when it appeared in the Press that $160,000 was paid for the ship you should have made an explanation.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member, having been a Cabinet Minister, knows that if he had written to the Minister responsible, the information would have been made available to him. He is not performing his duties and that is why he makes reckless statements all the time. The hon. member obviously does not read the Government Information Service releases, for the information was there. He just wants to play to the gallery and make cheap political points. Another point the hon. member should be aware of is that the Government is carrying out a scheme for the creation of an underwater park which is one of the necessities for the development of tourism and it is unfair to suggest that Government is throwing away money on the ship when he knows that Government is building an infrastructure for tourist development.

The third point on which he is wrong is that, as the hon. Minister has said, there is only one complaint that has come to his Ministry about the payment of water rates and electricity. Now Mr. Graham of whom he spoke is a constituent of mine but has not approached me on the issue. During our time in Opposition he approached me on the matter of getting payments for his own house. One must investigate matters properly. I am sorry to have to bring the gentleman's name into the debate, but he seems to think that so long as one is an old age pensioner one would get water rates and electricity paid. But it is not right for politicians to give the wrong impression and so try to gain political points. This may be all right on the hustlings, but in here we are on the people's business and I suggest his debate is worth nothing.

12.45 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I want to take issue with the Leader of the Opposition who referred to Government's priorities in respect of my Ministry. He said that we bought a boat for the fish to go and play in; the fish will play rounders now. You have Kerry Packer matches down there, and all these things the fish will now have, but I expect that type of remark coming from the Leader of the Opposition, because he is a "play-play" Leader of the Opposition, he is not a "real-real" Leader, so therefore he can only think of people playing.

Our priorities will be that since we came into office we reduced the age from 68 to 65, thereby giving more people in the country the benefit of an old age pension as against you when you were in Government. Tell me if that is not a priority, that we have stretched it across the country whereby some 3,000 more people can enjoy the benefit, and now you hear the little, cheap, nippy arguments about fish playing and $60,000 and so on; a bogus argument. Your debate is as bogus as you look, and you look very bogus.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Now, he must withdraw that, Mr. Chairman!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member .....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, if you are calling on me to withdraw I will withdraw at Your Honour's pleasure, because it is my bounden duty, but that does not necessarily mean that his debates are not bogus, you have heard his arguments.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, is he withdrawing it or not? I want to hear what he is doing.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you please take your seat?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The hon. member looks good, but his arguments are bogus.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, is he withdrawing the remarks he made about "bogus"?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member did so.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I withdraw the remarks that he is a bogus looking person. He looks good but his arguments are bogus.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member take his seat?

The question that Head 19 (3) – Item 4 – stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Item 8 – Expenses of Commissions – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, Item 8 is seeking $2,000. Again, the problem here is that during 1977, you will recall that the age was lowered from 68 to 65 for old age pensions. Because of that many many people were under the impression that as long as they attained the age of 65 they were qualified to come under the scheme. Many of them were getting the National Insurance pension which was at that time $15 per week, and we carried the old age pension to $16 per week. Out of that a number of persons appealed and there were quite a number of meetings held by the Appeals Committee in the light of these people appealing against the Welfare Officers' decisions, and therefore this amount is to pay the Appeals Committee and also the Chairman of the National Assistance Board.

I beg to move that Item 8 do now pass. That is the whole position with this $2,000.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: The Cpposition is not opposing it, but I would think that a more appropriate Head would have been "Expenses of Committees." It is true that the Estimates have "Commissions" but I am wondering if the Government is so fond of Commissions that even the Child Care Board and the National Assistance Board are referred to as Commissions. Perhaps the word "Commissions" instead of "Committees" and "Boards" is just another extension of their thinking on Commissions. But as I say, the Estimates have it in so this Head must carry it.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I do not know what is wrong with the Acting Leader of the Opposition and these Commissions, these Commisions seem to be worrying them so much. There is no Commission at the Child Care Board, because the present Child Care Board, headed by Dr. Ramsay, is doing an outstanding job, so there is no corruption around the Child Care Board, so you do not need any Commission around the Child Care Board. You needed Commisions when they were in office for the corrupt practices carried out by them. That is why you have the Commissions, but you could not have a Commission at the Child Care Board with somebody like Dr. Ramsay on it, a man who is dedicated to the service of children in this country.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, this is the Item – Expenses of Commissions, and I am going to ask the Minister very civilly – and I hope that I can get a civil answer, because he seems to believe that noise and shouting constitute the equivalence of sense. It is not the more noise you keep the more sense you are talking – but I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, whether complaints have been received – and I am not going to refer now to the columns of the Press – whether complaints have been received in his Ministry, whether he is aware or any of his colleagues are aware that there is a growing body of opinion in the country among the senior citizens that a more liberal approach towards the grant of old age pensions should be made. That is, that when one has reached the qualifying age, now 65, that the means test should be liberalised so that a larger number of people, or all in the category, could benefit.

I would like the Minister to tell this House his thoughts on this particular matter, whether he is aware of any complaints or requests from people in that age group, that the means test should be liberalised or removed altogether so that those who reach the qualifying age would be entitled to a pension.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, there are three points which I would like to comment upon. First of all, the hon. member for St. Michael South got up and he wanted to ask a question in a civil manner. I do not know who else was asking the Minister a question other than the Leader of the Opposition, and by that inference he was merely reflecting on the uncivil manner of his colleague on the other side.

The Leader of the Opposition is not going to be allowed to get away with murder inside this House. He got up and in his cheap way he tried to give the impression that Expenses of Commissions had something to do with Commissions of Enquiry.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of elucidation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member does not give way to you. Will you please sit?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I did not come in here by a wheelbarrow, you cannot make me sit. All I said was the headnote in the Estimates and the headnote here say "Commissions" but the money is being voted for Committees, and therefore I am saying that the Government seems so fond of the word "Commissions" that the word "Commissions" is being used instead of "Committees". That is all I am saying.
12.55 p.m.

Mr. BRADSHAW: This deals with Expenses of Commissions. The Leader of the Opposition ought to know that "commissions" is a noun coming from the verb "commit"; and to commit means that you are committed to payment. (Laugh). Do not let us get away with this in here today. *(Asides.)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Hon. F. G. SMITH rose.

Mr. BRADSHAW rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot have two hon. members on their feet. Will the hon. member give way? He is not giving way. Will the Hon. Leader of the Opposition take his seat?

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, the member for St. Michael South, if he is thinking that the method for qualifying for old age pension should be better looked into, I want to remind him that I came in here last year and I read a Resolution which was approved by the Barbados Labour Party at its Annual Conference in which it asked for the means test to be looked into. The whole question of the old age pension and the qualifying age was looked into at this Annual Conference. We do not want them on that side to tell us what to do. He is asking what is to be done. He must find out what has been done and what has been said in this Hon. Chamber. I spoke about it, and members on this side said that we were not satisfied with the means test and we were looking into it with a view to raising the means test and looking at the old age pension altogether.

What was allowed to happen during the past Government's regime was that they did not allow their Board members on committees to abide by the law that was there; that is why we in here today are seeking money. If members on their committees had carried out the law as it was spelt out, then we would not be faced with most of these problems. More and more cases have got to be investigated and go back to this Appeals Committee because during the Democratic Labour Party regime they allowed people who should never have got pensions to get pensions and a situation has developed in the Island now that we have got to get the Committee now to go back and review these cases. Hence we have got an additional number of pensioners between 1965 and 1968. There are cases where pensions have been disallowed in the first place. Members on that side failed to carry out the law or interpret the law as it applied to these Boards and Committees.

I do not want him to come in here today with these cheap political points. I do not want him or the Leader of the Opposition making these points. I have been taking care of myself well enough, and I can take care of myself against either of them whether singularly or in the plural.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I did not want to enter this debate; but after hearing the various speakers, I considered it my duty to let the Minister know of the grievances which certain people have brought to my notice concerning the granting of old age pension to them. I am aware, Sir, that it takes money to increase the means test; but I do feel that something should be done to alleviate the hardships of certain members of the community who in the past have contributed to the economy of this Island; and at present they find it a colossal task to be given the old age pension.

I am not attaching any blame to the Minister or to the Ministry; but I want to draw it to the attention of the Minister so that he will do everything possible to assist these people. Now, Sir, while it is true that the age limit has been reduced from 68 to 65, I consider it my duty to let the Minister know that several poor people, agricultural labourers, have been turned down and have not been granted old age pension. I can refer him to a particular case in which a man lives domesticated with a woman, and who is unable to work. This woman works occasionally for a few dollars a week, and owing to the means test, this man has been told that he cannot receive an old age pension because the woman works for more than the means test.

I am not ashamed to say that the man lives next door to the hon. member for St. Joseph, in St. Philip; and if he wants to check on the case he may do so. (HON. C. L. BOLDEN: Give me the name.) Mr. Chairman, I want to let you know that the time has come for the Ministry to analyse and scrutinise the whole set up of granting old age pension, I know that it will take a reasonable sum of money to increase the number of pensioners; but I still feel as a representative of the people that I should let you know what is going on.

Now, Sir, as regards the payment of electricity, I must state that several people, old age pensioners, have approached me on this matter. It is not that I am

defending the Government, but I had to tell some of them that the world was not built in a day.
1.05 p.m.

Therefore, having made that statement, I look forward to the Minister for his whole-hearted co-operation in assisting these very, very poor people. The Minister is aware that workers in the rural areas, especially those who work on the plantations, would expect sympathy, favourable consideration and justice to be done to them when they have attained the age of 65; therefore, it goes without saying that we who are here to represent their interest, and we, who realise that without their votes we could not have been here, must at all times be serious about those people. They are not in a position to bear any wage squeeze because it is known that while we do our utmost for them that the pension is only a pittance and with the high cost of living – and checking even in the newspapers recently which state that it is going up and up – I am, again, appealing to the Minister to give this matter serious consideration and to consider it as paramount importance. He must give it top priority in his Ministry, and, in doing so, he will make a wonderful contribution in assisting the old age pensioners in this country.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I want to deal, first, with the statement by the hon. member for St. Philip South about the poor man who lives next door to me. I do not want him to leave the Chamber, because the Opposition has a nasty habit of making accusations and then running out. The time of political propaganda must stop.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I have passed the stage in which I would come in here to make any false allegation or to mislead this Honourable House.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member said that there is a man who lives next door to me who is domesticated with a woman. I do not know if he were an animal before, but he is now domesticated with a woman and he cannot get an old age pension. Now, I live in St. Philip. On the north of my house there is a man called Mr. Clarke, who is a fisherman and landowner.

Mr. WEEKES *rose*.....

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I am not sitting down now. To the east of my house is a man called Mr. Agard, who owns a considerable amount of property in St. Philip. As far as I know, the way in which the means test is operated, if, a person has enough property from which he can be adequately maintained he cannot get any money. Mr. Clarke owns a considerable amount of property. I live on 4½ acres of land, and Mr. Clarke owns about ten acres of land in St. Philip. He also owns a house. On the South of my house is a house which is owned by a doctor on 5 acres of land. Who is the poor man that is not getting the money for which he is entitled? You must not masquerade about this because there is nobody who lives around me who is in that position. On the west of my house, Mr. Chairman, you will see about thirty acres of land stretching down to Four Roads, St. Philip. What foolishness are you talking about? Mr. Clarke's son works in the Regiment. I am going to call names now, because one must be able to go out and check on who is telling lies.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, may I say that it is Mr. Clarke who came to my home and reported the matter. I cannot vouch, as the hon. member has stated, that Mr. Clarke owns land, because I queried it and he told me that he does not own anything other than an old house.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: The hon. member must recognise that Mr. Samuel Clarke lives on an acre of land, and he rents two acres of land on the south of my house and he works that land. He lives with a woman called Mrs. Savoury who has about ten children and one of them is employed by me. I know them very good. Mr. Agard owns about twelve acres of land around my property. I am living in the centre of a circle of land owned by the Clarkes and Agards. What I want this Honourable House to understand is that the hon. member is trying to make people believe that I live next door to a man who is suffering and has not drawn it to the attention of the Government. I know that Mr. Clarke goes fishing every Monday and every Tuesday.

Mr. WEEKES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would like the hon. members to know that I am not here for cheap publicity and, therefore, I would never, never cherish the thought of coming here to give any information which I could not substantiate. The hon. member requested me to call the name and I did so. If he did not request me to do so, I would not have mentioned it. On the other hand, I am not here to point out, or to draw to the attention of this House, that the hon. member for St. Joseph is not performing his duties well and that he knew about the matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. Philip South, please take your seat. You are trying to make a second speech.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, all that is said now cannot erase what they have tried to imply at the beginning. At one time they went to St. Joseph and said that I took more care of St. Philip than I did in St. Joseph. As a member of Government I understand

my responsibilities, and if anybody living in my vicinity has a problem, I will look after it as well as I would have looked after the problems of St. Joseph. Nobody talks about the problems of Mr. Mottley, the ex-parliamentarian, who was there looking for care and attention. Nobody thought about Mottley, but he was there parked under a tamarind tree last week in front of Mr. Clarke's house. He knows as well as I do that Mr. Clarke owns land in St. Philip. Everybody in St. Philip knows who owns every square inch of land in St. Philip.
1.15 p.m.

The hon. member for St. Michael South asked a question about the Minister's feeling on the means test. Now you have an Acting Leader of the Opposition. Some diseases are contagious, and the acting disease seems contagious at present, because he is asking foolish questions. If the hon. member would remember, at the end of the 1976 Session, every one of the Government members on his side got up and plastered every welfare Officer in this country about the method of the means test. Every one of them knew that the means test was not an adequate method of evaluating things. The Acting Leader of the Opposition.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I want a correction.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is no acting Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: The hon. member sat in his seat and talked about when the Welfare officer went around people had to hide their television sets, lend out their fridge, and so on. And we said we would look at the means test. But the trouble is that we have taken over Government and some people think that we can take a magic wand and say "Abracadabra" and everything can be made beautiful overnight. They expect us in fifteen months to remedy all the ills of this country. They cannot understand that we have a five year programme.

When the hon. member spoke earlier about spending money on a burnt-out boat, he should have known that tourist reports show that over $2 million are spent annually by scuba divers to travel to where they would have something to look at. Last Sunday night at the Hilton Hotel there was a group that promised to bring 2,000 people here because of the boat we have sunk, whose members are interested in scuba diving. But they come in here with cheap politics. Where will Government get money for increased old age pensions unless we attract more foreign currency into the country. Barbados has a limited acreage of land; it is not like Jamaica, Guyana or the United States. And we have reached a point of development where we must use every avenue for attracting foreign currency. But thank God the people in Barbados have enough education to understand cheap politics.

When the hon. member speaks about poor people, he must understand that there are lots of people in Barbados who appear poor but who have more resources than you or I. In St. Philip you can't get people to work; everybody has a piece of land or a boat. So the Opposition must stop their cheap politics in here. This Government does not make money, and I believe the only way we can assist the poor people is by increasing our revenue whether from increased production of sugar, increased sales of rum or the attraction of visitors to this country.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I really don't want to be long on the pension matter, but as Minister of Finance it is my duty to reinforce what the hon. member who has just sat down has said. A country can only operate within budgetary confines. No country in the world has unlimited resources to deliver all the welfare services its citizens could reasonably demand. There are times when you have to recognise that even a reasonable demand in terms of the individual, may in the end be unreasonable in terms of what the country can afford. It is as simple as that and it must come home to members of the Opposition that it is as simple as that. *(Asides)* The public? The public comprises supporters of the Government, sensible people independent in politics, and sensible people who support the Opposition and the Leader of the Opposition and others.

Now I do not believe too much in comparative statistics, but Government is gradually putting together statistics comparative of welfare services in Barbados and other developing countries. The old age pension in Trinidad works out to BDS$70.55 per month, which is about $16.10 per week. Since last month the old age pension in Trinidad has been raised to approximately ten cents a week more than ours, and Trinidad is a country with three billion dollars in foreign reserves, a country which has a local debt just for the purpose of giving investments to the commercial banks, not for Government need but presumably to produce short term funds for the market to hold, not that Government needs the money. Trinidad is a country with abundant budgetary provision to develop welfare and other services, yet in Trinidad old age pension is just a few cents more than ours. And we have to put up with these assaults and attacks on our integrity. The old age pension has been raised to one level and it will be raised to another. But we came in here and said that faced with two priorities, raising the old age pension or lowering the age for pension, we lowered the age from

68 years to 65, thereby adding 3,100 persons to the pension rolls.
1.25 p.m.

We have taken a choice to benefit an extra 3,100 citizens over the age of 65 in this country, and we did it to conform the retirement age under national insurance with the retirement age for the old age pensions. It may mean that at some stage in the future, Mr. Chairman, we will be able to reduce eventually the ages for all purposes say to 60 years. I do not believe that will form a part of the Government's election Manifesto in 1981, but it may very well form a part of our Government's election Manifesto in 1986. It may. We think in the long term on this side of the House, but we are appealing to hon. members not at a difficult economic time, not at a time in our history when we are trying to pull out of a mess, to inflame social factions, arouse expectations that perhaps will take a little longer than all hon. members would like. It is a very easy tactic to set your opponents up in a position which they have never occupied and then seek to shoot them down.

I do not believe that hon. members opposite are as familiar with the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party at the last election as they pretend, otherwise they would not select so many positions that we never took in order to concentrate their forces on, but I wish them well in reading the document. It will give them some political lessons that they sorely needed for a number of years, and when they read the document carefully they will understand that we came into office with a series of realisable pledges and we are in the process of realising them, but what they are doing is not so much to indicate on the basis of honest and sincere debate that a particular pledge is taking three years to realise when it should take two, they are not telling us how we are going to make it possible to pay the old age pensioners more or to deal with the means test in the way they are speaking, they are merely trying to inflame unnecessarily the feelings of some of the most disadvantaged people in our community. That is exactly what is being projected in debates such as this.

The Minister when he speaks will no doubt report to the House – I will be glad to hear it – about progress made with the steps towards the revision of the means tests, because I have spoken in here already indicating that some revision of the means test is necessary and the Government must undertake it. No doubt the Minister will be able to tell us how far he has got, or if in fact he cannot tell us he will indicate that confidential discussions are still proceeding along these lines, but the welfare of the aged is too important, Mr. Chairman, to be made an occasion for loud and abusive speeches in some cases, Mr. Chairman.....(Hon. F. G. SMITH: You heard Bradshaw and Bolden?) Do we still have a rule of the House that hon. members who are not speaking must converse in undertones?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We certainly do. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition will be a little quiet please.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Thank you, Sir. This is no occasion for that, we are not in a position. We provide a very high level of welfare services, educational, health service, pension service, we provide a very high level, and I am calling on the Opposition to help the Government to sustain that high level. That is the thing that is necessary. How can they tell us to pursue more public spending on welfare services when inevitably more public spending will stretch the gap between current revenue and current expenditure, lead to inflation and lead to erosion of the very same welfare services that they are proposing? What do they want us to do? Borrow money to pay the old age pensioners, and borrowed money eventually trades off into the balance of payments and severe and drastic steps have to be taken so that Barbados falls into the situation of Jamaica which has taken a 40% cut in its standard of living in two years? Do hon. members want the social unrest, the social dislocation that will result from Government's irresponsibility? If they want that, if they are active supporters of those left wing elements which believe that they will never come into power in Barbados until things come to the worse, I am stating categorically that I have been told by Senator John Connell when he was a member of the Communist party that ran in the City, the PPM, that he knew quite well that his political principles would never come to power in this country until we had social unrest and until things got worse economically. I am stating that I was told that specifically.

Is that what the Leader of the Opposition wants? (Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am going out, do not worry with me). Is that what the soon to be former Leader of the Opposition wants? The fact that he is going out, does that mean that he is abdicating from humanity? Does that mean that he is abdicating his responsibility to consider public affairs in a sober and reasonable way? If that is what is wanted, if the Opposition itself wants to lend the weight of its party to a deliberate policy of destroying the Government's finances so that the type of social unrest that will allow the growth of Communism in this country to develop, if that is what the Opposition wants, let them say so, but do not come out and constantly direct the rhetoric of revolution into a situation which above all needs one or two or three years of sober considered thought and sober considered Government. We are trying to give it this, Sir, I am

very much hoping that the advent of a new Leader of the Opposition will lead to a little more responsibility of that side, a greater capacity to understand the needs of Government in this year of 1978.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am no Einstein, but I have made two discoveries since the Prime Minister spoke. One is that he is now aware of the Leader of the Opposition, because when it tallies with "One gone and six to go" I did not expect him to take any notice of me at all, because from his utterance I had already gone, and therefore I am very pleased to find that he still acknowledges both my presence, apart from his insinuations about what I want, but in due course I will be Mr. John Citizen with one vote like the other 208,000 and I will not be influencing anything, so you do not have to bother about me.

Let me tell you another discovery I have made. The Prime Minister is telling the country now that Barbados has a high level of education, a high level of social welfare, a high level of everything, but in 1976 when the election was running it did not have anything at all, yet in 15 months he is admitting today that Barbados has such a high level that the people of this country can mark time because of the economic position and because of the high level. Let me tell you something. You did not give them the high level that you just mentioned in your speech, the high level the people of this country have which you just mentioned was obtained by the Democratic Labour Party. Education, social welfare and all the other services which you admit today and which you did not admit to the public of this country in 1976 when you were campaigning, all that was.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will not allow this debate to drag into political platform activities. Please speak more with what is going on.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, and you are not going to stop me, is that the Prime Minister has just admitted that Barbadians can mark time because of the high level of services, welfare and otherwise, which this country enjoys.
1.35 p.m.

All that I am telling him is that he did not give the country this high amount in 15 months; and therefore I am pleased to see before I leave this Chamber that the Prime Minister is prepared to admit that under the Democratic Labour Party the country had a high level of services; and this is reinforced today too by the Minister of Agriculture. He has admitted in his speech that Barbados has reached a high point of development, and therefore the need for foreign investment is there. Again that reinforces what the Prime Minister himself has said on this issue; and I am therefore very pleased, Mr. Chairman, to discover that whether wittingly or unwittingly they had to admit that. I do not know how the Prime Minister can twist that around. Those who have ears to hear let them hear. When the report comes out in Hansard it will be shown that the Prime Minister has admitted on the 24th day of January, 1978 that under the Democratic Labour Party there has been a very high level of development in social services and education.

Hon. H. deB. Forde rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition will please take his seat.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. One of the rules of debate is that an hon. member must not repeat himself. The hon. member is like a record. He has repeated himself four times so far in the last two seconds.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I do not have to repeat myself. I can speak English like him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, let me explain.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you please sit.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I submit that the hon. member is reflecting on my motives. I never admitted that under the Democratic Labour Party the country reached any high level. History did not begin in 1961. The hospital and the Health Services in this Island were created in their present form before 1961. So do not let him suggest and by repetition try to convince himself. We have had old age pensions since 1937. So, do not let him continue to misrepresent me that I have admitted anything about a high level under the Democratic Labour Party. The structure of what is called "Government Grammar Schools" was complete before 1961. No new ones were built since we were last in power. No new Grammar Schools or new hospitals, and no new system of pensions etc. Even National Insurance was introduced into the country as a result of reports made to the Minister of Health, the father of the present Minister of Health before 1961. This is a continuing process to which all of the political parties of this country have contributed.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I share some of the Prime Minister's views in that in 1961 old age pensions were $1.80. When the Democratic Labour Party left office, old age pensions were $13.00 with a promise that they would be $16.00 which has not been increased. In 1961 we had free secondary education,

free school books, free university education and free hot meals. I could go on *ad nauseam.* If he is saying that we did not have these things under the Democratic Labour Party, I do not know whether he gave them; but if he wants to say that they were there in 1961 because we had a hospital then I would begin to believe him.

In so far as the official Opposition is concerned – you can call me anybody or call me anything; but we are no less patriotic than the Government; and we love our country as we have done for the last 15 years with equal fervour and dedication; and there is no plot. Do not mind the slanders being made against the Opposition that we want any chaos in this country or any ideology to take over. Every party has people with different views; but the official Opposition, the official view of the Democratic Labour Party is that we do not want any chaos although we have been accused of some plot to overthrow the Government which filtered out.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member denying that on the Opposition platforms they have been inciting the people to overthrow the Government and to rebel? Would he deny doing it?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: If you tell me to say so, I will deny it for you. I did not attend the meeting so I do not know what they said. I have not seen the security reports. All I am saying is that I want to clear up these insinuations that the Democratic Labour Party wants to create chaos. They had in their manifesto about electricity and water; that they were going to equate the pensions of Civil Servants to the pensions that other people draw. The people voted for them on that basis.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that this debate has to do with old age pensions. I am submitting that the speech of the Leader of the Opposition is irrelevant.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, when the Prime Minister was speaking, he did not get up. I want to know why he suddenly got to his feet now, and when the Prime Minister was talking about the Democratic Labour Party wanting to create chaos he did not jump up. Was that relevant?

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I will ask you to rule whether or not the Leader of the Opposition is keeping to the rules of the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There has been quite a bit of latitude given in this debate. Will the hon. member please continue. We have had enough of it.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I will continue, but I do not like the idea that suddenly he finds himself on his feet now, but when his boss man is speaking you did not hear anything about irrelevancies. Is this another attempt to choke the Opposition?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is now making an irrelevant submission in this debate. The last three sentences since you have asked him to stick to the debate are totally irrelevant to this debate and to the Item under discussion. I am asking you to rule that if he continues to speak in an irrelevant manner, you must ask him to discontinue to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. member to discontinue his irrelevancies.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to you. I notice that the Hon. Attorney General in this House is Sir Oracle. As soon as he gets up and rules to the Chair you swallow it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you please take your seat.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: All right. I am about to stop anyhow.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If no other hon. member wishes to speak the Minister will wind up.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, whenever a measure dealing with old age pensions comes before this Hon. Assembly, there is always this heat being generated and tempers flare; but this afternoon I must confess that I have never seen such a display as today during my time in Parliament for the last 11 years. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition – I cannot help saying was in a friendly mood today because of the irrelevancies and the utter nonsense that he spoke, and his lack of leadership and statesmanship and lack of responsibility – all of these he has displayed today in front of a bunch of young children who will be the men and the women of tomorrow.

We are aware that he is going out. Try to go out like Sir Grantley Adams with dignity.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: A bunch of young people from Harrison College .....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition will please take his seat. *(Asides)* I must have order please. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition will contain himself with more dignity in this Hon. Chamber.

1.45 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The sooner, Mr. Chairman, they stop serving liquor before lunch in that Dining Hall the better off we are going to be in here.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: He cannot get away with that. I tell you I have not had any liquor to drink.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am saying.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot have two hon. members on their feet.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: You said that the Government should stop serving liquor, and you are inferring to the public that I was drinking.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you please take your seat.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I can say.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Hon. Leader of the Opposition take his seat!

Hon. F. G. SMITH: There are nasty insinuations you are coming with. I will take my seat.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am going to appeal to the Debates Committee, Sir, to serve liquor before lunch and do not serve tea, and I think we will be better off. I am not implying that the Leader of the Opposition is drinking. It is a positive fact that he is always like that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Hon. Minister carry on with the proceedings.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, the Prime Minister spoke primarily from the point of view as Minister of Finance, and he showed quite a bit of concern about the country's finances. I think the point which was raised by the member for St. Michael South was, "What do we plan to do about the means test?" He talked about being civil and so on. Maybe he has seen a display of it on the other side, but I will try to give him a very simple answer. We are examining the means test and we are prepared to face up to alleviating the problems of the old age pensioners in this country. I have tried to champion their cause, but how successful I am going to be only history will determine this.

I am concerned about those persons who live in homes or are unmarried for many years and the incomes of both of the persons disqualify them. I do not think it is fair. All of this I am examining. I would have hoped that I would not have had this problem of examining the problems which the former Minister of Education and Health, the Ministry that old age pension was dealt with, is now complaining about. I would have hoped that many of these problems would have been rectified before they had left office because these.....

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Hon. Minister give way.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I did not complain about anything. I simply asked a question, and I was not complaining about anything. I asked, what is the Minister proposing to do about the problems and the promises?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I heard the member for St. Philip South complain about the problems they are running into *(Asides.)* I am not going to deal with you as an individual. I gave you the answer which you expect from me. We are looking into this problem, Mr. Chairman, am I am very hopeful to have it rectified and to be able to do as much as I would like to do for the old age pensioners in this country. I know there are quite a number of them who are very upset for several reasons. I know that several complaints have been made against the Welfare Officers to the effect that because a person is a member of a particular Party he does not get a pension and so on. What I believe should be told to the pensioners is that, at this particular time, they will have to live within the ambit of the law. That is as much as I can say now, and to hope that within this session we will be able to fulfill our promises to them: that is to remove the suffering which many of them are going through.

I am hopeful that by the 15th February we will be able to move into the Senior Citizens Home in Black Rock which will house some 18 senior citizens. We are hopeful that within the coming Financial Year to be able to build at Friendship a Senior Citizens Home. The Consul General in New York is doing his very best to assist us here in Barbados with our old age pensioners by projecting a Food Programme. We are hoping that some time in March this year we would be in a position to open the Food Centre in Reed Street where we will be able to give about seventy-five hot lunches to the unfortunate and aged. I believe that a Government who fail to look after the old and the poor are not worthy of the Government.

I am quite sure, Mr. Chairman, that members on the other side will know that during the years when things were very good a Resolution was brought in here and the present Leader of the Opposition – I think he was Minister of Communications and Works at the time – said on the floor of this House that old age pensioners could not get one single red cent more, and that the country could do that much and no more. Today we are hearing all of these cries from the benches of the Opposition that we should, in 15 months, be able to pay the water rates, raise the pensions, and do all of these things.

We are hoping to carry the National Insurance pension to approximately $25.00 a week. They are well aware of the fact, Sir, that the National Insurance pension is there to phase out the old age pension over a period of years. That is all I can say at this point, and I beg to move that this Head do now pass.

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

The question that Head 19(3) – Item 8 – stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Item 9 – Grants to Public Institutions – $219,200 – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, the sum of $219,200 is required for the purpose of assisting the Child Care Board to carry on its functions. The amount of $1,850,000 provided to meet the expenses of the Child Care Board for the current financial year is insufficient and it is proposed that supplementary provision of $219,200 be provided. The vote has proved inadequate mainly on account of the Board having to meet from its current provision bills totalling over $140,000 brought forward from the last financial year, and also increased costs in administering the 15 Day Nurseries and 7 Children's Homes administered by the Board.

This also has something to do with people going on vacation. You had an outbreak of influenza during the year 1977 and quite a number of people had to be taken on in various acting appointments to carry out the duties at the Child Care Board. There are also some repairs to be done at 3 of the Day Nurseries. These Day Nurseries are in a very bad condition, and we are hopeful to have these repairs done immediately. During the last heavy rains we had to evacuate a number of children from these Day Nurseries.

Mr. Chairman, if there are any matters which members on the other side would like to raise, I am quite willing to give the answers, as long as they are within the terms of the Resolution before you.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: In seconding this Resolution, Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a couple of comments and, more or less, it is an appeal to the public. I believe that the Child Care Board is doing a first-class job but, unfortunately, the community in which we live is getting into the daily habit of assuming that Government must provide everything for the Community. Perhaps, the fault rests with the attitude which we, the politicians, have taken down through the ages in making people believe that the politicians have all of the answers and all of the provisions to give.

1.55 p.m.

But there is a strong case at this time in Barbados, and for a long time, for people to recognize that they have a duty to be their neighbour's keepers. Having been reared by a lady who dedicated her life to looking after children, I feel very passionately about this and I am appealing to the Barbadian public to give a little more time to help the children in our Children's Homes who know no normal family life like what so many of us have had the privilege to experience. We should take time off to invite the children to our homes, spend time talking with them, have them reside with us during their school vacations, perhaps adopt one of them either by way of the foster home or by complete adoption. It is too selfish an attitude to expect that our only concern is for the Government to provide out of annual revenue for the upkeep of these homes. Very few Barbadians even take the trouble to give a few books to these homes; yet we call ourselves an enlightened community. It is true that there are some organizations which have gone out of their way to adopt some of the homes, usually women's organizations, but what about the men? In many instances these children are in the homes because their fathers have refused to acknowledge or support them, and I believe that Barbadian men in particular are failing in their duty to their children if they are prepared to remain anonymous and allow their children to be brought up in institutions. There are too many children who do not know who their fathers are because of the father's failing in duty to them, and we believe we have a public duty to emphasise the necessity for Barbadian men to shoulder their responsibility in this direction. And I think this is as good an opportunity as any to make this point: Government revenue can only carry so much. Eventually it is all of us, the people, who can make a difference to the progress of the country, and it is a waste of vital human resources if we are not developing our children to the fullest.

International Children's Year will be celebrated throughout the world in 1979. I know that Government has already set up a Committee which comprises Government and non-Government persons to map out a programme for International Children's Year. We have offered our support at the Ministry of External Affairs to see what help can be had from UNICEF and other organisations and I think we Barbadians, particularly the delinquent ones, owe it to ourselves to do everything in our power to help our children's homes.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to second the Resolution.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg that you now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, this matter is non-contentious and I believe it can be finished by 2.10 p.m.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I am grateful to the hon. member that the other side will not indulge in any long debate on this matter.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one point to this debate, as far as my constituency is concerned, and I speak on behalf of the people of St. Michael South. This supplementary is for outstanding Bills and other matters concerning the Child Care Board. I would like to ask the Minister responsible for Community Services and the Minister of Health to get together to ensure that the children who occupy the Joan Arrundell Home in St. Michael South are not exposed unnecessarily to any illness or disease which may result from the pile up or garbage or refuse near the Home. There may be other day nurseries in this country with similar problems where refuse heaps are located either officially or unofficially near day nurseries. I know that the Minister is interested in the children at the Home and I hope he will get together with the Minister of Health to ensure greater frequency of collection in order to remove any possible threat of illness or disease which may result from the pile-up of refuse.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the hon. member that the walls which are now cracked at the Joan Arrundell Day Nursery – I thought he was going to refer to that – are going to be repaired. As regards the garbage, I cannot assist with that; I have already made my position quite clear. There were two jokers in the Press talking about how I want to bring in the Regiment, but they did not mention that I said I will bring in the youth groups also. But I will show by statistics a little later on that less garbage was collected in this country in 1976 than in 1971 in spite of better working conditions – more money, more equipment and more people. So I hope that the union bosses will stop talking this nonsense about confrontation.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: At this point I must report progress and ask leave to sit again. It has been drawn to my attention....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: It seems to me you want to get up, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I can certainly do that.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir, I know; but I want to assure you that when the union walks around talking about the army and collecting garbage.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us not get into debate about the garbage situation.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I am replying on a matter raised about day nurseries, which come under my control. I have to make sure there is no garbage accumulating around the day nurseries. I am talking on a point first raised by the Ministers.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking; it is not 2.10 p.m. yet. I would like to assure the hon. member for St. Michael South that I have drawn to the attention of the Minister of Health.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member please be seated.

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman has reported progress and has asked leave to sit again. This Sitting is now suspended until 2.45 p.m.
2.05 p.m.

On Resumption:–

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. There are no Questions on the Order Paper, it is now time for Private Members' Business. There is no Private Members' Business.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the suspension this House was in Committee of Supply, to which it now reverts.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. James may continue.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, on the suspension I was making the point that part of the money is going to be spent on the Joan Arrundell Day Nursery, Bagatelle and Belleplaine which are in very bad condition, and we would like to bring them in keeping with the condition which prevails at the other Day Nurseries. What we are concerned with particularly is the quality of the service which is given in the Day Nurseries, we are not as concerned with the building of stone structures, and the Ministry is at this very moment looking at timber structures in the light of the economic situation.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I want to draw to your attention that there is no quorum. Consequently I am suggesting to you that the bell be rung.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There was a quorum when this session started; I did the check myself. Will the hon. member please continue?

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, again I am drawing to your attention that there is no quorum in this Hon. House. Consequently I am asking that the bell be rung.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the bell be rung. *(The Bell was rung.)* The hon. member may continue.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: There are a number of persons who gave their services to this country, and I am also examining the possibility of renaming some of these Day Nurseries. For example, no one can deny the fact that the late Madam Ifill gave yeoman service to the country, and just as we have the John Beckles Day Nursery, I am looking at quite a number of those social workers who made a contribution to the country, and I am thereby supporting the idea that some of those persons should be honoured by renaming all the Day Nurseries. People like Violet Gittens, May Hall, so many of them it is almost impossible.

I would also like to draw to the attention of the Opposition that we have now expanded the old age pension scheme by something like 3,100 more persons who are now receiving old age pensions due to the lowering of the qualifying age from 68 to 65, and we are spending approximately $6 million more on welfare payments in the country as compared with what was being spent in 1971 or 1976. Therefore, when the Leader of the Opposition shouted from the house top about the social services of the country we can stand firmly, well justified of our contribution, since in Barbados there were Day Nurseries long before 1961. We had the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, there were social centres (now called community centres), all of these were part of the political, social and economic transformation of the country.

I would therefore move that Item 9 stand part.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE PROPOSALS IN THE WHITE PAPER ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BARBADOS DEFENCE FORCE

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, after many years the Government has decided that it is time to establish a small but viable regular military force in this country.
2.55 p.m.

I do not want to take hon. members too far into the depths of our history, but recent times have represented practically the only period since our settlement that Barbados has not had a military force that played a significant part in the public life of the country. Those of us who read of the politics of the 1640s and the 1650s will take note that the Leaders of our Defence Force included a Colonel Drax and a Colonel Mofiford, a Colonel Sandiford and others who combined their positions as members of Parliament – I dare say that on research you will even find a Colonel Smith, and that at least I believe that you will find a Lieutenant Smith – persons who were the great country gentlemen, and they stood for election to the House of Assembly and solicited for appointments to the Legislative Council; and they also raised a militia in their parishes. The Cavalry were drawn from among their white indentured servants, and the foot soldiers, also indeed, from among their white indentured servants. The officers were among their sons and the owners of the lesser plantations, and the camp followers of course, from among the ranks of the slaves who in those days were denied the right to serve in an established military force.

The troops that conquered Jamaica in 1665 were for the most part poor white settlers and indentured servants from Barbados, indentured servants who were promised relief from their indenture if they would enroll in the ranks of the Colonial army being raised to take Jamaica from the Spaniards, and the poor whites seeking relief from the land hunger that was evident in our little Island even 323 years ago.

As we go a little further down, the historians among us will remember that Sir Christopher Codrington, was born in what is now the principal's lodge at Codrington College, and was a member of a

family that contributed generally to the British Army in these parts and conquered many of the Leeward Islands in those days, taking them from the Dutch, and I believe the French.

There have been other military names in Barbados. There was a Timothy Thornhill, conqueror of the Leeward Islands in later wars against the French. There was a General Haynes, a member of a well known Barbados family which has given members of Parliament in this House in the life of all of us; but sir, the mould of those days was broken and the days in which Barbados was significant in world affairs, as was New York, indeed more than New York and a great deal more than Canada or any other petty American colony have passed forever; and in the 19th Century because the shift was in the direction of naval power, it was not felt important to raise an army in Barbados.

Of course population shifts have also made a difference. In 1650 Barbados had as many people as London, and was better able to raise an army than London was. The population of Barbados then was 150,000, and the population of the whole of England was perhaps under three million. The population shifts have been considerable since then and we have fortunately become a backwater; because it meant that during the 19th Century there was no need for expenditure on defence matters in Barbados.

In fact, if my memory serves me correctly, the West India Regiment which, unlike regiments raised in the West Indies before, admitted black soldiers to the rank and file. The West India Regiment was paid for from colonial sources, since it was raised for imperial service in Africa, and as I have seen it put by one writer in other distant parts of the far flung Empire. Barbadians and others served with great credit in the Second Battalion of the West India Regiment in many of the small colonial waters in the later part of the 19th Century. They served in the Ashanti wars in Sierra Leone in West Africa. They served in other campaigns because it was correctly felt to be inhospitable to white soldiers from European climates, and they served well indeed.

Their lowly rank would have disqualified them from the award of the Military Cross, and circumstances may have disqualified them from the award of the Victoria Cross; but there is no lack of evidence of the heroism of the citizens of this country – for example of those who were awarded military medals in the Ashanti campaign for acts that we would feel foolhardy today, and ill advised, perhaps in any age, throwing themselves in front of their officers in order to receive the spears of their opponents, and to give up their lives for what they thought appropriate in the circumstances.

We are not planning in this day and age a Defence Force for those purposes. We pay tribute to the members of the West India Regiment who in the first World War went to Egypt and to Palestine and were among the first Christian soldiers to enter Jerusalem for 600 years when it fell in December 1918 to the forces of General Allenby. We pay tribute to the Barbadians, some of whom are still among us, who marched into Jerusalem at that fateful time; and we pay tribute to the soldiers of the Second World War, many of whom are still among us – those who served in the locally raised regiment, including of course the hon. learned and gallant member, the Leader of the Opposition, the member for St. Michael South Central. We pay tribute to all those who have served for no other reasons but the call of duty or the call to the adventure in a military role that was considered appropriate at the time; but our present Defence Force that we hope to establish, and the details of which are contained in the White Paper now before the House, will have a different call to duty, because they will have a different duty arising out of our role as an independent country.

The role which the Minister of Defence is seeking the approval of the House to establish our Defence Force is contained in paragraph 3 of the White Paper. It says: "It will be to assist the civil power (that means the Government) in meeting any threats to national security including any aggression or threats to the security of our port or coast line. It will assist the civil power in the maintenance of law and order."

I hope that that will never arise, certainly at any time when I am Minister of Defence; but we have to be on the safe side. The White Paper goes on to say that it will have to assist the civil power in the event of a national emergency particularly because since we are amalgamating the Coast Guard with the Regiment, the Defence Force will have to provide law enforcement at sea, the survey of coastal and territorial waters and zones as have been designated following the expected passage of the Marine Zones Bill now before the House.

Paragraph (e) also indicates that the purpose of the Defence Force will be that it will be assigned the role of the assistance and maintenance of the central services. I will return to that later in my speech. I have seldom had occasion to wish that Mr. Frank Walcott was still a member of the House; but this would be one occasion if such could be so; because I know his concern about the establishment of the Defence Force, that this is a ground, and a general ground to build a monster within the bosom of the civil power that may some day overwhelm it.

3.05 p.m.

The remaining roles are to assist all government agencies in national development particularly through the training of youth, because it is hoped that the Defence Force will play a major role in youth training schemes now being set out in the country, and also we will be aiming to provide military ceremonial on state and national occasions and to take over such ceremonial duties from other disciplined forces which now perform them. I am emphasising the difference, Sir, between the Defence Force which we propose and former outlets of military activities that have existed in Barbados.

Although the Barbados Volunteer Force, now the Regiment, has also been given the job of assisting the civil power and, perhaps, also assisting in the maintenance of essential services, the conception of the Barbados Volunteer Force has always been, in my view or was always, to provide some supplement to what was known as the Imperial Defence Force. It was conceived within a framework of the entire network of Imperial Defence of the old British Empire in the early 1900s that had not yet reached its greatest extent, but certainly to quote the words of the historian: "Given comprised various portions of the earth and many of the most civilised portions of mankind."

The Barbados Volunteer Force was but a small cog in a wheel that revolved around the world from Australia back to Australia, from Canada to South Africa, through the Pacific back to Canada and having its centre in the British Isles. This is evidenced by the fact that in the First World War when Britain went to war with Germany, the Barbados Volunteer Force became a part of the British West India Regiment that fought in the Middle Eastern Theatre and, indeed, carried out some duties in France. In the second World War the Barbados Volunteers also became part of the Imperial Forces of the South Caribbean Regiment and fought in Italy and carried out defence activities in the Caribbean itself.

It is not intended that the new Defence Force will be in anyway related to any other Defence Forces of a Metropolitan or Imperial nature. Later on I will indicate that we do intend to seek some association, if arrangements can be suitably worked out, with other Defence Forces in the area but, certainly, there is no proposal, or no suggestion, that we would be related to the Military Forces of any other Nation. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to plug in any part of our system to Britain, United States, or Canada, no matter how much assistance in training of a hard-ware nature one can get from those countries. Still less are we going to make the mistake of some developing countries and plug our Defence Force into the system of one of the Communist Countries, because that is one circuit that you never break. In this region it would be Cuba, one presumes, if one would seek out. Cuba is the agency through which the military wish of the Soviet Union is exercised in the Caribbean and, indeed, now we are seeing in Africa. We have not the slightest intention of joining ourselves to any country where this would involve accepting officers from that country exercising most, if not all, of the responsible command positions in our little Army, or exercising authority over vital functions of our little Defence Force such as communications or intelligence.

I would warn all those who seek a leftward path in these matters that even Dr. Castro himself, when he accepted Russian assistance for the Cuban Army, found that in his own Intelligence Department the highest rank that any Cuban Officer held was Major, and the highest rank that any Cuban Officer, whom he could trust, held was Lieutenant. He had to form another Intelligence Division of his own to spy on the Russian dominated DGI, which was the main Intelligence Division of the Cuban Defence Force at that stage. That is a part of the price you have to pay for what they call "Scientific Socialism", but what is really only adherence to communism under a very thinly disguised veil.

Well, we do not plan in anyway to do that. We will not even become a Vietnam and accept Advisers from the Metropolitan countries who will sooner or later come to dominate us. What we want is a small Defence Force devoted to Barbadian principles carrying out Barbadian aspirations, and providing training for Barbadian youths. I emphasise small, Sir. Phase I of the Defence Force whose details will be found in Appendix I Annex 'C', of the White Paper contemplates the employment of 141 Other Ranks and 13 Officers. That is a total of 154 persons in all. That is how many people will be in the Defence Force at its inception. The Headquarters Establishment is intended to embrace 4 Officers and 24 Other Ranks. The Officer in Chief, who will be entitled "Chief of Defence Staff", will be a full Colonel, and it is no secret, Mr. Speaker, that I have already advised His Excellency the Governor-General to promote Colonel Banfield to the rank of full Colonel and he has been so promoted and will, in due course, be designated "Chief of Defence Staff". We may have other legislation before we have the Defence Staff because the present arrangements for the holding of the office of Colonel of the Barbados Regiment are somewhat limited and even for the interim, because of age and qualification, we may have to amend the Barbados Regiment Act. I am announcing as of this stage it is intended that Colonel Banfield will become Chief of Defence Staff and a new Commanding Officer of the Barbados Regiment will, in due course, be appointed.

The Regiment itself is intended to have 3 Officers and 61 Other Ranks. The 61 Other Ranks will, of course Mr. Speaker, not all be men carrying rifles. This will include the entire establishment; the Catering Establishment, the Signals Establishment, the Engineering Establishment, which in our context means those who

repair motor vehicles and will also include, I am certain, Training Officers for special jobs of the education and training of youths.

The Coast Guard, Sir, is projected to have 6 Officers and 56 Other Ranks, but I will say at once that I do not believe there is the trained man-power in Barbados to man a Coast Guard at the level of Lieutenant Commander, Lieutenant, Senior Lieutenant, Lieutenant Junior Grade, and 3 Sub-Lieutenants.
3.15 p.m.

I do not believe that we have the material for this position at the present time, and again I advise the House that it is likely that a non-Barbadian may be appointed as Commander of the Coast Guard. But we are not at this stage going outside the region for such an appointment. This is only tentative, but I think the House should know it at this stage.

Now, Sir, if I can go on to the role of the force in meeting any threat to our national security, as for instance to our ports or coast line. I know it is fashionable in Opposition circles to describe the threat presented by Mr. Sydney Alleyne during September and October, 1976; but the truth is that Mr. Alleyne caused us more embarrassment because there was no way in which we could have called out an army to apprehend even three armed men landing on our shores unless we had declared a state of emergency and asked the Governor-General to embody the Regiment, put it in barracks and treat the situation on an emergency basis. Unless we had declared an actual camp and set up a military post at the point where Mr. Alleyne intended to land, or commandeer the areas on which we had information, there is nothing we could have done except to ask the Police to go there and risk themselves in a role for which they were not prepared. No matter how transitory or unimportant Mr. Alleyne's threats may have seemed to those not on the receiving end, they could only have been met by bringing a sledge hammer to crack what might very well have turned out to be three or four nuts. This state of affairs has occupied the mind of the Government for some time.

Again, I would not hide from you that when we had the Russian aircraft carrier exercising off our coast, accompanied by powerful guided missile cruisers, and we had the information that the vessels appeared hostile since they were jamming the airport radar, under these circumstances we did not even have the means of putting trained manpower on the spot to assess exactly what it was disturbing the peace and quiet of Grantley Adams Airport. We therefore think it necessary to have a small force of persons who can address themselves to problems of this sort. I have not got a figure for the exact rifle strength of the Regiment but there would be no more than 30 or 31 persons whose duties will exclusively be what in military language is referred to as bearing arms in defence of the country. And paragraph 3 of the White Paper which says: "to assist the civil power in maintaining law and order." I sincerely hope we won't have to do that, but it is within the experience of at least one member of this House that this necessity arises from time to time when those who have volunteered for a military role find themselves called out to assist the civil authorities. The hon. member for St. John was called out in 1937 to help put down the riots and he at least will be aware not only of the necessity, but of the compulsion the Government sometimes has to deal with the matter of civil disturbances.

I would like to say, Sir, that this defence Bill has been in preparation for a long time. There are some people whose fulminations and mouthings on political platforms in talking about power make me regard them as persons needing the services of a psychiatrist. They should not, however, flatter themselves in to thinking that it is their activities that have caused this White Paper. I read some time ago where Mr. Gary Husbands, now known as Mohammed Amin Nasser, held a meeting shortly before Christmas in which he informed the crowd of persons present that they should have the right to recall their member of Parliament if they were not satisfied with his performance and that if he did not resign when they called on him to resign then they should kill him. This is what Nasser said just before Christmas, and I must say that even the long-suffering Barbadian crowd realized that they were hearing something that went beyond their good sense and they shouted him down, so much so that the Police thought that perhaps it might be necessary for them to intervene. The crowd shouted down that kind of lunacy, and I think such a person should be in the mad house, for a short period at least, getting some shock treatment to drive such nonsense out of his mind. (I beg pardon of the Minister of Health – I should have said Psychiatric Hospital.)

To continue, I regard paragraph 3(c) as merely an adjunct to 3(b).

To go on to 3(d), concerning the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard will enforce Barbados' maritime laws. It will have power of arrest of vessels outside our immediate coastal waters which may be breaking revenue laws, or vessels which may be arrested under the general law of the sea; it will have powers to enforce such new marine limits as we chose for ourselves in keeping with what is now coming to be accepted in the general law of nations.
3.25 p.m.

In addition, Sir, the Coast Guard will continue its role of air/sea rescue and qualifying of the Grantley Adams International Airport for its international role of receiving wide-bodied aircraft. It may not be

generally known, Sir, but every time a wide-bodied aircraft is going to land at our airport we put one of the Coast Guard vessels at sea to patrol within a certain distance of the airport for the ultimate of safety precaution, Sir. It is very unlikely that there will be a crash or accident at any time, but we wish to give this rescue and air/sea search facility and the Coast Guard is giving it at the present time and will continue to give it in the future.

Fisheries protection. For a long time it appeared that the only work the Coast Guard was doing consisted of rescuing fishing boats. I am glad to say that improved safety measures have resulted in a great reduction in the number of fishing boats that go adrift, and we have not in the Coast Guard had to carry out this role for some time past. However, we will be carrying out the role of fisheries protection and we will be carrying out the role of enforcement of Barbados' fisheries laws. There are fishing boats fishing in waters, I am informed, within 50 nautical miles of Barbados which will come very clearly into our economic zone and the zone within which we can insist on restriction of fishing by non-nationals or by persons to whom licences have not been granted. These boats, we are told, come in the main from Japan and from Korea.

We are giving a warning here and now that when we assume responsibility over a wider economic zone and a wider marine zone, that we will no longer tolerate fishing by non-nationals, we will no longer tolerate the economic exploitation of the waters adjoining Barbados' shores for the benefit of countries other than Barbados. We see absolutely no reason why we should be buying fish caught in our own waters from Japanese sources, whether via Trinidad or elsewhere, where we can establish a fishing industry giving employment to our people and reducing the outflow of foreign funds for this very important item in the diet of the people. This will form a significant part of the Government's fisheries plan now being worked out in collaboration between the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries and the Ministry of Planning of my office.

There is one other matter which I will mention at this stage. I think that it is appropriate that I should inform the House that I have held negotiations with the Premiers of St.Lucia and St. Vincent on the possibility of the formation of some structure of joint Coast Guard facilities between our three territories. The British Government, as being responsible for the external relations of St. Lucia and St. Vincent until such time as they should become independent nations, if they so wish, has also been brought into these negotiations, and plans for fisheries protection are also being pursued jointly with the Governments of St. Lucia and St. Vincent so that any fisheries plan which is eventually evolved may be sufficiently viable, sufficiently embracing as to cover our three territories and also to be meaningful enough in itself to attract overseas assistance for some of the technical aid that we will need, including indeed perhaps, Mr. Speaker, other vessels, other shore equipment and control equipment for the new task.

I have had very harmonious talks with the Governments of St. Lucia and St. Vincent, and I would like publicly to thank the Premiers of the respective territories, the Hon. John Compton and the Hon. Milton Cato, for the ready hearing which they have given to the delegations consisting the Minister of External Affairs, the Permanent Secretary, Defence and Security and myself who have visited their islands on this topic.

The next role of the Barbados Defence Force is envisaged as assistance in the maintenance of essential services. It would be a great temptation to skirt over this and wait and hear what the hon. member for St. Lucy has to say on the subject and then proceed to demolish him, for if as I expect he has been fully and completely briefed by Mr. Frank Walcott, he will say that armies are dangerous in themselves and are a great threat to the political integrity of Third World countries, he will say that the Barbados Workers' Union can never accept any concept of strike breaking or using the troops to put down the workers, and so on and so forth. I am sure he will say all these things, and he can rest assured that there are answers prepared for every argument which he seeks to bring, but I think he should know that there is no intention to use the Defence Force to break strikes as a matter of course.

This is not a country of strikes anyway, Sir, and the reason for this does not only lie in the pliability of employers or the previous political associations of Government and the Barbados Workers' Union, it lies deep in the responsibility of every Barbadian in this country. We are a responsible people and we understand that we cannot afford the social disturbance that violent strikes, that difficult labour relations would engender in this country. I believe – I hope I am not conveying to the hon. member for St. Lucy for the first time that there is a breakdown in the wage negotiations at the Barbados Marketing Corporation – but I want to assure the hon. member that he will get not one penny more than the Government is currently offering, and that if they choose to strike they can strike and the army will not be called out to sell the onions, the clod beef and the other items at the BMC which we observe from GIS are sold cheaper than anywhere else in the island. He can have my assurance on that, that the army will not be called out to break any BMC strike that the Barbados Workers' Union cares to call. We will just shut it down and let things settle. Life will go on despite the Opposition, despite the Barbados Workers' Union in this particular context, and the money we will save from closing down the BMC may very well be of assistance in revising the means test for the old age pensioners.

If he wishes that responsibility, if they wish that responsibility, so be it, but one thing I will say as Minister of Defence, because in the final analysis it is another Ministry responsible for the operations of the BMC, that I can see no circumstances in which I can be persuaded to break any strike at the BMC with the use of a Defence Force. I am giving an example which hon. members can take to heart. The power is needed, but it is not needed as the hon. member may want to suggest in his speech to destroy the workers, it is needed when you have a hurricane, when you have a national disaster, a natural disaster to permit the Regiment to maintain essential services to the people, and I do not want any misrepresentation about this. When you see that the Defence Force will be required to assist in the maintenance of essential services, fundamentally you are thinking about natural disasters.
3.35 p.m.

Now I do not want to hear any nonsense on platforms about strike breaking. I do not want to hear any misrepresenting, irresponsible nonsense about bringing in the Army to keep down the people. We are bringing an Army to help the people. I see the hon. member for St. Michael South pointing to the Clerk of the Chamber. Is cleaning up garbage not dealing with a national disaster? Does he want us to carry typhus and other diseases into the country and all over the country into the Day Nurseries and into the Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

Now, paragraph (f) says: "To assist all Government agencies and national development particularly through the training of youth," and the national scheme, Mr. Speaker, which has two purposes, is already well in the planning stage at the Barbados Regiment. Many secondary schools, not the traditional grammar schools have expressed some interest in the formation of Cadet Corps, and the Regiment is currently carrying out a scheme to bring together a number of youths who are at the secondary schools, plus other persons who are at cadet age; and this scheme will bring them to the Regiment for training in a number of skills, military skills, which will not only be basic skills, but will also include signalling and mechanical skills and other artisan skills, part of the engineering role of the Defence Force; and will also be attempting to instill the spirit of *espirit de corps* and discipline into the youths by means of drilling and communal living and the lectures which they will receive. I do not know when the scheme is planned to start; but it will be, I expect, very shortly. I will be able to get the information for my reply if hon. members want to know.

The training schemes are being worked on in collaboration with the Ministry for Youth Affairs; and announcements in this area will be made in due course; but particularly we want to instill those mechanical and artisan skills which are in short supply in our nation. I have heard some very optimistic words from the Regiment about how long it will take you to create a pioneer corps, a corps of persons skilled in building and construction; and I have given permission for a pilot scheme for the Regiment to carry out its own construction of a new kitchen, dining room and mess hall at the Garrison site.

The Regiment itself will be doing this, and we believe that we will be able to use these artisan schools in carrying on these activities. I may disclose that a pioneer cadet scheme will start in the middle of February. You may ask what models are we using in setting up our Defence Force. The Defence Bill will be laid before the House of Assembly very soon. Reference to Paragraph B of the White Paper will reveal that we have looked at the Jamaica Defence Act, the Trinidad and Tobago Defence Act, the Guyana Defence Ordnance, the Bermuda Defence Act and the British Army Act as interpreted in the British Manual of Military Law.

We will be looking at all of these models and we will of course be establishing full civilian control over the Force. The arrangements for control will be found further in the White Paper. Hon. members will have to look at the provisions dealing with the Defence Force; but to summarise, Sir, the Defence Board will consist of the Prime Minister as Chairman, another Minister, the Chief of Staff of the Force, the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Defence and Security, will control the activities of the entire Defence Force, as well as a person appointed by the Defence Board.

There will also be a Commissions Board which will select officers for commissioning. The Chairman will be the Chief of staff and the members will be Chairman of the Public Service Commission and a member appointed by the Defence Force. I have acquainted the Governor General today – he is familiar with the Bill – and I have fully discussed the matter with him this morning; and Commissions will of course continue to be issued in his name as representative of the Crown.

The details of the Force etc. will be found in the White Paper; but perhaps I should indicate the organisation of the Force. The Force will comprise a headquarters element which will be called the staff element. The headquarters staff will all be stationed at the Garrison at which arrangements are being made to receive officers and other staff. There will also be the Barbados Regiment itself which will also be one of the units; and they will have two regular sub-units. There will be personnel of the Volunteer Force which will include three sub-units or more as required, and will

consist of persons employed outside the Force by other agencies.

The Coast Guard as a unit and hon. members should know that at present all members of the Coast Guard are members of the Barbados Regiment also, and therefore are sworn to military discipline. There is a unit known as the Barbados Volunteer Reserve, comprised of those who do not wish to go into the Force itself, but who will be in the Volunteer Force and will turn out to parades as at present.

There will also be the Cadet Corps which we hope to extend to children of school age. This will form part of our Defence Force. We are also making provision for an air element; but at the present time the air element, such as it is, will be entirely voluntary and will rely on other equipment for any air surveillance as may be necessary. I would like to thank those people who, although the Defence Force is not yet in being, and we can only request them so to do, for voluntarily carrying out a surveillance over the Russian aircraft carrier and attendant cruisers at the time of our little difficulties.

Perhaps again the public should know that we were unable to get any information from those who are our friends and who should be presumed to know exactly what was taking place; and we had to rely for identification of the Russian aircraft carrier voluntarily carried out by persons with no immediate connections with the Government except their patriotism and sense of duty.

3.45 p.m.

As I see it, Sir, this will have to continue to be the case for some time to come. Finance is set out in paragraph 11. The figures have been somewhat revised downwards, but hon. members will understand that to give employment to 141 persons – you may not think of an Army as employing people, Sir, but if it enrols an additional 100 people, the jobs that those people now occupy will have to be filled by others. When you take up 100 people into the Army in effect you are creating 100 vacancies in the ranks of either the employed or the unemployed, both of which are all to the good.

It will be understood that the cost will have to be increased over our present appropriations. I am holding this cost down to a minimum, Mr. Speaker, and it will have one or two useful side effects in other areas. For example, we would be able to release policemen from ceremonial duties for police duties for which they are properly trained. It may also be found that, in carrying out its own Construction Programmes, the Regiment will be saving a good deal of money at the Ministry of Communications and Works, for, with all due respect to my hon. Friend the member for St. Andrew, I believe that if MCW proposed to put up a structure for the Regiment at a cost of $300,000, the Regiment could use its own paid soldiers to do it for, perhaps, and he really must forgive me, but I believe these figures are accurate, $75,000 or $80,000, and I think there will be some saving in this direction also. I think that hon. members will understand, in the circumstances, that you cannot build a house without bricks.

Sir, there are a number of details. For example, we would have to update our weapons. At the present time we are trying to arrange a package deal for bringing our weaponry up to date. Hon. members, who attended the Independence Day parade, will have observed that the modern weapons were insufficient to go around. There really is no point, I think, giving an obsolete 303 rifle to the lady members of the Defence Force and asking them to bear it on their shoulders far less actually putting it to their shoulders and firing in battle, Sir. We must up-date our equipment if we are to have a meaningful Force, and this will cost a relatively small amount of money. This is not a particularly expensive item. It is merely an item that has, perhaps, been overlooked for some time.

We will, Sir, be seeking some assistance for the general upgrading of facilities at St. Ann's Fort, and decisions will very shortly be announced on the future of the Headquarters of the Coast Guard and the areas where the Coast Guard will use as operational Headquarters, and also for the future. Hon. Members will be aware of the terrible White Elephant constructed up at Oistins which is filled in with sand with such persistence as to defy the efforts of even the best-intentioned dredger. We have some investment in other equipment at Oistins, Sir, and we, therefore, cannot altogether envisage the abandonment of the site. A good deal of money has been lost. This Government have, unfortunately, had to write off funds in more than one area. The Government had to write off bad investments of many different characters, but you are assured, Sir, and the House can be assured, that we are not writing off for the sake of writing off.

I should say, in connection with the Coast Guard, that it will take over the marine functions and duties of the Harbour Police, and it will also be taking over as its ceremonial uniform, the uniform of the Harbour Police. There are many sound reasons for this. The Harbour Police have shrunk in number until there are, perhaps, only eleven or twelve Harbour Policemen remaining. The uniform is virtually never seen, and the Harbour Police I do not believe can mount a section on parade. Certainly they have not so mounted a section for many years at Independence Day or other parades, but the symbolism of the uniform itself is not a police symbolism.

Contrary to popular tradition, the Harbour Police uniform is not the uniform that was worn by British

sailors in Nelson's time. British sailors in Nelson's time did not wear uniforms. Officers wore uniforms, and the well-to-do Captain might equip many of the, what are now known as enlisted men in particular jackets and particular breeches and so on, but most British sailors went bare foot in a pair of breeches and what we would call a jersey when it was warm enough – a jersey of miscellaneous pattern – and they might wear serge breeches, sea boots and shapeless upper garments of the nature of a south-wester, Sir, and beret when it was not so warm and they did not, normally, march on parade. It is mere fiction to think that our uniform is a Nelsonian uniform. It is a uniform of a much later stage and essentially it belongs to sailors and not to policemen.

Barbados had no sailors at the time when the Harbour Police were formed, and those were days of great whimsey, Sir. Queen Victoria saw a military parade with Zuaves wearing the costumes of the Algerian desert and she said, "Why can I not have some Zuaves, too?" To oblige her, they put the West India Regiment in Zuave uniforms. There were the nearest soldiers that Queen Victoria had to Africa at that time. It was a time of great whimsey as in the American Civil War when, believe it or not, New York gentlemen, who also liked the Zuave uniforms, went out and bought Zuave uniforms and dressed themselves in and enlisted in the Union Forces. It really was a time when people liked to put on a pretty uniform, and the Harbour Police in Barbados fell into this general pattern and put on a pretty uniform. I do not mean to denigrate the uniform, but that is its origin. Anybody, who looks at the few photographs that exist and the contemporary drawings of the British Navy in the Crimean War and the Union Navy in the American Civil War, will see that they are wearing uniforms right down to the straw hats, practically identical with the Harbour Police uniforms of our time. Therefore, Sir, we feel that when we have Marine Forces that the Marine uniform should be transferred to those Marine Forces.

The Police will continue to have an in shore role and a Port protection role, and I believe that the Attorney-General and the Commissioner of Police are currently engaged in working out new parameters within which Carlisle Bay itself, the actual waters of the Careenage and of the Deep Water Harbour can be patrolled and can be made secure, the yachts surveyed and so on, Sir, under the auspices of the Police. But the Marine role of the protection of Barbados' shores belongs to the Coast Guard. I think I can recall hearing the hon. member for St. John indicating here that the Police only have jurisdiction out to three miles anyhow. Well, the Coast Guard will have such jurisdiction as is given to them by the Law of Nations on the high seas and, certainly, much further out than three miles.

3.55 p.m.

The rest of the Defence White Paper speaks for itself. What I am asking the House to approve is the principle of the establishment of a Defence Force continuing in an accepted form, with the accepted duties of the Barbados Regiment, those duties no wider than what the Regiment was expected to carry out for defence, civil functions, etc. There is also the role of the Coast Guard which will be fully defined for the first time within a proper legal framework which will allow it a scale of less than a 150 persons in a manner appropriate to an independent nation.

One final point: I really do not wish to have anybody suggest that this Force is other than a Force of citizens in harness. We have no intention of creating a militant caste in Barbados or permitting an army which will be allowed to think of itself as an entity with the duty of maintaining law and order. And I say now that we do not wish to bring an army into being to defend the Constitution. The good sense of the people of Barbados is enough for that. I do not intend to use the army as an area for personal aggrandisement or to give the military vanity of any politician a chance to get into uniform. I do not intend to be an Air Marshal, Commodore, Brigadier, Colonel, not even Squadron Leader in any Defence Force. You will not see me in uniform; I can give you that assurance. I know it is a perfectly honourable tradition for some politicians to get into uniform. Again, I hark back to the American civil war when Senators and members of the House of Representatives hastened to get into uniform and become Colonels or officers of other rank. But I do not think that any of us are seeking that kind of pseudo-military recognition, a situation that led to three American Presidents being assassinated. I hope it will be clearly understood that this is a Defence Force for limited purposes, carried on by people who will understand our limited approach to the necessity for a Regiment and Coast Guard.

Sir, the House has given me a long and patient hearing. I will be glad to elucidate any doubts members may have, because I know the White Paper is somewhat complex in its appendices and notes. I hope that in due course we will be able to carry this Resolution and go ahead and have the Defence Force in operation by April 1, along the lines I have indicated, without any division of the House.

If there is an occasion for national unity, the occasion must be when you are setting up a Defence Force for national purposes, and I honestly cannot see anything that can give rise to political partisanship in this matter. I would be surprised if I hear anything along partisan lines which had any substance. And I would pledge to hon. members that if they can show any partisan approach in this matter I will seek to rectify it. I hope the House will give the Resolution a

unanimous passage and endorse the proposals unanimously as an understanding of the Government's sincerity in the matter and its full trust in those to whom the fate of the Defence Force of this country will be entrusted.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, we have been regaled with a very wide ranging discourse on the role of the military in various countries and in the Caribbean, especially the role of the West India Regiment, and in doing so the Prime Minister has displayed a considerable amount of historical knowledge. In the end he put some sugar coating on the matter and appealed for cooperation, national unity and non-division on a matter on which he says there should be unanimity. I regret that on this occasion we will have to disappoint him, because we on this side are going to vote against this Resolution. And I will start at the very first point and set out the reasons why we are going to vote against the Resolution.

There has been talk about non-partisanship, but when we look at the White Paper itself it starts out on a partisan note, not in terms of what it says but what it omitted to say, and there is no greater distortion or twisting of history than when you leave out important facts which should be mentioned in a document such as this. The paper, by reason of sins of omission, has left out a significant part of the history of a Defence Force of this country. That is my first point.

The second point I want to make is this: When we look at the proposals set out in this White Paper, and if my memory serves me correctly the ideas that are set out in this White Paper, 1978 version, are not in fact very far different from the ideas which were circulated for discussion before the Democratic Labour Party left office but on which the final decisions were not taken. So the second point is that these ideas embody to a large extent ideas circulated before, but ideas on which no final decision had been taken.

The third point I want to make – and this is perhaps an even more substantial point – is that in a White Paper setting out background, the purposes, etc., for a Defence Force.....
4.05 p.m.

In a White Paper setting out the background, setting out the purposes and so on for a Defence Force, this particular White Paper is particularly innocent of any philosophy concerning the role that the army should play, or the Defence Force should play in a country such as ours, in a small nation such as ours; no philosophy at all in respect of those matters, the role or an army or a defence force in a country such as ours. The whole question of the *raison d'etre* for such a force – and I will have of course to remind the Prime Minister of some words which he uttered – I think I have a quotation here, Mr. Speaker, 1975, 17th March, and the then Leader of the Opposition is speaking – "we have inherited," he said, "the European concept, and we have for a long period of time applied some good commonsense to that concept, which is that an army is for fighting, and since Barbados does not have to fight we do not need to waste money on an army." We do not need to waste money on an army, but that was.....

Rt. Hon. J, M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, if the hon. member is quoting from a debate, he must state what debate it is. I would like to get it that I can read out the rest of what I said at the time.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure the hon. member will gladly do so.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, these are the Estimates of Monday, 17th March, 1975, House of Assembly Debates, Official Report, and the page is 4726, first column, the last paragraph on the page. "we do not need to waste money on an army."

The fourth point I wish to make – and these are all very substantial points – the fourth point relates to the role that this defence force is to play in respect of the National Cadet Corps, and I would make this point in that regard, that I do not believe that the role as envisaged is the best one as far as the schools in this country are concerned.

The fifth point I wish to make also relates to the role that the defence force has to play in respect of youth camps. I do not believe that these military men should be running the youth programmes in this country, and I say that with very good reason. I do not believe that the military men should be running the youth programmes in this country.

Mr. BRADSHAW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: State your point of order.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Am I hearing that the member for St. Michael South is saying that the Prime Minister said that the role of the defence force will be to assist in the running of the youth camps? If this is so, I am sure I heard the Prime Minister say it would assist, which has a rather different meaning from running.

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The role of a defence force has been one which has caused considerable concern to theorists, politicians and to army men, military men themselves throughout the country, and it is one which this country has now had to face at this particular juncture in its history, and it arises particularly out of our concern for the development of this country, out of our assumption in 1966 of independence in this country, and hence the necessity to make provision for the defence matters of this country. Let no one doubt that we have vital interests to protect in this country. So long as we are a nation, we like all other nations have got to protect what is vital and what concerns our people, and we have got first of all to consider whether this country has value in terms of other countries that there may be some kind of pre-emptive strike if it were felt that some other country might use the facilities of Barbados and the land space of Barbados for some hostile purpose to that country. We sometimes believe that no one is going to attack this country or that we have no enemies, but the motivation which may lead country A to attack country B might not have anything to do with the importance of the particular country as such, but it may be what in that particular trade may be known as a pre-emptive strike.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me get back to the first point I made. I am now going to develop those points I have made and set out the reasons why this Opposition is going to vote against this particular measure. Let me make it clear from the start that it has more to do with what is omitted from this White Paper both in terms of concept and in development of those concepts than with the necessity for a defence force as such, because it would be well realised in this country that it was the Democratic Labour Party Government which took the responsibility of nationhood seriously enough, first of all in 1966 to bring independence to this country in order that development would have been forestalled and upheld by the Opposition elements of that day and the development of this country would have been to that extent held back.

In pursuance of the independence of this country proposals were made and decisions taken to establish the defence force and to establish the coast guard services, and this particular White Paper now merely brings together those two forces into what is known as a defence force. I say that there is some distorted history. The White Paper starts at the year 1977, and it starts with a quotation from the speech delivered by Her Majesty the Queen at the opening of Parliament on 1st November, 1977.
4.15 p.m.

I am submitting that as an important historical document and one which will form part of the records of this country, that a document of such importance should have started at a more appropriate point, either in 1970 when a committee was established to consider the whole question of a Defence Force, or should have made some reference to the fact that this thing has a history other than as one commencing on the 1st November, 1977; and I believe that, contrary to the assertion of the Prime Minister, that this is partizanship in this particular document, and he must take the responsibility for it because I believe and I have every confidence that the Public Officers preparing this Report would have acted under the instructions and directions of General Adams or whatever style he may care to assume – without the uniform of course.

So that is the first point. The Prime Minister comes and appeals for co-operation. He wants the support of the Opposition; but in the very document that he brings to form the basis of the discussions he has forgotten – refused because I do not think that he forgets anything – he has refused to indicate in any way that this has a history behind it, and that it was to the credit of the previous administration that these matters were brought on the agenda for discussion in this country; and to that extent I think that this particular Paper is defective.

I would like to pay a tribute to the members of that Committee and those who have worked subsequently on these very important matters relating to the defence and security of this country for the time and effort which they put into the early elaboration of these proposals; and perhaps I can also take this opportunity now that the Prime Minister has announced that Colonel Banfield will be given promotion and that he will be in charge as Chief of Staff, to offer him my congratulations in anticipation of that particular time. He is a dedicated servant of this country, and I am sure that this is most deserving.

Now the second point that I wish to make follows from the first, because when we look at the proposals that were circulated earlier on, and which, I stress, no final decisions were taken on although they were in an advanced stage of preparation. There is a remarkable similarity between the ideas which were circulated then, and even the appendices which have subsequently emerged – a remarkable similarity between what was set out then and what is set out now. The earlier proposals referred to a Defence Force. It referred to a Headquarters Force. It referred later on – I believe probably about 1972 or so – I am not going back to 1640 or indeed to 1898 or thereabouts when there was a riot in Boscobelle. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that from your study of that particular constituency you will be aware that in 1898 there was a riot in Boscobelle and the Forces of the time had to be called out to quell that particular uprising. Perhaps there was a

fractious nature in that particular part of the vineyard and the necessity for some power to deal with such an uprising. *(Aside:* In 1966 too.) In 1966? Well perhaps you are more qualified to speak on 1966 than I am.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get on with the debate.

Mr. SANDIFORD: It is the cross talk, sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is no time for heavy rollers or light ones.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, your interventions are becoming more and more witty, and I think that it lends a certain quality to our debates here. Nor am I going to speak as the Prime Minister has spoken about the scientific socialists and so on; but you know sometimes these views do not necessarily come from people who are socialists. I am not going to speak about a former representative for St. Lucy who, I believe in the 1900's opposed the establishment of the Volunteer Force. I believe that it was the late Mr. H. W. Reece who opposed the establishment of the Volunteer Force on the grounds that at that time it would be putting arms in the hands of a certain class of people in this country, and the only reason for that would be to oppose another class in this country.

Now, I do not believe that we could even by accident accuse that particular representative of being a proponent of class war. We have had these arguments and men of affairs speculate on these things. Now I am not certain that that would be the stand taken by the current representative of St. Lucy. I am certain that he will oppose, but not on those grounds of fomenting class war; and indeed developments have shown that the fears of the hon. member were at this time misguided.

I believe that it was at the turn of the century – probably the Prime Minister can tell me if this is accurate – it was around 1901 and 1902 when the Barbados Volunteer Force was formed, when the discussion took place in the House of Assembly and Legislative Council on this particular matter; and it is very interesting some of the arguments advanced at that time for the formation of the Volunteer Force and against the formation of such a Force. At that time it was argued – the main argument coming from the Government side at that time was that the Imperial Forces on which Barbados depended for its defence and security would have to be withdrawn from Barbados to be stationed in St. Lucia – I do not recall what the significance of St. Lucia was from a military point of view at that time – but I believe it might have had something to do with St. Lucia as a coaling station.

Between 1901 and 1902 the Imperial Forces were withdrawn, and indeed from 1885 there was a request for Barbados to shoulder some of its defence responsibilities because the Imperial Forces would be withdrawn from Barbados.
4.25 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the hon. member is asking for elucidation, Sir, I will be glad to help him. The occasion of the withdrawing of the British Troops from Barbados and the handing over of Garrison was surely the signing of the *entente cordiale,* because the Garrison in the British West Indies was maintained as defence against the French, and when France and Britain became allies there was no longer a *raison d'etre* and the forces were progressively withdrawn, St. Lucia being the key point that changed hands in every war. If the hon. member thinks about it, he will realise that Barbados was the Headquarters of the British Forces defending the British West Indies against the French. The British were more realistic. The poor French had saddled themselves with a Garrison at Martinique up to this day.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am grateful to the Prime Minister for making that point. I believe if he also researches he will find that there was a reason why they went to St. Lucia. I am more concerned though about argument advanced at that time in relation to the establishment of a Volunteer Force, and there was the argument advanced by the opponents of that Volunteer Force. It was said that it would have been a wiser step to expand the Police Force into a para-military organisation rather than setting up the Volunteer Force. That argument was certainly advanced, and there were persons who were willing to support that particular view to prevent Barbados from getting entangled into the very costly business of having a military establishment, and to expand the Police Force, which it was said in an expanded role would be quite capable of taking care of the internal security of the country. The question was asked: "What, in fact, can a Defence Force or a Volunteer Force – it must have been 100 men that was contemplated at the time – do in terms of any incursion from abroad?

Well, we are in 1978 and the question still has to be asked: What is the importance and significance of the role of a Defence Force either in repelling aggression from outside, or containing any internal uprising? It is a fundamental question; it is a vital question. Why a Defence Force? I am submitting that this particular White Paper is innocent of any exploration or examination of that fundamental question. It is innocent of any argument along those lines, or in support of the need for the establishment of a Defence Force or against such an establishment. The idea has just not been canvassed.

There are countries in the world – I can think particularly of Yugoslavia which in its defence law has set out the purposes and the reasons for the Defence Force.

It, perhaps, goes a little farther than we would wish to go, because it speculates on the whole purpose and nature and reasons for a Defence Force, what type of war can be called a just war and an unjust war, and it goes into the whole question of Colonial oppressors keeping down native populations, Colonial and Imperialists, and it also speaks in terms of cliques within a country keeping down the masses of people in the country. I merely advanced this to show that other countries have actually explored those areas and have thought about them and set them out. Sweden is another country. Indeed, we have the Commonwealth examples here, but we have not gone farther afield, according to the information that has been given to us, to examine the purposes and the reasons for such a Force.

I am submitting, therefore, that this White Paper is very innocent in these regards and, in fact, the White Paper should have set out these areas. I am making this point because I am saying that the contents of the White Paper, what should be in and what should be out, should be the responsibility of those who are the political directors of the Ministries, and I am not in any way at all blaming the public officers for what has been omitted here. Maybe, it should be recalled that one of the points made about that Volunteer Force, to which I referred, at the turn of the century, was that they tried to laugh it to scorn and to say that after the first shot you try to enlist these men; and when the first shot has been heard those volunteers, or those who have been enrolled, would find themselves hiding behind their pailings.

It is one of the rumours in this country that when Barbados had a moment of worry and concern that General Adams took refuge in the Central Police Station. He took up his command post somewhere in the Central Police Station.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In what country?

Mr. SANDIFORD: The country of Barbados. I understood that when the Russian ships were in the area that one General Adams took refuge not out of fear. I am not saying that he was scared – in the Central Police Station. In fact, it took all the wiles of men accustomed to military matters to get him out of there. *(Laughter.)*

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I enjoy a good joke as much as the next man, and I would really like it to go down into the *Official Gazette,* especially if the Reporter included the laughter and merriment that ensued, but I regret that I would really have to put the quietus to a good story. It would be amusing, Sir, and I would laugh, too, but the night of the confusion I never once budged from my house. Senator Trotman and I sat down and drank some liquor, and I spoke to the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister, who, I believe, was mobile and who was, in fact, directing operations from....

Mr. SPEAKER: In fairness to you, Mr. Prime Minister, I do not think the hon. member for St. Michael South was referring to you. *(Laughter.)*

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I would hope he would not mean me, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: He could not have been referring to any hon. member of this House.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It would be a good story because it would show good sense. Go to the place from which you could direct the battle. Unfortunately, Sir, I cannot help him in that. The only time I have ever been to the Control Room at Central Police Station was when the Greek Ship was being bought, and I went to find out how much money had been paid for it, Sir. I have never been in the Control Room before or since.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, we have this Defence Board to be headed by the Prime Minister. Anyway, I do not wish to pursue that particular matter. I am glad for some explanation on that.
4.35 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is that in a matter of this sort, we from the Opposition if being asked for support on a measure such as this would certainly wish to see in a White Paper the whole reason for the Defence Force, and see the philosophy set out in a document of this kind. I think this is the least we could ask from a document of this sort. This is very fundamental because at this time when there is so much speculation and concern about the role of the military in public affairs, when in fact the very concept of defence and security is changing from day to day, what in fact is the nature of defence of an Island such as Barbados? Where may the threats come from? From the South American Continent, the Caribbean Basin itself, or further afield? Where and what type of response should be made to any attack by any person as far as this country is concerned? We would have wished to see some examination of these vital issues. While the Force is out there in the coastal waters trying with whatever type of boats or ships the coastal arm might have, we would like to know exactly the role to be performed in these matters, particularly from a defence point of view. It is only in countries such as Barbados that there is this big secrecy about matters which concern the well-being of all the people. We can look in the learned journals and see the estimated forces of other countries. We can tell which country is capable of developing a nuclear deterrent, we can tell the capacity of various countries. As a responsible Opposition we want to see this set out in the relative documents, and that is the basis of my contention.

We know it is a policy of the Barbados Labour Party – I had better say that it has been set out in the

Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party – that that party will not get involved in the military alliances, or something to that effect. Those who had a hand in drafting that particular document can tell us about it. But if that is so and it still remains the policy of the Barbados Labour Party in Government we would want to know how in fact the defence and security of this country are being maintained without the involvement of alliances with other countries; how in fact is it to be a practical means of defence for this country not to have alliances with other countries. We would have wished to see some examination of this particular matter, but here again the White Paper is silent on these issues. And I think it is not fair or reasonable for the Government to come to this Honourable Chamber after promising a White Paper and after having laboured over it for so long, without all these issues having been examined or dealt with.

The third point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, relates to youth camps or youth training programmes. I hope I have not misinterpreted the intentions of the Government in this regard; and I sincerely hope that it is not the intention of this Defence Force to set up any youth camps or youth corps, or anything of the sort and I am warning the Government not to have that as one of the objectives of the Defence Force. I believe that youth and youth projects and the training and development of youth should remain for general purposes in the hands of the civilian population. I believe, however, that where youth camps are set up or the youth organized into youth corps etc., that as far as discipline or drill and such things are concerned, the instructors of the Defence Force could lend their services at the point where the youth camp or the youth corps may be operating; but I would not like to see youth camps being run by the Defence Force. We have many examples in the international field where a lot of wrong-doing can result from too close identification between the military and youth camps, and so on.

The problem of the Cadet Corps is slightly different. Here again I must confess that the White Paper is again defective to the extent that it really does not explore these issues, and if anyone would do an analysis of the White Paper the truth of the arguments I am advancing would come to mind. It simply asserts that there will be this relationship with the Cadet Corps which would be reorganized, and we have some information this would start by the middle of the coming month.

Now I have never been a military man and have no such aspirations. I have always been a man of peace, and when some of my friends and colleagues at Harrison College and other schools which had a cadet corps would on various occasions be marching around, up and down, trying to learn the elements of precision drilling and map reading etc., I spent my time in the Library reading or listening to music. I have always been afraid of the military and have a healthy respect for them.

4.45 p.m.

I have always been afraid of the military, and I have a healthy respect for them, and the development that I see taking place in certain countries where the military has assumed the ascendant role I think is a warning for any country, particularly a small country, to take note and to take warning. As the man said in song, "you better take warning, you better take warning." It has happened elsewhere and it can happen here, and I have no reason to doubt that if allowed to develop along the lines outlined here that this particular defence force will develop as an elite military establishment, and that the Prime Minister and Minister of Defence will have to think again and rethink this whole issue, because there are no safeguards at all that I can think of to prevent that type of development. It has all of the classic signs about it. A small, tight, highly trained – the Prime Minister will know, he referred to it in 1975 – whether at Sandhurst or the Superior War College of Peru – but wherever they may be trained they are highly trained. The problem will be how to direct those loyalties towards a civil power, and simply saying that the Prime Minister and a Minister will be on this Defence Board – he does not say whether it is the Minister of Labour, you know, it is a Minister – but simply saying that will not solve the problem.

This is a very real danger and a very real fear that I am trying to draw to the attention of this Hon. Chamber, and the fact that these areas which are not debated *in extenso* in this Parliament, and which the Government – not necessarily this Government but previous Governments too – have not been forthcoming in this area does not mean that it is not a real and a vital threat to this country. It will be a new dimension into the public affairs of this country, and it is one that we must take cognisance of.

As far as the Cadet Corps is concerned, it is my feeling, old-fashioned though it may be, but it certainly is my feeling that Cadet Corps should be allowed to develop at the secondary schools. They are certainly enough to permit the formation of companies at those schools, and again the training personnel within the defence force should be able to go to those schools and to provide whatever necessary training may be required in order to expose the young people to elements of defence and civil protection or people protection, or however the problem may be solved. That would be my view, but I am not necessarily advancing that as the solution to the problem, the burden of my contention is and remains that this White Paper should have explored those areas, but here again there is no examination of the alternatives available, the pros and cons as far as the development of the Cadet Corps in this country is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a point in relation to the philosophy relating to this defence force also. I have indicated that it seems to me that it has all the elements of an elite force structure and I believe that

the volunteer element should certainly be bulk larger in the elaboration of this force. My disappointment is that this particular White Paper does not go into these vital and important areas which are of concern to the people of this country. They are certainly of concern to us in the Opposition, and we feel so strongly about it that because of those heavy sins of omission we are going to vote against this particular measure. We are going to vote against it because those points that I have enumerated, six of them, and my colleague the member for St. Lucy will speak on other aspects of this matter, but because these issues have not been examined, the whole philosophy, the reason, the purposes and so on of the defence force, we have done a lot of talking about it but this is the first occasion on which the matter has been set down on paper for the consideration of this Hon. Chamber in this particular way, and I am disappointed that these very vital and fundamental issues have not been explored.

Here again the relationship that should exist between this force and the Royal Barbados Police Force, again the paper is silent on these issues. We can go through this particular document and all of the vital issues of a politico-military concern are hardly explored. If reference is made to them, then it is purely as it were in chest, *en passant.* What the paper is very heavy on, I must say, it is very heavy on accommodation, allowances and perquisites, rations, subsistence, special overseas allowances, travel, medical and dental, pensions and gratuities, clothing, transport and training, civilian personnel, a block vote and so on. It is very heavy in those areas with a number of appendices in those areas, but the very vital and crucial issues which we should be concerned about in the establishment, elaboration and development of this defence force, this paper is silent on and I certainly am in no position to vote affirmatively on this particular Resolution, given the text of this particular White Paper.

Again I make it clear. Those who had responsibility for preparing this paper were acting under the direction and instructions of the Minister responsible for defence, and the Cabinet generally, I believe. I am not blaming the public officers for these grave, heavy omissions, I am blaming those who have the political direction and responsibility for indicating what are the main topics and heads which should go into this particular debate.
4.55 p.m.

I am blaming this on those who have the political direction and responsibility for indicating what are the main topics and heads which will go into this particular unit. As far as costs are concerned, Mr. Speaker, I have every reason to believe that these costs – I do not know how serious the costing is – but I have every reason to believe that very soon if this Force is to have any significance and is really to develop as an effective unit, I am satisfied that the cost as set out here will prove highly inadequate. Barbados does not produce any arms or weapons that I am aware of. There is no ammunition industry as far as I know here. I am unaware of that; and I know that modern equipment being so necessary for a modern Defence Force, I know and you know that those costs are escalating like costs in other areas.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know, I am yet to learn.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. General Adams will speak to you on those matters. Mobility is important for any modern Defence Force; and the cost of equipment, the cost of vehicles, the cost of all the military apparatus represents a very expensive item; and I am certain that this particular costing here is going to prove very inadequate. *(Aside)* How much would you suggest?)

Mr. SPEAKER: There must be no cross talk.

Mr. SANDIFORD: No cross ignorance either. That is what that is.

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that this costing is going to prove highly inadequate; and that is because of the cost of military equipment and military apparatus.....

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

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: The hon. member is saying that the cost as set out in the White Paper is going to be inadequate.

Mr. SPEAKER: He is entitled to say so. No point of order.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: All that I am saying.....

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order. Please take your seat. He is entitled to say so. The hon. member for St. Michael South.

Mr. SANDIFORD: That is the Minister of Ignorance.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: There were two Ministers of Ignorance when they were in the Opposition before there was one on this side.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get on with the debate.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that I do not get any more interruptions from across the floor. I want to indicate, therefore, that we are going to vote against this particular Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: Without repeating yourself.

Mr. SANDIFORD: We are going to vote against it, for the reasons that I have advanced; and Mr. Speaker, we do hope to hear at the end of this debate that it is not being done for any partisan reason; but our position is that there is not sufficient information placed at the disposal – I cannot speak for over there. They know all about it. There is not sufficient information placed in this document which would enable us to come to conclusions on this matter.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I would like to add my little bit to this debate. I do not propose to be as long as the Prime Minister was in introducing this particular measure or as the Hon. member for St. Michael South who spoke first on this side; but certainly when one takes into account the reasons advanced by the member for St. Michael South and what has been outlined in the White Paper, it is fairly obvious that I would vote against this particular Resolution.

I have no doubt that the Prime Minister would have anticipated my position on this to the extent that he invited me to advance the argument which we intended to advance relative to the particular point that I am going to address myself to. In the White Paper, Mr. Speaker, on the first page, there is a section which deals with roles in the first paragraph, and there is a sub-section (e); and that is the one that I would be particularly concerned with; and this is the additional point which the hon. member for St. Michael South referred to. That is, they include this as one of the roles or objectives of the Defence Force; and it is not the kind of position that we on this side could support, that is, the role in the maintenance of essential services.

Now, the hon. Prime Minister in introducing this Resolution used, what is in my view, a lot of coating and white washing in order to make it look as if we are not dealing with what could be a potentially a monster; and if anyone takes into consideration the really serious point made by the Minister of Labour last week, one has got to sit up and take note of the possible use to which the Defence Force can be put; and this is really a serious concern; because when one can hear a Minister who presumably is responsible indicating that in an area of work the Army or the Defence Force could be used in order to get work done, then I think that all reasonable people must sit up and take note and find out the real intentions.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am now warning the hon. member. If the Minister for Labour made a statement last week, it cannot be referred to by any other hon. member in this present session. The Rules are there and they must be learned if you are to conform to the Rules of this honourable House.

Mr. GREAVES: Thank you very much, Speaker; and if I may continue to deal with this particular aspect, one must be concerned about the possible implications of the establishment of the Defence Force. I want, sir, to refer to something that was referred to by the hon. member for St. Michael South earlier on. It is a debate which took place on Monday, the 17th March, 1975, and in the contribution from the then Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for St. Thomas, now Prime Minister – Pages 4726 and 4727.
5.05 p.m.

The hon. member for St. Thomas said:

> "I myself, after the example of Trinidad, am not prepared to believe that there is any country in the world where Army Officers will not get into their heads the idea that they can rule over it better than the people's elected representatives."

Now, when one examines this statement and compares it with some of the things which the Hon. Prime Minister said here today one must wonder. If, on the other hand, he had indicated to us that he had undergone a change of heart since he spoke in 1975, at least, one would have been in a position to understand and to believe the real situation, but with this background it is difficult for us to accept the kind of position which we are hearing being advanced today. If I may go on to quote a little further from that same speech on page 4727, the then member for St. Thomas indicated:

> "I myself would do anything rather than see us having to run about at the behest of soldiers who have substituted Sandhurst or Mons Officer Cadet Training School, or wherever they train them in England for even the Academy of Politics."

I assume he was referring to the Democratic Labour Party's Academy of Politics.

> "I would prefer to think that the Academy of Politics rule us than to think that the graduate of the English Military College, or the American Military College rule us."

As I said, the Prime Minister, who was then Leader of the Opposition, was expressing the real fear we are expressing today. It is no mean concern on our part to be saddled with a Defence Force, bearing in mind the kind of things which can develop in this kind of situation. One only has to take one's lesson from the Caribbean, Mr. Speaker. Look around the Caribbean and examine what is

happening particularly in areas where Defence Forces have been set up, and also in other areas where action has been taken by Defence Forces and Para-Military Forces. I would want to refer, Mr. Speaker, to countries like Antigua, Guyana, Dominica, Trinidad & Tobago, examples which we all know, where the Army, or the Defence Force, has been used to bring force to bear on particular situations. In Antigua, right now, one finds that workers are shut out of the docks there because of some industrial dispute. This is a real fear because what, in truth and in fact, one will find, as indeed also happened in Guyana when the troops were used to break what was an industrial strike, that it caused a lot of trouble. One must, as I have said, take note of these things because what is going to happen in this particular situation is that you are going to use soldiers under a military command with guns to enforce a particular situation or, indeed, to control protests which, in my view, is one of the fundamentals of a democratic state. The right to protest is a fundamental matter and this would be denied.

If we are going to develop our democracy here, as one writer has said, "Democracy is a tender plant; it needs to be nurtured; it needs to be taken care of." I recall reading quite recently, Mr. Speaker, Harold Laski's *Grammar of Politics,* and he indicated:

> "The way to prevent a dislocation is not to prohibit, but to enable those so related to participate in its workings."

He was speaking particularly about the use by the State of the military to enforce particular actions particularly when people are protesting against a particular situation. I think we have to ensure that in setting up a Defence Force this kind of situation is avoided.

Sir, because the Prime Minister gets up and says that the Defence Force, or the Army, would not be used in industrial situations, we cannot take that as gospel. We have heard the Prime Minister making statements in other instances on other occasions and we know the outcome of those things already. Sir, we have to be extremely careful; we have to be wary and to take note of what could very well be a roundabout way of being able to establish what could very well be a Fascist type of rule in this country. We, therefore, must object to this provision in the White Paper.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, speaking personally now that, if a White Paper of this nature had been brought down by the Democratic Labour Party and I was sitting on the back benches, I would have voted against it for the same very reason. I am sure that history may show my displeasure at one or two measures which the Democratic Labour Party brought down and I have voted against. I am saying that this is a dangerous provision within this particular White Paper and it, certainly, cannot get my support even if I follow in the tradition, but obviously for different reasons, which has been established by a former representative of St. Lucy. I am not in any way using him as a model to follow but, certainly, I want to say that I, personally, regard this particular provision as one which is dangerous and obnoxious. We, therefore, cannot support this White Paper and will, obviously, be voting against it.

We must be aware that in a young, developing small country there will be a number of temptations – temptations to enforce unanimity on a number of issues. As I have said already it is the whole essence of democracy. I am sure we would not want to see this country develop into a whole country of yard-fowls, or people who would just agree with everything which the State Authority, or the Government in power, says is the position. We would want to be in a position to question and, indeed, to show our displeasure whensoever the occasion arises by protest. I am saying that when you have this kind of provision in the White Paper which states: "To assist in the maintenance of essential services," and where, for example, "essential services" are not defined, then it is obvious that an essential service can be declared by the stroke of a pen. This is the kind of provision that we are concerned about and we would once more indicate that we cannot support this White Paper.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I shall not be very long, and I mean it this time. There are two provisions in the White Paper that give me some cause for concern. Barbados has been without a Defence Force for all these years since the British Troops left. The Volunteer Act is 1909, and I think it can fairly be said that, for ceremonial purposes and for other purposes which such a Force should serve, the Barbados Regiment has certainly lived up to its reputation as a well-disciplined body and a Force of which all Barbadians can be proud.

5.15 p.m.

Looking at this particular summary in the White Paper – and I endorse everything that both of my colleagues have said, especially what I consider to be a very analytical speech by the hon. member for St. Michael South. I think we would be hard put, apart from political abuse or denigration, to say that his strictures or comments are not relevant. The White Paper itself does not satisfy or give to the general public justification for a Defence Force in 1978, but if the Government decides to set it up, that is their right. But we as citizens of Barbados, not only the Opposition, must make sure that the Force is not likely to follow the example or pattern of some African States or even of a neighbouring state some time ago.

Now, the Defence Board which I assume – it is not spelt out what the Defence Board will be but I imagine it would be a policy making Board to lay down the policy for the Regiment and more or less be the policy making body for the Regiment apart from the powers vested in the Minister of Security. The composition of the Defence Board is as follows – and this is where the danger comes. I am not criticising the Prime Minister, all I am requiring is that in a matter of this nature there should be a broader and greater involvement of the public or of eminent persons in the community.

What is the composition of the Defence Board? I cannot find out what the Defence Board's functions are; I suppose that will be spelt out in the legislation when it comes in the Defence Act. But you get the Prime Minister, and another Minister, the Chief of Staff who is appointed by the Prime Minister, and the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Defence. That is the Defence Board. No independent or impartial person at all on the Defence Board, which means that the Regiment or the nucleus of it can be an instrument of the Government in power. I am not accusing, I am only speaking of the dangers. I am not making reference to the present Prime Minister or to anybody; I am talking about a general rule. The Defence Board consists of two Government Ministers including the Prime Minister, the Chief of Staff who is also going to be appointed by the Prime Minister, the Minister of Defence and Security, and the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Defence and Security. No outstanding, impartial, unconnected persons on the Defence Board. Does the public want this sort of organization in a military establishment? I am not saying there might not be precedent for it in other countries, but I am nothing to do with precedent. I must not be told that because it happened in Jamaica and that this is the composition of the Board in Jamaica, or Guyana or Trinidad it is necessarily good for Barbados, because basically you are dealing with law abiding citizens who for over a hundred years, or at least seventy five years – for the Regiment has just celebrated its 75th anniversary – I as Leader of the Opposition was not invited, but that does not matter, that was only to give you an example of what I thought should be an occasion when there should be no partisanship; but be that as it may, we have just celebrated seventy five years of this distinguished Regiment and without a permanent force, just a volunteer force; now we are saying we want a new force. That is why I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that I am unhappy about the composition of the Defence Board in the absence of uncommitted persons in the community being involved, since the Defence Board which is the policy making body for the Regiment, can be an instrument of the party in power, whether DLP or BLP, and that is what worries me.

Now again, look at the Commissions Force. Again this does not to my mind safeguard officers of the Regiment. You get the Chief of Staff as Chairman – and I am talking about safeguards and impartiality – the Chairman is the Chief of Staff, so he must know who the officers are; he must know who has been commended and who is a good officer and who is a bad officer. He is a human being, so he knows Mr. Jones is a good subaltern and he may know Mr. Jones' father or mother to start with. Not deliberately, because he knows his Regiment, he knows the persons who are to be promoted to lieutenant, captain, major, lieutenant-colonel or whatever. And look at the other members of the Commissions Board. You have the Chairman of the Public Service Commissions who is also appointed by the Prime Minister; you also have to consult the Leader of the Opposition, but that is only consultation, that does not mean anything. Then you have a person appointed by the Defence Board on which two Ministers and the Permanent Secretary sit. So all down the line the hierachy and control of this military force is in the hands of the Government party which is in a position, rightly or wrongly, in cases where they want to use the military for some purpose best known to themselves to so use it.

Now if you are going to set up a force and place all the power in the hands of the Government – I am not talking about the Opposition – if this is to be a military force for the benefit and defence of Barbados and to carry out the purpose as set out in paragraph 3 of the White Paper, then I am saying that both the Defence Board, as well as the Commissions Board, need to be expanded to safeguard and to give to officers the opportunity of getting the impression that they are fair.

The Prime Minister referred to me as the gallant member. I was an officer too, and four weeks after I was in the army the captain who was from an English Regiment and apparently did not like black people, sent in a report to the Commanding Officer that four of us were ignorant, could never make good soldiers, and that we should be kicked out of the army. And I would like to pay tribute to Colonel Banfield who was the training officer at the time; it was a result of Banfield's denying

what this nigger-hating captain was saying that the four officers were able to remain in the force. So you see the danger of having in these positions persons who can exercise their influence in order to get promotion for persons who in fact are not entitled to promotion. And once you get disaffection because a subaltern, major, captain or whatever feels that he has been passed over by the commanding officer or the Chief of Staff or the Commissions Board in terms of promotion, once you get in an army one bad apple who can carry influence with his platoon or section or whatever group of persons he is leading, you have the nucleus of the possible overthrow and indiscipline in the force. I have seen it. If you are a major in charge of a platoon, or a captain or a lieutenant, and the men like you, you give them passes, you are nice to them, and one day you find you are passed over for another lieutenant who is promoted the captain, you go to your men and say: "Boys I should have been captain instead of John Brown." You can get right there and then an allegiance developing among the men and the officer which can be the first seeds of disaffection in any military force. This is my personal knowledge. If you can get on well with troops you can win their allegiance because you are the one who is training them and you have opportunities as an officer to give them an extra pass, an extra day and so on. You have these powers and if you are getting on well with your troops and they are satisfied you are being passed over either by the Commanding officer or somebody, you can get the germ of dis-affection which amazingly can spread throughout the military force. Therefore, to that extent I would like the Prime Minister and Minister of Defence to have a look again at involving – not necessarily the Opposition, I am not making a plea for the Opposition, you are the Government; but rather than place on the Government itself the burden of the Defence Board purely from a political point of view he should involve wherever possible more persons from the community and so satisfy the community that the military force as being set up by the Government is not to be an instrument of the Government but is for the purposes as set out in paragraph 3 of the White Paper.
5.25 p.m.

As I say, this is without any reflection, I am just making a plea for a broader based defence force; not too large, I am not asking that it should be 15, 20 or 10, I am saying it would be in the Government's own interest to satisfy the public, quite apart from two politicians, that a Chief of Staff who would naturally be on it, and the Permanent Secretary who would be the Secretary to it, there is scope in the defence force in Barbados in the Barbadian context where you are entering a new field with the establishment for the first time in 75 years of a permanent defence force of a certain number of men, and I would advise the Prime Minister that he should explain.....

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I was saying, I am asking the Prime Minister in the interest of satisfying the public that the danger of its ever becoming an arm of the ruling party, whether it is you or whether it is us – and I am not arguing now against you, I am arguing that as far as the establishment is concerned, whether we get in in 1981, 1986 or 1991 – it is a bad opportunity, it is a bad precedent to place the running of a military force purely in the hands of politicians without reference to the public.

After all, let us look at the Constitution. If a state of emergency arises, obviously it is the Government that is going to advise the Governor-General to declare a state of emergency under the Act. The Governor General cannot wake up one morning and say he is satisfied that there is a state of emergency and he is going to declare it, he has to act on the advice of his Ministers, and therefore you get the Prime Minister advising an emergency, the Prime Minister is the principal head of the policy-making body of the defence force, which he should be, but with a greater consideration that the public at that level will be satisfied with the use of the defence force, if at all, and for what purpose, at least some person on respect in the body will have been involved in the decision-making and the policy-making for this particular military engagement.

As I say, the hon. member for St. Michael South has argued that this White Paper – the only thing that can be said for it is that it is white – but it seems to me having listened to the Prime Minister in his opening speech, quite a bit of the matters which he explained in his opening speech should have been in the White Paper, because the public would have had an opportunity to obtain this White Paper but they will not, for another six weeks or so, be able to hear what the member for St. Michael South has said or what the Prime Minister has said, and therefore to that extent the contents of the White Paper are of the barest bones which could ever come to Parliament to justify the establishment of a defence force.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, with those reservations, and in support of what my colleagues have said, the Opposition is not going to support this White Paper as it stands.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I understand it, the members on that side are not going to support this Resolution on this White Paper. There are a few facts which have got to be told and there are a few things which have got to be told to the members on that side.

The member for St. Michael South has made a number of points, and in making his points he has made a number of criticisms of his own points. He has indicated that his quarrel with the White Paper and the presentation of this White Paper is mainly because the Prime Minister in introducing this Resolution did not allude, nor did the White Paper allude, to the fact that it was during the regime of the Democratic Labour Party that this particular defence force was thought about. He indicated that as early as 1970 his Government gave consideration to the establishment of a defence force; today, he is saying that he will not support the White Paper which proposes to establish a defence force. I would like him to tell this Hon. Chamber what are the omissions in this White Paper today and what did his party have to say about the defence force in 1970.

Under his regime it was decided to set up a youth camp, and they went as far as to negotiate with Cable & Wireless to use Cable & Wireless' building in St. Philip to have the youths in this country placed there. They took part of the $500,000 that was given to Barbados by the Nigerian Government and they decided to commit part of the $500,000 to purchase the Cable & Wireless building so that they could set up a youth camp. All we are saying today is that we propose, in keeping with their policy of establishing the defence force, to use the defence force to assist the youths who will be in the training camp or the youth camp to acquire skills and discipline; that is all. What is wrong in having people who are well trained and who are skilled and well disciplined to assist the youths in acquiring skills and discipline? There is absolutely nothing wrong, I see nothing wrong with that.

What is important about this particular Resolution is that there is a definite need for us to protect ourselves. We have seen what happened in 1976 and 1977, and every Barbadian knows that all is not well with the defence of this country, and if we had to canvass the country on this particular issue and we feel we are reflecting the views and the feelings of our countrymen that they are in favour of a defence force, no one in this country can question the credibility of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, and I want the member for St. Lucy to understand this now, if he has any doubts about the credibility of the Prime Minister as to what his intentions would be, I want him to understand that I have grave doubts about his credibility or the organisation he represents, because he cannot stand up on the floor of this House and say today that if this particular Resolution was introduced by his party when it was in power that he would have voted against it. I doubt that very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because at no time, from the records of this House, in this country, has the member for St. Lucy ever voted against the Democratic Labour Party when they were in power.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member must not display his ignorance and lack of parliamentary knowledge in this kind of way. That is really a travesty of commonsense he is displaying here.

Mr. BRADSHAW: At least I can choose my words and place them, the hon. member who just got up on a point of order does not know how to place his words; that is the difference between the hon. member and myself. What I am saying is that if history recorded that he has voted against the Government, it was because it was a foregone conclusion, but I doubt very much he would have voted against the Democratic Labour Party when they were in Government, especially on this issue.

What I am saying is this. This is a very serious issue. As early as 1976 during the election campaign I expressed my concern about the establishment of a defence force. I spoke about it, I was very concerned, because at that time it was brought to my knowledge that young boys of the age of 16 were trained to use guns, and I said that openly on political platforms, and there was a fear that the Government then would have established a defence force to destroy the forces of the Opposition, as the member for St. Michael South would have, if I am quoting him correctly.
5.35 p.m.

Mr. BRADSHAW: They were bitterly against the Opposition. They were going to deflate and depressurise the Opposition. So you can see the sort of contempt that they had for the Opposition; and I can assure the Opposition today that it is not the intention of this Government to silence the Opposition, even if at times they talk nonsense and pollute the atmosphere with their nonsense.

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of order. Is the hon. member for St. Michael South East indicating that it is not the intention of the Government to silence the Opposition today when they silenced it only last week?

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will go further and say that the Leader of the Democratic Labour Party, the then Prime Minister accused the Opposition of being malignant and destructive. So you can see that they treated the Opposition with great contempt. I want the country to understand, and I want it to be recorded in this Chamber today that we are listening to the first vice chairman of that party. Those are the people who talked about destroying or getting rid of the Opposition.

Now what is worse, we have seen classic examples of people trying to destroy the democratic principles of this country. We have members of the Opposition party who are reported to have said night after night that they would like to see a change of Government in this country overnight, and that they are banding together to remove a democratically elected Government.

I want to assure this Hon. Chamber that it is not the intention of this Government to silence the Opposition. We welcome the Opposition, although we are doubtful about the strength of the Opposition or their contributions to the debates in this Chamber. There is a need for serious thought about the defence of this country. We have seen a situation where in 1976 arms – and I believe it – arms were consigned for Barbados; and we could see that if those arms were allowed to come here, the destruction and disruption that there could have been in this country.

Not one member of this Government was involved. They cannot deny that members of their party were involved. They have never sought to exonerate members of their party. In fact they have tried to exonerate one or two and forced us to disclose all of them. The time has come when Caribbean countries must protect themselves because we do not know what subversive elements outside of the Caribbean territories exist.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, last year we have seen and we know that Barbados was at panic when it was alleged that ships were seen outside of Barbados; and we were somewhat helpless, having no up to date force to monitor this serious situation. The members of the Opposition should address themselves to this. It is not a question of injecting trivialities about General Adams going to some other place. I have heard or read that small things usually amuse small minds, but this is something serious. We as a Government have to give serious thought to it.

We have decided that it is absolutely necessary for us at this time to establish a Defence Force. The hon. member for St. Michael South has said that the idea was not canvassed. On the other hand, he is saying that as early as 1970 under his administration a Committee was set up on the establishment of a Defence Force. Is that not canvassing the idea of a Defence Force? Perhaps the hon. member for St. Michael South has not seen the White Paper, nor has he heard the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister say that it was under his regime that the talk about a Defence Force came about.

There are a number of changes. We envisage a democratic sort of Defence Force, as against the sort of Defence Force *(Asides).*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

Mr. BRADSHAW: A democratic sort of Defence Force as against the sort of authoritarian Defence Force which they sought to establish. Nowhere in the history of the setting up or management of a Defence Force have you found members of the Opposition sitting on it. What are they asking for? The impossible? You do not have a Defence Force like that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have got to address our minds to the seriousness of this particular White Paper. I am supporting this as it stands because the Defence Force will teach a range of skills and the discipline which is normally associated with a Defence Force will be brought to bear on the up coming generation. I am convinced, and I have said it before, that the young people of this country need direction. They need to be properly disciplined, and they need guidance. I feel that the Defence Force will go along way in helping them to develop themselves, and I am sure that the young people will not object to it either because that is what we in the Barbados Labour Party and the Barbados Labour Party Government envisaged for the good and betterment of young people in this country.

So, we are not looking at it from the partisan idea as the member for St. Michael South would have us believe. We are not asking anyone of them over there to take sides with this Government; and I want to assure him now that we in this Government are not afraid of the forces of the Opposition. We will meet them on any battle field or any platform anywhere at all. We are capable of handling them; but we will not threaten them with what they threatened us in 1976.

In this party, apart from the hon. member for St. Michael West, we do not have anyone with any military training; but the member for St. John and the member for St. Michael South Central, the Leader of the Opposition, had military training; and I am sure that he would be glad, if the opportunity had come for the Defence Force to be established under his regime to become Brigadier Smith or Field Marshal Smith. I want to assure him that he will not have any generalship in this, and neither is the Prime Minister seeking to have that honour bestowed on him.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have got an understanding on this. The Defence Force will consist of a defence and military force and volunteers. We are not having an army as the Opposition would have this country to believe. We do not believe in any army. We came to power through the ballot box, and we do not have use of an army.

5.45 p.m.

We feel that the democratic process is good enough. We do not need any safeguards. We do not believe in the sort of policy as advocated by the Leader of their Party, the member for St. John, who believes in the Nkrumah style and Nkrumah was a dictator, who believes in the Amin style. We do not believe in that. We do not believe in what is being done by the Verwoerds of South Africa who believe in hounding the Black people of South Africa. We do not believe in the philosophy of his Party's Leader or ideas that he should be with Ian Smith No member on this side has ever said that he admires either one of those parties. They have food for thought today. Let them understand that if Barbados has become respected for their democratic principles before, then the people are now beginning to see the true democratic process under the Barbados Labour Party's regime. There is no fear. People are coming here. Cannot you see? What we have to protect ourselves against is the divisive forces which we can point out fingers at within the ranks and hierachy of the Democratic Labour Party. *(Asides.)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please!

Mr. BRADSHAW: Now, as I said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution deserves the support of all conscientious members. They have no valid reason for objecting to support it. As I have said, they are playing their role as an Opposition. They must oppose something, but deep within their heart of hearts they know that this Government is doing the best thing for the country. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I doubt very much if they are conscientious if they vote no. They would like to support the Government, but at this stage they are going through a stage where nobody knows who is the Leader and they are a bit confused. They will oppose it, and that is the safest way out.

Finally, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this measure deserves the support not only of the Opposition, but of the people of Barbados because we feel that the time has come when adequate protection must be given to our citizens and to our shores. We cannot go on forever and ever thinking that what has not happened in a day or a year will not happen in a second or in a minute. We have to take protective measures, and, therefore, I give this measure my wholehearted support. I do hope that all right-thinking and conscientious Barbadians will join with the Prime Minister and all of us on this side and vote for it.

Hon. B. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to make a point which is not connected in anyway with military matters. I do not consider myself competent to make that kind of point. At page 3 of the White Paper, at paragraph or clause 10, when we talk about the Barbados Coast Guard, I am, in fact, rising to seek an assurance from the Minister of Defence about the specific role and function of the Coast Guard. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have had a passing experience with the Barbados Coast Guard which has not been a happy one, and I will not go to the extreme of recalling that experience in here today. It has been recalled elsewhere, but among the specific roles of the Coast Guard, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I had hoped to see separately and clearly spelled out the function of a strike force in the matter of monitoring the pollution of our coastal waters.

We have a severe problem, and it is getting to be a worst problem with oil pollution, Mr. Deputy Speaker. There are international tankers plying up and down the Atlantic Ocean across the Caribbean Sea, and because of our location we are becoming the frequent recipient of oil spill, and oil sometimes in the form of tar balls on our beaches. These tankers are known to wash their bilges well outside our territorial waters but, apparently, a 100 or 200 miles is no distance for oil to travel. Now, oil travels, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the top of the ocean, as I understand it, and I am of the firm belief that the fact that we have had a poor flying fish harvest from time to time during the past six or seven years is not unconnected with the fact that there is a great deal of oil floating around our territorial waters. I think that it is also not unconnected with the fact that it is believed that our coral reefs are endangered by oil pollution, and our tourist industry is endangered by oil pollution when the tar balls reach our beaches, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

In other countries where there are navies – it is true that we do not have a navy, the main functions of the Coast Guard are to do with protection against smuggling, dealings in contrabrand, the protection of fishery, and most important to do with the protection against marine pollution. I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it is so important a matter that it ought to have more specific mention than it has in this White Paper. I see here at (a) that one of the specific roles of the Coast Guard is the law enforcement duties at sea for all Departments of Government as required. I believe that that will cover requirements of the coming Department of the Environment.

I do not know if you realise it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, now as an environmentalist when the Department of the Environment comes, it will share many functions with other Departments of Government. For instance, when there is a spill, or when there is floating oil at sea, before it reaches the beach at the present moment that kind of marine pollution is the concern of the Ministry of Public Health Engineering Department. When the pollution in the form of tar balls or oil actually reaches our beaches, it then falls under the portfolio of the Ministry of Housing and in particular the Parks and Beaches Commission.

Now, the Department of the Environment, it is believed, will have among its functions the care and the policing of our territorial waters. It is true that the Ministry of Public Health Engineering Department will still have an interest in oil and other forms of pollution of marine waters. It is true that the Parks and Beaches Commission will still have an interest in the monitoring of the condition of our beaches, but in most other countries it is often a major function of the Coast Guard to act as a strike force in the event of an oil spill. Often they are mentioned and they play a large part in any Oil Spill Contingency Plan which a country may have. Unfortunately, we do not have one at the moment. It is believed that we are soon going to have a Regional Oil Spill Contingency Plan.
5.55 p.m.

It is believed we are soon going to have a regional oil spill contingency plan. But as far as Barbados is concerned, I would like to be reassured by the Minister of Defence that Item A and perhaps Item B, "Enforcement of marine laws with special reference to safety of life at sea," will be observed. I feel very strongly that the monitoring of oil or other marine pollution should be a major function and that the Coast Guard should be a kind of strike force to protect our economy and environment in this very important matter.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, of the contributions made by all hon. members I would particularly like to thank the last two hon. members who spoke for the very useful, and in one case enlightening, and in the other case important, contribution to this debate. But first I would like to deal with the speech of the hon. member for St. Michael South. I say I would like to deal with it, but really I can't. I have tried to get hold of something that he said to which I could reply, but honestly I am unable to find any matter of substance which he has raised. He said that the White Paper contains omissions of a serious and drastic character which are such as will force him to withhold his support from a national measure of this kind. Well, I have studied the White Papers and other papers going back to 1964 on this subject; previous papers are not available; and I can find nothing in the twelve years of the regime of the Democratic Labour Party which would assist me with the point he is trying to make, and his speech has given me no further assistance.

This matter was being discussed by the Democratic Labour Party in Cabinet almost up to election day, so it should be fresh in the hon. member's mind. It was a matter which was deferred from the old regime into the new, and indeed I deferred it further when I first saw it; I wanted a better analysis than was available in the old dispensation. The only matters which I find that might be said to be omitted that have ever been canvassed in the past are three little sentences that the Defence Force should "provide a source of discipline and skilled manpower; provide assistance and guidance in community youth projects and be a visible example of the development of discipline and loyalty." That is all I can find that has ever divided, as far as I can see, the two approaches in any philosophical way. And I find now that does not divide them, because what is embodied in those three principles has been rejected by the same hon. member for St. Michael South who complains of discipline when he counsels not to use the Defence Force for young people. We have come not to the same conclusion; we are going to use it for youth training. But we have come to a conclusion opposite that which used to be put forward so avidly by Mr. Peter Morgan when he was a member of the Government. You can sum it up by saying that you must take the unemployed into a youth camp and train them by the Defence Force to give them the impression they are doing something. That is roughly what it amounts to, and we do not believe in enshrining such hypocritical principles in the White Paper because we have no intention of trying to train the 10,000 unemployed persons who may be called young people in this Island. That is not what the Defence Force is for. Of course we are going to try to train them but not by trying to take them into the Defence Force. So I cannot concede what other omissions are appropriate.

It may very well be that the Serbs of Yugoslavia regard themselves as the Colonial masters of the moslems of Bosmia and Montenegro and therefore it is necessary to reassure the population of the Yugoslav Federalist Republic that the Government is against colonialism and that the army will be in the vanguard in fighting against colonial domination of one people by another. But I am not aware that Barbados has any colonies or that the public of Barbados requires to have an army justified in terms of colonial oppression, which is what I take the point of the allusion to the Yugoslav army to be. I am not aware that we are a country of disparate languages or different religions, or persons not of the same cultural background because of the size of the country or because of widespread racial, climatic or other conditions that require an army for national purposes as being a national institution to assist with the growth of nationhood. And I am suggesting at the intellectual level to the hon. member for St. Michael South that he really has missed the point; that type of justification is not necessary within the Barbados context. He is seeking the justification of the Germanized armies of Eastern Europe and he is repeating what the thinkers of Eastern Europe have managed to drive into the consciousness of people of those countries. We are not an Austro-Hungarian Empire, where in order to make the people feel wanted you have to develop national institutions, and there are only two national institutions, the Monarchy and the army. They can't teach everybody German, but they can make everybody join the army and learn the 118 German words of

command. Every able-bodied male in the Austro-Hungarian Empire knew at least 118 words of German – that is what they calculated they needed for the army – and military thinkers of that day are the people who designed these philosophies for the army. I do not think they have any place in Barbados. When you read those books you read them as an exercise in historicity; the justification does not even exist today, neither for the Soviet Union nor for the United States. The justification for that type of military thinking as an institution that must be justified to the people in my opinion is no longer valid in this day and age.

What I would really say about the hon. member's speech would be to repeat the criticism of the hon. member for St. Michael South, because in the middle of his speech he indicated that it was something the Democratic Labour Party was doing all these years and now we are doing it. Well, in that case, why can't he vote for it?
6.05 p.m.

If this is the policy of the Democratic Labour Party that we are now carrying on, how has it suddenly become offensive since 1976? Now, I will tell you for a fact some of the differences.

First of all, the speech – it was a pleasure to me, Sir, to hear that debate being quoted, pages 4725, 6 and 7; I always like to read a nice debate in which sensible things have been said, especially a debate which shows up one's political opponents as brutish or ignorant – and I think really on that occasion one person to whom I cannot refer as I suspect is the same person who is still a member of the House, I think he behaved very badly and was very abusive of the hon. member for St. James and others, but I mean the debate is there.

First of all, I have it quoted of me that I said on that occasion that we did not need to waste money on an army. I think the hon. member for St. Michael South should know my speeches better than that. My speeches cannot easily be thrown back in my face, I do not regard consistency as an invariable virtue, I think that if a politician cannot change his views in response to new situations, and that he lacks the flexibility that will enable him to give proper governance to a country – but when I read the speech I had to see that I was speaking of arguments put forward in Barbados in the past and I was discussing it as an argument, I was repeating somebody's argument, and then for two or three columns more I went on to discuss it.

Now, they were the days whenever I got up the then Prime Minister, the hon. member for St. John, used to make sneering references to a paler shade and all sorts of things. If I had to characterise my speech in terms of a popular song, I would have said there were more questions than answers. That was a debate initiated, I believe, by the hon. member for St. James, and he asked when the defence force was going to come about, and when I came to speak I continued and I put questions on the particular point; that was the argument. I said over a long period of time in Barbados that we did not need to waste money on an army, and I questioned what was the need.

On the question about the training, I said do not tell us that you are having an army to train people in electronics, because the polytechnic could turn out one thousand times as many people trained in electronics as the army. All of that will be found in the speech, and the then Leader of the Government, the then Prime Minister, said there were going to be 87 people for the headquarters, that it was to be an army of 450 people in all, and he said how in 1966 at the time of independence there was planned subversion in Independence Square and the Police Force virtually collapsed and he had to take the Regiment down to Independence Square – "I had the Regiment down there, they took the situation unobtrusively and completely in hand, whereas the Barbados Police Force virtually collapsed," and he said in fact that you had to have a defence force to deal with internal subversion. This was an occasion when he said that he did not know any more malignant or subversive people than he had found in the ranks of the Opposition parties. He said there were no more evil thinkers and evil doers than they had in the Opposition party.

All of that we had to put up with in the debate, and then God knows, poor Frank Walcott said how he was against armies and so on, and spoke about events in Trinidad. The hon. member for St. John said that Lieutenant LaSalle and Lieutenant Raffique Shah in the Trinidad revolution who were convicted for treason were now gracing the ranks of the Trade Union Movement, so he shared out some blows all round on that occasion. Frank Walcott was put in his place, because when he tried to say that the two Trinidad boys tried to start the revolution, it was indicated to him that Trade Unionists can organise and overthrow Governments too, because that in fact was what was meant, and he said maybe the army in Barbados will become the training ground for Trade Unionists, without the revolutionary aspect being involved. That is the basis on which the debate was carried on last time.

You may well see that in the face of all that, and being told about malignancy and subversion, that members of the Opposition on that occasion may have had serious doubts about what this defence force of 450 to 500 people was going to do in the hands of the then Prime Minister, and I can see that it was not only members of the Opposition on that occasion, because the present Leader of the Opposition when he spoke indicated quite clearly in cogent, lucid, polite and well reasoned phrases

that control of the defence force is important in a democratic state, and I will deal with his speech.

I do not think I can accede to his plea for widening the defence Board. Indeed, I will let hon. members into a secret. I questioned why the Prime Minister should be Chairman of the Defence Board. I questioned that with my officials and it was indicated to me it just has to be, this is the Board that deals with national security, that whether he is Minister of Defence or not the Prime Minister's place in a matter of emergency is at the head of the Defence Force. That is a matter which I have not sought, it has been specifically put to me by the officials who are there to advise me in this respect, and I do not see that in matters where decisions will have to be taken on defence and security that it is possible to dilute the system of Government and the system of administration by diluting the Defence Board to include persons other than those who have to take and carry out decisions.

It is a small Board, two Ministers, one soldier and one official; a very small one. In the final analysis, Sir, I do not want to become too fanciful in mind, but in the last analysis the President of the United States is the Commander-in-Chief of his armed forces. I am not seeking for that post myself, but he can take charge of the direction in which the armed forces of the United States are seeking to go. He hires Generals, he fires Generals, he hires Admirals, he fires Admirals, and so on, and he chooses as his advisers and National Security Council which consists of two Ministers, – the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defence – sundry soldiers, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and one or two other persons from the defence establishment. There are other democratic controls over the structure of the armed forces in the United States in their terms and conditions of service. There is the House Armed Forces Committee and so on that exercises perhaps closer control over the army than is customary in any country for politicians at large to exercise over defence forces.

In Barbados I suppose we only get it at the time of Estimates, and I am quite prepared to hear submissions when the defence bill comes before the House for such further methods of control as the Opposition may care to put forward, but not control at the operational level of the plans that the defence force makes to defend Barbados internally or externally for any intelligence operation which may be given to the Defence Board or to the Defence Force or for the dispositions of such armed forces as we have in the event of any emergency.
6.15 p.m.

That is no more than there is a Board running the Ministry of Finance than to be a Board running the Ministry of Defence, a Board that is, that goes outside the Minister concerned and his officials. Now, the Commissions Board is a separate matter, and I hearken to the wisdom of the Leader of the Opposition in this particular area, and we may very well consider widening the ambit of the Commissions Board. There have been some proposals on this already. I will raise the matter again with the officials, and perhaps also with the Governor General, since, as I have said, they are granted in his name; and we will investigate the very important power wielded by the Commissions Board since the officers of the Barbados Defence Force will not only be the 13 permanent officers, but there will be perhaps a much larger number of officers in the Volunteer Reserve whom we can call on in times of difficulty – and not even in times of difficulty, but perhaps on Independence Day.

Now, I was a little worried when I heard a reference to elitism, and I heard the remark when the hon. member for St. Michael South East was speaking, asking if we seek to elect the officers. Election of officers has in fact been tried in some armies for different purposes: and it is not even something – I do not mean direct election because I do not think that our society is structured in that way – but some participation of persons who are in the Army in the process of officers election from the bottom rungs to the top it is not impossible that something along those lines could eventually be worked out. I think that "elitism" is an unfortunate expression. The Dinner to which the Leader of the Opposition referred was an example of how far the Barbados Regiment is from elitism – the 75th Anniversary Dinner – for I dare say that.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I was not invited at all. I mentioned the Parade. I am talking about the official parade at the Garrison. I stood up at my gate and watched. I had no invitation for it.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Well, I must tell the hon. member that I cannot say that heads will roll, but I will join with him in saying that that was a grave dereliction of duty on the part of somebody; because I certainly consider that on a military occasion not only would the Leader of the Opposition been invited by virtue of his office, but he should have been invited to come as a Privy Councillor, he should have been invited to come as a member of the House of Assembly, and he should have been invited to come as a former officer of the South Caribbean Regiment; and certainly I will have an enquiry made about that.

I thought that he was speaking of the 75th Anniversary Dinner. A Dinner was held, and at this Dinner representatives of every rank in the Regiment ate with the Colonel, Col. Connell, the Commanding Officer, Col. Banfield, the Chief Justice and the Prime Minister, other officers, former colonels and so on, and it went right down to privates. It went right down to

Cook Privates. Those who cooked also ate. It went right down through the ranks. All of us sat at the tables as part of the Regiment that was celebrating its 75th Anniversary; and as an example of the type of egalitarianism which must inform our society, I was an extremely pleased and proud man that night.

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of elucidation. I do not think that when the term "elitist" was used there was a reference to any type of class separation or anything like that within the ranks of the Defence Force as proposed or in the Regiment. I think it was a reference to the proposed development of a professional class of soldiers as opposed to the rest of the society. It was not meant to have anything to do with the ranks and grades within the Force itself.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I appreciate the distinction. I would refer the hon. member to Mr. Frank Walcott's speech in which he sets out quite clearly and cogently some of the reasons why this elitism developed; and I think that most of those reasons are absent in Barbados. We are not quite like Israel where, as he said quite correctly, perhaps everybody is a soldier. You are a soldier working in an office today, and perhaps driving a tank tomorrow; because virtually the whole population of Israel of military age is in the Army. You cannot go that far where there is positively no elitism because of the nature of the country. Equally you cannot go to the other extreme with the election of officers.

It will perhaps surprise the Leader of the Opposition to know that the Army which had the longest tradition of election of officers was the Prussian Army, particularly the old Prussian Army, in which by the election of officers you could not be an officer in the Potsdame Guard unless you were elected by the other officers; and it used the election of officers of course to ensure that no one who was Jewish and Middle Class and Catholic, unless he was a ruling prince, could enter the officer rank; because the officers simply would not elect anybody who had passed out of Officer Cadet School with a thousand Swords of Honour unless he was a representative of their own very narrow Prussian ruling class. So election does not always result in the best product. Indeed election sometimes results in the very elitism that we are trying to avoid.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I would just like to say that I did mention earlier in the day that on a point of elucidation I was not invited to the 75th Anniversary. I must say that I got an apology which I accepted; but I mentioned it so that it would not happen again in matters like this.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I have a note that the invitation to the Leader of the Opposition to the Parade was to have been delivered to him by hand and it was not delivered. The Commanding Officer apologised in writing and the apology was accepted; but all is well that ends well in those conditions. The main argument to my mind against elitism is the size of the Regiment. A Regiment of seven officers and 60 people really will not have a chance to be elitist, to put down the workers, to put down the Government, or to do any damage. Not the permanent officers of the Regiment. Bear in mind that you are dealing with very small numbers. A regiment of 500 such as was being postulated in 1975 would present some of those considerations for analysis by those responsible; but not such a small number.

The point of the hon. member for the City – I would not call her the Minister on this occasion because Ministers are also members of Parliament – and she was exercising her right to raise a matter on the floor of the House relating to general interests as a politician. She has made a point which of course is also being taken into account by the Coast Guard. We have made more than one enquiry of the Coast Guard where exactly it is these ships clean out their bilges and we have been told that sometimes they may even be outside the 200 mile limit. All that I can say is that the Coast Guard will be equipped with the means to search and do whatever International Law allows to stop the tankers which at present are sluicing out their bilges in such a way as to pollute the beaches of our east and southern coasts.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I really can only say that I have listened carefully to what hon. members have said, and I surely cannot discern any reason why they should not support this. Obviously we do not have to beg, Sir. The Leader of the Opposition has reason to know that I can count; but I would still be glad if hon. members can really look into their hearts and say why are they opposing this. Is it just that you had a meeting last night and decided that you had to vote against it and you do not quite know how to change when you come in here? Because the representative of the workers has been assured that he can go ahead and strike at the B.M.C. without any danger from the Defence Force. I do not know what more assurance he wants. I do not know what more assurance can be given in the circumstances; but he understands what I mean. He knows perfectly well that the question of maintaining essential services is directed at natural disasters.

6.25p.m.

The hon. member for St. Michael South, I think, perhaps is arguing against us a case that he may have argued in the previous regime to a more muted extent and has been less successful there but feels more able to demonstrate his feelings here. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition is not against the establishment of a Defence Force, but I admire his loyalty to the younger and more positive minds in the Party on this area. I suspect really

that when it comes to the point, Sir, you will call for a vote and, perhaps, hon. members will refrain from voting for the Resolution and no more.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. GREAVES: Divide.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

AYES: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; Hon. L. S. CRAIG; Hon. L. R. TULL; Hon. C. L. BOLDEN; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE; Hon. B. A. MILLER; Dr. CHELTENHAM; Mr. WARD; Mr. SISNETT; Mr. JOHNSON; Mr. BRADSHAW, and Mr. ODLE –13.

NOES: Hon. F. G. SMITH; Mr. SANDIFORD, and Mr. GREAVES – 3.

APPROPRIATION (1976–77) BILL, 1978

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Order No. 4 is the next Order of the Day.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this supplements the funds voted for 1976–77 by some $37 million. A good deal of this related to increases in Personal Emoluments. There was an unusually large appropriation. I do not want to start a long debate, but I hope that hon. members and the hon. member for St. Lucy will recall, when he looks at the size of the Supplementary Appropriation for the last Financial Year, $37 million, he will recall that much of it was for Personal Emoluments and, perhaps, he will remember that, according to information made available recently to the National Union of Public Workers, but no doubt made available to him also that Public Officers salaries have, at the lowest levels, since the last Salaries Revision more than kept pace with the cost of living. I just ask him to look at the sum of $37 million and let him recall that the 15% increase that Public Officers got even on the 1st April, 1977 in the lower ranks will, adequately, even by itself have taken care of that. I just throw it out.

I am not saying Sir, that it is a matter of total importance when you consider wages negotiation and wages restraint and so on, but at least he will be deprived of the possibility of saying that since the last wage increase the cost of living has gone up more than Public Officers wages. He will not be able to say that, Sir, on this particular occasion – certainly not in the bottom and the lowermost part of the scale.

Anyway, Sir, having just drawn hon. members' attention to the size of the supplement, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.
6.35 p.m.

Clauses 1 to 4 were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee; Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that concludes the Business of the day and I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 31st January, 1978 at 12 Noon.

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

The motion was carried unanimously and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the Sitting accordingly.
6.45 p.m.