

---

THE

# House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

---

SECOND SESSION 1976 - 81

---

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

*Tuesday, 11th December, 1979.*

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

### PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, J.P. (Speaker); 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 Communications and Works); Hon. H. deB. FORDE, S.C., M.A., LL.B., (Attorney General and Minister of External Affairs); Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD, M.A. (Econ.); 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 Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs); Mr. J. G. ODLE, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. M. C. C. WARD; Mr. V. L. JOHNSON, M.A.; Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW and Mr. L. L. SISNETT.

*Prayers were read.*

### MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, 27th November, 1979.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes be taken as read and subject to observations of any hon. members, that they be entered into the records of the House as correct.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no observations from hon. members the Minutes stand confirmed.

*Dr. HAYNES and Dr. CHELTENHAM entered the Chamber and took their seats.*

## PAPERS LAID

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following.

The Training Report for the year 1978-79.

The Leave Passages (Amendment) Order, 1979 and

The Immigration Forms and Fees Regulations, 1979.

In respect of the third matter, Mr. Speaker, it is one which note should be taken of by the public that Immigration fees would be raised as from next Monday, December 17th, which are going to be gazetted on Monday morning.

The Regulations are dated yesterday, Mr. Speaker, but it is intended that they will take effect from next Monday and any person seeking to obtain work permits or pay for work permits after next Monday will have to pay the increased fees imposed by these Regulations. Generally, Sir, these fees have been free for all Caricom nationals and in one or two categories there have been substantial increases in the fees for professional persons.

Hon. members opposite may not be aware that the rules do permit a Minister to make an explanation about matters he has laid.

I am also commanded to lay the following as Minister of Finance and Planning:-

The Balance Sheet of the Sugar Export Levy Fund as at 31st March, 1979.

Report of the Accountant General for the Financial Year 1978-79.

## GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:—

Resolution to approve the Leave Passages (Amendment) Order, 1979.

Resolution to approve the vesting of land at Wildey, St. Michael, in the Caribbean Development Bank.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$822,558 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1979–80, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1979–80, No. 19, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to give notice of the following:

Resolution to grant the sum of \$3,000,000 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1979–80, Part II — Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1979–80, No. 20, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg your pardon, Sir. With the leave of the House I beg to move that Government Notices be re-opened to permit the giving of the notice of a Bill.

I beg to move that Government Notice be re-opened.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no objection.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Property Transfer Tax Act. 12.25 p.m.

## FIRST READING OF BILLS

*On the separate motion of the Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, the following Bill was read a first time:*

A Bill to amend the Property Transfer Tax Act.

## ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir the reply to Question number 13 is ready.

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is the instant order of the day.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1979–80 NO. 16 —  
HEAD 1 — POST OFFICE

*Item No. 1(a) was called. To move the passing of the Resolution to grant the sum of \$44,579 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Annexed Estimates 1979–80, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1979–80 No. 16, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.*

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: 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 on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.*

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, in the Government Manifesto it was promised that we would extend the Philatelic Bureau of the Post Office and make it into a commercial venture which would meet the needs of stamp collectors not only in Barbados, but around the world. In order to bring our Bureau up to recognised standards the Government obtained the services of a Consultant, Mr. Stubbs through the Ministry of Overseas Development and he was first assigned to Barbados for a period of one year. During that period the Philatelic Bureau has made great strides. He has been engaged in setting up the various operations which are necessary for a Bureau of this class and he has also been training personnel in the Division. He was paid through the British Overseas Development and at the end of one year, it was found that his services would still be needed for another one year period. The Government made the necessary advances to the British Government, they have at the moment, not agreed to extending the services of Mr. Stubbs to the Barbados Post Office for a further year. Negotiations are still going on as to how long Mr. Stubbs will remain in Barbados. The British Post Office has no objection to Mr. Stubbs being in Barbados for one year but it is a question of his salary which brings us before the Chamber today. In order to keep Mr. Stubbs in Barbados, the Government has temporarily approved an appointment of a Philatelic Adviser to the Post Office. The amount set out in the Supplementary Estimates is \$17,078 which is required to pay his salary and part of the sum of \$22,800 to pay allowances which are being paid by O.D.M.

Similarly, there was an agreement between the Government and the Trade Union in respect of allowances for officers who are stationed in the Mail Section at the Grantley Adams International Airport. The Agreement dates back from 1st April, 1979 and a sum of \$4,800 is required to meet the necessary allowances up to the end of the Financial Year. Following upon the extension of the Philatelic Bureau, it became necessary to appoint staff in the Division and the other sum appearing in the Supplementary Estimates, Mr. Chairman, for \$4,690 is required to buy necessary furniture for the Division and I now beg to move that Head 1 Annexed Estimates stand part.

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

*The question that Head 1 Annexed Estimates stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1979-80 No. 18  
AMENDMENT TO THE NOTE TO HEAD  
106 ITEM 1

*Item 1(b) was called: To move the passing of the Resolution to amend the note to Head 106, Item 1; and to grant the sum of \$350,306 from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1979-80, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1979-80, No. 18, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.*

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, Sir, this sum of \$350,306 requested at Item 12 is new. As the Addendum states, it is proposed that this money should be used to implement a project which will help us to place the Family Planning component into the polyclinic network.

12.35 p.m.

The United Nations Fund for Population Activities is a very well known organisation which has been exceedingly useful to Barbados over the years. I do not think there is a full enough understanding in this country of the kind of assistance which the UNFPA has offered us especially in more recent times. For instance, Mr. Chairman, the programme "Understanding" which is sponsored by the Ministry of Community Services is to a very large extent, if not wholly, funded by the United Nations Fund for Population Activities. Apart from this massive grant to us, the one under immediate consideration, at the University of the West Indies Campus at Mona, we have just recently requested, and this came about as a result of a request made by the Barbados Government at the Ministers of Health Conference in St. Kitts in 1977, that in view of the fact that we are planning a national health service for Barbados and bearing in mind the needs not only of Barbados but in the

Caribbean, that the University should look in the direction of a speciality of general practice. It is felt that health care needs to be more community oriented than it has been in past years. This is not something peculiar to Barbados or even peculiar to the Caribbean, Mr. Chairman. This is a universal movement. It turns out that Barbados is ahead in the Caribbean, and certainly with respect to other third world countries Barbados is very far ahead in implementing of this whole concept of community based delivery of health care, and the United Nations Fund for Population Activities has to a large extent funded that new specialty of family or general practice at the University of the West Indies; and so that organisation is a very great friend of Barbados in particular and the Caribbean in general.

This whole project is really part of the phased take over of the clinical service which the Barbados Family Planning Association has offered over the years. The fact is that the clinical service has far outgrown the capability of the Barbados Family Planning Association. The Government is in a position now to give far greater coverage and a more comprehensive service, and just as earlier this year the Government took over the service which the Child Health Committee was offering and has integrated that service into the Polyclinic network, so too we are in the process on a phased basis of taking over the clinical service that the Family Planning Association has been offering over the years. The Barbados Family Planning Association, Mr. Chairman, has now set its sights on a different kind of thrust, the educational aspect of family planning. I believe it is going to be their main emphasis during the decade of the 80s. Like I said, Mr. Chairman, what we are in fact now seeing are very early movements for the fitting of the national health service into place. All of this is part and parcel of the real infrastructure which we will require. We cannot wait until age day or health day to look to put all these services into action; and so on a very planned, organised and phased basis we are putting the infrastructure into this. This money, and I think I need to say this again, is going to be refunded to the Barbados Government by the United Nations Fund for Population Activities. I do not think there is much need for greater explanation.

I beg to move that Head 117 - Ministry of Health and National Insurance - stand part of the Resolution.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, just before we move on, obviously if this money is going to be refunded by the United Nations Fund for Population Activities, it is hardly money that will create any controversy in the spending of it, and I have no quarrel with the Minister's thrust to spread family planning throughout Barbados in any way or method which will redound to the benefit of especially the young people in the community. But in

the course of her presentation of this Resolution, Mr. Chairman, the Minister once again alluded to the National Health Scheme for national health service which we have been hearing about now for some very little time. Before the Government came into power, we heard words about, it, and we have seen it go through a number of different shapes and forms in the process of each different announcement by the Minister regarding this national health scheme. In the meantime, we have heard albeit through the newspapers from the organisation which represents I believe the majority of doctors in Barbados that there is still some difficulty or some lack of communication between the Ministry responsible for health and the doctors themselves, and indeed I believe that I heard the organisation to say at some point that they were unaware of the scheme and how it was intended to implement the scheme or if it was intended to implement the scheme.

The information which reaches me is that the Government engaged the services of an expert, I am going to call him an expert, from the Keyser Foundation who came down to Barbados and after consultation with a few people in Barbados prepared a report, and it is alleged that the report or rather that the man from Keyser in the process of putting together the report apparently did not consult with any organised group of doctors, and I am not in a position to say whether he consulted with any doctor at all. Now I believe that this community is entitled to something more definitive than what we have been getting in the newspapers from time to time. So far, Mr. Chairman, what we have had is the odd announcement by the Minister or somebody connected with the health or para-health services each time he or she was opening some seminar or speaking in some group connected with health services about the National Health Service.

Now, Sir, this Government is into its fourth year of existence. This Government is supposed to be a Government that is capable of planning. The Minister herself just said that this programme is part of a planned, organised and phased basis.

12.45 p.m.

I believe that the time has come when we should hear what it is they intend to do, if they intend to do it, if they can get it done, what are the difficulties, if any, why, is it not free any more, if it is going to be free, and why it is that the doctors of Barbados are at loggerheads with the Ministry of Health in Barbados on this whole question of the bringing in of a National Health Scheme.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not allude to the political statement which has been made from the Government on political platforms in which a very respectable doctor in this community was the butt of some of the worst public abuse that a person could get. I am not going to spend so

much time alluding to that lest I myself get some of this abuse, because that seems to be the fate which greets anyone who would raise any question, legitimate or otherwise, about the national conditions in our present time. But be that as it may, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the Minister in bringing a programme, as long as she is going to mention the National Health Service, ought to apprise us in this community as to where it is, what stage we have reached, when we might expect the implementation, and not let us have during next year, if next year as the hon. member over there has said is election year, if next year is election year we do not wish to have this thing thrust upon us like water trying to get through a funnel that is too small, saying that they have the National Health Service at last because somebody announced that they have it. If indeed it requires a phased implementation, let us get some details about some of the phases at least so we can make some intelligent appraisal of the programme to see if the programme is any improvement on the health facilities which the Government found in Barbados. Let us see, for example, how the deployment of the polyclinics in this country will bear relation to the availability of general practitioners, let us know if they intend to recruit general practitioners on a mass basis from outside the country, or if we have enough in Barbados and what is the attitude of the general practitioners, because Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that any National Health Scheme which is to be implemented can only be implemented by and with the assistance of especially the general practitioners in this country.

I would issue warning to the Government that unless they intend to seek the co-operation of the doctors in this community, no one will believe them when they say they have a National Health Scheme that will be an improvement on what we have in Barbados already.

Mr. Chairman, I may have a couple other questions to ask, but I think at this point I should allow the Minister or other members to raise any questions they have, or for the Minister to answer any points on this matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does any other hon. member wish to make a contribution? In which case, I shall ask the Hon. Minister to reply.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. Michael South West has clearly been — and it came out of his own mouth — listening to gossip and rumour. We heard about what was alleged and what he saw in the paper and what he did not see in the paper, we heard about what doctors are supposed to have told him, a lot of hearsay. If the hon. member had consulted his two doctor colleagues he might have been a little more informed, because together with many other members of the medical profession the two doctor colleagues of the hon. member on the other side have been exceedingly co-operative during the course of the last year with the Minis-

try of Health, so the fact that you are uninformed is your own fault.

Now, we have to get it quite, quite clear, Mr. Chairman. When the Democratic Labour Party Government came into office in 1961 they came and found not any survey or feasibility study or any idea about a National Insurance Scheme, they came and found a plan ready to go into operation; all systems were ready for go, and yet it took that administration the best part of four or five years to actually implement the National Insurance Scheme, and with national insurance you are only dealing with maybe 80 or 90 thousand workers in Barbados at any given time. When we are planning for a National Health Service we are planning for every Barbadian, every man, every woman, every child, every new baby born today, we are planning for life. The Cabinet of the Barbados Labour Party, the supporters of the Barbados Labour Party, the people of Barbados are not running my blood to water to bring any slipshod National Health Service to them. I want to get it clear that this is a service and not a scheme. The National Insurance is a scheme where you pay money and you get money back out. The difference with the health benefit in that scheme which is going to be the National Health Service is that it will be a service that you offer people, you will not put in your money, your contribution to the National Health Scheme and get money to go and pay the doctor and the druggist, we are actually providing a service and we are providing a service for life, we are planning for life. We are not planning for 1981 or for the year 2000, we are planning for life, and it takes time.

It is true that pronouncements are made from time to time and I am trying my best to keep the people in this country informed. They see us putting down a network of polyclinics, I am telling people and explaining to people wherever I go that this is part of the infrastructure of the National Health Service. They see and they hear, and I have repeated it already here today, that manpower surveys, training of the manpower and womanpower which we will need for the National Health Service is underway. The Health Sciences Division of the Community College is doing its job, the University of the West Indies in two years finds it possible to put a specialty of general practice on the ground. I have appealed, and I will use this opportunity yet again, Mr. Chairman, to appeal to the people in Barbados to get themselves registered in the current registration exercise, because it is important in the whole business of empanelling people. Every single store in Barbados has to be put on a doctor's panel, it is not going to happen in a day or a week or a month, it is going to take time, and the more people who are into the new registration system early the more easy it will be for us to empanel people. The new number is very important, confidentiality in the delivery of health care is very important.

All of these things are possible, and slowly we are putting the foundation into place. I know that hon.

members and the Barbadian public are anxious to see walls going up. Perhaps I can take the opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to say that the final report from the consultants, Keyser, is currently being printed and I hope that by December 21, which is the date of delivery, I will be in a position for the Cabinet and a few weeks later interested groups such as the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners to have this end document. Implementation is to start in January 1980. A huge public relations programme has got to be undertaken, people have got to be educated about what they must do and what services are going to be available to them. Even now in Barbados today they are many services which are available to people in Health and they are not fully utilised simply because people do not understand how to take advantage of them, or in some cases people do not know that these services are available. All of that has got to happen.

I hear a lot of talk about the doctors, all I know is that I am in consultation with the medical profession, with the nursing profession with the para-medicals like any other allied professions, including the pharmacists, I see that the doctors are in the process of forming themselves into a Trade Union. Mr. Chairman, I can only assume that the doctors are forming a Union because they are preparing to negotiate terms and conditions of service with the National Health Service with the Government. Why else would they be forming themselves into a Trade Union?

12.55 p.m.

I have no quarrel with that. I am glad that they too are getting into it and these are all of the indicators which must tell you and tell the Barbadian public that the whole thing is beginning to jig.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have said it on the Floor of this Honourable House and I am going to say it again. When consultations were first engaged by this Government with respect to the National Health Service I was told that I was talking about a 10-year plan. I told them that I had a mandate to deliver it in five years and I intend to deliver it in five years. Mr. Chairman, I have never failed the Barbados Labour Party or the people of Barbados in any such promise that I have made to have something done but it will take time.

I think we are moving at a good pace. I think, as we will hear later on today, on another matter on this Floor today, Mr. Chairman, Sir, that we have been a little ahead on our own schedule but it has got to be properly done because as I said what we are planning is for life.

I beg to move that Head 117 stand part.

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

## HEAD 106 – DEFENCE AND SECURITY

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is a very simple matter. There is a vote for the purchase of vehicles under Head 106 for the Barbados Defence Force. I have forgotten exactly which vehicles are mentioned. I do not have the Estimates before me but I am quite sure that the hon. member for St. Michael South who is anxious to talk about tractor vehicles and other mechanical instruments of war is fully familiar with the note and nobody has leaked the contents of his brief to me, Sir, nor was I listening when it was being discussed in the Opposition's Office, Sir. Nobody has leaked any of that by way of photocopy or documents. I might have been told, but nobody has sent me any documents.

Nonetheless, the fact is that we wish to purchase a Mercedes Bus. A Mercedes Chassis is available and we wish to convert it. It will not only be used for defence purposes, Sir, but it is also intended to make it available when it is not used directly for the transporting of troops by the Ministry of Education to take school parties around on site visits, visits to the Museums, Parks, the geographic areas, Scotland District and so on. We are hoping that the bus would stand up to this kind of strain and it may find itself pressed into service, perhaps for the House of Assembly if it makes another visit to the Scotland District. If there is any particular development in Barbados, it will be used for that.

It is intended to convert this bus to a high standard and to make it available for troop transportation as well as civil purposes which I have outlined. I have the details, I think. I am trying to see if I have the exact details, Sir. The hon. member wants me to tell him exactly the details whether we are having plastic moulded seats, whether we have carpeting and so on? Do I have a Chassis number? Do I hear the hon. member for St. Lucy asking for a Chassis Number? The chassis number is 081113? If hon members want to know the chassis number.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: We have a contract from the Acme Manufacturing Co. for conversion of the bus. It is planned to have the conversion done later.

I beg to move that the Note be amended.

Mr. BRADSHAW: I beg to second that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the explanation which has been given by the hon. Minister is at complete variance with the Addendum to this Resolution.

In the first place, if you look at the Estimates for 1978/79 and you look at the Addendum to the Resolution, one wonders why this matter came before the House

at all. First, let me go to the source. In the Estimates for 1978/79 the sum of \$1,780,000.00 was voted for the purpose of Defence and Security and this provided for the following items which the Prime Minister has obviously forgotten or was not given the information before he came in here.

The Note has in 9 Items. I should like to go through the Items which were provided for at that time. I said 1978/79 Estimates. It is 1978/79 Estimates. These are the true Estimates, not the draft Estimates. These are my final copy of the true Estimates which I keep here. Incidentally, this is the only document which has not been removed by persons unknown from my cupboard here and I made a complaint to the Clerk. I still have to get an explanation from the Clerk of the House why documents which have been left here by me have been removed either by Mr. Best or some other person, whoever he is.

Now this marginal Note to Head 106, and there is only one Note, says that this sum of money, \$1,750,000.00 provides for the purchase of vehicles as follows:-

- (1) Motorcycles
- (2) Trailers
- (3) Ambulance
- (4) Armoured Security Vehicles
- (5) Land Rovers
- (6) Trucks
- (7) Airplanes (Token)
- (8) Ships (Token)

Now he seeks to add another Item which is Item No. 9. When we look at Item 1, Head 106 in the Addendum to the Resolution, this is what it says: "Provision in the Estimates under the vote for the purchase of vehicles did not include a Mercedes Benz bus." That is true. "It is considered that the acquisition of a bus would greatly facilitate members of the Defence Force in transporting supplies to the St. Lucy depot. This Resolution therefore seeks to amend the Note in the Estimates so as to allow for the purchase of a Mercedes Benz Bus."

Nowhere in this Addendum, we are so particular in amending marginal notes that we come here to amend a note to purchase a bus to transport supplies and obviously my answer to that is that it would be completely unnecessary to buy a Mercedes Bus or to convert a Mercedes Bus to transport supplies because we voted \$1,750,000.00 of which \$330,020 was for the purpose of vehicles which included the purchase of trucks.

1.05 p.m.

Therefore if you want to transport supplies, my argument is that trucks are the proper method of transportation for supplies and not a bus. I am going further than that, unless we have a Defence Force which is being mollycoddled. Having served in the Barbados Regiment, two Cadet Corps in this country, at Combermere and

Harrison College, and having served for 7 years in the Royal Air Force, I have never seen any military establishment, apart from the Barbados Police Band – who have very delicate instruments – provided with any form of bus transport with carpeting as the Prime Minister has told us today. Even for troops, you do not mollicoddle troops and put them in buses so that they could drive down to St. Lucy when they are going on duty. You should be honest enough to say in the Estimates that you are going to provide a bus so that members of Parliament can go on excursions to the Soil Conservation Scheme in St. Andrew. Now, we hear it is for visits for school children to the Museum and all kinds of frivolous explanations being given which are not consistent with the explanation being given in the explanatory note which we are so meticulous in amending. It is completely out of keeping and in conflict with the amendment which we are making to the marginal note. That is what I want to say about that.

I do not agree with the purchase of any bus for transporting supplies or troops. Number 1, if it is for supplies, you do not have any right giving tins of corned beef a ride in a bus with plastic seats because they will mash up the seats. Number 2, if it is for troops, you will be mollicoddling the troops. They should do what I had to do even as an Officer of the Royal Air Force. Sit down on some hard boards in a truck and get to your station or your dispersal point of the aircraft. Even as an Officer I had to ride in a 3 tunnel truck from the mesh 3 or 4 miles away hanging over the tail board and some of them did not come back. The Prime Minister talking about laying wreaths. I had to be hanging over a tail board and now they are going down to St. Lucy to pick wilts or something down there and they are to be driving in a bus. What is happening down in St. Lucy? We never had any buses. Why are we so soft nowadays?

I am coming to much more serious matters. Under Defence and Security we have aeroplanes and ships. We are sending people now out of this jurisdiction altogether, not to St. Lucy. My reading of the Defence Act is a very simple reading: "The Defence Board may, with the consent of an officer or soldier, place him at the disposal of the military authorities of any country or territory for the purpose of his being attached to the armed forces of that country or territory." That is Section 8(2).

Section 7 reads: "The Governor-General may at any time order that the whole or any part of the Barbados Defence Force shall be employed outside Barbados; but no officer or soldier of the Barbados Defence Force Reserve is liable to be employed outside Barbados unless –

- (a) he is an officer or soldier who was transferred from the regular Force to the Reserve; or

- (b) he has entered into an agreement in writing accepting such a liability."

I was informed by no less a person than the Chairman of the Defence Force without going into details of the communication and I read in the newspaper, that Barbadians were sent to safeguard against foreign aggression in a foreign country. There is no provision, I respectfully submit, for that to be done and this is a very dangerous precedent which is taking place. I also heard a statement made that the St. Vincent Labour Party and the governing Party of Barbados have been close friends for a long time and therefore it must be taken that on a political level, they must come to one another's assistance.

I was in Trinidad two weeks ago, Sir, and Mr. Gairy made a complaint that he had been close to the Barbados Labour Party. He had done everything he could to support the Barbados Labour Party against the Democratic Labour Party and in his hour of need, he received no assistance from the Barbados Labour Party. No statement has been made supportive of Mr. Gairy or condemnatory of Mr. Gairy by the present Prime Minister or the Government or any Government Member. The general public in Barbados is anxious to know why it is that young Barbadians are being picked up, first to go and disturb some rastas down in St. Peter and now in Union Island. The interesting thing about it is this, Sir. That is no foreign invasion.

The Prime Minister of St. Vincent and the Grenadines has made one excursion, certainly up to two years ago and he was over 50 years of age, Sir. He had never been to Union Island and to the best of my knowledge, information and belief he never went to Union Island. Yet, Barbadians are going down there to defend an invasion on Union Island. The only time in his life that he crossed the Bequia channel is when I took him. I persuaded him to forget Mitchell, because this is part of your territory and you must come and go and see what the Grenadines are like and I took him and showed him where I thought the airport should be built. He is so unconcerned about the Grenadines and we are picking up young Barbadian soldiers and sending them off against some foreign alarm and excursion about some invasion that has never taken place. We are very concerned in Barbados about this. I question the legality of the whole operation. Others may have something to say on it.

I want to come back to my main stricture against the explanation given by the Prime Minister and the Addendum to the Resolution. The Resolution says that we are buying a bus. We do not know if the bus is in Barbados, outside of Barbados or in the high seas. The bus is to transport supplies to St. Lucy, yet we hear that they are going to put in seats in the bus and we hear contrary to what is given in the Explanatory Note that it is to carry school children to the Museum, M.P's possibly to

the Scotland District and so on. I do not think that the Prime Minister could be serious if he has not made up his mind what this bus is for and the next thing you know is that they will be putting floats on the bus with some paddles and send the bus down to Union Island with the Defence Force on the bus with a big steam engine behind it. You have trucks already provided for \$330,020, eight different categories also aeroplanes and ships to transport supplies not only within the jurisdiction, but outside the jurisdiction as well. You can send anything anywhere or anybody anywhere with the supplies which the House granted at the passing of the Estimates earlier this year. Now, we are getting a bus, a Mercedes Benz. He specified the type of bus, mind you, to go to St. Lucy and carry supplies and we are told today that it is for transporting school children to the Museum. This is a Museum piece then. The whole thing sounds like a big overgrown joke. This is not a serious Resolution at all, but there are more serious matters which others might have to speak on.

1.15 p.m.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, the proposed amendment to this note I would think would have some bearing on the analysis or expenditure on the page opposite page 15 in the Barbados Estimates 1979-80. We would like to know what effect the inclusion of this bus would have on the breakdown of expenditure in the Approved Estimates for this financial year, because under that analysis of expenditure we had \$330,020 for the purchase of vehicles, \$750,000 for construction and improvement to property, \$629,980 for plant and equipment and \$40,000 for furniture, fixtures and fittings, and certainly we would like to know whether the motor cycles or trailers or ambulances will not be bought this financial year or whether we are foregoing the armoured security vehicle or the landrovers, because we have the same amount of money but now we have additional demands and charges against that amount of money. The money has not increased but the items which are to be purchased under that Head have increased. So we would like to know whether we are not going to have aeroplanes or if we are going to have any aeroplanes or are they going to be cheaper aeroplanes and ships. This is a very serious matter, Mr. Chairman, because every additional dollar that we spend on guns there is a reduction in the amount of money that may be available for butter in this country. It is a question of guns or butter, and there has been a substantial increase in the outlay for defence and security in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I think this Parliament and this country are being treated very badly as far as placing information before this Honourable Chamber is concerned. Here there is a very important issue concerning the disposition of the defence forces of this country outside of Barbados and I would have thought on the very first occasion that that had taken place that the Minister responsible for Defence and Security would

have taken the opportunity to tell the representatives of the people assembled in Parliament the reason why young Barbadians have been assembled and transported..... I do not know whether the take off point was Grantley Adams International Airport, and how they could have gone through a whole ceremony for the opening of that airport without mentioning the sterling and preparatory work of the former Minister of Civil Aviation, the Rt. Hon. Errol Walton Barrow, the hon. member for St. John. How that could have happened..... (*Asides*) You had to look to see if he was present before you could give praise to where praise was due. It was most ungracious. This Parliament is being treated very shabbily as far as information of this sort is concerned, and it is time that the Government recognises that Parliament is the place for important announcements concerning the development and concerning the security of this country and concerning important national affairs, and I take the Government to task and the Minister in particular on this occasion — I am talking about the Prime Minister and Minister responsible for Defence and Security.

Even when he was introducing this Resolution he said nothing of the fact that you have troops of the Barbados Defence Force down in St. Vincent. I do not know how they got up to Grantley Adams International Airport. I do not think they have a Mercedes Benz bus converted or otherwise in the Defence Force, and I would like to know therefore if the purpose of this bus is to facilitate the transport of units of the Defence Force or troops of the Defence Force to points of departure from this Island in order to underpin any secret defence pact or agreement which may have been entered into or which may be about to be entered upon and of which this Parliament has not been given any information, whether it is the purpose of this particular bus to facilitate that type of transportation. I am saying that this country is due a full explanation of the use and disposition of these troops. We have not had it yet.

I heard that upon the elections in St. Vincent being determined that a member of the personal staff of the Prime Minister was despatched with a personal hand-written message to the Prime Minister of St. Vincent and the Grenadines. I may have something more to say about that on another occasion, but some of my supporters and persons in this country have been asking whether that despatch to deliver a message of congratulations was paid for by the taxpayers of this country or out of the ample coffers of the Barbados Labour Party. That is what people in this country would like to know. I am not against the personal staff delivering personal congratulations of political events and political victories. That is all right, and there is nothing wrong with that, but we want to know whether that bill and that trip was at the expense of the taxpayers of Barbados or at the expense of those who fund the Barbados Labour Party.

1.25 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, we would like to know under whose command the troops of the Barbados Defence Force are currently placed if they are still in St. Vincent. We would like to know if they are coming under the command of the Officer Commanding the Forces of St. Vincent and the Grenadines or if they are under the command of some officer of the Defence Force. What is exactly the position in respect of our young men in St. Vincent? There is a considerable degree of opposition to this particular deployment of the young Barbadian soldiers in St. Vincent; people are dissatisfied with that particular move by the Government, and to this date there has been no clear explanation as to the reason for that move, no explanation for it, the place for an explanation is on the floor of the House and if we are going to treat important national issues in this cavalier manner — and I charge that it is a cavalier manner — national issues, most important issues, the representatives of the people are assembled here now and not one word to the parliamentarians on this particular matter.

It affects the security of this country that units of the Barbados Defence Force are out of the country. Any deployment of troops outside of the country must affect in some way the security of the country and our security here, and I think that it is not less than shameful that far from making a statement on the matter, when the opportunity is given to introduce a matter we hear about chassis number 081113 or some number for an old Mercedes Benz bus. Mr. Chairman, we have to be very serious about our politics. We have been promised a Select Committee on External Affairs and we are waiting for that particular measure to be introduced in Parliament. Here we have a matter, the people are entitled to know about these matters.

Mr. Chairman, I was taking some notes here, I heard there is a quotation from Atlee on this conversion, and I don't think we were given the cost of that particular conversion, even in this particular situation. We are not even given vital information when the matter is introduced here. I believe the Government realises that this is a very sensitive matter. Why must Barbadian young people go down in a case of internal problems in a country? The British, as far as the media have reported or not reported, apparently the British have not responded by sending any troops. The British, of course, are the departing colonial power and we would have thought that they would have a particular interest in this matter. The Americans, according to what the media have reported or not reported, no response in terms of the despatch of troops. Oil rich Trinidad which has a much more powerful military outfit, Jamaica, Guyana, none of these countries has responded in terms of this internal breach of law and order, because that is what it is, and none of them has responded to any call, but Barbados now is entering into the sphere of military pacts and

military alliances and the despatch of troops... (A VOICE: Buying buses.) Yes, buying buses, the buses have to be part of this apparently because they have to be transported. I do not know whether they will have any security in the buses, whether any guns or any other type of equipment, any armoury will be on this bus to defend them from any attacks which they may encounter, I don't know.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that this country has been badly served. The Government has been making some very serious errors as far as the administration of national affairs in this country is concerned, and this is one of the big errors that it has made. I think it shows a lack of concern, a lack of sensitivity in terms of this matter, and if this is how the Prime Minister and Minister of Defence is going to respond to issues when they come up we will have to question whether the Government have the necessary balance and the necessary equanimity of mind to deal with national issues when they arise, because this shows bad judgment in prematurely and on insufficient information and an insufficient data base. I do not know if they were in a situation room, if the Chairman of the Defence Board and the other members of the Defence Board went into the situation room....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your time is coming up.

Mr. SANDIFORD: My time is coming up? I do not know if they went into the situation room and had all the information fed into their computers and whatever else — their brains would have been inadequate to analyse it, that is clear — it is clear that their brains would have been inadequate to analyse the situation and to make a proper response. It is the wrong response at the wrong time to a wrong situation.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, today we are being asked to provide additional sums of money for a purpose — the diversion of a sum of money for a purpose which is clearly questionable based on the disparity between the presentation by the Minister responsible for Defence and Security and the note attached here. However, Mr. Chairman, I wish to make it absolutely clear and to restate my position again and again that I am against the frittering away of the slender resources of this country on expenditure of this nature.  
1.35 p.m.

I believe that the people of Barbados in supporting the Barbados Labour Party at the last General Elections responding to the pledge which they made on Page 22, of that Manifesto in which they stated in no uncertain terms that "there would be no need to maintain any Standing Army or other Defence Force." That is a clear statement on Page 22 of the Barbados Labour Party Manifesto.

There would be no need "to maintain any Standing Army or other Defence Force" and I believe that my view represents the views of the vast majority of people in Barbados who are interested in a diet of bread, in a diet of rice, in a diet of chicken legs and not interested in a diet of bullets.

Starting off from that position, I can only find myself in opposition in dealing with this particular matter. Indeed, of even greater concern to me, is the fact that one has been unable to ascertain from the Government of this country whether they intend to establish an Air Force, an Air Wing of the Defence Force or for what purpose.

Every attempt to extract this kind of information from the Government, although a Token Provision has been made for the purchase of an aircraft has been met with obstruction even to the extent of the hon. Leader of the House making out a further claim that I could not refer to the Estimates, a document of this House.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: This is ostensibly a reflection on the Leader of the House, and in fact, a reflection on the Chair because the Chair ruled that the hon. member on an earlier occasion could not then, on the matter under discussion deal with an airplane. If the hon. member wants to hear about an airplane, he can hear all there is to hear about it today.

The hon. member must understand that he is not in the Nursery now. He cannot have things done at his dictation. He must abide by the rules and deal with things in a proper way at the proper time and in the proper manner. If he wants to ask about the airplane, and he is eager for the airplane vote now, let him ask everything he wants to ask about it and he will be told.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, this reckless error by the Government in despatching Barbadians to St. Vincent is nothing more than a culmination of a series of events which have been tantamount to blatant interference in the political affairs of several Eastern Caribbean countries by the Barbados Labour Party Government and it was almost inevitable that this would take place.

It is equally scandalous that this Government could take a decision on the assumption that there was a foreign invasion of the State of St. Vincent and the Grenadines and based on that mis-information they despatched our troops with no proper assessment of the dangers to which they would have been exposed in the event that there was a foreign invasion, no knowledge of how many people were involved, no knowledge of how many aircraft were involved by the so-called enemy to

discover what? To discover that there were a few Rastas in Union Island.

Our troops are now deployed at Arnosvale Airport behind sand bags and the Vincentians are making sport at them. I heard a tape, Mr. Chairman, and I felt badly about it, where the residents of Kingstown were telling our soldiers that they can give them cou-cou but they must shoot the flying fish.

Mr. Chairman, this situation has reached a ridiculous point where the St. Vincent Police Force are announcing that we have our troops in there because they felt they were competent to deal with this matter as a Police matter and they did it with great effectiveness. They had no difficulty in controlling the 13 Rastas, 7 of whom ran away immediately, one of them got shot by accident and arrested the 5 Rastas and we have our troops parked off down there at Arnosvale.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that I must articulate the demands of every single responsible Barbadian and demand that those troops be returned to Barbados immediately. This is a dangerous ball game. Barbados cannot find itself as a Policeman for the Eastern Caribbean. This is a bad principle which has been established. It cannot find itself as a Policeman for the Eastern Caribbean because it can only do this with the benevolent guidance of the CIA and the US Government and there will be a backlash.

You cannot send troops — no matter what kind of instructions you give them about not getting involved in hostilities, that is a bunch of nonsense. If troops are there and they are attacked they have to defend themselves. Just think of the position that this country would be in today if a single Vincentian citizen, if one was shot by a Barbadian soldier, even by accident, in a situation where the Vincentians and where the Commissioner of Police and the Police Authorities are satisfied that there was no need to have any foreign troops on their soil.

The people of St. Vincent are a proud people. They have just attained Independence and they do not wish that their independence should be compromised by the imperialistic design of Emperor Thomas or whoever he might be. I do not know where his Josephine is. I do not know whether it is Thomas. I do not know. It cannot be Napoleon, it will have to be Thomas. Emperor Thomas. They are not interested in having their State taken over by any Imperial powers nor has Barbados got the resources to carry this kind of exercise.

Mr. Chairman, this vote, this money, this diversion relating to the transporting of troops may well be to facilitate exercises of this kind in the future.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: A Mercedes Bus?

Dr. HAYNES: A Mercedes Bus unless there is a secret airstrip down in St. Lucy. One does not know. The way how things are going as far as informing the public and Parliament about the state of Defence and Security and the uses of Defence Personnel, there may well be an airstrip going up down there. We do not know what is going on. Nobody knows what is going on in respect of Defence and Security except his Imperial Majesty Thomas.

I tell you Mr. Chairman, it is also a reflection of the confusion in Government where some aspects of Foreign Affairs originating with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and in certain Caribbean Islands, personal arrangements originating in another office.

I have told the Hon. Minister responsible for External Affairs on the Floor of this House that he must take charge of what he is responsible for because I cannot think, judging from the legal opinions that I have heard expressed, I could not think that as a distinguished and eloquent Lawyer that he would not have known that there was not a legal basis for sending those troops into a foreign country.  
1.45 p.m.

All I am saying is that the legal opinion available to me is that there is no good, legal basis for sending troops into the Independent State of St. Vincent and the Grenadines. You can have your legal opinion, we have good legal opinion over here. What is more important is the principle behind the matter. If you start off in a position that you can send troops into an Independent country in a situation where there is civil unrest that could be controlled by the Police, what stops any country from sending troops into Barbados on a similar situation. There is only one international law unless you talk about the law of the Ayatollah and the law of the rest of the world. There is one general consensus in relation to the morals of international law. If you see yourself as taking a position in international affairs similar to the Ayatollah that is your business. I, as a Barbadian, must be concerned, Mr. Chairman when we find ourselves sending troops into an Independent country and directly interfering with the affairs of that particular country because sooner or later, there will be a backlash. Other countries in the Eastern Caribbean may well feel that they have a right to interfere in the domestic affairs of this country either militarily or otherwise and indeed, you might find that the equipment used for intervention in Barbados might not be owned by those particular countries but we might find ourselves being invaded, or might find interventions being made in our domestic affairs with the arms of some of the super powers in this world being used. I will go no further. It is a dangerous precedent and once again I am calling upon the Govern-

ment to make sure that those Barbadian troops are returned to this soil as soon as possible.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I have a few things to say on this matter. I am reading from the same document which my colleague quoted Sir. At page 22 of the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party it says: "Defence and Security". "Barbados should have no territorial ambition while recognising its crucial geographical significance to the Inter-American and Latin American continent. There is no reason why Barbados should attract foreign intervention. The Party will not commit our country to any foreign defence pact internally. The defence forces will be limited to such as are necessary to maintain Law and order" Presumably, Mr. Chairman, that means maintain law and order in Barbados and then they went on: "There will be no need to maintain any standing army or defence force. Externally the Party will work towards the elimination of all armaments of war and the achievement of social peace".

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order. I am sure that he will make it a document of this House Sir.

Mr. TAITT: If the Honourable Attorney-General were not intending to waste time, as a responsible Minister and Attorney-General he would have been aware that this document is already and has been a document of this House along with the brilliant Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member has assured me that such a worthwhile and valuable document is in the records of this House for posterity to judge its value, then I am satisfied Sir. I do not insist on my point of order.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, while we are discussing serious matters pertaining to life and death, we have the Attorney-General, not some little snub-nosed back bencher. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. TAITT: I could not possibly mean the Honourable Member for St. Philip North. His nose could not be described as snub, although his colleagues to the right or left may have, Sir, but Mr. Chairman a little clemency will relieve the tension which some of us feel about this very serious matter. I do not believe that the Attorney-General can feel comfortable that Barbados took up troops, they cannot be described as volunteers. They cannot be described as anything but troops. When the United States sent troops into Vietnam we said it was imperialism that they were imperialists. That caused confusion in the world for the last 20 years.

Now, Sir, in the Caribbean we have a Caribbean Community Treaty which requires that we do everything possible to maintain friendly relations between our Caribbean brothers and sisters. Mr. Chairman, I am submitting that the sending of Barbadian troops on so slim evidence as has been vouchsafed to us ordinary citizens in the Union Island situation is a betrayal of the trust which the people put in the Government of the Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. Chairman, I recall when the Honourable Member for St. Philip North was sitting in that Chair during the night of Estimates when that particular item was pushed through. The first 4 parts of the item passed through like grease at 10.30 p.m. in the night, Sir until my colleague the Honourable Member for St. Lucy, realising that something was up said to me "get up to stop this item from passing through without debate". We wondered then at the strange attitude of the Government of wanting to pass this Head, Defence and Security without debate. I recall then, Sir, in dealing with this Head, the Honourable Member for St. Philip North was in the Chair and I attempted to read a newspaper article against the rules of the House in which it had been said that the former Prime Minister of Great Britain had stopped off in the Caribbean to discuss, with the Prime Minister of Barbados and other Premiers of the region, various and sundry concepts of the Defence Pact. The Honourable Member stopped me from reading that newspaper article because he said that while what I was saying may very well be true, it was not allowed under the rules of the House. That newspaper article was vigorously denied by the Government.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, I never said to the Honourable Member that while what was being said in the article is true.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking to the Honourable Member for St. Philip North Central. I have not even mentioned him yet. I have not got to him yet. Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member stopped me because he was properly and correctly not allowing me to interfere with the rules of the House. He was stopping me from reading the material from the newspaper. He was stopping me from reading it into the debate, Sir. You will recall, Sir, it was the Daily Express. You were out of the country but I believe Sir you were.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the Honourable Member reflecting on a ruling of the Chair?

Mr. TAITT: The Honourable Member was so equitable when he sat in that Honourable Chair that he reminded me of you, Sir. I mean in so far as your fair ruling is concerned.

1.55 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I recall that we sought via the usual routes that we use in Parliament to get the substance of that report into the debate because we were concerned then as we are concerned now as to whether in truth and in fact the former Prime Minister of Great Britain had induced or coerced or suggested to the Prime Ministers and Premiers in the Eastern Caribbean that they should have some mutual defence pact. Here it is now we wake up and discover in the newspapers that the Minister of Defence and Security for Barbados has despatched troops to Union Island and even the people in St. Vincent did not know what was going on.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member must really not recite facts that are not facts. No newspaper report that I have seen said that any troops went to Union Island. Naturally no troops have been sent to Union Island and if the hon. member has information that I do not have, I would be glad if he would produce the newspaper that said so.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, it is just like saying that St. Lucy is not part of Barbados.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

*Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.*

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman has reported progress and asked for leave to sit again.

#### SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: The time is now 2 o'clock. This sitting now stands suspended until 2.45 p.m. today.

#### *On Resumption:*

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

#### QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question time.

Parliamentary Question No. 13 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Michael South, whom I do not now see in his place.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg that the reply be laid.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the reply be laid.

This brings us to the end of Question Time.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now time for Private Members' Business.

Item No. 1 stands in the name of the hon. member for Christ Church East whom I do not now see in his place.

Item No. 2 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Lucy, to move the passing of a Resolution calling upon Government to take steps to ensure that the bus service in St. Lucy is improved without delay.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, by now I am sure that the members of this Chamber are very much aware of the problems which I highlighted relating to the crisis in public transportation in this country when I gave notice of this Resolution on the 6th November. Ever since that date there has been a public discussion and indeed public expression of disgust at what turned out to be a very appalling and disgraceful situation in public transport.

On 6th November, Mr. Speaker, when I introduced this Resolution in Parliament, there was no doubt that this was a matter which was of utmost concern to the people of this country. It was a matter which indeed and which still needs the urgent attention of Government. That is my contention; and more specifically my Resolution deal with the problems which were experienced by people who have to rely on the public transport in the constituency which I have the honour to represent. I could have included the constituency of St. Peter also for the simple reason that there are two contiguous constituencies, and knowing large numbers of people from that constituency and they knowing me have also expressed their absolute disgust at the very serious problems which they have to experience in this matter.  
2.50 p.m.

I could recall, Mr. Speaker, in July 1978 the then Minister of Communications and Works making a boast about how good the transportation system in Barbados was. Indeed, he indicated at that time that we had the best transportation system in the Caribbean and attributed this of course to the work of the supposedly Great Combination, the so-called Great Combination. At that time nobody, even him, attempted to give any indication or indeed try to suggest that the Democratic Labour Party had laid any such foundation, but quite recently the Prime Minister as reported in the Press, now that the public transportation system is in a chaotic and disgraceful state, is seeking to say that it was as a result of decisions which were taken by the Democratic Labour Party that we now have this disgraceful transportation system. I think that this is, in my view, an attempt by the Government as is its usual fashion to shift blame on to the shoulders of the Democratic Labour Party, and whereas this is not a matter

which concerns, let us say, the Democratic Labour Party or the Barbados Labour Party as separate and distinct parties, what I would like to say is that this is a matter which is of the utmost concern to all Barbadians, and I believe that it is this kind of problem — and I am sure that this kind of problem exists in every constituency in each parish.

Now I have often been accused of canvassing the causes of the people of St. Lucy too much in this Chamber, but I would like to let hon. members know that I have no apologies to make for that and any opportunity I get to represent the interest of my constituents I will do so with all the enthusiasm and with all the courage that I possess and I do not, as I say, have to apologise to anybody for that matter, and as long as the people of St. Lucy experience difficulties and problems in the area of public transport I will certainly be airing these matters here in this House.

I would also like to say that I am very critical of the Government in this because I think that it is as a direct result of the bad planning, a direct result of the very, what shall I say, the incompetence on the part of the Minister and his directions that we are now saddled with this very tragic and serious transportation situation in this country thereby affecting in a very personal way those constituents of mine who have to rely on public transport.

I would like to say at this stage that this is a Resolution which is critical of the Government, and I am quite aware of what the rules are, and the Prime Minister or any other Minister would have the right of final reply, of course once I am guaranteed as I am sure I will be under your able and expert guidance.

Mr. SPEAKER: I might tell the hon. member, what makes it critical of the Government is what the hon. member might now say.

Mr. GREAVES: Now, I am sure that you, Mr. Speaker, like all hon. members would have heard the complaints from time to time which people have expressed regarding public transportation in this country. It seems to me that one of the crucial areas in this matter relate to the way in which the public transportation is arranged, or indeed the way in which it becomes disorganised at peak hours when people really need the service. There is no point in telling any person who has to travel to and from work by bus that they can get a bus at 10 or 11 o'clock at night. That is of no particular value to any person who has to rely on this service to get to and from work.

What we are concerned about is that we would like to see a better arrangement made for those people who have to be travelling at peak hours. Now, let us take the situation in reverse, Mr. Speaker, first. Where people who are working in Bridgetown or have to use the service from Bridgetown and have to go to St. Lucy, the first problem which they encounter, as I said, is that there too few buses

which are available. As a result of that you get all sorts of pushing and scrambling in the bus stand in order to get on the buses, and people only push and shove because of the uncertainty which exists in the public transportation system, and it is no mean sport if you have let us say to be travelling to Josey Hill or to Pie Corner or to Connell Town or any of the distant parts of St. Lucy to be faced with a situation where if you miss the bus which goes through then you might very well have to wait until 7 or 8 o'clock at night, and there are literally scores of people, bus loads of people who are forced into this situation where sometimes you have to be waiting in the bus stand for three or four hours after they have completed work in order to get transportation home. This in my view is very bad, it demonstrates very clearly the total lack of planning on the part of the Government, and this is why I consider that it is of utmost importance and this is why I consider that it is an urgent matter, and I would like to think that the Government would regard the situation and treat the situation in that manner.

I am told that even from the Speightstown bus stand where at one time, I think it was something like 30 buses used to operate from that area, now my information is that there are only about 21, so that with a growing population using the public transportation system you find that there is a reduction of the number of buses on the route with a consequential reduction both for St. Peter and for St. Lucy. I think that this is something which we have got to pay some urgent attention to, and I would urge the Government to pay some attention in this area because it is very difficult for people who have to travel long distances to travel in this kind of area of uncertainty, and obviously when people get home they are tired and unable to make proper preparations so as to get themselves ready for the next day, and these kinds of frustrations, Mr. Speaker, I am submitting do have an effect on the ability of persons to produce, and generally speaking they do have an effect on the general well being of the person.

There are certain psychological factors which we have to take into consideration here, and if this is applied to those children who have to use the school buses a similar situation obtains where again there have to be long waits and often when they reach home they are very tired and unable to do their homework. These are some of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why I found it necessary on the 6th November to seek the attention of the House to have this matter discussed.

But let us move on to some of the other reasons as to why this is a matter that needs some attention, and let us take it now from the situation where people begin journeys. I know for a fact that people from St. Lucy who have to reach work at 8 o'clock in the morning or half past eight have to do one of three things. In the first place, people from Pie Corner or from Rockfield or Bishop's Tenantry have sometimes to get up about half past four to five

o'clock in the morning and walk up to Date Tree Hill where the bus begins its journey in order to get on the bus so that they would be able to get to work by that means, and failing that if they wait at the normal bus stops then the bus is going to pass them because it is full, and this creates some very serious problems for them, so it means that they will have to take a later bus which might very well mean that they would be getting to work late and would run the risk of being dismissed from their jobs for constant late arrival which is not a fault of their own.  
3.00 p.m.

In this kind of situation it is even sometimes difficult to argue a case for that.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, you will find that some people have to catch the bus on its way up and so they have to involve themselves in paying two busfares. They catch the bus going up so as to get a seat coming back down.

When you get that kind of situation existing, it is really scandalous particularly for people who are living in the furthest parts of the island and where they are forced to involve themselves in expenditures over and above what they should be involving themselves in and furthermore, when they cannot get the kind of service which as taxpayers in my view and in their view they are entitled to.

It seems to me, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the Government should look at this matter in as realistic a manner as possible. I recall last week when there was a debate on transport I mentioned that some urgent steps should be taken and I would reiterate this to have a large number of buses to put on the route as soon as possible. If it means that they would have to be imported, ready done, then let that be, if that is the quickest means.

I heard the Prime Minister on the Radio the other day, which in my view was a chastisement of me for saying this matter here but he indicated that he had bought something like 80 new buses or something like this. I would hope that if this is really and truly the Government's plan that some attention would be put to the constituency of St. Lucy because the population has been growing in that constituency and you can see it very clearly from the kind of pattern which has developed in the use of the public transport.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there no family planning in St. Lucy?

Mr. GREAVES: I am sure there must be. As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the population has been growing in a very interesting kind of way. If you look at the way in which the routes go, you will find that particularly in the Half Moon Fort/Checker Hall and Crab Hill area, you will find that there is a definite building of the population there and particularly on that route, when the bus leaves Connell Town on mornings or anytime, what you will find

is by the time the bus reaches Checker Hall it very often cannot pick up anybody else because it is already full.

Crab Hill/Half Moon Fort/Checker Hall are areas of high population concentration. It would seem to me that what is really necessary is to, as it were, run some short routes, and I do not see it beyond the capacity of the Government to run a route beginning in Crab Hill and going through Checker Hall and Half Moon Fort. In this way, the Connell Town Bus would be able to move through and if there are any extras pick them up, but certainly, that bulge inside there would be taken care of.

The same thing could happen, in my view, as far as the Checker Hall area is concerned. That would also alleviate the problem which is experienced in the Checker Hall route. What happens also, particularly coming from Bridgetown, what you find is that sometimes after the bus passes these areas, when a large number of people get out that there is room in the bus, but yet there are people who have been left in the bus stands who are from the extremities of these routes.

In my view it needs much more detailed planning and I would hope that this is done and that more buses would be put on those routes soon to relieve this problem. When I say that this is a matter which is of some concern, I am sure, or at least I hope that the Government would appreciate the points which I have made and the issues which I have highlighted here, the difficulties which the constituents and the people of St. Lucy are experiencing in the area.

As I have said, I know that this is a matter which not only concerns them but I know it is a matter which concerns people in other constituencies because of the problems they have been experiencing. As I said, I represent St. Lucy and I think it is my duty to bring their problems to this Chamber and therefore with these few remarks I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to say a few words when I find out if the speaker is working. It is working now, Sir. Mr. Speaker, in rising to second this Resolution, I do not believe that it is necessary to make a long statement since this Honourable House recently had the opportunity to hear the views of a number of members on the transportation system.

What I do hope is that the hon. members on the other side are taking the trouble to hear the view indeed of the travelling public on this question of the provision of an adequate bus service. Mr. Speaker, the public transportation system is something that requires not a great deal of imagination as to what it should be. Primarily a transportation system is to provide efficient, comfortable and relatively cheap transportation for the majority of the

citizens of the community and any Government must be informed by those principles if it would seek to run a proper bus service.

Now, Sir, the tendency has been to blame the Transport Board for most of the ills of the transportation system, but, Mr. Speaker, our system of Government is very clear in this respect and I think that a full share of the blame must fall squarely at the feet of the particular Minister responsible for transportation at any given time in this country.

It is ironic, Mr. Speaker, that we had a Minister who, when he was responsible for agriculture, Sir, and within 18 months to two years, agriculture as an institutional organisation in Barbados seemed to have disintegrated. The same Minister now, Sir, appears to have responsibility and I believe has responsibility for transportation.

It is indeed not co-incidental that the transportation system of which so much hope was expressed earlier in the life of the Government and for which in at least in one section of the community I am told that the transportation system was so efficient, and I am speaking of the St. Andrew area.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. member is fully aware that he is merely rehashing the debate of quite recent time when the matter came before this House.

Mr. TAITT: Not having been here, Sir, on that occasion, I might not be fully aware of all that was said and I apologise to the House, Sir, if in seeking to make my point I have to repeat words that have been said before.  
3.10 p.m.

We have to put blame for the failure of the transportation system squarely at the feet of the Minister. It cannot be said that there has not been a plan for the transportation in the country. In 1973 a report was made to the then Minister. I think it is called the King Report, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must repeat that the Honourable Member is merely rehashing.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect, Sir, the Resolution which is before us on the transportation system as it affects the parish of St. Lucy; I am trying to deal with transportation in St. Lucy. In order for what I say to be intelligible, I would necessarily have to repeat words that might have been spoken somewhere before. It is not my intention to rehash.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the Honourable Member is to repeat words that have already been spoken, he will have to do so elsewhere, not in this Honourable House.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I accept and understand the Chair's position in this matter. I can only be guided and I am in the hands of the Chair. At a point when the Chair decides that I have to find elsewhere to speak, then I will have to find elsewhere to speak. The transportation in this country, the system as it affects St. Lucy, St. Peter, St. Michael, St. Michael South West, has some relation to the planning that has gone into transportation especially over the last 18 months or the lack of planning and I am contending that within the J. C. King report can be found the basis on which the transportation as it affects St. Lucy and the outlying areas could be dealt with.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wonder if the Honourable Member is begging the Chair to ask him to discontinue his speech.

Mr. TAITT: I am not begging the Chair to do anything Your Honour. I am trying to make a speech on transportation in St. Lucy and you seem to be asking me to do the impossible to speak about transportation without in anyway referring to any document that has been referred to before in a debate on transportation, I do not claim to be infallible, Mr. Speaker. If you feel I cannot make this speech in this context, I will sit down.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I would have thought that after listening to debate on the Resolution to make provision for the Transport Board last week, that events would have so overtaken this Resolution, that the Honourable Mover would have considered it necessary to get up and probably invite the house to allow him to withdraw this Resolution and not continue with it. What strikes me as funny is this, that one who pretends to be a very broad type of person and who involves himself not only with local matters, but international matters would continue throughout one's life to play the role of a parish politician. I am sure that Mr. Speaker you sat in amazement to hear the Honourable Mover of this Resolution constantly harping on the fact that St. Lucy is not provided with adequate transport. I believe that St. Lucy, over the years has been better provided than any constituency or any part of this Island of Barbados. There was a time when a previous member of this Honourable Assembly and representative of St. Lucy, I refer to no less a person than Sir Theodore Branker, who then represented this Honourable Parliament on the Transport Board and it was felt at that time that the most healthy network in the Island was in St. Lucy.

When the system of nationalisation came into being, fortunately, under the administration of the Barbados Labour Party Government, the then representative on the Transport Board made it quite possible to ensure that St. Lucy was adequately supplied with units to take care of its people. The transportation system in Barbados was pointed out in discussion last week and if there are any

problems within the transportation system, the Government has taken measures to remedy these problems, therefore anything that might be regarded as a problem by the Honourable Member for St. Lucy would be purged as a result of measures taken by this Government. What the Member does not seem to understand is this. The people in Barbados are using this transportation system. It is a very good one and I refer to the fact that I mentioned last year that it was the best in the Caribbean. I would go further and say one of the best in the world and certainly the cheapest in the world. The people who come here to Barbados use the transportation system. There is nothing you can do about it. We are a free society. We encourage people to come here to enjoy the amenities of life in Barbados and we cannot tell the tourists that they cannot drive in our transport system. They are entitled to do so. When they are in Barbados, they are our guests and if they utilize the service which we provide, we cannot quarrel.

The transportation system as I believe the present Minister responsible for transportation mentioned last week, was in the past carrying 'X' amount of people. Today, it is 'X' plus 'X'. That is the position which we now find. It is all well and good to complain and say that people are pushing and scrambling to get into buses, but let me be very frank and say this, Mr. Speaker, the Barbadian people are not accustomed to queuing. We have tried to introduce this measure in the past. They just do not like it. When they see that late is coming on and they cannot get home — and naturally a woman has to go home to look after her children, a man has to get home to look after his family and children have to go home to satisfy their parents that they are not somewhere wrong, they are going to rush to get into the bus. Whether the transportation system is good or bad, there are periods in the system where there will be a rush and there is nobody at all who can stop this.

On the basis of what I have seen and what I understand, the people in St. Lucy are well-served and better than well-served in relation to the bus service which is being provided all over this Island. Mr. Speaker, when the transport system was nationalised, there was hardly any system of transportation in the parish of St. John. I regret that the Honourable Member and Representative for St. John, I do not know if representative is the term, is not in his seat at this time, but I can tell you the cries of the people of that area were beyond belief. You could not imagine that here is a parish that has remained loyal to a man over 15 years and to a Government for 15 years and yet, nothing was done in order to provide it with a good transportation system. Not only did this Government seek to maintain the routes which they found when they came into office, but it extended the routes not only in other parishes of the Island, but within the constituency of St. Lucy. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South West referred to the adequacy of the

system in St. Andrew. As a matter of fact, St. Andrew came very late in terms of the nationalisation of the system.

3.20 p.m.

They came in at the end. Other people were served well before and the hon. member for St. Lucy should have no complaint. He is always with it. Your Honour should be more dissatisfied with the Government's treatment of your constituency in terms of giving you and your people a bus service, Mr. Speaker, than the hon. member for St. Lucy, because they certainly have a pressing need. There are areas where they have to walk more than a half a mile in order to get to their places of abode and to connect with the bus service. There is no place at all in St. Lucy in which it is so. The hon. member makes reference to Half Moon Fort and Crab Hill. I could quite understand him making reference to Josey Hill and Pie Corner and those areas, but sometimes I wonder how much he knows the areas that he refers to as far as Half Moon Fort and Crab Hill are concerned. I imagine he only knows them by hearing about them or when he reads them, but I can tell you that as far as the production and supply of buses are concerned they are well served in terms of the over-all national position. What the hon. member has to bear in mind is that he cannot, because like a child he feels he must get all the sweets or he is going to destroy all the sweets, alone get all that he wants, and that in planning for the over-all system within the country the total population must be taken into account.

It is not in the Government's best interest to know that children cannot get to school or people cannot get to work, but there is another matter that the hon. member for St. Lucy should be aware of; but certainly he is not doing his homework well. Since this Government got into office thousands of people who were otherwise unemployed have now joined the ranks of the employed, and therefore you have an additional 8,000 to 10,000 people who are journeying daily by the bus system, and further, as a result of the enlightened policies of this Government there are many people who would normally have in the past used cars to get to work and to and fro who are today using the public transport system. The Government is not unmindful, and the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister spelt it out. He said "yes it is true that the buses do not entirely supply the needs and the Government has seen the problem and is moving towards the correction of the problem." This is an open Government; we do not have to say all is well if it is not well in our opinion. We come and put the facts to the country and the people are capable of judging and making their own decisions.

I want to appeal to the hon. member for St. Lucy that he has made his point already and there is no point in pursuing this matter any further. The Government has

already come down with a Resolution to remedy whatever defects there might be, and in the light of that events have overtaken his Resolution and therefore there is no point in pursuing this; unless he wants the Government to move an amendment to it or vote against it, the best thing would be to withdraw this Resolution because it has no basis on facts. It does not serve any purpose now and we cannot support it as it stands, because the Government is doing more than is possible. In the light of the financial stringencies within the country, the Government is seeking to provide the country with an adequate transportation system, certainly one better than his Government has ever provided it with.

Mr. Speaker, the last speaker on this Resolution dealt with the reports. You have already ruled on them, but subsequent to the report by J. C. King, there was a report known as the Richardson Report which revealed far more than the King Report and the Government has sought to put into practice the points raised by the Richardson Report. In my view the Government is doing well on the question of transportation and its improvement and we will not flinch from that task which we have set ourselves, and no amount of attacks from the Opposition will change the course which this Government is prepared to pursue. We can assure you and the country at large that the Government has well under control the problems with respect to transportation in this country.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I think the point made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture that St. Lucy is well served by buses can be accepted in the light of facts. I wish it were possible for that Minister to have given the facts rather than to have made a blanket statement. Mr. Speaker, there is a half an hour service to St. Lucy from Speightstown. There is no more transfer system in Speightstown. They all come from St. Lucy into Bridgetown. The buses coming out of St. Lucy to the City start in St. Lucy and by the time they get to St. Peter and St. James they are filled, so that the burden is put on the travelling public who reside in St. Peter and St. James. I would be grateful if that could be denied when the hon. member for St. Lucy replies. The fact is that just as happens in St. Philip, the St. James people have to travel like the St. Lucy people. I am not saying and I do not want to repeat anything that was said or that I said last week, but clearly St. Lucy, and I am going to show too that St. John also are very well serviced by buses.

Take the situation in St. John. You have five buses which work the Clifton Hall and Martins Bay route and two school buses to Bridgetown. That is Route 6A. Between St. Andrew and St. Thomas, if you want to politicise the thing, in the constituencies of the Prime Minister and the former Minister of Communications and Works there are 8 buses between the two of them —

Shorey Village and Sturges. St. John has two school buses, and the districts in the country that suffer are in the areas of St. George in particular. The Boarded Hall people have to travel on a Route 10 bus which goes to Bayfield. Dash Valley itself has no service. I do not want anything written in the Press about what I have to say in here; they do not carry anything I say. I am speaking to the Chair and it will come out in the reports which will be written when I die. Dash Valley has no services, and on evenings the people going to Dash Valley or Boarded Hall in St. George have to use the bus going to Bayfield, Route 10.

3.30 p.m.

That has been one of the problems, and perhaps the biggest problem, in the organisation and management of the transport system certainly over the last year or 18 months. They have had an extension of routes and not a commensurate extension of rolling stock.

Now, I have a problem, Mr. Speaker, in St. Philip. The St. John buses go to Sargeant Street and College Savannah and pass through St. Philip. If a bus starts at College Savannah, by the time that bus gets a matter of a mile and a half or two miles away in Blades Hill it is full. When it gets to Parish Land and to Church Village, which is the biggest district in St. Philip North, the people in Church Village have got to stand up and let it pass, arrive at work late or get fired. I have a solution to it but I don't know if the Transport Board will listen to me. The buses that are for St. John, go through St. John; College Savannah, Society and Sargeant Street buses it is true should go through various parts of St. John and pick up people and come down. The buses for St. Philip should start at Bayfield or Blades Hill. I have managed to get a road connecting Bayfield with Blades Hill going over Three Houses Hill. It was promised to the people in that area from the time Mr. W. A. Crawford was in here, during the time of Mr. Neville Maxwell it was promised, but it has only become a reality in 1977. Now that connecting road could well take people from Blades Hill down over Three Houses Hill up through Thicket or into Bayfield, however they route it I don't care, but there should be a section of buses which would go around what we call the top road, through Marley Vale, East Point, Merricks, the coast road, Well House and come down through Six Roads and so on.

There should be another set of buses going through Blades Hill, Thicket, Parish Land, Church Village, and I want to say this in case anybody from the Transport Board is here. Church Village itself could be a turn around point. It has the largest population and it is unfair that the Church Village people should be left on mornings because when the buses reach them they are full and overcrowded with passengers who emanate from points higher up, Blades Hill, St. John, wherever. So the St. John could go through Four Roads, Kendal and

Clifton Hall and wherever they are going, start in St. John and go through St. John. The St. Philip buses could start in St. Philip, in Bayfield or Blades Hill, and come down and service my people, but it does not lie in the mouth of the member for St. John, and I don't think he has ever complained in the last Government or in this Government that his bus service is not satisfactory. They go out of their way to see that the Leader of the Opposition has a good and satisfactory bus service, he is well satisfied, and I believe the same thing for the member for St. Lucy. There have been problems which I am not saying that he does not have a problem that all areas served by buses perhaps are less than satisfactory, the answer to that was given last week. Part of the answer is in the fact that there is a shortage of buses, but the situation in St. Lucy is not as bad as it has been, for example, in St. Philip North, and I am not saying it purely because I represent St. Philip North. I have taken time out to go into the facts of this matter with people connected with the Transport Board and I am satisfied of the facts. Other matters that I have raised are based on my own observation and what I know of the various districts, and of course, commonsense, and it is commonsense that if you start a bus in Bayfield or in College Savannah, let us say, by the time that bus gets to Church Village it has no room for the people in Church Village. That is commonsense.

What no one has adverted to in any of these debates and I think it is important and needs to be mentioned. You keep hearing on the other side about unemployment and unemployment. The figures published by the Government show that unemployment is being reduced gradually. I am advised by the Prime Minister that a study by an overseas based group, independent of the Barbados Government....(Mr. GREAVES: No, I saw it). Well, if you have seen it, I said I was advised, but I understand that 5700 more jobs were created last year, put it that way. (*ASIDES*). But other people would have a chance. I believe the hon. member for St. Lucy has seen it, but I am told that on page 35....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get on with this debate. The people at Boscobel pass the 18 mile stone and the Risk, they are suffering.

Mr. SIMMONS: Without any reference to documentation or research.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If I may interrupt the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot permit this.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member in the confusion, Sir, is reading something.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the hon. member is rising on a point of order?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Yes, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must direct attention to the breach of order by the hon. member for St. Philip, and there is no breach.

Mr. SIMMONS: He said I am misquoting, Sir.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member gave a figure and made a mistake. He said that it was something which was in an Economic Survey which is not in the Economic Survey.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Prime Minister has an opportunity to address the Chair on this very matter, when he can correct the situation.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Because it comes from Economic and Social Progress.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot now hear the Prime Minister on this debate.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The Opposition read the wrong Table and if they had read it properly they would have got some information which would have been helpful to them.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, to get back to the point I was making, without any need for looking at any documentation, I think it is obvious if you talk with the members of the travelling public, there are more people going to work in the morning and going back home in the evening in 1979 than there were in 1978, 1977 and so on. That is one of the basic problems with the transport system, that it has not taken account. I will accept that this may be a criticism of the planning — I am not denying that — because if you do not plan for an increase in the working population over a period of years, then you cannot provide the necessary rolling stock to take account of that increase in the working population. But at the same time as that lack of planning is going to be suggested as a criticism, it has to be recognised as a fact by the very definition that employment must have increased. (Mr. TAITT: No, the stock fell down). I am not arguing with them across the table, Sir.

The other problem in St. Philip in relation to transportation is that unlike most areas in Barbados, to the best of my knowledge, there is one minibus travelling from Bridgetown to St. Philip, P. 1120, owned by Mr. Kenneth Gill of Six Roads Housing Area. Compare that with all the minibuses that ply on the west coast or all around and in and around town and in Christ Church, we have one.

Mr. SPEAKER: Here is a good investment opportunity for somebody from St. Philip.  
3.40 p.m.

Mr. SIMMONS: I would like to see the Philipians get together and form a co-operative. I would tell you that I am not putting any money in anything because I have no money to invest. It shows that perhaps that is an investment area for people who can come together, if, of course, they would be granted a licence to operate a minibus. The Minister of Transport would have to tell me but there is a definite need and we, as the St. Philip residents, must know that there is a shortage of minibuses in St. Philip. Sir, there is a shortage of minibuses and there has not been the necessary increase in the buses to compensate for that lack of minibuses.

Mr. Speaker, the problems of school children have been touched on last week. It is true that the school children tend to put pressure on the Transport Board at peak hours when people are going to work and getting back home in the evening but when you get....

Mr. SPEAKER: That was well aired last week.

Mr. SIMMONS: When you get 50 new buses, that should take care of that with proper organisation and management.

There is something that has always gone through my mind, Mr. Speaker, and I have put it up to the previous Chairman of the Transport Board. It has been a suggestion. It is a suggestion but I do not know if it is workable in practice.

Now at the peak periods, from about 3.30 p.m. to say, about 6.30 p.m., the bus stand at Fairchild Street is crowded with people and there is at the same time an insufficient set of buses. I wondered whether it would not be possible for the Transport Board to set up a radio communication system such as is operated by the people in the private enterprise, where they have the system of CB sets. I do not know the technical word for it, Sir, but they call back to their office and talk to their office by a kind of radio telephone operating in their car.

I envisage at Weymouth, at the center of the Transport Board, a fleet of buses. Let us say, for the sake of argument, 18 or 20 buses are waiting in the Transport Board yard with a crew. When you have 73 people standing up in line to catch the Route 10 bus, as I have observed, and took note one evening. Surely, a bus came in and is filled, it went and you still had 40 people still standing up waiting. The man in charge of the bus stand should be able to call through from some point in the bus stand to Weymouth on an intercom and say "send

one for Route 10" and a bus would come down in 5 minutes and pick up that crowd and go.

I do not know if it is possible, but I have a feeling that if it is put to the test, assuming that you had a sufficient supply of buses, if it were put to the test, it would work, that you have the stand-by buses waiting to be called from Weymouth. They would not be fulling up the bus stand as pure empty buses and people banging on them. When you want a bus, you call Weymouth and in 5 - 10 minutes time the bus is there, it picks up the people from the stand and it is gone.

Now another thing is the turn-around of the buses. Take for instance, Mangrove. All the buses have to come to Mangrove for crews to change. I think that is a waste of time, money and gas. If a bus is to start at Six Roads, the crew that is to work that bus should be at Six Roads. The bus comes from Bayfield or wherever, changes crew and goes to town, but no, the bus has to go to Mangrove, get a crew, come back across to Six Roads or whatever point it is and then go on.

These are certain matters which I think can be straightened up. I think the Union, if it is a Union problem, I cannot see that it will be one, but if it is a Union problem, I am sure that the Union would co-operate in the interest of the travelling public to have a more serious flow of buses. If they need a shed for the workers to hang out in or something, I believe they can get that.

These are some of the problems which I believe the Transport Board could address themselves to and which would improve the situation pending the acquisition and the functioning of the buses which we are told are on their way.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Lucy.

Mr. GREAVES: This is in response to.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Three hon. members are on their feet. Kindly address the Chair.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I have given notice of the amending Motion in this Honourable House, but I wonder if the hon. member is getting up to hash up some action in the past.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am speaking on the Motion. I do not wish to add anything to what I said earlier on the question of the transport service. I have heard what the hon. member had to say about the transportation service in St. Lucy. I am not qualified no more than he does nor do I take a bus from St. Lucy to Bridgetown and I believe I live nearer to St. Lucy than he does and to say

that I am not qualified to discuss it. I know that I am told that St. Lucy is not a particularly thickly populated parish and the population has not risen as it has risen in St. Michael.

I would be fair in moving the amendment, and I am not speaking against it, but all I would suggest is that hon. members pay careful attention to what the hon. member for St. Philip North has been saying about the increase of the travelling public. It is not a political point we are making when we say that there are many more people up there, and many more people travelling on the buses every day. It is a straightforward point of fact.

I was trying to show hon. members opposite an analysis of the Government's economic statistics by a group which has been doing a feasibility study for an industrial park for us. It will become a document of the House. It will be referred to at some later stage but I am not yet in a position to make it a document of the House and that is why I did not want it canvassed in any great length.

Hon. members seemed to have been afraid to read what I was showing them to read and they read figures on which the consultants perhaps showed a little discredit and I must say, Mr. Speaker, that the discredit follows precisely the lines followed by the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for St. Michael South West in last year's Budget Speech when dealing with our employment figures, the bad approach that the Government Statistical Service had made to the Employment figures.

The figures do reveal that in 1975 there was a bad situation in this country with regard to unemployment. That employment in 1975 had fallen to a smaller number of people as in the region of 76,000; a very, very small number of people, indeed. The situation improved in 1976. It improved somewhat less in 1977 and improved again in 1978, so there is something like 14,000 more people working in Barbados now than at the worst part of 1975 and that means 28,000 more. Suppose it does not even mean all 28,000, suppose it only means 25,000 more bus journeys every day than 4 years ago.  
3.50 p.m.

The bus service must, without getting any worse, in absolute terms, be worse in terms of what it means to the bus traveller. The Consultants' figures and our figures agree that there were over 5,000 new jobs created in Barbados last year and that is a lot of people to add to an overburden bus service. We do not have that same increase this year, Sir, but I do not believe that it will be far short. It will be within a few hundred of that. People are working, and all of them do not have cars and they are catching the buses and the Government is doing its

best. The Government is going to try to improve the bus service by fighting on all the fronts outlined by the Honourable Members. The Honourable Member for St. Michael North Central who is not in his seat made some very good points about the bus service. The Honourable Member for St. Lucy made excellent points about the bus service, but the Government, faced with what it is trying to do, cannot tolerate a recycle or habendum in the Resolution as is now for consideration before the House. We think the House will be doing itself less than justice if it does not congratulate the Government. We have not reached the step of implementation yet, and I think congratulations may be a little premature because there is many a slip twixt cup and lip, Sir. We have had difficulties and disappointments before. I do not want to exaggerate the situation Sir, I like telling it as it is.

I am not the sort of person who will say of the Honourable Member for St. Michael South West that he owns 6 houses in Paradise Heights and he never pays and he is drawing the rents to send him to the University, and then describe him as an abusive person. I do not want to pursue that type of political approach. I like to deal in facts.

Mr. SPEAKER: One fact is that the people at Black Bess cannot get to Speightstown.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The fact is that the Government is planning an improvement in the Transport services and I am told that there has been some improvement within the last four weeks because we have improved the turn-around time in the workshop. In the circumstances, Sir, I would beg to move an amendment to the Resolution in the second recycle. I beg to move that the words "is completely" be deleted and the words "has been" be substituted. This has been handed to the Clerk already, Sir, I think it is called the Addendum, the Resolution Clause, Sir. In the Resolution Clause, all the words after "House" be deleted and the following words substituted therefor: "notes that the Government is taking the necessary steps to ensure that the bus service in all parts of Barbados, including St. Lucy be improved". I beg to move that the Resolution in its recycles be amended in that form.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the Amendments to the Resolution.

I will continue to speak on the Transport Board, Mr. Chairman. Honourable Members over the past two weeks have had a lot to say about the Transport Board. One can understand that every Parliamentarian would like to ensure that his constituency has the best service, not only in transportation, but in health and all other related services, if he has any interest in his constituency, but where the Transport Board is concerned, I believe we should look at the history of the Transport Board and what is happening today and when we compare the two parts, one would see that the Amendments to the

Resolution are really the true state of the Transport Board.

First of all, let me make it absolutely clear, that the statistics have proven that the Transport Board is carrying more people today than it has carried throughout its existence. I have had compiled for me, Mr. Speaker, the statistics from January to October. I have not taken into account the month of November. The figures which I will quote would be exceeded by probably as much as the increase appears to be at the end of October, bearing in mind that the months of November and December are the months when more people are carried by the Transport Board. Between January to October, 1978, the Transport Board carried 35,240,468 passengers. For the relevant period in 1979 it has carried 41,466,319 passengers, an increase of some 6,225,851 passengers. These figures also appear in the draft produced by the Road Transport Consultants who are here and they coincide with a project that was made between 1972 and 1973 when the King Report was presented to the then Democratic Labour Party and when the Richardson Report was also presented, it forecast that by 1979 the Transport Board would be carrying 41,000,000 passengers. It was on that basis that a recommendation was made that there should be one transport authority in this country.

Let me deal with the Honourable Member for St. Lucy. He is complaining about the bus service in St. Lucy. In 1978, Route 1 carried 185,887 passengers, Route 1A carried 95,651 passengers, Route 1B carried 55,495 passengers, Route 1C carried 123,641 and Route 1F carried 17,889 passengers, this is the month of September, 1978. In September 1979, Route 1 carried 89,008 passengers because there was a shortening of Route 1 which resulted in a decrease in the number of school children that were carried. The decrease in school children was as a result of the shortening of the route and the opening of St. James Secondary School. 4.00 p.m.

Route 1-A carried 125,986 passengers; Route 1-B.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister would wish to explain that Route 1-A covers from where to where.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Unfortunately, I do not have the areas exactly, so if you can tell me I would be happy to accept that. I can only give you the figures that are presented to me by the Transport Board. Route 1-B carried 65,160 passengers, Route 1-C carried 145,632 passengers and Route 1-F carried 24,978 passengers.

Mr. Speaker, we have had a marked increase in the number of passengers carried in St. Lucy as I have been informed this year over what were carried last year. Now members have raised problems and have spoken about the problems of the Transport Board and about what should

be done. The Transport Board is faced with the problem of down time. How does it come about? Firstly there is absenteeism. At the minute they have not been collecting statistics on the number of missed schedules. Recently that has been started, but one of the basic problems for the delay in the buses when people talk about buses not coming on time is simply because the crews have not turned up, and there is no political party whether Democratic Labour Party, the Barbados Labour Party or the P.P.M. who can make crews turn out for jobs when they should turn out. There is a standby system and as soon as it is recognised that crews have not reported for duty, a standby crew is put into operation, but it takes time.

Now everybody will quarrel and we will come to this later, but the Richardson Report of 1973 indicated that at that time there were some 164 buses at the Transport Board. They were then running 30 routes. Today the Transport Board is running 62 routes and the routes have been extended since 1977. In 1973 when they were running 30 routes, Richardson said it was a miracle that the Transport Board could get through a day's work because they did not have a traffic manager.

Now I have heard the hon. member for St. Philip talking about turning around buses at various points. It is a technical job that has been recognised by the Democratic Labour Party. As I said last week, we recruited a Mr. Rostrum through the assistance of the ODM.

Mr. SPEAKER: If you have already said it last week, it need not be said this week again, and if the Minister is saying that he will have to say it, he will not be having to say it in this Honourable Chamber. You will have to say it somewhere else. It is as simple as this. The Minister has the ability to get around his points without rehashing what was said last week. He will not be allowed to say it in this Honourable House.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for St. Philip spoke about turning around buses, you do not turn around buses with laymen. There has to be somebody who can control the buses when they are turned around. There has to be some method worked out for turning around buses. You can only do that when there are competent people available to tick when a bus is turned around.

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of elucidation.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Philip North has risen on a point of elucidation. Will the Minister give way?

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I did not say anything about turning around buses. The buses turn around ten times a day because you go in the bus stand and turn around and go back out. I was not talking about that at all.

What I said was that when the crews come to change the buses should not have to go to Mangrove to pick up a new crew. It should stop at Six Roads and let a crew pick it up from there and come down, but it is waste of time, money and gas to go to Mangrove and get a change of crew.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member complains about where buses should run, you see it reaches the point where everybody is scrambling in 1979. (*Asides*). Let us get on with the debate, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, we have been carrying more passengers than normally. We have been looking at the system. The Transport Board has never had a proper roster system which means that the workers in effect have not been treated the way they should be treated if the system is to work correctly. That is what we are now working on. We are trying to make the crews know well in advance when they have to come to work and their off duty periods, instead of the system which existed when we came into power where everybody had to telephone the Transport Board to find out if he had a job that day. In order to give an efficient service, the hon. member for St. Philip spoke about a CB system or something that you could call the Transport Board and ask to send buses. The studies in 1972 showed that it would be highly uneconomical for any transport system in Barbados, in New York or anywhere else at all to provide all the buses that would move the working population within one hour at peak periods, morning and evening. Some people would have to wait. As a matter of fact, at the moment the Transport Board has no buses available lying down at any time that you can call out morning and evening to go and move people. We are operating 282 buses now including those taken over and some 94 new buses injected into the system in 1977. But what is needed in this country is for the industrialists and the merchants in Bridgetown to start staggering working hours. We cannot have a tourist economy, we cannot have 90,000 odd people going to work at 8 o'clock and coming out at 4 o'clock, and even if you put on an equal number of mini buses, some people would still have to wait. You cannot do it, and until the businessmen and the Union in this country begin to realise that you must stagger working hours even by one and a half hours a day, you will not solve the transportation problem in this country.

Mr. Speaker, we want to include the transport system. Let me tell you what happened last year. For the period January to October 1979, the Transport Board had 1,320 accidents including six accidents with buses hitting head on. The Board has been told that it must be serious about its rolling stock. Drivers have been warned, and when I talk about somebody able to control the turn around and the rostering of buses, I mean a traffic manager. 4.10 p.m.

When I talk about somebody being able to control the turnaround and the rostering of buses, a Traffic

Manager, when the Barbados Labour Party came to power in 1976 the Richardson report was already written, and I understand the Democratic Labour Party on its many platforms has been attacking the staff of the Transport Board. I am going to stand up for that staff. When they are wrong I will tell them so. Everybody knows me, I will tell my own staff when they are wrong and I will say it in public, but when they are right I am going to stand up for them.

When Mr. Richardson recommended, and he pointed out to the then Government, the Democratic Labour Party, that they could not run the Transport Board successfully without a Chief Engineer, without a Traffic Manager, without a Deputy General Manager, without a Financial Controller and without a Personnel Officer, in 1976 that was still the state at the Transport Board. It was under this Government that we found a Chief Engineer, and that man has come to the Transport Board and set up individual records on every bus at the Transport Board, something that was never done before. Nobody knew what the repair costs of a particular bus at the Transport Board was until the present Chief Engineer came there. That man has been able to put buses back on the road that were laid up in the Transport Board for years; they claimed they were waiting for parts. This man has been able to guide and direct the machinists at the Transport Board to fabricate parts for certain buses.

The Opposition would not tell the public that Seddon has gone out of production and we have in the Transport Board 124 Seddon buses bought by the Democratic Labour Party. In order to keep those buses on the road the Chief Engineer has been able to manufacture parts that are no longer available, and the man is criticised on public platforms, but Opposition will do anything, that is one thing we have to recognise, that Oppositions will say or do anything.

Mr. Speaker, a Workshop Manager. We have recruited a Workshop Manager, and I understand he came in for some lashes on the political platform too, but criticising the workmen at the Transport Board is not going to make things any better, they are correcting something that was wrong from 1972 and you have to give them time, they cannot do it overnight. The Opposition did not do it when they were in power but they expect the Labour Party and the workers to correct it overnight.

Now, the hon. member for St. Philip also dealt with crew changes. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Traffic Manager fell ill and he was forced to return to Britain. We have just been informed that there is the likelihood of another person being available to continue the work which the Traffic Manager has been doing. Until we get the proper personnel at the Transport Board, it is the

Government's intention to try as hard as possible to satisfy the travelling public in this country. The Transport Board is now a major employer in Government, or quasi Government, as you may want to call it. They are employing some 1600 people today, bus drivers, bus conductors. It is not that everybody at the Transport Board can be regarded as reckless or careless, we have some good drivers. As a matter of fact, I got a report last week of one bus driver who left Bridgetown at 10 o'clock going to St. Philip, and he said when he got to Six Roads there were only four passengers in the bus who were going further afield and he stopped and he asked the four passengers if they would be good enough to get out and wait at Six Roads while he went back to Bridgetown to move people standing in the bus stand. I understand they waited and that he brought another bus load to St. Philip and continued his journey. Somebody said he should be fired but I think he should be given a medal, because as I said earlier there are more passengers travelling on the Transport Board buses. The King Report in 1973 said that the moment you make a single stage fare you are going to encourage more people to use the Transport Board.

If unemployment is falling, if more people are travelling to Bridgetown — and the opening paragraph of all the reports that I have seen has highlighted that passengers generally travel from the rural districts into Bridgetown and that is how the pressure is created, because everybody comes to Bridgetown and everybody needs to be transported back to the rural districts.

Now, the hon. member for St. Lucy might think that St. Lucy is not well served, but I understand now that the Speightstown Depot has been literally taken over servicing St. Lucy. I understand Mr. Speaker's position in St. Peter, we are trying to rectify that. What we have done within the last three months is to increase the Inspectorate. We have decided on a training programme so that Inspectors are now trained to observe where passenger movement is greatest and to be able to direct buses where there is need. We have looked at the question of a VHF system or a CB system for the Transport Board and we have been advised that it is not good practice to put either CB sets or VHF on the buses, and that is the reason why the Transport Board has decided to increase the Inspectorate, deploy them in a completely different fashion than had been practised in the previous years where Inspectors were seen standing up under a tree for a whole day waiting until a bus reached him in order to check the bus and nothing more. The Inspectors at the Transport Board are now required to monitor passenger movement, check to see where passengers want to go, see when a bus is travelling half empty and to re-route the bus to satisfy the travelling public, but you cannot train people overnight. Whenever you read about major movement in industry, you read about re-training, retraining, re-training. (Mr. TAITT: Re-training spies?)

The hon. member said something about re-training spies. I heard a member from that side last week talk about meeting turns. That is something I wanted to talk about last week, I don't know about it, I heard a changing....

Mr. SPEAKER: I just want to tell the Hon. Minister that the meeting turn was sort of hackneyed in this Hon. House last week, the House heard enough about meeting turns and I will not permit it this day again.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe the rules say you cannot repeat yourself or you cannot repeat what other hon. members have said.

Mr. SPEAKER: The rule that the Speaker read goes much wider than what the hon. member has just said, that he cannot repeat himself nor can he repeat the tedious arguments of other members.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: The rules also, as far as I know, allow the Hon. Minister responsible to make a statement, and I am the Minister responsible for the Transport Board, and if I have to....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister is attempting to be rude to the Chair. I warn the Minister he is attempting to be rude to the Chair and he should desist from doing this. Please continue with your speech.  
4.20 p.m.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, all I would like to say further is that I want publicly to congratulate the Transport Board for having been able to cope with an increased passenger movement within the last year without having the necessary rolling stock to carry the passengers. As I said earlier and as the Prime Minister has said, the Transport Board will be improved over the next two to three years.

We have a number of buses that have passed their useful life. I understand the life of a bus is regarded as 12 years. I understand the Transport Board has in its possession some 70-80 odd buses that are now over 15 years old that would have to be replaced. It is a lot of money that has to be injected into the Transport Board. The Government between 1977-1979 has already injected some \$8.9 million in capital rolling stock. We will have to inject probably another \$15 million if you want to bring the Transport Board up to a proper order.

I, myself see that you will have to ask a certain number of mini-bus operators to operate during the peak periods. I do not believe that any administration can provide the rolling stock to handle the peak hour traffic. I really do not believe it. I believe we should try to prevent people coming into the three or four bus stands in Bridgetown and move them directly from places of employment to their final destinations without coming to the bus stands.

We, in the Transport Board, are now looking at season tickets. We propose a weekly ticket, a monthly ticket and a quarterly ticket. Tickets will therefore allow passengers to change from bus to bus or route to route and travel at a price, I understand which should be less than 7 days' journey, two trips per day and I would hope that the travelling public will make use of these season tickets when they are available.

The Board is also looking at other methods of fare collections and I am sure that within the next year the public of Barbados would be more than happy with the type of transportation system which has been provided for them under the Barbados Labour Party. Thank you.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on the Amending Resolution -- We have been circulated with an Amended Resolution here and I am really flabbergasted to see or to have read the contents of this Resolution. I want to read it with you to make it a document of the House because.. I am sorry, it is already a document of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been moved and seconded.

Mr. GREAVES: Okay. I am finished. I just want to read this because I think it is very important when one examines it to see that as far as the Opposition is concerned, we cannot support it because it is our view that it is a hurried and ill-conceived amendment for the purpose of getting around the truth of my Resolution.

Now what does this Amending Resolution say? "Whereas the Transport Board has a responsibility to provide adequate bus service throughout the island and whereas in parts of St. Lucy the bus service has been inadequate and whereas this inadequacy is causing serious problems to the travelling public, be it resolved, etc. etc. that this House and the Government is taking the necessary steps to ensure that the bus service, in all parts of Barbados, including St. Lucy improves."

Let us look, Mr. Speaker, at the second and third paragraphs of this Resolution. This Resolution, as I said, the amendment seeks to get around what was contained in my original Resolution which says "whereas in the parish of St. Lucy the bus service is completely inadequate." Now the Government is trying to say in this Resolution that the bus service has been inadequate." It is no longer inadequate now. I am contending, Mr. Speaker, that the bus service in St. Lucy is still inadequate and does not satisfy the needs of the travelling public and I will deal with some of the figures which the Minister read out here this afternoon because I think that when he spoke, the figures he was able to produce here demonstrated quite clearly the point that I was making.

The third paragraph of this Resolution goes on. Remember the second paragraph says that the bus service

has been inadequate so it is no longer inadequate, but yet the third paragraph comes on and says "and whereas this inadequacy" — now which inadequacy, Mr. Speaker, are we talking about? There has been inadequacy and there is inadequacy.

Now what the second paragraph is saying is that there is no longer any inadequacy. Don't worry to run. Come back and sit down. I wonder whether the Prime Minister drafted this. "and whereas this inadequacy is" — it is inadequate but now the inadequacy that they say is no longer there "is causing serious problems to the travelling public."

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, who drafted this. I am sure the Attorney General did not have a hand in this but I would really like to know who drafted this because this is utter nonsense. It makes nonsense of the language. It makes nonsense of intelligent people and we cannot support that. Furthermore, as far as the contents of this Resolution is concerned, the Opposition will not be....

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you referring to the amendment?

Mr. GREAVES: Yes, the Amending Resolution. The one which we are discussing at this point in time. The Opposition cannot support, as I said, this ill-conceived and as far as I am concerned the inaccuracy which is contained in this particular Resolution.

Now, the Minister for Communications and Works who just sat down after a very long and tiresome and what could amount to almost inept treatment of matters relating to transport. Imagine a Minister of Transport getting up and talking about routes and does not even know that Route 1A, Mr. Speaker, goes right up into the heart of your constituency in Boscobel and you would recognise that I ventilated the problems of the people of St. Peter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister has not been so advised.

Mr. GREAVES: He only asks for advice. Unless he is told he would not know. That shows the extent of his interest in St. Peter but what does the figure which he read out here relating to Boscobel, let us take that as an example because you know I will put in a little push for you here and there, but the people of Boscobel....

Mr. SPEAKER: I think you are referring to Boscobel via the 18 mile stone.

Mr. GREAVES: Beyond that. Going down right around the corner all down there, right under the hill. Right down there. I know the people down there. I have family living down there as you would know. Let us say St. Peter, anyhow.

Mr. SPEAKER: They love me. I know your family loves me. *(Laughter)*.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I believe that is because we have not been in a contest together but I believe if the boundaries are changed up and we are matched against each other then we will see who loves who. Anyhow, let us go on.

Mr. SPEAKER: Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.

Mr. GREAVES: It shows very clearly in Boscobel that in the course of one year, over 30,000 more passengers were moved on that route. What about the Indian Ground route which does not even go into Boscobel. It goes at another angle, but what I want to say is that as far as the Minister is concerned, the figures which he revealed here this afternoon bear out the point which I have been making.

There has been an increase in the travelling public and the Transport Board has not been able to cope with this particular problem as far as it relates to the constituency of St. Lucy. That is what I am concerned about.  
4.30 p.m.

The figures, of course, Mr. Speaker only relate to those people who manage to get on the bus, these figures do not include people who have been left on the route so that the situation is even worse. If we took these figures here, one would have to add maybe another 15% on top of these figures to really show the true demand of the travelling public of Route 1A, 1C and 1F. I recall talking about Route 1F, this St. Lucy Church route. I recall the former Minister of Communications and Works when I came in here and I made a plea for the restitution of this route which he removed, he argued that....

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: On a point of order. As Minister of Communications and Works at the time, I had nothing to do with routing.

Mr. GREAVES: You did not remove it. His Ministry. He is not responsible for that Ministry any longer. I recall indicating that it was something that should not be done. I remember he brought in some figures which I had no way of establishing whether or not they were accurate. But certainly, what has happened between 1978 and 1979 would indicate very clearly that there is absolute need for this, because even on that short route, there has been an increase in the course of a year of over 7,000 passengers so that I cannot, like the Minister, congratulate the Transport Board at being able to cope with the movement of people over the last year or so, because the truth of the

matter is that the Transport Board has not been able to cope and as a result, there has been chaos and frustration and people have been finding it difficult to be able to move backwards and forwards as far as getting to their work and doing other things which they require public transportation for.

The Member for St. Philip North supported the argument which I advanced by giving expression to some of the problems which the people of his constituency, St. Philip North, were experiencing. I really had to smile when I heard him say that I had no problem. He went on to outline the very same kind of problem which we have been experiencing in St. Lucy, that is, people who live at the beginning of the route get the bus, and people who are on the route down find it very difficult to catch a bus because when the bus reaches there, it is all filled up. By the time the Boscobelle bus reaches Mile-and-a-Quarter, the people there cannot get a bus because the buses come down full. When I say that the Transport Board needs to plan and reorganise the whole system in the growth of the population in this country, this is the point that I have been making and it has been clearly borne out by the Member for St. Philip North relative to his constituency, but I recognise that the Members of the Government have been saying that I canvass too much for St. Lucy. I would like to repeat and I say this for the benefit of the Member for St. Andrew, I have no apologies to make to him or anybody. I do not intend to withdraw my Resolution. Of course there is an amendment. The points which I have made in the initial presentation still stand and indeed I stand more firmly convinced in the view that has been taken up and as a result of the figures which have been put out by the Minister here today and of course, the inept way in which he handled this could well have demonstrated that the Transport Board cannot be very much better than the Minister who has responsibility for administering the Transport Board.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I did not intend at all to speak on the question of transport since, of course, it is well taken care of by both the existing and former Minister who have been knowledgeable on the subject. Last week we ventilated in this House quite a lot of problems confronting transport.

I just want, to add a few comments perhaps from the experience of having assisted in the running of part of the transport system when I was a young lad growing up and servicing the constituency which is now represented by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South West. Our buses ran in that area and I had to help look after the management of the bus service. I hope these comments would be useful to Honourable Members.

The Transport system in Barbados is not a perfect system. I believe Sir, that prior to the change in Government in this country, that the system was worse than it

is today. The Honourable Member is going to say no, but I have had the benefit of working during that period for both of the then private concessionaires. The Elite Motor Omnibus Company Limited, as well as, the Rocklyn Bus Company Limited. It was proven that despite the heavy subsidy which the Government was giving to the state board, the Transport Board, the private persons, particularly the Rocklyn Bus Company Limited were performing with inadequate stock, a little better than the state company was. That is a fact. There were tremendous pressures on Government, of course, at the time to take over the transport system and it was argued then that if one had one complete and centralised transport system, there would have been an improvement on that system. I said then, and I will continue to say that that is begging the question. Unless more resources are given to the transport system, you will never, ever solve the problem which confronted the past Government and which confronts this Government, the degree to which you are prepared to subsidise transport or to permit transport to be run as a commercial enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, under the mixed system which pre-existed the taking over of the buses, the private concessionaires suffered, vis-a-vis the Transport Board, because of the fact that their level of remuneration was kept down by the Public Utilities Board whereas the Transport Board could afford to accept a lower fare because their rolling stock and all of their capital requirements were being met from the public Treasury. 4.40 p.m.

The result of this mixed policy was that the private concessionaires were forced into having inadequate stock and stock that they could hardly replace, and the complaints then, if hon. members opposite who are shouting "no" to my earlier statements would take the pains to research the newspapers for the period, the complaints then were that there were rickety buses running under the hills and that the Government should do something to take over the buses.

Mr. Speaker, the Advocate-News during that period was replete with several articles criticising the bus system in St. James in particular. There was a young man called, I believe, Mr. Courtenay King who if he is still around worked with the Advocate who formed a Sub-Committee along with Mr. Payne, the Attorney-at-Law to ventilate the grievances of the Transport Board and of transport in the northern region under the Democratic Labour Party at the time. You can talk but these are facts. People must not all of a sudden believe that the problems are new and that they did not exist and were not worse. This is a fact. The problem here in Barbados is that people do not take time to do their adequate research. They live from day to day as though these things are new and novel, and the inadequacy in St. Lucy did not exist under any of these Ministers. It pre-existed. The hon. member must know that. (Mr.

TAITT: You promised to solve these problems.) Hon. members do not take time other than the hon. member for St. Michael South. He and myself believe in research. They say we do too much of it, but the point is that the research would show the hon. member for St. Lucy, and if he wants the benefit of the research I will tell him, including his own speeches....

Mr. SPEAKER: The time for Private Members' Business has now expired.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I will finish that sentence. Including his own speeches; the speeches of the hon. member for St. Lucy will show that prior to 1976 he was complaining about the inadequacy of transport in the northern section. Sir, the time having expired....

Mr. SPEAKER: You will continue on the next occasion if you so desire.

This brings us to the end of Private Members' Business.

#### GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: When the suspension was taken, the House was in Committee of Supply. To that it now reverts.

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

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the sitting was suspended the House was in Committee, and the hon. member for St. Michael South West was addressing the Chair.

Mr. TAITT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe when this Chamber broke off from this particular item that I was at the point of laying the foundation for my main contention. Mr. Chairman, Article 2 of the United Nations Charter, I think it is paragraphs 4 and maybe 7, but it was in Article 2 — it is true that St. Vincent Grenadines is not yet a full fledged member, but it has been through the United Kingdom in a sort of remote way, but Sir, it is a principle of international relations that Governments will not interfere in the domestic affairs of other Governments. We are sworn to that. Now I know the Prime Minister will get up and tell us that he had a call from Mr. Cato but I am sure the Prime Minister will tell us he had a number of calls from Mr. Cato over a long period of time. I am sure if he revealed all the calls he had from Mr. Cato it could take this House a fairly long time to discuss what went on in those calls. The point is that Barbados is not a banana Republic with a dictator who came to power suddenly one morning and who is free to experiment with play-toys, and if he thinks that perhaps tomorrow we should try out one of these newer single engine planes or jet planes or if he thinks

we should get a new SR rifle or if he thinks that perhaps we need a Mercedes Benz bus to drive around the Parliamentarians; Barbados is not that kind of country. It is not a banana Republic. It is a serious young country that has some grounding under the democratic system and I believe it is fair to say that the majority of the people in this country believe in the democratic way. Now that democratic way includes this Honourable Chamber and it includes in this Honourable Chamber those who have responsibility for the Government taking the other members seriously and more important taking the total community seriously.

It is not right, it could never be right that the people of Barbados could wake up one morning and discover that the Prime Minister had sent off troops to St. Vincent Grenadines whether it was to secure the airport, the seaport or to fight rastas in Union Island. Whatever reason they were sent for, ask yourself this question, Mr. Chairman. Why is it in the past when other countries have called on the then Government to send troops in circumstances which they considered and which many would consider to be much more serious than the little skirmish which we have heard of in Union Island, why was it that troops were not despatched then? Maybe it was because we had no Defence Force; maybe the Defence Force was not established in the way this present Defence Force was established, but it is the principle that we have to pay attention to. You know, first we start off by sending the odd policeman down in Dominica. Then we come to sending troops to St. Vincent Grenadines. What is it going to be next week or week after?

Mr. Chairman, sometimes when you are in public life moments pass and you regret those moments. The establishment of a Defence Force presented many of us with a challenge, and some of us in the interest of the system of Government which we have may have felt that we ought to cook it rather than air our innermost feelings on a particular issue. Mr. Chairman, let me take this opportunity to say publicly what I have felt and have not said, that the Defence Force concept which I have seen in the context of our establishment of a Defence Force does not augur very well for the future of Barbados. When we as a small country struggling to find ourselves among the other nations of the world begin to experiment with situation rumours, when we begin to believe that we are a serious military power, when we begin to believe that we may use our so-called military power to establish our image in the Caribbean area to create that image, when we reach that stage, Mr. Chairman, we will divert from the goals which we normally set, and which have been set for us to find a better way and a better life for the masses of the people in this country.

4.50 p.m.

There is something beyond the fact that there were 10 or 15 or 20 soldiers despatched from Barbados, it is

the military mentality which we are developing, Mr. Chairman. I call on the Prime Minister to see this in the context not so much as a Democratic Labour Party or Barbados Labour Party call, I call upon the Prime Minister and his Cabinet to see the drift which is occurring in this country in the context of the Defence Force. I do not know if it is true, Mr. Chairman, but you yourself must have heard persons worrying about what the Defence Force is doing at St. Lucy. There are all kinds of rumours put out about how the Defence Force is being trained, and I say of my own knowledge, Mr. Chairman, that my experience with military men, and the hon. and gallant member for St. Michael West and the Rt. Hon. member for St. John can confirm that when persons are trained in full fledged military establishments, among the things they are taught is that they should not point a rifle at anybody unless they intend to kill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please wind up. You have about a minute more of your fifteen minutes.

Mr. TAITT: This happens to me all the time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You will be able to come back again.

Mr. TAITT: The point is, Mr. Chairman, that military establishments have a certain kind of training. They get a certain concept about what they are established for, and when the persons at the top start behaving like if they are Generals, if the Prime Minister of this country starts seriously believing that he like President Kennedy or President Nixon or President Carter or Chairman Mao or the Ayatollah, when he starts believing that he is a true-true Commander-in-Chief deploying troops, we are heading for some serious times. I might have said it in such a manner as to evoke the laughter of the hon. member, but, Mr. Chairman, I am dead serious. I am appealing to the Prime Minister, because this is a matter of life and death, this is not a matter where it is just a political statement, it is a matter of life and death. The young men that are being trained to run on board with Ack-Ack guns, are going to have a gun mounted on this Mercedes Benz bus? Could the Prime Minister please indicate whether he intends to secure this bus? Because you will recall the Head under which we are discussing this they talk about armoured trucks, so I do not know if we are going to have Ack-Ack guns and next Independence we are going to have a fly past with the Air Force or a march past with our numerous weapons. This is a serious mental problem and I am saying, Mr. Chairman, on the floor of this Hon. House that the mentality which led the Government to send troops into St. Vincent-Grenadines is the same mentality which leads Governments to send troops against Trade Unions, it is the same mentality which when a Trade Union decides it wants to have a general strike will lead a Commander-in-Chief to say this is economic

warfare and we must prepare our troops to deal with economic warfare.

I, like a large number of people in this country, find it extremely disconcerting to wake up a morning and hear that there is a coup somewhere. I find it frightening when I hear that there was some disturbance in some other country and that Barbadian troops are already there. Not like that the Prime Minister of Britain or the President of the United States, that the Barbados Prime Minister is giving serious consideration to the request, oh no, the Barbadian troops are already in position, the facility with which the actual efficiency with which these troops were deployed by General Adams. Unlike the Prime Minister of Dominica, Colonel John, who only dressed up in the uniform, or General Burnham who only took on the name, our General is not making any sport, he is deploying the troops. We cannot have it, Mr. Chairman. I am going to stop because you say my time is up, but I would wish the Prime Minister to take the time out to defuse this militarism which is permeating this entire society. It runs like a novel, Sir, the plot began within days of his coming to power, the whole scheme has been developing and we have begun to see the culmination of the plan. It is not only a question of moving the troops to St. Vincent-Grenadines, it is a question of finding out how quickly he can mobilise troops, and as a person who may very well be at the end of the wrong side of the muzzles of those troops, I have to express fear on my behalf and on the behalf of all the rest of us who see the creation of a Defence Force in Barbados as a dangerous and pernicious excursion if its purposes are not for the sole defence of this community. That is what we were told when the Defence Force was established, that is not what we are seeing. I stop at that point, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GREAVES: My colleagues this afternoon and just before we went to lunch ventilated in very clear terms the feeling of the Opposition on this matter, Mr. Chairman. There is no doubt that these views reflect the feelings of the people of this country.

The member for St. Michael South West who just sat down said that he woke up on Saturday morning to hear that Barbadian troops were already in St. Vincent-Grenadines. Well I did not wake up on Saturday, but on Friday about 9 o'clock I heard that there was some skirmish in St. Vincent, and before the end of that day I believe about one or two o'clock on that day I heard on the News that Barbados had galvanised a Force and was sending it to St. Vincent. This is a very very serious matter, and it is almost as it were by a stroke of luck that we are able to discuss this matter here today, because I believe that the Order Paper was organised before Friday and we had this item on the Defence Force under Head 106 down to discuss here today, because the Prime Minister came in here today in the

face of this very serious national issue introduced this Head 106 dealing with the Barbados Defence Force and not one word from the Prime Minister on this matter. Now, I call this, Mr. Chairman, irresponsible behaviour, I call this a complete disregard for the people of this country, and complete disrespect for this Hon. Chamber. Further, I even expected that the Prime Minister would have been making a ministerial statement on this matter, because how on earth could he deploy Barbadian troops in a foreign country and does not come here and make a statement on it or anything relating to that? I think that this is the height of irresponsibility, and the Prime Minister must understand that the Opposition will not sit down and allow him to get away with this kind of behaviour.

We are demanding a very clear statement from the Prime Minister on this matter, and we are further indicating that we are in complete opposition to the decision which he took in this particular matter to send troops to St. Vincent-Grenadines. That is what we call interference in the internal affairs of another country. (*Asides*). You are not the Prime Minister of Barbados. 5.00 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you addressing the Chair?

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, the Rt. Hon. Member. Sorry, sorry, not you. You will reach the Prime Minister's Chair some day. The Rt. Hon. Member for St. Thomas, the Prime Minister of Barbados is not the Prime Minister of St. Vincent. Let us know what concern it was of yours or Barbados to be involved in the internal affairs of St. Vincent. Let us know that, because we must know what criteria was used to make that kind of decision.

My colleague just reminded me here that it does not appear that the Island of St. Vincent was threatened because we have been able to establish there were 13 Rastas with a couple of guns and the St. Vincent Police were able to recapture the place in a short space of time.

In this Defence Act, Part 2, it talks about setting up a Defence Board. The Prime Minister, from what I can recall, is the Chairman of the Defence Board and it seems to me that decisions which are made by this Board relative to the deployment of forces, to my view should be reported and a statement should be made on it.

As the member for St. Michael South West has pointed out, if the Defence Force is going to be used in this manner, in a matter which is external to Barbados, then we are left to wonder what will happen in the case of any kind of problem which the Prime Minister might feel might be threatening the stability in Barbados. As the hon. member for St. Michael South West has pointed out, in the event of some kind of industrial unrest, one

shudders to think what will happen if people attempted to pursue an industrial strike which could be considered as a legitimate act.

We are very concerned about this matter and I would want to say that the Democratic Labour Party gave some consideration over the weekend to coming in here today and moving the adjournment of the House on a matter of urgent public importance but inasmuch as this matter was down and we recognised that there was a Head 106 to be debated we knew that we would get the opportunity to ventilate our point of view on this matter and to express the concern of the Democratic Labour Party and also to express the concern of Barbadians about what can obviously be characterised as an irresponsible and reckless abuse of power by whoever made the decision to send Barbadian troops to St. Vincent.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, this afternoon during this debate it became quite apparent that many people in Barbados have not really come to grips with what they have attained when they got independent. It does appear to me especially from the Opposition remarks in this matter, that the Opposition does not realise that Barbados is an independent country and also it is not recognised that St. Vincent is an independent country.

When I hear them say, as the former member said, that Barbados is interfering with the international conditions or rights of St. Vincent when in fact the Prime Minister of St. Vincent himself, as Prime Minister of an independent country, communicated with the Prime Minister of Barbados, the Prime Minister of an independent country, and invited him to send troops there, at that time neither Prime Minister knew there were 15 Rastafarians or nobody else in the Caribbean knew whether there were Rastafarians or anybody else.

It was quite in order for the Prime Minister of Barbados, who I understand had a Cabinet Meeting and the Cabinet decided that they would send troops to St. Vincent. How can we say it is interfering with the internal relations and conditions of another country?

Prime Minister Cato was given overwhelming support by the people of St. Vincent to conduct their affairs and if he seemed fit to invite Barbadians, he invited the British and the Americans. Would the Opposition have criticized the British for sending in troops? No, because we are suffering from a colonial mentality.

Now here today we have heard the voice of the hon. member for St. John that in the last World War he left Barbados to go to Europe to fight in a war in Europe. He said, and it is true, that some came back and some were killed in Europe. He may have been one killed in Europe but he did not think of that when he went there to fight. He went to fight for a cause which he felt was just.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order, please.

Mr. WARD: He fought for the cause of democracy and where did he fight? Flying in a piston engine plane from Great Britain over Germany. (*Asides*) Listen, I have seen pictures of the hon. member for St. John and the hon. member for St. Thomas on different occasions laying wreaths in memory of the dead. Where did they fight in the Caribbean? They fought in Europe.

It was Europe's War that Barbadians went there to fight in but when you get something in the West Indies, you get colonial mentality. We must not get involved in our neighbours' affairs. Both countries are independent, you know. It is not to say that St. Vincent is a colony and Barbadians went into a colony. They went into the independent country of St. Vincent invited by the Prime Minister of St. Vincent.

How can they say that we interfered with the internal affairs of St. Vincent. It is absolute nonsense. Can we understand, Mr. Chairman, that every time something takes place in the Caribbean we must employ the Americans? What did Dr. Williams do when Chaguaramas was taken over. They did not get in touch with the Americans and they did not send aircraft carriers off Trinidad? Do you mean that we are suffering from such a colonial mentality that we must look for a big nation, we must look to Cuba, we must look to the American States, we must bring in American soldiers, British soldiers to fight our battles but Barbadians cannot go to St. Vincent.

Then this nonsense about going to the Grenadines. This is misleading the country. They did not go to the Grenadine Islands. They went to St. Vincent proper. They went to St. Vincent to relieve the St. Vincent troops or soldiers to go to Union Island. That is most important to get hold of and let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, if nobody else in this House saluted the Prime Minister and his Cabinet for having sent troops there to help a free independent sovereign nation, I salute the Cabinet at this time.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will have a chance but before .....

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair will not be directed by the hon. member for St. Lucy, please. Does any other hon. member wish to make a contribution?

Mr. TAITT: If the innocence of the hon. member who just sat down could have been taken, per se, we

could have ignored what he said but he is sufficiently innocent of what is going on that we cannot ignore it. I do not wish to say he is ignorant.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. TAITT: If he can allow the Prime Minister of this country to brainwash him with that kind of nonsense, we are in serious trouble.  
5.10 p.m.

Mr. WARD: On a point of order Mr. Chairman. The Prime Minister and I had absolutely no conversation whatsoever about this matter, so I do not know how brainwashing comes into it.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think I am entitled to speak, Sir. I am on a point of elucidation. The Honourable Member suggested during his speech that I was interfering in the internal affairs of Europe because I served in the Royal Air Force during World War 2.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Let me finish.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat and let the Honourable Member elucidate.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I was a member of the Royal Air Force on 2nd September, 1939. I was embodied in the local forces because a state of war existed between Barbados and Nazi Germany. Subsequent to my embodiment, after serving in Barbados because I did not like doing sentry duties, I volunteered to fly with the Royal Air Force. It was an avowed intention of the Nazis after they had finished exterminating the Jews in Europe, to exterminate all the black people all over the world. There was a state of war existing not only between Nazi Germany and the United Kingdom, but the whole of the Commonwealth and all of civilisation. How can he equate that situation where a state of war existed between Barbados and all the civilised world and Nazi Germany with a Rastafarian parang in Union Island which has probably 300 or 400 inhabitants. The newspapers say 4,000. There are 4,000 in the whole of the Grenadines as far as I know, apart from Bequia.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member said that he did not have any words with the Prime Minister. If the Prime Minister is able to convey to him what he conveyed to us without speaking to him we are in even worse trouble. Mr. Chairman, in the United States before President Carter could despatch a single solitary soldier of the United States of America in pursuit of an aggressive act of any kind or anything that can be remotely connected with war, President Carter has got to

consult under the Law that has been passed in the U.S. Congress, with persons whose names and positions are established. That is there for anyone to see. Who is the Prime Minister of Barbados that he can get up one morning and decide that one of his political friends in one of these Caribbean Islands wants some assistance and he can pick up Barbadians and send them in St. Vincent? Mr. Chairman, suppose one of the Barbadians had killed a Vincentian by some accident? What would be the state of relations between our 2 countries? We would be in a state from which we could not recover for the next 30 years, Mr. Chairman. I want to make this point, the Honourable Member talked about who we want if the British or Americans? Let me make my position clear, if that Honourable Member sees the British and the Americans through eyes that confuse him, they do not confuse me. I lived in America and I consider both the British and the Americans in the same light. None of them has any consideration for people like me in the Caribbean. It would be worse if the Honourable Member in this chamber.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. TAITT: If he could be talking in terms of the Americans and the British in the context of Independence and asked if the Democratic Labour Party realised their Independence. It was the Barbados Labour Party that walked all through this country and said they did not want any Independence and now he has the temerity to get up in here and talk about we do not realise our independence. It is precisely because of this Country's Independence that when they put people in this House of Assembly, or put them in authority that the people must relate to those who put them there and cannot make decisions as if they are in charge of peons. I will tell anybody that. It is a question of those who have been put in authority must realise that this is a democratic system and we cannot operate in this country on the basis of personal feeling.

If the Prime Minister of this country has a special regard for the Prime Minister of St. Vincent, that is his privilege and I applaud him for it. That in itself is not a crime and it is good that they should have relations, but the Prime Minister of this country cannot allow his personal relationship with the Prime Minister of any country to influence his judgment when it comes to the deploying of troops in this country. Any minute now, Mr. Chairman, we are going to hear from that Government how Gonsalves is banned from coming into Barbados. You can listen for the Prime Minister or the Ministry responsible for Immigration announcing that Mr. Gonsalves is banned from coming into Barbados. These are the kinds of remarks that you hear from those in authority. Mr. Chairman, if that is the kind of way we are going to run the affairs of our people in the Caribbean,

then we can expect anything from the people in the Caribbean.

Imagine, they insulted the people of Barbados by putting out a statement saying that the reason why Trinidad and Tobago and other countries did not join in the statement that was made congratulating them on their move, was because of the difficulty they had in communication. Can you imagine in 1979 any Government that had any concern for the ordinary masses could put out a statement saying that they had difficulty getting in touch with any country in the Caribbean about sending troops. Nonsense.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise on a point of order. The Honourable Member is taking advantage of a concession which this Government has granted, indeed refused it when it was in Opposition, of speaking more than once in Committee. In the previous Parliament, there was a rule, the wording of the rule said that you could speak only once in Committee. We changed the practice when we came into power. I said that we would ignore that ruling and allow Honourable Members to speak more than once. This is the first time in this Parliament that anybody, even a Minister, has spoken more than once on the same item.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker has ruled on that.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The Speaker could not rule on that because it is a committee matter. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South is wrong. Perhaps we go too far in leaning over backwards to accommodate the Opposition to try to get the Opposition to associate with the mainstream of public life, but I am objecting now at this stage to his making a second speech on the same item and we will have to make a ruling on it. There is only one item left before the House. He has already spoken for fifteen minutes and I object to his speaking longer.

Mr. TAITT: He has objected. He is only a Member of the Honourable House for St. Thomas.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Honourable Member take his seat.

The Honourable Member is being out of order. I asked the Honourable Member to take his seat. Be seated please. In Committee, the rule is that an Honourable Member may speak for fifteen minutes at any one time. The concession has been that an Honourable Member can speak again but it is clearly understood that in speaking a second time an Honourable Member is not expected to repeat himself, he is not expected to canvass the same, or put the same arguments that have been canvassed before.

I would ask the Honourable Member seeing that with the interruption he now has three minutes left to wind up.  
5.20 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I will wind up. I just want to wind up by saying this: that hon. member who occupies the chair of Prime Minister is an hon. member elected in this House like anybody else. He cannot come in here and say that I said so and therefore it is so. You, Mr. Chairman and the hon. member who sits in that Chair as Speaker run this House. I have the same rights in here as that hon. member and indeed as a member of the Opposition I may even have more rights. I do not care if he objects, nor do I care if he is tired of anything. I am speaking for the 15,000 people who live in St. Michael South West and he cannot speak for them, and they are concerned that he can pick up Barbadians and send them to St. Vincent willy-nilly when it suits him with guns in their hands. He does not care about the people in Barbados, the 250,000; I am saying that he does not care.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must withdraw.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that he cares.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must withdraw. I must warn the hon. member. I rule the hon. member out of order. Please take your seat.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I wish that I could have risen in a mood when I perhaps had not been quite so provoked as I have been during the extremely distasteful speech to which we have just been treated.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, a speech which is critical of a Minister or of the Government cannot be described as a distasteful speech because a Minister does not like what is said, and I object to the hon. member every time there is a criticism of the Government saying it is the nastiest speech, it is a distasteful speech. Everything that is not adulatory and sycophantic to him is distasteful, and as Leader of the Opposition, I must assert the right of the people on this side to expose what is going on in Parliamentary terms, and not have him every time getting up talking about a distasteful speech. I object, and I do not normally raise my voice. And talking about provocation, he is provoking the people of this country.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If I say it is a distasteful speech, it is only my opinion. I am only one member in here. I did not come in in a dung basket, but I am only one member and I am still entitled to express an opinion. I could not say the speech, for example, of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, was distasteful; it was mistaken but it was a reasoned and sober speech for that hon. member. But as this debate has gone on, I have been profoundly disappointed by the way in which hon. members have successively moved themselves to more

extreme positions in a national matter such as this. The speech of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition . . . (Asides)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please, and I will have no interruptions.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: . . . can be described as rolling the wicket for the others to bat on. I regret that I must deal with a part of it which perhaps he found amusing but it was not so amusing to others as this debate has gone on. The concern of Barbadians about the use of the Defence Force I do not think myself from my own sounding has been as profound a concern as perhaps the Opposition is expressing, and I think that short of the statements about Mr. Cato, the Prime Minister of St. Vincent, the speech of the Leader of the Opposition reflected moderately accurately a reasoned Opposition viewpoint on the matter; but aware of this concern hon. members on this side would naturally give careful thought before hand and have given careful thought to the overall matter.

I was aware that the Democratic Labour Party was contemplating moving a motion of urgent public importance with the matter, and on behalf of the Government I would have welcomed it and dealt with it at the appropriate point. I became aware that it was impossible to give notice in time and that the Opposition considered that they would be able to handle it in the light of other matters which were on the Order Paper, and therefore I welcome it. But I would just state this: the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the Rt. Hon. and gallant member for St. John — I am not saying it in any sarcastic way because he has been an officer in Her Majesty's Forces and he is aware of such things as morale, discipline, keeping up the spirit — is I believe thoroughly aware of the sort of talk; he must have heard the message during the war of the distaste which soldiers feel for being stabbed in the back and feeling that they do not have the public behind them, and he above all should be able to give guidance to the members on his side, guidance which would be in the direction of when you have soldiers in the field, as far as possible you avoid rocking the boat. For this reason and since the Defence Force contingent, a number of them are still in St. Vincent, I would not have been making a statement today. Any statement that I intend or intended to make would be made after the contingent had returned from St. Vincent or after the matter had sufficiently settled for the statement to be made without in any way compromising or endangering the position of Barbadians overseas. If the hon. members especially the hon. member who spoke last wish to exacerbate the feelings of such Vincentians as are open to exacerbation to persuade them to be hostile to our troops, to try to persuade them to destroy our boys who are overseas perhaps in a position of difficulty, he has made a good speech for that purpose.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Chairman, my complaint is with the hon. member who sent them. It is

not to fall out of his mouth now about our boys who are overseas. The initial error is sending them.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Well the hon. member may wish now to qualify what he has said. It is entirely up to the hon. member if my few words have brought him to a realisation of his irresponsibility, and I regret that in a national matter such as this that I have to be at all critical of some of the things which have been said opposite. The very fact that you are dealing with a Defence Force which is a Defence Force for all the nation would suggest to me that you have to step carefully. For my part I was disappointed in one of the great parties of State that what I knew to be its discussions over the weekend I could see faithfully repeated in the Advocate News on Monday morning by Eric Sealy. I think it disgraceful that any political party in this country should put itself in a position as following Eric Sealy or being led by Eric Sealy. Every remark that has been made in here is an echo of what Eric Sealy has already said and you should be ashamed of it, I say unto hon. members opposite.

5.30 p.m.

You should be ashamed of yourself. Eric Sealy's interest in the Defence Force is an entirely different interest, I hope, than that of the hon. members opposite. You should be ashamed of yourself. (Mr. TAITT: I never went to Government House with him yet). Yes, but you bore Racketeer Clarke's coffin to Westbury Cemetery with him. You and Eric Sealy took the head of the coffin. You didn't go to Government House, I couldn't stop somebody from walking with me to Government House but I didn't have to carry Racketeer Clarke's coffin to Westbury Cemetery. The hon. member for St. Michael South West and Eric Sealy were the chief mourners at Racketeer Clarke's funeral. (Mr. TAITT: I would bear yours too). Not unless you want me to rise up out of the coffin and throw you down in the grave first.

Now I have specifically to refute certain arguments made. First of all, I much regret that the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for St. Michael South Central should have been so careless of the facts and the law as to give any credence whatsoever to the suggestion that the Defence Force is not properly in St. Vincent. This is entirely without foundation, there is absolutely no shadow of legal authority for making the statement that there was no right to send the troops there. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition read out section 7 of the Defence Act which says the Governor General may at any time order that the whole or any part of the Barbados Defence Force shall be employed outside Barbados. That is the law, and then it goes on to say but no officer or soldier of the Barbados Defence Force Reserve is liable to be employed outside Barbados except certain conditions are followed. No part of the Defence Force Reserve was sent to St. Vincent, regular soldiers were mobilised in two contingents and sent to the Island of St. Vincent.

I spoke to the Governor General and I advised him under the Act, the Cabinet met and dealt with the matter and the Defence Force is legally in St. Vincent. That must be clearly understood.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Just on a point of order, Sir. The Hon. member who has just sat down said that I read out section 7, but my recollection is that two hours and 37 minutes ago I read out section 8 first, which says that the decision is a decision to be taken by the Defence Board. I do not have section 8 in front of me and the hon. member is saying that he spoke to the Governor General. He did not say that the Governor General ordered them outside, and he said after the decision was made by the Cabinet. Now he is accusing me of misleading the House or misquoting the law or something like that, but I would like to know this. Did the Defence Board make a decision? Did the Governor General under his hand in writing issue instructions for a part of the Barbados Defence Force to go overseas? Those are the answers that I would like to have, I do not want to take it piecemeal out of what I said after I read section 8 first.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Section 8 deals with overseas training, it does not deal with sending the Force as an embodied unit to serve overseas. Section 8 empowers the Defence Board to send any member of the Force overseas for training purposes. The Defence Force is not in St. Vincent for training purposes, it is there to relieve the forces of the Government of the State of St. Vincent and the Grenadines of certain duties on the Island of St. Vincent so as to release those forces from putting down an armed insurrection in another part of the State. That is precisely and exactly the advice which was given to the Governor General, it embodies the instruction which was given to the Chief of Defence Staff and the specific orders which were given to the Commander of the Contingent that went to St. Vincent. It has gone to St. Vincent not to fight, shoot or anything, it has gone to St. Vincent to enable the Government of St. Vincent, a friendly Government which has recently received an overwhelming mandate from the electorate to maintain law and order in its national territory which it might perhaps would have been unable to do without the assistance of an outside body of some sort.

Hon. members had gone on about Rastas. Hon. members should know that the first report to the authorities of St. Vincent in the early morning was that a force had landed upon Union Island and was attacking the Police Station, a force of unidentified persons. Indeed there was a somewhat alarmist report which sought to identify them but both Prime Minister Cato and I discounted the alarm. It does appear to be true that there were movements by boat, because after the Police Station at Union Island which had been deluded of its normal complement of its police officers by reason of the election — many of them had gone to St. Vincent to vote

and had not yet returned to the Police Station — after the Police Station was attacked the Revenue Office was taken over and the airstrip was seized by a group of persons. The persons cannot be described as 13 Rastas, the number of persons which I will not divulge who have been identified, who have surrendered in arms, who have been seen to bury arms and who have surrendered without arms exceeds any numbers that have been mentioned in here, and indeed according to the best information it exceeds by double the number of persons who accompanied the Leader of the Opposition in Grenada in taking over the Government of that country. More people were involved in this than apparently were involved in Grenada, therefore it cannot be condemned as a casual insurrection. Members of the St. Vincent Police Force seeking to return to duty .....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am sorry, I don't want to interrupt the Hon. Prime Minister, but I am on a point of order. I did not have the Act in front of me, but he read out section 8 of the Act and he said it deals only with ordering soldiers or officers outside for training, but I remember specifically referring to section 8(2) of the Act which says the Defence Board may with the consent of an officer or soldier place him at the disposal of the military authority of any country or territory for the purpose of his being attached to the armed forces of that country or territory. Now, the question which I asked in my original speech was this under 8(2); are the Barbadian "troops" the personnel who were sent there, under the military authority of St. Vincent? Was a decision made by the Defence Board? That is question No. 2. Was an order made by the Governor General under section 7? That is question No. 3.

The Hon. Prime Minister said he spoke to the Governor General, as I understand from him, I believe, here today — let us say, I understand from him here today, he knows what I am referring to, but I really did understand from him today, but I can back that up with documentary evidence that my understanding is perfect in this respect that the Cabinet made a decision. I do not understand from him up to now that the Governor General made an order, because they either have to be there by an order of the Governor General or by a decision of the Defence Board under 8(2), and I want to know whether they are under the St. Vincent Military authority. It was not fair for the Prime Minister, knowing that I did not have the Act in my hand, to say that section 8 deals with training. Section 8(1) deals with training, I referred to section 8(2).

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am very sorry for the hon. member, and indeed I would be more sorry for him if I had not seen that tactic before on numerous occasions when having been pushed into a corner he wants to impress people that do not understand and do not have documents before them, and he gets up with an air

of reason, an air of sweet reason and says I am asking a question about something, and the question has no substance, I have already said that the action was taken under section 7 and not section 8. The former Prime Minister's point of order addressed to the Prime Minister is nonsense.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I asked him if the Governor General made an order under section 7 and he has not answered that. I have asked him a question which I am entitled to on a point of order and he is now saying that he not going to answer.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member must ask that question of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central or of Eric Sealy or of other of his lackeys — I can't call the hon. member for St. Michael South Central a lackey.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I did not put Eric Sealy in the Chair, I do not know anything about Eric Sealy, he knows about Eric Sealy.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member didn't put Eric Sealy in the Chair, I challenge him to say if he didn't get Eric Sealy to telephone my father once and put a recording device on the line during the windfall debate in order to obtain evidence if possible to arrest my father, Mr. M. E. Cox and the hon. member for St. Andrew. I challenge the hon. member. You say it is not true and have the pleasure of letting Eric Sealy know you are a liar.  
5.40 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Hon. members must please contain themselves.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The situation was following the attack on the Police Station at Union Island, there was an attack on Prune Island and the reports which reached the Prime Minister of St. Vincent at the time when he spoke to me was that there had been an attack on Union Island and the Police had had to flee. There had been an attack on Prune Island by unidentified armed persons arriving from other places. An effort was made by the St. Vincent Police to land at Union Island and they were fired on by apparently automatic fire from the Airport and driven off.

There was also a small outbreak on the Island of Bequia. At the time when help was requested, three of the Grenadine Islands had been threatened; at least two by armed persons arriving by sea and an aircraft attempting to land with the forces of Law and order had been fired on and driven off.

Under those circumstances, a request was made to the Government of Barbados, and the Government of

Barbados acting under the authority of Section 7 of the Barbados Defence Act took steps to ensure that a contingent of troops were made available to guard the airport at St. Vincent so that St. Vincent Police and auxiliary Police who in effect comprise their volunteer force could restore order in the State as far as possible.

There are other matters which I do not wish to canvass because indeed when you hear tonight's News you will realise that the matter is a little more operational than hon. members are seeking to say.

Now I want to deal specifically with one or two side points. I want to say that I disassociate myself completely and utterly from the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition about Prime Minister Cato. He said that the first time he ever crossed the Bequia Channel he was over 50 years old and he went at the behest of the hon. member who took him there and that he has never been to Union Island. Prime Minister Cato has asked me.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Just a minute, Sir. I said that up to that time that Prime Minister Cato told me that he had never crossed the Channel and that he had never been to Union Island. He had then been Prime Minister, as far as I know, for six or seven years. I could not tell whether he went during the Elections so what is the point his telephoning Cato about that. He should have put me on the line to him.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member did not say Prime Minister Cato told him as far as I can recall.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said so. How else would I know? You go and ask the people at Bequia or Cameroon or Union Island.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, it has been said in the House that Prime Minister Cato said, according to the hon. member which is not true, that Prime Minister Cato never crossed the Bequia Channel until he was over 50 years old and he had already been Prime Minister for six or seven years. I do not mind how the hon. member thinks he wrapped it up in his speech.

The fact is that Prime Minister Cato's father for a considerable part of his childhood was stationed at Bequia as a Teacher and Prime Minister Cato lived there. Some of his sisters were borned there. It is absolutely and utterly untrue that he never went there until he was over 50. Now I do not believe that he could have told the hon. member for St. John that.

He said he never went to Union Island. Prime Minister Cato opened the Airport at Union Island when he was Premier. He put a Secondary School on Union Island. He brought electricity services to Union Island when he was

Premier. He was campaigning in Union Island since the year 1951.

I am specifically asked to say that he stayed at James Mitchell's house when campaigning on Union Island. Prime Minister Cato asked me to say that the hon. member for St. John was an outrageous liar who is as malicious as he had been led to believe, but I cannot say that in here, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Those words are unparliamentary.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir. We have all the people in Bequia, Cameroon, Union Island, Mustique, Monroe and the Tobago Keys to bear evidence. I also have Mr. Son Mitchell and other people who were with me when he said "This was an experience for me because I had never crossed the Bequia Channel. Ever since he had been Prime Minister he had never been to any of the Islands." I said that he was over 50 years of age at the time and I said that it was remarkable that he never went to Union Island up to that time and Barbadian troops have to go down there to defend them.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not wish to embarrass the hon. member. I want to have respect for his grey hairs and wish he would have some respect for them. I have respect for mine and I will have more respect when I have as many as he has and if he had respect for himself he would be very careful about making these statements which give enormous offence to people who have done him nothing.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I cannot have those remarks and asides. The hon. member for St. John, please contain yourself. Please be quiet.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: There are certain points of principle which emerge from speeches made by the hon. members and I will deal with the simple ones first. I do not think that the Opposition have appreciated that in effect, what they are saying is that no country should ever assist another country with Military help. Nobody has said that directly but they have characterised the sending of troops as interference in another country's affairs. They have spoken of President Carter. I am not aware that President Carter had to have a debate in Congress before sending the Kitty Hawk off the Rhine.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will please give way.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am not giving away.

Mr. TAITT: I am standing on a point of elucidation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will take your seat please. The hon. member has given way?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: No, Sir, and if he is going to make what is not a point of order a point of order, I will ask you to deal with persons who persistently seek to obstruct the business of the House.

I will just have to say that that point of view will have to be a division between the Government and the Opposition. I reject the concept that no country is entitled to ask another country for Military help. I reject that concept entirely. I believe that there are small countries which are entitled to call upon their neighbours to withstand aggression; that there are small countries which are entitled to call upon their neighbours under certain circumstances even to assist in putting down internal disorder.

The United Nation's Charter recognises that as well as it recognises the right of the nation to take Military action under certain circumstances, not only to defend itself within its national territory but to defend its national interest if threatened. (*Asides*). Ask President Carter. He will tell you which Charter. I will see him before you. I will ask him for you. You will never see him.

Members of the Barbados Defence Force have been to Dominica apparently without any comments from members of the other side. They went to Dominica to assist in unloading and keeping order at the Airport. Indeed they were more likely in Dominica to have been involved in the terrible things that hon. members have been speaking about than in St. Vincent because there was a time at the Airport at Dominica when food supplies which were being landed by members of the Barbados Defence Force were being looted and we were asked for assistance in protecting the food supplies in Dominica. 5.50 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think the Prime Minister is inadvertently misleading this House. Mr. Chairman, the matter of Dominica was a humanitarian gesture on the part of a Government going to aid a country.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: That is not a point of order. I am dealing with the points made. One of the points made was what would happen if a Barbadian had killed a Vincentian. I am pointing out that there was perhaps a greater danger of a member of the Defence Force on a shrimp boat or at Melville Airport being physically injured than in St. Vincent but nobody objects and do not believe that the sending of troops cannot be a humanitarian gesture also. The people who are getting obsessed with militarism are honourable members on the other side. When you send a body of troops to St. Vincent — I want to make it clear the Government of St. Vincent is being supported in

an effort — you may be taking the one step which persuades people who might otherwise go and put themselves into trouble not to do so. I say absolutely no more.

I believe that the fact that the rebellion was quickly suppressed is due to the swift action of the Government of St. Vincent assisted by its friends. The Government of St. Vincent was faced with an insurgency. You speak of rastas. Are hon. members aware that one of the people arrested is a school teacher who led the Union Island contingent to Independence? Do you altogether ignore the fact that it may be a well organised movement to use weapons at least as sophisticated as those used in Grenada?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. The Hon. member should know that some of the biggest rastas are university teachers. So what is this about school teachers? You have got to go to the Mona Campus in Jamaica.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am glad for the hon. member's support.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am supporting academic freedom.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I would point out to hon. members that they have had outbreaks of insurgency in Anguilla, in Trinidad and in Grenada within the past 10 years. In Anguilla it was successful. In Trinidad the Defence Force was able to maintain a state of insurgency for several days, many Ministers were worried and indeed were humiliated. The Government was shaken.

I do not accept that the Government of Barbados is wrong in attempting to do what it can to maintain stability in the Caribbean. The Government of St. Vincent, the Government of St. Lucia, and the Government of Barbados have been holding talks for over the past year relating to the establishment of a regional coast guard. I would have regarded myself as a traitor if in St. Vincent's hour of need, the very small steps of supplying St. Vincent with a small contingent of troops was an act that we would be afraid to do. I am making no apology of any sort in this matter. There is an expression "no man is an Island, but each is a part of the main". The Honourable Member for St. Michael South can quote it at even greater length. I have no doubt that we are all a part of one people. On this particular theme, I am going to indicate that the one Caribbean leader that I spoke to personally on Friday perhaps supported me in a particular aspect of being one people. It is alright when you recruit policemen to go to Namibia. I hope that Honourable Members are aware of that. Namibia is a place where people are dying every day. It is alright when we recruit people to go to Namibia, it is alright when we send people into a situation that in fact, is unruly. But out of opposition to Cato or because Eric Sealy wants to say so or because they are having a meeting on Sunday night and he

has nothing else to say, it is desired to make something out of this incident. This incident will be regarded as a Watergate.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the point I am making is that the Honourable Member suggested that the reason why one put forward one's view is because either Eric Sealy had said so, or because he has a political meeting to keep and had nothing to say. That is a reflection on my speech and I draw it to your attention.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order. Please be seated.

Mr. TAITT: He is bringing improper motives.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order. Will you please take your seat.

Mr. TAITT: As Your Honour wishes.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I have never heard anybody on that side condemn the Government of Trinidad for asking for outside assistance. I have not heard them condemn Grenada for asking for Cuban assistance, but the Government of Barbados is being condemned.

Let me just tell the hon. member for St. Michael South West that nothing in the United Nations Charter forbids helping a friend. The hon. member for St. Lucy and St. Michael South West who talked about interfering with the domestic affairs of other Governments. That argument is not even worth answering. Prime Minister Cato asked us for troops to help keep order in St. Vincent. That can never, under any circumstances amount to interfering in the domestic affairs of other countries. It is nonsense, and a complete lack of understanding of what is going on. I said before I was interrupted that this is a Watergate. It is the first time that the Caribbean has looked within the Caribbean for assistance that it needed of this nature. Until now, all the assistance has been coming from the United States and Britain.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. At the time of Anguilla, the British Government tried to persuade the Government which I had the honour to be Chairman of the Cabinet to send Barbadian personnel, paramilitary personnel to Anguilla. I refused. At the time of the strike, Mr. John Compton was at that time in Opposition in St. Lucia and he was arrested, they made a request, through the Governor of Barbados for Barbadian policemen to go precisely to relieve the pressures on the policemen. Again, I told the Officer administering the Government of this country that in no way would any Barbadian personnel go to St. Lucia. There were Anguilla and St. Lucia. Those were two specific demands which were made.  
6.00 p.m.

I remember in the debate on the Public Order Act that the hon. member said that we did not need anything like this, that in Trinidad you needed a revolution to get rid of doctor politics down there, but we did not need anything like this in Barbados. You needed a revolutionary movement. He was the person preaching revolution then. We have it in the debates. Do you want me to go and quote chapter and verse?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not want a speech really.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Considering that the Public Order Act was passed before the armed mutiny in Trinidad, I do not know how I could have said that. Anyway the hon. member has not heard what I said. I said it was the first time an order had been given. The hon. member should be aware that at the time of Mr. John Compton's revolution in Cul-de-Sac that that was an industrial dispute and certainly the Government of Barbados would not be assisting any Government to solve an industrial dispute by violent means. We would not even be assisting ourselves to solve it far less any other Government. At the time of Anguilla the hon. member well knows that the sending of policemen to Anguilla was in the balance. He should remember the American Ambassador sitting down over there and my father in the House raising the matter of urgent public importance and insisting that the Government not send anybody to Anguilla. The hon. member knows perfectly that that Tuesday no decision had been taken until the debate in the House. I was in here. I took part in the debate.  
(Asides)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No cross-talk, please! Address the Chair.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I should just like to ask the hon. member whether he was suggesting that the Government of the time was going to send Barbadian personnel to Anguilla, because I will produce all the documentary evidence. We have it and would make it public.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The argument at the time was that Anguilla was a colony and Britain should have sent its own forces to maintain order in a colony. It is a perfectly simple matter. I was in the House, Mr. Chairman. Hon. members think because it was a long time ago that I was not here. I remember the debate; I was in the House and the announcement was not made until after the House debate and I believe that if I chose to go and look at the file I will find that there is no decision on file until after the debate in the House. On this occasion the Government of St. Vincent has been assisted by one of its Caricom neighbours. The only person who is head of a Caribbean Government to whom I spoke personally was Maurice Bishop. We discussed the matter. Mr. Bishop emphasised that the Government of St.

Vincent should be supported, but he did not wish the support to come from outside the region. This was indeed after the decision had been taken. I am not suggesting that Mr. Bishop's views had in any way contributed to the decision. I am just commenting because at least it can be seen that we are working our way, having got away from political imperialism, having taken steps to get away from economic imperialism, perhaps we can now try to work out a way to getting away from the military imperialism which in the end we have been depending on as a last resort to protect ourselves in power.

Do not doubt, Mr. Chairman, that the situation has changed since the Barbados Labour Party manifesto was written in 1976. On that occasion page 22 could be written. Mr. Sydney Alleyne had not yet mounted his first assault from within the Caribbean. He had not yet gone to the Seaview Hotel in St. Martin in a room paid for by a West Indian politician, met with two persons from the United States tried to get somebody to fly a plane, made telephone calls to other West Indian politicians, making arrangements for payments of money; he had not contracted with a group of persons here to infiltrate Barbados as tourists and stay here for a week; he had not yet made arrangements to have a cache of arms in a house at Bath; he had not yet arranged that a certain number of people who were going to help him overthrow the Government would be here for a week and a certain number would stay for a month; he had not arranged the channels of finance through various areas; he had not been to any army training camp in Guatemala; he had not been given money by the Foreign Minister of Guatemala; none of that had he done or did we know he had done at the time the Barbados Labour Party manifesto was written.

The words in the Barbados Labour Party manifesto were seriously compromised. Our belief in the future peacefulness of Barbados was seriously shattered by Mr. Alleyne, and I could as well say, Mr. Chairman if I have not said it before, that the first threat was a very strong and real threat. The second threat was not perhaps of the same vein. Once the second threat had been publicised, the distance to travel was such that perhaps nobody would easily have got here. If we did not know of the second threat, they would have reached Dominica too. Don't doubt. Only recently I had been going to a cocktail party and I heard something that I regarded as very secret, namely the estate yard in Barbados which was to be a rendezvous for the second set of invaders. I could hear it being talked about because the person was saying that somebody came to him and was looking at the yard and asking how far it was from Foul Bay and so on and so forth, and it is a matter of a party conversation now. Anyway it was a threat, but from Marseilles to Dominica is a long way and once you know about it you could nip it in the bud. But the first threat was a very real threat

indeed, and based upon that, based upon what we have seen happen in other places, the Government decided to implement an earlier move, indeed I could say plans because the Defence Act was on the file when I got there, of the past Government, because the last Government were in favour of the Defence Force and we were doubtful. In this Government now, apparently they are against it.

I think it is really time, Mr. Chairman, that this sniping at the Defence Force take positive form. If the view of the Opposition is that we must not have a Defence Force, I call on the Opposition to pledge that if it is returned to power, it will abolish it. I call on the Opposition to make a declaration to that effect. This is like when you go into church and you are told "speak now or hereafter hold thy peace". If you do not want a Defence Force and you will abolish it, come out and say you are going to abolish it; let us know where you stand, but do not snipe continually at our soldiers, a small number of boys and girls getting work incidentally or releasing jobs for other people to get work, a small number of boys and girls trying their best to carry the weight of defence of a small island in a world where it is shown that small islands are vulnerable.

They talked about the woods in St. Peter. What do the Royal Barbados Police Force know of cordoning off a district and searching it? It is an essential part of military training. What on earth do policemen know of that? They are not trained for it. The Commissioner of Police asked for the help of the Defence Force in searching the woods in St. Peter. I did not even know about it. When I came back here I heard about a tent in a tree or some expression. It was a matter as far as I know entirely between the police and the Chief of Defence staff. I believe that the Attorney General may have been aware of it, but from the police point of view. That is what it is for. I do not know why we should sneer. The Leader of the Opposition is sneering at the Defence Force getting a bus to carry school children somewhere.

6.10 p.m.

I honestly can't see why that should be a matter of discontent.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I object on a point of order. I did not sneer at the members of the Defence Force getting a bus to carry children, I pointed out that the Addendum to the Resolution said that the bus was to carry supplies and I said you do not need a bus to carry supplies and furthermore you do not need a bus to carry troops, and if you want a bus to carry school children rent one from the Transport Board. I hear you are getting 80 new buses. We ordered 38 more in 1975-76 and you had more since, why do you have to get particularly a Mercedes bus to

carry supplies and now it is an entirely different explanation we are hearing. I do not think that members are entitled if they draw attention to the discrepancy between the Addendum and what is given as an explanation in a speech made by the principal Minister introducing a Resolution that they should be accused of sneering or improper motives, and we must put an end to this nonsense.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I have no objection to the hon. member drawing attention to what he thinks is a discrepancy, but I do assure him that the bus will be used to carry haversacks, ammunition boxes, cases of food and so on where it can, and perhaps unoccupied seats or if it is built with some space or whatever. The expression used to carry supplies, if that sticks in the hon. member's craw, why doesn't he move an amendment? I don't mind, I say that the bus is primarily for the carrying of people, if it has in the expression "supplies" *ex abundante cautela*, well I congratulate those who drew the Addendum. I must have approved it. If the hon. member now only wishes to say it must not carry supplies, if he wants I will arrange for the movements of the bus to be made known to the hon. member and he can send an inspector to check how many times it carried supplies and how many times it carried people.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I don't have the time for trivialities like the hon. member. If he wants to buy a bus just say Item 9 — Purchase of a bus. I am pointing out to him when you put in the Addendum "A bus to carry supplies" and then you say it is not for supplies but for museum trips and for members of the House of Assembly, that is completely contrary to what is in the Addendum. If he wants to delete the word "supplies" it is all right with me, but at least treat Parliament with respect and say we want a bus, period. It is all right with me, you have not come for any more money, I do not know what you are going to drop; the armoured car, the aeroplane, the ship or whatever it is you are going to drop to buy the bus. You haven't come for any more money.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: And we wouldn't even spend what is in the vote, all we have bought is a truck and a motor cycle. I believe, out of the vote so far, I am very obliged to the hon. member for his assistance in this particular matter, and he certainly has greater experience in writing notes to Estimates than I have, and I grant him that any time. What I do know is that when he was in power the Accountant General's reports were four years out of date and the accounts of Barbados were not audited for over six years after Independence. What I know now is that I laid the most recent Accountant General's report on the Table of the House of Assembly today and I would like to congratulate the Accountant General for keeping things up to date. I know you can get the monthly accounts generally within a month — sometimes I must confess they take six weeks — but none has ever taken 18 months as

they took under the hon. member. If the care which he is extending in debate on a note to the Estimates. . . .

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir, the hon. member knows I have never been Accountant General of Barbados and the hon. member knows the measures that I took to try to get the public officers to do their duty, so it is very unfair for him to come in and say that the Accountant General's report is 18 months late. We had an Accountant General that did not know the names of more than two people out of a staff of 58, how does he expect to get reports in less than 18 months in those circumstances? He never had to labour under those conditions. I have never been Accountant General of Barbados, I am not qualified and I don't want ever to be Accountant General of Barbados.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I agree the hon. member is not qualified to be Accountant General. Last week he abused the hon. member for St. Joseph and said he should resign on the grounds of ministerial responsibility. This week he says he is not the Accountant General so he is not responsible for the Accountant General's breaches of the law. You need no further comment on the hon. member's forgetfulness.

Sir, a few small matters. The hon. member for St. Michael South West said that Barbadians are already there and the facility with which the troops deployed shows the efficiency of General Adams. Is it really a matter of shame that having taken a decision to send troops to St. Vincent that they were there within six hours? Is that a matter of shame? Do you mean I have to apologise now to the House?

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, if the hon. member will give way, he missed the gravamen of the point. The efficiency with regard to the movement in St. Vincent was to be congratulated, but what I was fearing and what I spoke about and what was the gravamen of my speech was that when that efficiency is turned on the poor people of Barbados, how awful it is going to be. That is the point I was making.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The Defence Force is not going to turn on the people of Barbados, the only people whom I have been hearing express this view are Nassar, Parris, Tommy Miller, Happy Bryan, Gordon Matthews and Eric Sealy. These are the only people, I cannot understand how responsible people now come in here and follow Tommy Miller and follow Nassar and follow Gordon Matthews. I can't understand it. Week after week you get these fringe politicians putting a strong case. Honestly, Eric Sealy is a better speaker than anybody on the Opposition side, he and the hon. member for St. Michael South West are man-o man-o in this regard but they are putting a case and hon. members cannot approach his fluency and therefore they have to adopt his material? Do hon. members opposite feel that

if you repeat what Eric Sealy says that it will make them better speakers? I can't understand it. Eric today, Brandford tomorrow; Tommy today, Sandy tomorrow. The only one who seems to be careful is Walton, the only one who doesn't seem to involve himself in these platform nonsenses. Sometimes, Mr. Chairman, if I want to know what the people of Barbados are really thinking I listen to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, because the amount of his vehemence is always a measure of what is being said out on the road.

I remember the day when he came in here and defended the merchants and said that elephants could be running through the supermarkets and said how hard the Government was being on the merchants. I knew then that we were not the merchants' party in truth, or the merchants didn't think so. Now I hear him come in today and he said he is not saying he is rolling the pitch. I know by that all of this about St. Vincent is an opposition exercise and does not reflect any deep feeling in the country. But it is as well that we have had the debate.

I want to sum up, Mr. Chairman. Let me refute first of all that assisting St. Vincent with a few soldiers is a matter of interference. It is not, we have acted within the Defence Act, we could legally do it, we have been asked for help and we have acted within the United Nations Charter; both things. That is point one. Point 2, that there is any suggestion that the Defence Force is militarising Barbados, it is not it is protecting Barbados, it is giving training to some boys and girls, it is giving employment to some boys and girls. Point 3, that there are no circumstances in which Barbadian soldiers should ever serve overseas, I reject that. If the Opposition felt so they should have voted against Clause 7 of the Defence Act, they did not vote to delete Clause 7. It is part of the law of Barbados and I believe that we can hold our heads up higher in St. Vincent and Barbados because the united efforts of two small countries have very successfully nipped what could have been a dangerous insurgence in the bud. Point 4, that it is a matter to be dismissed and ignored, it is not a matter to be dismissed and ignored, there was action taken against a number of the Grenadines that could give rise to a serious belief that the integrity of the State of St. Vincent and the Grenadines was threatened. All of these points are involved.

6.20 p.m.

In the last analysis, Sir, I am persuaded sometimes by examples that can be drawn from history. Not the examples about Barbados being at war or about Cadets being embodied in the local forces. They are only froth on the great river of history which occurred through the 20th Century.

At the risk of being accused of having grandiose ideas beyond the confines of Barbados, yet looked to great events to find examples. I recall, as the hon. member for St. John may recall he might recall it personally and I recall it from reading about it.

In 1935 the first steps to disturb the peace in Europe were taken by the newly elected Prime Minister of Germany for people forgot that Hitler was elected to power, in a coalition Cabinet of 10 in which he only had three members and that he had to tread a very narrow path to establish himself in supreme rule. Indeed he was always a legal ruler. Never at any stage did he usurp the Constitutional powers of the State.

I recall that there was a Clause in the Treaty of Versaille which said that Germany should not station troops West of the Rhine and one morning, I think it was in March 1935, Hitler sent Military Bands, Germany Cavalry Units, and a few tanks, (He had no Forces) into the Rhine and occupied it.

All the things which hon. members are saying today were said by people in Britain and France. "No interference. Wait and see what happens. Why get into that". All the troubles of the Second World War came from that because it is now clearly established that the German General Staff obeyed the orders of Hitler under protest and that if they had been resistance the Government would have fallen in Germany and perhaps the hon. member for St. John would not have had to find himself threatened to pour out his blood in defence of far off countries.

Now it is a grandiose example but it is still an example to remember. All of these Islands can have Revolutions. All can have democratically elected Governments overthrown. All can have adventurers threatening them and unless we hold together in every conceivable sphere, the economic and political sphere, these treats will continue.

I regard the co-operation between Barbados and St. Vincent in this particular matter as being an example of political co-operation which we should be proud to have.

One very small point, Mr. Chairman, I think it was in the speech of the hon. member for St. Michael South. He should be ashamed of himself in thinking that the taxpayers' money would have been taken to send Mr. Howard Roberts to St. Vincent with any letter to Mr. Cato. Not one penny of the taxpayers' money was involved. Mr. Roberts was even back in his duties the following day. The St. Vincent Labour Party and the Barbados Labour Party are in fraternal association. The letter was from one Party Leader to another Party Leader sent by the Personal Aide from one Party Leader to

another at the expense of the Party. Do not be led by Eric Sealy, Mr. Chairman. It is completely untrue.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will now have to put the question to Head 106, Item 1.

*The question that the words be there added was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*On the motion of the Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*

*On the separate motions of the Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG the Resolutions were agreed to and passed.*

#### THE IMMIGRATION (AMENDMENT) (No. 2) ACT, 1979

*Item No. 6 was called – to move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Immigration Act, Chap. 199.*

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not want to take a long time on this matter. We are legally advised that in order to make Immigration Rules that deal with different classes of persons it is necessary to amend the recited Section and that is the substance of the very short and simple Bill.

The intention of the Government is to make regulations relating to the admission of students as soon as the Bill passes. We have also taken the opportunity to clear up an omission in our amendment to the Act on an earlier occasion by adding the words "permanent resident or immigrant" in what is called the "Work Permit" Section, which is Section 17. That is just a minor omission.

I have already in laying the Forms and Fees Regulations, Sir, indicated that Immigration Fees will go up as from next Monday. If any hon. member wishes to raise this, I do not believe that the House would object if I gave replies arising out of the new Regulations. 6.30 p.m.

In addition to the fees going up, I would just say this and it should have some interest to the Representative of the Barbados Workers' Union. We are introducing a new styled application form for a Work Permit. It is a much longer document than formally and in particular, in cases where employers apply for Work Permits they would have to answer a much more detailed list of questions than was previously the case. They will now be

called on to say what they see as special qualifications which non-immigrants are said to possess, proficiency in the use of machines and equipment and so on which will qualify them for a Work Permit. They will also now be called on to give new details on the form itself that can only be obtained at present, by writing them a letter and asking them for specified details.

The organisation will in future have to state its size, its annual sales or income. They will have to describe the capital formation, the percentage owned by citizens in Barbados, whether or not it is a subsidiary or affiliate of any foreign based company. They will have to analyse the present work structure to indicate how many employees perform the same work as the non-immigrant and very important, they will have to answer questions relating to unionisation of plants where they plan to employ non-Barbadians. They will have to answer if there are either labour disputes existing or labour contracts being negotiated. They will have to give very full details of the numbers of hours that they ask the Barbadians to work overtime and how many hours they will be asking the foreigners to work both basic and overtime. We believe that the Immigration Division will more easily be able to assist with the application for Work Permits after the new forms are in full operation.

We also have a new E.D. card, this is the Entry and Departure Card for tourists, Sir. Non-residents will now be asked one or two statistical questions. We believe that it should not be too much trouble for them. We will also be asking residents of Barbados the purpose of visits abroad and length of stay abroad. The fact is that when Barbadians leave the country there is no way of finding out if they are immigrants or not from the E.D. Card if they say stay abroad for 6 months. We will deal with the cards in a certain way. If it is vacation, say so. If it is business, say so. We are not intending to exercise any new form of control over Barbadians. Some time will be given to let the new E.D. Cards come into operation when this Bill becomes law if it is passed.

We will be producing new application forms for persons who wish to enter Barbados as students. We have detected that a number of persons who are refused permission to be in Barbados on a Work Permit and have been visiting here for several years when you see them in a shop on Broad Street or Swan Street, they say they are not working they are only visiting a relative. Some of these people enroll, Sir, with one or another ostensible educational institution and get letters saying they will take another twelve months to pass 'O' Level English Language or whatever the case may be. We are finding it necessary to tighten up on this. We do not believe that the student visa should be used as a means of evading the Immigration control. Cabinet has taken a decision that it will certify educational institutions as suitable for immigrants. Annual certificates will have to be obtained by the

students and the institutions will have to renew their certification also with the Ministry of Education. This should not really give any serious embarrassment to anybody. Spot checks have been made in particular areas and we found for example, a list which was brought before Cabinet recently, consisting of people who were apparently at large in the island without Immigration permission. A number of them gave an address in Amity Lodge. When you go to that address, the house is completely empty, closed up and no sign of occupation for a long period. There are one or two people, who have in fact succeeded in evading the Immigration Authority. We do not want to over state the case but it should be pointed out that the Amnesty period for CARICOM nationals has expired. The qualification date was September, 1975. Within another nine or ten months people who have been in the Island for that time, will be entitled to become residents. They will be entitled to register as permanent residents but we are still getting people that came in 1977, 1978 and 1979 without any qualification to be in Barbados. It is definitely putting pressure on the Immigration Department. We cannot afford to have unlimited immigration in this country.

Last year, the population fell through emigration. I do not think it can fall this year, there is more prosperity in the Island. People are coming here to look for work. (Mr. GREAVES: They cannot go to the States) It is not true to say that they cannot go to the States. The number of Barbadians who went to the United States last year would perhaps frighten the Honourable Member for St. Lucy. They are going to the United States in numbers that takes you back to the 1950's rush to England. The United States of America allows in by the front, some, and by the back many. Barbadians in effect were emigrants.

We cannot afford to have a very large open door even to our CARICOM brothers and sisters. We have accommodated many Dominicans since Hurricane David but we cannot afford to have any slackening in Immigration control in this very crowded Island. We are administering the Immigration rules as humanely as we know how. We have endeavoured to remove what is politely known as undue influence from having any part in administering the rules. Sometimes it may appear that there is a little capriciousness, but the capriciousness is exercised usually in the direction of humanity.

6.40 p.m.

We do maintain a very small quota. I will not say how large the quota is, but a very small quota of places for persons who are not otherwise qualified; it may be a political refugee; it may be a person who....I could give examples, but I do not think it would be wise....a person who perhaps works here for an international organisation who decides he wants to retire here. We may make arrangements for something like this in advance and

occasionally, Sir, the family who appears as though they have some potential in assisting in Barbados but who do not really qualify under the normal guidelines; perhaps one a year or two a year are allowed to remain in Barbados, but the numbers are very small, and we think that we have managed to diffuse, in fact I hope we have managed to diffuse some of the strains that used to tear apart the Immigration Department.

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

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

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

*On motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.*

*Clause 1 was called.*

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part.

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

Mr. TAITT: What I have to ask is very small and I might as well ask it on Clause 1, because it concerns immigration, the word itself. I believe in the parent Act I had raised this question and I do not think the Prime Minister got a chance to deal with it, but why are we talking about immigration as opposed to permanent resident whereas internationally the tendency has been to see an immigrant as a permanent resident? I am just wondering in terms of falling in line with the internationally accepted practice where for example in the U.S. you have immigrants who are all those persons who are going permanently to the U.S. or quasi-permanently as opposed to the non-immigrants which would include the students and the visitors and that sort of thing. Is there any special reason why we are differentiating between the immigrant *per se* and the permanent resident? I am not sure I fully understand this difference in our legislation. I wonder if the Prime Minister could tell us what is the situation on that?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: We have introduced the word immigrant to mean semi-permanent resident too, Sir. We have inherited a system by which a lot of people have been granted what was called residence and then we discovered that there were really two statuses; one was permission to become a resident and the other was resident; so we have renamed those persons who are in Barbados permanent subject to powers of revocation for cause as immigrants, and we have renamed residents "permanent

residents", and after five years an immigrant becomes a permanent resident. The status of permanent resident is very little short of that of citizen. A permanent resident can vote, can do everything except stand for the House of Assembly. Immigrant itself now connotes a permanency as would be obvious when the forms are seen, because the forms speak of non-immigrant visas and so on. It now does connote a good deal of permanency which will mature into permanency in five years.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, just one question. I am sure I understand what the Prime Minister said. I understand the change from what was to what is, but I think that on the next occasion this Bill falls to be examined he might examine the possibility of putting those two categories together, because for the person who is coming into Barbados this could create some confusion where if he were told that he could get immigrant status but not permanent resident status, for example he could be quite confused. I am sure that some of the officers who work in the overseas offices may find themselves saying that a man will get immigrant status but not permanent residence. It is a small point but for persons who will be immigrating to Barbados, as it were, this could develop into a serious problem because a person may give the wrong information or make the wrong application, and subsequently discover that what they thought they had they have not got. But for what it is worth I hope the next time it comes up you will give some consideration to it.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The point is taken, but I will tell the hon. member this: we are very flexible with applications. Normally if you apply for permission to become an immigrant you will not be granted permanent residence; but if you apply for permission to become a permanent resident and you are not qualified on legal grounds, you may get a letter explaining that you are not qualified to become a permanent resident, but you will be granted immigrant status and at the end of a certain period of time you will automatically become a permanent resident. There is a little confusion now, there is no doubt about it, but it is not as much confusion as once before with permission to become a resident and so on.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, one last question, am I right in understanding that everybody who applies to settle in Barbados permanently gets immigrant status and could move on to permanent residence?

*The question that Clause 1 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*Clauses 2 and 3 were called and passed.*

*On motion of Hon. H. deB. FORDE seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported*

*the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*

*On separate motions of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.*  
6.50 p.m.

#### RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT BATH VILLAGE, ST. LAWRENCE, CHRIST CHURCH

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I am seeking leave to deal with this on behalf of the Minister of Housing and Lands.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of a small portion of land — I think it is 850 square metres, 837 square feet — at the corner of Bath Village for road improvement. I think hon. members will know this awkward corner which exists, if one is coming from Bath Village, on to the main highway leading to Bridgetown, Highway 7. It is sought to acquire this land so that the Government may be in a position to improve the very bad highway conditions existing there, Sir.

From the file it appears as though agreement has been reached on the price of the land. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

#### THE JUDGES REMUNERATION AND PENSION (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1979

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, after longish negotiation, a new formula for pensioning the Judges has been agreed between the Establishments Division of Government and the Judges concerned. We have had to deal with the position of the Judges and the Widows and Children Pension Scheme; that has already been dealt with with other Civil Servants and it is needed to be dealt with with the Judges, and we have also had to straighten out one or two difficulties relating to Judges' pensions, how much service at the Bar one takes into account if a Judge is appointed directly from the Bar, and and so on, and so on.

It is complicated, Sir. If hon. members have read it and wish to question it, I would have to listen carefully to their questions and try to answer them. If hon. members have read it and are satisfied that it represents a fair pension scheme for the Judges, as I am, I believe

it could pass without comment, Sir. And in the hope that the second state of affairs is the actual one, Sir, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. gentlemen that we on this side have read the Bill and we feel very strongly that a matter of this kind relating to our Judges ought not to form the basis of any debate, we find that this Bill fairly represents the level at which our Judges may be compensated, and therefore for that reason we will give our wholehearted support.

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

*On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.*

*The Clauses to the Bill were called and passed.*

*On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. CHAIRMAN*

*reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*

*On the separate motions of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. deB. FORDE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.*

7.00 p.m

#### ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for tonight. I am asking that this House do stand adjourned until the 18th at 10.00 a.m. I will explain this. I am asking for 10.00 a.m. because this is expected to be the last Sitting of the House for the year. Not only do we wish to conclude proceedings early, but there is a reasonably full Agenda and we would want to get over the main Government measures without leaving over other than those that have been referred to a Select Committee of the House.

*The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 18th December, 1979, at 10.00 am. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.*

7.03 p.m.