

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1981 – 86

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, January 25, 1983.

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

PRESENT

His Honour C. L. Bolden, LL.B., (Deputy Speaker)
Hon. L. S. Craig, (Minister of Parliamentary Affairs,
Leader of the House)
Hon. H. B. St. John, Q.C., LL.B., (Deputy Prime
Minister, Minister of Trade, Tourism and Industry)
Hon. H. deB. Forde, Q.C., M.A., LL.B.
Mr. L. E. Sandiford, M.A., (Econ.)
Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, (Minister of Education)
Hon. L. B. Brathwaite, (Minister of Health)
Mr. J. G. Odle, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees)
Mr. B. M. Taitt, B.A., (Hons.) M.A., LL.B., (Hons.)
Hon. DeL. O. Bradshaw, (Minister of Housing and
Lands)
Mr. L. L. Sisnett
Hon. Dr. R. L. Cheltenham, M.A., M.Sc., (Econ.)
(Minister of Agriculture)
Mr. R. E. Brathwaite
Hon. Dr. D. G. Blackman, (Minister of Transport
and Works)
Mr. A. Truss

Prayers were read by Archdeacon F. A. Cayless.

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have been informed that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay:

Statements showing sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders for the months August, September and October, 1982.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Succession Act.

FIRST READING OF BILL

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, a Bill to amend the Succession Act was read a first time.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be the instant Order of the day.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Government Business is now the instant Order of the day.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Order No. 1.

Order No. 1 was called in the name of the Leader of the House (Hon. L. S. CRAIG) – To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the services of this island.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1982 - 83 No. 16

A Resolution for the sum of \$4 845 981 was called.

Head 15 - Cabinet Office.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 15 stand part.

The Addendum is very explicit as to the reason for the several sums. The only one that would merit some explanation, if honourable Members wish, is the one dealing with Contingencies. As the honourable Members would know, the provisions of the Severance Payment Act are being applied to the employees of the Governing Body of Combermere School who, strictly speaking, were not entitled to those provisions. Nevertheless, as a matter of policy, the Government has decided to treat those employees in a similar manner.

As I said before, Sir, the question of the Government's employees' position in relation to severance is one which was dumped very conveniently by those who were responsible for the administration of Government at the time when the Severance Payment Act was introduced. But we have to grapple with this problem, and after the consultations that are going on have taken place, this Government will not flinch from coming before Parliament with a position that should put an end to these *ad hoc* Resolutions from time to time.

Under Item (b), Sir, again Government finds itself having to answer for the misdeeds of an employee of Government. I am not sure what was the fate of the particular Marshal who has been tried, but I cannot go into the particulars as to his fate at this stage, as I understand it

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: It is a reasonable error.)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: It is a very reasonable amount, not error. It is a very serious thing that a civil servant can place another civil servant in jeopardy in that respect. As honourable Members will see, the Crown had no alternative at all but to pay compensation for a person who was wrongly arrested.

I beg to move that Head 15, Subhead 1, stand part.

With respect to Subhead 4 - National Insurance Contributions, again, Sir, this a routine Resolution we have had to deal with in relation to all the Ministries, because at the time when the Estimates were prepared this particular aspect of Government's budgetary measures could not have been implemented, so it was impossible for the relevant departments to envisage that their appropriated sums would not cover this new levy. Accordingly, it has been necessary throughout the year in respect of other departments for a supplement to be passed.

I beg to move, Sir, that Subhead 4 stand part, and that Head 15 stand part.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to second that.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to establish that we are dealing with this on the basis of the Heads rather than the Subheads. As I remember, the Estimates are dealt with on a Head basis and we do not debate the Subheads.

12.25 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I wish to raise a matter relating to the Head under discussion, specifically as it relates to the Cabinet Office in general and the Electoral Office in particular. I am raising the matter because we are being called upon to continue to meet the emoluments for the Electoral Office, and the matter I am raising is therefore germane.

What I wish to ask the Minister in principle is this: How much longer will it be that Parliament will be called upon to meet expenditure for the Electoral Office bearing in mind that a constitutional amendment was passed in this Honourable Chamber, I believe last Session, in which it was determined that the whole question of elections would be conducted by an independent agency?

Now, Mr. Chairman, Sir, we are now nearly two years into the period since the last election and, to date, we have had no indication; one has seen no indication from the Government that it intends to appoint, as provided for in the amendment in the Constitution, an independent body to conduct elections in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I have no intention on this occasion of reopening all the issues concerning the incidents arising out of the last election. I wish, however, to say, that if, indeed, we are to be spared the difficulties which were attendant on the last election, and if we are to be spared the pain and suffering which a number of Barbadians complained about as a result of their intentional or unintentional disenfranchisement in that last election, then I consider it to be unacceptable, and without excuse, that, having passed a constitutional amendment, having

had the required votes in the Parliament of this country for the placing of elections under an independent Electoral Commission, so much time has elapsed and the Government, and more particularly the Prime Minister, who is responsible for this area, has not thought it fit to explain to the people of Barbados why there is the delay in implementing what is in essence a constitutional provision.

I draw to Your Honour's attention that there are already rumours in this community of plans to interfere with the boundaries further. I believe that the people of Barbados, if they are not assured on any other matter, ought to be assured and reassured that they may look forward in the future to elections which they have every right to believe would be fair and honest.

It is therefore very difficult to understand the dilatory tactics of the Government on this issue. It is not your ordinary "run-of-the-mill", day-to-day issue. It is a matter of fundamental importance to the citizens of this country, and I do not believe that one can over-stress the need for the machinery concerning elections to be absolutely above suspicion.

It would seem to me that we have been able, during the interim, to establish a number of offices, many of which may not be considered even nearly as important as this office. It would seem to me that the requirements for the establishment of this Commission are simple and straightforward, and if my recollection of the measure that was passed in this Honourable Chamber is correct, provision was made for the appointment of five persons, three on the advice of the Prime Minister and two on the advice of the Leader of the Opposition.

It is obvious, Mr. Chairman, that the Leader of the Opposition cannot give advice on the appointment of two persons to serve on an Electoral Commission if the Commission has not been established. It is obvious, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the fault for the delay in the establishment of this Commission must rest entirely and completely at the foot of the Prime Minister, who is responsible for these matters as well as being Chairman of the Cabinet.

I should like from the honourable Member who introduced this Head, who must be in a position to understand why there is a delay; or if he is not in such a position, he, as a freedom loving person; he, as an honourable Member who has on more than one occasion indicated that he believes in democracy, should have been leading the fight within the Cabinet, if necessary, to ensure that this matter is not left hanging as it has been left hanging for the last two years.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West, who served as Attorney General during the period, cannot, I am sure, be comfortable in the knowledge that much of what has been described as "far reaching legislation" and "far reaching law reform" has, since his demitting that office, not seen the light of day. One is left only to speculate as to whether he was the only one on that side who could see and appreciate the need for a tidy approach to the legal and Parliamentary affairs of this country.

Mr. Chairman, the queries I am raising take on added significance when it is believed by some of us on this side that the Prime Minister is giving very serious consideration to overseas voting as part of a pattern of Barbados' elections. We have reason to believe so, even if other honourable Members on that side might not be aware that he is so doing. But based on information coming out of the mouth of the Prime Minister himself, I say from my position in this Honourable Chamber that it is not unreasonable to raise the question as to whether the Prime Minister is not considering overseas voting as part of the process of elections in this community.

One way in which we can be certain that, even if that is a rumour, that it can be scotched in the early is for the appointment and establishment of an Electoral Commission, as adumbrated in the policy Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party in the previous Session of Parliament, as outlined by the Barbados Labour Party Government as part of its achievements, and as required by the Constitution of Barbados, it having passed through this Honourable Chamber and having had the necessary assent in all the places it is supposed to have assent.

Asides

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member is indicating that we opposed it. The honourable Member is not known for having a short memory — although he accuses, with his Party, the rest of Barbados for having a short memory — but if he needs to be reminded, he will be reminded that we opposed it on a matter of principle concerning the frame in which the legislation appeared. He will remember that, to the extent it was opposed, it was opposed because the methodology enunciated in the Bill itself was not acceptable, because we do not trust them. We have no reason to trust them and so far nothing has happened to change our mind and make us trust them.

12.35 p.m.

But let us suppose that we opposed it. Is the honourable Member saying that when legislation was passed in this Chamber by the appropriate majority that if it were opposed or if it had been opposed by an

Opposition or this Opposition, that that is sufficient reason for it not to come into force?

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: It will come into force when we are ready to bring it into force.)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member, in the typical arrogance which he has displayed at all times, says: "It will come into force when we are ready to bring it into force". Sir, that is the problem we have in the country today. We have a pristine arrogance which emanates from honourable Members on that side, which is second to none we have seen, especially from a group of persons who led the people of the community to believe that they could be trusted.

I cannot accept, Mr. Chairman, the arrogance which would suggest that a constitutional amendment as far-reaching and as fundamental as the right to vote in free and fair elections would be billowed and tossed on the sea of expediency and treated in a manner similar to the hue and cry which is rampant on political platforms during a time of general elections themselves.

A constitutional amendment is not a matter to be taken lightly, and when that constitutional amendment goes to the very root of the existence of democracy in the community, even less so is it to be taken lightly. That the honourable Member can be casual in his *softo voce* remarks on this issue, is indicative, in my view, Mr. Chairman, of an illness which is permeating the body politic in this community, an illness which finds its head and its root in the attitude of certain members of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I call for a statement from the Government as to the status of the independent Electoral Commission which was enunciated in their policy and which was given birth and concept through an amendment to the Constitution of Barbados. I call for the Government to enlighten the population of Barbados as to when they might expect the appointment of the Electoral Commission, and when, finally, we in this Honourable Chamber will not have to be voting as we are today for funds for an Electoral Office under the aegis of the Cabinet Office.

Thank you for your indulgence, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I want to make two very brief interventions on this Resolution, and the first is merely an observation. It relates to the provision of funds to meet the expenses consequent on the Crown being engaged in litigation either through a tortuous act on the part of a servant or agent of the Crown, or in some other field.

I believe that there is now enough historical evidence to permit the Crown to provide an annual sum in the Estimates to pay for acts of omission or commission on the part of its officers, and I think that the place to provide for such a sum is certainly not within the Cabinet Office, but certainly within the Ministry of the Attorney General, or in the Estimates, for that Department.

The principal responsibility for the conduct of litigation is the responsibility of the Attorney General. He is, in fact, the only officer who can be sued under the Crown Proceedings Act, and it has always escaped my comprehension why the vote for this type of provision should be placed as the responsibility in the Cabinet Office. Some of these matters are routine matters and it does not seem to me to be necessary that they should go to Cabinet every time the Court makes a determination that an act by a servant of the Crown have resulted in the Crown being liable for damages.

I speak about those incidents which are not ensured by the Crown, and I would strongly recommend, as I know I had recommended when I held the office of Attorney General, that there should be a proper vote under that Head to deal with these contingent liabilities which may occur, rather than Parliament having to be troubled from time to time with the type of case which we now have before us.

The other comment which I would like to make, Mr. Chairman, relates to the Electoral Office, and whilst I agree with some of the statements made by the honourable Member for St. Michael West, I really do not completely agree with some of the statements which he has made, although he has not made them as saying that they are true.

To talk about overseas voting is really to create an atmosphere of suspicion about the whole electoral process. There is a degree of overseas voting already, under the electoral laws of Barbados, to the extent that officers in Barbados' Missions overseas are allowed to vote in an election in Barbados. The reason for this is that there is an assumption that, although they are physically overseas, they are still resident in Barbados since, under International law, such officers are treated as resident for all purposes in the country from which they have been accredited. So the concept of overseas voting in that sense is one well recognised by, I think, most systems where democracy, as we understand it, prevails, and it is nothing new.

If we are going, however, to a system of overseas voting where a person, by Barbadian nationality, is allowed to vote in an election although he or she may not have visited Barbados for the last 20 or 30 years, then I wish right away to disabuse the mind of the

honourable Member and say that that has never been within the contemplation of the Barbados Labour Party at any time.

The only source from which I have heard such a suggestion is from, I believe, the President of the Democratic Labour Party London Branch, who has been strongly urging that there be overseas voting, and I would expect that that sort of representation would be made within his party, as he is entitled to do. But I have known of no constituency at all within the Barbados Labour Party, either a constituency in Barbados or a constituency overseas, as we have constituency branches like the Democratic Labour Party overseas, that has ever suggested that overseas voting in that sense should be adopted. In fact, the only suggestion on that score that I have heard from any political person, and I am not even sure it has come as the official policy of the Democratic Labour Party branch in London — it may have been just the views of that particular person — is that there should be some system of overseas voting.

I would not like a statement to be made to undermine the veracity of the country in the democratic process. It is too important that we should try to maintain multi-party democracy in the Caribbean. It is under very serious assault in some Caribbean countries, as the honourable Member knows. There is a serious assault in Guyana in the manner in which elections have been conducted there — I said so when I held office, so it is nothing new for me to repeat it — and under worse assault in Grenada.

We will never, as long as the present Grenadian Government remains in power, ever see multi-party democracy allowed to be practised in that country again. The present Grenadian establishment does not understand, and will not appreciate, ideological pluralism within Grenada itself, and it is a terrible hypocrisy to let Heads of Government issue statements on human rights talking about ideological pluralism when it is not understood within the countries themselves that ideological pluralism must exist in Grenada, Guyana and such countries before they can have it in international relations.

12.45 p.m.

When I was the Minister responsible for External Affairs, I never hesitated, at any CARICOM meeting with them, to blast this type of hypocritical attitude that is now being reflected merely because it sounds as though you are radical. It is ridiculous that in Grenada and Guyana, and Suriname as well, if you have a political view contrary to the ruling party, you cannot express it in the country. And they are talking about ideological pluralism inter-state, but never intra-state!

I believe that the two great political parties of this country have a duty to maintain ideological pluralism

within the country and to make sure that democracy functions properly.

Now, Mr. Chairman, from time to time, both political parties have accused each other of various electoral malpractices. We are far enough from the last election and far enough from the next election that I think we have to get past that stage, and that is why I agree with the honourable Member for St. Michael West, that, since we have set up an Electoral Boundaries Commission, it should be established early enough to be able to grapple with all of the administrative problems which result from electoral lists and which result from re-alignments of boundaries etc.

Some of the problems that occurred in the last election had to do with the re-allocation of boundaries, and the failure of the system — I am not blaming any particular person. I believe that all of us, to some extent — to educate the public as to where they were, and the failure of the public to understand that, if you are part and parcel of a democracy, you have a duty early to find out where you vote, how you vote and the voting area in which you should vote.

In my area, I had instances where people in the same house were not within the same voting area. I believe that it was said that somebody got two leaflets from me. I have known them getting two leaflets from my opponent, too. The reason for this is that, between a list published in January and one published later, they were switch around, and obviously if you use both lists — you use the old list until the new list comes out — you will be sending out two such notices to people — and this occurred in the case of many honourable Members. In fact, I remember on voting day going to the Electoral Office and finding some other honourable Members there, like myself, trying to look at the master register to find out where a person was supposed to vote.

One of the recommendations that should come very early to the Electoral and Boundaries Commission is that every office, every vote polling district, should have a master copy of a whole Electoral Roll available to it on the day of voting to prevent people who come to the place from having to run around to find out where they are registered.

But more important, Mr. Chairman, is that we should set up the Electoral and Boundaries Commission in good time, make adequate staff and funds available to it, and let the Electoral Roll be published, be looked at and be known by everyone, so that well ahead of the next election, whenever that should be, people would know where they have to vote, where they are rightly or wrongly on a roll and so comply with the electoral laws of Barbados.

I recognise that there is an ongoing process of registration of voters. It is a fact that many of us do not pay regard to this until we are reasonably certain that an election is around the corner. Let me give you an example, Mr. Chairman. Within my own constituency, there has been a movement of persons within the last year and a half, since the last election. Some people have moved out more than three months and others have moved in more than three months. Rightly speaking, those who have moved out should be removed from the register, and those who have moved in should now be on the register. But that ongoing process is not necessarily attended to with the seriousness which is demanded of those of us who are in public life, or by the people themselves.

Although the monthly list may have served some purpose, it did not, from my historical analysis of that monthly list, either answer the total problem either. In fact, I believe that the Chief Electoral Officer himself have come to the conclusion that the expenditure of both time and effort on the monthly list was not reflected in the usefulness of the list. I know that some honourable Members will not share this view; I know for instance, that the right honourable Member for St. John does not share this view. But I know that time has come for Government to look at that again, and the Electoral Boundaries Commission should look at that factor to see whether we need a monthly list or a three-month list in order to keep people on a regular ongoing system of enumeration.

In my view, the right to vote is one of the most basic of fundamental rights. It is one that I hope that all Barbadians will be able to maintain. I seriously believe that if you want to have a democracy properly functioning, if you want dissent to be lawful and effective and if you want good Government, you are going to have to give people the right to vote so that they know that they have the right to exercise that vote freely and to be able to change their Governments from time to time. That is the system which, in my view, works better than any other system that I have seen.

Mr. Chairman, do not misunderstand me. I have seen other forms of democracy, in which there has been a degree of democracy sometimes better than in some of the so-called two party states where democracy is not allowed to function better. But I strongly believe that multi-party democracy answers the yearnings of people and does allow proper democratic institutions to function, provided the administrative snags are looked after.

I do not believe that any election held in any part of the world, even in the United Kingdom, has been held without there being some problems in relation to administration. That this is so is shown quite clearly by the

number of electoral cases which have gone before the court, but the system itself has provided a mechanism for correcting errors; and where errors cannot be corrected administratively, has provided a mechanism for legal sanctions to follow.

It is significant that, despite the problems which occur in elections, in the last two, three, four elections, in Barbados, that the number of cases reaching the law courts has been minimal. I do not know whether this shows a lack of enthusiasm on the part of persons to come to the law courts to have an adjudication of rights that, they allege have been abused, or whether, on the other hand, it shows that most of the political verbiage that flows from defeat and what not is not backed by the reality of what has really happened, and that there is not enough information to test the grounds for a case or not.

But whatever there may be, I will say this, that I do agree with the honourable Member that two and a half years is a sufficiently reasonable time to have the new system functioning in order to get away from the allegations which one hears from both sides, both the DLP and the BLP, about tampering with the electoral process. I think we are mature enough; both parties are mature enough; both parties have sufficiently capable people in them to be able to rise against the level of that politics and to ensure that there is a political consensus between us, that the electoral machinery must function properly to bring out the best in our people to have true democratic institutions so that this country can continue to speak from a position of moral strength to those other errant countries in the Caribbean which believe that ideological pluralism should only exist between states, and not within the states between their own citizens.

12.55 p.m.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, at least there is some consensus on this particular matter between the Member for Christ Church West and the Member for St. Michael West.

The House, indeed Parliament, has already spoken on this matter, and a decision has therefore been taken in the highest constitutional forum, and according to the procedures of the Constitution, for the establishment of a Boundaries Commission. The question, therefore, is not whether it should be established, but when the Government will take the necessary steps in order to see that the administrative arrangements necessary are, in fact, put in place. That is the question to which we on this side are adverting.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

We take second place to no one in wishing to see democracy in Barbados improve, and we speak on behalf of the people of this country when we say that there are definite areas in which the mechanisms of democracy can be improved in this country, and one such area is the area of the electoral process.

Arising out of the last elections, there were quite a number of criticisms from voters about problems which they encountered. This is a matter which representatives and candidates from both sides of the political spectrum can vouch for, so this is not a political point; this is a fact.

I am saying that one of the reasons for the problems encountered was the very dilatory manner in which the administrative and other arrangements for holding the elections were put in place by the political directorate of this country. Many of the decisions were taken very late, many of the lists came out very late, in spite of the requests, in spite of the urgings and proposals made from this side for an early determination of such matters. When these things are done in a hurry, confusion normally results.

What we are calling for on this side now is the timely implementation of the necessary arrangements for putting in place the arrangements necessary for an efficient electoral machinery in this country. The decision has already been taken to establish a Boundaries Commission and we would like to know what is causing the delay in the establishment of this body. I think the Government has a duty to this Honourable Chamber and to the people of this country to say what is causing the delay, what steps have been taken since the passing of the amendment, and, now, what is preventing the implementation of the decision of the Parliament of this country.

We are saying that it is very important that the measures which flow consequentially from that constitutional amendment should be put in place as early as possible in order that all persons involved – the voters, the parties, the people of the country generally – should be aware of where they stand so that they will be able to act in accordance with the provisions.

We do not want any hurried implementation of the provisions in this matter. It should all be done in due course and in the full glare of publicity, and I am certain that the Deputy Prime Minister did not really mean what he said when, in an aside, he declared that they will do it in their own good time.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Perfectly correct).

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Well, we know that their time has not really been good. The time has not been good, and the times are not good. We are saying that

the time is the time of the people of this country and that a clear statement must be made and a clear determination of what needs to be done should be told to the country, and that all of these matters, which are not really within the province of contentious politics in this country – they should not be, because they relate to the mechanisms, which should be clear, which should be patent, which should be open – are brought out. That is all we are saying on this side.

The fact that a particular important point has been made by the Member for St. Michael West and supported by the Member for Christ Church West on the principle that these matters should be put early in place, is, therefore, one which has the support of both sides of the House. But the honourable Member for Christ Church West is not on the front bench now and, maybe, cannot bring his considerable influence to bear on these matters.

I hope that the Deputy Prime Minister will enlighten the House on the present situation as far as that particular department is concerned. It is a most important one, and we are deeply concerned about it.

From time to time in the past, coming up to the last election, we made a request that the master lists should be available, if not for each constituency, at least for the two major political parties. As we understand it, the Electoral Office was ready and willing to make such a provision available, but the political directorate of this country decreed that such lists should not be made available.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Maybe the political directorate will explain why they took that decision, but I think it is now well understood that it would have led to a reduction of a number of the problems if such lists had been made available.

Mr. Chairman, I think the point has been made; there is no point belabouring it, but these things have got to be said from time to time.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, whenever a matter dealing with the Electoral Office comes up before this Chamber, there is always a cry from the Opposition benches – “shame” – that the political directorate – to use the words of the Member for St. Michael South – during the 1981 campaign was responsible for their defeat; if the electorate had received their I.D. cards for the purpose of voting on time, and if they had found their names on the register, they would have voted for them and nobody else, and they would have been in power and we would not have been in office.
1.05 p.m.

On the other hand, the Member for St. Michael South made the point that both sides complained. It therefore demonstrates that when both sides had complained that people had a degree of misgiving about the electoral lists, and both sides have complaints, but those who were able to go to the polls and cast their votes, cast them in favour of this Party.

I also complained. I went to polling stations and discovered people with their Identification Cards, but their names were not on the register and they could not vote. You complained, but the people have made a decision.

The Government has demonstrated its willingness to have the electoral mechanism in this country put in order, where there can be no problems, or to try to avoid as many problems as possible. Therefore, there was an amendment to the Constitution.

But what the Opposition is calling on the Government to do is to do it in their time. Do it now! That is your argument. You are satisfied that we have amended the Constitution for this purpose, but you are saying to us, "Do it now."

It does not work that way. We have been given the honour to govern and, therefore, we are going to do it in our time. Whether times are good or bad, we have the courage to do it when we feel we should do it. Then, the electorate of the country will decide who should be in office.

Only last week in here, Sir, at our last sitting, I heard the honourable Member for St. Michael West, already winning the election in 1986, 1985 or 1984, whenever it is to be called. He has already won the election: He stood up in here and said that they have already won the election.

Now, Sir, I do not know when the election is going to be. I do not know if I am going to win a seat. I do not even know if I will be alive to contest one — but you know already that you have won an election. This is the sort of ignorance you have to tolerate all the time coming from certain Members on the other side.

Let us, therefore, examine. In 1971, when the Deputy Prime Minister lost his seat, I know there were problems where they were people who were living in one house, registered by the same person, but found themselves in different polling stations. He lost his seat in 1971.

We were defeated, and I can remember very clearly we were shouting out that the process was wrong, too. I am telling you what we were saying, I know Opposition politics good. We were saying the very same thing

you are saying now. When you are on the thin edge, Sir, you must find some scapegoat, something wrong, but do not quarrel with us. If we have to govern now, we are going to govern as well as we can, and until an election is called and the people determine whom they feel should look after their destiny.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, Sir, during the Estimates there was an amount of money voted for this purpose, or it was to be voted. I have not looked at it, I have not checked it quite carefully, but I am told that it is no longer there.

I can assure the Opposition; as long as I am a member of this party, I am going to give them this assurance — and I believe I have the courage of my conviction, in this respect at least — that I am not going to sit down in any political organization, as long as there is life in my body — I make this boast — and see a party which I belong to set about to do things that will cause an Opposition party not to win a Government by way of foul means. No way! I give you that bold assurance — as long as I have strength and health in my body.

I am not like the Member for St. John, who in 1971 got up one morning and separated Orange Hill from St. James and the distance between Orange Hill and the nearest house in St. Andrew is two miles. And with all the fancy language he was talking about, gerrymandering and how one Lord Gerry from somewhere had won his seat and all sorts of nonsense, I did not quarrel.

He removed 987 votes, but I won the seat — without Orange Hill. And what was the whole idea behind it? He wanted a man called George Moe to win the seat, so he removed the Barbados Labour Party's stronghold, put it in St. Andrew, and said: "Craig has gone through the eddoes". But I had different news for you. I knew that as long as I had slipped your guard in 1966, there was no looking back for me, and I have demonstrated this.

You moved 987 votes in Orange Hill. There is no way geographically that Orange Hill can be in St. Andrew; no way, it is two miles from the nearest house in St. Andrew. There is a place called Springhead in St. James where you only have to cross over a road to walk in to St. Andrew, and he allowed Springhead to remain. You know why? Springhead has in 47 votes, and to get from Springhead into St. Andrew you only had to walk over a track. But the honourable Member for St. John, the then Prime Minister, this old nice, great, honest gentleman, who would not remove anything, who would not interfere with the electoral mechanism in this country, nothing at all, got up one morning, I think almost two months before election, six weeks, and moved Orange Hill. Well, you should be ashamed of yourself getting up and talking about this here. Six weeks before the election I knew, and the country knew, that you had shifted the

boundaries; you and Eric St. John and Howard Roberts. The three of them sat down one morning.....

Asides.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, that is one of the vagaries of democracy. At that time Roberts was there, and on this occasion he is here. There is nothing wrong with that.

I recall very well that when the honourable Member for St. Michael West was in New York, he was for all Grantley Adams, too. He was all a Labour Party man — until he became Consul-General, so I do not mind them.

He used to tell me about the grand old man of politics, and how he was from Eagle Hall, near Sir Grantley's house, and how Errol Barrow, he used to call him "Barrow" at the time — all sorts of nonsense. But then you became Consul-General, and you started pushing up your chest. You are the founding father of the Democratic Labour Party all of a sudden, and a great defender of the faith.
1.15 p.m.

I do not mind politicians with this shifty approach that they have. I therefore, Mr. Chairman, can only support the measure, and I feel quite confident that whenever the Electoral Boundaries Commission is appointed, when we have to go into the hustings, we are going into them asking no quarter and giving none. But as far as trying to do something to erode the confidence of the electorate by way of troubling the electoral process of the country, you can have absolutely no fear. I do not know who is going to win the elections; I simply hope that whenever one is called I will be in the fray, pushing my hand all about your face as I am accustomed to doing. That is what I plan.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to get into the debate on the Electoral Office, but suffice it for me to say that honourable Members on the other side should be gracious enough to recognise that something was wrong with the whole electoral process in the last elections, and that the sooner an effort is made to make that right, the better.

Asides.

Mr. M. A. KING: Everybody has complained about it. You said you had complained about it yourself.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order.....

Mr. M. A. KING: What point of order?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member is on a point of order.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Because of the mechanism of the last election, the honourable Member is in here. Rendezvous had no right being moved from where it was, and you would be outside looking in.

Mr. M. A. KING: That is no point of order, and you know that, too.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order! Please continue.

Mr. M. A. KING: There were two Maurices running and I am the one who got in. That is what is important. I am the one who is here.

Asides.

Mr. M. A. KING: Did you move back Orange Hill? The answer is, "No."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I did not have to move back Orange Hill because we are always championing the area. But the elections are all for five years.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair. No cross talk!

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, I am finished with the Electoral Office.

I wanted to raise a couple of questions on Item No. 12 — Contingencies. Now I will deal with (b) first, because I can get that out of the way quickly. I happen to have a personal interest in this matter in that the person who was arrested, and who was, in fact, sent to gaol wrongfully, was a client whom I represented. So I have declared my interest in this matter.

Asides.

Mr. M. A. KING: The matter is not *sub judice*. Judgment has been entered by consent, as is shown over the page.

I note, Mr. Chairman, that the amount for which provision is sought is the sum of \$7 000, which does not take into account the amount which was awarded for cost. The total judgment ordered by the court was \$8 160 and that was the judgment which was entered. I do not know if provision is made otherwise for the additional \$1 160. I am saying that, in fact, the Resolution as it comes before the Honourable House does not fully reflect the judgment of the court in this matter, because the amount was not \$7 000, but \$8 160.

Now when I came into this Honourable Chamber, I heard the honourable Member for Christ Church West addressing the House, and the point which I heard him make in the course of his intervention was that he did not see why provision for payments of this kind should come under the Cabinet Office.

That is a sentiment with which I agree. In fact, the Attorney General is the Minister responsible for representing the Crown in these matters which come before the Court, and I would think that, where it is necessary for provision to be made for settlement of judgments, the Ministry of the Attorney-General, which is the Ministry responsible for handling these matters, is the Ministry from which the funds should be got, and appropriate allowances should be made for payment out of the funds of that Ministry, because one always runs into the problem of having to wait some considerable time for the settlement of these judgments.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Relieve the anxiety!

Mr. M. A. KING: Yes, it would help to relieve the anxiety in getting these matters out of the way as early as possible.

So it does please me to see that the Resolution has come before this Honourable House. I have great pleasure in supporting that aspect of the matter, but I do express some concern, and have some reservation, about the absence of the amount in excess of \$7 000 which was awarded by the court.

In relation to the first part of that item where provision is sought for making *ex gratia* payments to two maids who were employed by the Governing Body of Combermere School, it seems to me that something has to be wrong with legislation in this country which results in people, who are employed by governing bodies of schools and who are made redundant, not being able to get a severance pay, but the Government has to come, by special provision, to get what is equivalent to a severance pay for them.

I believe that this problem also arises in relation to lots of Statutory Boards, because, Mr. Chairman, you will note that from the Severance Payment Act, apart from public employees being excluded from the benefits of the severance payments legislation, persons who are employed in any employment by any Statutory Board which is in the schedule of the Statutory Boards Act are also excluded.

In the Statutory Boards Act, there are only, in fact, two Boards mentioned — the Child Care Board and the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board. But it does seem to me

that a lot of problems tend to arise when persons in casual employment are laid off from statutory corporations and, very often, are unlikely to get the benefits of severance payments because of some confusion as to what the position may be.

It so happens that a number of cases are now before the Severance Payment Tribunal. I will not go into any detail on them because, of course, to use the proper terminology, the matter is *sub judice*, but there are a number of persons who were employed by the National Housing Corporation who have been laid off or who have been dismissed, certainly in circumstances which amount to redundancy, and the big question arises as to whether they are entitled to get a severance payment or not.

I know that some time in 1974–75, the Cabinet at that time had taken a decision that employees of statutory corporations, who were laid off in circumstances which amounted to redundancy, should get *ex gratia* payments. But I believe the question still has to be answered as to whether those persons in casual employment, who have not reached pensionable service and who have been laid off before they reach pensionable service, are not entitled to the benefit of severance payment legislation.

My feeling is that they probably are entitled to the benefit of severance payment legislation, and that the statutory corporation should be ordered to pay them severance; but then that raises an additional question, which is based against the background that statutory corporations do not, I believe, contribute towards the Severance Fund. Certainly the National Housing Corporation, which is the one now before the tribunal, does not contribute to the Severance Fund, and I believe other statutory corporations as well. I do not believe any of them contribute towards the Severance Fund.

But I do have the strong feeling, and this matter may reach the courts yet, that employees of statutory corporations, who have not reached pensionable service and who, therefore, may not receive pensions by virtue of the Casual Employees Pensions Act, and who are not employees of the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board and the Child Care Board, should get severance payments, and that, as a concomitant of that, that the statutory corporations should be required to make contributions to the severance fund.

I know that the management of the statutory corporations have so far been reasonably considerate, in that they usually tend to make *ex gratia* payments to employees who have given a lot of year's service, but who have been made redundant and would otherwise not be entitled to benefit. But I am saying that something

has to be wrong with our legislation if we have to come here everytime to make special provision for employees of that kind, and that the sooner attention is given to streamlining the law and updating it to take account of these kinds of problems, which are caused by the many layoffs which we are now having in the statutory corporations, the better. In circumstances like that, urgent attention should be given to the legislation so that persons who have given a lot of years' service and who are now being thrown out, virtually, on redundancy, should be able to get some benefit as a right, rather than sitting back and waiting for some *ex gratia* settlement of their problem.

1.25 p.m.

So whilst I support these two particular items of the Resolution, I would urge that urgent attention should be given to regularizing the situation so that constant recourse does not necessarily have to be made to the House whenever it is sought to make *ex gratia* payments in cases of redundancy for persons at the lower end of the income ladder who are made redundant and who are justly entitled to compensation for the service that they have given.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for St. John.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the parish of St. Andrew is bounded on the north by the parish of St. Peter, at the only point where that parish touches the Atlantic Ocean, and on the west by the parish of St. James and on the south by the parish of St. Joseph.

In 1971, there was instituted in this island the first major act of the electoral reform since 1951. In 1951, we had a universal adult suffrage, voting under that system for the first time, and the greatest constitutional change which has been made in Barbados, in my humble opinion, is when the people of this island over the age of 21 ceased to be political hangers and became participators in the process of Government, and that was the year in which I first entered this House, some 32 years ago in December. In 1966, the party of which I was not then the leader of which I was not even the Leader of the Opposition, went to the people of this country in the Manifesto which promised single member constituencies to have representation on a more equitable basis.

The reason why I prefaced my remarks by this little historical excursion is because we have had a great deal of prevarication, from no less a person than the honourable Member for St. James North, on the question of the redistribution of population that took place in 1971, when part of the parish of St. James which, if one reads the speech that I made at the time when it was done, was taken off and added to the parish of St. Andrew purely

and solely because of the three parishes which were adjacent to the constituency of St. Andrew, St. James was the fastest growing in population. In fact, it continued to grow so rapidly that in 1981, the party to which the honourable Member belongs, cut his constituency clean in half, from East to West, and left the Springhead area — the same one he is ranting and raving against our removal of it to St. Andrew, which has been dwindling in population. He did not protest! We had already instituted single member constituencies, and the constituency of St. Michael was divided into eight by a Boundaries Commission set up by this House, and at no time did I wake up and go and deprive, destroy or diminish the constituency of the honourable Member. It was done on recommendation because of the fact that St. Andrew had a then voting population, I believe, of less than 4 000, and St. James, as it continued to grow, was the only parish in which the readjustment and the imbalance could be rectified and could take place.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The honourable Member is arguing about this. But St. Joseph was diminishing at an even greater rate than the parish of St. Andrew. And if you read the speech which I made at that time, on the recommendation of the Commission it was purely a geographical alignment coming along a gully and a river, and the constituency, incidentally, to which I first took electric lights, which had in 47 voters, was right up on top of the hill in Springhead.

If the honourable Member was so perturbed, he should inform Your Honour why it is that when his party had a Boundaries Commission, which was dominated by members of the other side and all their legal luminaries, they did not do like the Romans implied at the time in giving us back our eleven days, why did he not call back for Orange Hill? Why was it then the only part of Barbados that was left untouched in 1981? Why didn't the honourable Member call back for it? Far from calling back for Orange Hill, you know what he did? He said, "I do not want the southern part of St. James; give it to Simmons." He gave up more. He gave up what he did not want. He did not want all of St. James; he only wanted a piece of St. James; and even had a wrangle with the Speaker, when they tried to take off a piece off His Honour, the Speaker.....

Asides.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not speaking of him. I am speaking to the honourable Member; not of anyone absent.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The honourable Member is so inconsistent. If he was so perturbed over Orange Hill being taken away, when they had the Commission, the biggest representation, he should have been like the Gregorian calendar, "Give me back Orange Hill." But he said, "I do not want Orange Hill and I do not want the rest of St. James at all. Just give me a little compact piece that I can handle it. I do not want Simmons up in there." That is what happened! So let us leave that to you.

And then what did they do, Sir? They came in St. John. We left all the rural constituencies and only divided St. Michael. But St. Andrew would have been like a cold pone constituency, so we asked the honourable Member to give us a piece of his generous population.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: He does not want it back; never took it back.

But they went up in the lower part of St. Michael and shafted the honourable Member for St. Michael North West, I think he was at that time, and put a long shaft up in there and shafted him, feeling that this would be a long narrow shaft; came in St. John and took away three different parts of my parish, and then added a piece of St. Philip in order to destroy the majority which the honourable Member for St. Philip had. That is what we mean by gerrymandering.
1.35 p.m.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: There was no General Gerry or anything like that. There was a gentleman called Elbridge Gerry who, somewhere about 1832, was the Governor of Massachusetts, and he went and carved up something like what they did in St. Michael, looking like a lizard, a salamander, a kind of prehistoric lizard – but he still lost – and therefore, they called it gerrymandering. I think he ran for the Supreme Court or something like that.

I would like now to take up the honourable Member for Christ Church West on this business of the actual voting procedures and so on. What happened in the election was that all of us, meaning all of us on both sides, who sent out circulars, including you, Sir, took a list that was supposed to have been published three weeks before the election and notified all of our constituents. Apart from asking them to come and support us, we took the precaution of giving them their registration number and telling them where their polling stations were sup-

posed to be. All of us on both sides did it. And then, three days before the election they published the "St. Vincent list". This is what we objected to. Three days before the election the "St. Vincent list" came out in which they dispersed the Vincentians all over the island. This was 14 600 non-Barbadians – not all Vincentians; only about 5 000 who had excursions, and the people that we had notified where their polling stations were – and I do not mean the Opposition, I mean all the candidates – were turning up and being sent from pillar to post not knowing where they were to vote.

The honourable Member for Christ Church mentioned something about master lists, and the Prime Minister said only one person did not know where to vote.

Aside: Four.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Four? Well, it has gone up 400 per cent.

Why did the honourable Member for the City and the Prime Minister himself have to spend a considerable time – I do not know if it was the whole day – down in the Electoral Office because they were having complaints? Such a thorough job was done of confusing the people, that they were having complaints from their constituents that they did not know where to vote.

I had to drive some of my constituents from Glenburnie to some church in Brittons Hill, where they had never lived, in order to find out where they could vote. We applied to the Chief Electoral Officer.....

Asides.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have never been in that road before, Burke's Road or something like that, in Brittons Hill. They were living and had been living for six years in St. John. Three weeks before, they were on the St. John register, and I had to drive them at 4 o'clock in the afternoon somewhere to some mission, some pentecostal, evangelical, glad tidings, some foolishness.....

Asides.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I was born in the church, man. I apologise to the honourable Minister for sno-cones for appearing to be derisory about glad tidings.

Laughter.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is this, that all of us experienced it. We may have experienced it more than they did, because some

of their people were briefed not to pay any attention to what was in the circulars, and this must not happen again. We used to have a register published every month, merely revised.

A statement was made by the Commanding Officer of the Defence Force not very long ago — the Brigadier or whoever he is — that there is no price too high to pay for security. I am not accusing him of anything. The particular occasion on which he made that statement I do not feel justified such an extravagant remark, but as far as I am concerned, there is no price too high to pay for having a proper electoral system, because that would mean there is too high a price to pay for democracy. That is the point which I want to make, and I do not think that with the computer print-outs that we get nowadays, minor adjustments to a monthly list can cause any financial distress to this Government, even although today we have to sell off a piece of Broad Street in order to pay the legal fees for the honourable Member and the Marshal of the House for his damages.

I am raising this point, and I agree with the honourable Member for Christ Church West, that each polling station at least should have a master list. There were a few master lists and we did not see the master lists, so we could not advise people where to go to vote. Maybe it is too much to ask them to supply each candidate with a master list, but certainly if you have the master lists in the polling stations, then the candidates or their agents could say, well you cannot find it, let us check the master list and see now where they have sent you to vote. When you bring out the final list on which the voter is placed only three days before the election, and after all the candidates, who sent out circulars — that must be everybody — had already notified people where, from their research on the final list published three weeks before the election, the people should have gone, then you are trying to destroy the whole basis of the democratic system.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I believe the honourable Deputy is going on very well. Will he wind up too?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I have to move an amendment to take into consideration the point that the honourable Member for Christ Church West made. I am sure that the House would not wish to deprive him of the just fruits of his labour. I hear that things are tight, and therefore, I do not wish to contribute in any way to the discomfiture of the honourable Member.

The allegations with respect to the last election are now history, as well as the investigations which were held as a result of the allegations, and the results of the investigations have been made public, so that all of this

rehashing of unproven allegations cannot possibly rebound to the credit of anyone.

The honourable Members on the other side know that it is the prerogative of a Government in power, under our constitutional system, to stipulate when elections are held. It is not even two years since we had the last election, but "electionitis" seems to be in the minds of the honourable members on that side. I am positive that in good and sufficient time, well before the next election, that the constitutional amendment will be brought into force. That is all I can tell honourable Members.

We have also, Sir, to deal with one or two other points raised. On the question of the publication of the monthly lists or periodic lists, I think it is all agreed that it is desirable, and I believe the Government has gone on record as saying that it will have quarterly lists published. After all, let us not forget that even if we bring into force the constitutional amendments, we would still have to make provision for bye-elections, because a bye-election cannot take place except under the same terms and conditions in which the previous election took place. So do not let us forget that.

1.45 p.m.

Do not let us forget that so you still have to have some machinery in force dealing with the contingency of a bye-election — and none of us know when there is going to be a bye-election in Parliament. Not one of us knows when there will be a bye-election in Parliament — only the good Lord can determine that — so there must, in any event, be provisions made for the continuation of the office for the purpose of a bye-election.

Now, Sir, I do not think there is anything else, except to say that the question of severance pay for Government employees and Statutory Board employees is one which we readily concede have to be dealt with. After all, it is this Government that has been raising the question of the failure of the previous Government to deal with this issue at the time when severance pay was introduced.

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: But we are having discussions.

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You hear this? It will be dealt with many years before the 15 that you had, and it will not take us our 15 to deal with it — because we are getting the other 5. Get that in your head and put that in your pipe and smoke it.

Sir, this question of the severance pay is one that has to be looked at in the context of a review of the total severance payment scheme, bearing in mind that if you bring in such a large class of employees of

Government, it has a fiscal impact on the amount of expenditure that you will have to have each year because, let us not forget, in Barbados an employee does not contribute to his severance. It is a pure employer's contribution, so we have to ask the actuaries to look at the position. If we are to bring in such a large number of people, we have to look at the actuarial impact on that, but it is being worked on.

And let me assure the honourable Member that there are more Members on this side that make more noise about this every week than the honourable Members on that side, because we have constituents too; we have a lot of constituents who have been affected by these matters and we would like to see a situation developing where we have not only a National Social Security Scheme in respect of severance pay, in respect of unemployment, which we brought in, but, also, we have repeatedly said that we wish to have an integration of the pension provisions of the National Insurance Scheme together with the one in existence in private enterprise and have the situation where you will only have to insure excess.

That is the position that we are working on. It is going to take some considerable period of time. My understanding is that all new entrants entering the Civil Service after a certain day will come in on different terms than the previous ones. After 1974 or 1975, the new entrants in the Civil Service will be different, but it will still take up to about the year 2000 to have it properly worked out. But we are working on it, and we intend to see that this is a matter on which both sides of the House reach agreement.

Now, Sir, the amendment that we have to move, I am going to get the exact amount, but we have to add \$3 500, they tell us, Sir, to the amount of the contingency, and that will consequentially affect the original amount of money as well as the total Resolution. The total amount now will be \$4 849 481 and this particular subhead, under Contingencies, is \$13 619. That is at Item 11, Contingencies, on the last column — Supplementary provision required. In the place of \$10 119 it would be \$13 619.

I beg to move that this Head, as amended, stand part.

The question that Head 15, as amended, stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress to His Honour, the DEPUTY SPEAKER and asked for leave to sit again, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the Leader of the House care to indicate what is his next step?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I was really looking at my watch to bring us up to 2.00 o'clock. I know you normally take the time from this, Sir, and it is a matter of two minutes behind time.

The debate has been relatively lively this morning, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition has been in a very happy and pleasant mood and I hope that it will continue like that during the course of the day. I am sure that when we return from lunch the day's sitting, Sir, should be a relatively interesting one.

I obviously would have to say one or two things here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about Springhead and all of these places and so on, but when the opportunity arises again.

I have no doubt, Sir, that we probably should be ready to break for lunch.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 2.00 p.m. This House Sitting stands suspended until 2.45 p.m. 2.00 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now Question Time.

There are no Questions on the Order Paper.

We now go to Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Order No. 1, in the name of the honourable Member for St. Michael South was called — to move the passing of the Resolution condemning Government for the manner of commitment of Barbados to the Memorandum of Understanding and calling upon Government to seek authorisation from this House before entering upon agreements involving regional or foreign governments.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in moving the passing of a Resolution in these terms:

WHEREAS the Government of Barbados has signed an agreement entitled a Memorandum of Under-

standing with certain governments of the Commonwealth Caribbean relating to security and military co-operation; and

WHEREAS by that Memorandum the people of Barbados are being called upon to commit their financial, physical and human resources upon an undertaking, the concept, scope and implications of which have not been discussed either in principle or substance by the representatives of the people in Parliament;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House of Assembly

- (i) condemn the Government for the manner in which Barbados is being committed to this undertaking, and
- (ii) call upon the Government to give an assurance that in the future it shall seek prior authorisation from this House before entering upon such firm and solemn agreements involving regional or foreign governments.

I would like to start, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by making the following preliminary observation. First of all, I believe that, if pursued along the right line, this can be one of the more important debates in this Parliament during this Session, for it raises a number of very crucial and very fundamental issues involving such questions as: What kind of democracy we wish to build in this country? What is the role and function of Parliament in this country? What is the relationship between the executive in this country? By that I refer to the Prime Minister and the Cabinet, the political executive, and Parliament, that is what is the relationship between the executive and Parliament.

It also raises fundamental issues relating to the regional integration movement and to the deepening of collaboration with the countries of the Commonwealth Caribbean, and then, last of all, it raises the question of what role the military, the men in uniform, should play in our society.

Now each one of these, taken by itself, would constitute a most fundamental theme relating to our national life and to the public affairs of this country. When taken together, and when related to this particular Resolution, it can be seen that some very wide-ranging and some very important matters are being raised.

First of all, let me express the premises from which I support and from which the Opposition starts. First of all, I express a fundamental commitment to the whole movement of regional integration and for the deepening of regional collaboration. Let there be no misunderstanding about that. Fundamentally, I am a federalist. I am committed to a deepening of the regional movement.

Secondly, I also believe that this country requires a small efficient Defence Force whose role and mission are clearly formulated — but after the widest public consultation — and which would be supportive of the role of the Royal Barbados Police Force, as the premier agency in this country for the maintenance of law and order. I do not believe in a Defence Force that will militarise the youths of this country, because I believe that that is a function that we can do without.

I also wish to express my abiding belief and faith in democracy and in Parliament in Barbados. I am a staunch believer in parliamentary democracy. With that kind of commitment it is clear, therefore, that the role, the function, the scope and the operational parameters of a Defence Force for this country must take place within the framework of parliamentary democracy, and this means that the institution of Parliament must be involved, and involved in a meaningful way, in the decision-making process involving the Defence Force and in military matters.

Parliamentary democracy refers not merely to the holding of elections; it refers not merely to going through the motions; it is the letter of the law and it is also the spirit of the law, and the two must go together if we are to have genuine parliamentary democracy in this country.

Parliament, through information, through debate and through the other procedures that have been established over time, must be involved in each major decision affecting this country in a meaningful way. The parliament of Britain was kept informed virtually from the very start of most facets of the recent war in the Falkland Islands.

It is not insignificant that in this country, when our forces were committed to some kind of involvement in neighbouring territories, we had virtually to put a lasso around the neck of the Government to try to get them to come into Parliament to discuss the issue or say something about the issue. It is not insignificant that this particular measure that we are debating now was given notice of way back in November and we are now towards the end of January, and we have been unable until now to have a debate on this matter.

What I am raising is this particular point: we must not be seen to be dealing with important matters in any lazy manner. We must be able to devise a mechanism for important matters to be discussed and debated at a time when they are pressing, and not some eight, ten or twelve weeks after that, when the urgency of the matter has passed. We have to devise a method inside of this Parliament for some particular mechanism to deal instantly with these matters just as in Britain the Falkland Islands crisis can be debated as soon as the troops are on the way. I do not believe that we have reached that particular stage yet in our arrangements.

It is indeed fateful, Mr. Deputy Speaker.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member seems to have lost track of where he is going because the honourable Member seeks to make out that Parliament has prevented him from debating his Resolution before, and I do not think that is correct.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, thank you for your reference to that particular matter. I certainly would not wish to give any impression that Parliament itself has been prevented. I am saying that our own arrangements, how we do things from one side to the other, has resulted in this particular position; but I am not in any way involving you.

It is indeed fateful that this present Resolution which we are dealing with now should come up at this time. It comes at a time when the minds of the people of this country, certainly towards the end of last year and continuing in the new year, have been taking up with this whole question of Barbados' involvement with the International Monetary Fund, and the way in which this Parliament has been involved or, rather, not involved in the processes relating to Barbados' commitment to the International Monetary Fund.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member should remember the Standing Order in which he cannot anticipate a debate of this Honourable House. Since there is a Resolution on the Order Paper dealing with that particular thing the honourable Member would have to be rather careful how he deals with that particular aspect of his debate.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not really dealing with or anticipating any Resolution. In fact, I am speaking after the event.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are speaking after an event. You are speaking on a matter which is already on the Order Paper. If I may draw to the honourable Member's attention, there is a Resolution dealing with the financial position of Barbados; therefore, one would not like the honourable Member to anticipate what is about to happen in that Resolution. It is Order No. 2 on the Order Paper.
3.00 p.m.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I will take the ruling, Mr. Speaker, but I am not really going into that question. I am referring to some facts, but I would not go down that road. There will be an opportunity to go down it.

I am really making the point that on important matters, this Parliament and the people of Barbados have not been treated to the kind of involvement, from the point of view of information, discussion, and debate,

that the seriousness of these measures would merit. I think that that is a point which needs to be made if I am establishing the major point and the premise that if we are to build our democracy in this country, we will have to do better in these particular regards than we have been doing.

I think that I would have, therefore, given the premises from which I stand, to express the views that I am a firm believer in parliamentary democracy and I will use every sinew in my body to ensure that parliamentary democracy is maintained and strengthened in this country. For on this side, we do not believe in any Prime Ministerial-government, we do not believe in any kind of executive democracy, and we do not believe in any form of elected dictatorship. We believe that for us to build a genuine parliamentary democracy, our Parliament must be involved at the crucial stages in the determination of, and in the decision on, important matters of state in this country.

Now, I would wish to charge at this stage that the Memorandum of Understanding that was signed by Barbados and other countries of the Eastern Caribbean, and I am speaking in relation to Barbados, represents a gross dereliction of duty on the part of the Government in committing the money of the taxpayers of this country, the physical resources of this country, and indeed it may commit the lives of Barbadians in this country, young Barbadians, to a concept and an arrangement, the scope the implications of which have never been discussed or debated inside this Chamber. It is therefore a matter which, as parliamentarians, we must view with great alarm and, therefore, we are taking this opportunity to express our views on this matter.

We dismiss any particular suggestion that by off-hand comments, or by means of any particular view expressed in a manner that does not speak to the heart of the matter, these important matters can be discussed or debated in this particular way. References, by means of asides or by means of indirect statements, are no substitute for the making of important statements on important matters inside this Chamber, and that is the particular charge we are laying against the Government.

This particular pact, the military security pact that we are dealing with, raises a number of issues. I will admit from my researches, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that in its 1976 Manifesto the Barbados Labour Party said: "The Party will not commit our country to any foreign defence pacts." That is what was said in the 1976 Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party. That must have been about Page 22, I believe, of that Manifesto for the 1976 General Election — "the Party will not commit our country to any foreign defence pacts." By 1982, of course, there has been some movement away from that particular position. And it said: "We will continue to explore the

co-ordination of our Coast Guards work and services with those of the Caribbean nearest us, namely St. Lucia and St. Vincent, and for whose vessels the repair facilities will be used." I believe those are the repair facilities at a Fort called Fort Willoughby on the Pierhead.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are Barbadians who are raising this particular question: why do we need this kind of military security pact for this country? And that argument continues along the line — we went through World Wars I and II, the gravest military catastrophies that the world has seen to date, without that kind of military security pact.

I believe that the onus is on the Government to explain why this country is in need of a military security pact at this stage. The Government, to date, has not done that in any very coherent or explanatory manner — I mean a manner in which the people of this country can understand and be convinced by — so it is a task which the Government still has to perform, and I hope that during this debate we can get the particular reasons for joining this military and security pact explained.

The second question I raise is this. Can the Barbados Defence Force, fledgling as it is, bear the heavy responsibilities that are being placed upon it as a result of this regional commitment?

There are still a number of issues to be settled as far as the Barbados Defence Force is concerned. It is a very small Force. It is a force which is now in its infancy. It is a force that needs developing, it needs training, it needs resources, it needs facilities — it needs everything — to carry out its role and mission in respect to Barbados itself. To involve that particular force in a regional pact would certainly raise the question: can it carry those responsibilities and those commitments at this particular time in its stage of development? That is a question which the Government will have to supply the answer to. For this force is still in that formative stage in terms of its training, its administration, its general security of its operational procedures.

Secondly, the leadership of the Barbados Defence Force is still very thin on the ground that is far as what we can gather still very thin on the ground.

I believe that the Colonel, well, all the rumours are, will soon be alleviated to the rank of Brigadier-General. Below the Colonel, soon to be Brigadier, whatever, we wish to ask the question, what is the officer level, what are the resources available for the command and administration of this small force that we have in this country.

3.10 p.m.

There are a number of persons, as I understand it, still lacking in experience, still lacking in the resources that more developed outfits would have. There are dedicated and they are hard working, I will say that much, but that is no reason why we must put burdens that they cannot really handle on their backs before the Defence Force is ready for such an undertaking.

In addition, as I understand it, there are a number of advisers from the British Government in this country. They are coming from different cultures, different kinds of training backgrounds and different kinds of experiences. I believe that they may have a role to play; we will still have to hear what that particular role is. I believe some of them may be very good soldiers also, some of them may be very good military men.

I understand that some have proved unsuitable and that, at times, some of the attitudes displayed may not be in the best interest of the development of the force. Maybe the "High Commander" will be able to tell me if any of them have had to be sent back home. I do not know if any of them have had to be sent back home, but the rumours may be very strong that one of them looked at the Colonel, soon to be Brigadier, and said he did not know what he was doing.

I am not really referring so much to the British advisers, but to the need for ensuring that the young officers of this country are given the kind of training and the kind of exposure and experience which will fashion and form them into a useful and efficient officer corps.

I do not know; you see, in between the Colonel and then coming right down, something seems to be wrong in how that outfit, the Barbados Defence Force, is staffed and structured at the moment, because in between you have the advisers, and we want to know, in case of any emergency in this country, can they be called out on service?

There is a certain element of frustration. I am speaking with a great measure of restraint on this particular matter. There is an element of frustration in the Defence Force at the moment, and that frustration is growing among some of our more dedicated soldiers. They have made a contribution towards this particular area of national life over the years. Some of them find themselves now assigned to protocol duties, ceremonial tasks, when the demands of this country perhaps would call for a better utilisation of their expertise.

There is also frustration growing among the volunteer element and among the force reserves. I understand that uniforms have been handed back in as part of that general level of frustration, and we believe that we have got to place greater emphasis, if we are developing a

Defence Force, on that volunteer element. We cannot have a large army of professional soldiers around; we cannot pay them, because that, in a large measure, may be non-productive. So we have to rely on a kind of citizen army, we have to rely on the volunteer element, and in that very element which can make a major contribution towards our forces, there is a certain amount of frustration, and we have to deal with that.

The area of procurement leads us into the question of the cost of the Defence Force. We have had some expenditures, we do not know what kinds of weapons and systems are being used or are being projected for the Defence Force. These are matters which you can take up in respect of any country of the world in any of the magazines or periodicals, but for this country we do not see them, so we have to ask ourselves what is the real purpose of this military, security and defence pact. All of these words about hot pursuit, whom will these forces be turned against?

There is a fear that, when we develop these pacts, the forces could very well be turned against the people of the Caribbean, and this is a genuine fear which any democracy has and must guard against, for, too often, we have seen armies used by those in power in order to sustain themselves in power and to prevent any change of Government. We will not wish that in this country, and we will not wish that in any country of the Caribbean, or any place for that matter, which has a belief in democracy.

I ask the question: what would have happened in St. Lucia if this particular pact were in force and the constituted Government of the day had called upon the regional co-ordinator and upon the Council of Ministers and the "High Commander", who commands the largest element of the regional security pact, to come to the aid of a Government which may have been hard pressed by certain forces operating out of the country?

We must raise these question, we cannot just dismiss them as mere speculation, because history is replete with examples in which the military has not only been used, but misused, by those in power, and therefore we must be on our guard in the Caribbean. We must be on guard that militarism does not develop as a way of life, but we must ensure that the military in our society is harnessed to the democratic forces in the country and is at all times under the surveillance, under the control of the democratic institutions of this country, and that they are part of the parliamentary process. All of these are matters which have to be canvassed, which have to be debated, and for which some answers must be found.

3.20 p.m.

From time to time, I have called for the establishment of a Military Review Committee in this country.

We tend to drift into areas of national life without due and careful examination of the issues involved, without involving the people as fully as they could or should be involved, and then we have to rely on the same people to try to understand when a crisis actually arises and how to deal with that crisis; we have to draw on the resources of the people of this country. Therefore, I have called for that Military Review Committee to identify the tasks and omissions of the Defence Force, such as may be suitable for Barbados and to decide what resources and organizations may be necessary for the efficient accomplishment of the objectives of that force.

But, so far, I have been ignored on this, just as I was ignored in the late 1970's when I drew to the attention of the Government the need to take certain steps. When in 1981 I told the Government and the people of this country that Barbados was facing a crisis and that there was need for a Task Force to be established to study and to make recommendations on those dimensions, the front bench, all to a man, except my representative — I do not think he spoke on that particular debate — said there was no crisis in this country and that the Government itself was a Task Force. But I have lived to see that, after that, the Government itself now is freely using the word "crisis". I have no reason to doubt that in time, the Government will see the wisdom of establishing the kind of Committee that I am talking about to identify the role and the mission of the military in this country.

In conclusion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to point out that this is not a mere rhetorical flourish. In the great United States itself, the Congress of that country, the House of Representatives and Senate, had to take measures in order to reign in the imperial presidency which had been developed, or which was being developed, particularly under Richard M. Nixon, because the country was being involved in military escapades, in commitments, security pacts all over the world, without the Congress, the House of Representatives and the Senate, being involved in any meaningful way. And they had to pass a national commitment resolution, they had to pass the War Powers Act in order to reign in that imperial presidency and to keep the military under control.

Now, if that is true of a country such as the United States, the Congress of the United States had to take that step, we in Barbados, which prides ourselves on our parliamentary democracy, must ensure that, in all respects, the military of this country is kept under the control of Parliament and that no Prime Minister can simply get on a plane, or a boat, or travel however he will, and sign a military pact — and the only thing we know about it is when we see on the television the picture of the "High Commander" signing, next to him the Colonel, and somewhere in the back peeping about is the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

I do not think that that is the way it should be done, and I am against that, because I am committed, and the Democratic Labour Party is committed, to parliamentary democracy.

With those words, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to second this Resolution, and in supporting the call in this very modest Resolution, which deplores in its terms the attitude demonstrated by the Government in yet another matter of fundamental importance to the community, there are a few points which I would wish to make.

The first, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that it must be understood that whatever the euphemistic language used to disguise this arrangement, it is, in fact, a treaty. The Government of Barbados has entered into a treaty with the Government of Antigua and Barbuda, the Government of the Commonwealth of Dominica, the Government of St. Lucia and the Grenadines. But, at least, the Memorandum of Understanding, as it has been called, does not deny that it relates to what it calls "security and military co-operation."

Now, I wish to establish, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Government's right to enter into a treaty with other members of the Caribbean Community is not being here questioned. In the treaty establishing the Caribbean Community itself, in Article IV (b), the Community indicates as one of its objectives the co-ordination of the foreign policies of member States, and in Chapter 3, under Co-ordination and Functional Co-operation, Article XVII (1), it says:

"To the end that member states aim at the fullest possible co-ordination of their foreign policies within their respective competences and seek to adopt as far as possible common positions in major international issues, there is hereby established a Standing Committee of Ministers responsible for Foreign Affairs."

So a Government of Barbados, however wrong-headed and however misguided, as long as it is the legitimate Government of the country, can enter into a pact, or a treaty or a Memorandum of Understanding, or an agreement, or whatever it is called, with other members of the Caribbean Community.

What is at issue here for us in this Resolution which now stands before this Honourable House, however, is, in a word, the morality of the attitude which we are seeing displayed by this Government time and time again.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are contending that the manner in which this Memorandum of Understanding has

been thrust upon the people of Barbados carries with it an element of responsibility which cannot be gainsaid, and which no attempt at grandstanding or stonewalling can deny.

3.30 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the very credibility of this Government is once again on the line. You will recall, Sir, that during the last general elections in this country, the question of the extent to which the Government had committed this country in terms of expenditure became an issue. I had the dubious distinction of being deemed a liar by the Prime Minister himself, by the Head of the Defence Force — the other head — by the Government Information Service, by the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, only because I had dared to suggest the level of expenditure to which this adventurous Government, and more particularly this adventurous Prime Minister, had committed this country. It was only a matter of time, Sir — unfortunately perhaps after the General Election — before the people of Barbados got an opportunity to assess the veracity and the credibility of the persons taking the opposite positions.

The history of this agreement, Mr. Deputy Speaker, can find its genesis in a meeting that was held in Martinique, not by representatives of the Governments of Caribbean States, but representatives of the Governments of the United States, France and Britain.

You may recall, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that during the time of the Estimates, in the year 1979 I believe, when the then honourable Member for St. Philip North was sitting in the Chair and when an attempt was made to have \$10 million passed through the Estimates without debate, and when the then honourable Member for St. Lucy and myself raised questions concerning the expenditure, we were able to point out, using as a source information which we had gathered from publications in London, that the then Prime Minister of Britain, Mr. Callaghan, on his return from the summit conference in Martinique, had made a firm statement to reporters that an agreement had been reached in Martinique for the establishment of a Caribbean Force in the Eastern Caribbean, to which Barbados, among other Caribbean territories, would become party. We queried the Government on this.

It is my recollection that neither the Prime Minister nor the then Foreign Minister could recall having any knowledge of any such matter. I recall, Sir, that on one occasion, when it was indicated that we would like to have a debate on the whole area of defence and security, the then Prime Minister gave the Leader of the Opposition a solemn undertaking that he would allow for time during one of the Estimates for discussion of this very important and vital matter. I recall, Sir, that, in the manner to which the people of Barbados have become

accustomed, as the appointed hour arrived, the then Prime Minister, in contemptuous fashion, uttered certain words to the Leader of the Opposition, who merely sought to get the Prime Minister to keep his promise.

And for some considerable time thereafter, the people of Barbados were given to understand that suggestions by the Opposition, that vast sums were being expended in pursuit of a creeping militarism, these mouthings of the Opposition, were merely mouthings that had no foundation in fact. But, it was not long after, Sir, that the Trident arrived, and to this day no member of the Government has ever told the people of Barbados the exact cost of that Trident. To this day, no one in Barbados is able to say with any certitude what is our expenditure on that particular flag ship, as it has been so comfortably called by the Minister responsible for Defence and Security.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it fell to an Englishman, who had command of the vessel when it came down here, to say to the Press, on television and radio that the Trident would become a flag ship in the main thrust towards the formation of a regional security force. An Englishman, an officer and a gentleman, had to come to Barbados to tell the people of Barbados that the Trident was going to form the main thrust in a regional force. Up until then not a single honourable Member on that side in here or outside had vouchsafed the information to the people of this country as to the role the Trident would play in this so-called regional force.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, soon thereafter, there was a lukewarm emittance from the Defence Force, which sought to warm over the statement that had been made by the English Commander.

I considered that an act of the gravest — I have to be careful what I say here — misrepresentation and contempt for the people of Barbados, which lay claim to being an independent country, when we have to have someone come from another country to tell us about our expenditure on a flag ship. And we have been subjected to these strange and sometimes nebulous utterances by a Prime Minister, who tells us that we have misunderstood the expenditure — because the money was borrowed for the ship and it could only be used for the ship, and therefore they do not have to pay it back next year, and therefore you do not have to spend so much time worrying about the cost of it.

I challenge the right honourable Member for St. Thomas — I now have to say "the right honourable and gallant Member", because he is the "High Commander". I do not know what action he has seen. I am told that on the occasion when he went for his first cruise on the flag ship that he did not do so well; but I would still call him "the gallant and honourable Member" — Mr. Deputy

Speaker, that honourable Member, I challenge him to get up in this Honourable House today, and tell the people of Barbados honestly and without reserve what is the total expenditure to date on the flag ship, and what is the total commitment for the package which he has given to us. I challenge him further to get up in this Honourable Chamber and tell us whether there are any other secret pacts which he and his Government have with any other Government in the western hemisphere.

I am not going to make false promises that I am going to tell the population anything that I will not tell him and you, Sir, in this Honourable Chamber. I am suggesting that this country has agreed in principle with countries, other than those which now appear in this so-called Memorandum of Understanding, to provide an umbrella of security in this region, and I am charging that the Government has not been entirely candid with either the Opposition or the people in this regard. I am charging further that it is only a matter of time before there are further revelations of tremendous expenditure in pursuit of this so-called Memorandum of Understanding.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let the Prime Minister get up and tell us that he is not pursuing the purchase of other more sophisticated weaponry for this particular exercise.

(Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I wish I had the money to do it. We now need some things.)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The problem with the Prime Minister is that he was not even a cadet. He does not understand the depth of the concern about this militarism, because he has not had the experience of seeing a bullet, tracer or otherwise, passing in any direction.
3.40 p.m.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Positive. Unless recently, since you have become "High Commander" and they have exposed you to a few. But the Prime Minister has not had the benefit of other honourable Members of the feel of a 303 rifle on his shoulder.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Even ones that can only fire blanks, Sir.

That might account for his tendency to take chances and to see these things in numerical fashion only. The Prime Minister's favourite way of relaxation is to play numbers, and he does not always understand....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would the honourable Member get back to the Resolution please. We are not discussing the personal life of the Prime Minister. We are discussing the Memorandum of Understanding.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to you, Sir. But if I were discussing the Prime Minister, the language that I would use, Sir, could not be used in here. I am discussing him in his capacity as "High Commander", and I am saying that he, as "High Commander", Sir, has the tendency not to understand the implications for the human being in the terms of even this Memorandum of Understanding.

I am saying, Sir, that, on the question of the amount of money we spend on the deployment of a force, to him it is merely a matter of figures; but to the rest of the community, or a substantial part of the community, it is a matter of much more importance than that. The point I am making about the expenditure takes on added significance when, as you pursue and peruse this Memorandum of Understanding, we discover that, like some emperor, he has committed Barbados to 49 per cent of the cost of this regional force.

And, again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have to have a newspaper man in St. Vincent tell us in Barbados that the 49 per cent is going to add up to "X" amount of dollars — three quarters of a million dollars is what we heard from St. Vincent.

We cannot rely on that information. We have a parliamentary system and we have a right to expect that the Prime Minister and Minister of Defence and Security would come to Parliament, if nowhere else, and tell the people of Barbados, "This 49 per cent is only three quarters of a million, or three hundred million, or no millions at all," as the case may be. But, Sir, not having come to us about the Memorandum of Understanding, he cannot be heard to be coming to us now with the parts of it, and that is the style of operation which, more than anything, will gall those who have any interest in these matters.

What about the use of this force, Sir, of which Barbados will now be the high command? Some time ago, Sir, it was written in one of the organs of the Democratic Labour Party that during the elections in St. Lucia a force from Barbados was put on alert, and we raised questions about whether, in fact, troops from Barbados were not dispatched through the Grantley Adams Airport, and there is even some question if they did not, in fact, land at an airport in St. Lucia. There was less question, and more certainty, that the Trident, itself, during the elections in St. Lucia, was, in fact, in the territorial waters of St. Lucia on manoeuvres.

It is passing strange, Sir, that not a single word came from the Government denying that — answering any questions about it. It is even more passing strange that the Press in Barbados, in light of the fact that having drawn that information, which we received on the highest authority, did not consider it a matter worthy of examination.

The honourable Member, himself, is on record as saying that the House of Assembly is not a place for truth; it is a place for inquiry. He is always, from time to time, talking about.....

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I will give you chapter and verse. I am saying that he is on record in here as saying that the House of Assembly is not a place for truth; it is a place for inquiry.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: But you are trying to give the impression that that was the first time you ever heard anybody say something like that, when you are, in fact, a past master at that sort of behaviour. But that is another story. I beg your pardon, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I am saying that it is passing strange that there was no utterance or reference to the movements of Barbadian troops in St. Lucian waters or in any area connected with St. Lucia. But, again, troops from St. Vincent were able to say to Barbadians that they were certain that they had seen the Trident in the waters during the St. Lucia election.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us suppose that they were on a routine visit. The point is that when you have these secret pacts, when you have negotiations for secret pacts and when you have written and unwritten understandings, you will always have suspicion about the use of the military between one Caribbean state and another. And when you have these unstable arrangements in the various countries of the Caribbean, where there are a number of persons whose only interest is in retaining power at all cost, these things take on added significance.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we on this side cannot accept that it is proper for the Government to enter into a military treaty without any consultation with the people of the country, either through their parliamentary representatives or directly, and we cannot feel comfortable when we are given, for the first time, information on these matters by a press release from the Government Information Service.

There are a number of economic problems in Barbados. And while the issue concerning guns and

butter, is an issue of which it may be said that it is not worthwhile to discuss it in Barbados in the same dimensions and in the same context as it may be discussed in some of the greater and larger countries, it is still true that, to the extent we can use our resources for the upliftment of the people through their economic and social development to the exclusion of any unnecessary military expenditure, it is a debate that will be worthwhile.

There is a pattern, which has grown up in Barbados recently, which tends to suggest that any examination, honest or otherwise, of our expenditure in the military forces is tantamount to being traitorous, is tantamount to being disloyal. Words such as "a stab in the back of our boys" have been bandied about when we on this side have dared to question the efficacy of dispatching troops to St. Vincent, in a manner which we considered illegitimate. We have had all kinds of suggestion of venal attitudes on our part, merely because we have dared to raise certain suggestions and certain questions concerning the use of our resources in military expenditure.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the United States, in the Soviet Union, in Britain, China, everywhere where the people have great military expenditure, where they have atomic weapons, where they have genuine secrets, there has been discussion, there has been probing and there has been what my colleague describes as "a tendency toward a democratic understanding of the need for such debate."

3.50 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to say that I will never be cowed, and I know my colleagues will never be cowed, by any words which suggest that we are disloyal, into allowing ourselves to fall prey to a kind of gargantuan personification of certain militaristic tendencies. We are going to question the expenditure, and when it is done in a manner which we consider to be bordering on the immoral, we will question it even more closely.

We feel that the people of Barbados are sufficiently intelligent that they can grapple with serious problems if they are told, and if they are treated like serious people. We believe that we do not hold the answers to every single problem which arises in this country, but we believe that the Government has demonstrated that it does not have answers to many of the problems, and some might say any of the problems, which arise in this country. What we cannot accept is the manner in which, in spite of their bankruptcy of ideas, they continue to treat the people in this country with a studied contempt, as if they are peons, as if they are mere appendages waiting at the gate like the beggar, Lazarus, for the crumbs to be thrown from on high. The high and the mighty walking through this land like a colossus —

driving, I am reminded — as if suddenly from nowhere God has visited this country with them, and them alone.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we see evidence of this contempt in almost every aspect of the Government's policy in the last few months, and this Memorandum of Understanding is no less a manifestation of that particular view and that particular way. This Memorandum of Understanding, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the epitome of their contempt for the people in the area of defence and security.

They have trotted out, from time to time, a lot of puerile arguments and discussion concerning one Sidney Burnett-Alleyne. Can you imagine a Prime Minister, who is reputed to be one of the brightest people in this country, putting out Sidney Alleyne as a reason for having a Defence Force? Only idiots could be expected to accept that kind of nonsense, which is put forward to the people of Barbados with a half smile — as if the people of Barbados have to accept whatever he says. He is Thomas the Great, Emperor of the Eastern Caribbean, so they move from a position of no military.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member has one minute to finish his speech.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: They move from a position of no military contact, no military pacts, to a position of total military pact where they are the dominant partner, all in a matter of six short years.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if this Memorandum of Understanding is a measure of what we may expect from that Government, all I can say is, may God help us.

We moved this Resolution not necessarily because we have nothing else to do; we moved this Resolution because we wish to debate the issue of morality as it applies to defence and security, as we will debate it as it applies to the other aspects of life in this community.

We wish to tell the Government that you do not have the right, because you have been voted a majority, to do whatever you like, whenever you like, however you like. The people of Barbados are still the owners of Barbados; the people of Barbados are still the managers and directors, and you have to hear them and listen to them.

I thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, the honourable Member for St. Michael West ended on the ideal note. The people of Barbados are masters and they make the decisions, and that is what they did only a couple of

years ago. That is a beautiful note on which to end his discussion.

I listened, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the Member for St. Michael South, the mover of the Resolution which is now before the Chamber, and it is needless for me to recite what the Resolution is all about, because in almost one single word the Member for St. Michael West said it was "a modest" Resolution. He could have gone on further to say that it was an empty Resolution.

I was really stunned today when I heard about the faith in democracy, faith in the Constitution of the country, confidence in the people, and faith in parliamentary democracy. I was stunned, hearing it coming from the Member for St. Michael South, because only in 1973-74, when he was sitting as Head of the Democratic Labour Party as its President, in just a few sentences he warned the country and this party, then in Opposition, that he would depressurise — do you remember those words? — and remove all persons in the Opposition.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I never used those words, and I challenge the honourable Member to produce evidence that I used those words.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: All right, Sir, I would be very grateful if the honourable Member would tell this Chamber what words he used. I am going to stand corrected. Rise, get up! In 1973-74, a man from humble background, and who rose to the heights of President of the Democratic Labour Party, the governing party at that time, had the gall to tell this country in an address that he is going to depressurise and remove all elements that opposed his party.

(Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: That is not true).

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Get up and correct me, then. I am putting mine in Hansard, you put yours in Hansard, tell us what you said.

Now, Sir, this evening what are we hearing? All about democracy, faith in it, the two party system. That is your belief this evening but if you had power, according to you, in 1974, leading up to the 1976 election, and you had won the Government, none of us would have been in here, and you have demonstrated it repeatedly. I am ashamed of you, I am ashamed to be your representative, when I can hear that coming from your mouth.

A man who was educated by the blood and sweat of the people of this country, had the honour of a free secondary education, a Barbados Scholar, the agricultural workers' money, and because they differ with your

policy, you are going to remove and depressurise them. That is your argument. Now this evening you talk about democracy and your faith.

Do you know why we have been chosen to govern? Maybe those very words threw fear into the hearts of the people of this country. I recall that your very colleague, the former senior Member for St. Michael, Mr. Patsy Springer, called on this country for a one party state, and the Member for St. James South has made it abundantly clear across this country that he has faith in Castro politics, so much so that his name is "Fidel" Simmons.
4.00 p.m.

Now, Sir, what are we accused of this evening? Do you know what we are accused of? Because of changing times, because of events so swiftly moving by, the Government has seen it fit, not only to set up a small army to defend its shores in case of emergency, but they have gone beyond that because of what we have seen in the past. The events of the past have brought integration of the territories together, just to defend each other in case of emergency. That is all this is about, and all that we have heard this evening are stones thrown at the Defence Force; abuse of the boys in the Navy.

You talked about Brigadier Lewis. I will say something. We are happy to know not only that we can call on Brigadier Lewis, but we can call on Air Marshall Barrow. That is who we can call on. Not only Brigadier Lewis but we can call on the Leader of the Opposition, an ex-navigator. We can call on him to be Air Marshall. I would support that rank for him. Air Marshall Errol Barrow, Brigadier Lewis and Major Simmons from the Cuban Army. His father was a Major and he is also going to be a Major.

Sir, after the elections of 1976, Barbados faced some rather strange and sudden events. You may recall, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that on the eve of the opening of Parliament, one of the blackest days in this country was the bombing of the Cubana airline just outside of our waters, or thereabouts, Sir. One could only conclude that there was going to be a degree of seriousness within this hemisphere.

The ink was not even dried from Members of Parliament signing their acceptance as parliamentarians before there was a Burnett-Alleyne, a member of that party — that cannot be denied — and so entrenched a member he was that he was given a banker's licence to come into Barbados and set up a bank in Barbados — to rob the Barbadians of their hard-earned money and import cement, Sir.

This is the very man who was prosecuted, not in Barbados — the jury in Barbados had nothing to do with

it — in Martinique, and when challenged and brought before the court, he admitted that he was on his way to Barbados to overthrow the Government of Barbados, of which the Prime Minister is a member, of the Barbados Labour Party — and he was a member of your party up to that time. The very Sidney Burnett-Alleyne — said at one of their conferences that there should be fire and blood and acid in the streets of this town — yet, you counted him.

If you examine, therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, such events within and around this country, there was nothing wrong. Although we may have put in the Manifesto that we do not support a standing army, the events of time demanded it. As you would understand, you have to trim your sails to suit the wind. It may not have been a hope; it was not in the Manifesto that we would have supported it then, but, Sir, the changing times, with vagabonds in the world, mercenaries, members of your own party, necessitated the formation of the Defence Force.

(Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for St. James North were ordered to be expunged from the records by Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I withdraw the remarks, Sir, but I would say that he might have heard about it before, not in the plot, and said nothing, because out of his own mouth he was the advocate of depressurising the Opposition and removing them.

This evening he is talking here about democracy and confidence in the people of Barbados. For what reason? Because the Prime Minister and his party set about to strengthen the ties between the Governments within our territories, with which we have so many things in common, that, in the event of any military disruption in our countries, we can call on each other for each other's help. We are our brothers' keepers, Sir.

It was that very Government, then in office, that had introduced a token vote into the Estimates to set up an army, around 1969. I recall the Leader of the Opposition at that time the Prime Minister, making it very clear, he used the term "battalion". He was not talking about a small army of 200 or 300 men; he was talking about a battalion of men; that was what he wanted. A token vote! The Estimates will reveal that, Sir.

We have come along, and recognizing the problems throughout the entire world, and we are part of the world, we set up a small army to protect our shores in the event of anything, for whatever purposes they may be called upon to do their duties. Every single moment the Opposition can get, they set about to discredit those young men

and women who may have to give their lives and their blood in this country for any one of them, Sir.

I wonder if the Member recalls that it was the same Regiment, the same members of the army, that had to go through windows and rescue two children in a burning house. Give them credit for that. You do not want to give them credit for that, but every minute — Brigadier Lewis, Lewis should be sent somewhere and shot. That came out of the mouth of the Member for St. Michael South West out there, that he was used to shooting down monkeys or men in Jamaica and he should be sent back to Jamaica.

Yet, for all the talk, they bought three fishing boats with taxpayers' money — one called the George Fergusson, one called the D.G. Lewis and one called the Captain Marshall or something so — and if an officer on the boat had to take a revolver in his hand to fire, you had to turn off all the engines and drop the anchor. And that was the taxpayers of Barbados money that you took up and spent!

You know what they did, Sir? They took an Inspector of Police, a very good friend of the Leader of the Opposition, who was a swimmer, Sir — that is all he used to do, swim all about and dive — and made him — Commander of the Navy? Coast Guard it was? Phillips, Commander Phillips, an old, retired drunken police, too.

Asides.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You tell me not to say so?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member must remember the Standing Orders.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I know them, Sir. I am not referring to Mr. Phillips in his duties, Sir, he is a retired man. I can talk about Gearbox and Phillips.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member must remember the Standing Orders in relation to naming persons.

Mr. B. M. TAITT rose.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sit down, you clown. You are not the Speaker. I withdraw the remarks.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You must also withdraw the remarks directed towards the other honourable Member.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I did not see him, Sir. Which honourable member.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Michael West?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You saw him, Sir?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I heard a comment.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I heard "a clown". Well, if he is a clown, Sir, I withdraw the remark.
4.10 p.m.

Sir, a Commander Phillips, a retired Superintendent of Police who used to drink a lot of rum about here, do you know what he was given a job to do? Do you know what was his duty? To command the Coast Guard under their direction?

What did we do? You could not get any parts for the things that they bought; they were obsolete. Some of them are still down there, I believe, in the docks rusting out. The taxpayers' money has gone down the drain. All we have done is to ask for advice and expertise on how to set up something in Barbados that we are not familiar with, because to quote the honourable Member for St. Michael West, he said that the Prime Minister did not see a bullet fired or he was never in a war, therefore he was not qualified to set up an army.

Did you ever see somebody fire one, or were you ever in an army? Therefore, you are not qualified to condemn him. How can you condemn him? You have to look to the Minister of Labour. I forgot him. He could be a Lieutenant-General in the army.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the honourable Member for St. Michael West said it was a modest Resolution; he was equally as modest in his contribution. It was empty, lacking in depth; and all he has displayed here this evening is that he would have been a Baptist preacher much more successfully than he has been a Minister of Government.

Sir, I cannot support the Resolution. I do not believe that a Government or a Prime Minister in circumstances such as these can come to Parliament and debate what they are going to do, how many guns they are going to buy, how many boats they are going to order and things of that nature. I believe it is a simple understanding, since we are already integrated by way of the CARICOM Movement at the economic level. We have failed at the political level, and now that we are trying to examine the level of defence, we are condemned this evening.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West said he was not condemning us. He said he was not questioning our approach to this matter. He said he was dealing with the morality, not that we are wrong. On

the other hand, the Resolution condemns us. The honourable Member for St. Michael West said he is not questioning the Memorandum of Understanding; he said, in other words, it was a treaty.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of elucidation, it is obvious that the honourable Member did not follow my line of argument closely. What I indicated was that we were not questioning the right of the Government to enter into a treaty because, under the CARICOM Treaty Article IV and Article XVII, this right is enshrined. That is what we were not questioning.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, if I may remind the honourable Member, I think it was my colleague, the Deputy Prime Minister who had to fight tooth and nail to get them to debate the CARICOM Treaty. You know that you went and signed up, and all the economic advantages and disadvantages were agreed upon, and you know that Parliament never heard anything about it. We had to bring it by way of a Private Members' Resolution. That is Opposition politics. You committed us to an economic treaty, and we had to ask you to let us hear something about it. Now this evening you are not questioning why we are in it; it is the way it was done.

He is satisfied that, under the Treaty, we can go in. Under the Treaty, Article VI and XVII, I think he quoted, it is all right to join up with your neighbours, but before we join we should come and tell you. Come and tell you what? Would you understand what it is all about?

You had an opportunity to help provide for this country when you were in the Ministry of Trade, and it is an absolute fact of life that you are recognised in this country as a ministerial failure. If you go out there and ask anybody if they know a man called Branford Mardsden; all they will say to you is that he used to give jobs to the people in his constituency and sell potatoes that he imported from St. Lucia at 80 cents a pound. That is his contribution to this country — Minister of sweet potatoes. Even your colleagues accept this. No wonder the Leader of the Opposition can come and jockey Haynes ahead of you. He sees you as a failure.

Sir, there is one point I would like to make. Reference was made about young Barbadian soldiers going to St. Vincent. You tried putting in across to the public before, and in here, that we did this without the understanding of members of the Opposition. Let me tell you, if you do not know, for the very first time — the Minister of Defence and Prime Minister of the country wrote the Leader of the Opposition. If he has that little respect for you all that he did not mention that to you, that is your domestic problem. A letter was written to the Leader of the Opposition by the Prime Minister, acting in his capacity as Minister of Defence. Do you know what is a

naval secret? It is a highly confidential matter that you are dealing with, and you just do not rush in here and say.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, the honourable Member is misleading this Honourable House. The impression is being given that the Prime Minister wrote the Leader of the Opposition in consultation prior to the troops going to St. Vincent. The fact is that the letter arrived after the troops had left for St. Vincent.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The first time you heard about the letter is now. You are here dodging about between the five year term wonder behind you and the honourable Member for St. Michael South on your right trying to find out what letter I am talking about. This is big business, you don't know?

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: That is why you are Leader of Parliamentary Affairs).

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: And Leader of the House and Acting Prime Minister of the country, all these things put together; and I cut canes in Florida.

Sir, I support the views of the honourable Member for St. Michael West, my very good friend for many years. We have a lot in common. It is a modest Resolution. The only thing is that I would go a little further and would like to say that it is also an empty Resolution. Modest for you and empty for me; so we have something in common, so therefore it was not necessary to bring it before Parliament. This is pure grandstanding politics.

Countries in the Eastern Caribbean have joined together just to look after their territorial waters and in the event of anything to come to each other's rescue. These are all Caribbean people in this troubled world in which we live today. People think today of the bullet and not the ballot, of undermining and hypocrisy. The world is full of them. If this is the course which we have taken, I believe that we have done the right thing in the light of what happened in the past since we came into power, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and therefore I cannot support the Resolution in its present form.
4.20 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Philip North.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: What the honourable Member for St. James North seems to have missed is not that he and his Cabinet colleagues did not have a right to enter into a treaty, or a Memorandum of Understanding, as it is called, with Antigua, Barbuda, Dominica and St. Vincent. But what the Resolution seeks is simply to state that, in the view of the members of the Democratic

Labour Party, we have been seeing the role of the Parliamentarians, the people's representatives, being downplayed to the stage where, if they are not careful, Parliament will just be used as a place for some of us, in our more jovial moods, to make jokes, for some of us, who are not in control of ourselves to abuse each other under the privileges of the House, and to forget what we are here to do, the people's business.

They also seem to make heavy weather of the fact that the people of Barbados elected them again in 1981. We all know that the people of Barbados have elected them. But what seems to have missed them completely is that they have not got 100 per cent of the votes of the people in Barbados. They seem to have missed this completely, and they seem to have forgotten that we on this side of the Table

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. I would just like to draw this to the attention of the honourable member for St. Philip North: you did not have that in 1966, and you changed a whole constitution. You did not have 100 per cent and you went much further than we have gone. You amended the Constitution of Barbados and carried the country into independence. You did not have 100 per cent. What nonsense are you talking?

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, it has been drawn to my attention, for the information of the Member who just sat down, that they represent 52.2 per cent of the people who voted and we represent 47.8 per cent of the people who voted, and I think that that gives us the right, as our conscience dictate, to draw the attention of the people of Barbados to what we see happening here. Any Government elected is expected to do a better job for the continuation of the development of Barbados.

We are indeed worried; I am very worried about the way the people's Parliament is being treated, about the contempt that is being shown, not only by the parliamentarians but the people, and the misguided belief that the moment you stand to question anything you are a traitor to this country and you risk having your character assassinated with dirty innuendos and all types of stuff thrown at you because you seek to do the people's business.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in my humble opinion, I firmly believe that this is a matter on which the Opposition should have had some prior knowledge before it came to this Honourable House. What does the Memorandum of Understanding seek to do? The Memorandum of Understanding, by joining the Defence Force of Barbados, and the Police Force with the police of St. Vincent, the police of Dominica and the Defence Force and the people of Antigua, seeks to form some

kind of organisation where one person's interest is the interest of another.

We have examined the Caribbean very closely within the last ten years and there are certain things that took place in the Caribbean that we are left to wonder what would have happened if this treaty existed. Let us cast our minds back to the St. Lucia situation that played itself out over a period of two years or so. Am I to believe that if this treaty existed at that time that the people elected at that time would have had the right to call upon the Barbados Government to send out youngsters and our police to St. Lucia in a situation which was purely a domestic situation, as I have seen it? I certainly do not believe that would be right.

The substance of the Memorandum will be debated by other people. But my biggest concern, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the falling or the breakdown of the importance of Parliament. We have seen time and time again where things that should interest the people of Barbados are coming to Parliament, if at all, very late. Very closely connected to this type of military situation is the proposed training scheme for the young people of Barbados. I have heard about the proposed training scheme. I am led to believe that it is a *fait accompli*, but only recently the Youth Council of Barbados and the young people of Barbados have sought to have the implementation of this scheme postponed, and they are saying that we have not been able to examine the implications of the scheme in relation to the young people of Barbados.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, those of us who have followed the history of defence forces of Third World Countries have all reasons to be afraid of defence forces and any militarisation that we see. Look right now at Suriname, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Those of us who are freedom lovers in the Caribbean look with disgust at the events that have just been played out in Suriname. What has happened in Suriname recently? People because they have the right to champion a cause, people with families, responsible people that were developing the country of Suriname and only sought to have democracy returned to Suriname were all unceremoniously taken from their houses in the presence of their families, and some of them brutally murdered, all because we have an inexperienced military force, like adolescents, proving to the people that they were the powers that were to be. This is a type of situation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that all of us in this young, evolving nation of Barbados have to be very careful about.

Barbados, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has been able to establish itself as one of the most stable countries in the world. We have, from year to year, been voted as one of the freest countries in the world, and this only came about because there used to be a level of tolerance in

Barbados which allowed us to discuss our differences and then have a drink at the end of the day. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am alarmed that this degree of tolerance is fast becoming a thing of the past.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not want to interrupt the honourable Member, but this Resolution seeks to deal with the Memorandum of Understanding with certain Governments. It appears to me that this debate is moving into the area of the Defence Force and the young people of this country. I have given members a certain amount of latitude because I do not want to restrict your method of debating, but I certainly will not allow members to go too far outside of the Resolution which is before the House. I would be grateful if the honourable Member would confine his debate to the Resolution before the House, and not expand it into areas which do not concern this Chamber at this time.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I went down that line only because the members of the Defence Force are the people who would be participants in any action that this Memorandum happens to bring about. But I will abide by your ruling.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like the honourable Minister in charge of this portfolio to give us some illustration of how it is that, in a Memorandum like this, Barbados ends up being responsible for 49 per cent of the expenditure on it and the other four participating people only 13 per cent or thereabouts?
4.30 p.m.

We could well argue that, as the headquarters is based in Barbados, there are certain advantages to be gained, and as a result we should carry the heavier part of this financial burden, but I would like, for my own enlightenment, some indication of how this whole ratio was arrived at.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Memorandum is a *fait accompli*. This is now history. This Resolution is very, very worthy, and if I might repeat it so that we can be clear of what we are debating, it reads:

WHEREAS the Government of Barbados has signed an agreement entitled a Memorandum of Understanding with certain governments of the Commonwealth Caribbean relating to security and military co-operation; and

WHEREAS by that Memorandum the people of Barbados are being called upon to commit their financial, physical and human resources upon an undertaking, the concept, scope and implications of which have not been discussed either in principle or substance by the representatives of the people in Parliament;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House of Assembly

- (i) condemn the Government for the manner in which Barbados is being committed to this undertaking, and
- (ii) call upon the Government to give an assurance that in the future it shall seek prior authorisation from this House before entering upon such firm and solemn agreements involving regional or foreign governments.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is a fact that this Memorandum of Association has committed the financial position of Barbados, so much so that it has committed Barbados to a little less than half of the possible cost and expenditure of this Memorandum of Association. It is a fact that it could well be only \$750 000 in this year, but what would happen if by some strange coincidence or some hysterical thing you find that the Caribbean is in a situation where our Defence Force and all the Defence Forces actually have to go into action for some reason or another, and the expenditure involved should mount in any one year, we are committed to 49 per cent of any of that.

It is a fact that the physical and human resources of Barbados have been called upon; it is a distinct fact and a possibility that the lives of some of our young men could easily be lost if a situation develop in the Caribbean and it is also a fact that the representatives of the people in Parliament have not had the opportunity to discuss this memorandum before it became a legal document and a binding document on the people of Barbados, so the Resolution has not stated anything that is not a fact.

The terms of the Resolution are very straightforward, the terms of the Resolution are very accurate, and I see nothing in the terms that would prevent this entire House from supporting this Resolution, because it only seeks to ask that the people's representatives in this House be given the opportunity to debate all things of importance, such as the Memorandum of Understanding that we are now faced with today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I have said before, I have been watching the situation in Barbados where serious decisions are being taken without the people of Barbados, and in the long run the people's representatives, being asked to comment. It is a serious development, and I would only invite the present Government of Barbados, despite the fact that they claim, which is a fact, that they have been representatives of the people, that they show some respect for the people and the people's repre-

sentatives and take them into their confidence in matters like this.

It is a fact, as I have said before, that the best way to lead a nation is for that nation to have the conviction and reason to believe that their leaders are setting an example that the nation can follow all the things that are being done. If you hide things from the nation, the people are going to become very suspicious, and suspicion is a very bad thing for a small country like Barbados. Suspicion will lead people to look around the corners for things that are not there, suspicion will eventually interfere with the moral standards of the people, suspicion is one of those things we could well do without in Barbados, and I can only invite the present Government to get back on the road where they take the people of Barbados into their confidence.

You are the leaders of the people of Barbados for the present time. You have been entrusted with that leadership and you, in turn, should trust the people and take them into your confidence. There are things that are going wrong in this country, and in times like these it would be easier for the people to make the economic adjustment if they felt that their leaders were leading them in a way they could believe that the leaders were setting the example that they would expect them to set.

All I am saying is that when you expect a country to be behind you, when you expect a country to support you, when you want to lead, when you want to develop a country — lead by example; have some type of faith in the people and take them into your confidence in all matters that affect them, because in the long run, it is the people of Barbados that would suffer or gain by any action that you might take.

You are only temporarily in charge as the councillors or the decision makers, and you should give the people the lead to follow. Listen to their voice and do not get too far from the people that you can no longer hear what the people are saying to you, because the voice of the people is the voice of God.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN rose.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Christ Church East Central will only have five minutes in which to speak.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Yes, Sir, in the five minutes.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member will have five minutes which brings us up to 4.45 and the

end of Private Members' Business, unless there is a motion to extend Private Members' Business.

MOTION TO EXTEND PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I believe that since it is the Opposition's motion, and they are always anxious to have Private Members' Business done, and we so graciously accommodate them all the time, I am quite sure they would not disagree with our asking, with the leave of the House, to extend it for a few minutes.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, all we ask for from the Opposition is that we stick to the rules, and the rules state when Private Members' Business should start and when it should end.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, am I to understand that they do not agree to an extension of time to debate their own matters? Why?

(Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Stick to the rules, we believe in rules).

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, we agree with rules! You do not wish to hear the gospel now. Last week there was a different story, Sir, the honourable Member quarrelled that we could not do it, but now we are accommodating them this evening and we are going beyond this; with the approval and pleasure of all Members of the House, we are quite willing to help you do your work.

Sir, I beg to move that Private Members' Business be extended until 5.30.

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

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

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: My contribution to this debate is going to be short, and it is going to be short because, in my opinion, the Opposition, in this case, knows full well that they have absolutely no case at all for bringing any Resolution before Parliament in the manner that they have done.

The simple position is that, constitutionally, the treaty-making power is vested in the Executive. None of them over there can challenge the validity of that statement. As a matter of fact, they, themselves, should recall that throughout their 15 years of power, particularly since 1966, they were involved in the exercise of treaty-making power without even laying the treaties that they

entered into on the Floor of this House. Of course, the classic case in that respect was the Caricom Treaty.

Now, Sir, it is clearly obvious to anyone who is a realist, who understands the political background of Barbados and the Caribbean, that in these days where the security of small island states is constantly being threatened, Barbados would have to take a conscious decision about its own defence.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want this clearly understood: This Government is a Government which believes in the maximum regional co-operation, and some of us believe that the future of territories inevitably lies in a political union. That has always been our philosophy. It is therefore hypocritical on the part of the other side to come in here and with one mouth say that they believe in federalism, and yet still, when we take steps which are the logical consequence of a step even not as great as a federalist step, they are critical of our association with other islands.

Asides.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The honourable Members on the other side are critical of every step that we take, which, in our opinion, are in the interest of co-operation with the other islands.

But you cannot have your cake and eat it. The public out there knows that the Barbados Labour Party is vitally different in opinion with the Democratic Labour Party, because we believe that the future of these territories lie in maximum co-operation, whereas you believe in isolationism.

Asides.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: That was only forced upon you. You did not do it willingly, and you never agreed with it either. You never did; not when you acted. When, in fact, you had to carry out policies in relation to it, you never undertook to carrying out the spirit and the letter of it; you always believed in isolation.

The position is that the Democratic Labour Party's speeches today mirrors their position. They are really isolationists, so let the public decide on that. I have no fear. Do not let us use any excuses.

The Comoros Islands, the Seychelles, Dominica, Barbados, all of them have faced threats. What is the Democratic Labour Party's view about that? Are you going to bury your head in the sand and say that if you were in power nobody would threaten you; so, therefore, since you are not in power, anybody who genuinely believes, having regard to the evidence, that there is a

potential threat must do nothing about it? We went through all of this already, Sir, and the public knows the position. We believe that it is vitally necessary.

In addition to that, quite apart from the mere question of defence and security, it is very necessary that we should have a Coast Guard in this area, and if you look at it logically, having regard to our geographical proximity to these islands, the only way you can have a proper and adequate Coast Guard to deal with such matters as marine pollution and fisheries protection is if you do it in conjunction with the other islands. You have to do it in conjunction with the other islands, and how can you do it in conjunction with the other islands if you do not have some agreement setting out the respective rates and obligations? And who is vested with the power to enter into that agreement?

Look, the honourable Members on the other side want to arrogate to themselves the power of governing this country. The electorate did not invest them with that power. That power was invested in the Barbados Labour Party. The initiating role in all of this is the Executive of the Barbados Labour Party, and when we enter into that agreement, we will bring that agreement before Parliament, and if the agreement has financial consequences, we shall insert that amount of money in the Estimates — and that is the true constitutional form which we, under our Westminster system of Government, will adhere to.

If the honourable Member wants a presidential system of Government, if he wants a system of Government in which the President goes out, like President Reagan, and makes a jackass of himself and then cannot get Congress to implement his thing, let him have that form of constitution. But that is not the form of our constitution. When the Executive of Cabinet decides and it comes into Parliament, the votes will back the Executive — and that is the fundamental distinction.

Asides.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Oh, I do not mind you. I do not mind you all. You all walk about talking about how you all are federalists, and then when you come to do any little exercise with the rest of the territories, you pretend to the people of Barbados that we must not associate with the other territories. You know that that is nonsense, too.

Of all the people in this world, of all the people who should move a Resolution of this kind, it would be the honourable Member. The honourable Member must recognise, if he is logical, that it is impossible for Barbados to act in isolation. In trade, in aviation, in marine, in pollution control, in fisheries protection, in defence — in

every aspect of our existence — Barbados cannot act alone. That is a fact. We never could act alone from the beginning of our existence, we cannot act alone now, and we will never be able to act alone because.....

Asides.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Well, that is your business. Do not take up the amount then.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is only another attempt by the Democratic Labour Party to confuse the minds of the people. They are now trying, once again, to discredit the Government by throwing a lot of red herrings across the trail of a very simple agreement that has been entered into, carrying out all of the legal powers that are vested in a Government.

Asides.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: What secret, what? Honourable Members on the other side talk about secrets. The honourable Member does not even understand the meaning of security, because if he thinks you conduct your security business in the public, there is something wrong with his head. There really is something wrong with any Member who can seriously advance the proposition that matters relating to security should be conducted in public. If the honourable Member feels that you conduct matters in relation to security in public, the honourable Member is unfit to be a member of any Cabinet, or to hold any responsible position.

Asides.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Obviously, because whether you are a communist Government, whether you are a capitalist Government, whether you are a socialist Government, the rules are exactly the same thing — that in matters relating to the security of the state, the maximum secrecy surrounds it.

You see, if the honourable Members were trustworthy — of course, if the honourable Member were the Leader of the Opposition, and he was trustworthy as Leader of the Opposition, a Government could vouchsafe certain things, in confidence.

4.50 p.m.

You see, the Democratic Labour Party are really hoisted by their own petard, because on numerous occasions, from the time they came in here in Opposition, when we tried to involve them in these matters, when we tried to encourage them to participate on a bi-partisan basis in certain respects, they have always said they are not in that, and that all public business must be conducted in public. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they

cannot then complain when we treat matters of vital interest to the security of the state as matters of secrecy. Once we have signed it, Parliament will be informed, and when there is a financial implication, Parliament will have the power to vote for or to vote against it in the Estimates.

The honourable Member is supposed to be a constitutionalist. He is supposed to have done a Masters in Government at Manchester or some place. Obviously he has forgotten his books on the British Constitution, because a treaty-making power resides in the Executive, and the only control Parliament has over the Executive is when it comes to a law-making implementation process, either financially or legally. You know that, too. If it is in relation to the treaty, if it is in relation to the Estimates, you have to put it in the Estimates, and you can challenge it there. If it is in relation to a law, in making it into domestic law, the honourable Member has obviously forgotten that these are the only two powers that Parliament has upon the Executive, and the third is public opinion, and you know that when it comes to the battle of public opinion that you cannot battle us out there. You cannot battle us out there and you cannot battle us in here.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: You have television.)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: We have the public platforms, too. We can handle you there any time.

Sir, I hope the general gist of this debate is correctly interpreted. The Government had done nothing wrong. The Government is only pursuing, and I will repeat it finally, a policy which it made known from the very beginning, that the Government believes that there are certain areas of activity with respect to Barbados that can only be carried out successfully if they are carried out in conjunction with the rest of the Eastern Caribbean.

And we believe it is cheaper to do it that way; we believe it is more beneficial in the short run and in the long run, and we believe that the agreement that we have entered into implements and embodies the principles upon which we feel we should conduct our arrangements with respect to a joint Coast Guard and joint defence, and we have no apology to make to anybody who believes that Barbados can exist in isolation.

Barbados can exploit the Windwards and Leewards economically, Barbados can do all these things, but Barbados is not to participate in any of the burdens. We do not believe in that. There is no one-way exercise. It is a question of mutual benefits and mutual obligations.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will not be very long, because I would like to see the debate over

this evening, but I think I have a contribution to make on this Resolution which is before the House.

It would seem that the Opposition right now is accusing the Government of acting in secrecy. Indeed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot agree at all with the Opposition, even though I see there is a lot of room where we could co-operate and have some understanding on this. To accuse the Government of acting in secrecy is certainly not a right accusation against the Government.

I was just glancing through the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party for 1981, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and on page 28 I came to the section "Defence", and all the accusations which the Opposition are levelling at the Government one would definitely have to throw out through the window, because this matter was thoroughly canvassed in 1981 before the last General Election. It is a matter which the people of Barbados have studied and it is, indeed, a matter on which the people of Barbados have again re-elected the Barbados Labour Party to office to govern.

Everything the Government did in defence has been put to the electorate of Barbados prior to the election, and I think it is really unfair for the Opposition to say that the Government acted in secrecy. The Barbados Labour Party clearly stated its position in relation to the Defence Force, in relation to the Coast Guard and in relation to the Trident. All these matters were put to the electorate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I do not understand what the Opposition is coming here with this evening.

Quoting from the manifesto which has already been made a document of the House, it says:

"Events within Barbados, the Caribbean and elsewhere, have proved the need for Barbados to have a limited Defence Force with a capacity to withstand the immediate assault of potential marauders, terrorists and mercenaries."

It is quite clearly set out here, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Do you know what I am beginning to believe? I am beginning to believe that hurricanes and storms, coups and threats of coups, and earthquakes happen in the world, but not in Barbados. It is a figment of the imagination of Barbadians that these things do exist elsewhere but they cannot happen here.

Sidney Burnett-Alleyne is a figment of the imagination of the people on this side of the House. John Banks is another case, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am reliably told that he has been to prison twice since the facts were made known that he was heading an invasion to overthrow the Government of Barbados; but in the minds of the people of Barbados, so the Opposition would make them see, it just really does not happen. It would happen

in Guyana, it would happen in Saudi Arabia, it would happen in some far off country, but it cannot happen here.

When hurricanes like Allen and David threatened Barbados and simply bypassed the country, it was a figment of the imagination of the merchant class in Barbados to set up fictitious hurricanes. Coups and counter-coups do not exist, as far as the Opposition would make the people believe.

The Democratic Labour Party perhaps might have the chance to rule again, but not in the foreseeable future, and it is the Government's duty to make preparations for the eventualities of disorders within the region and within the country. The Defence Force is money well spent on the protection of Barbados, on the protection of our fishing industry.

I am told that the International Civil Aviation Order requires that a country should have adequate sea-going equipment to assist jets of a particular size, and under the old Administration we were saddled with what was the George Fergusson, a vessel that was totally incapable of meeting the requirements of international standards. The Defence Force Trident, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am told, adequately fulfils international requirements. So what are we to do? Are we to sit idly by, let the world go by, and do nothing in the interest of protecting and developing our country?

The Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party — of 1981, this is no secret — in putting the case for a Defence Force, told the people of this country:

"The Party has therefore established a Defence Force, with the accent on its Coast Guard wing, to provide not only strict defence protection, but also to monitor the movement of persons and things along our sea lanes; to patrol our coastal waters; to assist in the prevention and detection of smuggling and protection of our seas; to protect our territorial waters and 200 mile economic zone; to assist our fishermen and yachtsmen in search and rescue missions, and to allow our airport authorities to comply with the standards of the International Civil Aviation Organisation, which demands adequate Coast Guard services in countries whose airports lie near to the sea."

What is wrong with the acquisition of the Trident, Mr. Deputy Speaker? "The DLP has been relentless in attacking the Defence Force, its role and its cost." That is what the manifesto said. The people realised that and they again voted for the Barbados Labour Party to govern, and it was these same conditions which the Barbados Labour Party said it was putting to you as a policy, which we were going to implement if the people

should give us back the Government — and today we are hearing it was done in secrecy, it was done without the knowledge of the people of this country.

"A Barbadian crew is now being trained and will, within the next few months, sail the coastguard flagship "Trident" from Britain to Barbados."
5.00 p.m.

How else could we have put it? What is wrong in Barbados making ample protection for its coasts, for its people, for its minerals around the coast of Barbados? What is wrong with the Barbados Government spending money in the interest of the people of Barbados? What are we supposed to do? If we had waited, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and there was an invasion of Barbados, we would have heard the cry. "The Government made no provision for the adequate protection for the people of Barbados." That is what we would have heard.

I just want to say in closing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Government, this Barbados Labour Party Government, made this known to the people before the people went to the polls to elect a Government; that if we were elected, we were going to amplify and build a Coast Guard to monitor the services, to monitor this country, and to protect the people from intrusion and invasion from the people abroad.

That is exactly what we have done, and for the Democratic Labour Party, the Opposition, to say that they were not aware of this, surely demonstrates that they do not have the interest, that they are not monitoring what is going on in this country, neither do they understand the importance of defence in a developing country.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Christ Church West Central.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is clear that the honourable Member for St. Michael North East did not understand what this Resolution is all about. His whole argument was designed to show, in his words, that everything that the Government of Barbados did in relation to defence has been put to the people before election. I will answer his whole speech with one question. Has this Memorandum of Understanding, which we are talking about, been put to the people of Barbados before election? That is what we are dealing with, a Memorandum of Understanding, and all that the honourable Member tried to illustrate in his speech is that the people of Barbados knew everything about defence before election, and in no way did he deal with the issue which is now before this Honourable House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Resolution which is before us, which has been so ably moved by the honourable

Member for St. Michael South and well-supported by others on this side, is simply calling on the Government to seek authorisation of this House before entering into any agreements involving regional or foreign governments.

Now it is clear that the honourable Member was not for a single moment questioning the right of the Government to enter into any treaty-making arrangements with foreign countries. But the whole tenor of the speech of the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central was designed to indicate that we on this side were questioning the right of the Government to enter into a treaty-making power with foreign governments.

He started by saying that, constitutionally, the treaty-making power is vested in the Executive. Now that is a most elementary principle of constitutional law. Everybody knows that the treaty-making power is vested in the Executive and that the Executive has the right to enter into whatever treaties it likes with foreign countries. So, that is not the issue which is before us.

But then, the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central, in typical fashion, mixed up his argument by saying that we in the Democratic Labour Party, when we were in Government, exercised the right of the Executive into making treaties with foreign governments and cited the CARICOM Treaty as an example.

Now we agree that we entered into the CARICOM Treaty. The objects and reasons and purposes for which CARICOM has been established are well known to all. That is a movement which was designed to deepen the process of integration in the Caribbean. Yet, in the very next breath, the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central makes the point that we in the Democratic Labour Party will seek at all times to destroy anything connected with regional integration, and makes the bold assertion, the bold and presumptuous assertion, that we on this side are isolationists.

I ask, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would isolationists be instrumental in organising the Caribbean Community and the Common Market? He destroyed his argument in the two statements that he has uttered, one that we are isolationists and, secondly, that we have entered into treaty-making arrangements with other countries in the Eastern Caribbean in the form of CARICOM.

We do not question — I repeat — we do not question the right of the Executive to enter into treaties with foreign countries; CARICOM is an example. But what we are saying is that in relation to a treaty of this kind, a treaty which is in essence a military defence pact with other sovereign nations in the region, it is better that the arrangements and the agreements concluded be discussed in Parliament.

That is not to deny that the Executive has a right to enter into that treaty, but this type of military pacts are serious things. For us in this region who have just recently, in relative terms, emerged out of independence, we do not have a history and a background of entering into military pacts and arrangements with others. That has been done for us before, by the colonial masters when we were part of the colonial empire. But it borders on arrogance to suggest that if we ask that matters of this kind be discussed in Parliament, we are doing something that is so offensive and hideous; and the whole tenor of the speeches on the other side is indicative that there is something wrong with us, as members of the Opposition, if we are asking that matters of this kind be discussed in Parliament.

What is wrong with that? Is it such a grave offence to ask that matters which affect the finances of this country, which the taxpayers are going to be called upon to finance — is it so wrong that we ask that matters of that kind be discussed in Parliament?

The honourable Member for St. James North spent three quarters of his speech attacking the honourable Member for St. Michael South because he dared to move this Resolution. He attacked him on the ground that he was an advocate of removing and depressurizing opposition when opposition did not agree with him. They want to hang that around the neck of the honourable Member for St. Michael South. He denied that. He said that the honourable Member for St. Michael South made the point that honourable Members on the other side obviously misunderstood and misrepresented the statement he was making. But the honourable Member for St. James North should be the last one to make that sort of accusation against the honourable Member for St. Michael South, or anybody else for that matter, because he has been the arch-advocate of starving people who do not agree with him, and his philosophy, the philosophy of the Douglas Leopold Phillips is — if your initials begin with D.L.P., you should starve.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order. The Member said that I am the arch-advocate of starving people. Well, Sir, that is their interpretation, that I want to starve people. But look what his colleague wants to do, mow us down with machine guns, I am only copying your style.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Deputy Speaker.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No point of order.

Mr. M. A. KING: No point of order; a point of disorder.

That does not alter the fact that the honourable Member has been the arch-advocate of that most pernicious doctrine, that persons who do not agree with him politically should starve. And his colleagues on that side did not take him to task on it. They should have done it. He should have been disciplined for it.

Asides.

Mr. M. A. KING: It was not a slip of the tongue — he meant that. He was probably articulating the feeling of many others. But I only cited that to show that you can make accusations against others. You cannot criticise the honourable Member for St. Michael South because he dared to bring a Resolution of this kind before Parliament; all he is asking that we understand that Parliament debate these issues.

The honourable Member for Christ Church East Central has made the point that we follow the Westminster tradition; we are a parliamentary democracy. We don't have a presidential system like the United States. But we all claim to be democracies, the United States claim to be one of the greatest democracies on earth, but even in the great United States, which we consider to be one of the greatest democracies on earth, whatever that means, even in that country where the Executive exercises its right of making treaties, those treaties have to be ratified by the Congress of the United States — the role of advice and consent.
5.10 p.m.

So there is nothing wrong at all with debating issues of this kind in Parliament, because that is where the people's business has to be done, that is where the issues affecting the country are properly to be debated, and it is pointless telling us and saying to the people of this country, "We have the right to make the treaties, we have the right to do this, we have the right to do that, we have the right to do anything." Parliament has the right to do anything it wants, and in the final analysis it is accountable, really and truly, only to the electorate which puts it there. Professor Dicey, the old constitutional lawyer, has made the point that the only thing perhaps Parliament cannot do is to make a man a woman, or something like that.

Parliament can pass a law here now declaring all of Barbados criminals, for that matter, but that does not make it right. Parliament has that right constitutionally, but it does not make it right. The Government has the right to make treaties with foreign countries whenever it likes, but that does not make it right for the Government to do that without the consent of those who are being governed, because the whole premise of parliamentary Government as we know it, and the whole point about elections, is that it is premised on the assumption that those who are being governed expect to

be consulted and expect to be informed on whatever is being done on their behalf and in their interest.

That is what the Resolution is designed to show. It is a way of saying to the Government this is a serious matter, it involves the defence and security of this nation, it involves committing the people of this nation to financing defence and security pacts, it involves perhaps risking the lives of young Barbadian men and women in the Defence Force overseas, and it is not only just but right that issues of such a great and serious nature be brought to the Parliament of this country and discussed. That is what the Resolution says. Read the Resolution and do not let us go down all kinds of side tracks and talk of misrepresenting positions just to indicate that you have the power, and therefore if you exercise the power, nobody can say or do anything about it.

We say that this Memorandum of Understanding should have been discussed. The Memorandum of Understanding has implications as far as the security of Barbados itself is concerned, it has implications as far as the Police in this country are concerned, it has implications for the maintenance of law and order in Barbados, it has implications for the conflicting positions of the Defence Force and the Police Force in Barbados, it has implications for the conflict and possible conflict of defence forces of other areas in pursuance of their right of hot pursuit in conflict with the national civil powers. All those are areas which are considered and articulated and covered by the Memorandum of Understanding, and all we are saying is that where there are so serious implications for the people of Barbados, it is right that these matters should be discussed in the Parliament of Barbados. What is so wrong with that?

In the final analysis, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no reason why the Government of Barbados cannot support the Resolution before us. We are talking about this Memorandum of Understanding which involves us, with the Governments of Antigua and Barbuda, with the Government of the Commonwealth of Dominica, with the Government of St. Lucia, with the Government of St. Vincent and the Grenadines covering the area of security and military co-operation. These are areas which, clearly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, must be debated in the Parliament of this country, and if any of us feel that we are too arrogant to come and deal with these areas in the Parliament of this country, something has to be wrong with democracy.

I would urge all honourable members to support the Resolution which is before this Honourable House and which asks for nothing more than that we should condemn the Government for the manner of committing Barbados to this Memorandum of Understanding, and we call upon the Government to seek authorisation of this Honourable House before entering into any agreements involving regional or foreign Governments.

I have great pleasure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in supporting the Resolution before us.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW rose.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS rose.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am not winding up, I would like to speak.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You cannot wind up, you can make up your mind now, one or the other.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I got up on the last occasion to speak and.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you had better indicate to me who caught your eye and I will abide by your ruling.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am not winding up, the honourable Member will be able to speak after me. I will move a further extension if he wants to speak this afternoon.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: We did not want an extension in the first place, so do not worry with that. Just give me a ruling and let me go along about my business.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. John caught my eye.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Thank you very much. One way or the other it is all the same thing.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Resolution moved by the honourable Member for St. Michael South, drawing to the attention of the people of Barbados that the Government of Barbados signed an agreement entitled a Memorandum of Understanding with certain Governments of the Commonwealth Caribbean relating to security and military co-operation, and that by that Memorandum the people of Barbados are being called upon — and this is the crucial part of this Resolution — to commit their financial, physical and human resources upon an undertaking; the concepts, scope and implications of which have not been discussed either in principle or substance by the representatives of the people in Parliament, and I should like to add these words: "or at all".
5.20 p.m.

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House of Assembly

- (i) condemn the Government for the manner in which Barbados is being committed to this undertaking....."

I would like to amend that, perhaps, and say — "has been committed."

- (ii) call upon the Government to give an assurance that in the future it shall seek prior authorisation from this House before entering upon such firm and solemn agreements....."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable Member for St. John reading the Resolution or is he moving amendments to the Resolution.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not moving an amendment. When I said I would amend that, I meant oratorically speaking, Sir. I am not moving an amendment. I am just using the past perfect tense instead of the present indicative. It is just a question of syntax.

"call upon the Government to give an assurance that in the future it shall seek prior authorisation from this House before entering upon such firm and solemn agreements involving regional or foreign governments."

This is one of the mildest, most innocuous Resolutions ever moved by an Opposition in the 31 or 32 years that I have been sitting on one side or the other of this Chamber. I do not really understand why it has generated so much heat and so little life, but I want to join with my colleagues in saying this. It is not simply a juridical question of whether the treaty-making power is one of the prerogatives of the Crown in its right to Government in this country at all, because anyone with a passing acquaintance of Constitutional Law knows that the Crown, in its right of the Government of Barbados, reserves to itself the prerogative right to make treaties. But treaties made by the Crown, in its right of the Government of any country, must inure to the benefit of the country and not be destructive of the public purpose.

I wish, in the short time at my disposal — I will write the definitive work on it at a later stage — to give a short historical review of the whole concept of defence and security in the Caribbean region. I am not going back to the buccaneering days; I will deal strictly with the 20th century.

It has always been regarded that, from a strategic point of view, the Caribbean Basin countries were under the sphere of influence of the United States of America. But, in truth and in fact, there were four other powers, despite the Monroe doctrine, which exercised military dominion in the area, and these would be the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the Republic of France, the King-

dom of Great Britain and, at one time, the Kingdom of Denmark.

In 1917, the United States made its first legal intrusion — I say "legal" advisedly, because some time around 1799 Mr. Teddy Roosevelt made his famous ride up San Juan Hill, ostensibly to assist the Cubans in their fight against the Spanish Over-Lords and to protect the lives and properties of American citizens at that time, but in truth and in fact, to start American imperialism on its march towards world domination.

In so far as the Caribbean was concerned, we had the British Navy Headquarters in Bermuda. There was such a thing as the West Indies Naval Squadron. The Americans had the first fleet and the second fleet, the Pacific and the Atlantic; the British had the West Indies Squadron, the Far East Squadron, the Indian Ocean Squadron and the North Atlantic Squadron. The West Indian Squadron was under the control, in my early days, of a gentleman who owned Drax Hall Plantation in St. George, by the name of Earl Drax. The plantation is now owned by his son, a former Naval Officer as well, Mr. Henry Drax.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: He is controller of the plantation.

It was the first sugar plantation in Barbados, and it shows the linkage between defence and sugar. Admiral Drax was in charge of the West Indies Squadron and started sugar in Barbados. In fact, his foreparents started sugar.

What is significant — there is a reason for what I am saying — when you look at the American Acquisition of the Virgin Islands, there was a strategic motive behind the acquisition of the Virgin Islands from the Government of Denmark in 1917, and I know quite a bit about that because I lived there shortly after. The first school I went to was a Danish School, and the gentleman, Hamilton Jackson, who negotiated the treaty, lived in our house.

There was a reason, because from the naval point of view, this archipelago of the Eastern Caribbean controlled the entrances to the Panama Canal, which the same Mr. Teddy Roosevelt had requested from the Government of Columbia. So American imperialism in the Caribbean started round about 1799.

In 1907, 40 000 Barbadians went in to build the canal. It was not built by the Americans, it was built by Barbadians. The Jamaican Government proscribed any recruitment of Jamaicans because of malaria, so Barbadians naturally went and built the Canal.

Time gone? I am now warming up.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 5.30 p.m. This brings us to the end of Private Members Business.

MOTION TO FURTHER EXTEND PRIVATE MEMBERS BUSINESS

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Private Members Business be extended to 6.30 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: There is no provision in the Standing Orders for the Government, without the suspension of the Standing Orders, extending anything. And certainly Private Members' Business is the prerogative of the Opposition and Private Members, and not for the Government to regulate Private Members Business.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is that Private Members' Business be extended until 6.30 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir. That is not a proper motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member please sit.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: But I am speaking, Sir and the time, as you said, has expired so you.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the honourable Member please take his seat.

The question is that Private Members' Business be extended until 6.30 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir. I just want to speak on the motion. I would like to point out that I understand that earlier on today, when I was temporarily absent from the Chamber, when the appointed time came that there was a motion made by the Government that Private Members' Business be extended to 5.30 p.m.

I do not know what all this manoeuvring is in aid of. I am submitting that that is not a proper motion to be put by any Government Member or by any Member. Anyone who.....

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: On a point of order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: What do you have to do with this?

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: You do not have to interpret what I have to say.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not even understand you, so I don't know how I could interpret you!

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are two honourable Members on their feet. The honourable Member for St. Andrew.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, am I to understand that when the honourable Member for St. John spoke that he was well aware that he was out of order in speaking on the motion that was before the House at that time?
5.30 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the point I was trying to make is a simple one.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You do not hear those asides. Let them deal with one another.

The point I am making is that if a motion like this is allowed after you had announced that the time has expired or at any time, it means we can go on until 3 o'clock in the morning the Government just extending Private Members' Business. I am saying that Private Members' Business is Private Members' Business, and even private Members could not ask for an extension unless, at the beginning of the meeting of the House, the Standing Orders were suspended. Now it is as simple as that. Am I therefore to understand that we are going to go on extending Private Members' Business interminably on this basis? One motion was made already.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order,.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Do you want to do Government Business?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, the Leader of the Opposition knows full well that as long as it is the pleasure of the House we can extend Private Members' Business. If I can refresh his memory, when Lloyd Smith was doing the Budgetary Proposals back in 1969, when he cut the wires in here, you, yourself got up and moved that the time be extended for him to speak. It was Private Members' Business. What are you telling me at all? It was a Resolution condemning the then Government and you, yourself, moved the motion, and Smith went and cut the wires with the pliers, and now you are saying you cannot do it. Have you forgotten that?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Speakers' rulings in this House have always been taken as precedents. Where the rules are silent, we are supposed to follow previous rulings made. I have sat in this House from 1970, and I

have observed motions made to extend Private Members' Business even when the Standing Orders had not been suspended, and I am therefore going to entertain a motion that Private Members' Business be now extended.

The question that Private Members' Business be now extended until 6.30 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM; Hon. L. S. CRAIG; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE; Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER; Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; Hon. H. deB. FORDE; Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE; Mr. J. G. ODLE; Mr. L. L. SISNETT and Mr. A. TRUSS — 12.

Noes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN; Mr. P. M. GREAVES; Mr. N. K. SIMMONS; Mr. M. A. KING; Mr. B. M. TAITT and Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD — 7.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Private Members' Business is now extended to 6.30 p.m.

Prior to the motion, the honourable Member for St. John was speaking. He may now continue.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was pointing out that prior to the American intervention in the Caribbean in 1899, prior to the Spanish-American War, the United States did not enjoy much dominion in the Caribbean Sea. The protection of the shipping lanes, the protection of our coastal waters was predominantly under the control of the Royal Navy and the West Indies Squadron.

For the first three years of World War I, the United States did not become one of the combatting nations; but in 1917, prior to the entry of the United States into World War I, the United States acquired the Danish Virgin Islands from the Kingdom of Denmark by purchase, in the same way that they purchased Louisiana, Alaska and other territories, whereas most other nations in the Caribbean had acquired their territories by conquest, and the United States did this specifically to protect the United States shipping which was growing apace as a result of the engagement of the other colonial powers in the European theatre of war.

In the inter-war period we then saw the development of an American fleet in the Caribbean, but this American fleet in the Caribbean, with headquarters in Roosevelt Road in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and in Guantanamo base in the southern part of Cuba, concerned itself more with manoeuvres with the North Atlantic fleet and with the protection of the Panama Canal than with the Eastern Caribbean. It is true that,

from time to time, these islands were visited by ships of the United States Navy.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would like to continue my intervention without all this noise going on.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You should have heard your side on Tuesday.)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not want to hear anything from anybody, either over there or over here. Stop being so obstreperous.

The visit of the United States fleet to these shores, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was more in the nature of what the United States personnel used to call "R and R" than for tactical or strategic purpose — Rest and Recreation, "R and R". In the same way that Hawaii was reserved for the Pacific Fleet, with large areas dedicated to the entertainment of American troupes, certain areas in Barbados were frequented by the members of the United States Navy when they came here strictly for rest and recreation.

The job of protection of the Caribbean Islands in the Eastern Caribbean therefore resided almost exclusively under the Royal Navy's West Indies Squadron, and that continued right up to the outbreak of World War II. At the beginning of World War II or soon after the beginning of World War II, two things took place. President Roosevelt and Mr. Winston Churchill met and, before the United States even became a participant in that struggle, agreed to exchange certain bases — which did not include Barbados, but Atkinson Field in Guyana, Waller Field and Piarco in Trinidad, two fields in Jamaica, Coolidge Airfield in Antigua — for 50 flush-deck destroyers which the United States Navy then had in Norfolk, Virginia in mothballs.

5.40 p.m.

The British Government was sorely pressed for escort vessels — I forgot to mention St. Lucia where there was also a base — and none of the Governments were consulted because the Colonial Office had dominion over these islands. But what the British did was to set up two projects, an air training project in Trinidad and a Trinidad Royal Naval Reserve, HMS Bimbow, and, therefore, for the next four years, the question of defence of the Caribbean was vital to the survival of Great Britain because of the refinings in Curacao and Aruba, which you would be aware of, Sir, the Venezuelan oil and, at that time, the largest producer of oil in the Commonwealth, which was Trinidad and Tobago.

Now we have to realise why I am giving this survey. Soon after, peace broke out; hostilities came to an end.

Both the United States Navy and the British Navy began a strategic withdrawal from the whole Caribbean, because, with the exception of the naval base in Roosevelt Road and the Guantanamo Naval Station in Cuba, which is being retained purely for political and not for strategic purposes, the whole of the Caribbean became irrelevant; completely and utterly irrelevant to any concept of modern warfare. Even Rainey Airforce Base, where the Americans used to send B-52s, twenty-four hours a day, over the Soviet Union in the Fifties and Sixties, unknown to the people down here in the Caribbean, loaded with nuclear weapons, even that had been closed down. A few desultory exercises are carried out from Roosevelt Road on the eastern side of Puerto Rico by the American Navy, which nobody takes very seriously at all.

The British Army continued to go to Dominica, unknown to the Barbadians, for quite a few years up to the Sixties. They had an operation, called "Operation Rum Jungle", under which they did training, but even that came to an end.

What is very significant is that whereas there was a whole complete West Indies Squadron — including aircraft carriers, counter-clash cruisers, battleships, frigates, destroyers and patrol boats — stationed in the West Indies right up to the Fifties, the British systematically pulled the carpet from under the West Indies defence and left the senior naval officer of the West Indies Squadron stationed in Bermuda, with a house with a swimming pool, and one frigate, which is a glorified kind of destroyer with a slightly more sophisticated weapon system. So the whole of the Caribbean now was left to the tender mercy of one frigate, which appeared maybe when there was a hurricane. They would race madly from wherever they were in the Caribbean and that was the whole British Naval presence — from having a complete fleet in the West Indies — because the whole concept had changed.

The point I am making is that in all the years, whether it was from the Treaty of Utrecht, when they acquired many of these islands in the Eastern Caribbean, or from the foundation of this colony in 1627 or whenever it was — in 1625, the British never thought it was any part of their duty, in those days when the Navy was all powerful, to patrol these waters to assist the Government in anti-smuggling or anti-mercenary operations or anything else.

I will go further and make this statement now: When they had three vessels operating in the Eastern Caribbean, they being the British, instructions were given to the Commanders of those vessels that they were not to interfere with any vessels suspected of smuggling in the Leeward Islands or the Windward Islands, specifically

Grenada, Antigua and Montserrat, because you would ruin the economy of those islands if these vessels were intercepted. I am saying that categorically. So if there were any headquarters for a token Caribbean Defence Force, it was in Trinidad during the Federation, with H.M.S. Bimbow and the presence of so many anti-submarine vessels and that sort of thing, and the fleet in Trinidad during the war.

Here we have a situation now in which the Government goes and joins up, not with people who have something to help Barbados, but we are playing big brother to a lot of islands, who not only are not interested in anti-smuggling operations — and I say that categorically — and I would prove it to you in a moment.

We had an air-sea rescue launch which was designed for air-sea rescue operations, so don't let me hear anything about the International Civil Aviation Organisation telling us what we should have, because we had one. When the time came for us to get the Coast Guard vessels, I offered the air-sea rescue launch, which was a high-speed launch, which could do 45 knots, to the Government of St. Vincent, because I was appalled by the dynamiting of fish and the smuggling I used to see going on in the Grenadines, particularly by people from Martinique and Guadeloupe. The Government of St. Vincent told me, through Colonel Anderson, who was then the Commissioner of Police, "Thank you very much for the launch, but it would cost them \$80 000 a year to run." They were not interested in stopping their own from smuggling, but we are stopping them.

Now if they cannot afford to pay \$80 000 a year, why should Barbados pay three-quarters of a million a year to protect them? Quite apart from that, the vessels are tied up there all the time, because the Government has now discovered that it costs money to put those vessels at sea. They are tied up alongside the Careenage most of the year.

The other logistical problem is this, as I told both the Prime Minister of St. Vincent and the former Premier of St. Vincent, the way to stop smuggling in St. Vincent is to pull in your defences — declare all the islands "free port" and keep your protection around the natural harbours of St. Vincent, rather than saying you are going patrolling up and down. There is no way that, even with radar, you can patrol the Grenadines adequately.

This whole exercise is an exercise, I regret to say, in militaristic jingoism, one hundred years too late. It has nothing to do with modern technology or the logistics of our situation.

I listened with great interest to the intervention made by the "First Sea Lord", who is also the "Minister

of Snowcones", in this debate. But nothing that he said had anything to do with the Resolution which is before us.

Now this is a very serious agreement. I do not like to call it a Memorandum of Understanding; this is an agreement which was made. The history of this agreement is that the head of the Defence Force took off with the Prime Minister and a few other people.

Asides.

5.50 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not care who he took, the Prime Minister can take whoever he wants wherever he wants. It is his prerogative. But he went off in a plane that cost \$600 000. Both the plane and the Trident had breakdowns on their way down to Barbados; I am glad they did not have a breakdown on the way to this conference.

Now, when they got up there, Sir, after this thing was signed, on the Friday — I think it was the 25th of some month or the other — the Prime Minister sent me a copy of this thing saying that this was an agreement that they are contemplating, but I only got it on the Monday afternoon — it was sent by hand and arrived the Monday afternoon, but it was signed on the Friday. By protocol, the Leader of the Opposition was supposed to be consulted, but I am not offended. My objections are different kinds of objections. My objection is that we do not need it — let the islands look after themselves.

The other thing is that Trinidad, which is in a better position, because they had P.T. vessels of that kind of facility, they have helicopters.....

I wonder if the Prime Minister is going to give us some information on the two helicopters, for over \$7 million each, that a British firm has published that the Barbados Government has ordered. I wonder if he can give us some information on that, because the first thing we knew about any vessel was when I discovered in England that they were buying a thing called the Trident for something like \$13 million.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member will have three minutes more to complete his speech. I have excluded the eight minutes which were used to extend Private Members' Business. The honourable Member started at 20 minutes past, and I am allowing him three minutes, to 6.00.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Plus another minute and a half for your intervention.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am entitled to intervene.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the point I am making is this. In the 1978-79 Estimates there was a heading for ships, aircraft and ammunition. The very next year, when these things were being actually bought, it was deleted from the Estimates altogether, and yet this was the year in which the decision was made and contracts entered into without any discussion in this House, either in the Estimates or otherwise.

I have the newspapers in front of me here, and you will find that on Wednesday, April 9, 1980 they speak about Coast Guard vessels for sale, to be replaced by new ones, and in August they announced that a new Coast Guard vessel had arrived, and in the same paper — Wednesday, July 31 — when there was a \$20 million package for the Coast Guard, the *Advocate News*, at the bottom of the same page, announced

"The U.S. — Caribbean contingency task force has staged a week long mock invasion exercise in Puerto Rico under a veil of secrecy ordered by the State Department."

This whole thing is a mock invasion, this whole thing is what the taxpayers are being asked to spend \$20 million here for new vessels, the shrimp people and shrimp workers put out of work.

I am saying that in a society like this, in the context of modern warfare and modern technology — and I do not care what the honourable Member for Christ Church South East, or wherever he comes from, says — the Minister of Trade — I am the only one in here who has either fired a shot, or dropped bombs or seen a shot fired in anger — that is, outside of Barbados, I do not know what shots have been fired in anger in Barbados — but I am speaking about real warfare, I think I know something about it as a staff officer and as a front line operator.

You all will just talk but money spent on those Coast Guard vessels was a complete and utter waste of time, because the vessels we had were adequate for air/sea rescue operations and for the protection of our fishing fleet. And for the Government to go, clandestinely behind our backs, and agree to take on in, an imperialistic manner, something that both the British and the American Governments abandoned — if they had ever assumed it — over 15 or 20 years ago, could be nothing more than militaristic jingoism and imperialism.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Thomas.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Thank you, Sir.

Sir, I do not know how often I will have to speak in this debate, and therefore I am not going to speak at

enormous length at this stage. What I will say is this: The debate is a very confusing debate. The form of the Resolution is that the Government is to be criticised for entering into a Memorandum of Understanding, but the substance of the arguments in many of the speeches is that the Defence Force is unnecessary, the Coast Guard is unnecessary, the Defence Force is badly run or some other matter applying more particularly to defence generally, rather than to the Memorandum of Understanding.

There is nothing that I can add to what honourable Members on this side, and indeed some honourable Members on the other side, have said about a Government's treaty-making powers. You cannot enter into defence arrangements, in my respectful opinion, if they have to be analysed as if they were supplementary resolutions for a Maid's wages at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

Foreign Governments expect that when a sovereign Government makes a treaty, that it is free to negotiate the terms of the treaty, and the constitutional arrangements, under which we all live in Commonwealth countries, allow for Governments to make treaties without reference to Parliament. That is one of the very few Executive powers given to a Government which does not require parliamentary consent.

In the United States, a great innovation was introduced in 1782, I believe it was, when the Senate was given power to advise and consent to treaties, and a great embarrassment it has proved to the United States, too. Would honourable Members have me in the position of the United States President, President Wilson? In 1919, having set himself up as the arbiter of peace in Europe — he was the principal architect of the Treaty of Versailles that was to bring a new political order on any wars — when he got back to the United States he was repudiated by the Senate, and the United States never joined the League of Nations? That particular provision in the United States has long been the cause of debate among constitutional historians because of the enormous potential for embarrassment to the American Government.

As a matter of strict, constitutional practice, it was not even necessary for us to lay the Memorandum in the House. I did not even have to send a copy of it to the Leader of the Opposition, and I must say that I much regret that, because of whatever difficulties there are in the Government delivering documents, he did not get it in time.

The leaders of the Eastern Caribbean countries met here in Barbados; we agreed, while negotiating the Memorandum of Understanding, that we would each sign the Memorandum and then lay it in Parliament. That was the pattern, it is the normal pattern — because it is the

first time for a defence treaty in Barbados, it does not mean that there is not a usual pattern in other countries — and it was a matter of specific agreement between the Prime Ministers concerned of the Eastern Caribbean States that we would sign the Memorandum and lay it in our Parliaments. We even co-ordinated the meetings of Parliament and the laying dates so that the Memorandum would be laid in the different Parliaments as near as possible to the same time.

It should clearly be understood that there are some matters which are in their nature secret, and there are some negotiations which because of their nature must be untrammelled and unimpeded by obstruction or accusations of bad faith — all the matters that we so readily associate with the name of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.
6.00 p.m.

I do not know if any Government would negotiate with a Government that had to put the negotiations to Parliament to be spoken on by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central in his latter-day mood. I know for myself that if I was negotiating privately on matters that affected defence and security, it would not be possible for me to come and discuss the matter with the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central first. I know that. I do not trust him.

Apart from matters of personality, however, I think all Members know perfectly well that treaties are entered into by Governments — we have heard of the Caricom Treaty — and they then come to Parliament. Sometimes you move a Resolution to approve them, sometimes you do not. In this case, the Opposition has moved a Resolution to condemn, not the Memorandum of Understanding, but the manner in which the Government undertook it.

Well, what can I do with this? You have a Memorandum of Understanding. I thought we were going to discuss the Memorandum when I heard the Opposition was bringing a motion. Is the Opposition for it or is it against it? The Press, no doubt, thinks that the Opposition is against it, but the Opposition has not condemned it. A few people have said something against it. This is a case of trying to ride two horses going in opposite directions. The Opposition has not condemned the treaty; it has dropped a remark here and there.

Trying to say it is a very mild Resolution that the Government can accept is ridiculous, because the Resolution contains the words "condemn the Government." That is ridiculous. Those words by themselves are enough to give the Government a right of final reply, which may or may not be exercised, according to how the debate goes. It is a Resolution critical of the Government. We are not accepting that.

I would have been quite happy to debate the Memorandum of Understanding. I think we are all agreed, no matter how much ridicule is poured on Sidney Alleyne, that the security situation in the Eastern Caribbean is a different one from that which existed 10 years ago, and certainly a different one from that which existed when we were still colonies.

We are all agreed that there have been threats to the security of the Eastern Caribbean Islands. We are all agreed that each island is too small to look after its own security, even Barbados, and there are a whole set of doctrines — for those whose military reading have progressed beyond reading manuals for the care of a Boer War, 303, whether resting upon the shoulder or otherwise — which would tell you that defence in depth is as important in an archipelago of islands as it is on the broad continental plains of Europe; that the first line of defence of one island is its neighbour. Because a threat in a collection of islands is not likely to be mounted across thousands of miles of ocean, it is likely to be mounted from one island to another, and, therefore, you try to embrace all of your immediate neighbours in a security understanding to ensure that you avoid confusion.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I hear an honourable Member talking about the domino theory. We are not in Parish Gap now; these are not things you lick down on a board; because the honourable Member, all he knows about the domino theory is whether to play double six or six ace.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I think the honourable Member is misleading the House. I know when to play double six or six ace, as well as knowing the domino theory as it was enunciated in connection with Vietnam. The fallacy of the domino theory lead to slaughter, and I was merely trying to assist the honourable Member. I was not trying to be malicious.

I was trying to assist the honourable Member, and I was suggesting to him that he was, in fact, adverting to what has been described as the domino theory in the context of the islands or the countries in these regions.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am not going into the domino theory. As far as I know, the domino theory says that if Laos, Cambodia fell to the Communists, so would Vietnam. And I do not believe that that is exposed as a fallacy, since it is what happened.

But, nonetheless, it has to be clear to honourable Members that there is some need for defence, and that mutual defence is a desirable method of answering that need.

The Government of Grenada, Sir, has asked the assistance of the Government of Barbados in ensuring that certain Grenadians, who they named to us, do not come to Barbados to try to overthrow the Government of Grenada. They well recognise that a threat to them might come from a neighbouring place. The Government of Dominica, when it was threatened in 1979 by Sidney Alleyne, well recognized that they had to look to their neighbours in the French Islands for evidence of the threat. The threat to Barbados in 1976 was hatched in St. Maarten and intended to be mounted from the French Islands of the Caribbean. So we are trying to deal with that.

I am really not interested in smuggling and all the charming reminiscences of the right honourable Leader of the Opposition and whether or not the high speed air/sea launch was bought by Colonel Anderson or not. What he should have said that there is a high speed air/sea launch which came from HARP, that is what he should have said, and that when he offered it to the Government of St. Vincent, perhaps the Government of St. Vincent did not want to have any dealings with those vagabonds. He is talking about a launch that belongs to HARP. It was part of the sweetener for Barbados keeping Jerry Bull and the other criminals, who were making shells to destroy black people in Southern Africa, in Barbados. I really cannot pay too much attention to all those details.

We need a joint Coast Guard, and we are getting a joint Coast Guard. We have it now, you can say.

Now, there are a few specific points that I want to advert to, although I am not going to debate them at length. Can the Barbados Defence Force bear the burden of the Memorandum of Understanding? I do not see anything in the Resolution that obliges me to deal at length with the points raised by the honourable Member for St. Michael South under that heading. He must come when we do the Estimates and discuss the adequacy or inadequacy of the Barbados Defence Force.

The leadership of the Barbados Defence Force is very thin on the ground. He is perfectly right. There is the Colonel, and perhaps there is no immediate cadre of officers right behind him who are of his experience and training. For this reason, we have entered into agreements with the British to supply of Loan Service personnel, and we have also hired a number of experienced officers, some of them English in origin, who, one or two, have settled in the West Indies — there is a Major, there is a Captain, who honourable Members,

no doubt, will see in the House when Estimates time comes up, who have West Indian connections, I believe, by marriage — and we have searched the British Army itself for Barbadian officers — there are a number of Barbadians in the British service — and we are aware of the needs.

I do not understand what the honourable Member means about British officers coming from a different culture. If the honourable Member can find a major difference in the culture of the Loan Service officers from the culture of Colonel Lewis, Major Mapp, Capt. Maynard, Lieutenant Reece, the two Lieutenants Brathwaite; if the Honourable Member can find a major difference, I congratulate him. I think a little realism ought to enter our considerations.
6.10 p.m.

I think some officers have resigned for some very petty reasons indeed; some middle-aged Second Lieutenants, who were jealous.....

Asides

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: They were, actually, men of forty and that kind of age. They were of value to the Force, and when I say "jealous", I am not really attacking them. They took a mistaken view of their privileges and they may very well be a loss to the Force. Perhaps when saner counsels prevail, they will come back into the Reserve and we will have no difficulty. But their resignation has nothing whatever to do with the general capacity of the Defence Force. We are talking about a few reserve officers.

I do not know if the honourable Member thinks that if an English officer behaves badly on parade, is improperly dressed for a church service, uses bad language in the presence of the men about his colleagues and senior officers, that because he is British you should keep him here. Is that what the honourable Member for St. Michael South was suggesting? That would show a degree of subservience towards a former colonial power and I would not have expected to be in the honourable Member's normal catalogue of performance.

I know that since the Defence Force is in his constituency, he cannot attack it, and I admire the way that the two barrels of the Democratic Labour Party were fired. You fire one who is in favour of the Defence Force and who said it needs resources, facilities, everything; in other words, he is going to support the vote in the Estimates; and then you fire the other barrel, a man who with all the experience of a cadet at Combermere and the carrying of an old Lienfield can tell you that the Defence Force is the worst thing in the world for Barbados. So you ride the two horses. I am very glad that the honourable Members at least each rode his own horse and they

did not try to ride each other's. But I admire the debating tactic.

I must also say, however, that there is no pact entered into between Barbados and any other nation other than in the Memorandum of Understanding. There is no pact entered into in Martinique by any nation we know of, and Barbados is no part of any pact other than the one now being debated before the House.

The honourable Member for St. Philip North I thought made quite a constructive speech in favour of the Memorandum of Understanding, in favour of the Government's defence policy, and he well recognised — he put it in better language that I could put it, "Suppose you really have hostilities, you would spend much more than \$700 000 a year." Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is true, and that is true whether you have this Memorandum of Understanding or not. The honourable Member has seen the point, and I commend his argument to his colleagues.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West Central said that this Memorandum of Understanding impinges on the relations between the police and the military in Barbados. Of course it does, because the Commissioner of Police as well as the Chief of the Defence Staff are joint force commanders in the regional exercise. It says so specifically — the Commissioner of Police, Antigua and Barbuda Police Force; the Chief of Staff, Barbados Defence Force; the Commissioner of Police, the Royal Barbados Police Force, the Commissioner of Police, Commonwealth of Dominica Police Force; and so on.

The Police and the Defence Force are together in this Memorandum of Understanding, and a half truth, such as that uttered by the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central, to suggest that there is some reflection on the functions of the police within Barbados, is nonsense. Mr. Durant and Colonel Lewis were both with me in Dominica. All I can hear is how I signed and the Colonel was behind me. How come nobody saw the Commissioner of Police of Barbados.

Asides

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It was Durant who was there. Are you going to tell me now?

Honourable Members honestly, Sir, have me doubting myself. I travelled in the aeroplane with Mr. Durant; we got out together. Maybe in one way it was not with Mr. Durant, but he was there on the tarmac in Dominica with me.

Anyhow, Mr. Deputy Speaker, be assured that the Police and the Defence Force are together in this matter.

We really must not make any mischief between them upon this occasion.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, having listened to the speeches of the honourable Members of the Opposition, especially the most reasonable speech of the honourable Member for St. Philip North, having heard the history of defence in the Caribbean since 1899, having heard about San Juan Hill — the honourable Member said 1799, but he meant 1899; I am being kind to the Leader of the Opposition — having heard of the visit of the great white fleet, of Operation Rum Jungle, of the B52s which were flying with nuclear bombs some years before they were actually built — I think it was the B36s still carrying the bombs in 1950 — having heard all that, I am persuaded that the House is in favour of the Memorandum of Understanding, even though it does not like the manner in which the Government achieved its signing.

I therefore think that all honourable Members will be able to agree with the following amendment: to delete all the words following the first semi-colon in the Resolution, that is after "military co-operation," until we reach "Parliament" — in other words delete the second recital — and delete the present habendum and substitute therefor —

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House of Assembly supports the Government in its initiative and endorses the aforesaid Memorandum."

I beg to move that the Resolution be amended in those terms.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir: I heard the honourable Member putting an amendment.

Aside

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am dealing with the Deputy Speaker. I don't have to deal with you.

I am at a loss, Sir, as to what the position is. I am seeking guidance from Your Honour — (a) has the amendment been seconded and (b) has it been circulated or will it be circulated? Because, Sir, I am not sure what is before this Honourable House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: An amendment to the Resolution has been moved by the honourable Prime Minister and seconded by the honourable Minister of Trade. What is now before the House is a Resolution and an amendment moved by the Government.

The amendment to the Resolution will delete all the words appearing after the word "co-operation" in paragraph 1 and substitute therefor:

"BE IT RESOLVED that this Honourable House supports the Government in its initiative and endorses the aforesaid Memorandum."

That the Resolution will now be typed and circulated. We still have five minutes more to go in Private Members' Business.

Asides.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am putting to this Honourable House, Sir, that the amendment moved by the right honourable Member for St. Thomas is out of order. It would appear to me, Sir, that this amendment has so emasculated the Resolution as moved by the honourable Member for St. Michael South, that it is, in fact, not the same Resolution, but another Resolution. So, therefore, what we have before the Chamber is not an amendment to the Resolution moved by the honourable Member for St. Michael South, but a completely new Resolution. And, Sir, I think the Rules of this Chamber provide that we cannot have two Resolutions before the House at the same time.

Sir, there is nothing wrong with amending the Resolution of the honourable Member for St. Michael South. That can be legitimately amended. But the point I am making is that it has been amended in such a way as to make it a completely different Resolution, and for that reason, Sir, that amendment by the right honourable Member for St. Thomas is not in order.

Rule No. 23, Sir, of the Standing Orders of this House says

"When any motion or Bill is under consideration in the House or Committee thereof, an amendment may be proposed to such motion or Bill if it is relevant to the question or matter then under discussion; provided that no amendment can be made in the first part of a question, after the latter part has been amended, or has been proposed to be amended, if a question has been proposed from the Chair upon such an amendment."

In paragraph 2 it says, Sir,

"An amendment may be proposed if it is relevant thereto"

But the point I am making, Sir, and I think the point is found in Erskine May's, is that the amendment

must be germane to the Resolution and it must not be such as to make it a completely different Resolution. That is the point I am making, Sir, and it is for this reason, Sir, that I am submitting to this Honourable Chamber, for Your Honour's ruling, that the amendment as moved by the honourable Prime Minister, the right honourable Member for St. Thomas, is not in order. It is in breach of the Rules of Parliament and, therefore, Sir, cannot be in order. That, Sir, is my submission — for Your Honour's ruling, Sir.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I would just like to answer. I made it clear when moving the amendment that the original Resolution does not attack the Memorandum of Understanding; it merely criticises the manner in which it was entered into and, therefore, the amendment I proposed to move was in keeping with the spirit of the Resolution.

Sir, honourable Members know it is common place to move wrecking amendments on major matters. They know perfectly well that the last three or four Private Members' Resolutions to pass the House have all passed in an amended form. So I hope honourable Members will not seek to confuse the House with rules that do not exist.

The only difficulty that I have had for years and years in the House with these amendments is the ruling, which the honourable Member for Christ Church West subsequently assured me is correct, that after you have had a debate, when you have such an amendment such as this, which is, so to speak, consonant with the original motion — not the same, but it is of the same subject matter; it is not opposed in theory — that the speech in the original motion is the speech in the amendment. It is all the same. In other words, suppose the Leader of the Opposition had moved a small amendment to make the meaning of the Honourable Member for St. Michael South clear, the Honourable Member for St. James North could not speak again.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 6.30 p.m. That brings us to the end of Private Members' Business. Government Business is now resumed.

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, the DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.
6.30 p.m.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee of Supply.

HEAD 34 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for a number of relatively small sums of money. The Addendum is, I think, quite adequate. Erdiston College, supplies and materials of one kind and another - these are common occurrences where fees and bills due and owing in a particular financial year find themselves running over into another year, and we then discover that we have not got a sufficient sum of money in the current year's Estimates and are forced to come for a supplementary.

Most of the subheads, apart from Erdiston College, would be Primary and Pre-Primary Schools and Secondary Schools, relate to increases in certain utility rates occasioning the need to come before this Honourable House for supplementary funds.

There is a substantial supplementary requested under Subhead 10 - University of the West Indies. You will have to bear in mind that last year, 1982, was a salary revision year not only for the Barbados Public Service, but also for the University of the West Indies, which is budgeted for on a triennial basis, and that is responsible for the large sum requested under Subhead 10.

Under Subhead 15 - Government Industrial Schools - utilities again; School Meals Department, certain supplies and materials, unpaid bills, which have come forward from the last financial year into this.

I do not propose to go into any greater detail than is to be found in the Addendum, Mr. Chairman, and I do now beg to move that Head 34 stand part.

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

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, under this Head, I agree that it is only a small sum of money, but I would just like to ask the honourable Minister one or two questions.

As far as Erdiston College is concerned, I notice that the boarding establishment has been phased out. I would like to know what is being done with that space and what is generally being done up there. Also, I understand that some of the teachers are now asked to buy their own equipment, and I would like to know if this is true, or if this was always the case. As I understand it, this was not always so, and they are very concerned about it.

Under Subhead 5, I was in St. Joseph not too long ago and passed by Lammings, I think it was, and saw that school there in a very serious state of disrepair. I wonder if the Minister would use some of this money to upgrade

that school, or the facilities there. I understand that the facilities have been run down considerably and that the children and teachers there are concerned about the condition of that school and the facilities there.

This might not necessarily come under your Head, but dealing with the transport for pupils, from my recollection it does not seem as though the one in three children in the family is getting the subsidy for transportation, and indeed I wonder whether you could not look into the possibility of giving the child, who is spending the most money in transportation, the subsidy, rather than the oldest child. As I understand it, the present policy is that the first child gets the subsidy, but in that particular case it would not mean that the parent could not be less burdened than he or she is if the child spending the most money is getting the subsidy.

As I understand it, at the present moment if there are three children in the family, then one will be assisted, but that one to be assisted is the first child. However, it seems to me that in a family there could be three children, one could be paying two bus fares and be the second child, but the mother is not necessarily paid the money for the child using the most money, and I feel the burden on that parent could be eased considerably if we were to take into consideration paying the child spending the most money on bus fare and not necessarily the first child.

Those are the three points I want to raise with the Minister and I do not think at this moment there is anything else I want to ask.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I have a few points I would like to ask the Minister about this Ministry. I take note of the fact that a substantial amount of money is being asked for under this Head, and I am very concerned about some of the statements made in the memorandum accompanying this Head.

I wish that we could do these under subheads because I have so many questions, and I do not know that they can all fit into 15 minutes, so I give notice, Sir, that I would reserve my right a second time in view of the number of subheads covered here. But under Subhead 3 - Operating Expenses for Erdiston College - the last sentence there says that the bills did not reach the College until this financial year and are still outstanding since funds were not included under this Item to pay for these items.

That has to be wrong, Sir; there must be something wrong with it, because if you have a commitment, as I understand the system of accounting in the Ministries and in the departments, when you order goods there has to be a commitment against the vote for that amount. When the amount lapses, it would be a measure of incompetence, and I would not put it at the feet of the

authorities at Erdiston College. I am sure they would have submitted that they have these bills still outstanding, because if they were not paid they would have to be outstanding, so provision would have to be made in the Estimates for them. The funds may have lapsed, but the bills were still outstanding.

I want to know about the incompetence that led to provision not having been made, that is the point I am making. Why was provision not made?

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You are the only person I can ask, you have to tell me why provision was not made. You are the officer, you are the Minister; and if the Minister is doing her job competently, Sir, then she has to tell this Honourable House what is this business. How do we know that in the Ministry of Education generally, we are not going to have six, seven, or eight or nine other departments submitting now that they made no provision for the bills?

When this Parliament passes money for expenditure, it passes that money on the understanding that it has been given full information concerning the expenditure in the Ministry. Now we see here in the subhead that no provision was made. I would like the honourable Member to tell us what else, as far as she is aware, we can expect by way of non-provision in the Estimates.

(Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Now move on, try and make your point).

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Now, she is going to get a little uppity, Sir. The Minister now is going to get uppity and cause me to have to question her in a little more detail. It is her duty to answer those questions, she cannot tell me to move on. I have talked about the arrogance of this Government, the honourable Member has not been displaying such arrogance recently.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us get on.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I want to get on, I want her to tell me why

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chairman has not stopped the honourable Member.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You wish me to ask her, too. Very well, I will ask her for you too, Sir.
6.40 p.m.

I am going to support the \$50 000, under Subhead 7, for urgent repairs to the roofs at Springer Memorial School, St. Leonard's Boys and St. Leonard's Girls

School, Sir. I would like to suggest that this amount is not enough. I wish to draw it to your attention that what urgent repairs can be made with this amount, based on my knowledge of the repairs that have to be done to the roof and to other aspects of the structure, that this \$50 000 is misleading. I do not know how much is allocated to the Springer Memorial, but the roofs at the St. Leonard's Boys and Girls School are in serious disrepair — dangerously so, Sir.

There is a joy to see that the last intervention I made, Sir, has fallen on good ground. I can report that the roadway surrounding the new Science Block that was donated by one of the Governments, I think it was the Canadian Government, has now been barber-greened, and it looks like the kind of environment in which the children can learn. I am very pleased to see that.

The Science Block is very pleasant to the eye, but the rest of the school — now, Sir, now that we have the Science Block and the nice barber-green yards, the rest of the school which is in a dilapidated condition is beginning to bare itself.

The Walls in the Hall for the boys have not been painted for well nigh seven years, Sir. There are cracks in the walls of the Boys School. There is an area which used to serve as the Domestic Science Building, that area needs some urgent attention. I believe that the school now uses that area, and I believe the Headmistress recently indicated that, for the first time, the Girls School is embraced into one compound, but the block that contains the toilets is in a sad state of disrepair as well. The building, especially for the Girls School, gives the appearance of not having been painted for some considerable time, and I believe that the Minister would wish to take account of that.

I am aware that there are other schools in the island that may have similar problems. I am aware that funds are hard to come by, but these two schools have been fighting manfully in all the circumstances, and I believe that this \$50,000 is only going to allow for make-shift work. I would make bold to say that the roof on the Girls School needs to be replaced. I am not a carpenter, nor indeed a contractor, but I believe that the roof of the Girls School probably needs replacing completely, and I am not sure that it is going to be done with this amount that is voted here.

Under Subhead 10, Sir, I wish to declare an interest. This is Grants to Public Institutions, University of the West Indies. Since I have some small attachment to the institution and receive some remuneration, I wish to declare an interest. But I am not going to talk about the amount allocated; rather, I am going to raise a question concerning the policy of the Government on this whole question of the restructuring of the University.

I had the privilege of hearing the honourable Minister, outlining what she said at the time was Government's policy on the restructuring issue. I formed the impression that, in her capacity as Chairman of the Minister's group, which was discussing and negotiating with the university people on the whole business of restructuring, she was, on behalf of the Government, in the forefront of the restructuring exercise as outlined from time to time, and as outlined by her on that particular occasion.

I formed the impression that it was the policy of the Barbados Government to be for devolution of responsibility to the respective campuses, and I understood her to be putting that devolution in terms of autonomy on the campus — beyond that which has been asked for by the University Group of Teachers. I formed the impression, Sir, that if one could discuss the issue in terms of doves and hawks, that the honourable Member would fall into the category of the hawks.

I was utterly devastated when, at the recently Heads of Government Conference, a statement purporting to come from the former Minister of Education, now in his capacity as the Minister for Foreign Affairs, and alleged to be supported by the Prime Minister in his capacity as Head of Government, suggested that Barbados was not at all in favour of restructuring along the lines as had been outlined by the Minister, according to my understanding.

Now, Sir, you will appreciate that it is extremely difficult for an average citizen, or indeed even a parliamentarian, who is following these issues, to hear on the one hand a position taken by the Minister responsible for the portfolio, and on the other, at the highest level, where there is a Heads of Government Conference and where the big decisions are being made concerning a regional institution, to hear what is, in fact, the opposite position put by the Head of Government and the former Minister of Education and the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

I believe that we in this Honourable House, and indeed the people of Barbados, need a clear statement of policy from the Government on the restructuring.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You agree that we need a clear statement? Thank you.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: As to what the policy is.

But the honourable Member, who is a member of the Cabinet, the honourable Deputy Prime Minister, seems to be in the same kind of fog as the rest of us as to what restructuring is, what the Government's policy

is, who speaks for the Government and when we can accept statements coming from that side.

I believe, Sir, that I would beg the question if I seek to go into any greater detail at this point. I believe that it would be better to do that in the light of the opportunity to reconcile their views, because I am assuming that, on their return from Jamaica, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs would have had some kind of reconciliation with the views expressed by the Minister responsible for Education.

The people of Barbados have a vested interest in the clarification of this issue. I believe, Sir, that you, like me, happen to be at the point where the future of our children, and, therefore, we can recognise, the future of the children of the vast majority of Barbadians, who look to the University of the West Indies as...

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member is obviously like the gentleman who was described by his colleague for St. James North. I am not here to tell you. I cannot say that, Sir.

When this is taken into consideration, that in spite of the statements which we get — and I believe those statements are made in good faith — when we hear the statements from the authority for the Caribbean Examination Council, who I believe makes her statements in good faith, despite those statements, we have information that authorities in Canada are continuing by their attitude, to cast aspersions on the CXC results, it becomes even more important that we have the policy concerning the university clarified.

6.50 p.m.

As I was saying, many of us have a personal interest in what happens to the university, but those of us in this Honourable Chamber have a representational interest, because we represent the interest of a large number of constituents who ask us, from time to time, "What is the position with the university?" They look in the newspaper and they see a position taken by the honourable Member, they see the position taken by the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister, and they wish to know. I would like the honourable Minister to, if she can, tell us what the position is.

I believe my first fifteen minutes have run out and so I will stop at this point.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does any other honourable Member wish to make a contribution?

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, just as a matter of enquiry from the honourable Minister, Subhead 15, Item 7 reads as follows:

"No provision was made in the current estimates to pay for telephones. The Ministry paid the institution's telephone bills up to the end of the 1981-82 academic year."

I want to find out from the honourable Minister if this was an oversight in the preparation of the Estimates, or if it was deliberate policy, which is now being reversed, for the Ministry to be paying the telephone bills of the Industrial Schools.

Now that I am on my feet and on Industrial Schools, I would be much obliged to the honourable Minister if she could update us on what is the present position of the school, if it has settled down under its new head, and if she is satisfied with the situation at the school at the moment.

On the Audio-Visual section, Subhead 19, it really is a very pleasant occasion for me to be able to offer congratulations on this particular section to the Ministry for the programme that they did on Independence, and I am glad to see that the Minister is providing them with some additional funds to carry on the work in that particular section. It is pleasing that on Independence we were able, through the Audio-Visual Division, to show the talent of our young people in Barbados.

The lady Minister would be very pleased to hear that on that particular day I was actually dressed to leave, but I started to watch the programme and it was so pleasing to my heart that I changed my appointment, and I watched it right through. I took the opportunity to telephone the Headmistress of the Westbury Junior School and offer her my personal congratulations on the work that is being done at that school.

This is only an indication that if facilities are made available to our people in Barbados and our children, they can show the talent that is latent in them. This is why it is so necessary for us to have a clear understanding of the situation at the University of the West Indies.

I, too, have to declare a small interest. Mine is not a direct interest; my interest only comes from the fact that my wife works at the University of the West Indies, but I must admit that I am rather confused about the Government's position on the University of the West Indies and the proposed re-organisation of the University of the West Indies. It is most important that we should get some clear indication from the Minister about what is her Government's decision and what is her Government's role in the University of the West Indies' future.

I am certain that no one has yet quantified the impact the University of the West Indies has on the

Caribbean Governments, but I think it is reasonable to say that there must have been an impact, an awareness and an improvement in the Government Service and the private sector as a result of having a University in the presence of all of us. And any move that would have the effect of being likely to (1) interfere with the independence of the University of the West Indies, (2) interfere with its academic freedom, (3) interfere with the academic excellence that the University has been striving to meet, would have to have a very serious look at by all of us who are interested in the development of Barbados and the West Indies.

I await the Lady Minister's clarification on this particular point, and sincerely hope that she takes an opportunity on this occasion to inform this Parliament on the Government's position on the restructuring of the University of the West Indies.

On maintenance of schools, unfortunately this is only dealing with secondary schools, but I hope that the lady Minister is having, through her building department, a serious look at the elementary schools throughout Barbados. I know for a fact that the St. Philip Boys' School's roof is beginning to reach the stage where it is posing a danger to the students and teachers. There are serious structural problems with that roof at the St. Philip Boys' School.

I would suggest to the Minister that she instruct her building department to see that a survey on the structural integrity of that school is done before we are faced with the calamity of the death of one or two of our younger people, and I am concerned particularly because these young people deserve their lives, and, more particularly, I would hate for a thing like that to happen in the constituency of St. Philip North, or in any other part of Barbados. So I invite the lady Minister to ask of her building section to make sure that the roof at the St. Philip Boys' School is inspected to make sure that its structural integrity is not a danger to the young people and students of that school.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is now 7 o'clock and I shall report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It now being after 7 o'clock, this sitting now stands suspended until 8 p.m. 7.00 p.m.

On resumption:

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee of Supply.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South. We are on Head 34.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I just have a few brief comments to raise, and one relates to the School Meals Department, Subhead 17, Item 9 – Supplies and Materials. I believe my colleague, the Member for St. Philip North, did refer to a number of unpaid bills which had accumulated at the end of the 1981–82 financial year. We are now at the end of the 1982–83 financial year and these supplementary funds to settle these unpaid bills are only now coming before us, and I am wondering if the Minister could explain the delay in this matter being settled.

No doubt there are persons to whom these monies were due and they must have been concerned about the non-payment. I wonder if the Minister could throw some light upon this particular matter. Was it that they were being held up at the Ministry of Finance and not being paid? Is it the fault of the Ministry of Education, or the School Meals Department?

Asides.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am entitled to ask questions. Don't tell me not to anticipate you. I am asking questions and I am entitled, as a Member, to ask questions. I am doing them quite politely. If you want to get annoyed, we can get very angry over here too, you know.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member is not addressing the Chair. I can only conclude that he has finished his submission.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: On that particular point.

Aside.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Keep that language for the Ministry – not in here. Keep that for your officers, not in here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member must address the Chair.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry about that. Let us return to a little calmness on this. I hope that I can get some explanations on that particular point, and I was asking whether they were held up in the School Meals Department in the Ministry of Education or at the Ministry of Finance.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is the third time you are asking. You.....

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Apparently they don't hear me, Mr. Chairman.

The second point I wish to raise relates to the University of the West Indies. We are being asked to provide a supplementary of some \$3.5 million, and this is by no means a small sum of money. There was some kind of suggestion that the amount of money that is being requested is a small supplementary. I do not consider that \$3.5 million out of \$8.9 million is a small amount by any means. This is a substantial supplementary that we are asking about, and I suspect that this is not the amount for a full year either – this is only the amount that will take us down to the end of the financial year. I am concerned about the total bill which the Government of Barbados will have to meet arising out of this restructuring and this University of the West Indies matter. I want to know if the Minister can tell us what is the total amount involved.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order!

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I wonder if the Minister can tell us what is the total amount that the Government of Barbados will have to meet as a result of the revision of these salaries as well as out of the total restructuring exercise. I have a feeling that the financial burden which this whole exercise would put upon Barbados may be beyond the resources of Barbados and I am wondering whether the Minister can tell us exactly what is the commitment to which she has let in the country, whether the entire policy in relation to this restructuring has been settled as far as the Government of Barbados is concerned and exactly what is involved. I certainly will not say anything more on that matter at this stage, but you can expect that a full-scale debate on this matter will be coming in due course. I will pause at this stage.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does any other honourable Member wish to make a contribution?

(Aside)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I rather call on the Minister to reply once and get the matter over with.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, if that is the method we are using, I have to raise the question now under this subhead. Now the information which has reached us is that the Headmaster of Coleridge and Parry has retired prematurely. There was in the newspapers an indication that sheep and goats and cows were being kept in the school and there was dung which did not allow the teachers to function — I saw that in the newspapers — I don't know whether these were agricultural classes, but they had reached the stage where teachers could not function. That is what was put out.

But now we see that seven, Sir, — I want to be certain; did I misread this? — seven additional posts of teacher for a secondary school are coming up at this stage. Something does not smell quite right here.

(Aside)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: A lot of mobility? The head-teacher has gone; you need seven teachers at a secondary school. Now in the context of the quality of education which both sides are sworn to deliver, and bearing in mind that the Prime Minister, in a very misguided policy, has cut back teachers — the teaching staff in almost every institution has been cut back — and furthermore.....

(Aside)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: He is too foolish to follow what the IMF tells him to do; what he should do is cut back on the Ministers. If the IMF would tell him to cut back on the Ministers, he might would save a couple of dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I am addressing you, Sir. This business of seven teachers at one secondary school is bound to raise a fundamental question as to the quality of education which the children at the Coleridge and Parry School would have been getting during the past year or so. It says "seven teaching posts", and I am going to give the Minister the benefit of the doubt, but I believe this is only the tip of the iceberg in the manifestation of the misguided policies of the Minister of Finance and his attempt to cut back and to demonstrate that he is a good manager. He has a very shortsighted policy in the Ministry of Education, and I believe that the Minister of Education wish us to raise this question. 8.15 p.m.

I read in the newspapers that the head of a better secondary school has indicated that, contrary to popular belief, his school does not have the best facilities in the country. If that school is saying it has not got the best facilities, these seven teachers at Coleridge-Parry signal to

me that Coleridge-Parry must be in an awful state, and when you couple that with the fact that the Headteacher has left prematurely — he said he could not put up with this thing any more, from what I understand,.....

(Aside)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member is saying *sotto voce* that I am only talking. He is casting aspersions on my intervention, but he does that from time to time, but we need to know more about these seven teachers.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that you have indicated that the manner of debate would be that the honourable Member would be winding up, because, based on what she says, the other questions would tend to follow. In the interest of keeping the debate within reasonable proportions, I would prefer to hear the Minister's initial explanation before going further, because I can ask other questions which might only tend to prolong the debate.

How many teachers, for example, are missing from Alexandra? How many are missing from St. Michaels? How many vacancies are there at the other secondary schools? What is the position at the Alleyne School? You see, Mr. Chairman, when you see that they have asked for \$468 000 under Utilities for Pre-Primary and Primary Schools, and when you look and see that the vote was \$278 000, according to the information here, for the whole year, now they come for a supplementary of \$468 000, more than twice as much, it seems to me that it begins to suggest to me that there was a lot of under estimation, and it confirms my point that we do not have the schools in Barbados, especially the secondary schools, functioning at the level we have been led in this Parliament to believe they are functioning at.

Now, I will try not to deal with the two secondary schools, which I know well, that are getting the roofs repaired. I have tried not to deal with the staffing at those schools. I happen to know, however, that there are a number of specialist posts in the Ministry of Education which have not been filled, and when you consider that relief teachers are now a past item in the educational system in Barbados, and when you consider that there are a number of temporary teachers who have gone home, one stroke of the pen and the Prime Minister sent home a significant number of them, many of whom cannot get work...I have had occasion to speak about a specialist mathematics teacher who cannot find work in Barbados teaching; she is currently working well below her capacity in another field, and here we see that at Coleridge-Parry School they need seven. What percentage of the teaching staff is this? Would the Minister make a note and tell me how many teachers they have at Coleridge-Parry? Because seven seems like a significant number to me.

Does that include the Deputy Headmaster's post? The Deputy Headmaster's post has been vacant, and now the Headmaster's post has been vacant. I saw an advertisement for a Deputy Headmaster; has one been appointed? One has not been appointed. So you have no Headmaster, an acting Deputy, seven vacancies. The quality of education at Coleridge-Parry must be zilch.

Furthermore, Sir, with the removal of the Headmaster from St. James' Secondary, they had to move the Deputy from St. Lucy to act as Headmaster at St. James' Secondary because the Deputy at St. James indicated that she did not want to get into that mess, whatever that is.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, Subhead 5 Item 7 — Utilities. I am a little concerned here. If you look you will see that the approved Estimate was \$278 000, and I am wondering if it is correct that the supplement is \$468 000. That could be about 190 per cent for the supplementary estimate. There must have been serious under estimation for Pre-Primary and Primary Schools. Why the necessity for such a big supplementary? The provision for 1982-83 was \$278 000 and the supplementary is \$468 766. Is this correct or is this a misprint? I would just like to have this clarified.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does any other honourable Member wish to make a contribution? The Minister will please reply.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, starting at the top, with respect to Erdiston, the honourable Member for St. James South, who I do not now see in his seat asked a question. I understand that he is my shadow — I do not often see him in his seat, and I am sorry he is not here to have the answer now — but we have closed the boarding establishment at Erdiston College.

The previous Minister of Education had instructed the Advisory Board at Erdiston College to advise him on the whole question of the viability of the boarding establishment. The fact is that, within recent years, most of the LDCs, which used to send their trainee teachers to our college at Erdiston, have now established teaching colleges of their own. In fact, I think there is only one LDC outstanding now from which teachers come to Erdiston, so most of the teachers at Erdiston College are Barbadian nationals. Out of a total student intake for 1981 of 260, only 45 were resident.

8.25 p.m.

I find it very difficult to justify continuation of the boarding establishment in the circumstances, bearing in mind that financial constraints have been imposed upon us. I did not think that it was a fair or economical use of the plant and so we have closed the boarding establishment. There is now a cafeteria at the College, which caters to the needs of the staff and students there.

The dormitories which were liberated as a result of the closure are already being pressed into a multiplicity of uses. You know, when the CXC examination scripts are corrected, they are done on residential arrangements — teachers come from other territories here to correct papers from yet other territories — and some of the dormitory space at Erdiston will be useful for that exercise. There are many other uses to which that square footage can be put — there are seminars, there are further expansion plans for Erdiston itself — and I want to assure honourable Members that the closing of the boarding establishment, in my view, can only redound to the better and more efficient running of Erdiston College.

In respect of teachers equipment, I am instructed that teachers do have to provide their own teaching aids and that this is nothing new. This has always been the case. It is something certainly of which I approve. I think we have to get away in this country from the attitude that Government is to provide everything. You only have to listen to some of these radio programmes that you hear in the evening — everybody has a suggestion, and at the end of that suggestion it is always left to be assumed that the Government will pick up the tab, the Government will pay the bill. I think, Mr. Chairman, Sir, that we are going to have to get away from that and people are going to have to assume responsibility that rightfully belongs to them.

I believe, in fact, and I suspect that it is particularly true in the educational sector in Barbados that we have perhaps cheated our young people of that sense of responsibility by offering them so little, and in some cases nothing, for which to be responsible, not even the trouble of assimilating, or attempting to learn what we are teaching them.

I have spoken elsewhere on another occasion about the high rate of absenteeism which we see at the examinations, and this is all symptomatic of a certain rot that has set in, a certain misconception that has come to us with independence — that we are free and, therefore, we can do every and anything. People do not accept that this freedom, this liberty, brings with it even greater responsibility, and we are going to have a very difficult time now trying to inculcate that sense of responsibility, especially into our young people.

Pupil transport no longer has to do with the Ministry of Education, and I shall not trespass upon that territory.

In response to the honourable Member for St. Michael West, again in respect of Erdiston, he asked about provision of funds. This question was asked so long ago that I am not sure what I am supposed to be answering.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The last sentence in the Explanatory Note, which suggests that the bills had been incurred, but no committal was made.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Yes. This is Subhead 3? You are talking about Subhead 3, Item 11?

I think the explanation there is that during the 1981/82 financial year, the College ordered some educational supplies and materials from an overseas firm, through the Central Purchasing Department, for use by the Teacher Training Division. It seems that the supplies reached the College on March 30, 1982 and May 8, 1982, which made it impossible for the College to make any payments to the Central Purchasing Department before the end of the 1981/82 financial year. This is a common occurrence. And since funds were not included under this Item here in the current Estimates to pay for these supplies, we are asking for the supplementary funds.

I do not think that there was any question of carrying forward, which you sometimes do when you think that you are not going to be able to close it at the end of the financial year. I think it was felt that we would have been billed and would have been in a position to pay before the end of the financial year 1981/82. But you see, the supplies arrived, literally the day before the end of the financial year, March 30, and then a later bill came on May 8, and this is something that happens from time to time.

Sometimes you can make educated guesses, you know, that the time period will exceed the end of the financial year, and so you carry forward. This is a case where we had no reason to believe that it would exceed, and we did not carry it forward, and therefore, we are without funds.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the honourable Member will give way for a moment. I am not sure I understand the explanation. I can appreciate that, in her present position, she might not have got the best information. It would seem to me that if, in fact, it arrived on March 30 — we are now into January — some 9 months would have elapsed before they sent for the supplementary. It does not make sense.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: The answer is simple. This Ministry has not come to this Honourable House for a supplementary before now. I chose to come with one omnibus, rather than come to the House from time to time for \$50 000 here and \$75 000 there.

Now, to further answer the honourable Member for St. Michael West, he asked about St. Leonard's School. I know what the problems are. We have 112 primary schools, 21 secondary schools; they cost a great deal of

money. If you look at the Estimates for the Ministry of Education, you will see that the largest sums of money are spent on the University, the primary schools, the secondary schools and the School Meals Service.

Remember we are living in the days of budget cuts. The honourable Member for St. Michael West was a Minister, and he knows what it is to make what he considers in his Ministry to be a proper estimate and to go up to the Ministry of Finance in the month of January and have the hatchet wielded; and he knows what it is to have the Director of Finance and Planning later in the year send a little message down with a percentage mark and a figure in front of it. All Governments live with this and all Ministries live with it, and we have to apportion this money to all the schools as best we can.

The honourable Member well knows and did state that the St. Leonard's Schools have enjoyed tremendous expansion in recent months. You have the new Science Labs there now that the Polytechnic Division, which used to be down at St. Leonard's compound has moved up to Wildey. We have refurbished those rooms. I do not know whether he has taken the trouble to look at them; they are very well refurbished, and St. Leonard's will just have to wait its turn a little longer.

8.35 p.m.

What has happened at the Springer Memorial is that the roof, literally, had caved in at one point and it has now got to be fixed. So I don't think St. Leonard's has done badly. It has had that little mud pit properly paved, as you have pointed out, and I think that the school has had more than its fair share of improvement of its physical plant during the past eighteen months, and it will simply have to wait its turn. Thousands of dollars have been spent.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West asked yet another question, about livestock at the Coleridge Parry School. The Coleridge Parry School has Agricultural Science on its curriculum and I think that what happened there simply was that the sheep got away and strayed on to the compound of the school, and like other animals dropped their droppings where they walked. An explanation was given. I really do not think I need to delay the House of Assembly explaining about goat rolls.

Now in respect of the seven teachers. Under the World Bank project, the Coleridge Parry got a substantial expansion, and these seven teachers are required because the roll at that school has increased dramatically. During 1980-81, Coleridge Parry had a role of 640 and in 1981-82 some 830. The Coleridge-Parry has also gone co-ed, as you know, and so we are literally needing these seven teachers to man the new class rooms at the Coleridge-Parry.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the honourable Member would give way, the gravamen of what I was asking is this: the school term would have begun in September, so I take the point she is making now, Mr. Chairman, but what happened in between September and now? How have you been making out? Or, would these seven be for a new intake?

If the increase in the roll is as you have said, then these seven teachers were needed at the beginning. The honourable Minister of Lands, a former Headmaster, could tell you that the planning of education does not happen after the students come in; it has to happen before; so I do not understand. I am not trying to be obstreperous.

It seems to me that if we have a supplementary now asking for seven teachers that there was some dereliction in duty somewhere, because if the seven teachers are needed now, they must have been needed, if the reasons you advance are valid, at the beginning of the term.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: The supplementary is meant to cover salaries from September 1982 to the end of the financial year. I do not know what difficulty there can be about that. A Deputy Head has been appointed to the Coleridge Parry School. This was announced at a recent Speech Day and a Headmaster is literally just about to be appointed to the Coleridge Parry. In fact, we are awaiting the Governor-General's assent.

Now if I can back-track a little bit, Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member for St. Michael West asked about the University and restructuring.

I do not propose at this time, and at this hour, to make a major speech on restructuring. I propose to do it at some point in time, and quite soon, but I am not left enough time to do that tonight, and I do not want to do a half-way house job.

The most that I am willing to say at this point is that the whole history of the dialogue and the discussion up and down this region on the issue of restructuring of the University of the West Indies started in 1969; it is not new. At my own request the university has, and I think they have done it very well, put together a small document setting out the history step by step, bringing us up to the present day.

The present-day situation is that a special Ministerial sub-Committee, of which I am a part — and I admit freely I do chair and I do seek to play a prominent role — has been set up. You see, people are behaving as if the politicians have sat down quietly in a room and done everything themselves. With the help of the Univer-

sity we have framed out a skeleton and we have asked the University now to go into the public domain, to other universities, to look in upon itself and we have particularly asked them to invite the university staff, itself, to play a prominent role in this exercise and flesh out this skeleton which will then come back to the Ministerial sub-committee. If it then has to go back out again, it will go back out again.

I am happy to see that, in Barbados, some public discussion has taken place. I, myself, have gone to the trouble of accepting invitations to be part of public discussions. I have reason to doubt that this sort of thing is going on in other territories, but I cannot account for what is happening in Jamaica and Trinidad and in the LDCs.

You see, people have serious misconceptions. It is like the Abortion Bill; people thought the Abortion Bill was asking for abortion on demand. Restructuring of the University of the West Indies is seeking greater autonomy for the Cave Hill campus and for the St. Augustine campus. The LDCs have quarrelled from the very beginning; they feel very bitter about the fact that they have not been sufficiently represented on the whole matter of the running of the university. We are proposing that there should be a central authority. It is my hope that the central authority is not going to be located at Mona. If the LDCs had any sense, and I have told them so, they would get together and decide that the central authority should be located in one of the LDCs.

There will be a central authority, part of whose function will be to manage the affairs of the LDCs as a group. In the meanwhile, it is important to note that the LDCs are expanding their tertiary institutions, to the extent that they would be far more self-sufficient than they now are. They would not need to lean on Cave Hill as much as they do, because Barbados carries the brunt of the LDCs load, always has done and continues to do so at present.

So the central authority's main function will lie in this business, which is entertaining so much discussion, in keeping the regional character of the university, of overseeing the quality of work that goes on in the university and the quality of examinations set in the university. There will still be one university and one degree.

The other campuses and the LDCs will have strong representation on that central body. But as I say, Mr. Chairman, all this can change. This is a framework, a skeleton that has been put up by the Ministerial sub-committee.

I understand that the university campuses are busy, as I have said, encouraging discussion among themselves,

looking to see what happens on other similar campuses, certainly at the University of the Southern Pacific, which is not unknown to the University of the West Indies. Certainly our Vice Chancellor, Mr. Preston, has connections with the University of the Southern Pacific, and there are other universities which operate in a system where they are a number of colleges.

Mr. Chairman, London University is like that, and has been for many many years. People who graduate from the University of London could not tell you how many colleges there are at the University of London today.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order.....

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: If you keep interrupting, time will run out and the answers will not be given.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Well, I want to interrupt the honourable Member so that she can move away from her favourite dissertation and the historical development. I did not ask for that. I asked you to relate to the clear difference in policy which has been enunciated by you, which you are now repeating, and the policy statements which emanated from Jamaica and were given by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the former Minister of Education. The two statements seem in conflict and we want to hear what is the real position of the Government.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Ministers who attended the Heads of Government Conference, like the whole of the Caribbean, have the right to comment on the paper we have put forward, and I really do not see what the difficulty is. We have not arrived at an end product at this point, and if the Prime Minister of Barbados and Grenada and the Foreign Minister of Barbados have views, they are entitled to put them forward. In fact, they have asked the sub-committee to meet again to specially consider these views, and that is what we are proposing to do. I really do not see that there is need to see this in terms of confrontation and conflict.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: But, Mr. Chairman, we are not seeing it in confrontation — on a point of elucidation. I am suggesting that when two Ministers from the same Cabinet purport to pronounce policy, the Prime Minister is not the Prime Minister of Grenada; it is the Prime Minister of Barbados, the Foreign Minister of Barbados and the Minister of Education of Barbados, three Ministers from the same Cabinet I wish to know what is the view. When I hear the Prime Minister of Barbados speak, I believe he speaks the policy of the Government. When the Foreign Minister speaks, I believe he speaks the policy of the Government; so if the Minister of Education tells me one thing on restructuring, the university is a regional institution.....

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: We are in the process of formulating policy. It is not even a question of where in the conflict my views prevail. Everyone in the Caribbean is free to have a view on restructuring at this point in time.

8.45 p.m.

Aside

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order please!

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: No, I am not a relief Minister; I am the Minister. We are in the process of formulating a policy. We are dealing with all the territories in the Caribbean. Goodness, we have been discussing restructuring since 1969. What do you want me to tell you in 1983?

The honourable member for St. Philip North, Mr. Chairman, Sir, asked questions about the status of the Government Industrial Schools. I spoke about this quite recently, last week. We are seeing an unwelcome increase at the school for girls, Summervale. I am reliably informed that gone are the days when the girls at Summervale were girls who were mostly picked up for what was known then as "wandering", walking away from home and found in St. Lucy or wherever. Most of the young ladies at Summervale are there as a result of serious charges — stealing; stealing in groups. I am beginning to wonder if there are adults organising young children now in stealing operations. It is very disquieting, and I have asked for the matter to be further investigated.

The number at the boys' school, at Dodds, has remained fairly steady over past years. I believe that, subsequent to the disturbances of a little while ago, matters have settled down. New programmes, I have seen, have started at the school. There is a great deal of participation. Of course, we have spent some money on the school. We have upgraded and refurbished it. Some of the old practices which were good, which worked well in the past, have been reinstated. I understand there is a new garden, there, there is a pig project. There are all sorts of things going; there is more integration in the community.

I noticed that one of these busy-bodies, who writes to the Press, wrote to the Press during Christmas time, saying that bodies, organisations and persons were seen making donations to all sorts of charitable institutions over the Christmas time and that the Government Industrial Schools seemed to have been left out.

I did not consider it worth my while answering at that time. But, perhaps, now is a good time to say that most of the boys at Dodds went home on home leave at Christmas time, and I don't think we could have given them anything greater than that. It is a thing that is done on a regular basis; it is not the first time. It is something that we encourage, and something to which the boys and their families look forward.

But this is another instance where people speak without even trying to seek the information first. I was sad, because the letter to the Press seemed to patronise the young men at Dodds. You have to remember that they were born and bred here in Barbados; they have not dropped in on us from Mars or any outer planet. They are thrown out by this society in which we live. All of us are responsible for all of them, and I am hoping that the public's attitude to the young people who find themselves in these two institutions will change.

I am not expecting that it is going to change on its own volition. We are hoping to start a public relations programme which will encourage that kind of change. In fact, the boys' school is having, I think, a centennial year this year. I think during the month of May there are going to be some celebrations, and I hope that the public would come out and join in those celebrations, perhaps more than they would join in others. I think the boys need that kind of re-assurance from the public — that they are not forgotten and despised people.

In fact, they were not planning to highlight it but when it was drawn to my attention that they were....

Aside.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I am not looking at the clock, Mr. Chairman. When the time runs out, the time runs out. I made the point earlier. They spend all the time asking the same questions in three different languages over seven minutes. When the time comes for us to answer and the time runs out, it runs out. I will sit down and that will be the end of the case. I am not going to truncate my answers to accommodate people who just will not learn to organize their business and ask questions in a simple fashion.

I was saying that when it was drawn to my attention — because this came up during the time when they came down to do their draft Estimates — that there was going to be a centennial and that they would have a little celebration within the institution, I suggested to them that they should not restrict it to the institution, but they should get as much publicity as they can, they should plan it on as large a scale as they are capable of doing, and making it a gala affair in as far as it was possible for them to do it. I am even asking now for the public's support when the time for the centennial celebrations come about at the end of April — the beginning of May.

I am grateful for the praise that have been showered upon the Audio Visual Aids Department. This department has a great deal of work lying in its lap to do. There is a great deal of work before us. The Education Act and Regulations are requiring a great deal of change; there is a lot of change, at any rate, being planned at the

Ministry of Education for the whole system, and I am a strong proponent of P.R.

I have alerted these people to the fact that there will be a great deal coming down for them to do; they have got to burn a lot of midnight oil, and I am happy to say that they seem very pleased to take up the challenge, and I hope that more words of praise will be forthcoming in the months and years ahead of us.

The roof of St. Philip Boys, in reply to the honourable Member for St. Philip North — we are well aware of these things already. But, as I have said already, funds are so tight. There are so many calls upon this money. Don't let us forget that the Ministry of Education gets the largest share of the national budget even now.

Everybody cannot get repairs at the same time. It seems to me, very sadly so, that we operate on the basis that we are literally waiting until the roof falls in on a particular classroom or until a wall falls down in a particular classroom before we can do repairs.

A preventative maintenance programme is very difficult. Apart from the World Bank project, we are dealing with a very ancient plat. We have not built schools in Barbados for many, many years — I mean scores of years before the World Bank started. A lot of those buildings are rubble-stone buildings, which have a finite life. We go on painting buildings. I say to myself — why do we go on painting buildings? Why don't we trowel-plastic these buildings and do a maintenance free job once and for all? But then you look to see the basic materials that you are working with. What is the point of putting a coat of trowel plastic on a rubble-stone wall that has damp in it, that was built before the days of damp-proofing material and so on. So, on a systematic basis, we are doing repairs. But from time to time, emergencies will happen.

I have made it clear to the Heads and to the Chairmen of the Governing Bodies, when they come to me to do Estimates, that they must call a little more on the Parent Teachers Associations and the Old Scholars Associations to help in this, and the scholars of the schools themselves must be urged to take part in the fund raising activities. That has many lessons for them in itself. It can teach them many things which they will not necessarily learn in the classroom.

But we struggle and try, but do not think for one moment that we do not know what the condition is at the St. Philip Boys School.
8.55 p.m.

Now, the honourable Member for St. Michael South asked a question in respect of the School Meals Depart-

ment, and outstanding bills there. The honourable Member for St. Michael South should know, because I think it was true when he was Minister of Education just as it is true today, that over the years the School Meals Department has experienced the perennial problem of paying outstanding bills for supplies, which have accumulated at the end of a financial year, out of funds provided for the succeeding financial year.

The expenditure which has been incurred under this Item up to 31st December, 1982 includes the payment of outstanding bills amounting to \$1.3 million, which had accumulated at the end of the 1981-82 financial year. A similar payment of \$625 000 was paid during the last financial year in respect of bills which had accumulated during the 1980-81 financial year. In other words, there is a substantial sum of money being carried forward from one financial year to the next in respect of the School Meals Department every year. We never get in the vote enough money to carry it and that, unhappily, is how the business of the School Meals Department is done.

In my view it is highly unsatisfactory. There is a great deal, Mr. Chairman, that is unsatisfactory about the School Meals Service. I do not think that the taxpayers realise that it costs them \$10 million a year, and I have reason to believe that in the coming financial year, which begins on 1st April, I can expect it to cost even more, because the World Food Programme, which made certain foodstuffs available to us, is coming to an end in August this year. Barbados has had two extensions from the World Food Programme and it has been made abundantly clear that we can enjoy no further extension, and that separate and apart from that at any rate, our per capita income has now put us well out of eligibility for that programme.

There is a severe pilferage problem in the School Meals Department. I called in the police last year and the now Commissioner of Police did not hesitate to tell me that it is possible that I could be losing in the region of 50 per cent.....

MOMENT OF INTERRUPTION

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is the moment of interruption. I will report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit again, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: According to Standing Order 6, if there is unopposed business, the House can sit until 9.30. I would like an indication from the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition as to the status of the debate.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I do not know if this matter is controversial.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: No, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are not considering this matter as controversial, so we can carry on and complete this Item.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee. The time for debate having expired, I shall now put the question.

The question that Head 34 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 43 - Community Services - was called.

The question that Head 43 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1982-83 No. 17

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, this is one Resolution and we understand it is not controversial.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the Addendum is very clear - retention monies due and owing under the World Bank Project.

I beg to move that Head 76 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 79 - MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND LANDS

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, the Addendum to this Resolution is quite clearly set out, and I therefore move that this Head stand part.

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

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: We cannot even say whether this is controversial or not, because we cannot even find the Addendum. If you can tell us where to find these things.....

9.05 p.m.

I think that what we were saying is that the items relating to Education were not controversial and we were

prepared to finish those. We cannot even find the Addendum to this particular Resolution, which the Minister says is

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Head 79.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: He said it is clear, but it is not visible to us.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I rise to give an explanation here. The problem here is that the sum of money, \$1.7 million, includes a sum for the Ministry of Housing for acquisition purposes. The \$1.2 million is supposed to pay for properties and lands that have already been acquired, and this sum of money is to supplement the \$3 million that was provided for under this Head in the 1982-83 Estimates.

I must apologise for the Addendum not being here. There is an Addendum on my file, but apparently it was omitted on the paper which should have carried the Addendum, so I wish to apologise for that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, we are unable to deal with this matter because we will need further and better particulars. In fact, we are in need of particulars, because there are no particulars before us. I think the Leader can take the necessary steps.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, let me clarify this whole matter, because it is not a question of the Ministry of Housing and Lands. I have an addendum which says:

"Head 79 - Ministry of Housing and Lands, Sub-head 1. Purchase of Buildings and Lands, Supplementary Provision in the sum of \$1.2 million is required to meet the payment of compensation as agreed with property owners in respect of land acquired by Government for property purposes."

Why it is not circulated, I do not know.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I have no doubt in my mind that my colleagues on the other side would have been quite happy to finish the Resolution, but in the light of not having the proper information by way of the Addendum, they are not prepared to proceed with it at this time. Am I to understand that, or are you prepared to accept what the Minister of Housing has informed this Committee?

I do not think that the matter is controversial either, because it is only a matter of paying, as I understand it, for properties which have already been bought. We are just getting the money now to pay out to the people for their properties.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to have an indication from the members of the Opposition in respect of this matter. The honourable Member for St. Michael South.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it from the Minister, he has an Addendum which has not been circulated. On this particular occasion, we will take the indication from the Minister, in the interest of settling the full Resolution at this stage, but we hope that in future the business from the Ministries would handle in a better way so that we would not be called upon to pass Resolutions for a substantial sum of money without the particulars not being here. On this particular occasion we accept the

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, if the honourable Member will give way.

Sir, I am in sympathy with members on the other side. I can appreciate that this is not an error (a) by the Ministry of Housing or (b) by the Leader of the House or any of the Ministers. You can appreciate that when you were in Government some of these problems did arise where you did not have the Addendum on to the Supplementary.

It is for payment of compensation to people, to whom you have already agreed to pay the sums of money, in respect of buildings and properties which have been acquired over a period of time. This deals exactly with what you have been asking for a very long time - why do we not pay the people? This is part of it.

I hope that you are now satisfied with the Minister and my explanation, and I would wish to apologise on behalf of all concerned. I hope that in the spirit of true democracy, we can have this matter kind of resolved.

I beg to move, Sir, that Head 79 stand part.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to second that.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, I have decided, in the spirit of compromise, that I will let this ride, but at the appropriate time I will seek to find out certain things from the Minister. This is a topic that keeps coming up all the time, the delay in paying compensation.

I have discussed this privately with the Minister and I know he is doing his best, but I want to suggest to the Minister that there needs to be some streamlining of the procedure towards compensation, and I would be very grateful to the Minister if he could, at the appropriate time, give us some idea of the amount of claims outstanding, the length of time that they have been outstanding and those which are being settled, so that we can get some indication of the problem that this matter is now posing to the Ministry.

We will let this point slide, but I am glad to see that some money is being put into the vote so that we can get some settlement of outstanding matters.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I will just make a few brief remarks on this issue, because in my own constituency, Bonnetts, I have had acquisitions that have taken place for upwards of three years or more, and there has been a delay in paying some of the persons concerned.

In one case, I understand the reason for the delay. There was an error in the surveyor's plan and I think only last week the Minister brought the relevant Resolution before Parliament. In another case, however, there are various other reasons.

What I find is that the legal procedures being demanded, where the Government is getting an indefeasible title by compulsory acquisition, are unduly onerous and unnecessary in my view.

If the Government is going to use the compulsory acquisition method, to continue to insist that people should go through the whole gamut of conveyancing and what not is unnecessary, it is superfluous, because the Government gets an indefeasible title the moment that it passes this Resolution through Parliament and gets the sanction of the Governor-General to the Resolution, and I would seriously urge the Ministry to ask the legal officer to review this procedure.

In many instances, people are asked to give affidavits going back for years. Let me declare an interest now, because the same thing has happened to land belonging to my mother's estate down in St. Peter, for which the legal officers want so many affidavits about a bit of land that has been in possession of my parent's family since 1848, that you would think that the estate is asking the Government for \$3 million.

9.15 p.m.

The amount involved is compulsory acquisition of 4 000 square feet at \$2 a square foot, a waste of time as far as I am concerned, and then what is most scandalous is that the sort of cost that is paid for all the work is an insult to the lawyers involved in the exercise. It is about time that this procedure be looked at. This is not a criticism of the Minister; it is a system that we have inherited.

I also find that some of the officers, when you write them and tell them that you have expended a whole lot of time, they want you to tell them what work you did. In one case, a client was paid over \$100 000, of which about \$10 000 was interest. The fees they want to pay on the whole transaction after all the negotiations and the problems is something like \$1 000 or \$1 200. I felt like telling the Government to keep the fees and use them for other purposes, if officers believe that that is the way they are going to approach the matter.

I will ask the Minister to seriously look into this, because there are certain aspects of compulsory acquisition

that are archaic in this country. One relates to the fact that the Government pays people 6 percent interest on their money. It is not proper for a Government to pay 6 percent interest to people when they are in possession of the land for the length of time, when the people, themselves, have to pay interest on arrears of tax at the rate of one percent per month.

I have always attacked that provision for interest in this House, both in the Income Tax Act and the Compulsory Acquisition Act. It started under the past Government. I told them they were wrong and it continues to be wrong. The state must be fair to its citizens. If it is exacting its due, it must give its citizens their due in return, or citizens are going to be dissatisfied with the harshness of practices and laws in this country.

I have made these recommendations before. I know the Minister is sympathetic to this plea, but it must get home right through the Cabinet, and something must be done about it. Because it is a bad principle that you can be in possession of people's land, delay for three years to pay the acquisition, use their money and their property, and then tell them they are entitled to 6 percent interest; and in several cases, the Collector of Taxes is asking for taxes on land that the Government has acquired.

That is basically wrong; it is immoral that that sort of thing should happen, and I am not mincing any words about it, because I am terribly fed up with having to write the Collector of Taxes and having to write the legal officers on areas that should be quite simple in the manner in which one is dealing with acquisitions. I will ask the Minister to try and get the Compulsory Acquisition Act upgraded.

Unfortunately, the right honourable Member for St. John adopted some laws from Pakistan, brought some gentleman down from the United Nations and imposed on the country an ignorant Land Acquisition Act based on principles that could never be justified, and I said so at the time when I was in Opposition. It continues to be ridiculous.

I have made representations about this before, when I was in the Cabinet. Unfortunately, we did not have time to rectify it, but I trust that this Government will see that it is rectified before long, because it cannot be justified. It does no good, either to the Democratic Labour Party or the Barbados Labour Party, to persist with this system of acquisition.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am completely and totally mystified about the intervention that was just made by the honourable Member who has just sat down. I cannot say I disagree with him. What I find particularly difficult, however, is that he speaks as if we are in two different worlds.

Six years after the Barbados Labour Party has been in power, fifteen years before that the Democratic Labour Party was in power, and the honourable Member says the Acquisition Act was bad, it came from Pakistan – it is not controversial, it is academic – and the honourable Member was the first Attorney-General after the fifteen years. He knew that it was bad, he said it was bad when he was in Opposition; he went and sat in the Attorney-General's Chambers, he promised to leave at the end of two years.....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of elucidation, if the honourable Member would give way, ...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am not giving way on a point of elucidation.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I said in my speech, Mr. Chairman, that I made representations and the past Minister and I did not have time to rectify it.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am totally disinterested in his inability to get his views taken by his colleagues when he was in Cabinet.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, I never said I did not get the views of my colleagues. I said we were working on the matter. The honourable Member must listen to what I said. The past Minister of Housing and Lands, also with comments from Professor Wade, were trying to revise the Compulsory Acquisition Act before, unfortunately, the House was dissolved. Otherwise, you would have had it done under me.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, it is well known that the business of Government goes on. Is he saying that the business of Government came to a halt from the time he left the Attorney-General's Chambers? The logical conclusion of what he has said is that neither the present Minister of Lands nor the present Attorney-General, in the absence of Professor Wade, has the legal capability or the interest to pursue a matter which the Labour Party recognised was bad fifteen years ago.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member must not misrepresent my speech. I have never yet said that the honourable Minister nor the honourable Attorney-General has not got the ability. That is foolishness. The honourable Member knows that. He must not try to set up any position. If I wanted to criticise them, I am man enough to criticise them; but I am not criticising them; I am criticising the system.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the system....

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: When it comes to the law, there is no relief. This is pure.

The system is nothing more than a legal system. I have heard the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central giving an exposition on the question of acquisition of land, and the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central was crystal clear in his mind as to what ought to be done. When we had the right honourable Member for St. John putting the position that it was his view that if what the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central was saying on the law was how they felt, they should change it, at that time the honourable Member who just sat down was Attorney-General; but now that he is not Attorney-General, he gets up in here and says that he is fed up; his words. The present Attorney-General should resign. The present Attorney-General is not doing his job, according to what his predecessor in office has just said. He is not paying attention to bad law which is still on the Statute Book after fifteen years of Democratic Labour Party and six years of Barbados Labour Party. It would not have been a problem if, as the honourable Member has said, the people were not suffering. What he has said is that after twenty-one years we have had bad law on the Statute Book.

Well, Sir, you know about John the Baptist. John the Baptist came before Jesus, but Jesus came subsequently to correct all the wrongs and to settle all of the debts that had been incurred.

Honourable Members on that side have not been doing their duty, and the former Attorney-General really ought not to try to give the impression that from the time he has left the Chambers none of the reforms he has been trying to implement, with the help of Professor Wade, has been seeing the light of day. We had the Administrative Law Act which was a progressive piece of legislation. It was not proclaimed. We had other progressive legislation including the Ombudsman Act, it has not been proclaimed; and no doubt the honourable Member's good intentions for the Acquisition of Land Act has not been dealt with.

We are suggesting that the honourable Members on that side, the former Attorney-General, the present Attorney-General, the former Minister of Lands, who lost his place to the more erudite and the more competent honourable Member who now holds the portfolio, should get together and let us not have this debate again. After all, when the people.....

Mr. Chairman, I see you are signalling to me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am signalling to you that you have just half a minute.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the honourable Member wants the money, we are accommodating them to allow them to get the money, but we really think it is not right for the former Attorney-General to give the impression, or to inform us now, that laws over which he presided, when he had the opportunity to change, are so bad. We hope that this is the last we will hear of this whole matter.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I just wish to say for the records of this House that there were no amendments on file that were left for the Minister to pursue. I want to make that abundantly clear.

The question that Head 79 — Ministry of Housing and Lands, stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
9.25 p.m.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the

passing of two Resolutions in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, the two Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that this House now stands adjourned until February 1, 1983 at 12.00 noon.

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

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, February 1, 1983 was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the sitting accordingly.
9.35 p.m.

CONTENTS

PAPERS LAID

Hon. L. S. CRAIG 2663

Statement showing sums advanced to the
Postmaster General for the payment of Money
Orders for the months of August, September
and October, 1982.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG 2663

A Bill to amend the Succession Act.

FIRST READING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG 2663

A Bill to amend the Succession Act.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1982-83

No. 16 - \$4 845 981 2664

HEAD 15 - CABINET OFFICE 2664

Mr. St. John, 2664, 2675; Mr. Taitt, 2664;
Mr. Forde, 2666; Mr. Sandiford, 2668;
Mr. Craig, 2669; Mr. King, 2671; Mr. Barrow,
2673.

HEAD 34 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION 2707

Miss Miller, 2707, 2713, 2714, 2715, 2716;
Mr. Simmons, 2707; Mr. Taitt, 2707, 2712,
2714, 2715, 2716; Mr. Franklin, 2709, 2713;
Mr. Sandiford, 2711

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1982-83 No. 17 -

\$1 723 771 2718

HEAD 76 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION-

\$523 771. 2718

Mr. Craig, 2718; Miss Miller, 2718

HEAD 79 - MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND

LANDS - \$1 200 000. 2718

Mr. Bradshaw, 2718, 2719, 2722; Mr.
Sandiford, 2718, 2719; Mr. Craig, 2719; Mr.
Franklin, 2719; Mr. Forde, 2720, 2721; Mr.
Taitt, 2720, 2721, 2722.

MOMENT OF INTERRUPTION 2718

Mr. Deputy Speaker, 2718; Mr. Craig, 2718;
Mr. Sandiford, 2718.

PRIVATE MEMBERS BUSINESS

RESOLUTION CONDEMNING GOVERNMENT RE

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING 2676

Mr. Sandiford, 2676; Mr. Taitt, 2681, 2703,
2705; Mr. Craig, 2684; Mr. Franklin, 2688;
Mr. St. John, 2691; Mr. Sisnett, 2693;
Mr. King, 2694; Mr. Barrow, 2697, 2699;
Mr. Adams, 2702, 2706; Mr. Greaves, 2706.

MOTION TO EXTEND PRIVATE MEMBERS

BUSINESS. 2691, 2698

Mr. Craig, 2691, 2699; Mr. Sandiford, 2691;
Mr. Adams, 2698; Mr. Barrow, 2698, 2699;
Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 2698, 2699; Mr. Deputy
Speaker, 2698, 2699.

SUSPENSION. 2676, 2710

ADJOURNMENT 2722

Mr. Craig, 2722.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ADAMS, Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. (St. Thomas)

BARROW, Rt. Hon. E. W. (St. John)

BOLDEN, His Honour C. L. (St. Joseph)

BRADSHAW, Hon. DeL. O. (St. Michael South East)

BRATHWAITE, Hon. L. B. (St. Andrew)

CRAIG, Hon. L. S. (St. James North)

FORDE, Hon. H. deB. (Christ Church West)

FRANKLIN, W. O. (St. Philip North)

GREAVES, P. M. (St. Michael North)

KING, M. A. (Christ Church West Central)

MILLER, Hon. B. A. (City of Bridgetown)

ST. JOHN, Hon. H. B. (Christ Church East Central)

SANDIFORD, L. E. (St. Michael South)

SIMMONS, N. K. (St. James South)

SISNETT, L. L. (St. Michael North East)

TAITT, B. M. (St. Michael West)