
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 18th December, 1979.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 10.20 a.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, J.P.(Speaker); Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, LL.D., (Leader of the Opposition); Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment); 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. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.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; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Trade, Tourism and Industry) (Leader of the House); Mr. V. L. JOHNSON, M.A.; Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Mr. L. L. SISNETT; Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, M.Sc. (Econ.); and His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, LL.M. (Deputy Speaker).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 4th December, 1979.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, these Minutes have been circulated and subject to any observations by any hon. member as to the accuracy thereof, I beg to move that they be confirmed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no observations by hon. members, these Minutes stand confirmed.

The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 11th December, 1979.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, these Minutes have been circulated and subject to any observations by any hon. member as to the accuracy thereof, I beg to move that they be confirmed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no observations by hon. members, these Minutes stand confirmed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to announce that I have received the Report on the results of the examination of the Accounts of the Island for the year ended 31st March, 1979, together with the relevant Statements and Accounts as prepared by the Auditor General.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister for Finance and Planning, I beg to give notice of the following:—

Financial (Amendment) Rules, 1979.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 6) Order, 1979.

Barbados Development Plan 1979–1983.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister, I beg to give notice of the following:—

Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 6) Order, 1979.

On my own behalf, I beg to give notice of the following:—

Resolution to amend the note to Item 2 – Equity and Other Contributions, Head 108 – Ministry of Finance and Planning.

On behalf of the Prime Minister, I beg to give notice of the following:—

Resolution to grant the sum of \$27,610 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. 21, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that last week it was intimated to the House that the Government would endeavour to complete its business today so that we will have the usual Christmas recess. It is the intention of the Government to move that these Resolutions be dealt with at a later stage today.

I understand there is likely to be one other money Resolution from External Affairs.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it you are giving an intimation that you are seeking leave of the House at a later stage today.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: That is right.

Mr. TAITT entered the House and took his seat.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. SPEAKER: On Friday, 14th December, 1979, at 12.45 p.m. there was tendered to the Clerk of this House a Resolution having as its object a prayer that this House resolve that it has no confidence in the Prime Minister and calls on him to resign. The Resolution bore at the foot thereof the following in typewritten form:

“Resolution submitted by Errol W. Barrow, Leader of the Opposition, December, 14, 1979.”

It was signed “E. Evelyn Greaves for Errol W. Barrow, Leader of the Opposition.”

This in my view is worthy of some comment for the benefit of the House generally. Standing Order No. 15 which was made under the Constitution of Barbados, subsection (2) states that notice must be signed by the member giving it. That is Standing Order No. 15(2)(2). Similarly Standing Order No. 2(2) states “Every notice must be given in writing and signed by the member giving it.”

Such a notice should have been deposited with the Clerk of this Honourable House not later than 12 noon on Friday last giving three days' clear notice.
10.30 a.m.

I am prepared to exercise my discretion in view of the fact that the notice was delivered 45 minutes late. I exercise my discretion in this respect, but in view of the fact that the notice of motion was not signed by the person purporting to be the mover thereof, or the intended mover thereof, I rule this motion to be out of order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I think that I should draw to the attention of the House that before this sitting I gave Your Honour notice that that motion was withdrawn and a new notice substituted.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am yet to exercise a further discretion.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, if I may crave Your Honour's indulgence.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot be interrupted. I learnt a few minutes before this Hon. House was in session today that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition intended withdrawing the motion which was then in the possession of His Honour the Speaker. It not being a motion before this Hon. House, there could be no question of withdrawal. It can only be withdrawn if it is in the possession of this Hon. House. The motion remains out of order.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, if I may now crave Your Honour's attention, I never intended to interrupt Your Honour.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the hon. member rise?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I would just like to draw to Your Honour's attention that this side, if Your Honour even exercised full discretion to allow the Hon. Leader of the Opposition's motion to be in order, that we can do it today. I appeal to Your Honour, Sir, as a Christmas gift

to this side, just let him do it today. I ask you, Sir, I pray to you today, Sir, let us deal with it today and let me eat them raw.

Mr. SPEAKER: I promise the Hon. Minister I will take note of what he just said. I am to state further, a few minutes ago I received from the Hon. Leader of the Opposition a notice to effect that he intends seeking permission to move a motion, or the adjournment of the House today on a definite matter of urgent public importance. The matter as stated in the last paragraph thereof, the matter on which this action is being taken relates to the sending of Barbadian troops to the island of St. Vincent on Friday, December 7, 1979.

In the limited time at my disposal I have given this matter every possible consideration, and in particular I tried to find where the urgency now exists. In view of the fact that at the last meeting of this Hon. House the demands of the Opposition, those members who addressed this Hon. House, were the immediate return of Barbadian troops to Barbados, I now find that since the troops have returned to Barbados there can be no further question of urgency. The request of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition therefore remains, one of public importance. It remains, in my view, still a definite matter, but since it ceases to be urgent the request must be disallowed.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give the House notice that later today during the session of the House the Prime Minister will make a statement.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Standing Orders have not been suspended yet, as far as I know, and at this stage, according to the Order of Business, statements are normally taken, and I gather that what the Leader of the House is saying is that he is going to ask leave for a statement to be made out of the normal order of things.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am grateful to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, but I must let it be known a statement by a Minister can be made at any time. What is important, the Minister must notify His Honour the Speaker, but he does not require the Speaker's permission to make a statement nor does the Minister have to seek the leave of this Hon. House.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Reply to the Question asked by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, No. 35, is now ready.
10.40 a.m.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of the day.

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken and that Order No. 3 standing in the name of the Attorney General be the first Order of the day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is the instant order of the day. Order No. 3.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Order No. 3 was called — To move the House into Committee on a Bill respecting treason.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply on this Bill. The Bill has been read a second time.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, in moving that Clause 3 stand part, I want to refer to the last occasion on which debate of the Bill took place and that is at the second reading of this Bill. At that time, the Rt. Hon. member for St. John raised the question of the implications of Section 3, subsection (a) of the Bill which says "Everyone commits treason who, in Barbados, (a) uses force or violence for the purpose of overthrowing the Government of Barbados".

On that occasion I pointed out that offence is well known based on common law in respect of treason and also in legislation of other countries of the Commonwealth. I undertook to research the point

further and to make available the benefit of the legal draftsmen who were concerned in drafting this Bill.

On another occasion I did make available Mr. Jim Ryan and Mr. Shelton Bowen and I believe the Rt. Hon. member did take the opportunity to speak to them on the implication of Clause 3(a).

I wish further to clarify for the benefit of this Committee that this is nothing new in the law as known to democratic countries in the Commonwealth. Specifically, I would wish to draw the Committee's attention to the Working Paper, No. 72 of the English Law Commission which has been published by Her Majesty's Stationery Office and which contains the 2nd Programme, Item 18 on the Certification of the Criminal Law dealing specifically with the crimes of treason, perdition and allied offences. I wish to quote specifically from paragraph 30 and this is what it says:—

"Many countries have offences of treason or their equivalent which apply in peace time. Canada and New Zealand each provide that it is treason to use force for the purpose of overthrowing the Government of the country and in the case of Canada, or province, or to conspire so to do.

Australia distinguishes between treason and treachery depending upon whether the acts occur in peace time or war time and provide that it is treachery by any act to —

- (i) overthrow the constitution of the Commonwealth by resolution or sabotage; or
- (ii) overthrow by force or violence the established Government of the Commonwealth or of a State.

In another case the Proposed New Federal Criminal Code proposed in the sense of armed insurrection with an attempt to overthrow, supplant or change the form of Government of the United States or of a State."

The Report of the Law Reform Commission goes on to say that it is an offence which should be kept in any updated legislation on the United Kingdom Treason Act. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the summary of the provisional Proposal of that Commissioner is interesting because we have actually gone ahead and to implement a new modern law dealing with treason in which subsequent research has revealed that our proposal is one that finds favour with this Law Revision Commission.

I have also taken the opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to research the type of circumstances referred to in the

speech of the Rt. Hon. member in which he assumed a given set of facts and on the last occasion suggested that these facts may lead to difficulty and may cause people in the Union to be guilty of treason in those circumstances.

I am satisfied, beyond a shadow of a doubt on the basis of the Treason Law in the Commonwealth and looking at the construction placed on the Canadian and the New Zealand Law that the set of circumstances which the Rt. hon. member have assumed, if they existed in this country, would not constitute treason under Section 3(a).

In the circumstances, I think that the draft as it stands makes no change in the Common Law. In fact, other than limiting the number of events which constitute treason as now exist in Common Law and as set out in the Section which were alluded to on the last occasion, the draft of Section 3(a) is identical with provisions in the Criminal Code of Canada which has stood the test of time for several years, has been properly censured and I do not think anyone would suggest that it is contrary to the fundamental rights provision of Canada and the Human Rights Act or any other provision.

Secondly, it is almost identical with that contained in the New Zealand legislation and thirdly, that it is identical almost, except for the words "Commonwealth of Australia" with Sections 24 and 24 (a)(i) of the Crimes Act 1913–1966 of Australia. The actual Section of the New Zealand Act is the Crimes Act, 1961, Section 73 8(e) and (f).
10.50 a.m.

The provisions, of the Canadian Criminal Code 1954 — 1966 Sections 46(d) and (f).

Mr. Chairman, I have taken the opportunity to go at length to explain not only the geneology of this legislation and its sound Common Law tradition, but because the question of fundamental rights was raised, I have been at pains to ensure that this section would conform with our Constitution and with democratic tradition as exists in this country. I can do no more than say this to the Committee, but this is the legal opinion of my officers and myself and our research. Other than that, I can only say that there may be political questions that members want to debate. I am satisfied myself, beyond any shadow of a doubt that this section is in order and I beg to move that Section 3 stand part.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, during the second reading of this Bill, I drew attention to

Clause 3A where there is the departure from the Statutes in the United Kingdom which the Honourable Member who just sat down has brilliantly extruded. The Treason Act of 1351 and 1495 and existing Law of Barbados were brought here by the settlers. I searched the Bill diligently to find out why the Government, at this stage, should be preoccupied with matters such as the Treason Act and other strange bits of legislation which even at this time of year are preoccupying the attention of this House. I still have my reservations even after my discussions with the legal draftsmen. Legal draughtsmen put into acceptable language what they are instructed to do.

What a Conservative Government of New Zealand and a Conservative Government in Canada or any other Government for that matter in Canada or New Zealand may consider efficacious for those countries did not influence me in my duties as a Legislator in Barbados in the peculiar atmosphere in which we have to live in the closing quarter of the 20th Century.

What is remarkable in the United Kingdom is that up to today the word "Government" has never been employed. The Treason Acts in the United Kingdom, the ones of 1351 and 1495, were Acts relating almost exclusively at first, to occasions on which the country might be engaged in hostility with foreign powers. I agree with the Hon. Attorney General that when you study the history of the United Kingdom, the history of a strictly monarchical system, one in which the monarch becomes a constitutional monarch, to have "the Sovereign's daughter and daughter-in-law" and all those collaterals of Royalty not strictly concerned about Barbados, therefore, we do not have to worry about that Clause because as I pointed out, the ordinary criminal law of the island so far as Section 2 is concerned would deal with any attempt to kill any citizen of Barbados, whether he be the representative of Her Majesty the Queen or His Majesty if it is the King. To do bodily harm — there is an Act of 1873, or some time around there relating to offences against the person. Grievous bodily harm — all of that is there in Section 2. Levying war against Barbados or does any act or is a party thereto. That is not treason. If you levy war, you are liable to get shot, you are an enemy. I do not think that anybody will contend that there is any departure in Section 2 or that anything new is being introduced.

I am saying, in the Legislation in the United Kingdom as the Hon. Attorney General tried to influence us to believe on the last occasion, although he did not say so directly, but he had one presiding officer believing that he had something up his sleeve in so far as the term "Government" is concerned. It is not in the United Kingdom Legislation and the United Kingdom Parliament would not accept that a Government needs

any protection against civil disorder, riots, commotion, or anything else so as to make it treasonable to use force to overthrow a Government. The last time on which Mr. Churchill turned on the troops was in 1926 during the general strike. He was then, as far as I remember, the Home Secretary and he has been condemned ever since for his action for rolling the tanks up to the East End of London to be used against the dockers and the people who were on strike and it took him nearly 20 years to live down that act of turning out the tanks against his own people. But even in the fullness of his conservatism, I do not think Mr. Churchill would have considered it an act of treason for the dockers or anybody else using force to exercise their rights and would have invoked the provisions of the Law whether it is the Common Law or the Statute Law of England against citizens of Great Britain because they felt that they were asserting their rights.

To tell me today that there is nothing new, is one reason why you should not bring in the legislation because it is a waste of our time to bring something that is not new. I say that it is new. There are things in the legislation of Canada and the Dominion or whatever it is called of New Zealand that you would not sit down here and pass. There are things in their legislation that say that black people cannot land, so because they have that kind of legislation in New Zealand or Australia, does it mean it is good legislation? It is the same Parliament that has the white New Zealand policy, the white Australian policy and that kind of thing. Mr. Ryan showed me the legislation. I knew Mr. Ryan long before the Honourable Attorney General because I was the first person who brought him here some years ago to assist me with a draft. I am not questioning Mr. Ryan's draft at all, I am questioning the decision to do what the Honourable Attorney General calls repatriating the Law of Treason.

11.00 a.m.

The law of treason was never domicile in Barbados; it was never resident in this country and you only repatriate something that was here and went abroad and now has to be brought back home. It was never domicile or resident here, and therefore in so far as Clause 3(a) is concerned, I cannot support it. I cannot in my conscience sit down here and repatriate something that was never roosting or nesting or even temporarily residing here in Barbados because it is invoking new principles which are the thin edge of the wedge when you look at the whole conundrum of legislation which is creeping into these so-called democratic societies and the kind of actions that are taking place to support the legislation. We can never support it and the trade unions are a people on whom I suspect that legislation of this kind will first be invoked.

Now the Attorney General may have honourable intentions, I have no doubt. I give him the benefit of the doubt. I have no reason to believe that he himself personally has any dishonourable intentions because he likes everything to be tidy. He likes to repatriate things that were never citizens; he is repatriating, I believe, a lot of people whom may never have been citizens of Barbados at all. I believe there are a lot of people repatriating and getting on the electoral register in Barbados who were never patriots of Barbados. They are being repatriated too, not by him necessarily, but the Attorney General may have honourable intentions. But who is the next person who may have to give advice on the interpretation of this section? I remember during the debate on the Constitution, I think it was the Attorney General himself said that as long as I was Prime Minister he did not have any fear about the amendments, but he was concerned about who was going to be the next Prime Minister. I wondered whom he meant and now I know whom he meant. So I am telling him the same thing now. I am not worried about him because I think he has some kind of respect for the rule of law. I cannot support it because I know how these things can be perverted and they will say that maybe what somebody else intended, but this is what I say and this is how we are going to use it. The United Kingdom Parliament has not employed it. The section to which you wanted to refer about anybody doing anything which would pressurize the Sovereign to change her advice or her counsel is not on all fours, *in pari materia*, as they say with Clause 3(a) of this Bill, and therefore Clause 3(a) is not going to have my support on this side.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, in rising to speak on this Clause I will first indicate that I am grateful to the Hon. Attorney General. I thought I had looked at this Law Commission Report and indeed I did not have a copy and he sent over his copy. Let me say at the outset that I would wish the same thing to amend Clause 3(a) if he wishes to get my support on this Clause. In its present form I do not think I can support it for the following reasons: in the first place to quote from the same document, the Law Commission Working Papers of 1972, the Attorney General did not indicate, I do not think intentionally that the section from which he read came from a section which says "proposals for the reform of treason" and throughout the discussion they are discussing treason in relation to a time of war; and then later the Commission goes on to point out that many countries have offences of treason or the equivalent which applied in peace time. Paragraph 58 of the same document — the Attorney General quoted paragraph 60 — starts off saying "a strong practical argument against retaining an offence of treason in peace time is that the criminal law provides as we have seen in the previous paragraph an adequate armoury of serious offences with which to charge offenders who

execute or plan acts which might otherwise be punishable as treason in peace time."

Now, Sir, what we have heard is a classic situation of one side of the argument being given followed by the other side of the argument, and we heard the Hon. Attorney General quoting the other side of the argument. In essence this paragraph says "anyone who uses force or violence", and the Attorney General indicated that in New Zealand and in Australia and in some places a certain construction was put on the use of that phrase and he alluded to the criminal code of Canada and indicated that the construction and interpretation of Canadian Law has led him to be satisfied, but Mr. Chairman, in the first place there has not been a great deal of treason in peace time to begin with, and secondly we in the Caribbean are familiar, I am sure the Attorney General is familiar, that in different islands of the Caribbean with the identical words in a particular statute, they have seen different courts interpret the same words differently. For example, Mr. Chairman, there is something called the Emergency Powers Act in almost every Caribbean territory especially before independence. There was a case in Guyana where a man called Benn was arrested under the Emergency Powers Act in the then British Guiana, and when Benn's attorney applied for a writ to get him released under what appeared to be a clear interpretation of what could happen to an Act before it is *vires* or *ultra vires*, the then judge in Guyana after a long examination of the facts and the law ruled that the requirement for publishing the law in the Gazette was not mandatory. Not long after, Sir, in Trinidad on a similar Act framed in identical terms, Chief Justice Wooding I think it was, but in any case a Trinidad Judge argued that re Benn he did not say it in those words but how it came down the Judge was wrong in deciding and that he would not be influenced by what happened in that court in Guyana, and that in his opinion the particular set of words or the particular Act was required to be published in the Gazette, and therefore the basis on which the particular individual had been arrested was *ultra vires* to the Act.

I bring these two examples to refute the arguments put forward by the Hon. Attorney General that he is persuaded that the construction that would be put on these words based on the common law history and what statute law has been interpreted so far would lead to a reasonable interpretation of this in a court of law in Barbados. That is the gist of what I think the Attorney General said. My argument is that under the present circumstances perhaps the present crop of judges in Barbados may see it fit to interpret along the lines of the Hon. Attorney General's submission, but we are not legislating for next year or three years from now. We are legislating for all time.

11.10 a.m.

We have witnessed in the Caribbean a very slow but clear diminution of the rights of the individual. We are satisfied that in Barbados at this time so far as the courts are concerned that there is no attempt to interfere with the rights of the individual, but I think that everyone in the Caribbean is aware that there are or there have been in some Caribbean countries courts where judges have appeared to ordinary persons to lean more towards the political direction than the tradition of legal interpretation. We are aware of circumstances in which it can be argued that the only justification for a particular decision was the feeling that the Government's case had to be proved right, and, Mr. Chairman, you yourself having some wide experience in the reading of the law, are aware that anyone who wishes to come to any conclusion can find the rationale for coming to that conclusion.

It seems to me, therefore, that in the light of what the Hon. Attorney General himself has said, that he should have no strong objections to an amendment of this section 3 to remove any possibility of a misinterpretation of this Act. We are legislating for the people of Barbados for time to come, we do not know what kind of labour leaders we are going to have in the future, we do not know what kind of Governments we are going to have in the future, and so long as the rule of law is going to be functional in the community, we as legislators ought to make the law sufficiently clear that any misinterpretation of the law could be seen as a blatant violation of the principles or the tenets by which the law has survived in this community.

It is in that respect that, in spite of what the Attorney General has said — I have not had the benefit of talking to the legal counsel — but I have to agree with my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, that we are not discussing the efficacy of the drafting from the point of view of the abilities of the draughtsmen, we are not discussing whether this clause is properly worded, what we are discussing is what is the effect of this clause on life in Barbados over the next 20, 30, 40, 50 years, and we say that in its present form that "using force or violence" is open to at least more than one interpretation, and for that reason the Hon. Attorney General ought to agree with us that this clause should be amended.

For those reasons I would find it difficult to support this clause. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, subject to what the Attorney General will now say on this clause, I will find that I will be unable to vote for the clause in its present form.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, if I may reply very briefly to the points raised by both hon. members, as I understand it the Rt. Hon. member is satisfied that there is precedent for such legislation in other

Commonwealth countries, but he goes on to argue that the fact that there is precedent for it does not mean that the circumstances of Barbados justify similar legislation. Now, Sir, that is a question of his opinion and mine. He says that in England there is no similar offence. That is a legal view with which I respectfully disagree. I again refer the Rt. Hon. member to the very book which he used on the last occasion, Hallsbury's Laws of England, Vol XI, 4th edition, at paragraph 814. It says this:

"The treason of levying war against the Sovereign in her realm may be of two kinds, express and direct, as where war is waged against the Sovereign or her forces with a view to injuring her person or to imprison her or to force her to remove any of her Ministers or Councillors; or (2) constructive, as where there is a rising for a some general public purpose."

Now it has two and it refers to a footnote, which refers to Foster's and Hale's Pleas of the Crown.

"Among general public purpose instanced are to effect an alteration of the law; to alter religion established by law, to open all prisons, to pull down all meeting houses, constructive levying of war is in truth more directed against the Government than the person of the Sovereign." (First Privy Council Cases, 72).

Now, I cite that, Sir, to show that the category of acts which constitutes constructive treason at common law are much wider in existing Barbados law than anything contained in clause 3 of this Bill, and indeed clause 3 of the Bill limits the scope of the Barbados existing law so that these wide categories of offences of opening a meeting place — we no longer have an established church — but if we had the Anglican Church trying to force the Government to change from the established Anglican Church to a disestablished church and using violence for that purpose in England constitutes treason today, and the Rt. Hon. member must not say that he has no quarrel with the efficacy of the draughtsmen and that is all, because one of the objects of the exercise was to say that our construction of events in law that exist today shows that clause 3 is a limiting clause rather than encompassing the whole transaction of Acts which at present constitute part of the law of Barbados, and therefore, rather than this clause having the effect of undermining the rights of the individual, it rather limits events, therefore giving fundamental rights a wider scope in which it could act than at present exists.

Now, Sir, the politics of it is a different matter. My friends are quite entitled, if they wish to, as has been done on some platforms, to use this as part of what they call the political milieu, but in my view their arguments are really invalid. not only as law but in my view they are

also invalid from a democratic form of Government, and that is a political exercise on any objective test it is the sort of argument that one uses for emotion rather than for any proper validity of the argument. It is very difficult for me to do otherwise than reply that I really am not convinced of their case. I don't think any sane and rational person would be convinced of their case, of the argument put up by the hon. member at all in these circumstances, and to draw in the red herring of what is the immigration policy of Australia or New Zealand is begging the question. Surely New Zealand or Australia will probably have an immigration policy, if it is racist it will not meet with any support from this side of the House, but we are not dealing with that here. Australia and New Zealand also have laws that the Rt. Hon. gentleman, I am sure, would follow in many instances if they are solid and sound, and this is one such because it is based on a long common law tradition, part of which already exists in this country and is part of the law of Barbados.

The Rt. Hon. member goes on to argue this point. He said that if it is part of the law of Barbados, why do we put it in the Statutes of Barbados. There is a simple point here. The United Kingdom legislation after Independence still continues to suffer from the legal limitation that it has no extra-territorial effect outside of Barbados. In short, other than laws made under the Colonial Laws Validity Act and specifically extended by an extra-territorial clause, all laws made by the United Kingdom Parliament that are in being and that effect Barbados have no validity beyond our territorial waters.

Now, the act of treason and conspiring for treason can take place outside your territorial waters by your citizens, and obviously I must be persuaded as the Minister with overall responsibility for the criminal law, although its day to day exercise is within the competence of the Director of Public Prosecutions, that if we have a defence arising from the fact that some of our legislation is deficient, I have a duty to the House and I hope to the country to try to remedy the defects.

11.20 a.m.

Recommendations were made to me on the basis of this existing law that it is inadequate because there is doubt that the extra territorial validity in so far as Barbados is concerned today is extremely limited and that we would have to rectify this and we have sought to do so in this legislation.

It is significant that our legislation take into account similar reforms which are going on in England and I am saying that the United Kingdom Legislation as part of its overall criminal reform will be bringing down shortly legislation similar to this and revoking some of the old Statutes which it has and which are not up to date today.

Now the hon. member for St. Michael South West has raised the point of the construction placed by different States on Statutes. I agree with him. British Courts right up to the Privy Council or the House of Lords can take the same words and construe them differently. This does not apply only to this bit of legislation but applies to all legislations passed by this House.

Obviously, it makes a valid point. We are in the realms of men. We are men in the realms of God when it comes to construing such laws as these and we have to abide with the defects that men seem to set. They try their best to construe how they believe legislation is but that does not mean that we should not pass legislation, Sir.

Mr. TAITT: If the hon. member will give way, I think he has or is missing slightly the judgment of my contention. Since he agrees with me that men are fallible and if he agrees that Judges are capable of interpretation, that this is possible, even up to the Privy Council, my contention is that since we are making the law let us try to be as clear as possible in our law so that the fallibility of men would be reduced to a minimum. That is the point I am making.

If he claims that he put in the legislation a set of laws which will be amenable to different interpretations, any one of which could be detrimental to the citizen, let us in our legislation try as well as we can to avoid this kind of problem.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am very much obliged to the hon. member, Sir, but I am not at all agreeing with the hon. member that these laws which are very clear are capable of being interpreted other than it is intended by this legislation. They may be interpreted by someone who does not understand it but that is the risk we run when we have men as judges but I am suggesting that we must be concerned with the correct legal interpretation and it is not difficult. It is one that can give no Court any problems whatsoever.

The hon. member says he is not quarrelling with the draftsmen or the way in which it was drafted. He is just quarrelling about the effect or the legal implication. Well, what the hon. member is saying is that he believes that unlawfully overthrowing a Government by violence should not constitute an offence in law.

Mr. TAITT: Sir, if the hon. member will give way. The answer to that question is "No", and you yourself know that in formulating the law it says *unlawfully* overthrowing a Government by violence. My contention here is the use of words. Anyone who tries to or attempts to overthrow a Government unlawfully by violence deserves any punishment which the Courts mete out.

Even when you are formulating it you don't use the word "force", you use the word "violence". It is the use of words which could be termed against the Trade Union, for example, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am not going to go into the Trade Union position, Sir. In this very Bill, and this is the last point I am going to reply to, the only person who can bring a prosecution under this Bill is the Director of Public Prosecution who has an independent role to play in this country and with whom I have never interfered. I do not believe constitutionally it is proper, although I have had pressure to give directions in an event as witnessed in the Pele case. Everybody wanted me to tell the Director how to act.

It is not constitutionally proper. There is no right of an Attorney General in the 1974 Changes of the Constitution to give directions so there is no political input when it comes to the question of prosecution for treason. That is one of the other safeguards in here, Sir. That is a safeguard we have instilled in this Bill specifically to deal with these situations.

The hon. member must know that we have tried to ensure that we deal with all of the lines of abuses that could occur. I would not want hon. members to believe that Barbados is immuned from the sort of acts which may be started even outside of our borders and those are the ones in particular which we have been concerned with and we will have new legislation on the Statute Book adequate to deal with those types of circumstances and it will apply not only to this Government but to successive Governments and this is why I am satisfied that this is necessary.

The Rt. hon. member asked why we wish to bring this sort of legislation. Sir, we have been reforming and next year I hope we will be reforming several sections of the Criminal Law which is outdated. We cannot be happy about Bills in 1351 and copies of which are not even on our Statute Books and members themselves cannot even find copies of the Law to read. That is antiquated.

In addition, all countries with a democratic situation as existing there, have sought to update this type of legislation and make it more applicable to present day circumstances.

Let me say this. I agree with the hon. member for St. Michael South West in this respect when he says that in Barbados so far there has been no attempt to interfere with the fundamental rights of the individual and I assure him that that is the position under this Act. I agree with him in that respect, Sir. That is what he has said, Sir. He has said so and I want to hear.....I cannot give way to the hon.....

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. member when he checks the record will see that I was specifically careful to say "by the Courts". I was very careful to say "by the Courts." The records will show that.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I will tell the hon. member I wrote down that particularly and I gave it several ticks there. It was very excellent work, beautiful research and correct analysis, Sir. I agree with the hon. member, Sir. That is the position of this country, a position that this Government is really strong in and believes strongly in that there should be no interference with the rights of the individual and it is because of that that I have gone to pains in this Committee to try to explain to the Rt. hon. member and the other hon. members the reason why this Section is drafted the way it is.

I beg to move that this Clause stand part.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what does the hon. member rise.

Mr. TAITT: I am speaking on the same Clause 3.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This Clause has been debated exhaustively.

Mr. TAITT: I just want to make one small point. Only one small point.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I cannot grant you that. You are out of order, please sit.
11.30 a.m.

The question that Clause 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Hon. B. A. MILLER, Dr. CHELTENHAM, His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, Mr. SISNETT, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. BRADSHAW, Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, Mr. WARD - 12.

Noes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Dr. HAYNES, Mr. GREAVES and Mr. TAITT - 4.

Clause 4 was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part.

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

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

Clause 5 was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to move that Clause 5 stand part.

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

Mr. TAITT: Clause 5. I am not rising to oppose Clause 5, but to ask the Hon. Attorney General since he used as I understand it, the Law Commission as a guide, and since that Commission seems to have recommended that this offence be removed from the Order Book — their specific direction was “we do not think that there is any need to retain an offence of compounded treason” — I am wondering if the Attorney General has any special reason for retaining it in the Act.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: No, Sir, I have no special reason other than we think that offence is necessary. It is part of the existing common law and it does not widen the scope of the common law. We have retained it, as other countries have. I am not satisfied that that recommendation of the law commission will be accepted by the British Government.

The question that Clause 5 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 6 to 11 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. H. deB. FORDE, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1979–80 No. 19

Item No. 1 was called — to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of this Island.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to move, Sir, that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

The question that His Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

11.40 a.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1979–80 NO. 20

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, this matter need not detain the House for any significant period of time. In the current Estimates the sum of \$10 million was voted for construction works on the Bridgetown sewage project during the course of the current year, and it was felt that the project could not absorb more than that during this financial year. The fact is Mr. Chairman, that works at the sewerage project are ahead of schedule. The sewerage project is divided into three sub-projects; there is a plant which is under construction at Emmerton Lane and it is that phase of the project which is ahead of schedule. There is sub-project No. 2 which is the out-fall line which will take the treated effluent one thousand feet out into the ocean, and that was completed during the month of July this year, only remaining to be put into the main system when that is finished.

Sub-project three which is the actual sewerage of the city of Bridgetown is scheduled to start at the very beginning of next month as we did not want to get in the way of the Christmas shopping season, and that is why it did not start this month; but we are ready to start at the beginning of January on sub-project three. The upshot is that contrary to the belief of the Ministry of Finance and Planning the project has moved ahead more quickly than we had planned and for this reason the additional \$3 million is now required to carry us to the end of this current financial year. It is not often that a Minister can make that type of statement, a project being ahead of schedule, and I am happy to report such to this Honourable House. The sewerage of the streets of Bridgetown like I said, Mr. Chairman, is the third sub-project in the sewage project. It is going to be a lengthy operation and it is going to disturb the traffic flow and the peace of Bridgetown, but this is the price we pay for progress. The Ministry of Health through the project unit in charge of the sewerage has planned a fairly substantial public relations programme. We want, Mr. Chairman, to minimise as far as possible the element of chaos and turbulence which inevitably must come. Every street in Bridgetown will have to be dug up. We are working in close cooperation with a sub-Committee with the Ministry of Communications and Works, with the Police Force in an effort to plan alternate routes and to keep the public as well informed as we can do so that the noise element, the dust element and particularly the alternative flow of traffic will be as little of an irritant as possible. We cannot wait until any later down in the year,

and we have got to catch the dry season as far as we can. We do not want to be sewerage in the wet season so that when you dig trenches they fill up with water overnight. It is unfortunate that the sewerage has to take place during the height of the tourist season, but then, Mr. Chairman, the sewerage project is primarily for the benefit of Barbadians and that consideration took a lesser priority in our view than any other. (*Asides*)

Nobody is going to get up and tear me up, Mr. Chairman, about my objecting to the sewage project. The only objection this side has ever had to the sewage project was the way in which the transfer and the re-allocation of the people who lived in Emmerton was planned. It is a fact that it was planned to take those people to Clapham and put them into sub-standard housing there. The same slum atmosphere that they enjoyed at Emmerton was being planned for them at Clapham. It is a fact that I had to persuade this Cabinet early on in 1977 that I was not having any pit latrine arrangements in the Seventies for people from Emmerton and that water sewerage arrangements would have to be provided for them there. So I do not want to hear from the other side any nonsense about what was talked on a platform in 1976. The person who talked about it was myself and I would not be misquoted.

It gives me great pleasure, Mr. Chairman, to draw to the attention of this Honourable House the fact that the Government in very recent weeks has applied to the Inter-American Development Bank for a feasibility study for the sewerage of the South Coast which has now reached saturation point. The number of hotel rooms and residential premises along the South Coast where again we have a very high water table demand that at the very soonest opportunity we sewer the entire south coast starting at Oistins and coming right back down to the esplanade. In this present project we have applied for an extension from the corner of Jemmotts Lane which was the original proposal to the esplanade, so that we can catch the sewage from the geriatric hospital which is considerable, and it because of hazardous conditions at the esplanade at the moment that the Bank has agreed with us, and so the proposed south coast sewerage should run from Oistins town right down to the esplanade where it would join the Bridgetown sewerage and make one continuous arrangement from Oistins down to Bridgetown.

The Bank has agreed to a feasibility for the sewerage of that coast. Again on the west coast we have a similar problem. It is not at this moment as intense on the west coast as it is on the south coast, but again with the hotel density increasing every year, we are beginning to see the danger, and the Bank has also agreed for a pre-feasibility study of the possibility of sewerage of the west coast of this Island. Sewerage of the south and west coasts is particularly important, Mr. Chairman, for

environmental reasons. We have coral reefs protecting this Island. They play a very important role, more important than I suppose the average Barbadian recognises, and I do not want to go into that at any length on this occasion. 11.50 a.m.

It is important to note, Mr. Chairman, that coral is a very delicate animal, because it is a living organism, it is a living animal, and coral needs a certain temperature, a certain degree of warmth, a particular degree of warmth and light in which to survive. If we muddy up our waters with soil erosion, if we allow oil pollution, soil pollution or any other kind of pollution any more than we are already doing on the south and west coasts of this island, those coral reefs which I am happy to report are still very much alive and well will be in very great danger. The scientists have not yet discovered a way in which to resuscitate coral reefs once they are dead. Some of the reefs on the east coast are dead and we have to do everything in our power to protect our coral reefs, and for that, if for no other reason at all, it is imperative that we sewer the west and the south coasts.

Mr. Chairman, I move that Head 117 stand part.

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

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I believe it is appropriate at this time to make a disclosure in view of a statement made by the Minister of Health. Within recent weeks there have been numerous complaints about the condition of the roads, particularly in St. Michael. The Ministry of Communications and Works has been suffering for the past four or five years basically because of the quality of road making material it is receiving. I understand that years ago the roads used to be repaired by stuff which came as a result of oil coming from Venezuela. We have contacted Mobil, the suppliers of our road making material, and we have been informed that the present material is a water based substance. Fortunately, we have adopted the saying at the Ministry of Communications and Works that it runs for cover every time the rain sets up, which means that you are putting on bitumen asphalt on the roads, you are putting on your stones, but as soon as the rain comes down it is washed out and the holes are re-appearing.

Since we are going to sewer the whole of St. Michael, or basically Bridgetown, it has been decided not to spend a great deal of money on the roads which will be dug up in the next month or so. Over the years, or previously, the hot mix or Barber Green cost more than the traditional method of patching. Because of labour costs, etc. the two costs are practically equal, the cost of the normal method of patching and the Barber greening of the roads. We have taken a decision that we will wait until the sewer pipes have been laid and instead of patching the roads in Bridgetown we will do a complete

resurfacing of the areas that have been sewered. So when people complain about the pot holes in Bridgetown, let me give you an example, Mr. Chairman. Opposite Mr. Tastee's in Bay Street we have patched that at least four times in the last two weeks and the hole is still there. (Asides). I hear the hon. member saying change the product, but we have looked at different products, we have called in the suppliers, they have brought their experts from the United States and we held discussions with them last week. The Government is now looking at putting down a large storage tank, we are making preparations to change the material we are using at present to what they call an RC2, but it means a completely new technology, it means retraining the workers and it means devising a new technology for road making in Barbados.

But the main point I want to get over is that we have considered it a waste of money to try to repair the roads in St. Michael, particularly when we are having these heavy rains, we are having rain practically every day, and the particular material we are using is washed away as soon as the rain falls on it. It is no fault of the workmen at MCW, it is no fault of the Minister, it is simply we have not got the material which can stand up to the rainfall in Barbados now. Over the years I believe our highest rainfall was somewhere about 40 inches; this year alone we have gone over 70 inches of rain, and this is our big problem. Until we get better material and until the rain holds up we cannot do better on our roads.

To those of you who complain about the roads in St. Michael, what I will say is that as soon as the sewerage work is completed we hope to use the hot mix, the Barber Green, to resurface the roads rather than try to patch them at this time then to dig them up again to have to patch them again.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to say anything on this Resolution, because I think that the hon. member who introduced the Resolution merely indicated the state of play at the moment. She suggested that the sewerage project is on its way, and I really don't think it is necessary to get up every time a project like this comes up and remind the whole of Barbados that this is a Democratic Labour Party project, so I had not intended really to speak on it, but now that the Hon. Minister has got up and made what he said is a statement on the roads, he has forced me to get up and ask the Hon. Minister responsible for health if she intends to run sewerage lines throughout every lane and every little nook and cranny in St. Michael, because from what the hon. member said I formed the impression that roadworks are out until the sewerage project is finished. I do not understand. If he wants to say where the sewerage is going to be operated they have suspended the patching, that is clear enough. I am sure she is not going to be

running any sewerage down through Hanschell Land, I am sure there is going to be no sewerage going through Passage Gardens, where three years ago when I raised the question of trying to get the roads which had been included in the MCW schedule fixed they told me it was not true that they had taken off the workers. Well, maybe now the Hon. Minister says they will not be patching any roads in Bridgetown — and I presume all the way up to Oistin — because now with the pre-feasibility study it would not make sense, now that they are going to release some workers. . . .

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of elucidation. The hon. member seems to have been fast asleep when I was speaking.

Mr. TAITT: I have not given way, he just cannot get up and start talking. If he is going to elucidate he has to wait.....

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order.

Mr. TAITT: He cannot do that.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, you cannot tell me what I cannot do. On a point of order. Let the Chair rule.

Mr. CHAIRMAN rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will both hon. members please take their seats?

Mr. TAITT: As I was saying, Sir.....

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman,.....

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, am I going to be interrupted like this?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is on a point of order.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I said we were not going to work on any roads that will be dug up for sewerage pipes. That is what I said. When the hon. member talks about Hanschell Land, he knows that Hanschell Land is a tenantry.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please proceed.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has demonstrated that he is not even aware of what comes out of his mouth. He repeated on more than one occasion 'in St. Michael'. The point I am making is, now that he says he is releasing some workers from the Bridgetown area — although, Mr. Chairman, to be quite

fair no one has seen any workers in the Bridgetown area for some time — but he says he is releasing them, and if he is releasing them presumably some of them are going to be available to function in the areas.....

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order. The hon. member is trying to mislead the House. I never said I was releasing workers, releasing workers from where? Dishonesty has reached the point in this House now that there should be a law to stop it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat, your point has already been noted.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: The man is patently dishonest. That is what he is.

Mr. TAITT: Now, Mr. Chairman, you will have to ask him to withdraw that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes, an hon. member cannot make that accusation. Please withdraw it.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the statement, but that still does not mean that everybody understands.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please!

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful to the hon. member for withdrawing the remark, otherwise I would have to discuss dishonesty and I wouldn't like to discuss it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please let us not go any further with that.
12.00 noon.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the point is that if he said, and common ordinary logic suggest that if he said that they have made a decision not to do any work in the Bridgetown area, ordinary logic would suggest that those persons who would have been working in Bridgetown must be available to work somewhere else. He is a lawyer, Sir. I beg your pardon. The hon. Leader of the House says it makes no difference.

Mr. Chairman, the point I am trying to make very, very clearly so that the hon. member would understand it is that there are a number of areas in Barbados totally unrelated to sewage where the conditions of the roads have deteriorated to a point where no one in Barbados can believe that they are still existing.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Christ Church South East has been trying to provoke me to speak towards him for a long time.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am trying. I would like to be protected.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must understand that I am not going to permit a debate on roads and your question on security and protection, I will not permit any debate on defence and security either.

Mr. TAITT: I have no desire at all Sir to debate the roads. I am debating sewage. I wish to know if in fact it is the intention of the hon. Minister of Health. That is who I am addressing my question to, the Hon. Minister of Health. I did not hear her say that she was running a line through Hanschell Land or Passage Garden or any of those places.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Will the hon. member please address the Chair.

Mr. TAITT: Yes, Sir, I will address the Chair. I can stand up here all day.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: If the hon. member will give way. On a point of order. According to the hon. member's query, he is wondering if there is going to be light going through Hanschell's Land. For the past five years he was a Minister of Government and does not to this day realise that Hanschell's Land is a Tenantry of which this Ministry will soon be taking over.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

Mr. TAITT: Well, I am always grateful even if I am talking about sewage and lines and he is talking about lights, Sir. I am always grateful when the hon. member enlightens me. I have no quarrel about that because I know that if and when the hon. member takes over the tenantry of Hanchell Land, but I must be the predecessor in office to him or the Minister responsible for Communications and Works, because we would finally be getting roads in Hanschell Land.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman I object. Why all of this cross chat, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman stands.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am sure that hon. members know how to conduct themselves.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member is trying to mislead the House again. Hanschell Land had been the question of dispute under the last administration and no roads, no lights, no water, nothing could be done in Hanschell's Land because it was the subject of a Town Planning exercise, under his administration. How can he expect us to deal with it then. They had it tied down.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, presumably they have Passage Garden tied up too, presumably on the other side of Hanschell's Land which was settled in 1976 and where lots are being sold. I am not going to bother with him. He is not able with it.

Mr. Chairman, the roads in St. Michael where there is no sewage line, no digging up of the roads for sewage, will need to get attention. That is obvious to anyone who attempts to use the roads in St. Michael and the argument of my statement has to do with the Hon. Minister responsible for Communications and Works who gives us a lot of communications in here but no works outside.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order. Since this Government has taken office the file of the Executive Officer of the Ministry of Communications and Works up to 1974 when Mr. F. G. Smith wrote on the file that the material was useless and he asked the then Government to investigate, we would not be in the position that we are in now if action was taken then.

Mr. TAITT: Three years he comes and tells us about what Sleepy Smith wrote on the files in 1974. That is the extent of his examination of the responsibility.....

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

Mr. TAITT: I do not understand why the hon. members on that side are so agitated today. I really do not understand. The hon. Minister is so quiet waiting to get on with the debate and other hon. members are so agitated. I do not know if they had any sewage on Union Island. Was there sewage on Union Island? I do not know if they had sewage on Union Island, Mr. Chairman. I do not believe they have a Sewage Plant in St. Vincent at all, Sir. I did not know that we sent our engineering troops over to St. Vincent.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have two hon. members on their feet.

Mr. WARD: On a point of order, Sir. I think the hon. member is out of place to bring in the whole matter of St. Vincent/Union Island.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You may rest assured.....

Mr. WARD: Yes, Sir, but let me make my point. The hon. member is doing a good performance in the public eye because there are supporters who came in here to hear about the No-Confidence Vote and that has fizzed. It has back-fired so he now has to put on a performance.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order at all. Order please.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, Sir, talking about the question of the sewage.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, Please. Please take your seat a minute. I must draw it to the attention of this Committee that members must conduct themselves in a manner which we in this Parliament regard as dignified and we must consider that there are Reporters who are working in here and who will be finding it very, very difficult to do their work properly with this kind of conduct. Please resist, I ask you.

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central.

Mr. TAITT: I am very grateful to you, Mr. Chairman. I am most grateful to you. I agree with the hon. member that we require a continuation of the sewage project as it goes down the South coast. I would draw to her attention that although she indicated that the West coast is not as pressing in her opinion as the South coast, I think that she may be required to examine again that concept that the West coast may not be so pressing.

Mr. Chairman, it has already become difficult for bathers, and these are mostly Barbadian bathers, who use the beaches on the West coast to distinguish between the different forms of effluent which seems to be sweeping down the West coast.
12.10 p.m.

I know that in the industrial park which is proposed for next to Spring Garden, it is being proposed to establish industries of a certain kind. I think that the time has come for us when we are putting down industrial parks and factories, that we now insist that there be sewerage included in these areas especially as we are talking about those industrial parks that border or are near to the harbour or the sea coast. As I recall, Sir, the sewerage project envisages use of an area to the North of the present Industrial Park and I am not sure that any provision has been made for the seweraging of the area.

You would pardon the expression. There is sewerage, there is sewage and there is seweraging. I have no time at this point to give you a lecture on the difference between the three. As the sewage comes out of the lock which runs under Pelican Industrial Park, a build-up comes very regular now which extends on to the Harbour Industrial Park. Now Sir, as that Park becomes filled with industries, as I understand from the Prime Minister, the intention is to put a certain kind of industry on the new reclaimed land, we may find in fact that the project needs to be reviewed in the context of what is happening to the inhabitants who live just a stone's throw away.

The Sewerage Project as I understand did not originally include the Westbury Road area and the time has come for the Minister, since she has been able to get an extension for the project up to the Esplanade, to examine the possibility of getting an extension of the project as far as Paradise Beach for the time being, so that we can capture the outflow which is coming down from the new developments in the Cave Hill, Wanstead, Black Rock St. Stephen's areas. Mr. Chairman, if we do not include such areas now in the project, we may discover when we come to extend sewerage to the West Coast, the cost is going to multiply four, five, six or seven times. As I said, Sir, this is a project which came out of the foresight of those of us who had the responsibility of running Barbados, therefore it is a project which will continue to get the support of this side, so long as its intention remains to see that the people of Barbados have a healthy environment to the best availability of resources.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one point. The Minister seems to feel, I do not know if she is agitated by someone on the other side, that we, on this side, would make political hay of the fact that one kind of statement was made during election campaign and after coming to power, they found that something else had to be done. That is a standard problem with people who had not the responsibility for administering a particular programme, but to her credit, when she came into office, she looked at the plans, recognised that the plans were sensible and she proceeded with them.

I keep hearing about these pit toilets. I can only say to the best of my knowledge, and the best of my understanding, that at no time while I was in that place did it come through to us that what was intended was pit toilets. I am saying that while I was a Minister of Government, at no time was it made known to me to put down pit toilets. (*Asides*) Your hair is getting white. Respect your age. You are not young anymore.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

Mr. TAITT: If in fact there were pit toilets, no one can in 1979 or 1980 argue that the concept of pit toilets is not obsolete and ought to be thrown out.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time. If no other Honourable Member wishes to speak, the Honourable Member for Christ Church may speak.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: There are just two or three points and, as usual, I will be short. I think that the situation with respect to roads in all constituencies, certainly from this side has been made abundantly clear to the Minister of Communications and Works.

In our Ministry, we have received complaints with respect to the quality of the road material that has been used. This is a long history and the files are replete of complaints and counter complaints going back over four years. This Government, as part of its endeavour to correct this problem, opened negotiations with Trinidad for the use of asphalt. It is specifically part of the Memorandum of Understanding and it was raised as long ago as 1976. Technical teams from both sides have investigated the possibility of using natural asphalt together with oil based asphalt. On both of these products, it has been discovered that what we would need in order to import these products is a storage tank which would be heated continuously in order that the material would be liquefied to flow. A full study of the cost of heating a tank and deflating a tank is on going. In the meantime, as the Honourable Minister said, the Research Expert from Mobil came here last week as the Honourable Minister said and it is very clear that a whole retrieving programme will have to be undertaken if we are to use alternate material.

I can say, as a matter of policy that the Government has no objection at all to any road builder importing material into Barbados. It has repeatedly been pointed out that there is nothing in the Refinery Agreement signed in 1952 which prevents anybody from importing asphalt into Barbados. The problem is that none of the road builders nor the Ministry of Communications and Works want to feel the expense of having to put down a bulk storage tank to receive asphalt, natural or otherwise and keep it heated because that is the only way it can flow into the tank. As a result of the position, it is fairly clear that Government will have to put down the bulk tank. You just do not go and design a bulk tank like that. You will have to commission people who are competent in tankage and you will have to get a site where the ships can come in and you will be able to pump from the ships into the bulk tank. When the Spring Garden road and that area is finished, we will be able to have a site for the tank. The Port Authority do not want the tank inside the Port, they do not want a hot asphalt tank inside the Port, you have to put it in an isolated area, where, in the event of a fire or anything like that, it would be clear. You cannot put it next to the Flour Mill. All of them have been investigated, potential sites have been investigated. Nobody wants this bulk tank next to

them. The investigations are going on, because you have to import this tank and heat it.

Now, Sir, the other thing is that I know the problems on the South Coast. There is no doubt that as a result of the building up which has taken place between Silver Sands and the Hilton Hotel that every day, and every night none of the septic tanks can work properly and there are people who have to be constantly hired pumping tanks to pump off the excess of water after it goes through the sewerage tank.

12.20 p.m.

I was present when the mission from the Inter-American Development Bank came here and my Ministry both from the point of view of tourism and otherwise strongly supported the Ministry of Health in requesting that that be regarded as part of our new area of loans. But the problem that you get with some institutions is that they claim that Barbados' per capita income is so high and that sewage is really a social project, and having financed one they did not want to finance the other. We had to battle them and point out that this was not a question of a social project; this is a question of a project which had great economic implications for Barbados, because the tourist industry, industrial development and all of them are dependent upon having access to rab land in Barbados, and topographically and otherwise most of the rab land in Barbados that is available and not good for agriculture is situated near the seacoast, and you have problems with the sewage. It is the same thing with the development straight down the west coast; it is no mystery to anybody that most of the development is on the lower crest of Barbados near to the sea. It was not good agricultural land in the old days and that is why housing was put on it, and if the nature of our topography is such that our land that cannot be used for agriculture happens to be situated under the two lowest ledges, but you have the problem of water coming down from the higher ledge meeting with the sea and when you have a heavy rainfall you also have high tide; so when they meet it is no where for the wells from the septic tanks to work properly. The only alternative now with the amount of building up you have from the west coast right up to Silver Sands is to establish a sewage scheme, and we just have to face it. That is the position. I know now that as a result of the combined representations of all Ministries we have been able to demonstrate and prove that this is not only a social project, but an economic project that the necessary feasibility study will be gone through, and we can look forward in the planning period to having the implementation of the drainage and sewage for the south coast and after that for the west coast. That is the position in relation to that. We have done an elaborate examination of it and we strongly support this view.

Hon. Miss. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out that there is a plan of the proposed sewerage of the city of Bridgetown which can be made available to any hon. member who wishes to see exactly what streets and what roads will be sewerage. The city of Bridgetown has very clear definitions. The city of Bridgetown does not include St. Michael South West, it does not include St. Michael South, it does not include St. Michael South Central, it does not include St. Michael North Central. It is the city of Bridgetown.

Now in respect of these pit latrines, Mr. Chairman, I have to make it abundantly clear that when this Government took up office in 1976 the arrangement for pit latrines was already on the way and the work had to be stopped. The Cabinet had to issue a directive to stop construction and the preparation of pit latrines. Every house which has gone to the new estate at Clapham has running water, water-borne sewage, an inside bathroom and toilets. I heard much talk about the concept of the sewerage of Bridgetown having emanated from the foresight of the former administration. Mr. Chairman, let it be known and Barbados should be proud of this, that the whole idea of sewerage at all in Barbados is the brainchild of a man called Arthur Beresford Archer who was the senior public health engineer and is today the project manager of the Bridgetown sewage project. He is the person who had to persuade the Government of the day of the high priority that a sewage project rated in this country. He is a man who today is an authority in the Caribbean on environmental matters and will very soon become an international authority on environmental matters.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, if the hon. member would give way.....

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I am not giving way. I am not giving way on anything.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, I believe the Hon. Minister is misinforming herself and misleading this Honourable House. Mr. Chairman, at no point did anyone suggest or sought to suggest that the original idea did not come from Mr. Archer or from some civil servant. What we sought to suggest was that there was foresight and it is a simple every day administrative acceptance that the Ministry is responsible for it whether it is plus or minus.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is a very long point of order. It is a speech.

Mr. TAITT: I am not making a speech; I am explaining a point and I am finishing now. It is wrong for the Minister to suggest that this side was in any way attempting to take credit from Mr. Archer. It was foresight on the part of our Ministers.

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

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the record will show that the hon. member for St. Michael South West said it was the foresight on the part of the Democratic Labour Party. Arthur Archer is a civil servant; he is not any Minister of Government. Let the credit go where it truly deserves to go. Which Minister of Government?

Mr. Chairman, there was talk about the possibility of extension of the Bridgetown sewage project into St. Michael West. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that this administration has almost \$300 million in capital projects underway and I cannot hold out any hope that having fought to obtain an extension to the esplanade that I can within the next two or three years get the possibility of an extension in the St. Michael West or South West in train. The fact is, as I said, that a pre-feasibility study, and I want to say this for the benefit of the media, for the south coast and a pre-feasibility study for the south coast and the fact that the Bank is amenable to a pre-feasibility study on the west coast would at this stage preclude the likelihood of extension of the Bridgetown project into St. Michael West and South West.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1979-80 No. 19

Head 1 - Governor-General - was called.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, this is a sum of \$3,000 to pay for the cost of repairs and maintenance to the official car. The amount will also cover the anticipated usual servicing of the vehicle for the balance of the year.
12.30 p.m.

The car had to go into the garage and the cost of the parts and maintenance was much greater than anticipated in that it was some \$2,000. The other \$1,000 will be kept in reserve for the balance of the year.

I beg to move that Head 1 stand part.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, one does not normally raise this sort of question, but did the hon. member say that the car had to go into the garage and it cost \$2,000? Now, Sir, that is not a car like, say, the Hon. Leader of the House's car or mine or yours that get some beating on a daily basis. I should like to hear

from the Hon. Leader of the House which garage it was and what was the extent of the repairs, because \$2,000 sounds to me like a rip-off. Two thousand dollars for a garage for the Governor General's car that drives from up the hill down the road a few times? But what do they think? Do you mean they replaced the engine or something? I know the Hon. Minister might not have the information with him, but I want some information on how it could cost \$2,000 and I want specifically to hear which garage, and if it is the new car. If possible, let us hear which car it is.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member obviously has not sent his car to the garage recently. Mine is a Toyota Crown, a second hand one, and it only went to the garage two days while I was away recently and my bill was \$900. The position as I understand it, I don't have the actual bills here, but as I understand it, the sum of \$1,400 or \$1,500 that it cost for the purpose of repairs of the car, which is an Armstrong-Siddley, I believe, and hon. members are aware that car parts are very very expensive in Barbados, whether they are American cars or Japanese cars, and the worst experience I have had is with Japanese cars, so what I can tell the hon. member is that having had notice of this question by Estimates time he will be able to get the full details of the cost of operation of the car in the course of a year, but I do not think that one can necessarily use such words as "rip off" bearing in mind the experience of all hon. members who have motor cars and who know what they have to go through with the cost of parts, which is very high, but the details will be supplied to the hon. member.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I am interested in this particular debate because this is a lot of cheap, nippy politics.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I object to that. I object most strenuously to that. I ask the hon. member to withdraw that, Sir.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You cannot ask me to withdraw anything.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask both hon. members to take their seats. I will remind hon. members of the Standing Orders. (ASIDES) (ASIDES). I warn you that both of you are out of order and will not be heard. Please take your seats!

Hon. L. S. CRAIG rose.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You said that I will not be heard in here, Sir?

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, just let me seek your ruling, Sir. Are you saying that Lionel Craig, the member for St. James, will not be heard in here today, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member please take his seat? The hon. member is disobeying the Chair, please take your seat. Now, the hon. member will be heard on the question of the motor car.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: We are now on a good wicket.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I rise on a point of order to ask Your Honour to ask the hon. member to withdraw the remarks about it being cheap politics, because I asked a legitimate question on \$2,000 for repairs. I ask Your Honour's ruling that the hon. member should withdraw the remark under the Standing Orders; it was an insulting remark. I ask Your Honour for a ruling, please.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. James, as I heard, at no time referred to the hon. member for St. Michael South West. I do agree that the words themselves were certainly not parliamentary, but they were not applied to the hon. member.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The hon. member's politics are not cheap, they are expensive. Is that also unparliamentary, Sir? This 14 years I have I am going to use to my best advantage today. I am saying the hon. member for St. Michael South West's debate was cheap.....

Mr. TAITT: Under the Standing Orders, now that the hon. member has referred to what I said, I am asking Your Honour to ask him to withdraw it under the rules of this Hon. House as being offensive.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have been trying to overlook the hon. member's remarks. The hon. member for St. Michael South West must understand that he cannot be jumping up on points of order at every instance. It disturbs the tenor of debate and it is out of order. The hon. member for St. James, the language he uses, "cheap" is unparliamentary and I ask him to withdraw it.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to withdraw the remark that the hon. member's contribution is inexpensive. Now, Sir, the hon. member if querying the \$2,000 expenditure. My contention is that he has not set out to determine what is wrong with the car, if it wants a gear box, a transmission, or what, but he is just trying to get into the debate. Each of us in here knows what garage bills are like today.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Standing Order 28. You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that in the course of the debate I specifically asked some questions of the Hon. Leader of the House, including precisely those questions which the hon. member now accused me of not having done.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your point is taken.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: If I were the Leader of the House I would not have carried on and given him the information which he is seeking, he would have to bring this by way of Question, but I can help him now.
12.40 p.m.

The car was ordered by their administration. It was prepared at Detco Motors. It is a cleared bill and the parts are very expensive since there are no garages in Barbados carrying parts like Grant's and other small garages. That is the whole problem, Sir.

He is seeking to captivate what he considers an audience today, Sir, and he is querying every single thing. That is why I say that his contribution in this debate is inconclusive and will serve no useful purpose. Can you imagine only \$2,000 expenditure on a motorcar. Is that something you would debate?

We want to hear a debate on the economy of this country. We want to hear a debate on the employment in this country. We do not want to hear a debate on toilet paper and sewage, and on a \$2,000 expenditure. We want to hear a debate on the Budget. That is how we want to hear a debate. We want to hear a debate on the Development Plan and Housing. That is how we want to hear a debate. We do not want to hear a debate on nonsense trying to captivate a little political audience of your supporters.

Of course the Skipper is not here so I do not know why you are wasting your time. I can appreciate what you are doing because you want to get back in good faith in the old man's book. You want to capture his eyes, not me.

You are questioning motorcar parts of \$2,000 expenditure. It is a very simple expenditure. The car is over 3 years old. You do not get the parts in Barbados

from a Garage where you can go and purchase them every day so you have to import them. If I had it to deal with you would have to bring it by way of a question.

We want to hear something heavy. We want to hear heavy topics. We want to hear about the economic structure in 1976. Do not run away from those issues. You know what amuses me about you all, you always run away. They are no policy decisions among you all. You just run to the platforms and Eric Sealy. That is what you all do.

You are trying your very best, all day, just posing for the camera. Everything you want to rise on, talking all nonsense. We want something of substance. We want something of more substance.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am addressing the Chair, Sir. I cannot look at you all day, Sir. You are not so good-looking. Your hair is grey too. I have to look around.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have to remind the hon. member that that is not the opinion of.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: That is my opinion, Sir. I cannot look at the Chair all day. I don't want to look at you all day. Do not tell me to look at the Chair or address the Chair. I have started off by saying "Mr. Chairman". I address you already as "Mr. Chairman" so I do not have to say Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman all the time. I address you as "Mr. Chairman", but I finish with you and I will continue. I am addressing the Chair from thereon.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hon. member...

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir. You want me to take my seat and hear what you have to say, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes. In your contribution you will please be relevant to what we are now discussing. You may now continue.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir. What is relevant is that I am dealing with a Money Resolution and I can talk about the Airport or St. Michael's Infirmary. It is a Money Resolution. That is what I am talking about. This is the taxpayers' money I am dealing with. I can talk about it as much as I like.

This is 13 years, not 13 days. I came through the Maxwells, the Brankers and the Coppins, coming all the way through, Sir. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Apparently the cooling system in the car was giving trouble. The exhaust system was faulty. It had no steering knuckles and new ones had to be put on. The Bill therefore came to something like \$2,053. That is the level of the question sought by the member and former Deputy Leader of the Opposition. This is the sort of thing he wants to know like steering knuckles, water cooling system, toilet paper, Squezy. That is what he wants to know about. We do not deal with that. Put it in the way of a question and he will get an answer. That is what we have to deal with.

These are not the prime issues. If the Leader of the House is going to be there at Estimates time, I will call the Heads. You cannot run away from it. I can talk about Loans and S. E. Marshall. I can talk about it. I cannot get into your books. The only house you can go in is the one in Black Rock owned by Cameron Tudor. That is the only house you can go in.

I beg to support this Resolution, Mr. Chairman. I hope that both members of this House of the Committee — I want it right down the line, both sides of the Committee, not the House, we are in Committee now, have understood quite clearly the need for this \$2,000 expenditure.

The car is three years' old and a car three years' old must at some time, some moment must have repairs done to it. That is the level of questions that we have to put up with and that we have to live with.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member making another speech?

Mr. TAITT: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I think that you will agree that in every Parliament, in any part of the world where Estimates are being discussed, it is a fundamental right and indeed a fundamental principle to question where money is being spent, how it is being spent, why it is being spent and with whom it is being spent and no amount of grand standing or grand charging by anybody whether it is a clown out here or clown out there, no matter who it is, or any other hon. member in here will lead me to desist from my Parliamentary duty.

Mr. Chairman, the amount of money may be only \$2,000 and it may be small but the questions asked were relevant (1) who, (2) by whom and (3), Mr. Chairman, we want to know by which Garage and (4) we also want to know for what.

The hon. member got up and suggested that we should only ask about the big things. It is in keeping with their philosophy. They only concern themselves with those larger things. (*Asides*). Yes, like the Sedan. We will talk about the sedan outside. I will tell you about it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, Please.

Mr. TAITT: There are some hon. members in here who believe that by shouting loud that they can confuse somebody but when it comes to....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order.

Mr. TAITT: When it comes to disclosure we can disclose freely at any time. I unlike some hon. members I know....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, Please. Hon. members please remember we have Reporters here who want to do their work. Order, please.

Mr. TAITT: If the hon. members on the Government side are not behaving themselves the way they ought to, instead of their bad example....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am getting shouting from both sides.

Mr. TAITT: It is a bad example for a young person who may happen to be observing them and I am disappointed that a hon. member who has been given the responsibility of being a Minister in this Honourable House....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: All of this is irrelevant to the Bill. Please carry on with the debate and let us get something relevant.

12.50 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, every time a measure comes down here like this one, and every time we have reasons to doubt any aspect of an action of the Government, whether it is two dollars, two thousand dollars, two million dollars or twenty million dollars, it is our fundamental right to question it and no amount of hollering on the part of those over there who pretend not to know any better, will stop us from doing our duty. It will not stop me Mr. Chairman.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1979-80 NO. 19

HEAD 4(1) - CABINET OFFICE

Item 15 was called - Grants to non-profit agencies - \$20,000.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Addendum to this Resolution sets it out very clearly. The Methodist Church, which Honourable Members are aware, has the support of a number of the Barbadian public,

found themselves in a situation in which a number of their churches, particularly those in the Ebenezer Circuit were in an advanced state of disrepair. The estimated cost of repairs to the church roof is \$200,000. They themselves, by their own efforts including a loan, have raised \$140,000 and they have appealed to the Government, in view of the special nature of the cost of repairs and the extensive cost, for a further grant. The Government, having considered their case, and having considered the fact that the Methodist Church is supported by a large part of the population, acceded to the request and proposes to give them an additional grant of \$20,000.

I beg to move Sir, that this stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I wish to second this Head of the Resolution and in saying so, I wish once again to pay tribute to the Methodist Church for the tremendous contribution which they have made not only to religion, but also to the educational development of Barbados.

I had the privilege of managing the ecclesiastical affairs for a short while since 1976 but because of pressure of work, I asked that I be released to another Minister. During that time, I have had very worthwhile suggestions from the Methodist Church as a whole, and in particular, from Reverend Wiltshire who now looks after this circuit. I am aware that in the disestablishment of the Anglican Church, it was agreed that when schools used by the churches were no longer wanted, the Government would put them in a good state of repair before returning them to the particular church. The Anglican Church has had a good deal of very favourable consideration during the last three years from this Government and indeed Honourable Members will recall that I piloted a Resolution for a substantial sum of money for the Anglican Church in relation to some of the schools. In the case of the Methodist, Vauxhall was returned and they were given exactly what the job would have cost. I do not think that is what they asked for. They were not treated with the same generosity as was handed out to the Anglican Church. Therefore, it is appropriate that this request of theirs for assistance with Beulah, Shrewsbury and Ebenezer should be met.

I regret that the Honourable Member for St. Philip North is not now in his seat, I am sure of course, that the Honourable Member for St. Philip South is there and he will have something to say. I know as a fact that the Honourable Member for St. Philip North did make representation on this particular issue, both to the Ministry of Ecclesiastical Affairs, as well as, to the Ministry of Finance. I think that his representations have borne through because of his concern as well for the state of the Anglican Churches particularly in that part of the Island. He has managed to convince the Government to bring down this Resolution which I am sure would meet

with the support of both sides of the House. I think we can use the occasion to pay tribute to a congregation who has followed very faithfully and maintained the highest christian principles and at the same time, made a contribution to the social and economic life of this country.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak on this matter but after hearing the Honourable Member who has just spoken on it, I deem it my duty to associate myself fully with all that he has stated.

Only last Sunday night I attended a meeting at the King George V Memorial Park when this matter which we are discussing now was intimated to the public. While I have been criticised by a few for associating myself with that particular meeting, I did so as a christian and one who does not believe that because a person is affiliated to another party, he is my enemy. Consequently, especially at Christmas Festival I think we should throw away petty differences and try to see that we display a full sense of responsibility in the interest of our culture and therefore, I can only describe my being there to share with the constituents of both North and South, my best wishes and implored them to let us do our utmost and the foreword should be togetherness.

Let me now, Sir, get to the various denominations and especially the Methodist Church. The three churches are in a delapidated condition.
1.00 p.m.

Most of them can only be described by me as only fit to be demolished, especially Beulah and Ebenezer, and therefore I am very happy to associate myself with the Government who has seen it fit to grant a sum of money to assist with the repairs of these buildings. I do not want to blow my own trumpet, but in these cases I as a representative of St. Philip South make a contribution of my own regardless of the sacrifice I make to assist the various denominations in any matter or when it comes to the repairs of a building, I always give my private contribution, and therefore when the Government comes here today to request us to grant this money, I think it goes without saying or without contradiction that they should be given wholehearted support from both sides of the House, and I know that my side will cooperate fully, and will be happy to know that this amount has been granted to the Methodist Church. The Methodist Church has been doing a very excellent job in this Island for a very long time, and regardless of the turmoil in the world and now as we see it in the Caribbean, I am saying here today that without these various denominations you, Mr. Chairman and I and most people would not be able to live in the various countries, because it is the spiritual side which keeps the populations of the various countries under control

without guns, ammunition and what not. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, with sincerity I have great pleasure in supporting the Government on this occasion and I commend them for coming here to assist the Methodist Church so that they can rebuild the various churches.

The question that Head 4(1) – Cabinet Office – stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 2 o'clock.

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

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

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Papers be re-opened for the purpose of laying a report.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it there is no objection.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in laying before the House the Tenth Annual Report of the Barbados Development Bank for the fiscal year April 1978 to March 1979.

In view of the more than \$31 million dollars committed to projects in industry, tourism, small business, and until recently, agriculture during the ten year period, the Bank has sub-titled this report – "A Decade of Development Financing".

During the fiscal year under review, the Bank, made 109 loans — a record.

Its portfolio with 232 loans and a dollar value of \$19,864,074 are both records also.

The reduction of unemployment is a key responsibility for a development institution and in this regard the Bank's record of 462 permanent job opportunities is a particularly welcome and note-worthy contribution.

In its report, the Bank points out that a profit of over \$96,000 which reversed the loss position of the two previous years. Development Banks are often required to finance projects which, while in the national development interest, need long gestation periods of marginal operation. However, as a banking institution its own viability is important, for it also must borrow funds to serve the necessary demands upon it.

In this regard, I was pleased to sign in Barbados this year a loan agreement of some Bds.\$6.6 million which the European Investment Bank had approved in February. The EIB took the unusual step of signing the loan agreement in the borrowing country, a tribute in which we can all share.

The Barbados Development Bank is negotiating with other international and regional lending institutions and expects soon to be receiving its first loan from the World Bank, while further loans will be forthcoming from the Inter-American Development Bank and the Caribbean Development Bank.

Access to such long-term funding is vital in the light of the Bank's four year projections with an indicative lending programme of some \$67 million, of which it is estimated that \$47 million will constitute the foreign exchange component.

Another important area of operation has been the contribution to the development of small businesses. In the fiscal period, 1978-79, one hundred and fourteen direct job opportunities were created by the Bank's commitment to fifty-four small projects. In total over the ten year period commitments were made to 177 projects totalling \$1,273,990.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would wish to commend the Bank on its significant contributions to employment creation, foreign exchange earnings and the development of a new indigenous entrepreneurial class. With its recent capacity to make individual loans of over one million dollars, it can now provide medium to large scale enterprises with essential long term funds and boost the national industrial programme. The future

performance of an organization is as important as its past no matter how notable that has been and I will close with the Bank's own words of its approach to its responsibilities, I quote —

"The Bank faces the challenge with confidence based on the knowledge and experience gained from its past achievements, an absence of complacency and a determined will to achieve the goals of its Second Decade even more comprehensively than those of the First Decade."

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$179,092 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. 22, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, as indicated by the Leader of the House earlier today, I will seek the leave of the House to deal with this Resolution in all stages today.

QUESTION TIME

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. Question No. 35 asked by the hon member for St. Michael South Central, whom I do not now see in his place. Let the Reply be laid.

I am advised there are no other Replies ready, and this brings us to the end of Question Time.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken.

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

RESOLUTION URGING GOVERNMENT TO SPONSOR A REVISION OF THE TREATY OF CHAGUARAMAS

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not now see the said hon. member for Christ Church East in his place.

RESOLUTION RE IMPROVEMENT OF BUS SERVICE IN ST. LUCY

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not now see the said hon. member for St. Lucy in his place.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, if I could just seek Your Honour's ruling. You must pardon me on my ignorance on this point, but in the light that this is now Private Members' Business and the Opposition is not present, I wonder if the hon. member for St. Philip South could lead off on any of the matters, lest they die. To bring a Resolution in here and then not come in is only dilatory. It is their business and we are here to do it, I do not see them in their places.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Philip South is in his place.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I would be grateful if he would initiate the debate on the Item before this House as he is the senior member of Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER: This now brings us to the end of Private Members' Business for today.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is the instant Order of the Day.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House resume Committee of Supply.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: 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 resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.
2.15 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1979-80

PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE HEAD 5(1) DIRECTION AND POLICY FORMULATION

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, this Resolution is for \$20,500. The explanatory notes are set out in the Addendum and are self-explanatory.

I beg to move that Head 5(1) stand part.

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

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

MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING HEAD 8(1) - DIRECTION AND POLICY FORMULATION

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, Sir, this vote is for money to provide for a Commission to investigate alleged murders which have occurred in Barbados over a period of years. Mr. Chairman, in connection with Police investigations into alleged murders, I wish particularly to speak of two, and in particular of the alleged murder of Victor Pele Parris on the 17th May, 1978. *(Cheers)*.

Mr. Chairman, you will apparently recall that as Attorney General I made it abundantly clear during the main Estimates that I considered it would have been highly improper for me to direct how the Commissioner of Police should carry out his statutory duties of investigations. From the very beginning, I assured the Commissioner of Police that funds would be made available by the Government of Barbados if he felt that his hands would be strengthened by introducing outside investigation and in which if the Director of Public Prosecution shared this view.

I took that step because I believed it was in keeping with the correct Constitution of this country. That view is shared by my Legal Advisers. What I was not prepared to do was to substitute my judgment on matters pertaining to the investigation of crime or in the day-to-day administration of the Police Force for the judgment of the Police or the Director of Public Prosecution.

The Commissioner of Police is aware that the Police were criticised during the Coroner's Inquest but he has never been able to identify any areas which in his judgment warranted any application for external efforts. Consequently, he could not recommend to me that Scotland Yard or any other external agency for that matter should be invited to Barbados to assist in this investigation into the alleged murder of Victor Pele Parris.

Nevertheless, I am satisfied that there is continuous public disquiet concerning Pele's investigation and other aspects of the alleged murder of Victor Parris as well as other murders which have been committed in this Island and which have gone uninvestigated. Under those circumstances, I have been satisfied that the Cabinet ought to advise his Excellency the Governor-General to set up this Commission on those earlier cases of a similar nature which are unsolved in the annals of local crime and obviously the Police would wish to be assisted as far as they can be in their methods of investigations not only

to look at these cases but also to investigate any similar cases in the future.

In the circumstances, His Excellency the Governor-General, acting in accordance with the advice of the Cabinet, has deemed it advisable to appoint a Commission of Enquiry under the Commission of Enquiry Act Chap. 112 with the following terms of reference:—

- (a) To enquire into and report on the facts and circumstances surrounding the incidences of suspected crimes of murder which resulted in the death of —
 - (i) Jefferson Erskine Lloyd in the year 1970;
 - (ii) George Aimey in the year 1970;
 - (iii) Anthony Harris in the year 1971;
 - (iv) Victor Desmond Parris in the year 1978.
- (b) To make such recommendations as may be deemed practicable and helpful for assisting in the further investigation and solving of the said or similar suspected crimes and for strengthening the existing system of investigations with a view to lessening the incidences of such crimes remaining unsolved."

I said I would make reference to a second case. The second case is that concerning the disappearance of Mark Stokes (*Cheers*).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, it is under item (b) that the Commission will be supplied with all of the files and all the information in the possession of the Police in order to pursue not only the disappearance of Mark Stokes but the wife of a former Diplomat whose disappearance has never been accounted for.

Another similar case which will be investigated under (b) of the terms of reference will be concerning the murder of an Indian resident in this country whose murder has never been accounted for.

Mr. Chairman, I will inform the Committee that the Commissioners are —

Sir Denis Malone of the Supreme Court of the Bahamas, Chairman.

James Frances Nevill QPM of New Scotland Yard, London, England.

and

Mr. Bruce Lionel Northrop of the Canadian Mounted Police, Canada.

I am much indebted to Mr. Humphrey Walcott, the former Director of National Insurance and a person who has had long service in the Public Service of this country in the Courts and in the Probation Office to accept the position as Secretary.

I am happy to announce that the Commission is scheduled to commence hearing on Monday 14th January at the Government Conference Centre at Wildey, St. Michael.

Sir Denis Malone is a well respected Judge. He is a retired Chief Justice of Belize and is now holding the post on contract to the Judge of the Supreme Court of the Bahamas. He was formally a Solicitor General of Barbados and has been performing outstandingly well in these fields. I am completely indebted to the Government of the Bahamas and particularly to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the Bahamas and to my friend the learned Attorney General of the Bahamas for releasing him to carry out this job.

Commander James Nevill joined the Metropolitan Police in the United Kingdom in 1948 and has served in various Departments. In 1969 he was promoted to the rank of Detective Chief Superintendent and to the rank of Commander in 1976. He was awarded the Queen's Police Medal for distinguished service in the New Year's Honours for 1978.

Superintendent Bruce Northrop has an extensive Police background with over three years in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and he is currently Criminal Investigation Officer in charge of Criminal Investigations. He became Commissioner in 1971 and was promoted to the rank of Superintendent in 1976. Superintendent Northrop has received Commanding Officer's commendation for outstanding ability to take command in dangerous situations and Commissioner commendation for bravery. He is also the recipient of a long service Medal with the silver plate and star in addition to the Queen's Jubilee Medal and was honoured by being appointed a member of the Order of Candidates in 1979.

Mr. Chairman, I have gone to some pain to ensure that the members who constitute this Commission are persons of wide experience in the legal phase and in the investigation of crime and that they are people whose integrity would be respected for the job which they have consented to do.

I have already thanked the Government of the Bahamas. I wish also to thank the Government of Britain and the Government of Canada and of other friendly

Commonwealth countries for agreeing to permit their respective citizens to serve in this regard. Mr. Chairman, I look forward to their Report. I certainly would not prejudice their Report.

Let me say this case has become the cause of them because of the tendency of people to prosecute freedom of speech in such a way for short-term political gain and of course the abuse of freedom in order to derogate people in this community.
2.25 p.m.

We wish to make it absolutely clear that the Commission will sit in public and hear in public any evidence which is proffered to it, except the Commission deems it proper in its own and absolute discretion, to sit in private. There are several persons who have had a lot to say on this issue. I am appealing to them if they have evidence connecting any citizens, any residents, any visitors to this country with this crime, let them come forth and give the evidence or hereafter stand condemned.

Mr. Chairman, the Director of Public Prosecutions, on the basis of whatever evidence is produced will be only too happy to carry out his constitutional rights if there is anyone who can be brought before the Court.

I cannot promise anybody giving evidence before the Commission that they will not be subject to the normal rules of evidence. They must tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

I have been severely criticised and that no doubt is the subject of other proceedings and it will be improper for me to comment on any proceedings which are before the Court. What I want to make quite clear is that the Government is more than anxious because it has nothing to hide, to ensure that all aspects of the cases, not only the Pele case, but all outstanding murder cases with similar characteristics as well as, other cases, which have caused disturbance in this country are properly investigated and the facts made clear to the public. In the long run, we are anxious in achieving two things. To see that justice remains unravelled and unsullied most important and secondly, to ensure above all, that any person responsible for the disappearance or murder of any one of these persons is brought to justice. I add a third, to make sure that decency returns to public debate on issues of this nature in particular, and that people would stop making short term disastrous political expediences out of this situation. I can say that the Honourable Member for St. Michael South East has suffered in this regard more than I have and it must be very distressing for him to have heard some of the allegations which were made and still continue to be made from public platforms in this country. This Government, and I repeat, not only the Honourable Member and myself as Attorney-General,

this Government has nothing to hide at all and is not scared.

As far as the police are concerned, they are prepared to give as full co-operation to this Commission as possible. They feel that they have done as good a job as they could, given all the circumstances but they are prepared to be advised if there are any other ways they could adopt to continue investigation of any such case. Let me say one thing to you. All of these cases that I have mentioned remain active files that means, that the police and D.P.P. assuming relevant evidence is forthcoming, are prepared to bring anyone against whom there may be reasonable evidence before the Court to be dealt with according to Law. That is all that we are asking in this case and that is why this Resolution is before the House.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, it is with a deep sense of responsibility that I rise to second this Resolution. I have been in politics now in this country for over fifteen years and never have I seen the technique of lies, propaganda, rumour and false allegations to attempt to destroy two or three people in a political party and a political party as a whole as has been used in the case of the late Mr. Parris. Throughout it all, the other side did not stand up to their responsibilities. Their hirelings exploited it to the health of any political game they thought they were making. Today the Government is throwing the book at them.

I challenge the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central to write to his cousin in the United States of America and tell her to come and give evidence to the Commission of Enquiry. I challenge Eric Sealy of the P.P.M. to go and give evidence to the Commission of Enquiry. I challenge Mr. Simmons, the Magistrate of St. James to go and give evidence to the Commission of Enquiry and justify your findings when you did not reply to the Commissioner of Police. There comes a time, Mr. Chairman, when men must stand up like men or be treated like what they are. The Government of Barbados has stood firm in spite of all the propaganda, malicious lies and all of that. Let them come forward now and give their evidence. It is their public duty.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, believe me Sir, I could not allow this debate to pass me by without adding my sentiment Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I think the Attorney General would agree that if there is one Cabinet Minister who, almost every Thursday in Cabinet would ask him when are we going to bring in Scotland Yard — I said Scotland Yard because I am limited in this field and hearing as a boy of the outstanding work of the Scotland Yard and in

more recent years of the F.B.I. and Royal Canadian Mounted Police — it is like a Christmas gift to me hearing the Attorney General introduce this subject matter today. I have spent countless nights at public meetings tabling them. I would say that it is my take, I initiated the idea to have the first division captain of the Democratic Labour Party take up Mr. Eric Sealy and his handful of drunkards, tricksters and swindlers and reverends as guest speakers to hear what was going on. I was torn apart when a society which boasts of some ninety-eight percent literacy, many of them I heard at street corners, accusing my colleague and friend, the Member of St. Michael South East of the murder of whom I considered his best friend.

It was only a matter of time, the Attorney General has his constitutional approach. I would have had a rug-a-down approach. I would have flown in Scotland Yard and done it one time. Lock up who is to be locked up. Beat who is to be beaten including you, because you did not remove yourself from the team.

2.35 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: By "you", do you mean the Chair?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: No, Mr. Chairman. Do you mean that gentle Jim would kill somebody out there? I am speaking about my friend who journeyed with me to the East and saw all the acupuncture and sat down and talked about Pluto and che che and ping, who has associated himself with the remarks coming from the public mouthings of his first eleven team and from the hon. member for St. Michael South Central leading actually to the destruction of my colleague's family. I know as a positive fact, reported to me by a school teacher, that little kids at school were saying to my friend's child "don't play with his daughter or his son, his father killed a man!" That is what you all did, and strange enough the same PPM leader said he does not like joiners. He did not attack the Attorney General or tried to destroy him; he did not attack the Prime Minister, a lawyer or the Deputy Prime Minister. Whom did he look for? He looked for the small man whom he said he was supporting, not a lawyer, to destroy him or attempt to destroy him; but I will be here, I have a little strength in my body, and I am going to try very very hard after this report comes out to recapture what ever lost ground there might have appeared to be in the interest of good government and the society in which we live. If you want a Government, organise yourselves. Look for important issues. I speak with a background of ten years in Opposition. Do not set out to malign and destroy a man's character and kill him. You can say anything about me. You have called me a libertine, a gambler, a thief, a poker player. I am all right. All that he has done for this society is to offer himself to the people of St. Michael South East and won a seat and the Deputy Leader of the

Opposition sat down and allowed his colleagues and never for one single moment dissociated himself from the allegations made against him. I thought I would have heard him in here; I am surprised at you. A doctor is due for you, either Ramsay or Blackman, I do not know which of them, in St. Michael South. Take note from a friend of yours. It is not Dr. Jekyll or Dr. Booby or Dr. Sidney Alleyne or Dr. Errol Barrow. A doctor is due. There is a Dr. Ramsay and a Dr. Blackman; I do not know which one. Neither is it going to be Dr. Caddle or Dr. Haynes; but a doctor is due. You take a little tip from me; I am not putting you wrong. You know I hear some things and I know you will telephone me tonight asking me which doctor, but I am not telling you.

You want an election, you wanted an interim Budget, you want the Government to resign, you want squeezy, you cannot get school meals, the roads are bad, the bus fares are too high, all these things; but the economy is healthy, and that is important. I want to associate myself with the contribution of my colleague here. It took a bit long to me, but he stood firm and he has brought in eminent people and I hope that from Sandford, the hon. member for St. Michael South, the hon. member for St. Philip South, the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, the hon. member for St. Lucy is not in this, he would be looking for Cammie Tudor, the hon. member for North Central, the entire crowd would come and lead a delegation to give evidence before these eminent people whom we have set out to ask for this expenditure to bring into Barbados to make sure that once and for all the allegations made in the mouthings of the hon. members on the other side would cease. Whatever the consequences are I am prepared to bear, and I am prepared to face up to whatever the consequences are, but I sincerely hope that members of the Opposition would come forward and give evidence because they have been part and parcel of this campaign, nothing else but dirt and smut in this society. Do not think you can divide the society any more than you have done. You cannot train young people, give them free secondary education under your administration and up to University level and expect that they are going to come and stand up each night and hear you talk your bundle of nonsense and not understand what is going on. This is going to be the answer once and for all, and all the elections that you want you are going to get. I only hope that the 23 or the 17 candidates you have to field you do not have to back. We only have to look for seven; you have to look for seventeen or twenty-three. We either have to look for thirteen or seven and you cannot win. You have not got a chance to win. The country is well aware of what is going on. Go through St. Philip, St. George, St. Peter, St. James, all over this country and you will see the small man putting on a piece of wall behind, painting his house, not at Christmas time but long before Christmas. Of course last year you talked about Harold Laskie. Did you say Lassie? Well you are history; the old

Professor Laskie is in the Pine, but you are Lassie; that is the name of a dog.

I sincerely hope that when it comes to the real issue that I will hear you. I have great respect for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition; I have no respect for any of the others.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to associate myself with this Resolution and sincerely hope that whatever evidence there is to come before that Commission, the consequences of either the Opposition or the Government we are prepared to face up to.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to rise to support this Resolution calling for a sum of money to provide for this Commission of Enquiry. I recall in 1978 sitting on a wall in Belmont Road and being shot out of my wits to hear a certain member of the PPM making what I would call vicious, nasty statements involving the character of one of my colleagues on this back bench, and I said, Mr. Chairman, I could not believe my ears and I went numb, because while I am quite aware of the fact that politics can get quite lively sometimes, I was not prepared for the kind of allegations that I heard on that public platform in Belmont Road that night in 1978.

2.45 p.m.

It was not an isolated incident, it was a systematic, purposeful, deliberate, vicious, slanderous campaign that was carried on for the remainder of 1978 which brought my colleague to the point almost of collapse, because people in this country having heard those charges of an incident which had taken place over that long period of time were beginning to have doubts in their own minds as to whether or not there was any validity to the statement.

At the Barbados Labour Party Conference in January of this year the Prime Minister made a call and pledged that he would like to see an end to this speculative campaign and he pledged that he would do whatever was in his power to make certain that the Labour Party Government uncover the facts behind the Pele incident. The Hon. Attorney General was concerned that he should not allow himself to be involved in constitutional matters that in his mind were improper, but we on this side were eager to exonerate our colleague, and on the other hand to serve the course of justice by letting the people of Barbados witness a disclosure of the facts that were available and let them see that justice was being done.

I am very pleased that the Attorney General has been able to find a solution on the constitutional niceties, but at the same time serve the purpose for which we at all times wanted, that is, that this thing should have a complete examination. I can recall that on the Estimates

in 1978 I stood up in this Hon. House and led off the plea for an urgent investigation to be undertaken, and, Sir, I am extremely relieved to be able now to see a date, January 14, 1980, set down for the thorough investigation by eminent jurists, an investigation into the circumstances surrounding the death of Victor Parris.

I know, Sir, that political parties from time to time find comfort in attacks on the Government, particularly if they are the Opposition side, and I was hoping that some solitary member, if it could not be found in the breasts of all of them, I was hoping that some solitary member on the Opposition side would have been able to get up and allow the public of Barbados to know that residing within his breast was some code of honour and decency. The hon. member for St. Michael South, a man to whom we have always looked for leadership, particularly as it relates to politics on that side, we would have hoped he would have got up and say he did not lend his voice to all the accusations. But, Sir, a remarkable thing is that even though we have the highest regard for him he was unable to lend his voice to the pleas of the public who were concerned that somehow a man innocent of any injury or blame was being character assassinated, and I, Sir, on behalf of all those people who attended the Barbados Labour Party's Annual Conference in January of this year, therefore commend the Government, the Attorney General for methodically going through and searching for the constitutional means through which we could have access to a full and fair investigation uncharged by the emotions that are characterised upon this time.

I hope that in the process of the investigation some of the disquiet that has prevailed with respect to the disappearance of Mark Stokes will be laid to rest, because I too would like to know what happened to that gentleman. So many years now he has disappeared into thin air that I would like to know where he has gone, and if he is found, where was he? And why should he disappear and who was instrumental in keeping him silent and secret for so long and for what reason, and I would like to know what has happened to all the information that he asked about members on that side, what has he done with it? Is it still in good condition, and will the Commission be able to look into those diaries to see what it is that he was lying about and who was responsible for his sudden disappearance.

There are others whose death leaves some disquiet if not in the community at large, certainly in the breasts of those who held them dear, because there are families who still have to sit down at night and wonder what happened to the husband or father or brother or man. This Government continues in my view to demonstrate that it is a Government that deserves the support of the people of Barbados, because it has on its benches men who are not afraid to call for justice and men who are

not afraid of the consequences that may come in the course of pursuing justice. I remain resolutely satisfied in my own mind that my comrade will emerge, as he has been, unsullied, and that he will go on to represent the constituency of St. Michael South East for a long time to come, and I am fairly certain, Sir, even though his constituents may have been relatively subdued, that they will emerge with a resounding vote that will let the people of Barbados know that they are not prepared to sit down silent and allow their elected representative to be tarnished in the way that the hon. member for St. Michael South East has been tarnished.

We were concerned that that vicious campaign had gone to such an extent in Barbados that perhaps it may be beyond repair, but he is an extraordinary resilient man. I do not know that I would have been able to bear up under that kind of pressure, but I think it is a credit to him that he is built of that kind of psychological sturdiness that will enable him to go home night after night knowing that out there circulating was a rumour that even Eric Fly should be having to carry. He started it all and I am saying that not even he should have to live with this kind of smear and, Sir, I will sit down.

I would hope that the Attorney General when this report is laid will allow us to know all the details, and I would hope that he will have the courage — I know he has it — to take whatever steps are necessary to make sure that in Barbados the reputation of men who present themselves for public service is not destroyed by men who themselves never had and never hope to have that reputation. Thank you, Sir.
2.55 p.m.

Mr. SISNETT: Mr. Chairman, I myself want to be associated with all that has been said by the former speakers. If perhaps Barbadians today would want to feel that they have a true Christmas gift, it is indeed to hear the news that finally the ball has been set into motion for a full enquiry into the disappearance of a number of Barbadians.

I would not want to dwell, Sir, on those with whom I was not perhaps very intimately acquainted with but to know that finally the truth would be told as to what happened to one of my very closest friends sometime in 1978. I am so very relieved that I am at a loss for words.

Pele Parris was a very very close friend of mine and to know that he was taken so suddenly away from the circle of friends which for a long time stood together in many circles, politically, socially and otherwise. It is a very hard thing for us to understand how a man as young, as vibrant, as intelligent, should have been taken away so suddenly and for no apparent cause.

I was wondering, Sir, in 1980, what the Prime Minister would have told the General Conference of the Barbados Labour Party if this Enquiry had not been started. You will remember that earlier this year it was promised that within months the Enquiry would have been set into motion and I am particularly happy, Sir, to know that eventually the truth would be told. Who killed Pele Parris does not matter to me at this point in time but that the nation should know who killed Pele. We will all feel satisfied to know that we know the person who took the guy's life.

Late last year before the rumour took form that one of my colleagues was responsible for the death of his very close friend, very few Barbadians would realise that the rumour was intended not for my colleague in St. Michael South East but the rumour was aimed directly at myself.

I will never forget when a very close friend, one of my ardent radio fans, a female who works in an Attorney's Office in the City called my Office in tears to report to me that the Police were about to make an arrest, an arrest of me I am emphasising, for the murder of Victor Pele Parris. The rumour that was intended for me had never bore any ground, as well as the opposition, the rumour-mongers of the various political factions of the country who wanted to find a scapegoat. I did not take it too seriously myself, Sir, and it was turned on to my colleague in St. Michael South East and today I am relieved and ultimately when the Commission of Enquiry makes its Report the truth will triumph.

It does not matter to me who killed him but that that person, whoever he is, whoever she is will be brought to justice is of great importance to me and the people of this country at this point in time. I believe the truth must be told. Pele Parris has gone and perhaps still in our society is the murderer. Perhaps still in our society is the one who took his innocent blood.

I want to congratulate the Attorney General. I want to congratulate the Prime Minister for the decision he took in 1979 at the Annual Conference of this Party in deciding then that a full Enquiry would be started sometime this year.

As the member for St. James said, and perhaps I think like him, if he had his way and if I had my way, we would have grabbed it by the neck and perhaps we would have got somebody in prison now regardless of whom it could have been but this is the way the Attorney General feels it must be conducted and I want to commend them both, the Prime Minister and the Attorney General for their patience and understanding of the law and for eventually setting into motion this Commission of Enquiry. I want to give it my full support

and certainly the people of St. Michael North East whom I have the pleasure to represent at this point.

I would also want, Sir, and I believe I would be abdicated my responsibility if I did not hear on the floor of this House mention some concern and some disquiet among the relatives of the Thompson Family of Buckingham Road, St. Michael whose young son, sometime last year, 1978, on the 22nd August, after a normal day's work in the Domestic Courts of his country suddenly disappeared.

I have been asked by his parents to see what can be done to have started a full investigation into the disappearance of their son, Alexander Thompson, who on the 22nd August, 1978, after having left his work and went to the beach has never been found again.

I am very concerned about his mysterious disappearance and if the Commission of Enquiry would have powers to look into the circumstances surrounding that disappearance I believe that we would at least be setting at ease the minds of the family of that boy, Alexander Thompson who lived at Buckingham Road, in St. Michael, a part of the constituency which I am honoured to represent.

Mr. Chairman, again I am delighted, honestly delighted, to realise today that this Commission of Enquiry has been set into motion and on behalf of all the people in my constituency and on behalf of all the families and friends of the late Victor Pele Parris, I want to give this Commission of Enquiry my fullest support.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If no other member wishes to speak I just briefly want to say that I am indebted to the hon. members who have spoken for the words they have spoken. I should not wish it to be thought that this Commission is concerned only with the enquiry into Parris's death.

Although people tend to have short memories and the disappearance of the other persons have not been emphasised in the way in which Parris's death has been emphasised, there are three other persons specifically named whose murders took place in equally similar circumstances in which there was only one eye witness and in which it was alleged that those persons were in the act of love-making. People tend to have too short memories and I think that it is the short memories of a lot of people which forced one particular case to become the *cause celebre* and to be misused in the way it had.

For instance, Anthony Harris who died in July, 1971. He is also the son of one of my constituents and I myself have on numerous occasions between 1971 and 1976 been asking what can be done to carry out further

enquiries into his death. So was George Aimey, a young Reporter of the Advocate Newspaper.
3.05 p.m.

I never saw that the press rose, or one section of the press, not the Advocate-News, rose unflinchingly to ask for further investigations and the bringing in of Scotland Yard regardless to whether it meant breaching the Constitutional provisions of this Island. Emotions are sometimes the dominant factor in these matters. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, I am an emotional person, but I have had to learn to control emotion when searching after truth because in many events, the search for truth is an objective enquiry. Sometimes, it means that one has to be firm and tough. One has to suffer attacks. You have to learn to take that, but if you are wedded to the principle of seeking truth and justice, that is a small thing to suffer in the process.

I believe that the course which I have recommended to the Government and to the Cabinet is correct. I believe the procedures are correct. I said before that as long as I have the honour to represent the Government of the country and to be the Attorney General, I will carry out my Portfolio to the best of my ability with the utmost honesty and with firm strength no matter from which quarter the criticism comes. I hope this will be a fair enquiry.

The Government is making all funds available to bring back the lady who is the principle evidence in the Victor Parris case, as we will bring any evidence in the other cases. The Honourable Member for Christ Church South Central, my close colleague both at the Bar and in politics feels deeply about this matter, as I feel deeply and all Honourable Members. I hope if there is any Honourable Member here who has any influence on Miss Goring, I believe she is related, a blood cousin, either a first cousin or second cousin to the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, and I hope he will exercise all of his influence to get her to come back to this enquiry because you know Sir, politics has many faces and if he does not want to exercise his influence with his friend, Mr. Sealy, I hope he will exercise it with his friend his cousin, to bring her back here in these circumstances. We are prepared to make the funds available to do it. The Foreign Affairs Section of my Ministry have been instructed to get her back here and in any event, we are prepared to make funds available to bring her, or if she does not want to come, for the Commission to go and take evidence from her wherever she will be.

I believe it is extremely important that not only the characters of innocent people should be vindicated, but we should find out in all these cases, where, if at all the police have gone wrong, how we have gone wrong. We should find out who the culprits are and have them brought before the Court to be dealt with according to

Law and justice and most importantly, we should try to re-establish in this society, some respect for decency, honesty and truth and to get rid of the vicious rumour-mongering which is becoming all too acceptable to some of our people. It is a great pity one has to speak on this, but very often in this country today one believes that what is the truth and what is justice is according to who could shout the loudest on a public platform and the filthiest in bringing down people's characters. I have never believed that a seat in Parliament is worth that. That is why when I am doing something, I will do it the right way or else, as I have said to my constituents, and my Party colleagues before I came in here, if I do not do it the right way, then you do not have me to do it any way at all.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As Chairman, I cannot get into the debate, but I must say that I am anxious myself to see what happens tomorrow and how this is dealt with by a news media in Barbados.

The question that Head 8(1) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1979-80 - No. 19

HEAD 10(1) - MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Item 16 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution for the sum of \$1,605 to purchase furniture, fixtures and fittings for the Forensic Pathologist.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: This Resolution need not detain us very long. For several years now, and I am talking about upwards to ten years, the Government has been trying to retain the services of a Forensic Pathologist to help us improve the investigation of crime in this Island and we have been unable to do so. We have recently been fortunate in recruiting, with the help of the Government of India, an Officer from India who will serve us on contract for a period of time as a Forensic Pathologist and it is necessary for us to provide furniture for his office and this Resolution seeks to obtain \$1,605 to buy that furniture which consists of a metal desk, an executive chair, cabinets, a bookcase and two side chairs. I believe that the presence of such an Officer will help the police to investigate crime much more thoroughly than it is capable of doing today.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

The question that Head 10(1) Item 16 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES - 1979-80 No.19 HEAD 22 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING

Item 2 - Loans to Agencies - was called - To move the passing of a Resolution for the sum of \$650,000. In order for Carib West Airways to continue its operation it has become necessary to settle certain outstanding debts in the sum of \$650,000. These relate to \$420,000 to meet the balance of moneys due by the Company to Shell Antilles and Guianas Limited and the repayment of the advance (of \$230,000) made by the Bank of Nova Scotia to pay the Aircraft Lessor.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, this Resolution is for the sum of \$650,000 and the object of the Resolution is to settle outstanding debts relating to the operations of Carib West Airways Limited. As Honourable Members would recall, when this Government came into power, it had a decision to make with respect to the operations of Carib West Airways. After a most thorough investigation, the Government decided that it would give Carib West a reasonable chance to demonstrate whether it could be viable and to assess whether alternatives were available to provide the service which it now provides.

A new Board of Directors was appointed and some progress was made towards reducing the burden of the subsidies which Government had to give it annually. A thorough investigation into the operation of this airline by my Ministry has indicated that a service is necessary for the transport of cargo from Barbados to certain points abroad and that employment in some industries would be adversely affected. I have always held a view that the amount of cargo that is available in this country is insufficient to justify economically an operation with Barbados alone.
3.15 p.m.

Hon. members will recall that throughout my political life I have held steadfastly and unrepentingly to the view that there are certain areas of economic activity which can only be carried on by a combination of citizens or Governments in the Eastern Caribbean acting in concert, in corporation. It is for this reason that later today we will be asking this House to approve a sum of money to provide the essential initial capital for the creation of a company to be incorporated before the end of the year now that it has received Cabinet approval by both the Governments of Barbados and Trinidad, and have received the legal fiat of both the Attorney General's office in Barbados and the lawyers in Trinidad, a company which will be the successor company to Carib West Airways, but which company will be a joint venture of the Governments of Barbados and Trinidad with the clear understanding that the door is open for any other

Government in the Caribbean who so wishes to participate to join in the creation of a true air cargo company dedicated to pursuing the interests of our manufacturers and others in this area. That Resolution will be dealt with a little later.

I hope, Sir, that when that company succeeds Carib West that the cost which Barbados, the Government in particular, has had to bear for a long period of time will be considerably reduced. It is our hope that subject to approval of the foreign Governments which will be necessary, that that company will be in operation early in the new year, perhaps the first quarter. We have done all that we can do. There will be space for cargo available in the old airport terminal building which will take some time to build, but instructions have been given as to the area earmarked. I know that available to the new air cargo company in Trinidad will also be warehousing space. One of the things we have learnt in the operation of Carib West in the last year particularly is that the rising cost of fuel which has doubled between October last year and 1979 is a very important component of the cost of operations. We know that there cannot be any question of turning back. We only hope that our efforts at a joint undertaking, whereby the markets of both Trinidad and Barbados and we hope that with other Governments expressing an interest their markets will be sufficient to prove that a Caribbean air cargo company will not cause a drain on the resources of any one country.

I, Mr. Chairman, have just returned from a series of meetings in St. Lucia, two very important meetings; one dealing with trade and one dealing with transportation, both of which are of relevance to this Resolution. I am exceedingly happy to say that contrary to what people have said, the facts of the situation are that total CARICOM trade is still increasing. I am also exceedingly pleased to note that the two outstanding examples of regional corporations, namely, the West Indian Shipping Corporation and LIAT, in both cases the evidence is abundantly clear that viability is within sight, that losses have been drastically reduced, that the number of passengers carried in the case of LIAT has increased dramatically, and in the case of the West Indian Shipping Corporation that they too have increased their cargo carrying capacity. In short we have before us two examples of the fruit of inter-Caribbean cooperation, and as the Minister primarily responsible, I am very pleased that I have been able to secure the full agreement of my colleagues that we have another truly potentially great institution, namely, an air cargo company to cater to the needs of ourselves.

The accounts for Carib West, it is a private company, for the year 1978 have been audited by Peat Marwick Mitchell & Co., international Chartered Accountants with an office in Barbados and the loss for

the year 1978 has been put in these accounts at \$348,502. The loss for the year 1977 was \$472,046; so that between 1977 and 1978 there has been an improvement in the loss position. 1979 accounts are before the auditors; the preliminary accounts which are internal accounts have not been audited and I want to make that clear. The 1978 accounts have been audited, — The Preliminary accounts for 1978 and the financial year of this company ends at the end of February every year. The financial year 1979 shows that the loss is \$216,000. There has been also an improvement in that direction, but every one who has investigated this make it positively clear that it is only by a combined effort of the aviation authorities and industrialists in the Eastern Caribbean that we could ever have a fully viable and profitable air cargo company.

3.25 p.m.

I beg to move that this Resolution stand part.

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

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

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, there were two other Resolutions circulated earlier and I had informed the House that we would have asked that they be dealt with at this stage. Perhaps I should go back to the House first and get the leave.

I beg to move that you do now report to His Honour the Speaker the passing of two Resolutions in Committee.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to His Honour the SPEAKER, who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the Resolutions were passed and agreed to.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, earlier today I intimated to the House that I would be seeking its leave to deal with a number of other Resolutions which were necessary and which we would like to deal with today in view of the fact that we would wish to make this the last sitting of the House of this year. Notice has been given of these Resolutions and they have been circulated, and accordingly at this stage I ask that leave be given by the House for us to proceed with them in the normal fashion.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is seeking leave of this Hon. House to deal with three Resolutions in Committee. If there is no objection, leave will be granted. Leave is accordingly granted.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Dr. CHELTENHAM: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE NOTE TO ITEM 2

HEAD 108 – MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, all of the facts surrounding this were explained when I was dealing with a related matter. The Memorandum and Articles of Association will be filed before the end of the year, and this amount is required for the initial operating expenses. The plan of operation is that the company has to be formed so that it will be in a position to apply to the American authorities other than for route permission. 3.35 p.m.

The plan of operation is that the Company is to be formed so that it would be in a position to apply to the American Authority other than for route permission. The Government of Trinidad and Tobago and the Government of Barbados at this stage will nominate two Directors. The Directors will be charged with the responsibility of choosing competent staff to construct operations along commercial lines within the stipulated budget.

After the Managing Director is appointed other staff will be chosen by the Board of Directors. On the advice of the Managing Director, the Headquarters of the Company will be in Barbados and the Company which will be named the Caribbean Air Cargo Limited will have its Headquarters in Barbados.

The full requirements of our share of the capital of the Company, the initial subscription capital of the Company, will be the subject of a separate Resolution and will be brought to this House at a later date. This sum of money is purely for the initial operational expenses such as the formation of the Company, paying for the registration in Barbados, the salary of the Managing Director and the Secretary for a couple of months and the expenses of the Board of Directors who

will carry out the fundamental task of applying for permission in the United Kingdom and other countries.

I beg to move that this Head stand part.

Mr. SIMMONS: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1979–80 No. 21 HEAD 2 – PARLIAMENT

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, Sir as hon. members are aware the Debates Committee had certain advertisements for over two years to fill the vacancy in the Post of Clerk of Parliament. The Debates Committee subsequently appointed our Clerk and it is considered by the Debates Committee that advantage should be taken of the opportunities provided in the United Kingdom for the Clerk to attend a Parliamentary Course during the period January to April, 1980.

This Parliament and the Debates Committee are very indebted to the Clerk of Parliament in the United Kingdom for making the Course available to Barbados at such short notice. Normally these Courses are made available after request and there is a considerable queue which one has to partake in. However, due to cancellation and for other reasons, we have been notified that there is a place available in the next Course for the period January to April, 1980.

During the course of the attendance of the Clerk at the Course, it is obvious that supplementary provision will have to be provided so that subsistence and housing can be provided for the Clerk as the cost of living in the United Kingdom is considerably different from the cost of living in Barbados and the rates that have been worked out are rates similar to what other public officers of similar grades are granted. Accordingly, it is necessary to provide this money.

DEFENCE AND SECURITY DIVISION

HEAD 6(1) – DIRECTION AND POLICY FORMULATION

In respect of Item 5, the number of Security Guards had to be increased because of the demands for an increased number at the Airport and otherwise. In addition, public officers received additional allowances for travelling which were made retroactive with effect from the 1st January, 1979.

Some of these Security Officers are entitled to travelling on the new rates and scales. There was no provision in the original vote to cover the new rates of

travel on the Current Estimates of the Financial Year and it is necessary to supplement that in the sum of \$12,610.

I beg to move, Sir, that these Resolutions do now pass.

Mr. SIMMONS: I beg to second that.

The questions were put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1979-80 No. 22

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

HEAD 16(1) - GENERAL

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, the Addendum to the Resolution is set out very clearly. Since the last Estimates were prepared a number of inflationary factors have come into play in the United Kingdom, Europe, Caracas, New York and in Toronto to varying degrees. The highest rate of inflation recorded in that period in relation to Capital, I believe, is in the United Kingdom.

Barbados like other countries agreed to pay the cost of travelling subsistence and accommodation for officers in their Diplomatic Services. It is totally impossible to pay the cost of the charge for these items at the existing amount set out in the Estimates. No one in the last year could have anticipated that we would have been faced with the oil price rises in the course of this year to the extent that we have had to face in Barbados like the rest of the countries in the world.

This had a serious impact on the inflationary rates in the United Kingdom, in New York, in the United States, in Venezuela, in Canada as well as in Barbados and a number of items which fell under this Head increased considerably, air fares, hotel rates, taxis and other local cost travelling. Consequently, it is necessary to supplement this vote if these services are to be made for the balance of the Financial Year. There has been no increase in the rate of services. It is just that the costs on existing services have gone up because of the factors which I have just mentioned.

I beg to move that this Head stand part.

Mr. SIMMONS: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of three Resolutions in Committee.

Mr. SIMMONS: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.
3.45 p.m.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: I beg to move that these Resolutions do now pass.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 5 is the instant order of the day.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER 1979

Item No. 5 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 5) Order 1979.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir this Resolution seeks to provide adequate staff for the services at the new Grantley Adams International Airport. As Honourable Members would be aware, this Airport is considerably larger than the older Airport and it is necessary in view of the fact that it is considerably larger to provide additional staffing requirements for it. The Addendum to the Resolution sets out very clearly the objectives. The requisite Order has been made Sir, but this is the Order which seeks the approval of Parliament. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 7 is the instant order of the day.

LEAVE PASSAGES (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1979

Item No. 7 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Leave Passages (Amendment) Order, 1979.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: The Addendum to this Resolution sets out very clearly the object of it Sir, and I do not think there is any need to repeat it, Sir. It is necessary that this Order receive the approval of Parliament and accordingly, I beg that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 6 is the instant order of the day.

PETROLEUM WINNING OPERATIONS ACT CAP. 281

Item No. 6 was called — To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Petroleum Winning Operations Act Cap. 281.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I would like to draw to all Honourable Members' attention and indeed the staff of Parliament, the need for accuracy in correcting documents of this House. The existing Law of Barbados contained a typographical error in that the word "of" has been printed instead of the word "or". We came here sometime ago with a Bill to amend the Section to correct this typographical error and to my utter horror, the Bill as printed and circulated to this House repeats the error once again. I checked very carefully this morning and I found that the Bill given notice of in here corrects the error in that the word "or" is substituted for the word "of". I do not know what we can do with relation to this. We have had a repeated number of instances where Bills that have been given notice of have been amended in here and the Bill that is printed subsequently does not reflect what we agreed to. I do not know how we can correct it. It is a very serious matter. I hope that we will set up some system because Your Honour would well recall when we had the large Bill like the Law of Property Bill, we had to come back in to correct it. I hope that we can set up some mechanism for ensuring that this does not happen. It is a good thing that we looked at this very carefully. Last night I could not believe my eyes, because the Bill that is printed is what the existing Law is and the word "of" was printed.

I may say, Sir, that we are not singular in Barbados with this because the Revised Laws were printed in England and they have "of" instead of the word "or". Under Section 3 not only people who want to apply for licence and a submarine area which is defined in the Marine Boundaries Act, but also if they want to apply for a licence in respect to the land area. It should read: "no person shall drill for, or search for petroleum in a submarine area or Barbados". Two distinct areas.

I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time, but the correction of the word in the Bill must conform to the one we gave notice of. It is the word "or".

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Before putting the motion, I want to inform this Honourable House, that I have been advised that the Clerks at the table accept responsibility in this instance.

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

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

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

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, in line 2 of clause 2 the word "of" is to be deleted and the word "or" substituted and I beg to move that Clause 2 as amended stand part.

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

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

On motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN 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 Hon. H. B. St. JOHN seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 4.55 p.m.

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

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

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Item on the Order Paper "Statements by Ministers" be now taken.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection, the Hon. Minister may proceed.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: "Mr. Speaker, Sir: The recent involvement of a contingent of the Barbados Defence Force in security work in St. Vincent has occasioned notice, both in Parliament and in the media; but even apart from this, in Parliament I considered it my duty as Minister of Defence and Security, as well as

Prime Minister, to make a statement of the facts and their relationship to security in our region.

Even if the Opposition who have in the Press announced this to be a matter of confidence, do not deem it their duty to be present.

On Friday December 7, 1979, between 8 a.m. and 9 a.m., Prime Minister Cato of St. Vincent called me on the telephone and told me that there had been an armed uprising which had resulted in the takeover of Union Island, and which, he had reason to suspect, was the beginning of more general disturbances in the Grenadines and the mainland of St. Vincent.

The Prime Minister asked for help from the Barbados Defence Force and also asked me to make arrangements for an aircraft, the property of the government of St. Vincent, to be sent to the state from Barbados where it is normally stationed.

While I was considering this matter, a further call from Mr. Cato informed me that Prune Island, also in the Grenadines, was under attack, and that there were signs of unrest on Bequia, including the setting up of a road block.

This apparent northward trend of insurgency did not surprise me, because the Government of Barbados had for some time been aware of certain security problems in St. Vincent.

These reports indicated that Union Island was being used as a centre for the bringing of arms from outside into St. Vincent and the Grenadines, and on the independence day in the state, Prime Minister Cato made me personally aware of some of the problems, and that arrests had already been made, and some weapons discovered.

Subsequent to this, when the general election campaign got underway, there were rumours that at least one of the political parties campaigning in St. Vincent was not necessarily prepared peacefully to accept the results emerging from the democratic process of the ballot box.

Indeed, this Government was given some evidence quite independently of the government of St. Vincent, of an approach made to a citizen of St. Vincent by a prominent figure in one political party for the supply of weapons in this regard.

It was against this background, and against the background of an armed invasion of Union Island earlier this year, that the request of the St. Vincent government was viewed.

It was also borne in mind that the geographical position of Barbados places it in a special relation to St. Vincent in the sphere of security."

5.00 p.m.

"The existing police on the island were driven off, and the authority of the State of St. Vincent and the Grenadines was thus temporarily extinguished on Union Island.

Subsequent to the taking of Union Island, a group of insurgents attempted to seize the harbour, hotel and airstrip on nearby Prune Island, also known as Palm Island (as Prime Minister Cato had informed me) but this attack was beaten off. While this was taking place, I had given instructions for our Defence Force to be placed in readiness, and the Governor General was informed.

A Cabinet Meeting was summoned at 10.15 a.m. The Leader of the Opposition was informed, and a first small detachment of the Defence Force was sent to Arnos Vale Airport in St. Vincent.

A party of St. Vincent police was then assembled and flown to the airstrip on Prune Island. An element of confusion was introduced when it was reported that a number of armed men had earlier landed in Carriacou, an island very close to Union Island, but a part of Grenada and not of St. Vincent.

It was established that these men had been arrested by the Grenada police, but later released sometime during the morning on orders from the Grenada People's Revolutionary Army stationed in Carriacou. This matter was not cleared up until Prime Minister Bishop of Grenada explained to me during the afternoon that contradictory orders had been given to the two groups of security forces on Carriacou, and that the police had been asked to arrest the men and the People's Revolutionary Army had been instructed to deport the armed men.

The task force of policemen from St. Vincent effected landings at a number of points on Union Island, and although repulsed at first from the harbour and police station, succeeded in recapturing the airstrip.

A second contingent of police, released when the remainder of the contingent of soldiers of the Barbados Defence Force arrived for guard duty at Arnos Vale Airport, landed at the recaptured Union Island airstrip, and the revolt was then finally subdued following that with the recapture of the various Government buildings and installations.

After it was clear that the revolt had failed, it was decided to withdraw the Barbadian troops within a few days. However, although more than 20 persons were then in custody, the weapons used in the insurrection had, for the main part, not been found.

The further assistance of our Defence Force in recovering these weapons was requested, and this was agreed. The Commanding Officer of the Barbados Regi-

ment returned here on Sunday, December 9, to obtain the necessary equipment, including metal detectors to be used in the search for buried arms.

In connection with this activity, it should be noted that searches of houses can competently be carried out by police forces, but large scale area searches do not normally form a significant part of police training, and are usually conducted by military personnel.

It was, therefore, for the purpose of providing manpower and technical assistance in searching that the Barbadian troops remained for a few more days.

The Force assisted in carrying out searches on the islands of Petit Nevis, Quatre Isle, Union Island, and St. Vincent itself, and participated in the discovery of substantial quantities of weapons, and explosives.

In particular, the second-in-command of the Barbados Regiment was able sufficiently to gain the confidence of one youth on Union Island, who may fairly be described as a Rasta, that the youth led him to an unoccupied house where a large number of rifles and guns of varied makes, as well as quantities of explosives, were concealed.

In the light of certain allegations ascribed to a former Premier of St. Vincent, Mr. James Mitchell, in the Nation newspaper on Friday, December 12, to the effect that the Barbadian forces had exchanged fire with rebels on Union Island, I wish categorically to deny that Barbadian soldiers were ever in any way under fire or engaged in combat with insurgents or anyone in St. Vincent or anywhere in the Grenadines.

Not only were their guns never fired, but when on Union Island they were, for the main part, not even loaded. The Nation spoke of Mr. Mitchell's giving them information from what was described as "nearby Bequia".

Bequia is in fact approximately 30 miles from Union Island, and I deplore Mr. Mitchell's adding irresponsibility to an already unfortunate situation in his native Grenadines.

He has since written me what is styled as an open letter, Mr. Speaker, calling upon me and Parliament in Barbados, among other things, to support the setting up of a judicial enquiry presumably in St. Vincent into what he describes as "the whole affair".

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you will agree that the Parliament of Barbados has no authority to heed any such call.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, while on the subject of misinformation, to have to advert to another article, also in

the Nation Newspaper, this time on Wednesday, December 12.

The source this time is a former Deputy Prime Minister of Barbados, Mr. J. Cameron Tudor, who, on the date in his weekly column, made a number of false and insulting statements about the Prime Minister of St. Vincent.

I would also feel free to ignore his question as to why I did not heed Mr. Gairy's call for assistance in Grenada since Mr. or Sir Eric Gairy has never called on Barbados for any assistance then or since against the coup which unseated him.

I cannot, however, ignore the malicious gibes against the head of a friendly Government in his relationship to a part of its national territory. Contrary to Mr. Tudor's allegations, Mr. Cato has visited Union Island on numerous occasions.

5.10 p.m.

He opened the airstrip there, as a culmination of developments during his various administrations that also brought electricity and a secondary school to the island.

Contrary to what Mr. Tudor said, Mr. Cato did ring and discuss with me the foreign invasion of Union Island earlier this year, and the Government of Barbados was able from its own resources of intelligence to establish the source and origin of the then incursion.

I ignore the other trivia.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, a general comment.

In the last 12 years, there have now been four insurgencies in the English-speaking Caribbean aimed at toppling a national government or, at least, separating a portion of national territory. Of these two those in Anguilla and Grenada were successful; and one in Trinidad, although frustrated in its objective, was ended not by force, but by negotiations, after much alarm and distress.

Only one of these four was put down summarily, and that is the one under discussion. Thus, two succeeded, each in a single day, and this alone was put down in a single day.

The lesson is thus underlined, that in most coups the first 24 hours are decisive. Any policy of "wait and see" is a policy of "no assistance."

The public will note that every CARICOM government has supported the statement by our Government about this matter.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, a word about our troops. Although members of the Barbados Defence Force have served overseas before, most recently in Dominica when guard services were provided in the aftermath of Hurricane David, and in St. Vincent when a marine detachment was sent at the time of Independence, this was the biggest contingent to go abroad under the powers of sections 7 and 8 of the Defence Act.

In passing, I would mention that the Government of Barbados has no intention of amending these sections at the behest of the so-called Movement of National Liberation, whose real interest in the matter, in my opinion, is the destruction of all barriers against subversion in any part of the East Caribbean.

I wonder how its members find it possible to condemn Barbados for heeding a plea from a democratically elected government in our nearest neighbour, while praising Cuba for assisting what was then only a faction in distant Angola.

But to return to the Barbados Defence Force. It has acquitted itself well, and I wish to congratulate all those embodied troops and the reserve officer who freely consented to take part in the operation, for the efficiency with which they responded to the call for urgent assistance.

I am assured that their conduct in St. Vincent and the Grenadines was exemplary, and that they were fully welcomed and appreciated by the over-whelming majority of the population.

I would, therefore, ask our soldiers to be of good heart, and to regard the vigorous comments to which they have been subjected about their role, not as a stab in the back while they were on foreign soil, but as a part of the democratic process which informs the fabric of our national life.

I thank you, men and women of the Barbados Defence Force."

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that Item No. 8 be the next Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 8 is the instant order of the Day.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE VESTING OF LAND AT WILDEY, ST. MICHAEL, IN THE CARIBBEAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, when the Caribbean Development Bank was being formed and Barbados was selected as the Headquarters, the Government of Barbados undertook the responsibility of

providing land and a building for the operations of the Bank. This building was constructed with abundant facilities but in the course of the operations of the Bank it has proven too small for the Bank's present demands.

We have been negotiating with the Bank for sometime as we still carry the responsibility for supplying the necessary structures. We have come to an agreement with the Bank that we will give the Bank a portion of land adjoining its Headquarters at Wildey to permit it to carry out its own building operations there. This Resolution seeks to effect that purpose.

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.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 4 is the instant Order of the day.

VISITING FORCES ACT, 1979

Item No. 4 was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill respecting the armed forces of countries visiting Barbados.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, military exchanges between friendly nations for training purposes are commonplace and to support these military exchanges it is usually considered necessary to have provisions in the domestic law of the country receiving the contingent from the other country which is going to take part in exchanges for training purposes. Provision must be made for a set of Government's visiting forces, governing the conduct, behaviour etc and also offering them protection in the host country.
5.20 p.m.

This Bill is a standard form Visiting Forces Bill and it is designed to effectuate the purpose which will be found in the Addendum and will be observed at a glance in different headings, in parts of the Bill. Visiting Forces in Barbados will be subject, under the provisions of this Bill to certain of the Criminal Laws for Barbados for acts which they carry out in the Island. On the other hand, for certain military offences, they will be subject to the jurisdiction of their own Service Courts.

Provision is made for certain personnel and property damage against Visiting Forces by means of a claim against the designated state to whom the Forces belong. Provision has also been made, Sir, for the application of the security provisions of the Laws of Barbados to the Visiting Forces Act in this context, Sir. We shall be asking for amendment to sections 28 and 29 of the Bill

before the House which misdescribes the Official Secrets Act applicable to the present Laws of Barbados.

Part 4 deals with taxation of Visiting Forces. Part 5 permits the Barbados Defence Force to have attachments to overseas Forces and permits Forces to send members for attachments here and provides for mutual powers of command. Part 6, Miscellaneous Sections relates to Coroners' Inquests and so on.

Sir, I should perhaps, on behalf of the Government, say that if any further delay had been solicited on a matter not of Forces visiting this Island, but of our Forces visiting overseas, I have little doubt that the Government would have been prepared to entertain answers to questions and discussion on the matter. I really would have to say, Sir, that I cannot understand a parliamentary Opposition which conducts its business in the Press and cannot face its political opponents in Parliament, if apparently, they suspected that we may have answers to the arguments that they are going to put forward, or be able to put forward counter-arguments in their places. This debate will not now canvass the issue of St. Vincent. I would want it to be recorded in my speech that the Opposition has run from Parliament on an occasion when they have excited the public not only of Barbados but of St. Vincent and no doubt neighbouring islands, on a matter, Mr. Speaker, on which national unity is normally thought to be one of the prime main springs of Government. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second the motion before Parliament which relates to a Bill to make provision for certain matters with respect to the armed forces of countries visiting Barbados.

I would have thought, Sir, that it would have been in the interest of members on the other side, in the light of what they had considered to be something of public importance, at least to have used this opportunity to debate a matter of this nature. Sir, during my years in the Opposition, and for the past three years on the front bench of Government, I can safely say that I have seen both sides of Parliament. You can recall, Mr. Speaker, that when we were on the other side that it was always the duty of the Opposition led on one occasion by the late Sir Grantley Adams, on another occasion by the Deputy Prime Minister and on another by the present Prime Minister to sit around on evenings and have meetings to determine what we thought best to attack the Government of the day on. We would plan on strategies and would face the realities of Parliament rather than taking to the streets. But they say to each his own, Sir. I think it was approximately six public meetings which were held by the then Opposition, the Barbados Labour Party over a period of five years as compared to an Opposition whose Leader on more than one occasion

has made it abundantly clear both in Parliament and from the public platform that he does not see the need for public meetings to be held. Now in the evening of his years he is contaminating the air with a matter of this nature which to my mind is of paramount importance.

I think it is time when the Caribbean must look at bringing themselves together, as a military force, to protect each other. As they say, Sir, be their brothers' keepers. With a build-up of super powers in these areas for one reason or another I think the sovereignty of the peoples in the Caribbean must be respected. When we examine the political trials we have had over the years which for one reason or another failed when the Eastern Caribbean territories attempted to come together as one nation they were frustrated and destroyed. If you recall, Dr. Lewis in his booklet, where he said the salvation of these territories in these areas should be togetherness.

In the light of not having Jamaica, Guyana, and Trinidad the big brothers, it is the bounden duty of the Government of Barbados to take the lead in attempting to bring her neighbours into togetherness, whether at a political or at a military level. The time has come when we must examine this or we are going to be overtaken by events. If Barbados must take the lead and I still retain my Cabinet post, I am prepared to support that every single ounce of the way. We have been leaders in other fields, Sir, in cricket, boxing, education, law, medicine and in recent days we have scored what we can safely consider as a first at the Organisation of American States by having Mr. Val McComie there. We can say, that in these areas, within the Eastern Caribbean, we have been leaders, even in going to China as a first goodwill ambassadors of the Eastern Caribbean and Barbados. There is absolutely nothing wrong when the Government of Barbados must take the lead on the occasion of sending troops into St. Vincent. They took the lead on that occasion, Sir.

5.30 p.m.

The Prime Minister's statement this evening I know cannot be debated and I would hate to say anything that would attempt to trespass on the statement which may lead to an attempt to debate any aspect of it. I therefore am appealing to the Minister of Defence and his Cabinet colleagues from the floor of the House and I hope my appeal will go beyond these shores where in the not too distant future rather than having a Barbados Defence Force we can safely sit down and say we have a West Indian Defence Force for the purpose of protecting our own soil as far as we can. It is a plea which I hope will not go on deaf ears. It is something which we only have to wait until something happens then to say we are ready to move. I think the time has come when we must clip it in the bud.

Mr. Speaker, it therefore gives me great pleasure not only in seconding the motion before the House but also to lend my wholehearted support to it.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a short contribution to this proposed legislation. Mr. Speaker, the history of independent countries or should I say countries which have recently acquired independence from their former colonial masters shows quite clearly that not only having achieved political national independence and to some extent and respect a measure of economic independence, shows that it is also necessary for these recently independent countries to seek to preserve their territorial integrity and to that extent to amass a certain degree of arms with which to protect their independence. The question of acquisition of arms for defensive purposes can be carried to extremes as perhaps is evident in certain areas of the Caribbean, but no one can deny the people its right to protect itself by the acquisition of arms.

We are in the habit from time to time of saying that all of us in the Eastern Caribbean, indeed as far as Jamaica, are brothers. Nowadays everybody is a brother whether he is a blood brother or otherwise, that we are part of the same family. It is clear that we are geographical neighbours. If we are brothers and if we are neighbours it is clear that when members of the family or neighbours ask for assistance to protect themselves from attack that they are entitled to be aided if it is within the power of the brother or the neighbour to offer that assistance. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the decision of the Barbados Government to respond to the invitation for assistance by St. Vincent must be seen against a background of the two premises which I have already outlined, otherwise we would have been abdicating our responsibility and our moral duty as brothers or neighbours in turning aside from that request.

The second point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the Caribbean area has been in turmoil for the last few years. The instability in the Caribbean area itself cannot redound and enure to the benefit of Caribbean people, and it is our responsibility to try to stabilise the area if we intend to make any form of economic progress. Now God forbid if there were a coup in St. Vincent or an invasion by unidentified foreign troops as the first reports around 9.30 in the morning alleged. The people in Canada or in England or in Europe or America coming here as tourists will automatically conclude that there is some trouble in the Caribbean and Barbados is so closely connected to St. Vincent geographically, that it does not take a Solomon to see that the instability in St. Vincent and the Grenadines could affect the viability of our tourist trade.

Thirdly, foreign investors whom all these Islands woo with a view to developing our manufacturing sector

and with a view to alleviating the unemployment problems in these areas would be very wary about committing their capital to an unstable region if the Caribbean were going through that period. It would affect our ability to attract foreign investment to Barbados. In those circumstances, can anyone deny that the Government of Barbados had an interest in assisting the Government of St. Vincent in ensuring that the area remained stable or that the uprising be quelled without undue delay? For the Opposition to say otherwise, Mr. Speaker, would be for the Opposition to show themselves as not being true Caribbean people as they often say on political platforms when it suits them. There can be every justification if only for the two reasons which I gave without knowing all the ramifications and the details that prompted the actions of the Government. It is clear that we had a moral, geographical, economic, political and every possible reason for assisting St. Vincent by sending armed forces.

Mr. SPEAKER: There has always been an area of absenteeism in Caribbean communities.

Mr. SIMMONS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I notice even in the Barbadian community gambling as hon. members of this House. On the other side there is that element of absenteeism today.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am addressing the Chair and I ignore their absence other than to make it very clear that the people of this country must start to analyse the behaviour of the members of the Opposition. I saw in the newspapers on Sunday some article saying that the Opposition has improved or the Opposition is doing well. 5.40 p.m.

When you consider that it is they who got the headlines in both newspapers on Sunday talking about some vote of no-confidence precisely connected to the sending of armed forces to another State, and when you see that their statement is made and that a Bill dealing with armed forces is before the House now and the Opposition does not even bother to come to the House to take part in the debate, the general public must be asked to judge them by their conduct and to determine whether they themselves are people who are worthy of being in Opposition, far less being seen theoretically as any alternative Government. Whether that lot that is now absent really have any place in the Government of Barbados. They cannot even organise their business in accordance with the Standing Orders, and they have on their side some of the oldest and youngest serving people.

Mr. SPEAKER: They may organise the armed forces.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the question of a build up of arms in the Caribbean is a serious threat to the Caribbean area as the zone of peace, and I am going to

lend all of my support to any Government of Barbados and in particular this Government which seeks to control the build up of arms in the Caribbean, and seeks to ensure the stability of the Caribbean area. It is not out of personal self-interest, it is out of commitment to the national good that I take my stand on this matter.

We can only deprecate the absence of the Opposition from Parliament, and those who write in support of them and say how well they are doing now have an opportunity to write another article stating the true position. Twice in a year they come in here and are caught by the rules and get knocked out in less than half a round. Twice in the year, the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition has been in here from 1951 with a break until now, the hon. member for St. Philip South just as long, most of the others are ending two terms, but the people still persist in attending their meetings at night. If they go for entertainment I cannot blame them, you need as human beings entertainment and diversions from the daily chores of life. If you go to hear people talk foolishness, fair enough, but so long as the general public — and this is my concern — so long as the general public realises that they are only talking, but in talking seek to catch the headlines in the Sunday newspapers for fun, and if anyone is taking them seriously in 1979 I am worried about the future of Barbados in the years ahead. How people come in here, their supporters, they bring them in here, they know they are here, but they keep the sheep in here, go in the Gallery and graze, they are elsewhere.

This is not the first time in the year they have done it to them, but they are gluttons for punishment, they will keep doing it, and they are right to do that to their own supporters.

Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this Bill concerning the visiting armed forces. The principle of the Bill is to be commended. There is nothing really contentious in it and I am grateful that I have had the opportunity before Christmas to speak on this matter.

The question that the Bill be 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. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.

Part I was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Subject to comments by hon. members, because Part I contains 17 sections, I beg to move that Part I stand part.

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

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

Part II was called and passed.

Part III was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In Part III I beg to move that clause 28 be amended to the effect of the proposed amendment circulated to hon. members, that is, by striking out "Act, 1979" in lines one and two thereof and by substituting "Acts, 1911 and 1920 of the United Kingdom Parliament (hereinafter referred to as "that Act")"; and also by striking out paragraph (c) at page 14 of the Bill and by substituting the following: "(c) a reference in that Act to "safety or interests of the state", or to "interests of the state" or to "public interest" included the safety and security interests of a designated state."; and further, by striking out the words "The Barbados Defence Force" in paragraph (c) at page 14 of the Bill and by substituting the words "Her Majesty's forces in right of Her Government of Barbados".

I beg to move that clause 28 be amended to that effect. I think Your Honour will have to put the words to be deleted stand part.

Mr. SISNETT: I beg to second that.

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

The question that the words proposed be deleted stand part was put and resolved in the negative without division.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that the Clause as amended with the inserted words stand part.

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

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 29 be amended to the effect of those amendments circulated to hon. members namely that the whole of Clause 29 be struck out and the following Clause substituted "Section 10(1) of the Official Secrets Act, 1911 of the United Kingdom Parliament."

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

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

Parts IV to VI inclusive were called and passed.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Bill with amendments in Committee.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the Motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, the Bill was read a third time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 9 is the instant Order of the Day.

THE PROPERTY TRANSFER TAX (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1979

Order No. 9 was called — to move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Property Transfer Tax Act, Cap. 84A.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Bill is really a very simple one indeed. We have had some difficulties in the Property Transfer Tax Act because it seems that we have made the conditions for buying property a little too simple and what we have been getting is a situation where a foreigner who wants to buy property in Barbados is first applying for permission to become a resident before he buys the property as to avoid paying Property Transfer Tax.

Now we have been really having considerable difficulty and I think that our liberalism in this regard has been very self-defeated because many of these people who apply are unfortunately very well qualified to be residents. In the ordinary way if a person has a large sum of money there is virtually no country in the world that he cannot immigrate to. If he cares to go to Iran I dare say he can get a resident permit. This really is a case where there is one law for the rich and one for the poor.

We have observed that Christine Onassis, Sir, had no trouble in setting herself up in comfort in Moscow when she desired to marry a Soviet Citizen. In Barbados you get people perhaps who are millionaires who have no need to work, so they do not need a work permit, who will employ domestic staff and who are certainly on the brinks of prosperity settling in some little corner in Barbados. When they want to buy a property their Solicitors have been advising them to get residence first so as to save the 7½ % imposed for Property Transfer Tax and we have been forced to contemplate and then decide on the control of this privilege.

In effect, what the Bill now before the House seeks to do is to amend the Property Transfer Tax in such a way that you have to be a citizen or someone who has lived here for at least five years as a minimum before you can escape the Property Transfer Tax. You have to be a permanent resident which is, as the Leader of the House has pointed out, a different status from immigrant.

If you have the money or whatever, you can come here as a resident on retirement or an immigrant but you will have to become a permanent resident in Barbados before you can buy property. I think it is a necessary safeguard in the long-run both for those buying properties and for which Barbadians should be allowed to also compete.

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

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

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: 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.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill with amendments in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS the Bill as amended was read a third time and passed.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I would like to seek leave of the House to deal with the Civil Establishment Act General Order. Notice of the Resolution was given earlier today. Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order No. 6. I have the original Order that I had made here, Sir. This Order is intended to come into force from 1st January 1980. I wonder if Your Honour would mind if I showed you the original Order. This is the actual legal Order which I made and signed, Sir. Mr. Jones, show Mr. Speaker the original Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister is seeking the leave of this Hon. House to deal with Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1979. There being no objection, leave is granted.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: This is intended to come into force on 1st January 1980 and it is important to deal with it, as this is the last meeting of the year. It carries out certain reorganisations in the Training Division of the Prime Minister's office. We have abolished the post of Chief Training Officer which was a post of Permanent Secretary level. We have reduced the posts of Permanent Secretary by one. We have substituted the post of Principal Training Officer which is one level below the original post of Chief Training Officer and we have given a new position to the holder of the post of Chief Training Officer who is Major S. A. Headley.

I would like to thank Major Headley for his invaluable work in that position because he transformed local training for Civil Servants during the two years that he was there. I am satisfied that the programmes of training set up by the new Training Committee which was set up at the same time as Major Headley took up his post and the work which Major Headley has done brought new breadth especially into middle management level of the Civil Service. The training programme which he introduced covered members of the Barbados Police Force, Sir, at the level of Sergeant and persons of equivalent rank inside the Civil Service. I do think that the work has now been done and such initiatives as would demand the service of a Permanent Secretary to carry out have been applied to the job. I think that an expanding system of local training, and a reduced system of overseas training is now well on the way and can be carried out by a person of lesser rank than a Chief Training Officer. We are seeking to abolish that post.

There are some consequential changes in the Organisation and Management Division of the Prime Minister's Office because we are transferring an Assistant Secretary from that office to the Ministry of Information, Sir. We are abolishing Organisation and Management as a separate division and treating it instead as part of the Training Division. Most important, the Ministry of Education and Culture, Archives, and Library are being removed from the Ministry of Education and Culture and being transferred to the Ministry of Information. This is what the rest of the Order seeks to achieve except, Sir, that the Ministry of Information is being given a Permanent Secretary, who in fact is transferred from the temporary post he was holding to which Major Headley is now being assigned. An Assistant Secretary also is being provided by this Ministry from savings made in the Prime Minister's Office because previously, Information was under the Prime Minister's Office. We have been able to send some of the staff over to the new Ministry of Information as well as, transferring a new Permanent

Secretary. It is hoped, Sir, that the organisation can be complete by 1st January 1980. This Order is stated to come into operation by this date and for this reason, I have asked hon. members to support this being done in all its stages.

I now beg to move that this Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, No. 6, 1979 do now pass.

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

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

6.10 p.m.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for today.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 15th January, 1980 at 12 o'clock noon.

As is customary, Sir, at this time of the year, it gives me great pleasure once again to extend on behalf of the Government the season's greetings to you, Sir, and to members of the staff and all those who are involved in making our work in here pleasant. Unfortunately today, Sir, is the first time that I have been in Parliament where there is no one occupying the benches opposite, but nevertheless, Sir, I still feel it is customary and my duty to extend to them in their absence the usual greetings at this time of the year. I hope that all of us will return next year fit and ready and willing to continue to perform the functions for which we have been put here by the electorate and for the benefit of the people of Barbados as a whole.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second the motion.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the back benchers, Sir, the hon. members who sit behind, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the Hon. Leader of the House and to tender to Your Honour personally the warmest greetings for the season, and of course, Mr. Speaker, to the members of the staff of Parliament, the Clerks, the Reporters, those whom we do not see in here, Miss Banfield and the others. We wish to offer them the season's greetings for a very happy Christmas and a prosperous 1980. Mr. Speaker, you have our assurance that our greetings are conveyed to you and your family as well.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, in as much as this side over here is a Government comprising the Barbados Labour Party, I believe it is appropriate that on behalf of the party which it is my honour at the moment to chair, to express our fondest regards to the people who

comprise the staff of Parliament, to Your Honour the Speaker and to the people of Barbados who through the past year have given us their support and who I am sure will continue to give us their support in future. On behalf of the Barbados Labour Party I would like to wish them the best for the season and a very prosperous year in 1980.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members, I feel a bit flattered. Nevertheless I am happy to accept the felicitations extended to me as Speaker and I am extremely happy to be able to be associated with those kind remarks relating to the members of the staff of this Honourable House. I feel that they have laboured in and out of season and with a very pleasant spirit above everything else. So to hon. members I wish to extend the season's greetings. I

do hope that each one will have a very sober Christmas, and we look forward to returning here in the new year I do believe with renewed vigour, because each and everyone of us from the Chair, the Clerks at the Table to the last member of staff along with hon. members have certainly had a hair-raising experience throughout the year, and I hope we have all learnt a lesson therefrom.

I extend to one and all the seasons greetings and look forward to the most prosperous 1980 of all.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 15th January, 1980 at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
6.20 p.m.