THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 10th July, 1979.

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

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, J.P., (Speaker); Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment); Hon. H. deB. FORDE, S.C., M.A., LL.B., (Attorney General and Minister of External Affairs); Dr. R. B. CADDLE, M.D., Ch.B.; Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD, M.A., (Econ.); 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.; Hon. L. R. TULL, M.A., (Minister of Education and Culture); Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW and Mr. L. L. SISNETT.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday 26th day of June, 1979.

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

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

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

The Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, 3rd July, 1979.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS and Mr. TAITT entered the Chamber and took their seats.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: These Minutes have also been circulated and subject to any observations by any hon. members as to the accuracy thereof I beg to move that they be confirmed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no observations by any hon. members those Minutes stand confirmed.

Mr. GREAVES entered the Chamber and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

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

The Customs (Caribbean Community) Order, 1979.

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 2) Order 1979.

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 3) Order 1979.

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 4) Order 1979.

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

Report of the Ministry of Education for the period 1st September 1973 to 31st August 1974.

Report of the Ministry of Education for the period 1st September 1976 to 31st August 1977.

Dr. CHELTENHAM entered the Chamber and took his seat.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

Resolution to grant the sum of $516 000 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1979–80, Part 1 – Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1979–80, No. 4, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

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

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Wavell Avenue, Black Rock, St. Michael, for housing development.

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

Resolution to grant the sum of $85 125 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. 5, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that Standing Orders 6, 16, 18 and 20 be suspended for the remainder of today's Sitting.

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

The question that the Standing Orders be suspended for the remainder of the day's Sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

12.25 p.m.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, I have no wish to embarrass, but I must draw it to your attention that about eight weeks ago I handed in to your Chambers notice of a Private Member's Resolution and to date I have had no intimation from any person as to when I can get the opportunity to give notice of this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a procedure for dealing with matters to which the hon. member has just referred. I must take this opportunity to let the hon. member know for the benefit of the House that when a member files a Resolution, Question, whatever, with the Clerk of the House it is on the hon. member if he finds that in his opinion too much time has elapsed before he hears anything about it or he is allowed to table it that he should enquire through the Clerk. If he is not then satisfied with what the Clerk gives as an explanation, he should cause the Clerk to know of his desire to discuss the matter in Chambers with His Honour the Speaker. *(Asides).* Let us have some order, please!

Dr. CHELTENHAM: I am grateful to you, Mr. Speaker, for setting out the steps, but I would just like to point that.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps the mistake that I am making is this, that when the Speaker is addressing the House the Speaker should stand. That is the mistake that I am presently making, but I must offer this explanation. On account of the contraption that is here under my feet, which is very uncomfortable and very ungainly, I do not appear to be exerting this authority by constantly jumping up, but I can politely sit here and tell an hon. member what is the position.

As for the hon. member who is enquiring about his notice, it is being processed and he will be advised through the Clerk if or when he can table it or if it is out of order or whatever might be the case. The matter is being processed.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Item No. 2.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No 2 is the instant Order of the Day.

THE DEFENCE ACT, 1979

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of my speech which introduced the Government White Paper entitled "Proposals for the Establishment of a Barbados Defence Force" in January 1978 the rationale for a Defence Force was set out. The main outlines were also contained in that White Paper, and I do not therefore propose at this stage to go over all the basic reasons for the establishment of a Defence Force or its fundamental form. Sufficient to say that the Force will for the first time introduce a full time complement of men under arms in Barbados compared with the part-time Barbados Volunteer Force, Barbados Regiment and other military bodies of merely antiquity which have existed in the island from time to time. The only thing that I would add to what I said on that occasion is that sadly since January 1978 it

does appear as if the security conditions of our small islands in the Eastern Caribbean have declined somewhat.

We have moved into a stage where security is a more important matter to these small islands than it was a year and a half ago, more important both because of threats and because of actual events. I myself am not an alarmist, but I would draw to hon. members' attention a recent article in a magazine entitled "Africa". I think it is the issue of two months ago, in which the security situation in the Caribbean is analysed and the writer there compares the coup in Grenada on March 13 this year with the coup in Togo in 1960 in which President Olympio was overthrown and killed. The comparison which he draws is between the fact that each of these situations was, as he put it, the first. In Togo in 1960 the pattern of overthrowing Governments by force was established and the writer suggests that we in the West Indies are now being brought face to face with certain problems which can exist. I myself do not believe that our history is the same as Africa's history, and that the dangers which face us are the same as the dangers which have overwhelmed democratic Governments throughout the great continent of Africa. Nonetheless, we would, I think, be most unwise any longer to assume that it cannot happen here, and in Barbados there have not been lacking persons who in their temporary unwisdom have welcomed the events in Grenada that they cannot actually happen, not the overthrow of one man and the putting in of another, but the promise that they hold on events in other places. This was, of course, only a limited fringe, a minority fringe, but experience has shown that these limited fringes can make a lot of trouble for Governments, and I think that throughout the eastern Caribbean we are now faced with the necessity of improving the security arrangements available to Government in the same way as they had to be improved in Jamaica and Guyana, and indeed in Trinidad and Tobago, and to establish security forces of one kind or another to cover areas that were previously left to an assumption of good sense.

Those of us, Mr. Speaker, who watched television on Sunday night I am quite sure do not wish to see Denar's minions coming ashore in their black uniforms and throwing themselves between the palms at the Hilton Beach or Foul Bay or anywhere else in Barbados, and when we consider that the programme which we watched opened with a picture of Mr. Sydney Alleyne and a certain person, the darling of the newspapers, described as a political activist in Barbados, with his name emblazoned across his chest, we can perhaps, Mr. Speaker, not be blamed for taking with some small degree of seriousness the necessity to protect ourselves against the vicious lunatic fringe that has so vehemently threatened law and order in Barbados from the political platform and from the safe distance of London.

12.35 p.m.

The Bill before the House has 230 sections and will also be supported by Regulations. These Regulations have not yet reached final form for promulgation, although Officers Regulations will be promulgated very shortly after proclamation of the Act. Until the Regulations are in force, the Army and Navy Discipline Act of the United Kingdom will apply to the Defence Force. I have made a copy of the Draft Regulations available to the acting Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for St. Michael South West. He will understand that they are confidential, but they may assist hon. members with the thinking of those responsible for the legislation, especially in respect of the terms and conditions of service of officers and in respect of the procedure which is intended to be followed in that part of the Act relating to military discipline and defence.

Part I of the Defence Act is preliminary in nature. It refers to the establishment of the Force, defines active service and gives authority for the Defence Force to be used in certain circumstances outside Barbados and provides for overseas training.

Part II establishes the control of the Defence Force. This is achieved by means of a Defence Board which will be responsible for discipline and administration. The Defence Board will consist of myself as Chairman, the Chief of Staff, the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Defence and Security, and the Attorney General as the other Ministerial member of the Board. Operational control of the Force will rest with the Chief of Staff, subject of general directions to be given by the Governor General. The Chief of Staff will therefore have complete tactical control of the activity of the units. In certain emergencies which will necessarily be of an urgent local nature, where the Governor General has given no directions, the Prime Minister will be authorized to give such instructions to the Chief of Staff as may be necessary to secure law and order in the emergency conditions. I do hope, however, that the occasion will never arise for these last-ditch powers to be brought into operation.

Part III of the Act relates to the officers of the Defence Force. Officers will be appointed by a Commission Board. The Commissions Board will have no political input. It will be chaired by the Chief of Staff of the Defence Force and will have two other members, one of whom will be the Chairman of the Public Service Commission and the other to be appointed by the Defence Board.

I will draw hon. members' attention to the Draft Defence Officers Regulations which broadly speaking embody the conditions of service of officers in the Defence Force. The Defence Officers Regulations will lay down the conditions under which officers serve.

Part IV of the Act covers general terms of enlistment in the Defence Force. Persons enlisted will normally be eighteen years of age or over, though there are provisions where younger persons may be taken in.

The Act provides for twelve years of full time service, and following that for transfer to the Defence Force Reserve. There it also provisions for reenlistment. The present intention is to enlist soldiers for periods up to five years. It is not at present thought desirable in a small Force without many opportunities for promotion to make provision for twelve years of service, and therefore a shorter period was selected. The enlistment and service regulations are being drafted and will shortly be completed. But broadly speaking, the intention is that the Defence Force itself will choose its staff. In other words, the Colonel and officers of the Force will select the soldiers, subject to the overall right of approval of the Defence Board. This will not be found in the Draft Regulations as these are still being drafted and there are one or two provisions to be added as thought necessary. Two sets of regulations will be found, one for the regular posts and one for the Reserve, but consolidation of the two sets of Regulations is being considered.

I would like to utter a word of warning at this point. It must be understood that service in an army is not like service in the Public Service. Some questions were raised in here recently when it was revealed that as a result of acts of insubordination a former member of the Coast Guard was summarily dismissed from the Service by the Commanding Officer. Honourable members who have any familiarity with military procedures will be aware that there is a whole range of offences for which soldiers can be removed from service. These as far as possible have been set out in the Act and will be further set out in the Regulations. We are giving soldiers a full right to trial, to appeals and to make complaints before punishment. But it must be understood that there must reside in the Commanding Officers of military units a residual power to take action to control matters; and I would wish it to be known that this matter was given careful consideration by those responsible for drafting the Bill and that I fully concur in the provision which retains for the Commanding Officer the present provisions of the Barbados Regiment Act, which provisions as far as I know are contained in similar Acts. But I also imagine that hon. members would be glad to hear that there will be no political input of any sort into the dismissal of members of the Regiment. It just will not be within the power of politicians to get between the disciplined ranks system that will exist in the Force and try to interpolate their views on matters of discipline.

12.45 p.m.

Sir, the longest part of the Act is Part V which contains 106 sections. It deals with discipline and trial and punishments for military offences, and it lays down the structure of Courts-martial, and it should be read in conjunction with Part VI of the Act which contains 18 sections dealing with appeals from the Courts-martial. It is possible, Sir, to spend a great deal of time going into these two parts. I do not propose to do that at this time or at any other time.

Sufficient to say, Sir, that these are common form provisions in enforcing military discipline, and laying down what are military offences; and they have been taken from Army Acts in other countries where useful models exist. The exact Acts from which they are taken are in geneological order in the list which has been circulated to all hon. members. The terms and conditions will be found to be much the same as the terms and conditions in the unified Manual of Military Law in force in the United Kingdom.

Part VII also deals with punishment, but the minor punishment of deductions and forfeiture. Part VIII is a general part. It deals with precedence between the ranks. A word is sufficient at this stage. This Force is a unified Force on much the same model as the Canadian Force is unified. The different divisions of the Force will wear different uniforms, and courtesy titles will be accorded to naval officers; and when the time comes, to air force officers, coast guard officers or wing officers; but fundamentally, they will all hold the same rank – the rank of colonel at the top, which corresponds to the rank of captain; the rank of lieutenant colonel which corresponds with the rank of commander or wing commander; the rank of major, corresponding the lieutenant commander and squadron leader and so on down the line. It may be that even now the coast guard ranks contain persons described as sergeants. Sergeants in the coast guard will be given appropriate ranks where necessary and may well be referred to by courtesy as petty officers; but their fundamental rates of pay will depend on the rank which they hold substantively.

This is merely an explanatory note to assist in understanding the structure in the future. Sections 169 to 171 of the Act deals with the appointment of a chief of

staff who will be in command generally. Section 169 lays down that the chief of staff will be appointed by the Governor General, and subject to the terms and conditions of the appointment, will hold office during the Governor General's pleasure.

Complaints by officers and other ranks of a specialised nature – in fact they cannot be dealt with otherwise – will be dealt with under the provisions of section 172 and 173 by the Governor General's Privy Council.

These sections were drawn up in a most general way, and we are giving the right to any officer or soldier who feels himself aggrieved by a decision to appeal to the local Privy Council directly; after he is heard, and such redress as may be appropriate, is offered. Other provisions under this part relate to matters like jury service and matters in which there is an inter-play between the Civil Law and Military Law – levies of execution, the relationship of the Civil Police in relation to offences such as desertion or absence without leave, and generally between the civil institutions of justice including the prisons and the army.

Opportunity has also been taken to embody in this part of the Act the provisions of the Uniforms and Military Desertion Prevention Act, of 1895 which forbids the wearing of military uniforms without authority. This is all contained in Part VIII. Part IX, with 13 sections deals with Defence Force Reserves. When I was dealing with the proposals in the White Paper in January last year I said that the Reserves would form a very important part of the Defence Force. Indeed, Sir, tentative plans are underway to make it form and even more important part than was envisaged at that time.

I would like to take the opportunity publicly to thank the National Guard of the US Virgin Islands for giving the Permanent Secretary of Defence and Security and an officer of the Force an opportunity of seeing the mode of operations of the National Guard of those islands; and those islands reserves embrace the whole social spectrum of society and it is a force, as in the case of many American National Guards, a Force of high morale, good equipment and a thorough understanding of its role, something which we have a good deal to learn about the putting together of a citizens army in these small islands.

The Reserve Force will consist of persons who not only have been members of the regular Force, but also persons who enlist directly into the Reserve Force. They will be liable to be called out each time for not more than 90 days at one time; and there are various provisions for protecting the conditions of civilian employment of members of the Reserve Force. It will be noticed that employees who are members of the Reserve Force cannot be dismissed or victimised on account of being called out or on account of any military duties that they are obliged to perform.

Part X of the Act deals with the Coast Guard. The duties of the Coast Guard, in addition to any such orthodox naval duties as in our humble way we think we can employ them, for coastal defence and harbour protection duties. A look at the third schedule will indicate the areas where the Coast Guard will have some responsibilities. A certain number of Harbour Police responsibilities are being taken over in their entirety by the Coast Guard, and there will be in consequence some amendments to the Police Act to delete the references in that Act to the existence of the Harbour Police.

The Coast Guard will now have what it does not now possess – powers of arrest of persons found committing crimes within the territorial waters of Barbados on the same conditions that the Harbour Police formerly had these powers. The matters relate to quarantine, immigration, fisheries generally, arrest under the Barbados Port Authority Act, the Beach Protection Act, the Marine Boundaries and Territorial Waters Jurisdiction Act which is more of a naval nature, the Better Security of Shipping Act, the Oil in Navigable Waters Act. This will be the most important feature of the work of the Coast Guard.
12.55 p.m.

There are certain powers also under the Police Act which they will share with the Police relating to arrests inside the harbours of Barbados, and similar powers under the Barbados Harbours Regulations. There will also be powers under the Collisions Regulations of the United Kingdom which are being specially kept in force in Barbados for collisions which happen in Barbados' waters by a later section of the Act.

Part XI of the Act deals with the Barbados Cadet Corps which will be under the jurisdiction of the Defence Force. There will be two types of Cadet Corps envisaged when the Bill is passed. Cadet Corps formed at secondary schools; and hon. members I know will be glad to hear that every encouragement will be given to all secondary schools and not just to the so-called grammar schools, to form Cadet Companies, and Cadet Companies formed independently of secondary schools. Full regulations are under contemplation relating to the setting up of Cadet Companies, but these are not contained in the Draft which has so far been circulated.

In conclusion, Sir, I will deal with Part XII of the Act which contains the remaining ten sections and is there to tie up a few general loose ends and to provide for general application of the Act. By section 223 it is laid down that the Army Act, the Naval Discipline Act and the Air Force Act of Great Britain will cover any

gaps which exist in this legislation. We have gone to some trouble to make it possible for persons who are now public employees to join the Defence Force by preserving the pension right of any public employee who transfers to the Force. That is by virtue of section 226.

Finally, Sir, a few general remarks to bring the House up to date since January 1978. Independence involves many things for small nations. Improved defence arrangements are obviously one of them. It takes time for the necessity to be seen, but as I said at the opening, the necessity is now on us with some force. Time was marked with the Defence Act for a long time. We were promised a White Paper on Defence during the currency of the last Government. I recall reading a newsletter by Peter Morgan, then the hon. member for Christ Church North Central to his constituents in which he very strongly put the case for a Defence Act and in which he said he looked forward to seeing national service being part of Barbadian life. On the whole, Sir, although I do not go all the way with him on national service, I prefer Mr. Morgan's views on that occasion to the views that he has recently expressed in a letter to the newspapers saying he is against a Defence Force. He must think that all Barbadians have short memories. But I have also heard the Leader of the Opposition put the case for a Defence Force, and I must say in his favour I have never seen him renege from it. Even last Tuesday when we had to postpone the Bill, I was glad when he indicated that the previous Government had been working on a White Paper for a Defence Force. We have now come to the stage where the thoughts of both parties have to be fully realised. We were once a British colony, but it is not the custom of the United Kingdom generally to sign defence treaties or have standing defence arrangements with its former colonies, and a little self-help is therefore necessary in these last twenty years of the 20th Century. We have pirates to defend ourselves against as I mentioned at the opening. We have brigands; we have a few plain bad Johns right here in Barbados who also have to be considered. These are some of the things the Defence Force is for, and I am going to indicate a few things which the Defence Force is not for.

A Defence Force is not for the suppression of civil liberties in Barbados. We want a citizen's army; we want an enlightened citizenry that can recognise where its real interests lie and that can recognise that every political party and the very structure of democracy is dragged down when disorder and violence are preached on political platforms. We are not, Mr. Speaker, for a Defence Force which will in any way interfere with workers' rights. One of the quaintest and the most enduring of the beliefs of that great and wise man on most subjects, Mr. Frank Walcott, the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union, is that the Defence Force somehow presents a threat to the Barbados Workers' Union. Mr. Walcott perhaps had better be aware that in democratic countries normal workers have civil rights given to them that they never had when democracy is overthrown in the country. He had better be made aware of that, and there is no intention in this Government to act in any way differently towards the matter of workers' interests when there is a Defence Force than when there was no Defence Force. We are not aiming in any way to substitute the responsibilities for the maintenance of general law and order in the Island which now rest in the Police with any responsibility in the Defence Force. The Defence Force will work closely with the Police. It will be deployed at more than one place in Barbados and increased measures of security will of course be taken to ensure that Defence Force barracks and other installations are fully equipped to maintain themselves against any such stroke as occasioned the demise of the elected Government of Grenada.

New communications and control measures are under consideration as a matter indeed of urgency, and in due course the House will be informed of their nature when plans are finalised. The Defence Force itself, I know that this will please the hon. member for St. Michael South, is not planning to buy tanks, self-propelled howitzers whether from Carlton Brathwaite or Dr. Gerry Bull or anyone else in Space Research. We are not planning for armoured warfare in the St. George Valley. We are not buying weapons of aggression. We have had proposals put up to us which would have equipped the Coast Guard at enormous cost with the means to fight navies. After all let it be remembered that the one Egyptian success of the 1967 six-day war was to destroy the Flag Ship of the Israeli Navy with forces so petty that they were not even considered serious by the Captain of the Israeli guided missile vessel, but we are not even going as far as that. I have very little belief that Barbados is going to be attacked by a cruiser or even a gun-boat or anything else like that. We are maintaining a low defensive posture in the light of reality. We will however have to be purchasing new equipment for the Coast Guard services. The present Coast Guard vessels have not proved adequate for the task with which they were entrusted. I am not assigning any blame, Sir. Bad judgement may very well have been exercised in the purchasing of the original vessels as it was in the siting of the Coast Guard Harbour, but I would like to draw the curtain over that as well as anything else.

1.05 p.m.

I am glad to see the hon. member for St. Michael South West is giving his thanks to heaven that there will be no further criticisms of the Coast Guard and matters concerning it in respect of past expenditure and past activities.

Hon. members have been kept fully aware in the House at Estimates time and otherwise with the plans

for a Joint Coast Guard between our two nearest Caricom neighbours. These plans are still in existence and are still being pursued and the British Government has played an active part since it still has responsibility for both those neighbours and has responsibility for one in respect of the negotiations.

It therefore appears that a new Coast Guard Flag Ship is legally to be bought in the near future and a number of quotations have been made to the Government of Barbados for its supply. Financing of the purchase is being pursued at the present time and again in due course upon a Supplementary Resolution if it arises during the present term of Parliament or at Estimates time in March 1980 the matter will be fully ventilated before the House.

Three of the Shrimp Boats belonging to International Sea Foods will be purchased. They have already been identified and converted for surveillance work close to shore, Sir, and between the three Islands. These vessels are slow but we have been assured by the best Naval advice that they have the capacity to be converted for naval use and it is expected that the work will very shortly begin.

We also intend to assign the Pierhead as the Headquarters for the Coast Guard and again, Sir, we are now drawing plans for the conversion that will be necessary at the Pierhead to make it suitable for a fully equipped Coast Guard Headquarters. The present dockyard will be used for naval purposes but it will not specifically form a part of the Coast Guard's Headquarters although relationship between the dockyard and the Defence Force can be expected to be as close as those which exist between some dockyards and Defence Forces in virtually every country in the World.

The present activities of the Port Department which are carried on at the Pierhead will not be interferred with and particularly fishing boat repairs will still be allowed to be carried out in a segregated area. I have every hope that they will be facilitated by the existence of a Coast Guard Headquarters in the general area of the Baggage Warehouse yard and the area now occupied by the Port Department.

The Coast Guard when stationed in Bridgetown will also be called on to carry out some of the duties which the Police carry out in respect of the issuance and the clearance of yachts which visit the Island and the Coast Guard will also keep some surveillance over yachts which are anchored in Carlisle Bay. Some of the present Coast Guard vessels, Sir, will in all probability be transferred to the Police for such continued duties for protection and transportation between the Deep Water Harbour, the Careenage and other areas of the Coast which is necessary.

There are one or two matters, Sir, which I would like to comment on very shortly. There appears to be some misunderstanding over the recent statement made by the President of the United States relating to the supply of small arms to Barbados. No request has been made of the United States for the supply of small arms. Certainly, Sir, I would wish to contradict what I read in a despatch coming out of Guyana that Barbados was to be given arms by the United States in the interest of the security of the United States.

That is not my understanding of the statement made by the President. Barbados is in the market for buying a certain quantity, only a small quantity, Sir, of small arms for the Defence Force, and for the Royal Barbados Police Force. I believe that some of their weapons may need up-dating and it is obviously in the market for buying weapons of a slightly larger calibre. We wish to shop around for these weapons but under U.S. legislation the U.S. cannot even sell weapons to countries unless certain steps are taken under an Act of Congress and the President notifies the National Security Council of his intention to permit certain countries to buy arms in the United States.

I have no idea how the routine announcement which amounts to no more than where an Independent country on a permitted list has been given such magnification by the local press. I think it sounds exciting to know that President Carter has talked about Barbados. I much prefer to think and indeed to know that the principal advice that President Carter gets about Barbados and the principal thought would run in the direction that Barbados is indeed a well run country rather than Barbados is a country which is seeking as a priority or otherwise a few rifles and machine guns that as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will surely know can be bought for amounts measured in hundreds rather than in thousands of dollars.

To end, Sir, on the note of expenditure, I would wish again to give all hon. members and the public the assurance that the Government intends the Military Expenditure in Barbados to remain the same as is humanly possible. We had a block vote last year of over $2 million and we did not spend anything like that. We are not even now spending anything as large as the permitted vote.

Hon. members will understand that the actual numbers under mobilisation at present are matters of confidence and therefore I am not going to announce them publicly but I will make available to the Leader of the Opposition the actual staff list of those members of the Regiment who are currently embodied as the

incipient nucleus of the Barbados Defence Force. He will be able to see not only the members but the names and I am sure the Leader of the Opposition is aware of the confidential nature of this information.

Sir, as far as the position is concerned that while we may have to vote sums of money and some depreciation will have to be asked for as has been asked for and granted on the last two occasions of the Estimates in making the Defence Force, the Government has no intention of pouring funds that are needed for the development in the Island in other areas to the unnecessary proliferation of the Defence Force and arms.

We have to make some Capital Expenditure. We have to buy another Coast Guard vessel. We will have to buy an airplane. We have to buy some weapons. We have to pay the soldiers but I do give the House the assurance that the same principles of the economy which applied in the last two years of Government Expenditure will be applied to Military Expenditure as well as to civil.

Mr. Speaker, the Defence Act is long but hon. members have had the opportunity to study it and I beg to move that it be now read a second time.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak on it.
1.15 p.m.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, we have had an introduction in the usual inimitable style of the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance of this document which is a very fat document. Let me say at the outset that we regret that we had to bring pressure to bear on the Government to give the Opposition more time to study this particular document, and even now, because of the very importance of the subject we regret that even more time was not given, because the matters that we are talking about are very fundamental matters and we cannot deal with these matters in terms of rushed or hurried legislation. All of this within the context of a situation in which I believe in January 1978 we were promised the Defence Act while we were dealing with the Defence White Paper.

As far back as January 1978 that is what we were promised, it is only now, well after a year after that, that this piece of legislation is coming before us. We were long on the promises as far as this piece of legislation is concerned, but very short on the time given to us to study this particular matter, and when our historical perspective is foreshortened to the extent that we hear that some year or two years' work has gone into this White Paper, we must sit and think and wonder whether the genesis of this piece of legislation that is before us is merely of one or two years' origin. My recollection is that the very basis on which this White Paper is formed goes way back into the early seventies when the very concept of a Defence Force, what type of Defence Force, how it should be structured, what the duties and objectives should be; all these matters were canvassed and discussed by the previous administration and a draft White Paper left. With whatever imperfections there might have been in that White Paper, it was left for the benefit of the present administration, and I must say as far as thinking and as far as the development of those ideas are concerned, we have not seen any major development as far as ideas and views are concerned about the defence and security of this country. So those who in the heady days leading up to 1976 and the elections of 1976 and thereabout, those who in those heady days were claiming that the Democratic Labour Party administration had run out of ideas, they have been seeing ever since 1976 that the present administration is running on the ideas of the previous administration. It is the energy and the views of the previous administration that are keeping the present administration afloat and on the go.

This particular measure that is before us, the piece of defence legislation that we are discussing now, is yet another instance of ideas being taken over from the previous administration, being given a little warming over and put into a great rhetorical frying pan and then sold to the country as though they were some new ideas being promulgated.

As far as the main ideas in this legislation are concerned, let us look at the main ideas that were promulgated before. There was a Regiment and the Coast Guard, the integration of Harbour Police functions with the Coast Guard Service, there was the proposal for a Volunteer Reserve Force, there was the proposal for a Cadet Force, and there was a suggestion that the Force should be engaged in some youth development and civil training projects. All of these were the ideas canvassed prior to 1976 and which we are now seeing being presented to us, so as far as this Bill is concerned, it is a reasonably faithful representation of views which were discussed before and suggested before, and the reason why we were pressing for this Defence Bill for quite some time is the very fact that we realise that we, when we are talking about the defence of this country we have got to ensure that we are not setting up or we would not have in existence a lawless group of people – and by lawless I do not mean bad-behaved in a Bajan sense – I mean operating outside the framework of law, and it is the intention of this piece of legislation to put the Defence Force of this country, the activities of the Coast Guard, the Reserve Force and the Regiment or however you may style it, within the framework of law.

But why has this Defence Bill taken so long to reach us, Mr. Speaker? When I look at it I must confess that the Bill seems to be a more or less faithful representation of the Jamaica Defence law or Defence Act of 1962. It seems to me to be a fairly faithful representation, and when we examine it, if we do a critique of it, we will see that in terms of the very sections and in terms of the contents of the sections of this piece of legislation that it is substantially taken from the Jamaica legislation which in turn in its genealogy goes back to the Army Act of the UnitedKingdom. In order to to illustrate this let us look at the sections. In this piece of legislation we see Preliminary Section, in the Jamaica legislation we see Preliminary Section We go through the next section in the Jamaica legislation which refers to the Jamaica Defence Board, and we go through in the Barbados piece of legislation and we have the Barbados Defence Board. The next section deals with Officers, and in the Barbados piece of legislation it deals with Officers. The next section, Enlistment and terms of service in the Regular Force, and similarly in the Jamaica piece of legislation, so when we go down from the very start, the beginning of sections from A down to Z, it appears as though this is a very faithful copy with the necessary changes such as where you see "Jamaica" substitute "Barbados", and I therefore wonder why it has taken this long for the legislation to reach us.

1.25 p.m.

I believe the Minister of Education likes to use the word "plagiarism". I will not use that word myself but there seems to be close affinity between the words here today and the words written down as far as the Jamaica Defence Force is concerned. And when we come to the content of the Bill, just to show one example of the faithful copying, almost word for word, of what is in the Jamaican legislation that we are imposing on Barbados with its different circumstances, traditions etc: Clause 69 of the Jamaica Legislation reads as follows: "Every officer subject to military law under this Act who behaves in a scandalous manner unbecoming the character of an officer and gentleman shall on conviction by court martial be cashiered." That is Clause 69 of the Jamaica Legislation and we have almost virtually the same statement of these ideas in the Barbados legislation. If we look at Clause 70 of the Bill – the Jamaica Clause is 69, the Barbados Clause is 70 – "Every officer who being subject to military law under this Act behaves in a scandalous manner unbecoming the character of an officer and gentleman is guilty of an offence and shall on conviction by court martial be cashiered." This is almost a word for word copy of the Jamaica Legislation, and I as a non-military person, a man of peace not of war – I am not steeped in the ways of the language about officer and gentleman and what is becoming of an officer and gentleman, and I would really like some explanation as to what type of behaviour would be characterized as that unbefitting an officer in terms of Barbados today. The whole phraseology seems to be archaic and not in keeping with the type of phraseology and expression we would expect in Legislation in this day and age. I am surprised at the Barbados Labour Party Government which is claiming that it is going to bring new levels of Government and dignity and respect to the people of this country creating an offence like this – it is now an offence in this country for those under military law to behave in a scandalous manner or behave in a manner uncharacteristic of an officer and gentleman. These words come out of the 19th century British culture, and I am surprised that the hon. Attorney General has allowed this type of phraseology to be present in this legislation. I am sure he is capable of seeing that there is better phraseology in our legislation, and we will have to knock this language into shape when we go into Committee. So much then for the faithful reproduction of the Jamaica Legislation in the Bill that is before us.

There was a massive defect in the White Paper that the Government placed before this Honourable Chamber in January, 1978, and one of these defects that I pointed out at the time was that the White Paper was very short on the purposes and objectives and indeed of the role that the Defence Force should play in Barbados. The duties were not elaborated upon, and it seems that those responsible for giving directions to the drafters of the White Paper – I am not being critical of those Public Officers involved – but in this piece of legislation before us we have very little to go on as far as the duties of the Defence Force are concerned. The legislation is very defective in that regard. Now it is in Section 5 that the duties of the Defence Force are set out and this is how Section 5 reads: "The Barbados Defence Force is responsible for the defence of Barbados and such other duties as the Defence Board determines". Now that is the kind of circumlocutory expression, the type of tautology that we go for. I really do not understand it. We are talking about a Defence Force and speaking about the duties of such a Force, but when we come to read of the duties under the Act all it says is that the Defence Force shall be responsible for the defence of Barbados. I think that we should be able in these enlightened days of 1979 to speak in clearer terms than that. If the Government is convinced that we need a Defence Force it should be able to set out clearly the duties and functions of such a Defence Force. But I suspect that the Jamaica legislation did not say what were the functions of the Defence Force and we were therefore unable to set it out with any greater clarity. I believe that the United Kingdom legislation is more explicit on this matter, and I know for sure that the legislation in Yugoslavia goes into very great detail on this matter and puts forward proposals in their legislation on the duties of the Defence Force. I think this phraseology is very unsatisfactory, especially in a small country where we are creating such a Force and where we are putting the balance of power in the hands of a group of military persons it

beholds us to ensure that the duties and functions of this service should be fairly set, because one of the problems we will have in this country will be keeping the military within the control of the civil authority.
1.35 p.m.

This is one of the major problems. A lot of newly independent countries have found themselves in conflict with their military because sufficient safeguards have not been on the military and in the hands of the civilian powers to ensure that those powers are controlled. Government is about power, and ultimately behind the voluntary observation of the laws of any country is the power to enforce those laws; and what we are doing here now is trying to put some clothes on that naked power – legislative clothes on the powers that are at the base of any society; and we should be very careful about what we are doing.

I am concerned that in this legislation there is not sufficient control indicated – in this legislation or elsewhere – of control by Parliament over the military. I am not satisfied that there are enough safeguards for this parliament to ensure that there is this control over the military. I will get the General Adams a little later; but what we have to be concerned about are these matters.

This legislation, if it meets the approval of this Hon. Chamber, will at least provide the legal framework within which the military of this country will operate without any close scrutiny and control which Parliament should have. In dealing with the military, we must be certain that there are enough safeguards that Parliament can keep a watch over the military.

Some time ago, I think in the late 1950s, a distinguished Professor of Sociology at the University of Columbia wrote a book entitled "The Power Elite." I believe that it was by C. Wright Mills. He spoke in terms of the development of a military clique which was at the top of the United States Society and which was operating in a kind of interlocking way with the political power elite and the industrial power elite and so controlling the American Society. He spoke in terms not only of that power elite, but of the very close inter-locking relationship of the military with industry, forming a kind of industrial-military clique.

These are the things that we are talking about, and we want to be certain that when we set up a military force in this country that we are not putting powers into the hands of persons and that Parliament cannot control those persons. I am not satisfied from this legislation that Parliament can control necessarily the Chairman of the Defence Board, whoever he may be; and I am not satisfied that there will be enough opportunity provided for parliamentary scrutiny of military affairs in this country.

As far as I can recall legislation – I believe that it is called the Army Act of 1955 – we have a battery of legally trained persons over there who can tell me about these matters. I am advised by my military legal man over there, the member for St. Michael South West that it was 1955. I will rely on his legal expertise, and I will abide by his legal advice on these particular matters. It was the Army Act of 1955, and as far as I can recall, and my colleague can put me right if I am wrong on this – as far as I can recall it was considered necessary that each year an opportunity was provided by Parliament in the United Kingdom not merely when going through the Estates, not merely by discussing the Estimates at Estimates time, but the whole purpose was to ensure that there was no provision beyond the period of one year so as to ensure that Parliament could carry out the accustomed functions of scrutiny, examination and oversight of the procedures of the military.

We give these powers to the Government in these matters; but without the protection which went along in societies which have a much vaster experience than we have in military matters. We give powers, but we do not have the safeguards, and we do not have the foundations for Parliamentary control of this monolithic thing that we may be creating in this country; but we will hear more as the debate goes on.

Now, this piece of legislation, as the Prime Minister indicated, is taking place at a time and against the back drop of disquieting events in the Caribbean. I say disquieting, because I am a believer in the ballot box, as indeed, Mr. Speaker, all of us in this Chamber are. We are all believers in the change of Government by the ballot box. I believe in the democratic form of Government; and I believe that a Government which is elected should ensure that it get in touch with the people and should not attempt to use the power placed in its hands temporarily – in the case of this Government until 1981 and no longer. That is the duration of the mandate – we must ensure that against the back drop of what is happening in the Caribbean, that we do not create any force in this country which may be turned against the people themselves.

In 1978, I spoke of the need for a Defence Force which will be used not to surpress the people, but to ensure that the liberties and freedoms of the people are extended and safeguarded, and that they are not squelched out by those who do not believe in the democratic way of government and in the democratic process; and we must be vigilant in this regard. Barbados has a democratic tradition, and we must ensure that when we are creating a military force, that we are not creating any opportunities whereby that force may be turned against the very people for whom these freedoms should be safeguarded.
1.45 p.m

Now the Defence Minister cannot avoid a grand stand. I heard that word recently. He likes to grand stand and he believes he has the eye and the ear for the occasion. Some two to three weeks ago we were discussing a piece of legislation in this Chamber relating to offshore banking and by some well studied and well-timed questions, I believe it was the hon. member for Christ Church East who asked one or two questions relating to the granting of a licence for operating some mercantile Bank.....but he believes he has the eye for grand-standing, and one of the speediest Parliamentary Questions that has ever been answered in this Parliament was that particular question or those two questions asked by the hon. member for Christ Church East. Precisely what was the reason.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member explain what relation that bears to the present Defence Bill?

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am going to explain that. It involves the hon. member for Christ Church East. He has some problems with his questions and Resolutions, I notice. Because we were dealing with a piece of legislation, there were some questions asked, so that the information could be used in the debate relating to offshore banking, and now we have this Bill for the establishment of a Defence Force and for related matters, on Sunday night – this is the grandstanding, the timing, you have a sense of timing – he comes up with something on the television, as it were to set some type of stage against which this particular piece or legislation may be discussed. If hon. members in this House do not realise the type of connections that are being drawn and the type of.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to draw the hon. member's attention to this: if we are to understand the hon. member is drawing to the House's attention that the television at some stage offended the dignity of this Honourable House, we can entertain it. Failing this, it has no relationship to the Defence Bill.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I will pass on because I think I can refer to what happens on television in this Parliament. I watched the programme on Sunday night and I am saying I find a relationship with this piece of legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is well known that there must be control of the military, and I want to know what type of directions are given to this military, because that military must be very sensitive to the feelings of people in this country. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Come in and land.) I am going to land now because we know about the Normandy landing, but I want to hear about the landing at Six Men's Bay. That is what I want to hear about. The purpose of a Defence Force and the military in any country is to extend the security of people, not to give them feelings of greater insecurity, and I want to know how with a big Minister of Defence and Security in this country he can authorise operations which diminish the security of the peaceful citizens of Six Men's Bay, St. Peter. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that you are interested in this particular question. You want to know how the people of Six Men's Bay can be diminished in their security, when they look out they see these men wading ashore. I do not know what uniforms they were wearing; they were properly dressed. I do not know what arms they were carrying or bearing, but then you see these people wading ashore with all the talk about invasions and plots and counter-plots and coups and counter-coups; you see the military wading ashore at Six Men's.

I believe the Minister of Defence should explain the conduct of the military on that particular occasion. Not only that, but he should give this country and this House an assurance that when exercises, be they training exercises or whatever type of exercises, are being carried out in this country that the people in the area in which these exercises may be carried out should be given adequate warning so that they are not scared out of their wits. I believe that this is an assurance which should be given. I believe that in other training exercises in other countries that such warning is given. But just do not among the peace-loving people of this country send in the military in that way. Training is necessary, but I think it should operate within a given framework and against a certain environment. It was not the first occasion of course, because I heard of instances in which certain exercises were also carried out at or near the Parkinson Secondary School somewhere in St. Michael North East which caused some upset to the people in the area as well as to those who may have been at the school. I think it was irrelevant that at the time the Barbados Union of Teachers was having a confrontation with the Government; that has nothing at all to do, I am certain, with the exercises that were taking place.

Mr. Speaker, we will have to look at what are the characteristics of the Defence Force. We have heard that Barbados' defence system will not be plugged into the circuit of the United States Defence system or any of the larger countries, and we have been told in the manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party, if I recall it correctly, that we will not be entering into any military alliance with other countries, but yet alliances are being formed with St. Lucia and St. Vincent, and this Parliament has not been given the full details of what is involved in the alliance that is being forged between Barbados, St. Lucia and St. Vincent. When Barbados goes into alliances with other countries and when they are contemplated, I do not think that it is enough simply to raise a banner of the public interest or to raise a banner of security and clamp down on debate. I believe that this Parliament must be fully apprised of what is involved, what military involvement this country may be entering into. We should be fully apprised of that.

There is a temptation for modern Governments to hide behind phrases like "the public interest", a phrase which recurs very often in this legislation before us.
1.55 p.m.

When once you say the public interest you believe that you have said a lot and that there is no further debate on that matter. Sometimes we mention the magic word "security" and believe that you should not say anything more about these matters. It is a big secret how many men are enlisted in the Barbados Defence Force or what the size of the Barbados Defence Force should be. Big deal. It is a big secret. When we can take up studies by Institutes in the U.K. and the U.S. and see which countries are capable of developing a nuclear capability which are on the verge and so on but here we have a few men to go into training and it is a big secret that Parliamentarians cannot be told the details on these matters.

I want to know something more about the co-operation among regional Governments as far as Defence and Security matters are concerned. There was a time when, and I recall it well, boats of the Coast Guard vessels from Trinidad and Tobago used to work in close co-operation with the Coast Guard service in Barbados. Training activities used to take place. I do not know whether those boats have been up here recently or why that type of close co-operation in spite of the much vaunted visit that took place some time ago, why that close relationship seemed to have waned a bit, and why it is not as close as it used to be.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may continue.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: If the hon. member is in the process of closing his speech having reached this hour I would be delighted to wait for a couple more minutes for him to go on but if the hon. member is now only mid-way, of course, I do not want to interrupt the hon. member at all so it is in the hon. member's hands.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I will have a little longer than a few minutes so I think it might be appropriate for the member to move whatever Motion he wants.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, it is now 2 o'clock and I beg to move that this Sitting be suspended until 2.50 p.m.

The question that the Sitting be suspended until 2.50 p.m., was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.
2.00 p.m.

On Resumption —

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed. When the Suspension was taken the hon. member for St. Michael South was addressing the Chair. He may continue if he so desires.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I so desire. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my attention now to the question of what I may call the internal arrangements within the Armed Forces of this country. Let me say that I believe that the Defence Force should be constituted in this legislation and as it is now under very capable control.

I have every confidence in the Commanding Officer of that particular Force so that what I may say is not directed at the competence of those who now command the Force but I think that as legislators we have got to look beyond the present situation and we have got to take wider consideration into account. I will like to say from the start and I would like to warn all those who will have control over the Defence Force and I am talking about political bosses now, that nothing must be done in order to undermine the authority of those who may indeed command the Force.

In a number of recently Independent countries armed coups have been the order of the day and in a large measure coups have been the result of political interference in the internal management and control of the military. There is a feeling that the position at the top, if you hold the position of Minister of Defence, even if you combine that position with the position of Prime Minister, there is a feeling that that is a very lonely position.

When you have to make decisions as a Minister or as a Prime Minister you may get all the advice in the world but the making of decisions is your responsibility and it can be a very lonely position to be in and in these circumstances, certain Ministers and certain Prime Ministers, certainly not in this country, Mr. Speaker, but in other countries, have tended to take the easy way out and persons within a particular Organisational structure, or particular Department, or a particular Ministry may run to the top brass with news and information and because some person who is in a higher position does not take the role of favouritism and carry back news and tales, the political boss may tend to favour the person who comes and who has that type of direct pipeline with the Minister or Prime Minister, or Parliamentary Secretary, or Minister of State as the case may be.

There is nothing that can destroy the morale of a Force, particularly a Force that is supposed to be a disciplined Force more than by passing the archaicy of power, the natural lines of authority than the situation which I have just described. I would not like to hear that as far as this Force which we are now by law creating that such

matters would affect the morale and discipline of the Defence Force.

I am issuing a warning that the authority or the person in charge – we are told here he is styled as the Chief of Staff – and I will come to this problem a little later because I want to hear a little more about the relationship that exist or should exist between the Chief of Staff and the Officer commanding the Regiment or the Defence Force proper because I understand there is a difference here in the person who actually has the day-to-day control of the Force and the person who may have a little more titular control of that Force. I believe in other forces. 2.55 p.m.

In the United States you may have the Defence Secretary and you have the Chief of Staff, and you have the other advisers who constitute the Defence Council. I believe that is how they style it in the United States, and I want to draw a comparison. Mr. Speaker, the Defence Board or however it is styled in the United Kingdom, I believe the Chief of Staff there or however he is styled, does not actually have tactical command of the Forces – I may be wrong – but each service has its own immediate head. Here we have a kind of situation in which we have a Chief of Staff and then you have another position of the person actually commanding the Forces, but the Chief of Staff is actually in charge of the Forces, but the Officer, the Deputy or however he is styled, may be in charge of the day to day operation. There is a kind of a grey area here. I believe there may be some areas in which there may be conflict, and when I draw the attention of the House to these matters I am not necessarily talking about what may pertain at the present moment but about problems which may be there in a kind of Pandora's Box which we may not be fully aware of.

Now, we can come up with all types of glib answers, but I am saying that there is the possibility of conflict between the Chief of Staff – I like the term Commander-in-Chief – and the person who may be responsible for commanding that military unit which we now call the Regiment, and I am saying that in such a situation where the possibility of conflict exists, where there is the potential, and if the type of situation I have described actually comes into being we may have a Minister of Defence who by-passes or goes around behind the Chief of Staff and takes news and information from lower down the ranks, you can see how morale could be broken down in what is supposed to be a disciplined service. I am not speaking of anything that is mythical, these things have happened in other Forces, and I use the words which I used in January 1978 and which the Prime Minister has repeated here, there is no point in saying it cannot happen here because it can happen here. We must not try to insulate ourselves and believe that we are a unique case in this country. It has happened elsewhere and it can happen here, so I issue a warning that under not circumstances should be authority of the Chief of Staff be undermined or by-passed or circumvented in any matter, great or small, because it is very important to maintain the authority and the command structure in this disciplined Force.

Let me give an example, purely hypothetical. Suppose in the area of procurement – and I do not know what are the arrangements, I have not heard very much of this from the Defence Minister on this matter – how are the different material and material for this disciplined Force to be acquired? Will they go through the tortuous paths of Central Purchasing? Will it be done through the mechanisms of the Ministry of Defence and Security – and while we are on it, if you are going to have a Defence Force you need a Ministry of Defence and Security, and this is yet another matter of great foresight by the previous administration in setting up a Ministry of Defence and Security to look after these matters – but will those procurements be done through the Ministry of Defence and Security or will they be done directly by the administration?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want to interrupt the hon. member for St. Michael South, but I would much prefer to hear him on the general merits, the principle and the general merits of this Bill.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am dealing with the principle and merits of the Bill, because it may be a defect that I am pointing out in the legislation.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are dealing with details rather than principles and merits, and the details are for the Committee stage of this Bill.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I accept your ruling, although I have not referred to any specific detail of any clause, but I accept your ruling in this matter and I will deal with general principles, and I have enunciated it as a general principle that there should a clear mechanism for the procurement of material for this particular Force.

The Minister of Defence referred to the acquisition of certain arms of a small nature for the Security Forces or for the Police Force, and then I believe his words were "arms of a larger calibre" for the Defence Force, but I would not like to know that certain equipment turns up for the Defence Force ordered by somebody in the Defence Force of lower rank and the Commander-in-Chief or the Chief of Staff does not know about such orders. Now, as I said, this is hypothetical, but these things are possible.

Mr. SPEAKER: And the hon. member I am sure will agree that these things are details of the Bill and not the principle.
3.05 p.m

Let me now turn to the question of regional security and matters of regional defence. There was a State visit to this country by the former Prime Minister of Britain, Mr. James Callaghan, and there was some understanding – we gathered subsequently – whereby this country would purchase certain equipment from Britain through the mechanism, I believe, of the Export Credit Guarantee Department. I do not recall that this Parliament was taken into the confidence of the Government in these matters, and this is one of the matters of principle that I have to refer to; we can have this country entering into arrangements which commit not only the Government but the Treasury of this country to certain areas.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir. No such arrangements have been entered into, so the hon. member has no point. And if a guarantee is called for we will come down to Parliament for the necessary guarantee, unlike what happened in the last administration.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am glad to hear that no such arrangement has been entered into with a foreign Government for the purchase of arms which would call for a guarantee by the Export Guarantee Department. I take the assurance of the Attorney General who I believe will be designated as the other member of the Defence Board, so that he will have full knowledge of these matters. I believe in the establishment of a Defence Force; that is my submission. It is a proposal that was put forward by the previous administration and I support it because I believe that every country must have a first line of defence against incursions from outside of the country, and I believe that as far as the internal situation is concerned there must be some force in any properly organized country that can go to the assistance of the civil powers in certain circumstances. I believe that because I am looking at this from a statesmanlike point of view. It was very interesting for me to hear the Minister of Defence stating that it is one of the necessities of independence that there should be a strengthening of security and of the defence forces in the country. I agree that it is a necessity to have a Defence Force but I show you the different levels of statesmanship that exist on this position over here and when those of you were on this side of the House. The Government recognizes now that it is necessary to have proper and adequate defence in this country. They recognize it in 1979, but when in 1972, 1973 and 1974 the Democratic Labour Party Government of the day in the interest of the further protection and guarantee of the freedom of the people of this country proposed that there should be the establishment of a Coast Guard for this country, at that time we heard all types of posturings, all types of argument and all types of dodging and ducking. They on that side were better than Muhammed Ali in trying to roll with the punches and find areas of disagreement rather than agreement. As usual in these matters I really can't catch out the Prime Minister because he speaks and adds so many conditions and modifications that at the end when you read what he actually said you would believe he was opposing something but when you read it again you will find that like with a lawyer there is a kind of escape clause; the hatch opens so that he can get out. And so while we had the hon. member for the City – at that time Mr. Elliott Mottley saying – this will be found in Hansard and I can refer to it although I do not have the actual date of Hansard.....

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member wants to quote from Hansard he must give us the page.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am referring to the words and I can give my assurance that the words are accurate, and if you press me Mr. Speaker, I may have to ask for the particular Standing Order which you would be employing. But to be serious, it was said formerly that the Barbados Labour Party felt that the time had come when there must be some cut back in Government's spending and Mr. Elliott Mottley said that he thought we must look at our priorities and see whether you must have a Coast Guard service in this country or whether that money could be better spent for other purposes like providing social service.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point, of order, Mr. Speaker, I would like the hon. member to give me the page of Hansard to which he is referring.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thought the Honourable Attorney General was rising to ask that the member's document be made a document of the House.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am not quoting, Mr. Speaker but following my notes closely.
3.15 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are following your notes very closely.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am refreshing my mind from notes. Indeed, I recall, Mr. Speaker, that from the Opposition benches there was a tower of strength. One Mr. W. C. B. Hinds – I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, the member for St. Peter, joined in that debate himself.

Mr. SPEAKER: It may have been his privilege.

Mr. SANDIFORD: And his right, Mr. Speaker. I believe that you still hold those views now which you held then.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure that you will not want to invite the Chair into any debate.

Mr. SANDIFORD: No, Mr. Speaker. The Chair never enters into debate in this Hon. Chamber. You may recall these words, Mr. Speaker. I am again speaking in reported terms. What was said was that the Government could not then justify its attempts to spend money on establishing a coast guard service when the money could be used to help people produce food in the country. The point I am making is that the then Government of this country, when it came with proposals for establishing a coast guard service, was opposed by the then Opposition. I exclude the member for St. George South because he was in the Other Place making some pretty little speeches on matters of general interest to this country. *(Asides).* That was the position then; and when I spoke, listen to what – I am refreshing my memory here.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chair is listening.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I know that the present Prime Minister knew at that time that the coast guard service was necessary for Barbados. That is roughly what he said; but the member for St. Thomas added that he wanted the then Prime Minister to tell the country if he could seriously say that there was any need to establish a coast guard service. The point I am trying to establish, Mr. Speaker, is that history plays some very funny tricks; and whereas the difference between the front bench over there now and those of us over here, and certainly myself, when it comes to the national issues which I believe to be above the scoring of political partisanship points, that we will say that may be it is in the interest of the country. We will not come and try to find ways and means for some cheap political future gains and say that it should not be the case or that that it should be the case merely to oppose what the Government is saying.

I speak on these matters as I see them. I believe that I satisfy my conscience. When a matter comes before this House and I am satisfied that potentially it would be in the interest of this country, I am prepared to speak in support of it; but I contrast the position when they were over here and opposed the establishment of the Coast Guard. When they got into power or before they got into power they said that they would close down the Coast Guard. Now that they have the responsibility, I take up this piece of legislation here and see that far from any obliteration of that coast guard service, I see that it has a privileged position. It is a separate section altogether dealing with the Coast Guard Service.

I do not know who is in command of that particular service now such as it is. I believe that some officer was sent abroad for special training, and that when that officer was abroad the whole service was pulled from under his feet. The Coast Guard is integrated into the Defence Force and the person who went out on special training in these areas was left not even without knowing what this "open Government" had done as far as that particular officer was concerned.

That is why I say that we have to be very certain in these matters when actions are taken that it will not create any feelings of frustration within this disciplined service; because from small beginnings problems may arise; and I hope that I will never live to see the day in this country when the morale of the Defence Force would be undermined through the by-passing of the structural hierachy of the service.

As far as regional defence matters are concerned, we are living in a world, Mr. Speaker, in which defence matters that affect a small island territory have implications for all other territories in the island chain and beyond; and it is very necessary that whatever steps we may take for the defence of this little rock – not of Arkansas – the little rock of Barbados – that we should take into account the wider considerations. That is why one of my particular beliefs in so far as the Caribbean is concerned is that we have got to work much harder at bringing about a greater measure of regional collaboration and regional integration.

I believe in that passionately, because when you get little bush fires here and there, and when you get petty dictators setting themselves up and wanting to squelch out the flame of liberty in this Caribbean, and then having to call upon the military in order to uphold obsolescent legality, that is where the problems arise. *(Asides).* You are not coming to St. Michael South.

Mr. SPEAKER: Kindly address the Chair. The next thing you will hear is who goes to China.

3.25 p.m.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I hope to hear that pretty soon because I hear an invitation has been extended, and quite naturally I would expect to hear as a Parliamentarian and as a member of the public; and we must study the army of the Chinese and the role that it is playing.

Mr. Speaker, it is when those who are in authority call upon the army to use its guns and its bayonets against the very people and nationals of a country that we run into problems, and that is what we have. We have a situation in this Caribbean and Latin American region, we have Nicaragua where there are problems; we have much closer home in some of the Caribbean territories problems, and we have got be very certain that such situations do not occur.

Now as far as regional security is concerned, I am saying here and now that I disagree with any proposal to turn shrimp boats which were intended to harvest fish life into naval patrol boats. They were not built for that purpose and I do not think they can be properly converted for that particular purpose, and if that is the type of

advice which this Government is acting upon rather than seeking ways and means for harvesting the protein that may be in the sea and which we need in this country and turning these boats to a purpose for which they were never intended nor designed, I say that I disagree with that, and I say that the thinking is purblind on that matter if you believe you can take shrimp boats and turn them for naval purposes. I do not agree with that. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: What about the North Point?) I am talking about shrimp boats; there was not one called "North Point". I do not know of any shrimp boat called the "North Point".

I think, Mr. Speaker, if you are looking for a patrol for this country, you have got to talk about boats with the necessary design and specification and made of the right material. I do not know anything about these matters, whether they are made of steel hull or whatever they are supposed to be made of, and if you want to get regional patrols and you want to put fibreglass boats where if they are on patrol and any Russian boat may be out there jamming the radar at sea or whatever it may be doing anything comes across the boat or in the bow, it is the height of military madness for anyone to suggest that this is what should happen to the shrimp boats in this country. We have had instances in this country, Mr. Speaker, in which already the very Coast Guard vessels, the Coast Guard service which should not have been established according to Opposition speakers at that time, were sent way out into the deep. Those that go down to the sea in ships and do their business in deep waters. These poor fledgling seamen were sent out to take on the might of the Russian navy. We have got to be very careful what our priorities are, what our objectives are, and this is why I am somewhat disappointed in this particular matter, because the defence of the country has not been put in the broadest possible terms in which they should be put.

Mr. Speaker, I have touched on the question of the amalgamation of the Forces because I believe that theoretically speaking it is necessary that there should be some co-ordination as far as the defence of this country is concerned. I believe that as far as the United Kingdom is concerned it must have been as far back, and the military experts can put me right if I am wrong if they have more knowledge that I have, but I believe it may have been 1856 or so that Disraeli, a former Prime Minister of Britain, tried to get integration among the Forces, the Army, the Navy and the Air Force in Britain at that time. I am sorry; not the Air Force. It was the Navy and the Army. He tried to get integration into the services at that time. I believe in the immediate postwar period a piece of legislation was passed in order again to get co-ordination among the three Forces. I believe it was in 1846 or so that a piece of legislation was passed in that particular regard, but still the three Forces went on their separate ways, and I believe it was left to Harold MacMillan in the Sixties to bring about the co-ordination of the three services. In this country we have had a problem of the co-ordination of Forces, and I put the attempt to amalgamate the Forces on the same level as the attempt to integrate and totally the Central Bank of Barbados into all of the financial institutions in this country. It is Opposition nonsense which a period of time as the Government will correct. You will go on down your own way, but when you get and you actually see the matters and realise that the only place where you have that type of amalgamation is in fiction..... there was some book called the "Great Crash" predicting the downfall of the Shah of Iran; that is the only place where I know you had a Saudi Arabian Monetary Authority, where you had all these institutions collaborating.

Mr. SPEAKER: I believe you are dealing with the amalgamation of the Defence Force and the other Forces.

Mr. SANDIFORD: We will come to that because we will have to think of guns and of butter too; but that type of amalgamation I think was wrong-headed and this particular piece of legislation I believe is evidence that the Minister of Defence and the Cabinet have now had a change of heart and realised that you cannot just take up a service like the Coast Guard Service and try to do that with it and believe that all you have to do is to call out the Defence Force and bring it into the military and that is that.

3.35 p.m.

There are specific functions to be carried out and I am glad that with this piece of legislation that some sanity has returned into the thinking in these areas and that the Coast Guard Service has been given a separate part altogether dealing with these functions. These functions are set out in a much clearer way than the functions of the Defence Force itself have been set out. That is a measure of satisfaction to me and again it shows that the thinking of the Barbados Labour Party when in Opposition has now gone about a kind of a change of heart and they have now seen the wisdom that the Democratic Labour Party had in setting up a Coast Guard Service.

I think that just as we said there were benefits and changes in development that they could admit that they were wrong on these particular areas. Of course I do not expect them to have the type of magnanimity which would enable them to get up and say we were wrong on this matter and the Democratic Labour Party was right. I do not expect to hear that at all on this particular debate.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I have dealt with quite a range of matters relating to this Bill before us. There are a number of matters which I will wish to draw the attention of this Honourable Chamber to when we go into Committee because there are quite a number of ideologies

in this legislation that is before us and we have to deal with them when we go into Committee.

There is one point which I want to advert to before closing and this is the role of the military as far as youth development is concerned. There seems to be some hurricane going abroad in this country that the military must be concerned with the training of youth and I will also deal with the role of the military as some sort of training ground for some sort of civilian court. I issue you a warning here that the military should keep as far as possible from the young people of this country who are not enlisted and enrolled in that force.

I do not believe that we should use the military in this country, the soldiers of this country to organise the youth in this country. I believe that youth and the training and development of youth should be left in the hands of civilians because I rule the day when military approaches, military techniques and military traditions might be instilled in the young people of this country and then in addition you get a military political relationship I believe that spreads even further danger to this country.

I believe that there are sufficient skills and attitudes and techniques in this country to train our young people and to give them discipline. I believe the civilian Ministries are quite capable if they set their minds to it and call upon people in this country on a broad basis to work out programmes for youth training and development. This should be left in the hands of the civilians because I fear the development of a strong military development in this country and when you start with the youth that is where our problems are going to multiply and I am warning this Government that if that is their proposal and if it formed a part of our proposals when we were in Government them I am against it nevertheless.

I believe that youth training should be left to civilian authorities in this country. If it is considered necessary that further discipline should be given to the youth, I believe an officer could go to that particular youth group or youth agency and serve his part or offer his or her service as part of the smooth operation but I do not believe that youth training should be approached or encouraged in the Defence Force.

I am speaking as the member for St. Michael South. I am speaking on these matters and as far as the civil approaches are concerned, again I believe that the Defence Force should remain as an efficient disciplined service. I do not believe that it should get too much embodied in skills training in this country. Again I believe that skills training should be left to the civilian population or to the civilian agencies and if there are any special skills in the Defence Force I believe these skills should be placed at the disposal of civilian agencies.

You will gather, Mr. Speaker, from what I am saying that I am not within the military position. I am a man of peace. I believe in peace. I do not believe in the development of a European type of military tradition in this country. I believe the member for Christ Church West might have read a book called "The Trumpet Major". I believe it was by Thomas Hardy. We have had a long tradition of the military in certain European countries and in certain Latin American countries. I do not wish to see that tradition develop here.

I want to see a Defence Force that if there are problems arising from whatever you call them "crack-pots" or serious minded people who are interested in subverting a duly constituted Government of this country, whatever political complexion, I want to see a Force that can be the first line of defence against them. I want to see a Defence Force which if there is some growth of civil unrest and this is why I say there is no reference to the situation at all in which the military can be used in this piece of legislation that is before us. There is no reference to these matters at all. The conditions are circumstantial even in broad terms.

I want to know that there is some power that can come to the defence or assistance when such is required under the circumstances but nowhere in the introduction of this measure have we heard what is to be the relationship between the military and the civilian when there are problems of a breakdown of law and order in this country. Nowhere has there been any reference at all to the relationship that should exist between the civil power, in this case, the Police, and the Military as far as any breakdown of law and order maybe concerned in this country.

While there is a lot about the circumstances in which the military law will be exercised I leave others to deal with these wide matters, of the wide offences that have been created here. I will not go into those at this particular moment.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I will underline one important point. I am not satisfied that there is enough control provided by this parliament to keep a scrutiny on this legislation that is before us and on matters relating to the military and to related matters.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael North Central.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, there has always been speculation in Barbados about the real reason and intention for setting up of a Defence Force. This was so when the Democratic Labour Party gave consideration to the idea and it is so even today.

3.45 p.m.

Today I do not believe that the position is any clearer in the minds of the people of Barbados about whether there should or should not be a Defence Force. The mere name "Defence Force" conjures up in the minds of people that we are defending ourselves against some enemy or attack coming from outside, and it provokes people to ask who are the enemies outside that want to attack us, but when people try to answer this question it is not easy to pinpoint any particular enemy and therefore people can speculate, and speculation runs as far as whether it could be Cuba or whether it could be some other person outside who may have some personal grouse with politicians in Barbados. What is noticeable about this stage is that there has been a psychological preparation of the people of Barbados for the introduction of this Bill, and that psychological preparation has come about by reports of an intended invasion of this country by a crackpot such as Mr. Alleyne and his associates, and maybe events which have taken place in the neighbouring island of Grenada has facilitated this psychological preparation of the people of this country. Therefore, there are some people who with this background must come out and say that a Defence Force for Barbados is the answer or the means to deal with this type of intrusion as put forth by people in this country, both by the Government and other people in the society.

Then there is also the school of thought which will argue that in any country it is not wise to have only one efficient organisation saddled with the maintenance of law and order in the country, because when there is dissatisfaction in that organisation the maintenance of law and order may very well suffer. And when you look at Barbados you will see that for a very long time in this country the maintenance of law and order has been chiefly the responsibility of the police, and one can expect dissatisfaction even if dissatisfaction only arises out of salary negotiations, and for those who think that they would see the setting up of a Defence Force as a foil to the police or a sort of containment or any dissatisfaction that may arise from such an organisation and its subsequent influence or action on the maintenance of law and order in this country, or there are those who would be advocating that in Barbados you need another organisation, an efficiently run organisation, maybe as a compliment to some people's thinking, like my colleague on my left, to assist the already established organisation in moments of national crisis, but I will say that when such people feel that they have a grouse with Government, Government can treat them maybe more firmly and overlook what may be their demands and grouses, because Government is fortified in the fact that there is another organisation lying around to which they can turn in the hour of need. That is something one will have to see as time goes by, whether this could very well be the thinking behind the people who advocate the setting up of such an organisation.

But there is a real concern among people in Barbados, and this is based on the observation of what happens in other countries, particularly in Africa, Latin America and some of the Asian countries, and the trend nowadays is for political direction of military forces to take place and then after a while you get military direction of the politics and the politicians of the country. To explain further what I mean, you have Armies or Defence Forces, or whatever word you care to use, which are set up in newly independent countries, and due to the politics of the country one always finds that the politician responsible or in charge of these military forces takes some sort of pride in giving directions to the officers of those military forces, and usually they set about to ensure that the people who are put in charge of these military organisations are people who are willing to follow the direction of the politicians, and as a result of this type of political direction of the military, at some time later you find that the officers of those military organisations tend to feel that they can turn around now and direct the politics and the politicians of the country, with the result that you get the establishment of military regimes in many parts of the world, especially in newly independent countries, and the setting up of a Defence Force in Barbados must further strengthen the speculation of those people who are not happy about the running of things in certain countries in those parts of the world which I mentioned.

I would like to say at this stage that the setting up of a Defence Force in Barbados, given that we have good reasons for so doing, must not appear to be unsupported by the political parties of the day because it may very well lead to the in-breeding in the minds of the people of those organisations that in cases of crisis or dissention within their ranks they can look to one or other political party for support and comfort. I would like to go a step further, and I am stressing that I am airing the views and comments of people outside, and draw to the attention of the Government that there is also a segment of concern in Barbados about the charge that the setting up of a Defence Force is likely to have on Government funds. I take the assurance of the Hon. Prime Minister that it is his intention to keep the expenses to the barest minimum possible or desirable, but when one looks at the trends in other countries one must observe that after the setting up of those organisations year after year there are increases in the money or the expenditure spent on these organisations. Even although politicians may very well be keen to keep this expenditure to a minimum, there are pressures which are usually put on politicians to make them acquiesce to the demands of the military leaders of these organisations.

Apart from that, one will also have to observe that as a result of improvements in armoury and also in the strategies of warfare, existing arms have to be replaced by new arms, and usually you find that in setting about to replace them there is increased cost.

3.55 p.m.

What effect this is going to have on Government revenue will only be seen when the Defence Force has been in operation for some time and one will have to wonder at this stage whether it is wise or not to spend that amount of money on defence of Barbados when there are many other areas – education, health, industry, environmental sanitation – that could do well with the money. This is an area where we will have to wait on time to tell us exactly whether we have been wise or whether we can accept that the expenditure on the Defence Force will not make it difficult for the Government to meet the other commitments and requirements of the people of this country, or whether it will not make it necessary for the Government to look for other areas of taxation in order to meet the new and increasing expenditure brought about by the setting up of this Defence Force.

The failure of the Government to spell out what are the duties of the Defence Force will go a far way in strengthening the convictions of the people that there is some ulterior motive in the establishment of the Defence Force at this time, and I think it is in the interest of the Government to allay the fears of the people of this country by setting out quite clearly what are the duties of the Defence Force and not cover the duties in such vague language as expressed in Section 5 of the Bill.

Another area of concern must be what will be the relation of the Defence Force and the attitude of the Government of Barbados to events taking place in other Islands of the Caribbean. I am certain Barbadians will derive no comfort if at a later stage members of the Defence Force are sent off to neighbouring Caribbean Islands to prop up some undesirable Government – I mean undesirable to the people of the particular country. I think this is a matter of grave concern not only to the people of Barbados but I believe to the people of the neighbouring islands what role will the Defence Force seek to play in the events in neighbouring countries. It is nice to assure us that we have no intention in interfering in the internal affairs of other countries, but we know from experience that very often when countries are in trouble they appeal to friendly countries for help.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have been trying to follow the hon. member from the time he made mention about an ulterior motive in setting up the Defence Force at this time, and I have been trying to see if he had an example to offer to justify the remark. I cannot find such from what the hon. member has said and I must come to the conclusion that if the hon. member is suggesting that in setting up the Defence Force at this time there is some ulterior motive, that ulterior motive would have to be vested in the hon. member who introduced the Bill to the House firstly, and whoever follows him subsequently. I must therefore call on the hon. member to withdraw the remark and desist from that line of argument unless he can support it.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to repeat as best I can what I said.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, after you have withdrawn the remarks.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to crave your indulgence to repeat what I said.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am calling on the hon. member at this stage to withdraw the remark.

Dr. CADDLE: I withdraw. Mr. Speaker, in this country there is speculation among the people as to the purpose why we are embarking on setting up a Defence Force and the failure of the Government to spell out exactly what are the duties of the Defence Force. In contradistinction, Section 5 of this Act has done nothing to allay that speculation, and I feel it is incumbent upon the Government and the Minister of Defence to allay the fears of the people of this country by spelling out what are the duties of the Defence Force, rather than leaving these duties to be speculated upon and leaving such vague language as we see in Section 5 that "the Defence Force is responsible for the defence of Barbados and such other duties as the Defence Board determines." Such duties can be very far-reaching; they can be anything; they could very well be duties exercised by a Police Force. But the concept of a Defence Force or an Army is for defence of the people against possible interventions from outside and in the event of a national crisis to go to the assistance of the usual civilian authority entrusted with the maintenance of law and order. Therefore, while you say it is for the defence of Barbados, and people would be prepared to accept that as one of the legitimate duties of the Defence Force, the terms "such other duties as the Defence Board may determine" could vary from one Board to another and from member. to member of the Defence Board. And I repeat that it is incumbent upon the Government to allay the fears of the people of this country by spelling out what are the duties of the Defence Force and not leaving it to speculation.

Another area of concern is whether the people of Barbados will see members of the Defence Force sent off to neighbouring Islands to prop up unpopular Governments in such islands, and somebody must get up in here and draw the attention of the Government to this. We do not want see a Defence Force become an offence force. If it is set up to defend Barbados I am happy with that; but I do not want to hear of our Defence Force making forays into other Islands of the Caribbean.

My colleague, the hon. member for St. Michael South, has spoken at great length on this matter and on various aspects of the Defence Bill, and I do not want to repeat what he said but would just like to focus atten-

tion on certain aspects that have been discussed in Barbados and I will state now that if the Defence Force is to get off the ground, it must not appear to the public that there is any partisan or party political differences about the setting up of a Defence Force. I think that is very important because if we can make the public feel that we all accept that it is necessary to have a defence force may be because it might provide employment for people or perhaps because there is an area of concern in this country that could deteriorate and you would have a Defence force that could be helpful in combatting any of the consequences of such a development – whether it is for any of these things, we have to give the impression that there are no political differences where the institution of this Defence Force is concerned. To do otherwise would be to create the impression in the minds of some members of the Defence Force that there are individuals in either party who would pay attention to their grievances, real or imaginary.
4.05 p.m.

I would like to say that a case can be made out for the setting up of a Defence Force for the defence of this country against probable invasion whether, as we say, it be by crackpots or whether it be by people whose political thinking or political philosophy or whose international motives may not be in keeping with ours; and bearing in mind that it may be a very long time or difficult to get bigger countries to come to our aid – in fact by the time they come to our aid we will have found ourselves already in deep waters.

I will accept and will support that we have to have some sort of defence at home, so that if these things did happen, we could resist until we could get assistance from other sources. I would like to make that quite clear; but because I would support the institution of a Defence Force, I cannot blind my eyes to what has gone on in other countries where there has been an abuse or misuse in other countries; and I want to make it quite clear that we have a belief in this country that a lot of things will not happen in Barbados; but events, especially in recent times, have gone a far way in making us understand that we in Barbados are no different from people in other parts of the world.

We have been here all the time comforting ourselves with these words that this will not or cannot happen in Barbados. I do not think that it would be wise to wake up one morning and find ourselves struck by events which we thought could not happen here; and Mr. Speaker, I will close by emphasising again that there is speculation in this country about the reasons or intentions of setting up this Defence Force in this country; and if we are to get off to a good start and if we are to keep the minds of the people in comfort it will be the responsibility of the Government to set about to allay these fears by taking note of the points that I have raised and giving reasonable answers to them.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, there was an Act of Parliament, prior to the introduction of this Bill, which came into effect in this island on the 14th day of September, 1909, which set up a Volunteer Regiment under the command of the Officer administering the Government of the country on a purely voluntary basis. The British Army, as far as I can remember, which had been resident here for a long period of years, finally departed in 1906. The major outbreaks in the area were over. The last war fought in the Caribbean was the Spanish-American War. There was the famous intervention of Mr. Teddy Roosevelt which saw him storming up San Juan Hill with his Rough Riders in 1899; and then the annexation of Havana, Puerto Rico being saved from its own independence by the United States.

At the turn of the century we saw the departure of the British Army from the Garrison in 1906, the taking over of so many military structures by the Government, in some cases private enterprise, in other cases Queens Park under Lady Gilbert Carter, around 1906; and then three years after the departure of the British Forces from Barbados, the Act establishing the Barbados Regiment came into being on the 14th day of September, 1909.

Between 1909 and 1979 we had two major outbreaks – the two World Wars which we had never had before in the history of mankind. Some people stood at home. Some served by standing and waiting, and some people served abroad; but the Barbados Regiment remained the main military or para-military establishment in this island from 1909 to 1979 – a period of 70 years in which there were two World Wars.

One has to agree in the meantime that there was the independence of this country in 1966; and the Government of Barbados that took this country into independence – the Government and the Party which I had the honour to lead at the time – made two moves in the direction of better security in order to ensure domestic tranquility, as they say, in the declaration of a country which celebrated its 200th Anniversary just a few short years ago. The two moves which we made were the establishment of a Coast Guard, which we did in the face of much opposition.

We had had a Harbour Police in their picturesque uniforms, a few small launches which were designed and built locally, merely for the purpose of patrolling what used to be known as the "Shippings" – in other words, Carlisle Bay. In 1961 we had a deep water harbour, but we still continued to have the Harbour Police whose duties were mainly confined to the immediate environs of the Harbour Police pier, the yachts at anchor off the Royal Barbados Yacht Club and the Careenage. Many of the harbour policemen in their Lord Nelson uniforms could be seen doing traffic duty at the busy morning and evening hours in the City of Bridgetown and because

both their equipment and their functions seem at that time to have become superceded by the construction of the harbour, and by events overtaken by events.

And so, the Government after several consultations, after inspection of units which performed similar functions in the Commonwealth of the Bahamas, consultation with the British Government, we purchased as far as I can remember, three coast guard vessels, which were built and designed for coast guard services. in order not so much to protect the harbours and coastlines of Barbados against invasion or anything like that, but inorder to deter smuggling, in order to carry out the functions of air-sea rescue; and that is why the headquarters of the Coast Guard were placed at Oistins so that it could be within reasonably easy reach of the Airport in the event of any major air disaster both in the approach and take-off from our international airport be it over the ocean.
4.15 p.m.

One of the requirements of the International Air Safety Organisation was that there should be such provision for the safety of passengers using the airport. I am surprised to hear today, Mr. Speaker, that it was bad judgment to purchase the units which are in every respect similar to those used in the Commonwealth of the Bahamas with 700 Islands to patrol, with intense smuggling traffic taking place between the United States mainland and the Bahamas Islands.

We read in the newspapers frequently of the intervention made by the Coast Guard of the Bahamas in arresting Cuban fishing boats poaching illegally, of their capturing large vessels which indulge in the illicit drug trade and matters of that kind. Anyone visiting the harbour at Nassau between Paradise Island and the mainland at any time can see scores of boats lined up there which have been impounded by the Coast Guard Service of the Bahamas. The chain of Islands stretches from the Turks and Caicos Islands right up to Bimini, a distance of some 700 to 800 miles, and this chain of 700 Islands is patrolled by vessels which are similar in every respect and design to the vessels which were purchased by the Coast Guard for Barbados.

Now we heard today that fishing trawlers with refrigeration are the proper subjects for investigation and reconnaisance, although they say that they are slower, yet we have taken on apparently the responsibility of the others Islands such as St. Vincent, taking on the responsibility from Her Majesty's Government, a responsibility which Her Majesty's Government never chose to exercise. Her Majesty's Government never provided any of the Windward or Leeward Islands with any kind of vessels to prevent the people from the French Islands or the Dutch Islands or from farther afield from poaching and actually devastating the fishing grounds or doing all the smuggling that has been carried out traditionally in the Windward and Leeward Islands; but Barbados is coming to the rescue now.

When my Government offered on the acquisition of the "Captain Fergusson", the larger of the vessels and other smaller vessels from Thorneycroft on the advice of the Admiralty and the British Government, a vessel which we had been using for the Coast Guard Service, a vessel capable of a speed of 45 knots and an air and sea rescue launch which was admirably suited for anti-smuggling activities to the Government of St. Vincent, the Government of St. Vincent declined and said it was too expensive to run, they could not afford to put the gasolene in it; but the Government of Barbados is going to take three trawlers that cost over $300,000 each and provide them for surveillance so that the British Government and the Government of St. Vincent will be relieved of their primary responsibility in safeguarding their shoreline.

Now I just want to say this, Sir. I do not play at soldiers. I do not have to invent insurrections, wars and rumours of wars and that kind of thing. I know that a whole generation of people probably missed, through no fault of their own and luckily, being involved in real military activities. I unfortunately came from a generation that found myself embroiled. Those people who think that it is something that they have to put on their escutcheons that they have to invent military games, alarms and excursions, have to get things in their proper perspective. No Defence Force of 300 or 600 men can offer total resistance to any attempt by any external power, and I am not talking about nitwits and lunatics and megalomaniacs and so-called mercenaries. Any power that wanted to take over this country from outside would not find 600 persons an irresistable force in so far as preventing them from capturing this country is concerned. Even at the height of the Napoleonic Wars, even at the time before the Treatise of Versailles in Paris, countries like Haiti, Santo Domingo, Martinique, St. Martin, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Dominica, the Saints, all the way down the line had been changing hands frequently, but Barbados out here to the eastward never had to think about changing hands. Now in the 20th Century we are talking about insurrection.

Let me put the Defence Force in its right perspective. I started off with the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard has a specific function. The Coast Guard was designed primarily as an anti-smuggling force and as an air/sea rescue unit. The first is a domestic necessity, and the second an international requirement. Great was the opposition to the establishment of the Coast Guard in 1975–76; even the Hon. Minister for Defence said it was not a priority, what did we need a Coast Guard for. Now he sees himself as the Supreme Commander in section 9 giving directives on the operational duties to the Chief of Staff. What does section 9 say, Sir? The Chief of

Staff of the Barbados Defence Force is subject to the directions of the Governor-General, responsible for the operational use of the Force, but the Prime Minister may, where no directions have been given by the Governor-General, give to the Chief of Staff directions with respect to the operational use of the Barbados Defence Force in Barbados, but for what? .....not for providing for the common defence or keeping out the invasion .....for the purposes of maintaining and securing public order and public safety as the Prime Minister thinks fit. He is the sole judge of what is public order and public safety, and the Chief of Staff shall comply with those directions.

The first thing I want to say is this: can anyone imagine the Governor-General giving – the Governor-General should not be referred to in debate but only in the context of this – can one imagine the person upon whom this duty is cast giving any directive to the Chief of Staff? He has never seen as far as I know a shot fired in anger in his whole life time. I do not think he has seen a little boy throw a rock at a mango tree. Can you imagine him giving directions to the Chief of Staff? So in the absence of the Governor-General according to the section.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I appreciate that. You could only be dealing with the section, and the hon. member is also dealing with the Governor-General *per se.*

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: What I am saying is that in the absence of whoever the Governor-General for the time being is giving directions to the Chief of Staff .....

Mr. SPEAKER: All I am asking the hon. member is not to make mention of the Governor-General with a view to influencing the debate.
4.25 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: No, Sir, I am not. I find it difficult to deal with a Defence Bill which makes reference to the Governor General who gives direction to the Chief of Staff and then in the absence of the Chief of Staff for the Prime Minister without any reference to the Chief of Staff or let me put it this way for Your Honour's satisfaction. If the person originally charged with the responsibility is absent it then falls to the Governor General or the person originally charged with the responsibility here.

Mr. JOHNSON: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. member for St. John is referring to the Governor General. He is talking about the Governor General if he is talking about a boy throwing a stone up in a mango tree. I am saying that it is a direct reference to the present incumbent of the office.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am appealing to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition not to use the Governor General with a view to influencing the debate.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not influencing any debate. I am dealing with the Section that.....

Mr. SPEAKER: It very much appears so to me when you specifically make reference to a boy throwing rocks at a mango tree.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: What I am saying is this, Sir. What we are concerned about is this. The Prime Minister then assumes the role of Commander in Chief. This is an Act establishing a Defence Force. The Prime Minister then gives directives and what are these directives for? What I am suggesting has nothing to do with the present incumbent of the office. It has nothing to do with my predecessor but it may have something to do with his successors in the office, whoever they may be.

The Prime Minister *de facto* and *de jure* by default will be the person who gives instruction to the persons for the purpose of maintaining public order and public safety. Public order deals with people demonstrating in Broad Street and what happened in 1937. The person in charge of the local force who at that time was the officer administering the Government of the Crown in its right of Barbados, gave instructions that people should be shot. That was public order. That was public safety and innocent people lost their lives. The officer at least was not supposed to be employed in politics. He was not a politician and it is very dangerous.

If you set up a Defence Force you will see nowhere in the White Paper which was introduced in January, 1978 any mention that these powers were going to be imposed on persons who would be the political head of the Government of Barbados from time to time. I am not making any reference to the present holder of the office because I do not know how he will perform. I am not suggesting that he.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want to order the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to take his seat but he must desist from this type of argument.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: What type of argument? I am dealing with the.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Whether you know how the Governor General would perform is not a matter for this debate.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not referring to the Governor General. I do not think Your Honour quite heard what I was saying, Sir. I was not at that juncture dealing with the Governor General. I stopped dealing with him

a long time ago. I do not know how anybody will perform under this Bill. It is a shot, Sir. It is a leap in the dark and therefore when we enact legislation we ought to be sure that there are all steps and plans taken against another making use of power because we do not know 50 years from now what will happen. You may be around, Sir, but I might not be here. You may still be Speaker 50 years from now but inside here in your Chair, Sir, you could not exercise any control after this legislation is put on the Statute Book over what somebody does outside. Twenty-five years from now you do not know.

The other thing that I am concerned about is that in this Act members of the Regiment who are in the Defence Force of Barbados can be picked up and sent to the rescue of somebody who is not acceptable to them in another part of the Caribbean or elsewhere. That is specifically mentioned that they can be sent outside of this country in the Act itself. We feel on this side that anyone who enlist in the Defence Force of Barbados short of a declaration of war by the Commonwealth, by the Caribbean Community or some such body should not be called upon to serve outside of Barbados unless that person volunteers on each and every occasion that he is called upon to serve outside and expresses his willingness to go.

It is one thing to enlist in a Defence Force for the defence of your country, to attend ceremonial performances in Independence Square, to take up sentry duty at Government House, to go to camp and indulge in exercises with your colleagues and that sort of thing. It is another thing altogether to pick up Barbadian troops and send them to other countries in the Caribbean to prop up Regiments as was recently proposed by the LDC Council of Ministers that they should be some kind of peace keeping force.

Now I remember well, Sir, when Mr. John Compton, the recent Prime Minister of St. Lucia was in office there was a strike at a place called Roseau on two Sugar Estates because they had Sugar Estates at that time in St. Lucia. The British Government asked the Barbados Government to send down members of our Regiment to St. Lucia in order to, the same words as he used here, "In order to ensure public order and public safety" and that request came from the Governor of St. Lucia from the Cabinet Office to the Government of Barbados and I was summoned by the Governor of Barbados and this request was put to me and I said I was not even going back to the Cabinet on it but I would inform them that there was no way that I was going to allow any personnel of any of the forces of Barbados to go down to St. Lucia under the pretence of ensuring public order for the British to break a strike against Mr. Compton or any other politician involved down there.

4.35 p.m.

I am saying that the correct position is on record. At the time there was a tremendous amount of pressure being put right here in Barbados on the Government to take part in a peace keeping force to deal with Anguilla and we said it was not our responsibility to maintain law and order there, it was the responsibility of the British Government. After that a telegram was despatched to the Prime Minister of England saying that the Prime Minister of Barbados was seen in Anguilla lending aid and comfort, and all I did was to land at the airport and take off Mr. Nigel Fisher, so that was the only intervention by any Barbadian in the Anguilla crisis.

Let us take the Grenada situation. We do not know up to now what the sentiments of the Government of Barbados vis-a-vis who came here and embraced all the various people are, we do not know what the sentiments are. What guarantee do we have that the Regiment would not be sent there? Because the authority is in the Act to pick up people who have been moulded in the Defence Force and send them outside here. How could you be defending Barbados in Grenada, in Anguilla, in St. Lucia and in Dominica, for that matter? It is true that the Israelis have invented in modern warfare the device known as the provocative strike, so I suppose we would be thinking that the presence of Barbadians in St. Lucia would be all right. There is the authority here in the Act where our people could go and lose their lives in foreign lands.

The establishment of a Defence Force is one thing, but what kind of Defence Force? Nowhere in the White Paper was it ever suggested that our people would be taken up and sent overseas. Is this the satisfaction of the blandishments of the people from the Lesser Antilles who are now scared that their turn may be next and they want to have some military presence standing by at the expense of the Barbados taxpayers? The defence of Barbados is one thing but offences against people who are fed up with their regimes in foreign countries is another. There is no provision for compensation in the Act, in the old Volunteer Act although the people were volunteers, Mr. Speaker, and any soldier got wounded, or died, there was provision for compensation for his family, but there is no provision for compensation to the families of people going in the military service that I could find anywhere in the Act, and I wish to draw that to Your Honour's attention that in the Act of 1939 in which it was a volunteer service there was provision made for compensation, and now in 1979, some 40 years later, there is not that provision.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I think I had better very early reply to some of the scarecrow statements made by the Rt. hon. member for St. John. The technique which he adopts has been typical of his political life in that he creates enough fear in order to attract sufficient attention so that a situation will appear other than what it genuinely is, and on this occasion he has not done anything other than that.

In the first place, the Rt. hon. member should be intelligent enough to understand that this Act is subject to the Constitution of Barbados, which is the supreme law of Barbados. The hon. member certainly understands, regardless of what he pretends in his speech to this House, that the Governor General acts, and must act, on the advice of the Cabinet of Barbados, and there are limited circumstances in which the Governor General may act out of his whim and fancy, and that therefore whenever reference is made in section 7 to the Governor General deploying the armed forces of this country, it must be with the advice and consent of the Government of Barbados. It is hardly becoming of the hon. member, after his several years as Prime Minister of this country, to get up and advance an argument that has no basis in law and is unworthy of the logical arguments that one should expect from a man of his age and experience.

The second point he must clearly understand, and one must deal with it early, because the sort of way he put forward his point might attract people who do not read and who do not understand these matters. Every Act that we know of provides for circumstances in which a Cabinet cannot meet because there are emergency circumstances and it gives an alternative for those limited circumstances that the chief political head of the country is in order to give directions. Let me go back to it, Sir, and the hon. member knows this. In the United States Constitution despite the fact that there is a Secretary for Defence it is the President who is the supreme Commander of the Armed Forces of the United States of America. The hon. member knows this and it hurts me to see that he cannot advance an argument in here without using the intellectual gymnastics that he is becoming capable of.

4.45 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I believe the hon. member is inadvertently giving misinformation to the House. When the President of the United States acts as Commander-inChief of the Armed forces he is acting in his capacity of Head of State.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member must understand that when he acts in the capacity of President and Head of State, the functions of Head of State and Head of Government are combined. What has happened is that hon. members have not made a study of any of the relevant legislation on this matter in other parts of the Commonwealth. We are decent enough on this side of the House to assist them in making the debate intelligent, by giving them the details of each section of each Act which we have followed in compiling this legislation. We have mentioned specifically the United Kingdom and Jamaica, but we could well have given them similar provisions in New Zealand, Australia, Bermuda, Kenya, Zambia, India etc., because one of the things we carefully did was to research the situation to see the provisions in other places, so that no member could come in here and say that we are making up our own laws. Now I am hearing from the hon. member for St. John that these are strange provisions, provisions that he well knows are correct. But if he wants the benefit of our research he can come to the Chambers and examine it. His argument is worthless and merely put out for political confusion and I am surprised at the hon. member.

To come to the second part: the hon. member talks about the sending of forces overseas and tried to make people believe that under this section anything can be done with the regular forces. In the first place, Section 8 deals with overseas training only. Section 7 deals with no employment of the Defence Force outside Barbados except in two circumstances, (1) he has entered into an agreement in writing accepting such a liability, or (2) that he is an officer or soldier who was transferred from the regular force to the reserve. Now the hon. member is jumping on the bandwagon.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. member saying that a member of the Defence Force can only serve outside of Barbados if he has entered into an agreement to do so? Because he quoted that first and that is the second provision. It says "unless he is an officer or soldier who was transferred from the regular force to the Reserve." Then he is not sent outside; the "or" is another thing altogether. There are two different categories of persons.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The member must be transferred from the regular force to the reserve; a member of the regular force cannot be employed outside of Barbados unless he has entered into an agreement in writing accepting such a liability. The hon. member makes a song and dance about the use of the regular force outside of the country but went on to say he would do it for the Caribbean community or as a result of a declaration by the Commonwealth. He does not seem to understand you must have these provisions in legislation if you are going to use them on behalf of the Caribbean Community or on behalf of the Commonwealth. And then he seeks to make a distinction where Barbados force may be part of a peace-keeping force pursuant to a charter of the United Nations to which we are bound. This is another set of circumstances in which the Defence Force may be used overseas.

There is great confusion on the other side. They accept the necessity for this country to have a Defence Force and the hon. member for St. Michael South accepts the necessity for there to be political control of the Defence Force because in the last resort the Cabinet of Barbados is subject to the vote of this House and finally to the people of Barbados. But when Section 7 incorporates that political control which the hon. member for St. Michael South favours, the hon. member for St. John gets

up to say that the Prime Minister is taking undue power to himself. Now you either have political control or you don't have it. If you don't put it in the Governor General acting on the advice of the Cabinet, in whose powers would you put it? And if the Cabinet cannot meet, who is the next choice but the Head of the Government until the Cabinet can meet? Do you want the control back in the hands of the military, the hon. member for St. Michael South is afraid to have?

Let me come to the argument about a regional Police Force and let me make a statement to clarify this. In the first place it is untrue to say that Barbados has at any time committed itself to a regional security force; that is untrue; it has no basis in fact. I understand that the regional security force was discussed by some Leaders of the Eastern Caribbean in the context of a Regional Police Force and not a force consisting of soldiers or sailors, and that what was advanced was a police force from the other islands being used conjointly. Barbados has never at any time through any member of its Cabinet committed itself to the use of a police force in these circumstances. Secondly, the regional force was discussed in the context of perhaps the formation at some time of a Defence Force. Again Barbados has never been a party to that. As the hon. member for St. Michael South said, Barbados under the previous administration has co-operated in training exercises for its Coast Guard with the Trinidad Coast Guard, and obviously it is in the interest of all Caribbean countries to share training opportunities where they exist with other friendly countries in the Commonwealth who have the same sort of Governmental and democratic institutions as we have.
4.55 p.m.

So that I cannot see any argument against Barbados, not only having common training facilities in Police matters, but also sharing in common training facilities with Trinidad, the United Kingdom or Canada for that matter. Barbados has always been part of a common Caribbean Police Training organisation; and to that extent, since the Barbados Police Force has been a paramilitary force, we have had to a limited extent some form of joint training, and to that extent in collaboration with other countries in the Eastern Caribbean; and we intend – and this has not been hidden – to upgrade our Police Training College so that we will continue to share its facilities with other countries in the Commonwealth Caribbean.

In so far as the Coast Guard Service with St. Vincent and St. Lucia is concerned, in the first place I want to make it clear that we have been having discussions with the Governments of St. Vincent and St. Lucia about co-ordination – and I stress the word co-ordination – of Coast Guard services in the Eastern Caribbean. No agreement has yet been reached on this matter up to now, therefore it is not correct for the hon. member for St. John to again get up and make a statement now that Barbados is taking over the responsibility of the British Government, and using Barbadian money and Barbadian boats for the protection of St. Vincent and St. Lucia.

I believe that he was being churlish there; but the fact remains that he was not speaking facts when he said that we were doing that. I will point out to him that discussions are going on over the co-ordination of the use of the Coast Guard services. Anyone would recognise that the answer to that is simple. Let me give an example. There is no point of Barbados, for instance, having here a main dock for the repair of Coast Guard ships and St. Vincent and St. Lucia having the same.

Let us face the fact, Sir, that Barbados' territorial waters and the exclusive economic zone intersect back to St. Vincent and St. Lucia; and in our own interest, the logic of the situation demand that we co-ordinate our activities, because they are the territories nearest to us and with whom we have a common border of waters between our respective countries. Let us face up to it. In the area relating to our fishing, it is obvious that when we are struggling against the outside infiltration of our fishing banks that we should co-ordinate our actions. We have in no way discussed subjecting Barbados' forces to the political command of anyone in St. Vincent or St. Lucia, nor have St. Vincent or St. Lucia asked for any joint command structure with our Coast Guard.

What we have discussed is whether there can be docking facilities. We have been discussing that in so far as how we can co-ordinate fees, how we can co-ordinate repairs and how we can co-ordinate joint action against a common enemy. In NATO countries such co-ordination takes place; and indeed, in what are called the Low Countries, co-ordination between the military forces takes place almost as a matter of course. The hon. member need not believe that this is a debate that he has won as he won the 1964-65 debate by default. He gave what he says are facts, but which are non facts; because he is going to get the first answer and our Government would be highly irresponsible if we assumed the mantle of the defence of the Eastern Caribbean and allowed the British Government not to do the duty of defending them as long as that is part of their responsibility for so doing.

Equally, it would be highly irresponsible if we are interested in a strong Caribbean Community, if we did not explore avenues for joint co-operation particularly where the eventual cost to each of our territories will be reduced while having safe guards to ensure that the democratic freedoms in the Caribbean are maintained.

That is the challenge that the hon. member for St. John did not accept. He ducked out of it when he had the chance in 1964-65. That is where I differ from him

fundamentally on an issue such as this. He does not see the vision of a Caribbean Community that has substance and that could work for the benefit of the Caribbean people; and I do not expect him latter day to be convinced, and convinced in the true sense of the word. He does not have the wider vision of the Caribbean, and that is the distinction between him and the member for St. Michael South; and that is why that member will never be leader of the Democratic Labour Party, because he might outpace the hon. member in history.

He lacked the vision in 1964. He lacked the vision in 1966. He lacked the vision in 1976, and he lacks the vision in 1979. Because people are bringing new ideas that you cannot understand, and you are harping back on a time that has long past. We will continue to get Grenadas as long as your ideas remain ideal.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please address the Chair.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member for St. John will continue to get Grenadas as long as his ideas about the future of the Caribbean remain the same as they are. I will fight you in Barbados, I will fight you as I did from the Under 40s, I will fight you right through and.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please address the Chair.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I have heard that this Force is to be used to put down the people in the Caribbean area. For what purpose? Why would he want to do so? Whenever Barbadians are involved in anything, it has to be in accordance with the traditions of this country, so we do not need to be ashamed. This country has no territorial ambitions. We have never sought to have a Commonwealth of Dominica and Barbados ruled by Sydney Alleyne. The hon. member knows that association with Sydney Alleyne has been confined to his party and to himself, not to this party; and when it comes to using force, Sydney Alleyne would know about that; but not the Barbados Labour Party in any circumstance.

We have no fear, but we must defend ourselves against the Sydney Alleynes of this world, crackpots or no crackpots. The hon. member can afford to dismiss Sydney Alleyne as a crackpot, but we must take it seriously as a country; and I welcome the remarks of the hon. member for St. Michael South and the hon. member for St. Michael North Central that we must be prepared for incursions from outside.

5.05 p.m.

The Rt. Hon. member for St. John does not see the necessity for this. I do not know what more overwhelming evidence he would want. I am sure that if he was in Antigua at about that same time he would have seen Dennard right in Antigua; he would have seen that happen also in the Caribbean, and it is a mistake to believe that those things cannot happen within our region.

The Government intends to bring a Visiting Forces Act to enable the forces from other friendly Commonwealth countries like Canada and the United Kingdom to come here from time to time for joint exercises. It exists at the moment under the United Kingdom Jurisdiction of Forces Act which is outmoded legislation. We intend to bring down a law dealing with mercenaries so that you cannot recruit mercenaries on this territory to be used against anyone; so I can give him this undertaking. We do not intend to use our forces as mercenaries against anybody. As a matter of fact, instead of that, we are going to bring legislation binding Barbadians if within or without Barbados they enlist as mercenaries with any forces at all. That is what we intend to do. We intend to go a bit further. We will be spearheading at the United Nations a Resolution against mercenaries and a convention to get other countries also to become party to this, because that is the only way we will eventually be secure as small states. I have no doubt that this Bill is worthy of this House's attention and approval and that is why I support it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any other hon. member who want to exercise his right?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, before the hon. member for Christ Church West rose on two occasions, he said he was replying on behalf of the Government. *(Asides.)* I am saying that the hon. member said he was replying on behalf of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the hon. Attorney General made his contribution, he made it clear that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister would wind up the debate since he was back in here.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I must say, Sir, I do not recall ever, when I was Leader of the Opposition, that I had to ask for time. If the hon. member does not want me to reply because he is afraid of what I will say, I will sit down. If he wants to admit that he is afraid of what I am going to say, I will sit down. I do not understand hon. members who can make irresponsible statements and then seek to avoid the consequence of criticism of those statements that may ensue. Anyway, I have very little to add to what the hon. member had to say about the speech of the Leader of the Opposition at this stage.

Sir, consistency is a very important virtue in politics. It is not at all important virtue because if a man cannot change his views from time to time in response to

changing circumstances, then he probably does not have that flexibility of mind that will enable him to bring to the Government of the country a proper consideration. But, Sir, the flexibility of mind of the hon. member for St. Michael South astonishes not only for its comprehension, not only for the extent of its flexibility, but for the narrow span of time within which circumstances have changed. In January, 1978, the hon. member for St. Michael South led members on the Opposition in voting against the Government's proposal for a Defence Force. To my mind, that disposes of the first hour and twenty minutes of his speech, because the first hour and twenty minutes of his speech were devoted to explaining how the Defence Force was the brainchild of the Democratic Labour Party, but there is something about changing your views in these circumstances that goes beyond mere flexibility, because the hon. member in 1978 was surely aware of the fact that the Defence Force was the brainchild of the Democratic Labour Party, if it was. It was surely open to him then.....

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of explanation, I should like to indicate that when I spoke today I indicated that I was supporting the Defence Force. When I spoke in 1978 I spoke because the White Paper was defective and that is why I spoke against it, not that I was opposing the Defence Force. I was opposing the contents of the White Paper as presented at that time as being very defective.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: There is a noun known as "sophistry". I do not know if it has made its way into Erskine May's as an unparliamentary expression. If it has, I withdraw it. If it has not, the hon. member on his side will be peculiarly well placed to understand what it means. The hon. member has to be admired for that point of explanation. There are certain things that cannot be explained even by sophistry. The hon. member was inconsistent not only in that but in other regard. Who would think, Mr. Speaker, and I am looking now at the Debates for Tuesday, 24th January, 1978, that the hon. member on that occasion referred us to the Defence Laws of Yugoslavia and contrary to what he has said today went on to say that these laws go further than we would wish to go, because they speculate on the whole purpose and nature of the reasons for a Defence Force, what types of war can be called a just war and an unjust war, and the law goes into the whole question of colonial oppressors keeping down native population. Which is the view of the hon. member? The view expressed in January last year that the Defence Act of Yugoslavia is inappropriate to Barbados or the view expressed today that the Defence Act of Yugoslavia might be more appropriate than the models which we have taken?

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of explanation, in January, 1978, I indicated that the Yugoslav Law went into the question of duties of the Defence Force and the role of a Defence Force, but we would not wish to go as far as they went. I am saying that in this particular legislation that is before us, we have not gone anywhere at all, so I do not find the inconsistency.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I admire the hon. member's persistence, but unlike the persistence of Alexander the Great which was rewarded with the conquest of all Persia, Babylon and those parts and turned back only at India, I do not think that his persistence has even got him as far as the battle of Arbela.

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of explanation, the hon. Prime Minister knows that he lost the battle as far as Alexander was concerned, and I was right on that occasion as much as he is wrong on this occasion.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member for St. Michael South has a remarkable knowledge of my mental processes. I honestly think that when he reverts to his proper role of very high-powered civil servant, international civil servant perhaps, I very much hope that he will still be available to give of the benefit of his technical advice on the knowledge of other people's minds to the Government of Barbados. I am sure that in the fullness of time, in the late 1990s the hon. member who is so careful a student of my speeches, no doubt of my writings, will prove an admirable biographer in due course. If he spent as much time on the problems of Defence and acquired as much knowledge of the problems of defence as he evidently has of the mind of the Prime Minister, he might be in a position to make a speech that could enlighten the House, but what am I to make of a speech which speaks of Disraeli attempting to amalgamate the British services? He can read the biographies of Disraeli from Monypenny's time to the present day, and he will find Disraeli absolutely innocent of any intention to amalgamate the services that then existed which were those of the Army and the Royal Navy. He will read Caldwell's Reform and he will read that far from amalgamating Caldwell was Minister of War in 1870 – no doubt the hon. member has the dates on his finger-tips, and was the diversifier who introduced the principal of linked battalions.

5.15 p.m.

I am obliged to the hon. member but he will I think find that in 1856 that Lord Palmerston was the Secretary for War because Britain was then engaged in the Crimean War and that Caldwell certainly did not go in until a long time after the first expedition of the mutiny. Anyhow, Sir, that is irrelevant. These really are irrelevant. There are as irrelevant in my speech as there were in his, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order now, order now.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. Member's speech apparently is constructed on the basis of *omne*

ignotum pro magnifico. You see, all that you do not know about is magnificent in the mouth of somebody else and the real nonsense that the hon. member was talking was well revealed when he spoke about MacMillan amalgamating the British Force in 1960. The hon. member is not denying he said that.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I never said that MacMillan.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that you rise on a point of elucidation.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Yes, Sir, you took it correctly, Mr. Speaker. I am correcting as I have had to correct so often on a point of elucidation. I never said that MacMillan amalgamated the Force in 1960. I said in the early 1960's.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The point is that the hon. member is a victim of knowing something but not enough about the subject because MacMillan never tried to amalgamate the Force. There has never been any attempt in Great Britain to amalgamate the Force as there was in Canada and as we are doing in Barbados. What the MacMillan Government did was to reduce the size of the British Army which disbanded certain Regiments in the Army and the Army alone.

The hon. member if he knows any military history he will know that the Green Jacket Brigade is an amalgamation between the Rifle Brigade and the 60th Rifle. That is the Regiment with connections in the West Indies. That is the amalgamation of the Royal American and so on and if he knows anything about the use of the word amalgamation in the British Army ranks he will know that it refers to the Army because over periods of time from the Caldwell Reform when the British Army was given territorial bases, the Regiments lost their numerals. They used to be known as the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, right up to the 56th. When the Regiment lost their numerals each Regiment was assigned a territorial county and they became known as the ranks of Regiments and were given titles appropriate to the particular individual and so on. The amalgamation was the process by which Regiments were incorporated together and formed units of a larger territorial extent. That is the sole British Army of 1914 and again 1939 so any hon. member....

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of elucidation. I do not really want to cross intellectual swords with the member for St. Thomas. There is no cerebration going on over here. He has his match right over here; St. Michael South against St. Thomas and I am saying that in the early 1960's, I believe it was 1962, that MacMillan re-organised an amalgamation of the services to the extent that at least he was destroying the old land marks in the service so there is no point getting up or trying to prove that I am wrong.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point is well made. The hon. member has made his point.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I have made my point.

Mr. SPEAKER: And you take your seat.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not wish to go into any argument with the hon. member. The only thing that MacMillan did to the Army in 1962 was to dismiss Mr. Atley and accept his resignation. That is the only thing that happened in 1962. Mr. Atley was not in politics in 1962. He never made any criticisms at the time. The only point which is relevant in so far as this Defence Force is concerned is the grading of the Force. The hon. member is insisting that the British Army was incorporated in this way.

The point I was making is that there will be one set of ranks as there was in the Canadian Army and so on. If the hon. member wants to go back to Alexander he will remember that the British Army fought on land and sea. We in Barbados are constructing that type of Defence Force and any talk about amalgamation with Britain is quite irrelevant.

The hon. member is also mistaken when he talks about the use of the shrimp boats. I do not know what he thinks the Shrimp boats would be used for, but they will be used for surveillance work. I hesitate to cross wits with the hon. member when he sets out to imply that fibre-glass was the material in common use during the Second World War. I am not sure that the hon. member served in the Second World War but no doubt he has had some experience as some of the other members who have been here in the House of Assembly.

I will say this as far as the shrimp boats are concerned, and I am referring to the speeches of the hon. member for St. Michael South and the Leader of the Opposition that the shrimp boats we are using now are very good boats. Much work has been done on them. I know they are slow but they will serve the purpose for which we intend them to serve in the Defence Force. We have had trials and we have persons with experience to give advice on them and we are quite satisfied that they will be provided with the necessary facilities to carry out surveillance work in the Coast Guard.

I heard one hon. member said that we would equip the boats with guns. We have been advised that small guns can be stored in the shrimp boats. They are not intended at this stage to carry guns but will carry out surveillance work and provide transportation facilities. There are 25

shrimp boats and some of these will be converted for use as oil-spillage cleaners because in this day and age oil spillages are becoming increasingly frequent. With the expansion work which will be done in St. Lucia, the Northern part of Barbados will become a major shipping lane and the possibility of oil spillages will become more eminent so we regard it as extremely important that the Act now should have the facilities to guard us against any possible oil spillages.

5.25 p.m.

I appreciate what the hon. member says about keeping the shrimp boats in the harvesting of fish, but I will say this, that all the fish that we may eat, Sir, and indeed export in Barbados, we are now harvesting by and large a lot more fish with a smaller fleet than the swollen fleet of 19 vessels which we at present possess. I would have thought that hon. members would welcome the use of the shrimp boats, I would have thought I would have heard from the hon. member for St. Michael South West who has exercised his usual prudence on this occasion, very wisely perhaps, by not contributing unnecessarily to the debate, but if he had a contribution I would have thought that he would have said that the shrimp boats would save Barbados from having to pay extra for oil at some time in the future. I have no apologies whatsoever to make for saying that a useful purpose has been found for some of the shrimping vessels which belong to International Seafoods; no apologies whatsoever.

To take a small point, Sir, I gather that some point has been made of the Commander of the Coast Guard going on a course, but I am instructed that it is really quite untrue. The Commander of the Coast Guard went on leave, and he is the only person I think the hon. member could possibly be referring to.

Over the speech of the hon. member for St. Michael North Central I think a veil should be drawn. If I could summarise that speech, it appeared to me to be saying that the hon. member's point in a roundabout fashion was that the Democratic Labour Party had voted against the White Paper and if they vote now against the Defence Bill that the officers in the Defence Force would feel that the Democratic Labour Party was against them and it might harm them in the future. I cannot take the hon. member's speech to mean anything else, and I have very little respect for it, very little respect indeed. I think it is a speech which is unworthy of the occasion, and another speech which I find unworthy of the occasion, Sir, is the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. He has no right to come in here to make a lot of irresponsible accusations. He makes a point about overseas service for the Regiment, but any member of the Barbados Regiment at present who enlisted after the 12th April, 1941 is entitled to be sent overseas under the present legislation, and that is something the hon. member should know. If he thinks it is bad that the Regiment can be sent overseas under any conditions, he should have changed the Barbados Regiment Act in the 15 years he had to do so. It is very irresponsible to come in the House and accuse us of risking Barbadian boys overseas when Barbadian boys have been risked overseas for something like 40 years, and the hon. member will be well aware that he was prepared to join the Anguilla Police Force scheme in 1969 and it was the former Leader of the Opposition, the former junior member for St. Joseph, who had to come in here and oppose it. Hon. members who were here, the hon. member for St. James and I were all in here, and we remember the occasion very well.

I also want to take the hon. member up on the scare tactics in relation to the command of the Force. Again, I do not think that the hon. member had really considered the matter in any depth. You either have political control of the Defence Force or you do not have it. Hon. members on that side are talking as though they want political control of the Defence Force. If you have political control of the Defence Force it has to be exercised along lines laid down by Statute by the Constitution. There could hardly be any other way. We laid down the line that the Governor General should give the directions to the Defence Force but under the general command of the Chief of Staff. I believe that such control exists even in countries that have military Governments. I know, for example, that in Nigeria the Commander-in Chief of the Army cannot take decisions on local law and order. Even although it is a military Government it is headed by a Head of State with a person as Chief of Staff who effectively is an Executive Prime Minister, and the Chief of Staff has the authority for determining the deployment of the Army, not the Army Commander-in-Chief, although I believe he is second in rank to the General. So even in circumstances where the Army is in control of a country it is not the Commander-in-Chief of the Army who gives the final orders in emergency situations or even in general situations.

The Governor General will lay down directions under which the Defence Force will operate, and directions under which the Chief of Staff will exercise his command. What happens when the Chief of Staff wants orders and he says to the Governor General a situation has arisen and I have no directions to cover it, what am I to do? The Governor General has to act on the advice of the Cabinet. The Cabinet may not be able to give the instructions, and as the hon. member for Christ Church West, the hon. and learned Attorney General, has pointed out, it is the political head of Government upon whom you fall back. All the reading of military literature that hon. members on the other side have done, have never read the general saying, well this is a new situation, I must get orders? Have they never read about that? Has it never occurred to them that the initiative does not necessarily come from the politicians? That the initiative

comes from soldiers by making sure that the opinions political judgments have allowed them to reach were perhaps in countries where emergency measures are taken in accordance with the law and the proper practice? That it is the Chief of Staff who will use whatever communications are going to be established in those circumstances to get in touch with the Governor General and say Your Excellency, are there any directions for dealing with the situation? Your Excellency, can you get the Prime Minister to give you the necessary directions?
5.35 p.m.

Instead of understanding that that is at the core of control of the military, the hon. member comes with remarks to catch the headlines and suggest that Government is doing something that is against practice, decency and order. What does the hon. member want? Why does he not get up and make an amendment that if the Governor General is not available the Leader of the Opposition should do it?

It is important that the political parties be seen to support the Defence Force. It is important that this matter of a Defence Force not become a political football but in the last analysis somebody has to take decisions, and we are creating a framework for exercising control over the small but capable Defence Force we are creating in this country.

I am gratified that on this occasion the Opposition does not intend to divide the House and I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

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

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

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I propose to take the Bill in Parts.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I do not object basically to doing the Bill in parts so long as adequate time is given when the Parts are called for members to consider any section on which they may want to speak.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: No objection as long as they stick to the rules.

Part I was called and passed.

Part II was called.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I did not myself speak on Part II, but I believe the Leader of the Opposition did refer to the question of the powers of the Governor General, etc., and I must say that I have some reservation on this particular section. I did hear the hon. member for Christ Church West indicate that the Governor General must at all times act on the advice of the Prime Minister, but Clause 9(2) states that "The Chief of Staff of the Barbados Defence Force is, subject to the directions of the Governor General, responsible for the operational use of the Force....." But it continues that "The Prime Minister may, where no directions have been given by the Governor General, give the Chief of Staff direction with respect to the operational use of the Barbados Defence Force in Barbados....." What I want to draw to the attention of this Committee is whether in these matters the Governor General acts in his own discretion or whether he acts on the advice of the Prime Minister. I would like to hear some amplification on this, because it may affect the way in which I respond to this particular part as far as voting is concerned. Is it conceivable that a Governor-General could read this particular Clause and interpret it that he is acting in his own discretion or that he is bound by the advice of the Prime Minister and Cabinet? And if indeed he is bound by the advice of the Prime Minister, is this Clause really saying then that the Prime Minister in both internal and external situations where the security of public order....(INTERRUPTION BY VISITOR IN GALLERY; VISITOR EXPELLED).

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am sorry the hon. member was interrupted.

There is little I can add to the statement made by the hon. Attorney General. I do not want to be sarcastic but I cannot understand how an hon. member who served in the Cabinet can ask such a question. The hon. member should know that the Governor General takes advice on Constitutional matters from the Solicitor General, and the hon. member was referred to the Constitution by the Attorney General. I can do no more than ask the hon. member to look at the Constitution, but the hon. member should know that the Governor General acts not on the advice of the Prime Minister but on the advice of the Cabinet on matters that are not specifically referred to under the Constitution or by a specific Act.
5.45 p.m.

The hon. member will be aware of a little flurry some years ago when it was discovered that in relation to an Act known as the Expulsion of Undesirables Act, the Governor-General acted in his own discretion. I do not know if this is giving rise to any disturbance in the hon. member's mind. I do not know if the hon. member is thinking about the Governor General in Australia who fired his Prime Minister.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I will go further, Mr. Chairman. I do not know if the Prime Minister wants to become sarcastic, because he will find that he will be dealing with this Bill by himself which does not spell too good for democracy in this country.

I would like to refer to a matter which relates to membership of the Defence Board. I would like to state that in my view the Defence Board is too small, and taking into account the matters which this Board will have to deal with, I am wondering if the person in command of the Coast Guard should not in his own right and *ex officio* be a member of this Board. There is the Prime Minister who is Chairman *ex officio*. No quarrel with that. In the USA the President is Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces. That is one, I believe, of the six roles that he performs in the USA, all rolled into one person.

In Britain, the Prime Minister also plays a key role in this area; but if we look at it in Barbados, the provision is that there is the Prime Minister and such other Minister as the Prime Minister appoints. That is the alter ego of the Prime Minister, some other Minister who no doubt sees eye to eye with the Prime Minister on these particular matters. Then there are only two others, one of whom as a result of his office must take directions from the Prime Minister. He is Permanent Secretary to the Office of Prime Minister and somehow or other must relate to the Prime Minister.

The only other person who may bring some other view points to the deliberations of this Defence Force is the Chief of Staff, and I am maintaining that as far as the defence of the whole country is concerned, there is too much inter-breeding on this type of Board, and the membership should be increased. There is the person who commands the Coast Guard and the person who has day to day control in the Regiment and the Defence Force, the Military and the Air Force.

I am sure that the Hon. member for St. Thomas knows that the Service Chiefs in the United Kingdom would form part of this type of Board, in the UK and the USA where there was amalgamation and reorganisation carried out and the Heads of the three Forces together with the Chief of Staff are members of the Defence Board. Under this Act this Board is too narrow, too restricted. I can see why it has come to this because of the structure of the Force here in this country, but I believe that it should be wider.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, if the hon. member looks at section 12(c) he will see that the Board may "consult with such persons, other than members thereof, as it thinks fit, including officers commanding units of the Forces, on matters relating to their units, and the officers shall attend such meetings of the Defence Board as the Board requires."

It would not be appropriate for individual commanding officers of either the Regiment, the Coast Guard etc. to attend meetings of the Board, because their interests are being looked after by all the defence staff. I think that the hon. member is confusing to some extent the staff organisations set up with a model of approved permanent staff which was established in 1919; and during the last war the USA, namely the general staff and the joint Chiefs of Staff procedure.

We are not, in my view, going to be fighting a major war in which the element of joint command will be necessary. We already have that element in the Chief of Staff who has control down to the technical level. This is a significant point towards what the hon. member is seeking, amalgamation and reorganisation in the USA. In the second World War there were tactical questions of joint command under the Supreme Commander and there was the American Joint Force and so on and so forth. This is a different matter. It is a matter of exercising patrols over the coast; and the closest parallel that I can find would be the National Security Council in the US under the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defence, and over which the President does not even necessarily preside. That is the nearest parallel. There may be other bodies set up to deal with particular problems, and these problems may very well have wider representation within the Defence Board.

5.55 p.m.

It may very well happen, but there is no place for that in this particular Act. One may very well imagine that at a different intelligence level there are certain bodies necessary to maintain intelligence structure in Barbados. The hon. member for St. John would know about that. At any other levels, it may be appropriate to have other bodies, but one should not confuse the function of the Defence Board with that of a National Security Council such as exists in the United States. I would like to give the hon. member the assurance that his point is well taken that left to itself as the only means of considering the defence of the island, this would be a very small body; but this is a Board set up for the purpose of administering the Defence Force, nothing more, a comparatively narrow base, and in the event you have an integrated Defence Force in which one person, the Chief of Staff commands land, sea and air down to a tactical level, I repeat this makes it unnecessary for the subsidiary commanders to have a right to voice their opinions at the level of a Defence Board. I hope I have satisfied the hon. member.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I would normally have accepted what the Minister of Defence has said, but in the absence of not spelling out all the duties of the

Defence Force and in a situation where section 9(1) specifically says that the Barbados Defence Board is responsible for the command, discipline and administration of and all other matters relating to the Barbados Defence Force, I would find it difficult to circumscribe this particular Board within the confines as the Minister of Defence has just indicated, because it is in total control, not any narrow responsibility for the Defence Force, but the command, discipline and administration. Anyhow, I will leave it at that.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member looks at what is given in this Act, he will get a better grasp. Does he see anything in this Act about the Police Force? And obviously the Police has a defence role. Does he see anything in this Act specifically, for example, related to secret matters? Does he see anything relating to external affairs? Can he not concede that it might very well be possible that only a small Board is necessary to deal with the Defence Force, but there may be bodies which deal with the wider issues which he is raising? Defence is not only going to be carried by the Regiment. In our life time if we are lucky, if Sydney Alleyne and Eric Sealey and the other of their co-conspirators allow us, we may never have to use the Defence Force for anything other than what it has been used for all along. But the Police have day to day activities. What is it the hon. member wants? Does he want to bring other bodies now under the Defence Board? The Defence Board is there to run the Defence Force.

The question that Part II stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Part III was called and passed.

Part IV was called.

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

Dr. CHELTENHAM: I beg to second that.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I may have missed it, but during his introduction of this measure, I think the Minister of Defence did indicate that any member may join the Defence Force directly. In other words, not necessarily on transfer from the colour service to the Reserve Force. It may be my fault in having not been able to read this particular part here directly, but I am simply asking because as I said in my introduction, I would have wished more time to study this particular measure in further detail, but if the Minister can direct me to the particular Clause where this is possible, I would appreciate it very much.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Clause 195(2)(c). I beg your pardon; just Clause 195. If he reads it he will see the point. The first class of the Reserve comprises of soldiers enlisted or deemed to be enlisted or re-engaged in pursuance of this part for service in that class.

The question that Part IV stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Part V was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: This Part relates to discipline; it is the longest Part and is taken from orthodox Acts that come under indictment. I am sorry we have not found it possible to adopt Yugoslav Rules of Procedure to satisfy the hon. member for St. Michael South.

I beg to move that Part V stand part.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: I beg to second that.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, this is a very long Part. It is really not appropriate to do this particular Part in this speedy way. I am just trying to find out where it ends. It goes from section 34 to section 139, so you must bear with us, Mr. Chairman, in this matter. We are cooperating on this side in trying to get this through. 6.05 p.m.

Let me draw to the attention of this House that under Section 40(b) there is some wording here about if a person is guilty of an offence and leaves his "pose" and I believe this must be a typographical error for "post". I am not certain about the niceties of legal drafting but I believe what is written here as "pose" should "post".

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to second the hon. member's amendment, Sir, because I think that is what it is.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I want to move that particular amendment and while on it if I may be bold enough to go down to Clause 46, line 4. There is the second word in that line which is "wheter" which is unknown to the English language, of course, and I would beg to move that that word be changed to "whether".

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to second that. I will make it clear. It is intended to spell WHETHER.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I notice that this Defence Force is also a disciplined force. Alcohol or other drinks should not play a dominant role on members of the Force. I do hope that the members of the Force will be able to live up to these high ideals that are set out in this and that you will not see any of them drunk or disorderly because there are penalties ranging up to two years imprisonment or any other sentence waiting for them by court-martial.

I would like some clarification here. Most of these Clauses have the phraseology "Any person who being subject to military law". I notice that this is excluded in Clause 68. I assume that it is excluded for a good reason because the only person who would be in a position to attest to that would be someone making himself subject to military law but I am just wondering if this is an omission or in my non-legalistic, mind, I am wondering if it is an omission here. I am simply raising a question. I am certain there is an answer for it.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am glad to hear the hon. member. I think this is not only the House of Assembly but it is a house of cerebration. If the hon. member will review it again he will see that Section 68 could not normally apply to a person who is subject to military law since his false attestation would not make him one as such. The Section does arise if the person becomes and remains a subject to military law under this Act and so the subjection of military law is a part of the qualification for the offence.

In other words, if the attestation is not discovered and the person becomes subject to military law he is guilty of an offence which will make him liable to conviction by court-martial but if the attestation is discovered and he does not become subject to military law he no doubt becomes subject to the ordinary law of the land relating to the falsehood. Perhaps there is something else in the Act. I cannot pretend to remember all 136 Sections of this Act.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I take the reference to cerebration and I allow that to pass. I now turn to Clause 70. This is our favourite here, Mr. Chairman, and we have the words "Every officer who, being subject to military law under this Act, behaves in a scandalous manner unbecoming the character of an officer and a gentleman is guilty of an offence and shall, on conviction by court-martial, be cashiered." I am persuaded that this is due to my not reading the other legislation in other Commonwealth countries or may be indeed of a lot of legislation relating to the United Kingdom that I am unfamiliar with this particular legal phraseology of an offence namely, "acting in a manner unbecoming the character of an officer and a gentleman".

I think that was the type of phraseology which you heard – I do not even know the language which they use in military circles, mess house or mess office, is there something called mess? Whatever it is relating to mess. There is some word relating to mess, whatever it is. I think that is the type of language they spoke under Colonel Blitz and others would use that type of language but I do not think that in this day and age we would be creating an offence in Barbados in terms of behaviour unbecoming the character of an officer and a gentleman, which does not seem to me to be precisely the language but I maybe wrong on that. I wonder if the Minister will expatriate on that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have some kind of experience relating to those charges. I once defended a brother officer in the town of Burgenburg in Germany who went out on Saturday night and he had a little bit too much to drink. Nobody saw him in a drunkened condition. I agree with the hon. member because I do not think that many people who serve in the force would like this idea of conduct unbecoming a person because it is much too wide. He leaned against a glasscase and the glasscase collapsed and the pane was broken. They were trying to establish that he had to throw a brick in order to break it but he declared that he was a bit groggy and he leaned against the window and the pane of glass collapsed and he decided to sleep there in the show window right in the light so that when the police passed next morning they found him sleeping inside the shop window.

They could not charge him with breaking and entering because nobody saw him break the actual window so they charged him with conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman. Normally he would have been cashiered but my defence was that if they found him sleeping he was not doing anything and to sleep was not conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman and the senior officer complimented me and they said that I had a very indubious defence.

I am just trying to assist the hon. member because they did not produce any evidence when he was away to show that he had carried on in a drunken manner like that. So he got off on a technicality. I just show you because when the military police found him he was sleeping in this shop window and they woke him up and put him in the jeep and he did not say anything and they charged him with unbecoming conduct. If a man is sleeping you cannot charge him with unbecoming conduct.

I think the hon. member has made a point because it is a very wide thing. I think it is a relic of the old days. An officer may go to a dance and grabble a young lady and say you have to come and dance with me and the Senior Officer may see him and say this is conduct unbecoming a gentleman.

6.15 p.m.

I would hope that in these enlightened days nobody would seek to charge an officer under this section, but I have had the experience of having to defend my brother officers on a similar charge. I did several Courts Martial defending both airmen and members of the Grenadier Guards and also brother officers, but it is the only case that I knew of anybody being charged with conduct

unbecoming of an officer, but to sleep is not unbecoming of an officer or unbecoming of a gentleman. As a matter of fact, a lot of us used to go to sleep during lectures by senior officers, so we could have been charged. That was a little technicality and I think that the members of the Board of the Court Martial are sympathetic about Saturday night affairs when many people go out and have a little too much to drink. They never actually saw him sort of going down the street tottering or anything like that. It is a minor point, but it is obviously a relic of the days of the Bengal Lancers and people like that.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, the standard specimen charge as given in the Manual of military law of conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman is that of Commanding Officer of a company with junior leaders battalion Cadet Corps who exhibited films of an indecent and a disgusting nature to junior officers of his unit. Evidently the hon. member, the Leader of the Opposition, was not so fortunate as to have to deal with a charge of that sort where he might have been forced to view the photographs with a view to determining their indecency or disgusting nature.

Sir, I think the Government can make a concession on this matter. The modern form now in use in England which abolished the category of gentleman in so far as officers are concerned in 1971 is every officer subject to military law who behaves in a scandalous manner unbecoming character of an officer, full stop, and they just leave out the words "and a gentleman", and if the hon. member wishes to delete the words "and a gentleman" I think the Government will accept it. If the hon. member wishes to delete the words I will on behalf of the Government permit their deletion.

There is a further possible amendment. The word "cashier" is no longer used, the dictionary definition of "cashier" means dismissed. The present form is with or without disgrace, but I do not think I can easily give way on that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am just saying that in the Interpretation Clause there is no definition for it. I think that cashiering started as a slang term in the British Army and has now sort of come into the language, but I think if you are going to use the term "cashier" that it should be in the Interpretation Clause or somewhere, I do not think that we could just accept it like that, because it may be in the Webster's Dictionary or the Oxford Concise or something like that. It did start off as a slang term.

The amendment which the Hon. Minister has suggested, I think, is one that we could well adopt. An office is supposed to be a gentleman, so it is almost tautologous to suggest..... Supposed you find that the person is guilty of conduct unbecoming an officer but yet it was conduct becoming of a gentleman, then you would be in real trouble, so I think that the term "and a gentleman" has a real snob value and could probably be eliminated in legislation which we pass in this House.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I would move the deletion and the amendment as seconded by the member for St. Thomas.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I would consider the point made by the Leader of the Opposition about "cashier" but cashiering is a punishment provided in other parts of the Act, and I am told it is a dictionary definition and it will also be contained in the Regulations, and therefore I am fearful at this stage to undertake the rewording of punishment, but I give the hon. member the assurance that it will be considered.

I think the matter of an officer and a gentleman actually goes a little further than that. I think that conduct of an officer referred to military and conduct of a gentleman referred to social matters, so I think you could be convicted of conduct unbecoming a gentleman generally although it had no bearing on military matters, and was not automatically conduct unbecoming an officer. That referred to the Army out in India, the young officer who persisted in paying court to the Anglo-Indian ladies and so on could be asked to leave the Service because of their unwise choice of paramours far less that of wife, and it persisted a very long time indeed.

The hon. member would not have been here to recall that in 1943 the Commanding Officer at Atkinson Air Force Base in British Guiana put up a notice saying that the population of British Guiana consisted of (1) English whites, (2) Portuguese whites, (3) persons of mixed race, and (4) Indians, Negroes and others, and underneath it said officers' dates shall be confined to Class 1, to a limited extent, if approved, to Class 2, and that would have been conduct unbecoming a gentleman, one presumes, Sir, by the standards of gentlemen in the American Army at that time. I think we can get rid of this, but I will ask the Hon. Leader of the Opposition for forbearance on the matter of the word "cashier". It does have a dictionary meaning apparently.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not think that the Hon. Prime Minister really understood me. I did not ask for it to be deleted but I was suggesting that it could be put into the Interpretation Clause rather than leaving it to the Oxford Concise or even the Cambridge, if there is such a dictionary. That is how I feel about it, because I know it is a slang term which was imported from the Indian Army. I was not suggesting that we should delete it wherever it occurs, because obviously that would put us in difficulty. It means dismissal and the reduction of

your status and everything else, but I think that some definition of "cashier" ought to be put in. That is all.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I will ask the hon. member still to bear with us. I believe it means dismissal with disgrace and it would involve redoing section 77. Apparently, Sir, there is a difference between officers and soldiers; soldiers are discharged with ignominy and officers are cashiered. All these old phrases are rooted in so much tradition, so much has come from the Indian army, as the hon. member says, that I would really like to read carefully. I understand his point about interpreting it properly, but I think that all officers know what to be cashiered means. The hon. member will no doubt have seen officers cashiered. We have had the misfortune both to be acquainted with a West Indian Air Force Officer who was cashiered for a sexual offence and degraded with some ignominy, I believe, on a parade square. The hon. member would know what I am speaking of, and I really do not believe that anybody becomes an officer without knowing what is involved in cashiering, and indeed what is involved in this clause, but I will second the hon. member's proposed deletion of the words "and a gentleman". 6.25 p.m.

So there are three amendments: "Pose" to "post"; "wheter" to "whether"; and deletion of the phrase "of a gentleman". Subject to the direction of the Clerk, I wonder whether the motion could not be made at the end that Part V as amended stand part. However, if he says we should do each amendment separately I would be happy to call them one by one.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not think we need to put each amendment separately; we can put the Part as amended.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest you take each amendment separately because there is at least one other amendment which I have to move which I think will meet with the approval of this Committee.

The question that the word "pose" in Clause 40(1)(d) be amended to "post" was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The question that the typographical error "wheter" in Clause 46 be amended to "whether" was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, in dealing with the Part as a whole, there are offences and in the penalties under these offences, in only a limited number of the offences are the penalties prescribed; and in another section where we deal with similar offences there is provision that where similar offences are tried by military tribunal that the penalties should not be greater than those which would be imposed by a civil court, but at the same time the civil authority is not prevented from punishing an offender who has already been punished by a military court, but there is provision that the legal civil authority may take into consideration the fact that the person may have been punished by a military court. To give an example of what could happen. I have had on few occasions to sit as a member of a court martial and at other times to defend soldiers and officers in courts martial. And to give a specific case: a solider takes up a vehicle without the owner's authority, drives it into the town and gets into trouble, perhaps runs into a telephone post. He was charged with about three or four offences – and this is an actual case – unauthorised use of a military vehicle, causing injury, driving without a licence, etc. He was then charged in a civil court. Actually, the particular offender was given a fairly severe sentence on one of the charges but was still charged in the civil court. It is a cardinal principle of the system of law under which we operate that no person should be punished more than once for the same offence; but there is specific provision in the Act here that the fact that a person has been before a military court does not preclude his prosecution before a civil court; but there is a provision that the civil authority can take into consideration – probably on evidence being produced by the Police or by an officer from the Defence Force – the fact that a particular offender has been already given some punishment by the military authorities. I think that is a fair provision; in other words, what you are saying is that you do not take the jurisdiction of the civil courts of this Island merely because a person is a member of the military establishment. And that is as it should be. But there are lots of offences under which a person who is subject to military law is liable to be imprisoned and no limitation has been set on the imprisonment, although where the offence is a civil offence as well you should not normally impose a greater penalty insofar as imprisonment at least is concerned than the civil authority would have power to impose.
6.35 p.m.

Right through the Act if you go through it – it is not only in Part V – they say that a person should be liable to imprisonment. They do not say two years or three years or seven years, and that could mean for life. The other thing that I am concerned about is this: There are courts martial and courts martial. Normally what you have is a person called a Judge Advocate who is a legally trained person. Some of these offences are serious offences. Right here in Barbados, as far as I know, two offences only which are subject to capital punishment.

There are several offences under the Act where a soldier can lose his life as the result of a decision of a court martial. In addition to the normal offences under the Civil Law, there are other situations where a soldier in the case of desertion in the face of the enemy – I

will not worry to itemise them – but a soldier can actually be sentenced to death by a military court. I am not satisfied that in the Act there is provision that where there are serious offences being committed it is mandatory that a Judge Advocate, other than an ordinary officer or a tribunal comprising two or three or four officers would be making such a serious decision.

I do not like to refer to what happened in Trinidad, but there was a situation in Trinidad where there was a mutiny; and it is true that the people who were on that particular court martial did not sentence any of the people to death, but they gave them very long terms of imprisonment; but they had the authority to impose the death penalty. Now, we know that one of those persons, Brigadier Acompong himself, was recently summarily executed by a court martial. Yet he was sitting in judgment on officers of the Trinidad Defence Force; and one of the members of the Trinidad Defence Force who was sentenced by Brigadier Acompong is now a member of Parliament.

There was no Judge Advocate. Dr. Williams, the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago, thought he was doing an impartial thing by sending all over the Commonwealth, getting people from Nigeria and Ghana, people with no legal experience, as far as I know, and putting them there to pass judgment on Trinidad soldiers; but there was no Judge Advocate. I had the distinction of serving on courts martial with Lord Russell, the Judge Advocate General, a great jurist; but down here anything can happen. Any number can play. No legally qualified person sitting there in cases involving capital punishment.

I think we should look very carefully at that provision because we saw what happened in Trinidad. It could easily have gone the other way. Just by bringing in people from overseas does not invest them with any sanctity as far as I am concerned. They must have a certain amount of legal training and legal knowledge. There are certain offences that are normally committed like being absent without leave. Imagine a man absent without leave – I have been absent without leave for two or three hours so often that I cannot even reckon the number of times. There is no provision in the Air Force. You miss the train. Your leave is up on Sunday night and you do not get back until Monday morning. You are absent without leave. Here it is six months imprisonment. All that happens in the Air Force when you are absent without leave is that you are confined to barracks for seven days or 14 days. You can play dominoes, whist, ping pong or anything but you cannot go outside the gate. Being absent without leave is nothing to put anybody in prison for, but they have it inside here.

But, Sir, what I am particularly cautioning the Minister of Defence about is this: your provision for courts martial should specify the occasions on which it is mandatory for the Judge Advocate or the Judge Advocate General or a legally qualified person to be a member of the Board. Otherwise you are going to run into trouble. The other thing I want to draw to the hon. member's attention is that nowhere in the laws that we have passed in Barbados up to tonight have we ever imposed a penalty without a limitation on that penalty. There are certain limitations in the Act; that leave it to the discretion of the court martial or even the officer who is sitting as a court orderly room officer to impose a penalty including imprisonment for an indefinite period on somebody who may have committed a relatively minor offence.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Sir, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has spoken quite learnedly on that. I myself have been concerned about these large number of offences that we are creating under the law with no provision for legally trained persons to be present to ensure that the members of the disciplined force get the type of assistance and can get the type of fair trial outside of the rough justice that may be given or handed down by a court martial. I do not know if the Minister wishes to reply to that point first or whether I should go on to another clause. I am at the disposal of the Chamber. All right, I will go on to the point I was making.

I wish to turn to Clause 72 which carries the subhead of "Disgraceful Conduct", and it reads as follows: "Any person who is subject to military law under this Act and is guilty of disgraceful conduct of a cruel, indecent or unnatural kind is on conviction by court martial liable to imprisonment for two years or any less punishment provided by this Act."

I am just trying to findout what would be these – I do not know if this is an impossible question I am asking here; but what would be these acts, this conduct of an unnatural kind? "Unnatural" may be taken to mean "against nature or contrary to nature," as interpreted by those who are interpreting it at a particular time. I think, Mr. Chairman, it is well known that where you bring vast numbers of people together it is not unknown that certain acts take place. I do not know if it is any reference to the "gay guys" or gay conduct or whatever it is; and I am wondering if this would be an offence; because more enlightened jurisdictions have taken a more liberal view of these matters. I am just trying to find out exactly what you are talking about here when we refer to persons guilty of disgraceful conduct of a cruel, indecent or unnatural kind.

What are we going to do in this particular disciplined force that we are talking about? What type of offences, because there are many people brought together with different backgrounds, different interests and different proclivities; and I really would like some expatiation on this particular matter. What may be considered an act

of an unnatural kind? Are the "gay guys" to be embraced under this particular phraseology?

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, with your permission I would like to go back to Section 53(2). 6.45 p.m.

I just want to get some clarification on this. It says "For the purpose of this section a person is guilty of drunkenness if, owing to the influence of alcohol or any drug....." and I would like to enquire from the Hon. Minister if "drug" here is being used in the sense that you are dealing with dangerous drugs, or if it is being used in a wider sense and therefore any drug can qualify, because I would like to point out that a member of the Defence Force may be using drugs medically prescribed, and some drugs, as we know nowadays, can influence people's judgment or behaviour to some extent. I would like to caution that as this now stands "any drug", you may very well be leaving it to somebody who may want to embrace all drugs, even drugs which may be medically prescribed for a person at a particular occasion, or the person may be thinking of dangerous drugs as embraced by the Dangerous Drug Act.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not know who to deal with first. The point by the Leader of the Opposition is a very heavy point. It is a deep and serious point and requires a rather more studied answer but the point relating to indecent, unnatural and cruel conduct does refer largely tc sexual offences. The Manual of Military Law provides an example of cruelty, the throwing of a cat against a wall, cruelty to animals, but in regard to indecent and unnatural, the Manual of Military Law suggests, and I have no reason to doubt that this is the interpretation, that notwithstanding that homosexuality between males may not any longer be illegal in Britain and homosexuality between females has always been legal in an army, it may still amount to indecent conduct and found an offence under this section. I am persuaded that this is necessary for purposes of discipline. In all armies of which I am familiar, homosexual conduct between soldiers even of equivalent rank is an offence. The United States Army and indeed the United States Navy have been going through the toils in the last three or four years; the Air Force, I think, has had male homosexuality and the Army has had female homosexuality. There were the problems of being in the Navy. The Navy true to form has had heterosexuality charged as an offence right even up to this year with a midshipman's case, I believe which is current, a female midshipman having sexual relations with an officer-instructor at Dartmouth Naval Academy, and the Officer-instructor and the midshipman have all been charged with indecent conduct under the corresponding section of the American Naval Discipline Act. That is what it is. The American Air Force recently drowned out a Sergeant, hon. members will recall, for homosexuality and he has been writing up his story in numbers of respectable newspapers; I think the Washington Post took him up. The American Army has drowned out a number of women for lesbian conduct although lesbian conduct is not normally an offence in the United States no more than it is in Barbados, and as I said already, homosexual conduct has come under punishment in the United States Navy. Of the three, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the only one that the American Supreme Court if it reaches there is likely to overturn as a military offence may very well be the heterosexual conduct. They may very well say that heterosexual relationships between soldiers of equal rank should not necessarily be criminal, although for all I know they will preserve the old regulations which for example prevent and Army Nurse having sexual relations with anybody but an officer, because she herself is automatically an officer by virture of being a nurse and was acting in scandalous conduct unbefitting an officer in having sexual intercourse with persons of the rank of Sergeant and below. But to mention all these examples is really only to say that I know of them and to say that they illustrate to some extent the hypocrisy in sexual matters of mankind.

I myself do think there is some merit in restraining sexual relations between soldiers certainly while they are in camp or while they are in close proximity where their relationship to each other may have an effect on discipline, and I must say, Sir, that I do think that the restraint should be general. I do not know if the hon. member is raising the raison d'etre of the section or if he is merely asking for a clarification of what is meant by "indecent".

As far as unnatural is concerned, the standard example is sexual abuse of an animal. That is a standard example of what is meant by unnatural conduct. I am not aware of and nothing in the Manual of Law suggests to me that you charge a soldier with unnatural conduct if he has a sexual relationship with another soldier whether of a lesbian nature or buggery or indecent behaviour as between two men. Unnatural refers to matters which bring in the animal kingdom or no doubt bring in depths of sadomasochism that are not considered usual in ordinary society. I myself would be extremely hesitant about altering this section in any way. It is a section which by its wording accommodates differing attitudes relating to what is decent and what is not decent, what is natural and what is not natural, and I think that it cannot be predicted what view a Court Marshal will take on heterosexual conduct or homosexual conduct whether between men or women.

Again I turn to section 53 relating to drunkenness. I cannot see any reason why there should be any limitation on drugs. I believe there is a leading case called Armstrong and Clarke in which the taking of insulin was held to constitute an offence under the appropriate section. The British section is slightly different because it binds malingering and drunkenness, but I again cannot see any reason to limit the application of this section to noxious

drugs. A soldier has a duty to keep himself fit. If he is a diabetic and manages to remain in the Army, to my mind he has a duty not to take an overdose of insulin; he has a duty not to take an overdose of dispirin if that would make a man unfit for military duty, and I think if the hon. member realises that drunkenness is punishable not only as a matter of order but as tending towards malingering, I think he will appreciate that the ambit of section 53 cannot be limited. You must prevent soldiers from taking anything that makes them less capable of being soldiers. It may seem a little hard, but we are dealing with people who accept military discipline.

Now section 76, that is the section raised by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, raises to my mind very profound questions of military law because it raises.....

Mr. SANDIFORD: I wonder if the hon. member would give way, because before he deals with clause 76 and the broader implications, I am having a little difficulty with the language of section 76(2).
6.55 p.m

My copy reads: "For the purposes of this Act of a civil offence is an offence punishable by the law of Barbados" and that to me makes no sense. I do not understand what this particular Section, Section 76(2) means. It does not make sense to me. I will not take it upon myself to suggest what are the words that have been omitted between the word "Act" and "of" in the first line. It is clear to me that there are some serious omissions there.

It reads: "For the purposes of this Act of a civil offence is an offence punishable by the law of Barbados." Cerebration does not indicate that this is correct and therefore I am wondering. Maybe the Minister has the correct words.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I must admit, Sir, that I have some doubts about Section 76. For example, in Section 76(4) I am going to move an addition to add the words "in Barbados" because the Section would not really have any meaning unless it is clarified. This Section (4) is one which gives rise to difficulties because it is written in imperial history. We would not have any difficulty if you read the American Act. It is necessary to stop British Soldiers from committing treason in Hong Kong. In other words, conspiring to overthrow the Hong Kong Government, and if they commit treason in Hong Kong, as I understand it, they can be court-martialed in Britain for that treason. If they commit treason in Britain they cannot be court-martialed, they would have to be tried by the ordinary court.

Now that answers to some extent the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition which is that in respect of very serious offences, the court-martial cannot proceed to trial. He can only charge and the offender will have to be handed over to the Civil Court in Barbados.

Sub-section (2) which has been raised by the hon. member, clearly has either a redundant of "of" or an omission which itself may need a word Act or omission after "Act". It may well be an omission. Those words may well be the ones to appear in some form or another in the Act and I do think that if you read this Section carefully you will have certain difficulties understanding the circumstances which will activate sub-clause 3(a) in the light of sub-clause (4) because sub-clause (3)(a) speaks of conviction by court-martial of treason or murder but sub-clause (4) forbids the charging of a person with treason or murder under this Section.

Now I am told that to add the words "in Barbados" in sub-clause (4) will resolve this difficulty but in the light of the question raised by the hon. member for St. Michael South and my own doubt, I am going to propose that we take dinner when this clause is considered but in respect of the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition, the point is very well taken and his point about the Trinidad court-martial is a deep and profound one.

Of course they were acting under legislation much more flawed than this because they had that very unfortunate regulation common to Colonial Forces which in the last analysis was designed to save the British Officers administering the law of a commoner who were given an order by the Governor or a Commanding Officer to do something, and in pursuance of that, serious mischief ensued, murder, treason and whatever; the Commanding Officer had the power to forgive by certain courses of conduct the action of the Junior Officer and this is in fact what happened in Trinidad. They claimed treason and this was compromised by the combination of the relatively beneficient attitude taken by the Colonel, subsequently Brigadier, and the operation of the legislation under which they were performing and the Trinidadians really found themselves in an enormous difficulty. None of us will be told after all these years that he who lives by the sword dies by the sword, or he who lives by the bullet has to be slained by the bullet, and by a lieutenant bullet too.

One can see how these things escalate and how unfortunate the whole Trinidadian thing was. I think that one of the benefits that Trinidad has had over and above the benefit of an increasing oil price is that the Trinidad people rallied around the election institutions of the country and queried the rebellion but I am sure that all hon. members would wish to avoid the dangers of having these serious offences to try and not having qualified people to preside at the trial and having to hunt about for a court-martial and so on and this Section is designed to ensure that those serious offences can be

tried by a Civil Court. That is what Section 76 is designed to do. The Defence Regulations also lay down that the Defence Board can appoint a Judge advocate to court-martial where this appears desirable so that the court-martial will not be bereft of legal advice which all of us know that the court-martial needs to a large extent.

The points raised by the Leader of the Opposition are very well taken and he can be assured that the Government will be vigilant in the areas which he raised and the Defence Board will be alert to its duties to the extent of making Resolutions relating to the matter of legal advice at court-martials.

The other matter is that I will now ask Your Honour to report progress to His Honour the SPEAKER and ask for leave to sit again so that we can consider Section 76 and whatever amendments may be necessary.

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.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended until 8 p.m.

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

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

On Resumption:-

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. When the suspension was taken the House was in Committee and to that it now reverts.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Clause 76. There are two amendments which I will move to that clause. In clause 76, subclause (2), I will move that the word "of" be deleted. The reason for this is that it possibly forms part of a longer definition but we have refashioned the model from which we took it and therefore not only the "of" but the definition of which it forms part is redundant, being covered by our Interpretation Act. I beg to move that that word be deleted.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: I beg to second that.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I will also move to add in subclause (4) between the words "section" and "and" the words "in Barbados". The reason for this is that this Act is modelled in corresponding British sections which took account of the fact that British soldiers were to be found all over the world. I do not really think it is necessary for us to take such account, it is very unlikely that members of the Barbados Defence Force will find themselves spread over the face of the globe, so we want to make it clear that these serious offences which particularly are offences such as those to which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition referred as being too serious to be dealt with my Courts Martial that may not have full complements of judge advocacy, we want to make it clear that these offences – treason, murder, manslaughter and rape – if committed by a soldier will be tried by the civil courts.

That is the purpose of that amendment and I beg to move that these words be added.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: I beg to second that.

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

The question that the words proposed to be inserted stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, now that we are finished with these amendments, I wish to go on to section 85(3) (vi) on page 78. There are some words here which read as follows: "extra guards or" and then some word here "picquets". I must confess, Mr. Chairman, that I do not have access to a military dictionary and I do not know if this is a spelling that is current in military jargon, whether it is one of these anachronisms which let us say a poet like Spencer in the Fairie Queene or any of his other poetic effusions might have been interested in, but I have searched – I must admit it is only the Webster's dictionary, not having the prestige of the Shorter Oxford Dictionary – I am sorry, I have the Shorter English Oxford Dictionary, and I cannot find the meaning of this word which would make any sense in this particular context. I have searched and I have discovered that the word as spelt in this particular subsection here can refer to some card game. I am certain the Minister of Defence can enlighten us in this particular regard in which the lower numbers would not be taken into consideration, but that area is foreign to me.

When I searched further I discovered that the same antique spelling is in the Jamaican legislation, and this is a matter which I adverted to earlier in my second reading speech about the copying of these antiquated expressions which have very little relevance to modern English usage and which should not really form any part of the legislation that a Parliament of Barbados in

1979 should be attempting to put on the Statute Book. All of this is with the proviso, of course, that this is not a military term known only to those persons – what do you call them? The judge advocates? – People who study military law. I know we have some experts on debt collecting and so on, the member for St. James can enlighten me on this, for he has some colleagues who are expert in that area, and it is a very lucrative field.

I do not know, but this particular word is antique and there must be a more modern spelling for it. It certainly could not refer to a card game because I believe it must be an offence for any person subject to military law to be playing this type of card game, whether it is poker or piquet or whatever it may be, it would have to be an offence. I do not know, but I am drawing it to the attention of the experts on this matter. I am only a layman, but my feeling is it should not be in here unless there is some explanation for it, so out of an abundance of caution – I would not go in for the *ex abundante* or whatever they say in their Latin phrases – but there must be some explanation for it.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member really should not tempt me, because if he wants cerebration he will get it in full. "Picquet" has a number of meanings but they all derive from the French "picquet". In fact, I am not correct in saying that, because if the hon. member is a student of Confederate military history he will remember that Colonel Piquet who led the charge at Graveyard Hill at Gettysberg when by which time he was a Brigadier when he was a Colonel he invented a rifle bullet, an elongated bullet, and they were known as pickettes, and they were spelt p-i-c-k-e-t-t after Colonel Pickett and that is the only known military use of "pickette" with which I am familiar where you do not use a "q".
8.10 p.m.

I am not sure what the hon. member is after; I am not sure if he is after the changing of "picquet" to "picket" or "piquet". I myself do not know what the punishment of the picket was in the 16th and 17th centuries, although I suspect it had to do with lying on stakes. I do know that picket duty is akin to guard duty and could be spelt picket, picquet or occasionally piquet. In the Indian Army nearly all the references are spelt picket. You will find it in European operations because the expression "picquet" is used in the British, French and German armies with a "q"; the "q" is a little more common way. I believe that in this section "picquet" means "guard"; but I will not be put off by the hon. member's drawing attention to the antiquity of the spelling. He will not find it, I think, in Websters, the American dictionary and I would be surprised to find that any American Army use the spelling with a "q". I doubt you will find it in Chambers – that being a Scotish dictionary – but you will find it in all its forms in the Oxford dictionary. And if the hon. member refers to the complete volume of the Oxford dictionary he will no doubt find it with the literary references. The spelling goes back to 1690, the use of the word picquet meaning a guard, and punishment goes back to the regulations of 1781. Is the hon. member happy about all that? As far as I am concerned, in 1979 we can allow ourselves a little anachronism and spell the word p-i-c-q-u-e-t, the spelling which was in vogue previously. If the hon. member wishes to learn a little history I can lend him this book by Mr. Norman Roger Buckley titled "Slaves in Red Coats" when regiments were raised in the West Indies from our ancestors of black colour as opposed to our ancestors of white colour; he will no doubt find that in those early days the slaves of red coats were posted in "piquets" rather than "pickets".

I really think that this point is one I am very unwilling to alter at this stage. The punishment of picquet is there; indeed we have overtaken – it is no longer used in the British Army Act but I am quite happy to leave it there.

Mr. SANDIFORD: If the Minister of Defence wishes to leave language and phraseology that is as antique as this, if his Defence Force is to be one made up of antique phraseology, that is all right with me. I have studied the etymology of words in a way he hasn't studied it, so what he says is no news to me. The word is not known in Websters dictionary, but he says it comes from America. I am not really concerned about all of that, and even where you get the word in the Webster dictionary it is not spelt in this way. My feeling is that in spite of whatever gloss – semi-learned or otherwise – that may be put upon this word, this is yet another instance in which words and phrases have been taken over lock, stock and barrel from the Jamaican legislation. This is my feeling, and I don't think when we are drafting legislation in 1979 that we should include these antique words and antique spellings; because after all – and make no mistake about it – there is a serious challenge to the Minister of Defence and the Defence Board that this same piece of legislation which the members of the Defence Force must understand there is a serious training function that rests upon the commanding officer. We may go through this Act and point out the major problems but they have to live with it and I hope there is a serious attempt made to educate members of the Barbados Defence Force as far as the terms and references and penalties and other related matters with which this particular Bill deals and that they have ample opportunity to understand all of this. So if you want to put in antique words to confuse members of the Defence Force and others you can do so. I can do the same research that you do with the Shorter Oxford Dictionary or any other dictionary and trace the history of the word, because each word has a history. But it is the members of the Defence Force who have to

understand these things and I would have thought you would try to enlighten people rather than try to confuse or obfuscate them.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Would the hon. member tell us what the word means? Because sometimes you can only be sure if you are looking up a spelling if you have an idea of the meaning. Does the hon. member understand what the word means having read the dictionary?

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, may I move on to subsection 4 and bring to the attention of this Committee that there is another word in here – we are trying to improve the legislation, that is what we are trying to do – there is a word "invloves" – maybe we will be told – on page 79 Clause 85–4 somewhere in the middle of the page – the only line beginning with a bracket – inside the bracket you get the word "invloves". This must be a printing error and I would move that the word be altered to "involves".

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

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

The question that Part V as amended, stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Part VI was called and passed.

8.20 p.m.

Parts 7 to 12 inclusive of the Bill were called and agreed to.

The first and second Schedules of the Bill were called and agreed to.

The third Schedule was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Paragraph "9" appearing in the third Schedule be deleted, and the words "9. Barbados Territorial Waters Act, 1977–26" be substituted therefor.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: 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 Schedule as amended be the third Schedule of the Bill.

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

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

The fourth Schedule was called and agreed to.

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

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

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

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

On separate motions of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ACCESS ROAD

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I move that Item No. 1 relating to acquisition of land be the next Order of the Day.

Item No. 1 was called – Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land required for the construction of the Spring Garden access road and for further industrial development.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, when this matter first came before the Chamber, further consideration was postponed due to the fact .....

Mr. SPEAKER: Before discussion on this Resolution is resumed, I would like to state that when it was last before this Honourable House it occurred that the Leader of the Opposition moved that further consideration be postponed. I recall that the Hon. Prime Minister rose subsequently and attempted to move that further consideration be postponed. I stopped the Hon. Prime Minister and intimated to him that the Leader of the Opposition had already made such a motion.

Now, upon reflection, I recall that it was a Government motion before the House, and as such no member of the Opposition could have moved that further consideration of a Government measure be postponed. It would have to be done by a Minister of Government. I therefore cannot allow it to remain on the record as it stands, and I invite the Hon. Prime Minister to state the position clearly, that a motion for further consideration of a Government measure must be moved by a member of the Government.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I agree with Your Honour.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the Minister of Communications and Works is winding up, but I want to make it clear that I have not yet spoken on this matter.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the object of the postponement on the last occasion was to ensure that hon. members would have an opportunity to see the sketch plans of the area; and members will appreciate that detailed engineering plans could not be produced at this stage because it would be impossible to do all the necessary engineering work on site.
8.30 p.m.

The Plan has been circulated and the objections which were raised on the last occasion, as I understand them, have not been met, and therefore this is the position we are at now, and accordingly I commend the Resolution to the House.

Hon. C. L BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I am getting more and more confused in this House as we go along, because it does not appear as if hon. members have followed the debates, because it seems to me.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I would advise the hon. member take his direction from the Chair and there will be no confusion.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: As far as I recall, in the midst of the debate last time it was suggested that the debate be postponed because in a series of acquisitions of this nature it was necessary that an outline plan be laid before Parliament so that everybody would know exactly what was taking place. All I am rising to do now is to formally lay the plan on the Table of Parliament and then everybody can see what is happening. The Leader of the Opposition drew to the attention of this House that when the East Coast Road was being constructed they had to lay a copy of the plan in the House, and we postponed on the basis that we would bring a copy to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now clearly understood that the Hon. Minister is not now winding up the debate on behalf of the Government.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I do not understand how they can want a debate when they said they did not want a debate last time unless they had a plan. I do not see how they are going to debate it unless the plan is produced, so I am at a loss.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay before the House a copy of the plan showing the turn of the road and what acquisitions are necessary in support of the Resolution that is now before the Chamber.

Mr. SANDIFORD: If hon. members are concerned, I will not detain them any longer.

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, you know that in this Chamber I always address the Chair, and on this occasion I am happy to do so, because I know that you use that Highway 1 very frequently and you are subject to delays and so on on that particular highway, and like myself who live in the good parish of St. James you welcome any measure which may speed up the flow of traffic which may pass on that Highway 1.

I merely wish to state that during this debate I certainly formed the impression, and it may be my mistake, that it was some external agency which was holding up the progress of the Government as far as this Spring Garden Road was concerned, because I heard complaints about having to get pre-feasibility studies and feasibility studies and post feasibility studies and all that is involved in getting a project for the approval of international agencies ready. Little did I believe until the hon. member for St. John raised the point that the Government itself far from being held up by external agencies was holding up itself in having the plans ready at that time, and even, at this particular moment do not have the very detailed engineering drawings ready which would form part of the presentation that would inevitably have to go to international agencies for approval as part of the project for financing. We heard a lot of talk about external agencies holding up the Government and it has so turned out that apparently it is the Government itself that is holding up the Government. That is my understanding of the situation. So while there may be good grounds for blaming the slow, tedious and tortuous procedures of international agencies, where we ourselves as a Government may not be ready, I do not see how we can blame international agencies for that.

Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to get an assurance that all of those persons from whom land is to be acquired have been treated with the ordinary courtesy of being informed, of letters being sent to them and that somehow or other they do not wake up one morning and see the workers of the Ministry of Communications and Works or of Lands and Surveys or wherever they may come from, from whatever particular Government Department strolling all over, around, about in on their properties without knowing what is going on. It would be very disquieting if there are any persons here listening whose land is being acquired and who have not been given the cour-

tesy of information directly without reading it in the newspapers that the Government is acquiring a particular piece of land or parcels of land for public purpose. I would like that assurance because there are disquieting rumours going around that certain land owners or at least one land owner has not been given one word by the Government that his land is being acquired or that the Government intends to acquire his land, and if that is so I believe that it is a gross dereliction of duty on the part of the appropriate Ministry to seek to acquire people's land without directly informing the land owner or land owners of the action of the Government. Simple courtesy would indicate that in all circumstances where the Government is attempting to acquire land it is not enough merely to put a notice in the Official Gazette or in any of the newspapers which may be published in this country, but there should be some direct contact with the owners of the property that the Government requires the parcel or parcels of land for public purposes. I want to get the assurance that for all of the lands referred to in these schedules the owners have been informed by letter directly to the owners or by contact through the telephone in personal conversation with the owners of these parcels of land that the Government intends to acquire them for public purposes. I would hate to know that in this country we operate simply by publishing something in the newspaper or in the Official Gazette that the Government needs a parcel of land for public purposes and that is that. I do not believe that is good enough in democratic open Government in Barbados.

That is the point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, I have seen the plan and here again I hope those persons whose properties may be affected by this road – this is another assurance I am seeking – have been informed, and I am calling upon the Minister to make the information available to this House and inform this House that the persons whose property may be affected have had direct contact over and above a general publication.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure the hon. member is aware of the fact that he is just repeating himself.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am not aware of that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: You have been told so by the Chair. 8.40 p.m.

Mr. SANDIFORD: You asked me if I am aware and I said I am not aware. I am seeking the assurance from the appropriate Minister that all persons whose properties may be affected have had direct communications on this particular matter.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member obviously has not followed the Land Acquisition Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Minister reflecting.....

The Hon. Minister has already spoken on this Resolution. He was given permission to lay on the Table of the House the drawings.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any other hon. member who wishes to exercise his right to speak?

I take it you are now winding up for the Government.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I would imagine so, Sir, if there is no other member who wishes to speak. Sir, this Resolution is for the acquisition of this land which is taking place. I just want to reply very briefly to what appears to be some charges. I believe there are charges laid on the doorstep of the Government hopefully that all letters have been sent out.

I can only come to the conclusion because I have never heard this argument put forward before by the hon. member for St. Michael South so I can only conclude that somebody must have drawn to his attention that they have not received a letter or letters. I want to very briefly say that I have the fullest confidence, I repeat, the fullest confidence in my Permanent Secretary and the officers involved that they would have sent out letters to the individuals on more than one occasion and that the acquisition notice was in the papers and that it went through all the necessary legal procedures whereby to carry out the acquisition.

I do not know if you are talking about Mr. Pile. I do not know if there is a specific complaint from an individual. I am prepared even now to withdraw it, let him tell me who the person is and I will investigate it so I do not know what is this big speech on. I thought he was going to criticise the length of the road or the width of the road. As the old people would say he like he is taking up somebody else's fire rage.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE BORROWING BY THE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION OF AN AMOUNT OF $2.5 MILLION BY THE ISSUE OF DEBENTURE STOCK

Item No. 4 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the borrowing by the Natural Gas Corporation of an amount of $2.5 million by the issue of Debenture Stock.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, this is a simple Resolution required by the Natural Gas Corporation Act to permit the Natural Gas Corporation to approve the borrowing by way of debentures of a sum of money of $2.5 million to carry out an expansion programme. The Resolution sets out very clearly what the expansion is, Sir, and I am sure that hon. members will be in full agreement with this Resolution which seeks to ensure that such Natural Gas as we have in Barbados is used to the maximum benefit especially in view of the fact that the supply of fuel nowadays is very important in each and every country. I commend the Resolution to the House.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, in principle one would like to support this Resolution but there are a number of points which one would like some information on. It is very easy to come here and ask the approval of this House for the borrowing by the Natural Gas Corporation of the amount of $2.5 million but I would like some details as to how this money is to be spent.

There is a suggestion in the Addendum on how they intend to spend this money but I would like more details for the very simple reason, Sir. We have noticed in the past that when Government guarantees the borrowing of money by Boards or by Corporations very often there is not enough information being available to really permit members to come to an understanding or to support the intentions of the Minister or Government that this Resolution or this guarantee be given.

What comes to mind is how is this money going to be paid, when, in what phases and what is the likelihood of the Corporation or the Board being in a position to repay this money or whether the Government will be saddled at some future date in writing off this money or paying off this loan. I think we have had enough of this in the past that we should now be taking adequate steps to ensure that when we come here to ask the House for a loan that the particular Corporation or Board has gone into the matter carefully and the operations of that Corporation be such as to ensure that the repayment of the loan will be made and that Government will not have to come at some future date and pay it off.

Sir, when we look at the importance of Natural Gas in Barbados at the moment, one can look at it from a different angle. One may ask why it is that Government is guaranteeing this kind of money and why is Government not in a position....

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: On a point of order, Sir. I think the hon. member is mistaken. The Resolution is not for a guarantee. Under the Natural Gas Corporation Act the Corporation cannot borrow without the approval of Parliament. That is what the Resolution is for, approval.

Dr. CADDLE: I take your point. What I am saying is that at the moment gas in Barbados is a very important matter and I think coming to the House at this stage to approve the borrowing of this large sum of money by the Natural Gas Corporation, one would expect the Hon. Minister to go into some detail about the future expansion of the Natural Gas Corporation in Barbados in some ways as to satisfy the expectations of a large number of people in this country.

For example, in Black Rock there are many people who would like to know why they cannot get natural gas although they are so close to the pumping station in Spring Gardens. There are also people in other parts of Barbados who would like to know when they will get natural gas and hearing about this borrowing of a large sum of money they would like to have some detail as to when they could look forward to having natural gas in the area.

We appreciate the importance of this because the expansion of the Natural Gas Corporation in Barbados can very well redound to the benefit of Government as reflected in the ability of Government to reduce may be or abolish it to some extent in that they will not have to be importing gas from Trinidad or Venezuela or somewhere else and that is important to all of us.

In addition to this, apart from the wonderful building that is going up in Wildey we would like to know what is the present space of the network in this regard. 8.50 p.m.

Some time ago I recall an exercise was being conducted in Barbados to detect whether or not these pipes in this country were still worthwhile and whether we would have to replace them at some future date, and I would like to hear from the Minister in his reply the results of that survey. In addition to this, people like to talk about what is the actual position with gas supplies in Barbados, and we would like to know what is the present position with natural gas in this country. Certain operations by a certain oil company have stopped and people would like to know also what is the prospect for the operations of gas and maybe oil in this country in the near future, and at this particular time whether such a large sum of money is to be operated by the Natural Gas Corporation.

I believe the Minister should have given the House and the public of Barbados some insight to the policy of the Ministry and the Natural Gas Corporation on their exploration, supply and use of natural gas in Barbados.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, unlike the hon. member for St. Michael North Central who just sat down, I rise to give my voice in support of this Resolution for the

Natural Gas Corporation to borrow $2.5 million in order to expand the distribution facilities of the Natural Gas Corporation.

It is my understanding that Barbados is in the position now of being able to supply all the natural gas needs of the island for a considerable period of time. The sad situation I would comment upon is the fact that present distribution facilities are seriously inadequate to provide for the installation of this service to the number of homes in the island that would need it. In the St. Michael West constituency, for example, where it is my honour to represent, we have a situation where in 2nd Avenue, Grazettes there is natural gas service and next door in the 3rd Avenue there is none. Furthermore, in the Brighton area, Westbury and the Deacons Court areas where natural gas runs in the main just up to the road there is none in these areas, and I am very anxious to see this service extended to all the constituents in St. Michael West and surrounding areas that need this facility.

We have seen in recent times the spiralling of the prices for natural gas and this is creating a reasonable hardship, if I may put it that way, with home owners in these areas. The natural gas service will significantly reduce in my assumption the cost of fuel to these homes and it will as well serve to improve the quality of life if distribution is extended to these areas that are now not receiving service. So, Sir, I would like to hear the Hon. Minister tell us that St. Michael and environs which already have some limited service will have that service extended before we embark on elaborate projects to get service down to the remotest corners of the earth. I would like to be able to expect that as I just mentioned 2nd and 3rd and 1st Avenue, Grazettes would get the linkages. A couple of yards of pipe is all they require to get service into those avenues where now one or two avenues have that service, and in supporting this Resolution I should like to hear the hon. member give us some word as to the distribution pattern that will follow upon the award of this permission that the Minister is seeking to $2.5 million for the expansion of natural gas service in the island.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, instead of supporting the Resolution for $2.5 million I would certainly like to see the Resolution here before us for something like 15 to 20 million dollars. We are very conscious of the position of the country in terms of finance, and we know it is not easy to spend money willy-nilly, but I do not believe there is anybody in this Hon. House who can speak with the feeling that I can speak with on the question of natural gas.

In the constituency of St. Andrew, the constituency that I have the honour to represent, has for many years been supplying the island of Barbados, the areas that the last hon. member spoke about and the member before him, supplying those areas with natural gas. The member for St. Michael West referred to the fact that there are certain areas within his constituency that have natural gas and some areas that do not have, and I look forward hopefully to the not too distant future when all areas of his constituency and the areas of St. Michael will be well supplied.

My situation is peculiar in the sense that I am like the man who is a shoemaker and has no shoes. The people of St. Andrew for years have been supplying from a well known as Well No. 19 at Gregg Farm all the natural gas supplies in this island. We are only now hearing about Woodbourne in St. Philip and Christ Church, but until they came on the scene there was Gregg Farm, Turner's Hall, and Springvale in St. Andrew. What is the position of the people in St. Andrew? Is it fair that their resources should be raped? I really seriously mean that. Should they do this for the benefit of other people who consider themselves far more enlightened? Is it fair that other people should have the benefits of natural gas and things like that that are basically from those areas and those people should be called upon to burn wood and cow dung? And I put it in straight, simple language.

I want to see in an expansion of the natural gas system that the areas of St. Andrew – and the natural gas main runs very close to the area of St. James and to Orange Hill as well, and very close to your constituency as well, the constituency of St. Peter – and I want to see practical developments taking place within those areas.

Mr. SPEAKER: First.

Hon L. B. BRATHWAITE: First, and I would like to see that if the question of money is involved, and if it is because of a lack of money that the Resolution rather than coming for $2.5 million, which is very laudable in itself and which has my wholehearted support, and I believe the support of all hon. members of this House, that we have a Resolution coming down for treble this amount of money in order to satisfy the requirements of the people who live in these remote areas and who over the years have been supplying the needs of the people who supposedly live in the more enlightened areas.
9.00 p.m.

I think the time has come when some people should not be regarded as first class and people in other sections regarded as second class, and I sincerely hope that the people involved – especially the Natural Gas Corporation – will see the need to develop a scheme which will not only concentrate on people in the Christ Church and St. Michael areas but it will look into other areas, especially those areas that have supplied the resource over the years in order to give Barbados the natural gas it has been able to supply over the years.

Mr. ALLEYNE: Sir, I believe the people of St. Michael North West have achieved a great deal through

this Parliament, but nothing would please their hearts more than to know that the large number of people in that constituency will get natural gas. I mention this because it is one of the matters which I have in my files and a matter which is frequently raised when I speak to my constituents. This is the number one problem in St. Michael North West, and I would like to see areas like Wanstead Gardens, Wanstead Heights, Black Rock, Rock Dundo Park – all these are densely built-up housing areas, and I make this plea because I want to be assured that these people get their share of the national cake.

Mr. SISNETT: Sir, the hon. member who has just sat down has made mention of the need to have natural gas in his constituency, and I share his views. There are other members in this Chamber who would wish that such service is extended to their constituency. But the hon. member for St. Michael North Central has raised a few interesting points and I feel it is part of my duty to reply to a few of them because it seems to me there is some doubt in his mind as to what the Resolution is all about and to how the money would be utilized. The first point is that the hon. member was for some time in the previous administration Minister of Communications and Works, and if I am not mistaken he was responsible for natural gas and he should know that there is but one main which supplies natural gas throughout the country – the one which runs from Woodbourne to the Belle – and he should have realized that if there was a disruption of that particular pipeline then there would not be any natural gas available to consumers. What the Resolution seeks to do is to have three additional pipelines so that in case there was disruption of the present main we would have alternative sources. We will be having a pipeline going from Woodbourne to Oistin, Woodbourne to the airport and one from Turners Hall to Lancaster. Because Woodbourne supplies some 95% of the natural gas produced in this country and Turners Hall supplies the remainder, that is why it is essential to have these pipelines and also because of the anticipated increase in demand for such a service. So there should be no doubt in his mind as to why we are asking for this. This administration plans to extend the natural gas supply and that is why we are expanding the facilities and we hope this will help to solve the problem.

Another aspect of the Resolution which the hon. member seems not to be clear about is that the Resolution seeks to provide a service in the Wildey area. There will now be a service for the people in St. Michael South East, and this is due to the extention of the Barbados National Bank which is now spreading its wings across the Island. So we are not only thinking in terms of a facility which will extend the consumer item of gas but also a facility which will be accommodating the economic boost which the Prime Minister has given Barbados. And we anticipate further extension of the headquarters of the Natural Gas Corporation because of anticipated increased volume of consumption, and that is why we are making sure now that building costs are not that great that we provide for this, so that when building costs go up later we will have already built at cheaper cost. It is a matter of thinking ahead and knowing exactly what to do so that the people of Barbados can benefit.

9.10 p.m.

I want to say a word on the Resolution before the House, and as the hon. member for St. Andrew has suggested, instead of a mere $21 million, I would have preferred to see some $30 million or $40 million in a national thrust to make Barbados self sufficient, not only in natural gas, but perhaps self sufficient in all of its energy requirements I would like to see a Board set up on natural gas that would regulate all gas products in Barbados, and dealing with LPG and the petrol that is sold for vehicles etc. I would like to see such a Board taking full command of every aspect of gas – sales, regulations, policy and everything.

As regards bottled gas, the Ministry of Agriculture and Consumer Affairs receives quite a number of complaints from housewives throughout the country, complaints of the nature that the supply of gas this month did not last as long as it did last month. They complained of buying a pig in a bag, and there are numerous instances where accidents have occurred in many households in Barbados because of leaking containers. Again I would like to see a Natural Gas Board taking complete charge of these cylinders and making checks over the length of time to which they have been used and making checks to see whether they are leaking at the top and the bottom, and getting these cylinders out of service when they are inadequate for commercial consumption.

One of the other points that I would like the Minister to explain, if he has the information, is to note what thrust the Natural Gas Corporation is putting into off shore exploration for oil. I believe that we should not at this point let up on our thrust of making Barbados self sufficient in oil at a time when this commodity is not only so scarce on the international scene, but is so costly. I believe that if you could give a financial injection to the Natural Gas Corporation, perhaps for off shore drilling, we may be sitting on a bonanza just waiting to be explored; and I would want all hon. members of this House to give the Natural Gas Corporation its support in exploring.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Are we now looking for natural gas or for natural oil?

Mr. SISNETT: Mr. Speaker, I think that Barbados is looking for both. I want to see a serious approach taken.

One of the problems that hon. members may not realise, and on which some of them have spoken is that you have and area supplied with natural gas, and the adjoining area is without natural gas. I myself have taken sample house surveys and my findings are really stunning. One of the major problems is the refusal by some landlords to grant permission to their tenants to dig trenches and that is surprising. Again, there are some people who are aback of people to the front and it is a question of crossing the land. Another question is that of having to till the land, and the landlords do not want the land tilled. Another problem Sir, is that landlords do not want holes bored into their houses for the installation of the natural gas service; and stunning as it may seem, in the Brittons Hill area there is one tenancy with at least 30 houses, an area in which there is natural gas; and these 30 tenants have approached the landlord who have been refusing to allow the Natural Gas Corporation to install Natural gas in the area.

I believe that these are problems on which you will have to educate people so that we can better utilise this commodity which is one of our natural resources; and I think that the Ministry of Consumer Affairs will shortly get this legislation, I am told Sir, and we will do our best to educate people into the use of gas. Some of the consumers themselves are afraid of using gas for fear that it might blow up. They do not know, or some of them do not know how to attach the cylinder to the stove.

Mr. SPEAKER: The people in St. Peter will be only glad to show you how they appreciate it.

Mr. SISNETT: And I am quite sure that with your capable guidance, Mr. Speaker, they will know, but some of the consumers themselves switch the gas on and then go looking for matches; and I would like to see the Ministry of Consumer Affairs putting out some leaflets on the use of gas. I would also like to see a Gas Board set up to test the safety of these containers, and to ascertain the exact quantity of gas that goes into them whether they are 20lbs or 100lbs. I would like the Board to take full control of all gas products that are being sold right here in Barbados.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to reply shortly. Some hon. members seem to have forgotten that we had a very long debate before, during the Estimates as well as previously on this question of natural gas. I pointed out then, and I will repeat now that in the present state of the supply of fossil fuel in the world, all Governments have to ensure that the maximum economic use is made of any fossil fuels that they have in their territories and all that they can command.

We have been advised that the best economic use for natural gas in Barbados at the present moment is to use it for the best commercial and industrial purposes; and the reason is very simple, that in respect of domestic use, the natural gas rate of return is insufficient at the present rates to justify a wholesale extension of pipelines. You have the cost of pipes. You have the cost of digging and the cost of re-instating the roads; and 34% of the cost of the extension of pipelines in Barbados goes to the Ministry of Communications and Works for reinstatement of the roads. Bearing that in mind, the extension of natural gas has to go to the great users of fuel with a view to preventing them from using fuel *vis a vis* bunker "C" fuel and other things.

I have pointed out before that there was a dichotomy in that commercial and industrial consumers were paying a rate twice the rate of the domestic consumers. It was uneconomic with that rate structure. Well, we have reversed that. Take the object of the Resolution. As the Parliamentary Secretary has said, it is very clear that we have a very tenuous system of distribution. We have one transmission line from Woodbourne which supplies 95% of the gas, and if anything went wrong with – because it is an open line on the surface, put in by the previous administration instead of having required that it be buried, they had it on the surface across the St. George's valley. If a tractor misses and has an accident at one or two points and that natural gas main transmission line was to be breached the vast majority of consumers would be affected and there would be trouble in getting gas.

We had a man here who was advising us and he suggested that what we have to do is to loop the line from the source of supply, from Woodbourne in St. Philip to Fontamara in Maxwell where you previously stopped, so that in the event of the main transmission line having an accident, you will have a loop and you will be able to feed it back. We also had some problem with the additional source of supply at Gregg Farm in St. Andrew in that they wanted to loop that from Gregg Farm to Lancaster which would mean that we would have a double system, and this is the primary purpose of this Resolution.

9.20 p.m.

In addition to that we had the question of the building. Everybody knew that for fifteen years the Natural Gas Corporation Headquarters in Bay Street was a national scandal situated right next to the busy Bay Street traffic, with people working in very inhuman conditions, and when I first became Minister I visited and and you will remember I made a statement then that I was dedicated to seeing that new Natural Gas Corporation Headquarters would be rebuilt, because I could not understand how people could work in those conditions, and therefore we went ahead with the planning and building of a new headquarters. *(Asides)* He may have chosen the site. If you tell me that he chose the site he

was the one who chose the sight bringing the line from Woodbourne in the air instead of being underneath the ground and exposed to all kinds of blasts and all kinds of things; so I do not have any faith in his choosing of any site.

Dr. CADDLE: If the hon. member would give way, I should just like to correct the impression.....

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

Dr. CADDLE: I said, if the hon. member would give way, and he has given way. I should just like to correct the impression that I had anything to do with the laying of the pipeline. It has nothing to do with me; it might have occurred before I took charge of the Ministry of Communications and Works.

Mr. SPEAKER: You could have laid it in St. Peter.

Dr. CADDLE: Thank you. What is true is that the selection of the site for the present building which is going up was done when I was in the Ministry of Communications and Works. The plans started then.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I am very glad that the hon. member agreed with me that when the Natural Gas was under his control that there was a need for a new natural gas headquarters. We are building it and we have put on a third storey because it is the declared intention of this Government to create a National Petroleum Corporation, and the National Petroleum Corporation will occupy the top floor, and while the building was being built the National Bank was looking for a site in Wildey to expand the National Bank. This Government believes that the National Bank should be given all kinds of help, and the National Bank is willing to finance an extension on this site for the purpose of having a branch, so that we will now have a Natural Gas Corporation building in which the Natural Gas Corporation will become a landlord to the National Petroleum Corporation and to the National Bank using up the space there.

As far as the question of rate of return is concerned, we are trying our best to see that the Natural Gas Corporation continues with its honourable record of being one of the most successful corporations. From the time the Barbados Labour Party Government in 1948 had the courage to say that all petroleum rights in Barbados belong to the people of Barbados and nationalised and took over the then Gas Company, the Natural Gas Corporation has been a profitable corporation and I pledge to see that it continues that, and it is in the context of priorities and profitability that you will get the extension.

Now the hon. member for St. Andrew has a point. We have been investigating the question of extension from Gregg Farm particularly to Greenland, because it is known that in Barbados we have resources which we are now documenting and putting in a map and testing to see the economic possibility of the clay, silica sand and things like that and that is under constant investigation. There is some work that has to be done to two of the wells there, and that is part of a special study, but we are quite willing and we see that in the not too distant future there will be an extension in the St. Andrew area with a view to supplying industry that can be developed in that area to exploit the raw material that they have down there. Discussions are going along there, but I do appeal to hon. members to remember that on the question of energy today all governments in the world have got to ensure that any fossil fuels they have within their control are put to the maximum economic benefit for the country as a whole. At the present moment we have been advised that we should start it at replacing Bunker "C" fuel to the large industrial and commercial consumers as opposed to the granting and extension of household usage of natural gas, and that is the position. Of course, in the course of the year we will do some and that is our position, so that domestic consumers are not altogether neglected, but they are lower in priority.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, there is an urgent matter here. The other side has been given notice of this. It is a Resolution for $516,000, and this is to implement a Budgetary Proposal to ensure that all Government pensioners received a pension of not less than $150 a month. Obviously we have to supplement the vote.

I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply to consider this Resolution.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1979-80 No. 4

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this matter arises out of the Budgetary Proposals, and it is to ask for a supplement to supplement Head 20 Item 4 which relates to allowances paid to Government pensioners. As will be recalled, Mr. Chairman, all Government pensioners who are receiving pensions of less than $150 per month are to have their pensions made up to

that amount. There are approximately 1,548 pensioners who have been receiving less than that sum. It is being paid by way of special allowance because it really would be extremely difficult to amend the Pensions Act to make provision for it, so it is being paid by special allowance in the same form as the former cost of living allowances. We have not so far been able to pay because the very many changes made in the Budget have placed a heavy burden on the staff of the Accountant General and the Ministry of Finance and other Ministries, all the old age pensioners to be paid, all that income tax to be given back, new tax tables to be prepared and so on, but we would like these pensioners to get their money in July backdated to 1st April. We would like them to get their four months backpay at the end of this month, and I therefore ask the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for St. Michael South West before the Leader of the Opposition arrives if this matter could be dealt with in all its stages today, and they assured me that the majority of the Opposition is in favour of so dealing with it. I do not know who in the Opposition is against the pensioners getting the $150 in July, but I am confident that all hon. members will support this initiative by the Government.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

9.30 p.m.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I will like to assure the hon. Minister of Finance that the Opposition supports this laudable exercise and we hope that the money would be paid very soon after the passing of this Resolution to the pensioners and we also hope that at some future date we will see another review of the financial status of these pensioners with a view to further enhancing their pensions and I would like to assure the Hon. Prime Minister that we support it and we wish him well in this undertaking.

The question that Head 20 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

On the motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Resolution was read a third time and agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3 is the instant Order of the Day.

THE BARBADOS TOURISM INVESTMENT CORPORATION ACT, 1979

Item No. 3 was called – To move the Second Reading of the Bill to provide for the establishment in Barbados of a Tourism Investment Corporation and for related matters.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Hon. members will be aware that the object of this Bill is to provide legal status for the Corporation to own the land and the buildings which they are building at Heywoods in St. Peter. We have had debates on many occasions in this House on the Heywoods scheme and I have already explained to hon. members in the House the main provisions of that scheme.

For the information of all hon. members we now have the pictorial representation of the general lay out of the area. I am very pleased to say that we have not only signed the Agreement with the World Bank but that work has started and that the scheme has been drawn up in conformity with our own ideas as to the needs and necessity to shape the original scheme into a comprehensive development plan in Speightstown and that a comprehensive plan has now been completed and it is now before the Planning and Priorities Committee and the additional features of the Heywoods scheme. Hon. members know that there will be a by-pass road starting from just above Cobbler's Cove. There will be an industrial estate. There will be a fisheries terminal and there will be provisions to ensure that the character of the old Speightstown will be preserved.

The development at Speightstown will be something of which all of us should be proud and I am sure, Sir, there will be no one who would be more proud than you, Sir, in your other capacity. The Bill, Sir, is for a typical Statutory Corporation and has been formed in accordance with the provisions that International Lending Institutions have. It is very closely monitored and modelled on the Port Authority Act.

As hon. members will remember the Inter-American Development Bank insisted at that time that they have a Port Authority Act. Similarly, the World Bank at that time said they did not wish the Heywoods village to be run as a department. It had to be run as a Tourism Corporation. We have drawn up the Tourism Corporation wide enough to include any other hotel undertaking that the Government takes up, not only this one but in the future so that it is pretty comprehensive and wide.

I have here for circulation of hon. members, I cannot make it a document of the House, but Hon. members on the other side if they want to have a look can see this aspect of it. We are going to get plans of the re-development of the old Speightstown but work has already been started on one of these roads.

There is one other piece of information I would like to draw hon. members' attention to and that is the additional sea-works which have to be done in St. Peter. I understand that of late a number of houses which are on the sea-side, in particular the market area, have been threatened by bad weather and the sea. Now we have had in Barbados this year some great problems which erosion. Not only there but I understand in St. James in the Folkestone area. It is a large problem and I was just discussing yesterday with the Hon. Minister that we have also received reports of great damage at the Crane.

Now all of these areas the Government has to look into. The preservation of our beaches and our sea coast land is a matter of urgent priority to us and we obviously will have to devote resources in preserving and enlargening the beaches because we believe that all beaches in Barbados should be preserved for all Barbadians so that they can be shared not only by tourists but by Barbadians and tourists alike. We have made our policy very clear on that and we are prepared to devote resources on that. It is fairly obvious that we have to have a comprehensive programme to do remedial work for the people of the South Coast because much has not been really done in the St. James, St. Peter and St. Philip areas.

I know that the Ministry of Environment, Housing and the Parks and Beaches Commission are very concerned about this and we look forward to seeing speedy work done in this area. That scheme is a great improvement on the previous scheme and the public access is very important. We hope to do some remedial work there. Some groyne work was done originally but that is not sufficient. We hope to do a considerable amount of groyne work as part of this scheme and as part of the Speightstown Scheme so that the beach will be greatly enhanced.

Public access will be improved greatly and we will have car parking both on the North and on the East because part of the re-development of Speightstown will include the straightening of the road and moving it a little away from the sea coast where the swamp area is. Now the member knows the swamp area down there and that is the area that has been threatened for a long time. I believe some trees have been lost.

In addition to that, there is a very bad corner down by the Retreat side and the plan which we have will be financed by us as part of our local cost will entail the straightening of that bad corner. I think it is called Six Men's Corner. That will be done so that people coming from St. Lucy in that area will have access to the North side if they want. People coming from this side will have access on the South side and there is a large amount of public amenities.

I think we have done the best we can to provide a comprehensive and integrated development with the rest of Speightstown and it should be a great asset in that our plans include not only the Tourism Development but an Industrial Estate, a new Fisheries Terminal and a Housing area.

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

9.40 p.m.

On the motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

The First Section was called and passed.

Part I was called.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Part I stand part.

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

Dr. CADDLE: I would like to enquire from the Hon. Minister under section 6 here where we are talking about the authorised capital and then we go on to section 6(2) where it is stated that the Government shall subscribe for the initial paid-up capital and may subscribe for any other number of shares at par value as the Minister may determine. Would this facilitate shares to be offered to the public so as to enable any Barbadian to share in any profits?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The Government has to put up a certain amount in counterpart funds and this is the amount of the counterpart funds. After the World Bank loan has been paid back the Government would be in a position to sell these shares, and that is why the words "initial paid-up capital" are used there. As far as I envisage, if I have anything to do with the administration in the future, I would certainly like to see this Corporation do many more developments in Barbados and that there will be as much participation in the shareholding as possible. It is our great hope in the future for hotel development that it would have to be owned by public corporations because I do not see many of these being able to put up the front money to put up hotels of the size we envisage.

The question that Part I stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Part II was called and passed.

Part III was called.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I have an amendment to Part III as follows: Delete the whole of Part III and substitute "(3) No person shall be appointed General Manager, Marketing Manager, Food and Beverages Manager or Finance Manager without the prior approval of the Minister." There was a mistake here in that the General Manager was left out. Under the terms of the World Bank Agreement we have to preserve this clause because there has to be prior consultation with the World Bank in respect of this clause.

Also, in respect of clause 11, add the following as subsection (4):

> "(4) A person who contravenes this section is guilty of an offence and is liable on summary conviction to a fine of $5,000 or to imprisonment for a term of 12 months or both and in addition thereto he is, by virtue of such conviction, disqualified from being a member of the Board."

I beg to move those amendments.

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

The question that the words proposed to be there inserted stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Parts IV to VI were called and passed.

The First Schedule was called.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to move that the First Schedule be the First Schedule to the Bill.

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

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

The Second Schedule was called.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to move that the Second Schedule be the Second Schedule to the Bill.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee with amendments, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.
9.50 p.m.

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

ADJOURNMENT

On the motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the House was adjourned until Tuesday, 17th July, 1979 at 12 Noon.
9.55 p.m.