

# THE

# House of Assembly Debates

## (OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1981 – 86

### HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

*Tuesday, 15th November, 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  
and Leader of the House)

Hon. H. B. St. John, Q. C., LL.B., (Deputy Prime  
Minister and Minister of Trade, Tourism and Industry)

Hon. H. deB. Forde, Q.C., M.A., LL.B.

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, (Minister of Education)

Hon. L. B. Brathwaite, (Minister of Housing and  
Lands)

Mr. J. G. Odle, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees)

Hon. V. L. Johnson, M.A., (Minister of Transport  
and Works)

Mr. L. L. Sisnett, (Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry  
of Tourism)

Mr. P. M. Greaves, B.A.

Mr. R. E. Brathwaite

Mr. A. Truss

*Prayers were read by Archdeacon F. A. Cayless.*

*Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN, Mr. B. M. TAITT and Hon.  
DeL. O. BRADSHAW entered the Chamber and took their  
seats.*

#### MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minutes of the  
meeting of Monday, October 17, 1983.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to  
move that the Minutes of the meeting of Monday,  
October 17, 1983 be taken as read.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If there are no observa-  
tions, let the Minutes stand confirmed.

*Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS and Mr. L. E.  
SANDIFORD entered the Chamber and took their seats.*

#### ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have to announce that I  
have received the following:

Accounts and Statements for the month of  
September, 1983 from the Accountant General.

The Annual Report on the Immigration and Pass-  
port Department for the year ended 1982-12-31.

#### PAPERS LAID

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

The Wireless Telegraphy (Video Tape Rental Ser-  
vice) Regulations, 1983.

The Wireless Telegraphy (Video Tape Machines)  
Regulations, 1983.

The Wireless Telegraphy (Amendment) Regulations,  
1983.

The Wireless Telegraphy (Satellite Television  
Receiver Antenna) Regulations, 1983.

The Annual Report of the Chief Medical Officer  
for the year 1982.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to lay the following:

✓ The Annual Report and Financial Statement of the National Assistance Board for the period 1st April, 1982 to 31st March, 1983.

✓ The Annual Report of the Child Care Board for the period April 1981 – March 1983.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, on behalf of the right honourable Prime Minister, I am commanded to lay the following:

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1983.

✓ Report of the Accountant General for the Financial Year 1982–83.

Statement of Account of the Transactions in Rum in the Several Districts for the period July – September, 1983.

The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 9) Order, 1983.

The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 10) Order, 1983.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I beg to lay:

✓ The Annual Report of H.M. Prisons for the year 1982.

#### GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions:

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at the Ivy, St. Michael for Housing Development.

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Oistins, Christ Church for Road Development and other purposes connected with the Oistins Development Scheme.

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Cheapside, St. Michael for Road Improvement.

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Holetown, St. James to provide accommodation for Rates and Taxes Division and for a Public Health Inspector and for a Post Office.

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Bush Hall, St. Michael for Housing Development and other Community Purposes.

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Queens Street, Speightstown, St. Peter for the construction of the Speightstown By-Pass Road.

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Fontabelle, St. Michael for the purpose of Road Improvement.

A Resolution to amend Resolution No. 80/1982.

A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1983.

A Resolution condemning the conditions in Grenada which led to the multinational intervention on 25th October, 1983, and approving the action taken by the Government of Barbados in participating in the rescue mission.

At this point, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to inform this Honourable House that the Government is quite willing to debate this Resolution today. It is a Resolution which as we are well aware, is of paramount importance and of international interest. I would be hopeful that members on the other side would agree to debate this very important Resolution, which, no doubt, has captured the interest of the international field.

I also beg, Sir, to give notice of the following Bills:

A Bill to amend the Health Services Act.

A Bill to amend the Immigration Act.

A Bill to repeal and replace the Schedule to the Expatriate Pensions Act, 1980.

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:

WHEREAS on the occasion of the opening of the current session of this Parliament on 17th October, 1983, this Honourable House was informed of the Government's programme for the session;

AND WHEREAS that programme is designed to continue improving the economic and social life of the country;

RESOLVED that this House endorses the programme as presented and pledges to support the Government in the effective implementation of it.

#### FIRST READING OF BILLS

*On the separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the following Bills were read a first time:*

A Bill to amend the Health Services Act.

A Bill to amend the Immigration Act.

A Bill to repeal and replace the Schedule to the Expatriate Pensions Act, 1980.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, the next Bill was given notice of under 22. 1. (b), and it is now on the Supplementary Order Paper 8A.

I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Special Loans Act be now read a first time, Sir.

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

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

*Mr. M. A. KING entered the Chamber and took his seat.*

12.25 p.m.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 42(5), 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

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

*Dr. R. C. HAYNES entered the Chamber and took his seat.*

#### GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Sir, earlier when I was giving notice of Government Business, I

indicated that the Government is quite willing to do a Resolution which deals with the Grenada situation, and I also indicated that it is of great international interest. At this point, I am going to take that Resolution, as Order No. 5 on the Order Paper, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The Resolution is going to be dealt with by the Prime Minister. I sincerely hope that Members on the other side appreciate the international interest in this matter, and the Government's stand on it, which has been lauded by the powerful thinking people throughout the entire world. I am quite sure that we are particularly interested in having this matter debated.

I beg to move that Order No. 5 be now taken, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 5.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Sir, before we actually get on to this matter, I want to stress a few points. A few minutes ago the Leader of the House indicated that there was a Resolution and that he intended to debate today. Subsequent to that, moments ago the Resolution was circulated to Members on this side. We have had no knowledge of the Resolution, it was not circulated prior to this meeting, and we are protesting against the cavalier manner in which the Parliament of this country is being treated in matters of the highest and utmost importance.

*(Aside)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the honourable Member will indicate what he is debating, I will be quite prepared to rule on this matter. Is the honourable member on a point of order?

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not debating a Resolution that is before us. I am rising on a point of order, and it relates to the business which it has been indicated that the House will take.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What breach of the Rules has been committed?

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am indicating that it is a breach of the privilege of the members of the Opposition.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable Member moving that a breach has been committed? What is the correct manner?

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am indicating, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we have privileges for studying matters which are to be debated in Parliament which are being infringed, and that the Government should not

proceed in this manner. We have a two page Resolution which we have not yet been able to read fully and the Leader of the House indicates that he wishes the House to proceed to debate this immediately. We are protesting against that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the Leader of the House indicated that a Resolution was before the Chamber which the Government was desirous of debating today, there was no comment from the Opposition side. It is only after the Order was called that a protest is now being made.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: There was no Resolution. We heard about the Resolution. We have just seen this two page Resolution. This is the first time that we are seeing it. What is happening to democracy in this country? Can we not be reasonable over this matter? The Government had all the time to indicate that they intended to debate the Resolution, as they sent out supplementary letters on other matters relating to the public affairs of this country, but there has been nothing at all on this matter. This is very cavalier treatment. We are talking about responding to democracy in other countries and not our own Parliament! Parliament itself is being treated this way!

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: There is no cavalier attitude towards this matter. I heard the word 'democracy'. We are going to hear a lot about it today. The Government is going to do this Resolution today. I have not committed any breach of privilege of this House.

I have indicated that I am going to do the Resolution. I would have hoped that Members on the other side would have welcomed a Resolution such as this, to debate it and let us hear their views on it, and join with the Government, which is being saluted throughout the entire Caribbean and some parts of the world, in taking a stand to restore democracy — and not only in here.

I recall very well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) brought crowds of people in this courtyard shouting loudly against the Speaker of the House of Assembly; that if there is no Haynes, there is going to be no Parliament. There were no guns or pressure to be removed.

What are we hearing? A simple Resolution about two minutes ago! You are saying we should write you, but write you and tell you what? When we try to get you on an important matter, you are in bed ill, you say. You cannot talk to the Prime Minister, you are sick, you have influenza, you are out of the country.

Who am I to deal with? There is no other person on the other side. At least not the Member for St.

Michael South Central, not him at all, because he is recognised and not only here, as a confirmed communist! This is known, and I am going to tell him all about it today.  
12.35 p.m.

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): On a point of order, Sir: The honourable Member, if I heard him correctly, said the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) is a recognised communist throughout the world. Is that what he said, Sir? That is what I thought I heard.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable Member asking me?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir! I am just saying that I thought I heard that, and I am submitting that that, in the context of this Parliament, is unparliamentary language.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I withdraw that. He is a confirmed conservative. Is that all right? He is a confirmed imperialist. Is that all right?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I believe I have checked the unacceptable words relating to Parliament, and I have not seen that the terms to which you refer is unacceptable.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Further to my point of order, Sir: With due respect I draw to Your Honour's attention that on previous occasions His Honour the Speaker ruled that the word "communist" was unparliamentary, Sir. I draw that to your attention.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have never ruled such. I am not bound by the Speaker's rulings. I will not be bound.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I take your point, Sir. I understand your ruling to mean that we can now say of the Prime Minister and the honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig), having gone to Communist China, or to Guyana to bring back the blueprint, or any of those places, that they are communists then, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not going to rule on that, you are free to make what statements you wish. I will not be bound by rulings which I consider are incorrect.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I thank Your Honour.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will make rulings according to my own judgment.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: If you assume that I am a communist because I have gone to a communist country to attend a conference, that is a matter entirely for you.

I know that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is, or was, a member of a communist party in London – that I know as a fact! – and that he attended, on more than one occasion, conferences in Russia.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Two Members are on their feet.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable Member has just said that he knows as a fact that I am a communist and that I have been a member of a communist party.

For my own personal protection in this society, and to preserve the integrity of this Parliament where members are responsible for the veracity of the statements that they make, I would like to draw it to your attention, Sir, that that statement is exceedingly false.

I am not a communist. I have never been a member of any communist party. I have visited two communist countries around the same time that the Prime Minister of this country visited one of those countries, when I was a student and he was either a student or doing post graduate work in the United Kingdom, as a member of a student delegation of the International Union of Students of the United Kingdom.

I wish to make that absolutely clear. My visit was around the same time he visited Russia, and this is some 26 years ago.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member rose on a point of order. He is now proceeding to make a statement. If the honourable Member wanted to reply to anything said by a Member on this side, he should await the appropriate time to make a statement.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: What I am saying, Sir, .....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Have you completed your point of order? You are not making a point of order, you are making a speech.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Is it a point of order to rise to correct an untruthful statement, Mr. Deputy Speaker?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are entitled to make a reply, but not on a point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have made the point, Sir. I would just like, finally, to say that I went in the capacity as the Chairman of the Federation of West Indian Students in the United Kingdom and Great Britain. That was

the capacity in which I attended Russia. Many people who were part of that organisation have held high office in all capacities, political capacities, throughout the Caribbean, and none of them were communists at any point in time.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I am prompted by my colleagues to say that we will do it a little later in the day, but this is what I am afraid of. After lunch, knowing that this Resolution is to be dealt with, and knowing that side so well, we are not going to see them back in here, and I might as well beat the iron while it is red. I am worried that now there is a Resolution of this magnitude to be dealt with, after lunch the benches will be empty.

In the spirit in which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and I in my capacity as Leader of Government Business have always acted – we have always had a good understanding – I wonder if 4.30 p.m. would be acceptable to Members on the other side. I would also like the assurance that each one of you will return.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, after consultation with my colleagues, we are prepared to proceed with this debate, under some protest, at 5 o'clock this afternoon.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: That is neither here nor there, 4.30 p.m. or 5 o'clock. Sir, we are going to deal with this at 4.30 p.m. That is the position of the Government on this occasion. This is the vote of the people at work.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: On a point of order, Sir: I think the honourable Member on the other side is trying to indicate their wish to second the Resolution. We will not deprive them of that privilege.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to move that.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member is now withdrawing Order No. 5?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir, until later in the day, at 4.30, as I indicated. I beg to move that Order No. 5 be postponed.

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

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Order No. 1, Sir.  
12.45 p.m.

## COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

### SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1983-84 No. 7

#### HEAD 16 – PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head 16 stand part.

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

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

#### HEAD 19 – MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head 19 stand part.

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

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

#### HEAD 35 – MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head 35 stand part.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: (St. Michael West): Mr. Chairman, I thought that the honourable Prime Minister would be getting up to withdraw the Resolution as it relates to Head 35, because my understanding – (Could I get a little more volume I am hurting my throat) based on the observation in the newspaper, Sir, is that there is no need, according to this Resolution, for a supplementary provision under the Item listed: required “to provide for the general running expenses of an Embassy to be established in the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago.”

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I believe –

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: It is a misprint. It is High Commission).

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am now hearing it is a High Commission.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that some time ago, at a consultation held by the Democratic Labour Party, to which we invited a number of scholars and other persons

to present papers, that one of the recommendations which I made in a paper which I presented was that Barbados should have representation in the Caribbean Community countries.

It was my theory then, and it is my theory now, that the Caribbean Community is the single most important institution created in this region in the last 25 years. It was my considered belief then, and it is my considered belief now, that Barbados as a country cannot hope to survive in this present world economically, or indeed in any form, if it does not see its destiny within the context of a Caribbean Community. It is to that end that a Treaty was signed in 1974 at Chaguaramas which established the Caribbean Community and Common Market.

Mr. Chairman, the efficacy and the desirability of that decision has not been questioned until the last few months or so when economic conditions and some substantial mismanagement on the part of some Governments, most particularly our own Government, led to a breakdown in the arrangement for the Caribbean Multilateral Clearing Facility (CMCF), the vehicle by which the Caribbean countries would pay their trade debts to one another.

The result has been that tension has been high in the region, tension arising out of the frustrations which come when people who earn their livelihood find that, through no fault of their own, they are in danger of being unable to feed their families. And when Governments have to look after those people, those Governments can sometimes transmit that frustration and that tension.

It is well known that in Jamaica they are unable, and have been unable, to pay us for goods we shipped to them for some considerable time. It is even better known that Guyana has been unable to pay and has not paid, for goods shipped to Guyana for some considerable time. It is obvious, therefore, that if the Caribbean Community is to survive, and if Barbados is to survive, that Trinidad as a market for Barbadian products is a requirement second to none.

Therefore, Sir, in the normal course of things, the establishment of a High Commission in Trinidad and Tobago would be welcomed. And in the context of my own beliefs that the peoples of the countries are more important than the Prime Ministers or any other official of those countries, I would agree, in principle, that the establishment of a High Commission in Trinidad and Tobago is still necessary and desirable, perhaps more necessary.

What I rise primarily to deal with, however is the capacity which the Prime Minister of Barbados has, on more than one occasion, demonstrated to open his mouth

in moments of anger or frustration and make the most undiplomatic statements imaginable by a head of Government who is alleged to be in economic concert with other heads of Governments.

It is totally unacceptable in the world of foreign affairs and diplomacy for a head of Government to say of a diplomat who represents another head of Government....

*(Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for St. Michael West were expunged from the Record by Mr. Chairman).*

Mr. B. M. TAITT: For a Prime Minister to say of an Ambassador — and High Commissioners are Ambassadors — there is an agreement within the Commonwealth that they would call the principal representative, “a High Commissioner” and not “an Ambassador” but they are one and the same for these purposes — for a Prime Minister to call the Ambassador an “outright liar”, whether it is true or not, is itself a breach of the protocol, of the arrangement, of the methodology which is employed between countries.

12.55 p.m.

It is a falling from the high standards.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): Mr. Chairman, if the honourable Member would give way, I would ask the honourable Member if, in the interest of objectivity — I am not quarrelling with him — he has ever before in diplomatic history heard of an Ambassador contradicting the head of a Government, to which he was accredited, on a conversation between them.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir, I have never heard of any such thing. But I have also never heard of a contentious Prime Minister who, even if that happens, wishes to continue the argument in the street as if they were quarrelling over a fence.

The point I am making is not what happened between the Prime Minister and the High Commissioner. Obviously I was not there, so it is the Prime Minister's word against the High Commissioner's word.

Sir, I have to be honest with you. Based on my relationship with the Prime Minister, if it comes to a matter of taking the Prime Minister's word, I have a lot of difficulty. But for the reasons which I am here outlining, I am not prepared to say publicly that in a situation where the Prime Minister of Barbados takes a position on an issue the Prime Minister is a liar. I would say in Parliament that I do not trust the Prime Minister's words on anything he says to us in the Opposition; but I cannot speak for what happened in his office.

He says that he had the Foreign Minister present. He says that he tape recorded the conversation which, if it is true, is another breach. What I am discussing.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order: I do not want to go on interrupting the honourable Member, but I never said that I tape recorded any conversation.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The newspapers in this country and the ones coming out of Grenada have been continuously misrepresenting the Prime Minister of Barbados, and I think that the newspapers ought to take note that they continue to misunderstand what the Prime Minister of Barbados says. They should not misreport him in the same way they misreported the Ambassador of the United States from France! They go and misrepresent the Prime Minister of Barbados! But I take his word on this occasion, if he says that he did not say he tape recorded it. I accept that he did not say that. I do not believe that the Prime Minister, who is so clever, would have, even if he had tape recorded the conversation, said so.

But that is not the gravamen of my input. I am saying that we in the Caribbean have every right to expect from the leaders of the Caribbean a level of behaviour that is above the kind of behaviour that you can hear in Stabroek Market, or Bridgetown Market or Kingston Market. Even if Prime Ministers feel that they can behave that way in their private moments, I am saying that when he speaks, he speaks for the whole of Barbados, and it is not proper to breach protocol arrangements in the manner which he did and put a firmer wedge between Barbados and Trinidad to the detriment of the people of Barbados and, in the final analysis, the people of Trinidad. It is not right, Sir.

I am not questioning or commenting on the right or the wrong, the truth or the untruth, of the matters as reported in the newspapers. I am saying that the Prime Minister of this country owes this country an apology for his behaviour. He may not find it convenient to say so, but I believe that, in his more sober moments, he would wish to recognise that that was an error of judgment. If he wishes the Ambassador or the High Commissioner to be recalled, that is what he must say.

Now we have the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago not even calling Barbados by name. He is referring to us as “that country.” You must understand, Sir, that in administration, leadership is the key, and if the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago communicates to his administration and he and Barbados are at war, you can expect that the lowest customs officer, the smallest individual in the administration of Trinidad and Tobago, will begin to treat Barbadians and Barbados as if the two countries are at war. But worse, Sir, because Barbadians are proud, when the Trinidadians start to react, the Barbadians will then, in turn, start to react.

We had a very interesting and strange phenomenon at the Garrison on Saturday. A racehorse came from Trinidad, invited by one of the distinguished newspapers of this country, *The Nation Limited*. The Nation Stakes invited the owners in Trinidad to send a racehorse to run in what they call "The Stakes Race". Now you cannot want anything more sporting than a horse race. You cannot want anything more inter-connected than the relationships between the people in Trinidad and Barbados who are in the horse racing business. The honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. John) will confirm that the relationships between horse breeders and horse people in Trinidad and Barbados, and throughout the Caribbean, are good relationships.

Seriously, Sir, I was very disappointed when I heard on the radio that the Barbadians booed that horse and its connections as they came out. Fortunately the horse won, and — as the honourable Member's father said, Barbadians have short memories — by the end of the race, when it was discovered that "Colt" Durant was a Barbadian and the trainer of the winning horse, they all cheered, so all was well. But I put it to you, Mr. Chairman, that had there not been this tension which is existing between Barbados and Trinidad, there would have been no boos for Ackstatic and his connections.

*Asides.*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Member admits he was not at the races.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: That is the point I am making, Sir. To a person who was listening to the broadcast of the race, who heard Barbadians booing and who heard the announcer saying that this is hooliganism and a very strange and unusual thing for Barbados, anyone who had heard that in the Caribbean especially, would begin to feel that the row between Barbados and Trinidad is deepening.

But there is more, Sir. In the same arrangements now, it is true that some of the manufacturers in Trinidad and Tobago had been pushing the Trinidad Government for some time to put some pressure on the imports from Barbados, because it is a fact that over the ten year period, Barbadian manufacturers have moved very swiftly upwards in their production of garments. This outburst by the intemperate Prime Minister of Barbados provided the foundation for a whole series of activities to come into play, and the result is that with Christmas coming up, a large number of Barbadians will be laid off in this country.

The Governor of the Central Bank, who says that there is no problem in finding the \$60 million, or \$80 million or \$108 million to build the Central Bank, could say four weeks later that Barbadians must tighten their

belts. Well, he and the people and the Prime Minister and the Shadow Minister of Finance will deal with that. But, Mr. Chairman, a large number of people, as you know, will not be able to eat as we come to Christmas, and I say that, apart from the policies which the Government has been carrying on which led Barbados into a particular state, which lead Barbados, economically, down a particular road, apart from those policies, the intemperate nature of the Prime Minister's remarks has done nothing to add to the stability and the creativity which is very necessary at this time for a reconciliation of the Caribbean Community.

1.05 p.m.

And then we have the other two Prime Ministers shooting off their mouths about starting a new CARICOM, starting a CARICOM 2. I really do not understand how people can allow their individual egos to interfere with their public responsibility as leaders in communities.

If we have a row with Guyana and we cast Guyana out of CARICOM, and next year the honourable Prime Minister of Jamaica, Mr. Seaga, finds himself in trouble, and we have another government and we and they fall out, will we start CARICOM 3? And then when Trinidad and Tobago's Mr. Chambers continues to put the pressure on Barbados, will we start a CARICOM 4? Or will we have an Eastern Caribbean State? Or will we become the 52nd state of the United States? What will we become?

It seems to me that what we have to do is to make sure that we use the resources we have, including the human resources, to the best of our ability. And that when the going gets really difficult and times are really hard, we would use our ingenuity even better; that we would strive to make the Caribbean region something of which the Caribbean people can be proud.

Instead, what we have had is the Prime Minister behaving like how he behaves during an election campaign, behaving like when he is at Eagle Hall saying who does this and who does that, opening his mouth like if he is a washerwoman and not a Prime Minister. He is cursing people, he is calling them liars. That will not do.

I am saying Sir, .....

(Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Barrow cursed the people.)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: He is always cursing somebody. He has cursed the members of the Cabinet worse than he has ever cursed anybody else. But that is another story. If you want to tell me how many times he cursed you all, I would listen, too.

He is there laughing. He is there laughing at you. Look! He is holding down there laughing. He cursed you

all bad enough. But I mean, Mr. Chairman, that is not my business. He is entitled to curse the Cabinet. If I had a Cabinet like them, I would curse them, too. But that is not my problem. I am discussing the higher level.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The trouble is, you do not have a Cabinet.)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: That is true. But if I had one, I would not want any 'Bernards' in it. I do not want any 'Bernards' in my Cabinet, so do not worry to look. Not you! No Bernards!

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Very strange you do not want any Bernards. He wants them.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, I think you were winding up.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The point I am making, Sir, is that this \$580 000 is not an amount that we, on this side, will vote against. What we will hope is that....

*Asides.*

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I know you do not want me to talk any more. I will stop now.

What we would hope, Sir, is that this establishment of an Embassy or High Commission in Trinidad will proceed in spite of the bad relations which seem to hover over the horizon for Barbados and Trinidad.

We on this side are prepared to offer our good offices. All of us on this side recognise that there will be need for reconciliation and reconstruction in this Caribbean. Every single one of us over here, Sir, will offer our good offices in the service of this country if it is necessary to rescue this country from the degradation into which it is falling because of the Prime Minister's mouth.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Chairman, I think the first thing that should be pointed out to the honourable Member is that the High Commission in Trinidad and Tobago has actually been set up, and there is, at least, one officer of diplomatic rank who is operating in the High Commission there.

The honourable Member ought to know that prior to the establishment of the High Commission, because of the importance of Trinidad in the CARICOM relationship and because of the strong ties which have always existed between Trinidad and Barbados, and will always exist between Barbados and Trinidad, that machinery was functioning at the trade level as well as at the political level. Indeed, there are strong views that, in the

context of the Caribbean, what is needed is not a protocollary type of appointment, but the appointment of people who have an understanding of the economic and trade relationship which they are sent there to preserve.

I have no fear, Mr. Chairman, that CARICOM will not continue. I am one of those who have gone through the exercise of witnessing the Caribbean people breaking up one association — and immediately after they broke it up, such was their need for association that they set about creating another association. So despite the fact that there has been a profound cleavage of opinion lately between some sections of the Caribbean Community and other sections, I believe that on a people to people basis, on an economic basis, on a cultural basis and on a social basis, the political leaders will have to take the cue from the people, and my view is that the people want integration. They want even further integration, in my opinion.

The economic condition of CARICOM is today not what it was previously. The reason is quite simple. All integration movements in the world, like most countries in the world, have suffered from the impact of the most prolonged recession which mankind has ever witnessed in the last hundred years.

We had a situation in which Guyana, first of all, as one of the largest territories in the economic community, found itself in an acute economic balance of payments problem. The commodities which Guyana produced at the international level were bringing less and less revenue, and the cost of producing them was getting greater and greater. Guyana itself had to take steps to restrict its importation.

From Guyana, we went to Jamaica; and a similar situation has occurred. As a matter of fact, Jamaica is a remarkably lucky country, because I believe it has had more aid, per capita, than any other country in the world. And notwithstanding that, it still has more balance of payments problems than many other countries in the world.

So the vibrancy in the CARICOM Movement for the last seven years was created by the increase of trade between Trinidad and Barbados and, in particular, by the fact that Barbados had a regime which bluntly refused to encourage the concept of protectionism. And Trinidad, because of its oil wealth, was able to be generous and distribute, by way of loans and grants to the Caribbean Economic Community, a tremendous amount of its oil wealth. If you look at the statistics, you will see that Barbados and Trinidad benefitted greatly.

Let there be no doubt about it, trade in CARICOM with Trinidad and Tobago and the rest is a two-way street. So when, because of the amount of wealth in Trinidad, Trinidad companies were able to invest in other

CARICOM countries, ultimately, the beneficiary of the profits of that investment will be the Government and people of Trinidad and Tobago. It was not like when they invested in Florida, and there is no record of the investment. When they invested in Barbados, the Central Bank of Trinidad and Tobago was aware, and the remittances will eventually earn interest to the benefit of the balance of payments of Trinidad and Tobago.

1.15 p.m.

In 1980, we exported some \$46 million in goods to Trinidad and Tobago and they exported well over \$100 million in goods to us. In 1981, there was an increase of \$56 million or \$58 million, and in 1982 that figure went to \$78 million. But something significant occurred in that period. It is that the oil price, upon which the Trinidad and Tobago economy was then greatly dependent, started to fall in the world and, as a result, there was a reduction in the amount of money available in Trinidad and Tobago. Indeed, it had reached the stage where this year, according to public reports, had they continued in the same vein, the reserves which they have built up over the years were in danger of being depleted by 1985.

So the Trinidad and Tobago Government took action which is designed to protect their balance of payments position. No one can have any quarrel with that. When the Barbados Labour Party Government came into power in 1976, we had to take action to protect our balance of payments. But what we all would expect is that, in taking the action, one takes into consideration the fact that CARICOM is a very special relationship. In truth and in fact, the percentage of trade that CARICOM trade represents is a totality of exports and imports, and Trinidad and Tobago is very small in relation to the total.

We would expect that, given the decisions of the Government to take action to protect their balance of payments, CARICOM, first of all, would be given preference over Third World countries in supplying the market. That is what we did in 1977. As a matter of fact, the Import Licencing Review Committee in Barbados deliberately sought out exporters from the rest of the Caribbean area and stressed that Barbados treated them in exactly the same way as they treated their own producers.

That may cause the honourable Member, in particular, the arch-protector in Barbados comparable to Mr. Gonsalves in Trinidad and Tobago, the former Minister of Trade, to be critical of me. But I have no apology to make. The Government has no apology to make, for saying that in the administration of its import policy it will not prefer a domestic manufacturer over a CARICOM manufacturer, because we believe that there should be equality of trade if, knowing the smallness of our market, the consumers are to get some kind of freedom of choice

and some kind of guarantee of reasonable standards. So I do not share the protectionism of the honourable Member who just spoke.

I believe that there is a small group in Trinidad and Tobago in the manufacturing sector who have been trying, for at least three years, to persuade the Ministry of Trade and Commerce in Trinidad that, since the oil crisis, the proper course of action to pursue is to restrict the Trinidad market to Trinidadians. They have been going on about this for a long period of time. You only have to follow the *Express Newspaper*, the *Guardian Newspaper* and the other newspapers to see that there has been a persistent cry by a small group of protectionist-minded people in Trinidad and Tobago who want the Government to restrict the market to Trinidad manufacturers.

Their theory is very simple. I heard them express it myself, and I was shocked at it. It is a narrow theory which ignores completely that one must take into account not only a particular sect of your manufacturing or productive sector, but that you must look at the rest, too. I think it is wrong that, in an integration movement, people do not follow the fact that there is not only visible trade.

Trinidad and Tobago earns a tremendous amount of money, much more than the rest of the CARICOM area, in insurance premiums yearly. In particular, they have cornered the fire insurance market, which is a lucrative area. They also have some control in the motor insurance market, although not necessarily a lucrative share. We ourselves earn great sums of money out of the life insurance market, because we were in the life business before. Out of the carriage of passengers and freight, Trinidad & Tobago earns tremendous sums of money because they have a large part of the lucrative aviation rights. When you take all these things and you put them together, you will see that it does not pay for the Government or any of these territories to indulge in a protectionist policy or to submit to the demands for such a policy in this area.

I believe that efforts are being made to clear up the administration of the scheme that has been introduced in Trinidad. We have three people in Trinidad, permanently paid employees of the Government, or institutions of Government, who are monitoring, on a day-to-day basis, the administration of this scheme. I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that it is not a question of the administration of that scheme being directed against Barbados. I am satisfied that at the present moment the scheme is not working out the way it was intended to work and that all exporters, whether they be CARICOM or non-CARICOM exporters, are undergoing great difficulty. Indeed, only yesterday, because of the criticism of the administration of the scheme, a special meeting was held between the officials of the Government of Trinidad & Tobago, at which, according to the newspaper reports, the difficulties surrounding the actual administration of this

scheme were to be discussed and attempts made to iron them out.

1.25 p.m.

I think that to try to connect this difficulty with incidents which have occurred subsequently would be an attempt which one can only regard as not really being genuine, but a last ditch effort to try and exploit a very unfortunate incident which has occurred between the two countries.

You cannot use the trade system which was introduced before. For you to do that effectively, you would have to demonstrate to this Honourable House that everybody else is getting their foreign exchange, but Barbados is not. I do not think that the honourable Member has made that charge. He has not made that charge.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the honourable Member will give way for a minute, the gravamen of my input was not that what is happening with foreign exchange has anything to do with the incident, it is that the incident is wrong *per se*. That is the gravamen of my charge! Also, that as a result of that incident, attitudes will harden in Trinidad where the people perceive that there is some kind of row going on between Trinidad and Barbados. That is the gravamen of my input!

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: That may well be so, provided that the incident did not have any connection with other matters, but the truth of the matter is that the people of Trinidad and Tobago believe that action should have been taken in Grenada. You forgot that point. The incident will be seen in the light of the fact of the origin of the incident.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No! The people of Trinidad and Tobago do not believe that Pitt is a liar.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I am not going to go into that, Sir, because that is a peripheral incident in relation to the substance of the matter. The substance of the matter was that action had to be taken in the Grenada situation, and that certain Governments decided on certain actions and other Governments decided on another action, and that of the Governments which decided on another action, one of them felt that they had to justify their decision. That is all, so you must look at this. In any event, West Indian people know that politics and international relations relevant to West Indian people are carried on in a stiff manner. We have passed that stage now.

How many times has the honourable Member not said of his colleagues that he would never ever do anything for them, and yet still he does it for them? That happens all the time in West Indian politics. The honourable Member has bitter hatred in his own party, but

that does not prevent the honourable Member from working with them. The honourable Member knows that as a fact. That is a characteristic of politicians worldwide, it is a characteristic of West Indian politicians. You know that, too. You know that your love for a certain person in your party.....

(Aside)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I am going to finish now. It is not going to pay the Opposition to try to magnify any incident that occurred with respect to any official for political gains, because the people of Trinidad and Tobago and Barbados have been working together for years. CARICOM worked and developed and expanded although there was not a Heads of Government meeting for some six or seven years, so what you have now, Sir, is a situation in which the Movement is sufficiently strong to take care of the rough and tumble that arises periodically in its existence.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: (Christ Church West): Mr. Chairman, obviously I am going to support the Government, not only because I am a member of the governing party, but because I think that this decision is in keeping with the Government's foreign policy as enunciated from the time it came to power in 1976.

I believe there is a seminal speech which I had the honour of making in outlining the tremendous change in Barbados' foreign policy, and in that analysis it became very clear, from all of the research in the Ministry, all of the advice from our diplomats, from our own political analysis and judgment, that Barbados' relationships with her traditional partners were shifting considerably, and that London was no longer for Barbados, and indeed for the Caribbean, the most important centre of diplomatic, political or trade activity.

It was quite obvious to us that we had to use our very scarce resources to get the maximum benefit from those resources in the overseas field, that we would have to shift a lot of those resources away from Britain and more into the CARICOM region, and that we would have to tackle the European market from Brussels rather than from London.

We have seen, therefore, the Government moving in a new embassy in Brussels, which is coming more and more to be the Government's leading diplomatic front in the European countries; we have seen the Government strengthening its representation in the United States at various levels, including at the level of tourism, and I hope shortly trade as well; and we have seen the Government placing increased emphasis on the CARICOM relationships and a decreased emphasis on the relationships with Venezuela and Latin America.

I think that, more and more, the Government is going to have to look at the Caribbean and have not only one embassy in Port-of-Spain, but divide the Caribbean perhaps into the Western Caribbean and the Eastern Caribbean, because the terms of our trade show clearly that CARICOM has now moved to be the second most important economic grouping for this country, and therefore we must tend to our export markets if, as a small country, we are to survive.

Our foreign affairs must always be pitted on a hard, business-like approach. We can no longer allow the luxury of being accredited to the Court of St. James, or the sentiment of having sent people to London in 1955, to be the guiding factors in how we shape our overseas Missions. It is not that we do not continue to have an abiding responsibility for our nationals overseas and those who are our kith and kin, but I think we must come more and more to recognise that the emphasis must be on getting the resources — by way of trade, by way of invisibles, by way of tourism — to sustain a foreign service and a standard of living to which our people have become accustomed and to which they aspire.

I think the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt), who is normally knowledgeable on these issues, has allowed himself to be somewhat sidetracked into making a quick political speech rather than one of his considered pronouncements on the movement of our CARICOM relations, because any objective analysis of what has happened in the Caribbean between 1977 and now must recognise that Barbados has probably been the prime mover in trying to cement the CARICOM countries in problems where the international economic climate was hard and difficult, and in circumstances where at times the personal relationships at the highest level between some of our leaders was less than was deserved.

1.35 p.m.

I do not think that we need to harp back at the time when the relationship between the former distinguished Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago and our own then distinguished Prime Minister, the present Leader of the Opposition, was very sour. It had reached rock bottom at one stage. We need not harp back on that. Obviously, relationships get that way. We can neither harp back to the time when the relationship between the then Prime Ministers of Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago was sour.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member apparently misses the gravamen of my input. I did not discuss whether Barbados took a lead in the development of CARICOM. I know that Barbados took the lead when I was Minister. I do not have to discuss that. The point I was making was that the language which was used by our Prime Minister is detrimental. The relationship

between Dr. Williams and the honourable Member for St. John did not degenerate into name calling. That is the point.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I grasp the honourable Member's point and I will deal with it. I hope to give a proper analysis from a Foreign Affairs point of view with the little expertise that I happened to have acquired in the field, both academically and also as a practitioner of the art of diplomacy.

The point I am making, though, is that one must recall that the very CARICOM, and the very harshness of the language to which the honourable Member refers, pre-existed the recent incident. There was the famous "dose of salts" speech of Mr. Michael Manley, which ruined one and a half years of planning for the CARICOM Summit, when Dr. Williams immediately withdrew and said that the summit was no longer desired to be held in Barbados.

We are accustomed to these setbacks. Who should be more accustomed to the setbacks than the Barbados Labour Party, which was in the forefront of West Indian political union, and those of us who were the younger ones at the time of the Barbados Labour Party, 'the Under 40's,' whose hearts, whose minds, whose attitudes, whose discipline were towards a wider West Indian union.

Obviously we were disappointed, but we were not down-spirited, and we have always looked at every hurdle as just another obstacle to be cleared towards the eventual union. So I am not like the honourable Member, unduly concerned about the little difficulties that occur along the road to widening and deepening the Integration Movement in the Caribbean. I rather take my cue from the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central, (Hon. H. B. St. John) the honourable Minister of Trade, who sees the wider problems of the Caribbean and the need for all of us to put our heads together to overcome those structural and fundamental problems.

I am happy that the Government has taken the decision to go into Trinidad with people on the ground, with experts there, but we have to go a bit further and we have to look at the time when we also have an embassy in Jamaica, looking towards the western Caribbean. We have to go a bit further, too, and we have to rethink the very relationships in CARICOM and how to cement and integrate the economy of Barbados with our neighbours who are closest around us.

We started out on that road with the Memorandum of Understanding between the Government of Trinidad and Tobago and the Government of Barbados in 1978. The fruits of that Memorandum of Understanding are the greatest testimony to the achievements of this Government in promoting proper bi-lateral relations with Trinidad and Tobago, much more so than the passing problem of which the honourable Member has spoken.

If one looks to the north of this island, you see an investment by both countries of some US\$70 million in the Arawak Cement Plant. If you look to the south of this island, you will find the presence of Caricargo, which is not only an investment in money terms but in it you can see the impact it is having on helping the manufacturers of the Caribbean to relate to themselves and relate the trade of the Caribbean to the outer world without being dependant and over dependant on the carriers of other countries. I believe that it is along this line that we must continue to look for functional and practical avenues of co-operation so that the integration process can be more and more entrenched in our countries.

Mr. Chairman, make no mistake about it, there will always be problems. In fact, the Caribbean Community, I believe, is unique in the fact that of all integration movements between under-developed and developing countries, it has managed to grow in the space of time that it has grown, and in the manner in which it has grown.

We have too many prophets of doom, who are always sounding the death knell of Caricom or of the Integration Movement, as I prefer to call it, because the Integration Movement preceded CARICOM, will deepen with CARICOM and will ripen beyond CARICOM as the people of the Caribbean learn to be more mature, more self-reliant and more co-operative.

Our relationship is changing with the wider world and it is deepening here at home. But we must be careful how we react to situations, and I sound a word of warning to our manufacturers and manufacturers in the Caribbean. They must not move their pressure groups to the stage that they believe that Governments can be compelled to make short term decisions which may look attractive but which might not take in the longterm interest of the Caribbean people, as distinct from Caribbean sectional interest.

Let me translate that into what is happening now, Sir. I would rather see the manufacturers of the Caribbean become alive to the fact that there are fundamental structural changes in problems confronting the Trinidad economy at this stage. Obviously, it is going to mean in Trinidad itself a tightening of the belt, which will affect not only the average Trinidadian but also the terms of trade between Trinidad and the other of her Caricom partners.

We have a duty to assist Trinidad in its task just as Trinidad assisted us when we were in problems. We cannot just heap scorn or attack Trinidad because at the moment the terms of trade in oil particularly is shifting against her. She has probably been using her resources

on so many projects that it is difficult to get them all going and coming to maturity.

We must understand what is happening to the Trinidad economy, analyse it, try to be sympathetic and use the opportunities that are available. But at the same time, we must plan for the wider world, to look at other export markets, because if Barbados remains strong and we can strengthen the others, we will soon see that the Trinidad economy will be out of problems.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: One minute more.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Yes, Sir.

I wish to wind up by saying that a short term political difference cannot be settled in the light of whether people boo a horse or not. I want to know how serious we were going to get about analysing this relationship.  
1.45 p.m.

I will say that it is mighty strange that an Ambassador's neck is put for the kill. I have never understood a foreign policy that you relate what your Ambassador says, but I do not want to throw any more oil on the plains. Normally, if one is looking at the issue, if you are going to say that language is intemperate, you must also have to look at what caused the language to be intemperate, and obviously there was an erring on the foreign field. But, Sir, that is for the practitioners, the Permanent Secretaries and what not to solve these problems. I believe that the political leaders will talk, and will have to talk soon. I also believe that the relationship between Trinidad and Barbados is too fundamental for little inconveniences like wants to stay anywhere in the deepening of the relationship.

I speak, constantly with quite a lot of people in Trinidad, in the Civil Service, the manufacturing level and at the political level. I remain convinced that Trinidadians, both on the political front and at the normal level, and the average Barbadian see themselves as destined to integrate their economies and their attitudes in the Eastern Caribbean, forming a tremendous and economically strong bloc, enabling them to negotiate with the Southern Caribbean and the Western Caribbean, and finally, widening the economic grouping to include other countries other than the English-speaking countries of the Caribbean. I cannot believe that this House will do itself great justice unless it recognises these wider problems and forget the personalities.

*Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS and Dr. R. C. HAYNES rose.*

*Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): Mr. Chairman, I am not speaking in final reply.*

*Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have two honourable Members on their feet. My eyes caught the honourable Member for St. Thomas. This is not a reply; he is entitled to speak.*

*Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, these few minutes of debate remind me that, no matter how much great events cast their shadow over the politics of small countries, there are yet small minds and small people in those small countries whose determination to remain small-minded, whose purpose to be makers of mischief for all their adult life, remains unchanged and unaltered. I do not intend to join in battle over language, semantics, linguistics and so on.*

*The two honourable Members (Hon. H. B. St. John and Hon. H. deB. Forde) who have spoken before me have made it clear that, like all good friends, there are frictions between Barbados and Trinidad. It would give offence if I were to give my interpretation of the frictions, therefore I shall not give it. Sufficient to say that they are not new. Our Party came to power in 1976 with a pledge that we would put an end to the then war of words that existed between the present Leader of the Opposition and his counterpart in Trinidad, and between the governments of the two countries in respect of political matters, civil aviation and one or two trade matters as well.*

*The relations between Trinidad and Barbados are in many ways like the relations between husband and wife, wife and husband. There is no wish for a divorce, but there is a great deal of wish, sometimes, for a little quarrelling to clear the air and otherwise.*

*The honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) has chosen to take up the cudgels for the former Trinidad High Commissioner in Barbados. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) also took up the cudgels for the People's Revolutionary Government and army in Grenada against the Prime Minister of Barbados. We are accustomed to seeing and dealing with people in the Opposition who are friends of everyone but their own country and their own Government.*

*I will say no more, except that if there is anyone in Trinidad who believes Mr. Pitt and not me, I have not yet heard of him, read about him or received a*

*letter from any such person, and I am answering every day, twenty to thirty letters from the Caribbean and other parts of the world. There is somebody working full time in my office doing nothing but replying to letters for my signature.*

*(Asides)*

*Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Perhaps I need one of those signature things. The difference is that the population of Barbados is 250 000 and the population of the United States is 250 million.*

*But if honourable Members need any reassurance on the particular matter, which undoubtedly bears directly on this Resolution, I would just point to the fact that I saw Mr. Pitt in the company of the Foreign Minister, and the Foreign Minister has said on more than one occasion that his recollection completely supports mine.*

*I called Mr. Pitt into my office for what everyone in my office knew — from the Brigadier who happened to be around and about, the Foreign Minister, the Private Secretary — everybody around him — the Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was not there but certainly knew my purpose of calling Mr. Pitt in — I called Mr. Pitt in to tell him that a military intervention was being prepared for Grenada and that Trinidad would be invited to participate. I used the words to him that I knew he could not give me an answer one way or the other there and then, but I expected him to convey the message confidentially to Mr. Chambers since it was a secret matter and people's lives were at stake — I used those words — and it is impossible for me to believe all that I have read as to the hearing, understanding and reporting process.*

*I will only say this: that the Leader of the Opposition, in commenting on this to the Cabinet Secretary, said that if I had wanted Mr. Chambers to know, I should not have told Mr. Pitt.*

*Asides.*

*Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Write to him in Trinidad and ask him if he did not say that. You made mischief; well I will just throw in my little pinch thereon.*

*Now, Sir, on the main matter,.....*

*Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order: it is my clear recollection that the Leader of the Opposition said that he thought the correct procedure would have been for the Prime Minister of Barbados to call Mr. Chambers. The construction that is being put on the response is a gross misrepresentation of what our leader said.*

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I have already told Mr. Chambers, and he has agreed, that you cannot call across an open telephone line within 400 miles of a Russian vessel which happened to be monitoring all telephone calls between the islands. That is how we know who told the Grenadians.

*Asides.*

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Not from the Russians. They were not the only people monitoring. I have already explained that to Mr. Chambers. I was of the impression that the Leader of the Opposition was not saying I should have told Mr. Chambers over the telephone. He was perhaps saying that I should have given a letter to Mr. Pitt because Mr. Pitt could not.....Well, I say no more, because I am not attacking him.

Honourable Members opposite were anxious to get up and put a different gloss on something about which I am fully informed, perhaps more fully informed than they are, and they are anxious to get up and put a gloss on a conversation which took place between two parties, neither of whom is present in the House of Assembly at the present time.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order: having been one of the first persons to get up, the point I made — the honourable Member continues and they all continue to miss it — is that, no matter what he says are the events that occurred, it is wrong for a Prime Minister publicly to say of a High Commissioner that he is an outright liar.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are not making a point of order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It is a decision on the use of language which the honourable Member will never have to make. He can rest assured on that particular point.  
1.55 p.m.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Barrow called Gairy a bandit.)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I think I still have three or four minutes left. I do not intend to take up all of those minutes.

It is clear that relations between Barbados and Trinidad, even if they entered a temporary trough, which I do not accept, will improve as time passes. Countries go through traumas when they discover that things have been going wrong and are going wrong. They take decisions which are necessary to correct those things, and I have to amend and smooth out those decisions as time passes.

Trinidad does \$100 million in business a year with Barbados. They sell us \$6 million in detergents, \$3 million in fruit juice. They even sell us garments; not very much, but some. They sell us a great deal of petroleum. We do \$70 million, \$80 million, \$90 million in business a year with Trinidad. Several thousand jobs in Barbados can be related to sales to Trinidad. Perhaps, a couple of thousand jobs in Trinidad can also be related to sales in Barbados.

Our two countries have very similar philosophies. Our two countries have even very similar economies, once you remove the factor of petroleum which looms so large in the Trinidad system. We both believe in parliamentary democracy. I dare say we both make mistakes from time to time. But our relations are not going to sink into, even the abyss that they were in in 1976 while this Government remains in power.

We are not going to make any threat about destroying British West Indian Airways. We recognize where our interests lie, and I believe that the Government of Trinidad and Tobago would recognize where its interests lie. Recent statements will indicate, Mr. Chairman, that the Government of Trinidad sees the danger of isolation just as we see the danger of any rift between the two most economically sound members of CARICOM at the present time.

We have had an unfortunate political rift related to an act of policy, which I believe would have been supported quite as strongly by the public in Trinidad as it was by the public in Barbados. But this is a disagreement which, in itself, has not led to any significant deterioration of relations.

If the honourable Member for St. Michael West is seeking to construct upon an edifice of forthright language, a superstructure of trade disadvantage, he is not abusing me. He would be accusing a lot of officials in Trinidad of pettiness, of which I do not believe them to be guilty, and of which I am certainly not accusing them.

Many persons in public life in Trinidad perhaps gave their views slightly greater air on a more personal tinge than we are accustomed to in Barbados. I have today instructed counsel in Trinidad to take action against a Trinidad newspaper, and possibly a member of the Government of Trinidad, for remarks. But that will not come as anything new to members of the Opposition.

These minor verbal exchanges are no more than tiny bits of straw on the ocean of amity that exists between two neighbouring countries who have been blessed by a succession of circumstances to be among the best-off countries, the economically soundest countries, in the Third World. Certainly among small island states, we have

both been extremely fortunate, and a few carving words and petty mischief making is not going to drive any wedge, such as the honourable Member for St. Michael West has indicated, between the Government of Barbados and the Government of Trinidad and Tobago.

I urge this Resolution on the House.

*Dr. R. C. HAYNES rose.*

#### MOTION FOR LEAVE TO SIT AGAIN

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, it is now 2.05 p.m. It is customary that we go to lunch at 2.00 o'clock, Sir.

I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress to His Honour the Deputy Speaker and ask for leave to sit again.

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

*Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress to Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER and asked for leave to sit again, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*

#### SUSPENSION

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move, that this House be now suspended until 3.00 o'clock today for lunch, Sir.

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

*The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.*  
2.05 p.m.

#### On Resumption

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

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on this matter before the House

out of a feeling of public responsibility, and to look at a major area which will affect the welfare of many Barbadians. I believe that the time has come when the people of Barbados should demand that those in public office conduct themselves in a manner which is compatible with the public interest, and ensure that the language which such offices use, particularly in relation to other countries, will not result in serious hardship to the people of this country.

There can be no excuse — I repeat, there can be no excuse — for anyone, no matter what kind of stress they might be under, to resort to referring to the representative at an ambassadorial level of any country as an unmitigated liar. The point behind diplomacy and diplomatic language is designed to avoid that kind of situation.

It is true that when one is under stress, one's true personality involves. It is easy for any of us to cloak ourselves in an atmosphere of decency when the going is smooth. It is when the going is rough that one realises, and can easily recognize, whether deep down inside one is a gentleman or one is not a gentleman. It is when you are under stress that this sort of thing emerges.

We have seen from the Floor of this Honourable House at least one honourable Member, myself, being called a liar. We have seen on television in this country again and again persons of high repute being referred to as liars by the Prime Minister of this country. Many people thought that it was a matter to laugh at. But now it has spilled over to the international arena and it has become a very different problem altogether.

If you wanted to hear the most serious condemnation of the diplomatic blunder made by the Prime Minister of this country, you only had to listen to the content of the speeches of the honourable Deputy Prime Minister (Hon. H. B. St. John) and the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde). Those two speeches set out very clearly the economic relationships and dependancy between Barbados and Trinidad, the difficulties in the present circumstances and, indeed, the importance at this stage in our economic history to ensure that our economic position was not frustrated by the vulgar diplomatic blunder which occurred in this country in relation to the state of Trinidad and Tobago.

It cannot be excused, and I am very glad that the honourable Deputy Prime Minister and the Member for Christ Church West did not get up and defend it. I sat down here and listened very carefully, and I was a little upset when I heard the main gravamen of the argument of the Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt), that such behaviour is unacceptable in any circumstance, being challenged on the other side.

Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of great disturbance to me. You may recall that earlier this year I cautioned the Prime Minister when I heard him say that he had some harsh words to say to Trinidad and Tobago. That was before the Finance Ministers conference in Barbados about the middle of the year. I called on him to exercise the greatest diplomacy. The exact words I used were, "this is the time for soft words, not harsh words." I said that in the light of all the information given to this House by the honourable Deputy Prime Minister.

We knew since the last Budget, and before, that Trinidad was going to undergo an adjustment process. We saw that the adjustment process was going to take full effect. We recognised that the pattern of trade between Barbados and Trinidad, particularly the composition, consists largely of non-essential items, exactly in the area any country would seek to curtail. Therefore, judging by Trinidad past performance.....

(At this stage there was a power failure).

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Mr. Chairman, apart from the fact that we cannot hear the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central there are other things involved, including one of the tape recorders.

(At this stage the power resumed).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central may continue.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Now Sir, it is important that those remarks were not isolated remarks. I do not need to go through the economic reasons which should have guided the Government and the Prime Minister — and sometimes I wonder why it is you have a Foreign Minister in this country, and several other developing countries, at all.

As to why one should not have allowed the state of relations between Trinidad and Tobago to deteriorate to the point to which it has deteriorated today, we know that there are some critical initiatives that can only be taken by the Trinidad and Tobago Government in the interest of Barbados. We know, for example, that the revitalization of the CARICOM Multilateral Clearing Facility, which is essential for the promotion of trade in this region, depends a lot on the initiatives taken by the Trinidad and Tobago Government, and we have \$130 million wrapped up in that facility. We also know that the other major markets in the Caribbean are not in a position at the moment to absorb much of our exports and pay for them. Therefore, all of these reasons should have informed any right-thinking person that they cannot be going around on a kind of emotional or ego trip, and use language of that kind in relation to the personal

representative of the Prime Minister of another country, and then go begging to get the situation reversed.

The Trinidad and Tobago Government has made its position clear, in diplomatic terms, by simply saying that "we have full confidence in our Ambassador". In other words, they are saying that they do not believe that their Ambassador is any liar.

Now there are many things at stake here. At stake are two joint projects, one being CariCargo. The recent decision by BWIA to lift freight again, particularly out of the Miami area, with more wide-bodied aircraft on that particular route, is a matter of concern as to the fate of CariCargo. In addition to that, there is a cement plant venture, and much of the success of that will depend on the continuing goodwill of Trinidad and Tobago.

I want to send a message out to all Trinidadians, and the message is simply that the people of Barbados are known always as civilized in their behaviour and they must disassociate.....

*Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central were ordered to be expunged from the Record by Mr. CHAIRMAN.*

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: To continue, Sir, I would like to ask all Barbadians to disassociate themselves from the unschooled behaviour and language of the Prime Minister of Barbados. He is totally unschooled in diplomatic matters.  
3.10 p.m.

I go further, Sir, and say this, that remark represents a culmination of events that should have been nipped in the bud a long time ago. In June of this year, the Prime Minister of Barbados included in a speech which he was intending to make at the CARICOM Ministers of Finance Conference here in Barbados, words that were highly offensive of the Governor of the Central Bank of Trinidad, the same man now who has responsibility for ECO forms. He was forced, under pressure, to remove those remarks from his speech, and, fortunately, that conference went off reasonably well. I know what I am talking about, highly offensive remarks!

Quite unperturbed by the reaction which he encountered which forced him to remove those remarks from his speech at that particular time, he then goes down to Trinidad and makes another major diplomatic blunder, knowing the sensitivity of Trinidad manufacturers and the strength of their lobby, as again adverted to by the honourable Deputy Prime Minister, a serious error in trying to accuse a major firm in Trinidad of breaking the Rules of Origin, referring to the Deputy Prime Minister's shirt-jac suit saying that the top had on a different label from the bottom.

Now, what on earth was the Prime Minister doing going through the suitcase of the Deputy Prime Minister? That is the first thing. Or did he go through the wardrobe? I hope he did not examine them whilst they were on him, because one label is here and the other one is usually there. I hope that is not how he discovered it.

The point I am trying to make is that that caused serious offence to the entire manufacturing sector in Trinidad, and small as it may seem, following on what happened here in Barbados, that created further problems. Mind you, Sir, there is something you always have to remember, that because of the performance of oil in Trinidad, the manufacturing sector in Trinidad has never over the past four or five years been performing at its full capacity. That is one reason.

We also have to remember that Trinidad and Tobago had a vibrant manufacturing sector even before Jamaica. I am going back now to the late Fifties and early Sixties. Trinidad has the capacity to produce everything that we produce in Barbados to meet its domestic needs. Therefore, it seemed to me that it required the highest skilled diplomacy to enter into an arrangement with Trinidad and Tobago whereby it could carry out its adjustment programme, which would necessarily impact on non-essential imports, while at the same time maintaining a secure niche within the Trinidad market for the Barbados manufacturers.

That was the diplomatic task ahead of us, that is what we should have been doing since December, last year, that is what I adverted to in this House. But instead, through clumsiness, through egomania, through — I would not like to say crudeness, Sir — but through a behaviour that is clearly, totally inexplicable, and indeed cannot be understood by anyone who sits in the Office of Prime Minister in this country and holds that particular post.....

I am sure that under no circumstances would the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) have done a thing like that. I am absolutely sure, I am sure he knows it is absolutely indefensible, I am sure he knows about the integrity of the person and the personality of an Ambassador. I am sure he knows how bigger countries behave when they are faced with this kind of situation. I am sure he is aware of that and I am absolutely sure he would not do it, because the implications are too serious for the man in the street, for the man who has investments in Barbados, and to some extent for the people who have responsibilities for the manufacturing sector in Trinidad which exports to Barbados.

The implications are very serious. You cannot play with the fortunes of the people in this manner, and no

amount of twisting — and I have seen it started already, suggesting that the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) is supporting Trinidad against the Barbados Government, simply because he calls for a more enlightened approach to diplomatic matters, and to avoid such coarseness when speaking about foreign representatives and in the conduct of public business. That is the distortion being made already. The suggestion is being made that the honourable Member for St. Michael West is unpatriotic in his behaviour by calling on the Prime Minister to follow a certain internationally accepted code of behaviour in his dealings with other states.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two minutes more.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The same thing was done to me two years ago when I got up and called on the Prime Minister of this country to exercise restraint in the language he was using in relation to Grenada on a serious matter, the calling for elections, and that was immediately interpreted as my supporting Grenada against Barbados. Those kinds of distortions are totally unhelpful. It did not matter that I said on the floor of this House on numerous occasions that I never even knew or met a single member of the Grenada Government. As a matter of fact, I regard it as a matter that will redound to my everlasting shame, as matters have turned out, that I allowed that type of propaganda to stop me from visiting that country to see for myself what was going on down there. It is a matter that I will regret as long as I live, to allow the kind of wicked propaganda by the Barbados Labour Party to stop me from exercising my rights as a Caribbean man. That is a very, very serious matter.

There is one more thing I want to say. I believe that as matters have unfolded between Barbados and Trinidad, several people will lose their jobs here in this country over the coming weeks. Some have lost their jobs already, more will go home this week and more will go home next week. I would like to submit to you, Sir, that those job losses are quite unnecessary, and I can assure the honourable Deputy Prime Minister that he is very mistaken in his belief which he stated when he was on his feet, that those losses would have nothing to do with that statement. I can assure you that much would be attributed to it.

I would seriously urge on members of the Barbados Labour Party that you should bring some pressure to bear on the Prime Minister, that you should look again at the statements made about other countries, and that you should probably give a little more authority to your Department of External Affairs and to your Minister of External Affairs, so that statements made in relation to other countries are not off-the-cuff remarks.

There are people on whom you spent a lot of money training, and who have a lot of experience in

dealing with this situation, and I am sure that if, as in other countries, the experience of those in the Public Service was brought to bear on these matters, and use was made of those in the Barbados Labour Party who have a wealth of diplomatic experience — for example, the honourable Member for Christ Church West, who if he were consulted I am sure he would advise against making a statement of that kind — and you let the Foreign Ministers go forward in most of these situations, so that when the time comes for an intervention at prime ministerial level matters would be clear, and then you will not be faced with this kind of problem on a recurring basis.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am winding up, Sir.

What has happened is that successive leaders of Government in Third World Countries in the past twenty years or so have sought to downgrade the position of their Foreign Ministers. I believe a lot less tension would emerge in difficult situations if the Foreign Ministries of the various countries were given the opportunity to bring their full diplomatic skills and experience, and so on, to bear on statements which are issued. When you make these statements in Barbados, there are some people who believe you — some do not believe you, some laugh and take it as a joke — but when you take it into the international arena, it is a different ball game. Just remember that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.  
3.20 p.m.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): I just want to say a few things because I do not think that the honourable Member (Dr. R. C. Haynes) should be allowed to get away with some of the things he has said.

The first point I want to deal with, Sir, is that the economic situation was deteriorating for some considerable period of time and the protectionist element in Trinidad was trying systematically to have Regulations passed to restrict CARICOM trade long before the Grenada incident.

To connect BWIA's decision with respect to Caricargo, to say that it had any connection at all to do with this, again is incorrect. BWIA has a new Chairman, a Mr. Rampersaud. They appointed a committee called the Draper Committee, and the Draper Committee has recommended that BWIA should go back to being its own agent. That is the point.

The honourable Member is saying that BWIA is now starting to ferry cargo again. BWIA never ceased carrying cargo. What happened was that after the 1979 Agreement

CariCargo became the sole agent, not only in Barbados but in other markets, and as part of the agency it agreed that the bellies of BWIA would be filled first. That is all. The Draper Report contends that CariCargo did not carry out that agreement and CariCargo's Board of Directors have always contended that they had carried it out. But if they wish to be their own agent, or appoint somebody else as agent in substitution for CariCargo, you cannot connect that with this. It has nothing to do with that at all.

The second point is that the same Draper Report has recommended that BWIA should compete with LIAT. When it was announced that BWIA was going to compete with LIAT on the same Grenada run, the Board of Directors of LIAT summoned an emergency meeting of the shareholders to deal with that development. If the present Chairman and Directors of BWIA wish to implement the Draper Report which, in my opinion, from what I have seen of it, is a report which seems very clearly to give a new direction to BWIA, namely, that it must pursue a policy of totally ignoring the interest of other states which have supported it in the past and have taken decisions to ensure that it has a measure of protection; if they wish to operate upon the basis that they are totally under an obligation only to one country, so be it.

There is absolutely no difficulty in that because the relationship with CariCargo and BWIA is a relationship which was worked out after a long period of balancing passenger rights *vis-a-vis* New York and cargo rights *vis-a-vis* New York. That is well known.

I have discussed this matter with the Managing Director of CariCargo, and as far as he is concerned, this part of the Draper Report does not in anyway affect the operation. If I appoint you as agent and you feel I can do it better than you, fire me and appoint another agent. There is absolutely no difficulty with that, so do not let us connect the two of them.

The third point. The honourable Member talked about bi-lateral relations. We have to have elaborate mechanisms to deal with bi-lateral relations with Trinidad and Tobago. Everybody knows that the Government of Barbados has a series of consultations — on insurance, which comes under the Ministry of Finance, investments which come under the Ministry of Finance, trade which comes under my Ministry, agriculture which comes under the Ministry of Agriculture, the cement plant which comes under the Ministry of Finance. So it is wrong for the honourable Member to suggest that strenuous efforts were not, and still are not, being paid to the question of this co-operation.

I can assure the honourable Member that all of the Ministries, the Prime Minister's Ministry, the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Trade, are constantly

trying to maintain the tremendous contacts that have been built up, and not only at political levels. This is where the honourable Member is mistaken. The servicing of the bi-lateral agreement was 99 per cent continuously being done at the Civil Service level. That is a fact, so do not think that there were not elaborate mechanisms in existence.

The question of the Multilateral Clearing Facility. The last thing in the world the honourable Member should raise is that. I would not like to deal with the details of that, because the honourable Member should know about it; his contacts are sufficiently great. Some of his contacts are not going to tell him as it is, that there has been a certain slowness, tardiness, if I may say so — not uncharacteristic — in implementing the agreement which everybody agrees should be implemented before the facility could resume. But do not think for one minute that the relationship between Trinidad and Tobago and Barbados is not one which is mutually beneficial to both countries. Do not let us forget that.

Now on the question of this foolishness about relabelling. It is a fact that at the CARICOM Meeting in Guyana there was cross-accusations about who broke the Rules of Origin.

Everybody confessed that no country could guarantee that at no period of time their manufacturers had not broken the Rules of Origin. This has been going on for some time; the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) can tell you it was going on. It first started with Ryan Rogers in Jamaica.

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: *Tell us how he saw that shirt-jac.*)

Hon H. B. St. JOHN: But that shirt-jac was produced in Guyana long before. That was a matter of record. It was no offence then. It was during the same meeting that we were discussing the necessity for the appointment of the Garment Commission that I raised the question as to whether, if you labelled one part of a garment one way and labelled another part of the garment the other way, that was not a breach of the Rules of Origin Labelling Laws, which we had all agreed to introduce to ensure that the policing by Customs would be easier. But as usual, the honourable Member picks it from the Press, which picks it and puts it in the way they want it.

It was not a question of the Rules of Origin. It was a question of the Labelling Laws. That is a minor incident. That was raised long before. It never caused any offence.

I agree with the honourable Member that it is important for all of us to recognise that we have to have

patience. Dealing with Trinidad and Tobago requires tremendous patience. It is their system. We cannot change their system.

3.30 p.m.

The basic position is that we have to have patience, but let it be clearly understood that everybody does not have the same amount of patience. Also, do not let anybody fool themselves that it is any one way street when it comes to trade between Trinidad and Barbados. There is no one way street. The aviation business between the countries is no one way street. It is mutually beneficial. It is in their interest to co-operate with us as much as it is in our interest to co-operate with them.

I just want to take this opportunity to correct the impression given by the honourable Member. It is the implementation of the Draper Report which, if implemented in full, will have profound consequences for LIAT. So serious are these consequences that already a unanimous decision has been taken to summon a shareholders' meeting to deal with the question of whether there is to be a breach of the agreement entered into between the governments in 1975, before our time, and the CDB with respect to competition within the Caribbean and LIAT.

That is not connected with this at all. It is a completely different thing, so do not let us try and wrap up the two things now for any advantage at the present moment. The position and the facts are exactly as I have said. Do not let the honourable Member think he can get away with trying to give any impression that the relationship with Trinidad has anything to do with aviation.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I want to make another intervention on this debate arising out of the remarks made by the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) and, more particularly, the remarks made by the right honourable Member for St. Thomas (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams).

I regret very much that the Prime Minister of this country cannot even, when debate is going towards suggestions as to how the country may move forward, desist the temptation to the picayune approach to these matters. He gets up and he starts to talk about small men with small minds and he gets up and tries to suggest ...

*Asides.*

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I have not identified you yet. He continues to suggest that any suggestion that perhaps the High Commissioner of Trinidad and Tobago's position has been misunderstood, or any suggestion that the statement he made was detrimental to relations between Trinidad and Barbados, is an indication that somebody is unpatriotic to Barbados.

Mr. Chairman, I want to lay this on the floor of this House once and for all. The Prime Minister is no more patriotic about Barbados than anybody else. As a matter of fact, there are things he does in his capacity as Prime Minister which raise questions about whether he cares anything about the people of Barbados or about Barbados at all.

Mr. Chairman, I am talking about CARICOM relations. He tries to give the impression in here that relations between Trinidad and Barbados are so smooth, and that his calling the High Commissioner an outright liar was a small thing, a drop in the bucket. But it is a fact that relations between Barbados and Trinidad and Tobago, at the highest level, have been sour for some considerable time. It is a fact that recently, when the right honourable gentleman from St. Thomas was in St. Lucia and the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago was in St. Lucia, the relations between them were strained.

The suggestion that the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago would be coming up here for the opening of the cement plant, the suggestion that it is a temporary problem between Barbados and Trinidad and Tobago, do not fit the facts which have been revealed by the Trinidad and Tobago Government in Trinidad about relations between Barbados and Trinidad. The problem we have in Barbados is that the Prime Minister believes that he is right — no matter what he does. They have trotted out all kinds of problems relating to when Barbados and Trinidad were having discussions about B.W.I.A.

No one is questioning whether there have been differences of opinion between Barbados and Trinidad and between Barbados and any other country. What we are talking about is the way in which the Prime Minister has, on more than one occasion, made public statements which have put the people of Barbados at tremendous risk. I recall when he interfered with the Prime Minister of Grenada. It was a time when we were both on American soil and he had been drinking, as I had been, and he went on the radio and opened his mouth and started a whole new ball game as if he is some kind of colonist.

*Asides.*

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I can drink a lot of rum and liquor. I do not know what he can drink.

The point is, Sir, that this attitude which we see permeating the policies of Barbados, the attitudes where, for example, the Foreign Minister of Barbados, on more than one occasion within CARICOM circles, has been reported to the Prime Minister because the Foreign Minister's attitude is not of the same mien and same kind as the Prime Minister ..... And I do not appreciate anybody in this Honourable Chamber, and least of all the

right honourable gentleman from St. Thomas, suggesting that he is the only repository of knowledge, wisdom, commonsense and all the other attributes which contribute to being a man. He gets up in this Honourable Chamber — I am talking about his remarks.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member is not in the habit of repeating himself over and over again. He has gone over this time and time again.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 35 stand part.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You can move whatever you want to move, but the point I am making is that this concept, that you are unpatriotic if you do not lie down in the same bed as the other people, is detrimental to this country. You cannot say on the one hand that this is a democratic country, and every time you take the opportunity, because someone does not agree with your point of view, to suggest that that person is unpatriotic.

If I had to say it, I would say it again that if I had to choose, based on my experience, the word of the Prime Minister of Barbados as against the word of the gentleman from Trinidad, I would have great difficulty choosing the word of the Prime Minister of Barbados, because my experience has been that he has not said anything to me, or concerning me, that I can accept his word on matters of that kind. So I have no problem being unpatriotic.

*Asides.*

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Now you see, Mr. Chairman, where he wants to take it. If I said that I do not believe that you have taken money concerning the putting of the medical school here, I would accept your word on that. Any time you want to discuss that,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This debate is degenerating. I will not have it.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I did not cause it to degenerate. He said that somebody made me a rich man, and I am saying that I would take his word if he tells me that he did not receive money. That is all.

Mr. Chairman, the point I am making is that this business of suggesting that people are unpatriotic is the beginning of a witch hunt which is permeating this society even now. The Prime Minister will use this Honourable Chamber and the media in Barbados to make a number of statements which are calculated to interfere with individual persons, and he has done it before, and I will not sit in this Honourable Chamber and allow him, even by innuendo, to suggest that I am unpatriotic because I say that for him to call an Ambassador or High

Commissioner a liar is not in the best interest of the people of Barbados.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Sir, I am going to move that the Head stand part, but it is really very embarrassing to sit here for almost four hours over one Head, Head 35, dealing with somebody quarrelling with a Prime Minister of a country over a diplomat.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will now take the motion which the honourable Member moved.  
3.40 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Will you take it, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Unless the right honourable Prime Minister wishes to wind up.

*Aside.*

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I must confess, Sir, that hearing the Members on the other side in relation to this, I must say that it is not a fitting debate. It turns out that Members on the other side are scolding the Prime Minister of this country because he had certain knowledge at his disposal. Not the information given by Senator Jacelon from Trinidad, who the Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) telephones every day, an arch-enemy of Barbados. Every day the Member for St. Michael South Central is telephoning Senator Jacelon from the Trinidad Ministry of Finance to make it difficult for the Barbados Government. That is what I call being unpatriotic!

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Probably, he would say that he does not know the Senator now, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member is on his feet.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir! There are certain types of behaviour in this House. That statement is totally and completely untrue.

*Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Members for St. James South and St. Michael South Central were ordered to be expunged from the Record by Mr. CHAIRMAN.*

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir,.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman,.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: ..... whenever there is an arch-enemy of Barbados.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, I cannot have this. Two honourable Members are on their feet.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Now, Sir.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must ask the honourable member to take his seat. An honourable Member has got on his feet to make a point of order. Please let us have it.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I believe that there is a Rule in this House which imposes a responsibility on each Member.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Which Rule is this?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: .....to observe some kind of veracity in his speech. And this is where the danger is, Sir — hear me on this one, this is a very dangerous statement — when you set out to mislead the Chamber in this way, it is wrong.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have heard this kind of Standing Order very often before.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You cannot mislead —

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. You obviously have no point of order to me.

*Laughter.*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable Member please take your seat. The honourable Member please take your seat. Would an honourable colleague of his lend him a copy of the Standing Orders, so that he can find out which Standing Order someone is in breach of. That is what I would like to see done.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: It appears, Mr. Chairman, that whenever there is an arch-enemy of the Government of Barbados, the best friend that arch-enemy of Barbados can have is the Member for St. Michael South Central.

I am repeating here on the Floor of the House that the Member for St. Michael South Central — I am sorry I cannot call him Richie Haynes, I regret I cannot call him that in here, Sir — had dinner with Senator Jacelon, in Barbados. He is a good friend of the Senator. The Senator is an arch-enemy of the Barbados Government.

He went to his house. They telephone each other. And yet today he is.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Do you know the man? Yes, or no?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, please.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order!

(Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I want him to deny it.)

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Member cannot continue to mislead this Honourable House.

I am telling you — and I ask you to hear me out, Sir. I am asking you to hear me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will hear you out.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Please! Please give me a chance!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will accept your point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Let me.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Just a minute. I would ask the honourable Leader of the House to tell us what all he has said has to do with the debate.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, he is in the Ministry of Finance.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Let me make my point of order. Please let me make my point of order!

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: And I am dealing with the Trinidad exchange with Barbados.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Let me make my point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot have two honourable Members on their feet. Please!

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Deny you know the man.)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Please, let me make my point of order, Sir!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please!

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You must first sit down. Let us hear your point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I wish, Sir, to make it absolutely clear to this Honourable House that I was invited to a small dinner party some time ago. At that dinner party was the Governor of the Central Bank and his wife, a local manufacturer and his wife, who hosted the party, and I believe that a Mr. Jacelon was invited there. It was the only occasion on which I met the individual. I had never met him before, I have never met him since, and it is absolutely and totally untrue to say otherwise.

When you reach the stage where you cannot go to a dinner party in this country — and no discussion took place at a private dinner party.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is this part of your point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is what this country is coming to, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I accept you made a point of order. I certainly accept it. But you are proceeding to make a speech. Please take your seat.

*Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central were ordered to be expunged from the Record by Mr. CHAIRMAN.*

(Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Do not leave.)

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: You want to get us angry now, so that we would go home.)

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

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Adams told Aaron Truss not to invite me to his house again.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is what Tom Adams did. That is what he did.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I cannot have that behaviour in this Committee.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, you can trust me to pull him from off his hole. Yes, Sir. And I do not want him to leave in here this evening.....

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: No empty chairs out here this evening!)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: .....because, Mr. Chairman, you may be aware of the fact that the television...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member may continue his speech.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am going to corner him on the Grenada debate. I do not want him to go. I am very sorry that the camera is not set.

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You cannot do that kind of thing. It is sheer nonsense.)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Now, Sir, what is the actual position here with the Resolution? There is already a Mission set up in Trinidad and Tobago, and Head 35, seeks a number of things for the Mission which is now in existence. That is all involved in this Resolution. But Head 35, provided an opportunity for the Opposition not to make any meaningful contribution as to what transpired between Trinidad and Barbados and its manufacturers, but to take a dig at the Prime Minister about one Mr. Pitt who is so all-important in this debate today, moreso than the woes and the cries of the manufacturers.

*Dr. R. C. HAYNES rose.*

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Do not leave, because we are going to deal with the television when the cameras comes in. Please do not go. I have a few more things to say to you.

Sir, it was the Leader of the Opposition (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow), about three or four years ago, who had forecast actual gloom and doom for the Trinidad economy. I cannot remember how many million dollars he said that country was then losing in their foreign exchange, but he said that it was slipping, it was going down-hill.

*Aside*

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am reminded by my colleague, the right honourable Prime Minister, that he did say that in five years' time they would be coming to borrow money from Barbados.  
3.50 p.m.

They cannot get their oil sold at the prices they would want; it is being stockpiled in Trinidad, and the position is that if they do not have money in Trinidad to buy goods from their overseas partners, it is simple commonsense that they will have to try and get whatever they can to their own advantage.

We are hearing today that because the Prime Minister had to speak in terms which he considers diplomatic, and strong terms on an occasion such as this, about Mr. Pitt and his ignorance of what was going on, the Prime Minister of Barbados should apologize. That is why I made the point that every time there is somebody who is going to attack this Government and the people of Barbados, members of the Opposition raise their hands saluting those individuals.

We had the case of Maurice Bishop. The Member for St. Michael South Central took it upon himself — he was not President of the Barbados Democratic Labour Party, he was not Leader of the Opposition, he was not spokesman for Foreign Affairs, but he took it upon himself to castigate the Prime Minister of Barbados, and agreed with Maurice Bishop that he was a yard fowl, a puppet. This is what Maurice Bishop was calling the Head of State, and the Member for St. Michael South Central, in his capacity as spokesman for Finance, went out of his way to deal with Foreign Affairs and supported Mr. Bishop.

I said on that occasion that all the Prime Minister of Barbados was saying, like many of his Eastern Caribbean colleagues were saying, was "Man, have an election." No rigging, as you all complained that we rigged an election in 1981! But you all rigged one in 1976 and we still won! We beat you in 1976, and you complained that we rigged an election; and in 1981 you complained about the same thing. Whenever you have a little argument between two Heads of State, you find members of the Opposition wanting to castigate the Prime Minister, calling on the Prime Minister to apologize to Mr. Pitt. Who is this Mr. Pitt?

Sir, I just wanted to make my little contribution, primarily to make it abundantly clear that whenever there is an arch-enemy of this Government, the Member for St. Michael South Central, as he admits, sits down and dine and wine with him, and this is doing the country no good.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Prime Minister may wind up his debate.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I do not often put myself in the position of asking the Opposition to consider their statements because of the general interest of the country, especially in a matter such as this where the debate has been personalized. It is not about anything else other than trying to find a stick to beat the Prime Minister with at a time when, possibly, they believe that the Government is at the greatest peak of popularity ever known by a government in this country.

But in their quest to do this, I am going to ask them to consider that we are not dealing with petty matters between political parties in this country. We are

dealing with major world events, in which for the first time since the 17th Century, Barbados has played a major part. Make no mistake about that. This House of Assembly is going to be the focus, through those gentlemen sitting down over there and the local Press, of international attention based on what is said today.

The report from this House of Assembly is going to be that the Opposition believes Basil Pitt and did not believe the Prime Minister. That is the impression that is going to be abroad. Do not worry — you are going to hear that in the Trinidad House and perhaps read it in the Trinidad papers! No doubt! Is that what you wish to convey to the world is the attitude of one of the political parties in Barbados on the day that we came to discuss the Grenada situation?

I put it beyond doubt that anybody believe that I did not call in the gentleman and tell him of what took place. Every honourable Member over there who has spoken believes that. You all know it! I was not making sport that day. This is not the foolishness that comes out of the Member for St. Michael South Central. This is not the pettiness, the "who say," and "I am every man's friend but my country."

I ask you to consider whether you have done your country any good by adding to the divisions in CARICOM, because that is what is happening; whether you have done your country any good by silly captiousness over an issue such as this.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. I object to the right honourable gentleman describing an input as "silly" when he is now turning the debate into an area which has not been touched. He has not yet admitted that the Prime Minister has no right to say publicly of a High Commissioner that he is an outright liar.

*Asides*

Mr. B. M. TAITT: That is what we have been talking about. We have not said that you were wrong or he was right.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is not a point of order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: What the Opposition got up to say is that it is unprecedented to say — they admitted when I said so — for an Ambassador to contradict the Head of Government to which he is accredited. I tell you that that is a disgraceful thing to have done. It is the first time that, perhaps I am commenting, other than the phrase "outright liar", on the matter. I say that the atmosphere in Trinidad perhaps made it possible, just as the Governors of the Central Bank and other officials find it possible to contradict even the President of the Manufacturers Association, to contradict Heads of Government

in CARICOM countries; that the atmosphere which made it possible for Mr. Pitt, for political convenience or whatever, or his own convenience, to say something which any reasonably intelligent human being would know to be false, and in respect of a Head of Government, that atmosphere is the atmosphere which is now fuelled by honourable Members opposite.

I cannot believe in the sincerity of at least one Member opposite, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. Inside here today, he started out by saying that he did not know Senator Jacelon when the honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig) spoke. I warned the honourable Member for St. James North to say no more, just let the denial stand, because it is a fact that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) was at a dinner party with Senator Jacelon, was questioning him about Barbados and Trinidad, that when.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please..... on what point of order?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order: I never said at anytime that I did not know Mr. Jacelon. I said that I did not know Mr. Bishop or any member of his Cabinet. I met Mr. Jacelon on one occasion, when I was invited to a dinner party. I did not know who the other guests were. The Governor of the Central Bank and his wife were there, the Ambassador of Brazil and his wife, and Mr. Jacelon, and no discussion of Barbados or Trinidad took place at a private dinner party. It is disgusting! I find it totally disgusting!  
4.00 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Will the honourable Member deny that Senator Jacelon complained about the car he had been given by the Government of Barbados to drive in, and he offered to drive him home — and drove him home? And that he questioned him on the way about certain matters.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir: It is completely untrue to say that Senator Jacelon complained to me or in my presence. I understood he was staying at the Hilton Hotel; I live in Golf View Terrace; the party was over in the St. James area and I offered to drop him home on behalf of my host. It is totally untrue that anything in relation to Barbados was discussed at that meeting. We just cannot have a situation where you cannot go to a private dinner party in this country without it distorted. That is wrong.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Well, who am I to believe? Senator Jacelon or the honourable Member?

*Asides.*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us carry on.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: You believe me and I will believe whom I will. Would the honourable Member ever had admitted that he drove Senator Jacelon home if I did not know it? Does anybody here honestly believe that the honourable Member spent a whole evening, before a conference opened, with the Minister in the Ministry of Finance in Trinidad and did not discuss Barbados or Trinidad? And he drove him home.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order: I arrived at the house before Mr. Jacelon, and indeed, Sir, at that table there was no discussion, otherwise you are saying that the Governor of the Central Bank was party to it. It is not true! It is totally untrue!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Now, let us wind up the debate.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Now, the attitude of the honourable Members opposite, particularly the attitude of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, is that in any controversy which affects Barbados which is entered into by the Prime Minister, the Prime Minister must be wrong. I hear how very wrong it is to have been critical of the Governor of the Central Bank of Trinidad and Tobago, yet the Governor of the Barbados Central Bank told me that the Governor of the Central Bank of Trinidad and Tobago made a specific pledge that if credit was extended further to Guyana under the Caribbean Multi-lateral Clearing Facility, certain payments would be made by Trinidad to Guyana and certain other things would be done. And they were not done! Now, whose side am I to take?

The honourable Members have no such doubt. They automatically take the side of anybody who is against the Prime Minister, whether or not in the course of it they are against the country or not.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: Once again, .....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: You have not ruled that any point of order he has raised today has been a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We have been having a lot of these, what shall I call them, fraudulent points of order? May I ask the honourable Member, what is your point of order?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: We are criticising the disgusting language that is used in diplomatic arrangements .....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please. The honourable Member knows that is no point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is what we are discussing.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: As I was saying, Sir, these are really not small matters. I do not believe the point particularly has to be laboured, that it is obvious that I had a particular function to carry out on that particular Friday in question, October 21. I do not believe it is in dispute that I was deputed to carry out that function not only on behalf of Barbados but on behalf of the Government as well, and I do not think that any of the other Governments concerned have complained of my conduct, or indeed complained of my language. You know, Sir, that the Government of Trinidad has not complained of my language in describing Mr. Pitt. They may not have liked what happened.

I will also tell you this. When the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs met Mr. Pitt that night at the airport and indicated the situation to him, he asked him, first of all, if he had contradicted what I had said, if he was correctly reported, Mr. Pitt said, "yes," and the Permanent Secretary indicated to him that he could no longer be welcomed in Barbados. Mr. Pitt told him, according to the Permanent Secretary, whom I believe, that he knew this would happen, and he had been warned of it in Trinidad that morning, that if he contradicted me he knew quite well he would be declared *persona non grata*. So I would suggest there was an element even of calculation in the matter, since you are pressing.

*Certain remarks made at this stage by the Rt. Hon. Member for St. Thomas were expunged from the Record by Mr. Chairman.*

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In those circumstances where there was some element of calculation, I believe that my language is not immoderate as it might be in other circumstances where there was either room for doubt, a lack of calculation, room for an honest mistake, or whatever.

I was able, Mr. Chairman, with the other diplomatic representatives to whom I spoke that day, to come to a complete accord as to what I discussed with them. So much so that I can write to Mr. Trudeau, as I have done today, assuring him of the truthfulness of his High Commissioner, and the fact that his account of a conversation and my account coincided. The same is true of the British High Commissioner, and I do not think there is any question of a lack of accord or recollection with the Americans. Indeed, there is some acceptance with the other High Commissioners to whom I spoke of the fact that we have not disagreed on any particular as to our recollections of those details.

In the circumstances what am I to do? These are not minor matters; this is not Laynes Road Corner which is the point of debate, these are international matters, and I suggest that the Opposition has let the country down by the stand it has taken. The Opposition will not wish to see it.

We had many opportunities to be critical of the Leader of the Opposition in the things he used to say about Trinidad, and he used to say many intemperate things about Trinidad and others, but we always drew a certain line. The particular quality of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central and, I regret to say, to a lesser extent the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt), is that they do not always know where to draw critical lines.

We have heard today that I am not a gentleman because I did not know how to speak to Mr. Pitt. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central said that in the last analysis you know whether you are a gentleman or whether you are not. The honourable Member is in no position to say who is a gentleman and who is not. I am not bothering with him. If I were to say it of him, it would be an explosion of social hostility, — no doubt! But these remarks are made in here without any consciousness of the boundary of proper criticism.

It will redound to our electoral advantage, I have no doubt. I have little doubt that the behaviour and conduct of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was a major contributory cause to our not losing any support between 1976 and 1981. I have no doubt that his behaviour over the IMF, over this and over other matters will be of great assistance.

But the people in Trinidad do not know that. The people in *The Guardian* and *The Express* do not know that. *Omne ignotum pro magnifico*: something you are ignorant of, you take for being important. He is the Opposition spokesman on Finance. They may not yet have learned, although I wrote to Senator Jacelon to warn him about the honourable Member...

*Asides.*

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sure I did! Confidentially, not in public! I am doing it now in public because of the honourable Member. There is a difference in these things.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I would not be surprised if the three hour limit for the debate has passed, and before you apply the guillotine to me, Sir, I will beg to move that this Head do now pass.

*The question that Head 35 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*  
4.10 p.m.

## SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1983-84 No. 8

### HEAD 73 — FINANCE AND PLANNING

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head 73 stand part.

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

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

### HEAD 77 — FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): I beg to move that Head 77 stand part.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Could we get a little detail on the purchase of the vehicles?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head 77 be postponed and Head 73 be recommitted.

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

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

### HEAD 73 — FINANCE AND PLANNING

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that under Head 73, Subhead 9 be amended to read "Subhead 10".

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

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head 73, as amended, stand part.

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

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head 77 be resumed.

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

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

## HEAD 77 – FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Head 77.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I heard honourable Members, perhaps *sotto voce*, asking how many vehicles were involved in this Head. I am told there are two vehicles.

I beg to move that Head 77 stand part.

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

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

## SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1983–84 No. 9

## HEAD 15 – CABINET OFFICE

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): Sir, Head 15 may take a little explanation. National Insurance Contributions have not necessarily taken account of the increase in the Health Levy, and Government hospitality has been a little high.

The Conferences and Delegations Vote, where there is a substantial supplement, has been unusually high this year. The Government has sent representatives to the meeting of the Non-Aligned Movement, of which we are a full member. We have also sent delegations to UNESCO in Paris, to the usual ILO and the UN Commonwealth Finance Ministers Meeting, and also to the Commonwealth Association Parliamentary Council in Hong Kong. But in addition, Sir, we have had to host a Caricom Finance Ministers Meeting.

I note that in the Press that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) is reported as saying that I should not have gone to one of these meetings or the other because Mr. Seaga and Mr. Chambers do not go. First of all, Mr. Seaga was here; but that is a side issue. The Government of Barbados does not govern its attendance at meetings according to who else is going to be there.

The honourable Member made some sneering remark about my going to a meeting in Trinidad at the time of the Commonwealth Finance Ministers Meeting saying – I think he used these words – that I was demeaning myself by going. But in fact, since I was the Chairman in charge of the whole thing and I had to call a meeting and summon it in Port-of-Spain, I would really like to know how I could have avoided going.

I remember I had to travel to Canada at the time and I had to go so far as to come back to Barbados,

get the Defence Force airplane to get me back to Trinidad by seven in the morning, because the meeting had been called for very early, and sit down for five or six hours waiting for the delegations to come. Unfortunately, that is one of the responsibilities that devolves on a chairman. He always has to be present, no matter who is there.

I have not heard anybody say that, perhaps, one of the Ministers in the Trinidad Government was less than respectful to the Chair at that meeting and in the end I adjourned the meeting, cut it short in the middle, and got up and walked out. But these are the things that, perhaps, it would be reasonable to think that perhaps a Barbadian would pay attention to.

Those are the circumstances in which I found myself, and all of that, of course, comes out of the Conferences and Delegations Vote, because that meeting was about settling the problems in CARICOM. It was about the Jamaican exchange rate, the two-tier level, about aspects of the CMCF – about CARICOM trade.

I may very well have to summon and chair another such meeting and I make absolutely no apologies for attending it, because it is at those meetings that the problems which honourable Members talked about are discussed, and discussed at times with some accuracy.

It was at one of those meetings that I repeated what the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. John) has said. And that in itself was in response to the fact that I did not know that the meeting was going to be broadcast, and that representatives of another delegation made a speech which called for some reply because it was not particularly friendly towards the spirit of CARICOM, nor indeed Barbados. But I have long since understood that there is no issue relating to our country on which one can look for support from the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.

4.20 p.m.

I do not want to add any of these things, but I remember after that meeting, and after the talk about the shirt-jac someone who was connected with importing into Trinidad sent me a consignment of matchboxes that had arrived from Liverpool, England, stamped "Made in Trinidad". I had them in my office and I shared them out to various people. But as I say, one cannot always expect support on these things. That is a matter I did not even canvass because of my interest in maintaining good relations in circumstances that have been very difficult, indeed as all honourable Members who have been dealing with the matter over the last few months will know.

It is not really the blows that you get from the front, it is the blows that you get from the back that

hurt you occasionally. But I am fortunate now, after five years, that there is very little the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central can do with or behind my back that will worry me.

In addition to the meetings I already mentioned, we have held the Seventh Session of the Caribbean Plant Protection Commission, the 14th Conference of the Caribbean Federation for Mental Health, the 12th Annual General Meeting and Convention of the Caribbean Confederation of Credit Unions and the Regional Agricultural Ministers Meeting. All these meetings have been held and have been paid for out of the Conferences and Delegations' vote and have virtually burst the vote. We now have to go to Delhi.

There has been no increase in travelling allowances for the Ministers and public officers for many years now, I think certainly four, perhaps five, years. We have done our best at that level to keep expenditure within reasonable bounds. I can assure honourable Members that an allowance to a Ministerial Head of delegation of US\$40 a day to provide for meals when breakfast in the hotels that you may willy-nilly stay in when you go, say, to an IMF Conference now can cost \$10 or \$11, is a very small allowance indeed.

I think there will have to be some revision, but I cannot promise that, with membership of many international organisations and with costs rising every day, we will be able to maintain the Conferences and Delegations Vote at \$1 million a year or less. Nonetheless, Mr. Chairman, the Government is looking at it very carefully, as I said. We have made some sacrifice by way of not asking for increased allowances and public officers have had to go along with that, but a qualitative step may have to be taken unless we are drastically to reduce our ordinary responsibilities as hosts, or our attendance at meetings abroad.

I anticipate that the Grenada matter will give rise to more expenditure both from the vote of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and from the Conferences and Delegations vote, because it is necessary to put our case in many fora and make sure that what we did in Grenada is understood in the world. But I hope this will be the only supplementary for this year and that we will make economies during the first quarter of next year that will allow us to ride through to the end of the year without asking for any more money.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

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

*On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of three Resolutions in Committee of Supply, 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 Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.*

#### SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Sir, at this point I am going to move the suspension, for about fifteen minutes, so that CBC television crew can come in to set up the cameras for the purpose of broadcasting the debate which we are going to have on Grenada on the Resolution which was given notice of earlier today.

It is on this premise that I beg to move that this House be suspended for 15 minutes.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not myself disagree with broadcasts in principle. I feel, however, that there is something fundamentally undesirable — I do not want to say wrong — about persons leaving home to come to Parliament on a given day and during the course of that day Parliament introduces the television cameras, and not everyone is prepared for a television debate in Parliament. Everyone is prepared for Parliament, but not every one comes to Parliament prepared for a television debate, and I believe that these matters ought to be dealt with.

If the Government knew that they were going to have the CBC cameras in Parliament, they could at least have acquainted persons beforehand that it would happen. We know that they have the numbers, and we know that there is no point raising the question because it would be done anyhow, but I feel that the Record ought to show that I myself do not agree with this method whereby when one leaves home to come to Parliament with a given understanding and belief, in the middle of the day one is told that one is going to have a television debate.

A television debate is not something quite the same as even a radio debate. It is a debate in which a person may have all kinds of psychological reactions having the camera. I, personally, do not have any problems with it, but I am saying that there is something not quite right in terms of Parliament and I feel that I should put it on the Record. I do not think it is going to change anything, but for the Record, that is my personal view.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I would have thought.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the honourable Member speaks, I had better set the Record straight. A request was made to me by CBC to broadcast the debate at 4.30 this evening. Since there are no rules governing broadcasts from the House, and since the power to allow persons to enter the Chamber rests with the Speaker or presiding officer, I thought this debate was sufficiently important, not only to the people of this country but to the international world, that this debate be broadcast by CBC. I therefore gave permission for CBC to broadcast from this Chamber.

If the honourable Member is concerned about the cameras coming into this Chamber at short notice, it only highlights the fact that honourable Members should come to Parliament suitably attired so as to raise the dignity of this Chamber.

Any blame for allowing CBC to enter the Chamber must rest with the presiding officer, and I have done it under the power and authority which rest with the presiding officer.

I will hear the honourable Leader of the House and then I will hear the honourable Member for St. Michael West.  
4.30 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I was about to make that point, Sir. Apparently, it is not how they are attired. I understand that the Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) is concerned that they are not psyched-up. But you have not got to be psyched-up to debate the people's business. When you leave home on Tuesdays to come here, you are psyched-up to debate. The cameras would not have any psychological effect on you! You are natural! You come and speak from your heart, not impressions!

(Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: That is right.)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Do you mean that we are having the cameras and all of a sudden you are not psychologically prepared? For what? To discuss the people's business? What nonsense am I hearing, Sir?

(Mr. M. A. KING: Bring the cameras, man.)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: If you want to ask for time to go home and put on lipstick and so on, I would have no objection to that. It would be a very good thing to change your face and your mind. That would be a very, very different thing. It would not take fifteen minutes for a cosmetologist to put you in shape, because she cannot succeed where God has failed.

I beg to move, Sir.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would ask the honourable Leader of the House not to be personal at this time.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am not being personal. This is a fact of life.

I beg to move that this House be now suspended until 4.50 p.m. so that the TV cameras can be put in place.

I would hope that during that time, they would get psychologically prepared.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the question is put, I will hear the honourable Member for St. Michael West.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Your Honour, I am most grateful to Your Honour for the explanation which Your Honour gave us. I think the circumstances, as outlined by Your Honour, are reasonable, and in all those circumstances, we understand the decision.

My view concerning the suddenness with which the television camera is inserted into this Honourable Chamber has not changed, but my understanding of the circumstances has changed.

I would say, in passing, that if the honourable Member (Hon. L. S. Craig) is suggesting that there is no psychological trauma about having a television camera, or indeed a microphone, for broadcast, then the honourable Member is disabusing himself of his own counsel, because on more than one occasion, he himself has pointed out that he is no television person.

I would not even lay claim to even remotely looking like the honourable Member, because he has a classic face and no one can touch it. No one has ever looked like him before and you can believe, Your Honour, that no one would look like him after.

*Laughter.*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must point out that the request was made about 3.30 p.m. We did not have enough time to notify everybody and I gave permission.

*The question that the House do now stand suspended until 4.50 p.m. today was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.*  
4.35 p.m.

*On Resumption*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I would like also to draw to the attention of my colleagues on both sides of the House that it is not possible to have the cameras and they have no need to be concerned about being sidetracked. I have no doubt that their contributions are going to be equally as good as if they had the cameras, Sir.

I beg to move, Sir, that Order No. 5 be the instant Order of the Day.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 5.

RESOLUTION CONDEMNING CONDITIONS IN  
GRENADA AND APPROVING ACTION  
TAKEN BY BARBADOS

*Order No. 5 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution condemning the conditions in Grenada which led to the multinational intervention on 25th October, 1983, and approving the action taken by the Government of Barbados in participating in the rescue mission.*

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution which comes before the House today, November 15, 1983, is one of the most momentous Resolution, perhaps history will say, for many more years, the most momentous that has ever been debated in this Chamber.

For the first time since Barbados has become independent, for the first time this century or indeed for a few more centuries, Barbados occupies a position at the centre of the world's stage. Goodness knows that this is not a position sought or welcomed by the Government, since it arose out of tragic circumstances that affect us all as West Indians.

But our moment of history came, Sir, and, solemnly as Barbadians, we considered our position and we grasped at that moment of history and sought to discharge our duty, as best we could, in all sincerity, doing what we thought was right and suitable for ourselves as Barbadians, for ourselves as West Indians and, ultimately, for ourselves as human beings.

It is well-known, and does not need to be adumbrated in Barbados or in the Caribbean or this House, that the Eastern Caribbean has been beset for five years, maybe more, by elements of that superpower confrontation which has affected the world so much and so grievously in the last twenty or more years.

There may be some who date the situation back to October 19, some who date it to the previous week, some who date it to 1979. I would myself date it to the month of October 1976, when, for the first time in recent history, the West Indies, particularly the Eastern

Caribbean, set its feet, or had its feet set for it, on a battleground between the ideologies that have rent our world.

I speak not of the minor aberration of an adventurer seeking to invade Barbados and set aside the result of the General Election of the previous month. That is a triviality which could happen at any time and in any place. I speak of the evidence which was available at that time of a concerted effort by forces in the Caribbean to examine the situation in the Eastern Caribbean – for I would use no stronger words – to see what possibilities laid there for the development of radical political movements and for the radicalization of existing political movements to the advantage of those powers in Eastern Europe which were making their first positive steps in the Western Hemisphere, outside their traditional sphere of influence in Cuba.

At that time, it was observed that many Cuban intelligence officers, persons who could be identified as members of the Cuban Directorate General of Intelligence, who had been trained in intelligence schools in the Soviet Union, near Leningrad and elsewhere, were arriving in Barbados with some frequency. Barbados was used as a central point whence these officers spread outwards to Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Antigua and St. Kitts, and some contacts were also discerned with the French Islands of Martinique and Guadeloupe.

The persons with whom these intelligence officers made contact became household names in politics over the next few years – Unison Whiteman and Bernard Coard to mention two. More subterranean persons were from time to time observed in contact with these Cuban gentlemen. The Cubans themselves have in some cases become household names. Two or three of them have become Ambassadors in different parts of the Caribbean. Others have become names known in Cuban enterprises in other parts of the world.

5.05 p.m.

These Cuban expeditions lasted a comparatively short time, but the movements with which they were in connection began to expand. Particularly noticeable was the expansion in Grenada and St. Lucia. In the year 1979, the Government of St. Lucia changed, and, of course, that in Grenada also changed. The Government of St. Lucia changed peacefully. The Government of Grenada changed by a coup that was not entirely bloodless as has been suggested. There were deaths, but certainly it was relatively peaceful and was carried out not by an Army or Police Force as is normal, but by an Opposition Party.

At the time of that coup in Grenada, the Government of Barbados, in common with Governments in other parts of the Caribbean was faced with a problem. It was

a problem, of a very special kind and character, that was not fully discerned or recognized at the time. Many of us were so glad to be rid of Sir Eric Gairy that we were prepared to overlook the means by which his regime was ended. A classic case of looking at the end and ignoring the means!

True, in a meeting in Barbados with representatives of Guyana and Jamaica, we attempted — the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde), who was then Foreign Minister, and I — to bring the whole situation back to an appearance of normality, by suggesting that we use either the Grenada Constitution or the powers of the Governor-General to gloss over the fact that there had been a forceful overthrow of a Constitutional Government.

Contact was made with the Governor-General, on that occasion, as now, Sir Paul Scoon. Suggestions were made that a way could be found to dismiss Sir Eric Gairy and appoint Mr. Bishop in his place, on the understanding that an election would soon be held. When it did not appear that the Constitution could permit this, a promise was extracted from Mr. Bishop, through his representative, Mr. Louison, that an election would soon be held.

Based on this, I made personal contact with the then Prime Minister of Great Britain. I telephoned and assured him of the expectation of a peaceful transition to an election — he even asked me if Sir Eric Gairy would be allowed to run again — and the Government of Barbados took the lead in giving such international respectability to the coup as it appeared that those who had carried it out wanted at the time.

We sent our Coast Guard vessels to Grenada with the American and Canadian representatives of Diplomatic Missions here in Barbados. We ignored the attitude of Trinidad and Tobago, which refused to take any part in the negotiations with the Revolutionary Government. We also ignored that although in theory it may have been Barbados, Guyana and Jamaica on the one side negotiating with Grenada, in reality, it may have been Grenada, Guyana and Jamaica negotiating and using Barbados. We knew that was the situation, but we felt that the effort to bring respectableness to the Grenada Revolution was important enough for us to turn over every stone to maintain the Caribbean's record of peaceful changes of government and to avoid bringing the Third World sickness of revolution and violence into the islands on a systematic basis.

It is one thing, Sir, to hold elections and to carry out substantial electoral fraud so as to ensure that you have won. This is disgraceful, bad, and reprehensible — people who do it have no character — but at least those people, we said to ourselves, have paid lip-service to

principle, and there is some hope that in the future, given the mortality of man, the situation can be repaired. It is another thing altogether to say that you are not having an election, as from that many results flow. From the broken pledge of the Peoples Revolution Government of Grenada not to hold an election, has flowed, directly, the situation in which we find ourselves today.

Revolutions of the left, Sir, tend to be cannibalistic — they devour their own children. Those persons who are suitable as revolutionaries working underground, planning the throwing of bombs, the shooting of people may not be the best persons to fall comfortably into the roles of bureaucrats after the revolution is over. Orators, who by their rhetoric have influenced those most open to influence, and have put forward a fair face in the days when revolution is in its active stage, are not necessarily the persons whom the revolution, as an institution, will find best fitted to maintain its objectives.

As we know from the captive archives of the New Jewel Movement of Grenada, we are facing a revolutionary movement, and faced it during those four and a half years, fully as ideological, fully as committed to Marxist Leninist as anybody in the historical academy in the University of Moscow.

They did not talk at their Central Committee meetings about old age pensioners. They did not talk about buses for the Transport Board. They did not talk about CARICOM trade and the two-tier exchange rate or the Multilateral Facility, which we talk about in Cabinet, in here, and I believe in the Executive Councils of both our parties. They talked about the commitment of the members of the Government to Marxist Leninism.

They had a monthly rating of all members of the Central Committee. There were ten areas in which they were rated and they were given points from 1 to 5. So that for the month of July, I think it was, Comrade Maurice was rated only two and a half for his Marxist-Leninist commitment. He got the full five for co-operation with the masses, but he got only two for application, and so on down it went. That was the daily work of the Government in Grenada during the past few years. 5.15 p.m.

Under those circumstances, there is little to be surprised at that the persons who owed most to the revolution, the faceless men who joined the Army and received ideological and military training in Russia or Cuba, the persons who were ideologues from their cradles practically found some dissatisfaction with the progress of the revolution.

The economic figures now being examined show that indeed there was not much economic progress in Grenada in the last four years, as we understand it. The

growth rates reveal themselves, and are explained, almost entirely by the building of the airport. There were no job creating investments as we understand them in Barbados, or in Trinidad, or even in St. Vincent and St. Lucia; no factories, no service projects to employ people. The physical facilities of the island tended to fall into disrepair, as anyone who has travelled on the roads of Grenada recently can testify. Unemployment was brought down by one thing, and one thing only. The only area where there was a growth of work in Grenada was Government employment and the entire growth system of the Army. There was no other area of job creation that was discernible from the available economic statistics. Even the work at the airport, as we have seen, employed 600 Cubans. Whether an airport needs 600 people to build it, I do not know. Evidently, it needed more than 600 people to defend it.

The propaganda machine, fuelled, generated by dissident elements throughout the Eastern Caribbean, and indeed in the developed world, as well as the Third World, revealed Grenada as a paradise on earth compared to other West Indian territories. But the Minutes of the Central Committee reveal a constant complaint every week of alienation by the population, alienation by the inhabitants of Tivoli and St. Andrew's, and by the women of St. George's and different groups, and so everything was set, as we come into the year 1983, for an explosion.

Lack of economic development, known to them but perhaps not to the outside world; alienation by the population, similarly known to them but suppressed since there was no element of a free Press in Grenada; dissensions within the hierarchy with the hard-line ideologues on one side and an increasingly disillusioned Prime Minister on the other, beginning at last to see the light, to realise that the arguments he had been hearing from Eddie Seaga, Tom Adams and John Compton over the years, and Eugenia Charles, had some weight – these were the ingredients in the recipe that made for that disgraceful Wednesday, October 19, in St. George's.

It is pathetic, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to read Maurice Bishop's comments when he was told that the Central Committee had decided that he was to be Prime Minister in name only, and that his functions would be no more than to sign the decrees of the Central Committee, go forward as the Leader of the Government and speak to the masses as the occasion demanded. He asked of what use could he be. He explained that he did not know; he could not understand the decision; he did not see what place there was in it for him.

That sealed his fate. He had broken the first rule, he had become disobedient to monolithic communism, to Marxist-Leninism, even Stalinism. They referred in

their Minutes to particular incidents in the works of Stalin, with which members of the Central Committee were required to be familiar.

After a visit to Eastern Europe where perhaps he tried to repair some of the damage that he was suffering at the hands of the hardliners by praising the regimes in Czechoslovakia and East Germany, he returned to Grenada to find that plans for arrest had already been drawn; he was denounced in the classic communist manner. He was put under house arrest, he was kept in circumstances of the utmost unkindness, half-dressed – virtually naked – kept in a house with a lady, subsequently brought to the house, with whom he was on close terms, but kept in separate bedrooms so that they were not aware of each other's presence.

I visited his bedroom, where he was kept, last Saturday, and the chief furniture seemed to be the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and a great number of other publications relating to communism in Eastern Europe. The soldiers who are now quartered in his house told me that they found hardly any clothes, hardly any food, no evidence of any attention being paid to his comfort. All he had was a view from his back bedroom window out to the north east over the hills of St. George's.

In Barbados, we were fairly early informed of these circumstances in Grenada, through the agency of the British High Commission. When we discovered it, we took counsel on the Friday afternoon of what could be done. All that Friday, that Saturday, members of the Government and members of the Security Forces discussed the situation in Grenada. We were very concerned about the political prisoners whom the Grenada revolution had incarcerated. Bear in mind, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that all regimes that turn their backs on a free Press, freedom of speech and elections are going to have to lock up people.

These journalists who in their own countries, or in the countries in which they become successfully unwelcome, who preach that the Grenada model is the ideal, that left wing models are the ideal, perhaps should take counsel with themselves and think of how many like them were in Richmond Hill Prison in eight by eight cells, bound up for 22 hours a day. The fate of these people concerned us just as much as the fate of Maurice Bishop.

We now, of course, know, as a result of information uncovered by our own Security Forces – not information given to us by the intelligence agency of other countries – that it was planned to start shooting the prisoners in Richmond Hill, and that the first batch of either 16 or 19 had been identified. Indeed, they were taken to the condemned cell in the prison, as the testimony of one of them, Lloyd Noel, has revealed.

We therefore began to ask ourselves if there was anything we could do to save these people, save the men who were going to be shot, save Bishop. In the middle of all of this, at a relatively low level, but an authoritative level nonetheless, we understood that it might be possible to get transportation for any effort which we made from a friendly source, the United States.

5.25 p.m.

We sought advice about these things. The situation got worse and worse. By the Monday of that week, we began to see death as the only fate to be expected for Bishop and his close associates.

Cabinet held a meeting on Wednesday, October 19 and we discussed what could be done. I had already spoken to a number of Heads of Government of Eastern Caribbean countries and I had spoken to our Security Forces to see what efforts could be made to assist the *de facto* Government of Grenada out of its struggles.

Cabinet decided to take steps to seek help to mount some kind of rescue team, but, as I have said elsewhere, we were overtaken by events. Bishop was "rescued" from his cell by Whiteman, Radix and others of the large crowd. He obviously was ill-advised — perhaps received no advice at all; and instead of taking himself away from the scene, he took himself to the centre of the scene and put himself into the bosoms of his worse enemies.

I have had a number of eyewitness accounts of the horrors that followed: the armoured cars driving like latter-day juggernauts, these Russian monsters, up the narrow streets leading to Fort Rupert; the hail of bullets and shells that destroyed so many people that have not yet been counted; Bishop taken and lead into one of the courtyards of Fort Rupert, shot along with Whiteman, Creft, Bain and others. The bodies, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have still not yet been cleared away. I saw the remnants of one in that fatal courtyard last Saturday afternoon. Thus fell the night of Wednesday, October 19.

Early the next day, I spoke to Prime Minister John Compton of St. Lucia, Prime Minister Eugenia Charles of Dominica and to others. Prime Minister Compton said at once that there should be a Caribbean initiative to deal with this matter. I had gone into this at some length. After the telephone conversations, I attended Cabinet, and Cabinet decided to pursue a military intervention in Grenada in company with friendly third countries which could assist us with the difficult and logistic support necessary to effectuate our purpose.

A great deal has been written in the newspapers of North America and of Britain as to how this initiative came about, who started it, the role the United States played and the role each of us played. The most

accurate account is to be found in the *New York Times* of Sunday, October 30, 1983. It makes a few mistakes as to where the events took place, but except for small errors which would indicate that its sources are American rather than local, it is an accurate account.

We in this House, I think, need no convincing, since we have lived through it all and know the feelings of the people of Barbados on the matter, the feelings of the people in the Eastern Caribbean and the feelings of the people in Grenada.

The thought and the initiative came from us, to redress a mighty wrong and to bring back to the West Indies that spirit of democracy and of freedom, that spirit of peace, order and good Government, that spirit of the Rule of Law that we all respect and we now know is deeply ingrained in our hearts and souls.

There are, of course, a few doubters. The Caribbean Conference of Churches, however much it may have retreated from its initial position, an organization riddled through and through with communists, Marxist-Leninists, whose purpose, if you will forgive me quoting myself again, is to preach the Bible, nor according to Moses, Isaiah and the Prophets, not according to St. Mark, St. Matthew and St. John, but according to Marx and Lenin.

There are a few among us, mainly non-Barbadian journalists, who have, in their zeal and their emotion at seeing the communist cause to which they are attached so damaged, gravely misrepresented the facts and sought once more to mislead Barbadians and Caribbean people.

There is even one among us, a journalist of non-Barbadian origin, whom I now know to have been aware that Unison Whiteman planned to lead the march to rescue Bishop the following day and whom I now believe to have informed his Cuban masters of the same. He will not be long among us.

The next day, after the Cabinet meeting on the Friday, the formalities began to be executed. Previous to that day, there were many persons holding diplomatic posts in the Foreign Service of the United States of America and the Foreign Service of Great Britain who were fully aware of many of the details of what we were planning.

We had to tread a very narrow path between secrecy and discussion on the one hand and frankness on the other. I myself had to be extremely careful not to expose the secrets of one Government to another, that is, the business of the Governments concerned. I exposed our secrets to those who had a share in them. Where the secrets were mutual, I kept some of our secrets. Even up to this day there are some aspects of the matter not

known to the friendly Governments from whom we sought help.

But on Friday, October 21, after the necessary contacts were made to the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States and guarded telephone contacts with Prime Minister Seaga, I commenced a series of diplomatic consultations. Since it was hoped that we would obtain the support of most members of CARICOM, including Trinidad and Tobago, we had asked the diplomatic representative of Trinidad and Tobago in Barbados to be present for a consultation.

5.35 p.m.

We were not at the time represented in Trinidad by someone of Ambassador rank, and I believe that the then Trinidad High Commissioner made a journey to Barbados on that morning. I saw him, first of all, with the Ambassadors. I saw him in the presence of the Foreign Minister, the honourable Member for St. George South (Hon. L. R. Tull). I specifically told him that the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States, in company with Barbados and perhaps others, were seeking a military intervention in Grenada to restore law and order, and that it would therefore not be possible for me to attend any meeting outside Barbados of CARICOM Heads of Government.

The reason why that came in was as follows. On the previous day there had been general agreement among the majority of the Heads of CARICOM Governments to hold a Heads of Government meeting in Barbados and Prime Minister Compton was deputed to ask Prime Minister Chambers, as Chairman of the last CARICOM Heads of Government Conference, to call such a meeting in Barbados. We understood, however, that Prime Minister Chambers called this meeting in Trinidad. In the circumstances, it was clear to me that it would be impossible to tell Prime Minister Chambers of our wish that Trinidad and Tobago should join in the enterprise personally, since there were grave risks involved in using the overseas telephone, and I could not leave Barbados to be present elsewhere to convey this to him. This explains why that part of the subject had to be raised at ambassador level rather than at Prime Minister level.

The High Commissioner for Trinidad and Tobago is on record as saying that I had told him that a United States task force had been turned around, that regional security forces were gathering in Barbados, but I did not tell him their purpose. He said I told him that I had to stay in Barbados to co-ordinate their efforts.

I offer no comment, Mr. Deputy Speaker, except to say that few things in public life have surprised me so much as being contradicted by the High Commissioner for Trinidad and Tobago. It is, in any case, a very serious diplomatic insult and a breach of protocol that is virtually unprecedented, certainly in our Foreign Office and in

others which I have asked. We can find no example of a Head of Mission publicly contradicting the Head of the Government to which he is accredited. In itself, it constitutes a very grave diplomatic affront indeed, and I have the witness of the Permanent Secretary in our own Ministry of Foreign Affairs that Mr. Pitt told him on the day when they had a discussion about this contradiction some time later, that he would warn his own Foreign Office in Trinidad that if he made a contradiction, he would necessarily be declared *persona non grata*.

The public of Barbados can choose on the evidence: the evidence that by agreement I was deputed to inform Trinidad and Tobago, through its High Commissioner, of our wish for military intervention and of Trinidad's participation in it; the evidence that the High Commissioner was called to my office to receive this information; the evidence that in the presence of the honourable Member for St. George South, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, I gave him this information; the evidence that he heard that troops were going to be in Barbados and that I had to be here to co-ordinate their activities; the evidence that I saw three more diplomats that day and told them all of military intervention in Grenada — and that they have agreed can certainly not in any way be gainsaid.

You can choose to believe that, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The public can choose to accept that or the public can choose to go along with the disgraceful scene engaged in by the Opposition earlier today in the House of Assembly when they chose, upon this particular battle ground, not to close ranks behind the Government and the people of Barbados, but to abuse the Prime Minister for calling an Ambassador a liar, when in my view he was a liar on that occasion. I am not calling him a liar out of any animosity. I have known the gentleman many, many, many years. But the interest of Barbados demanded that a strong statement be made in response to an unprecedented diplomatic insult to the Head of the Government of Barbados.

For the remainder of the day I made contacts with diplomatic representatives — the British, the American, the Canadian. I later went to the Dover Conference Centre. There I was greeted by the Foreign Ministers who told me that the OECS had unanimously decided on military action in Grenada under their treaty, and that they were already making pledges of troops of policemen to take part in the action. Indeed, as I went in, I could hear the numbers being counted out and, at first, did not understand what was going on. I spoke again to a number of the diplomats whom I had seen earlier and told them of the formal wish of the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States.

Now you must not think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the action was confined only to Barbados at this time.

Some of the action was also taking place in Grenada. I think that, as far as I am able to tell, I know of the contacts which were being made between the Governor-General and emissaries sent by myself to that country to discover His Excellency's attitude in the matter. I pitch the statement widely and I do not intend to do any more than that. It may be that the emissaries' purpose in going to Grenada was governed by many considerations other than the bearing of messages or enquiries, or other than making contacts with persons in Grenada to bear messages and make enquiries. I will only say that I am persuaded beyond peradventure that the Governor-General of Grenada gave prior approval to what the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States intended to do. He was made aware of it, and he indicated that when it was safe for him to do so, he would issue the necessary formal invitations.

I dwell slightly on this because a great deal has been said about legality and illegality. Even the representative of Guyana in the Security Council debate on the matter conceded that the sole legal authority in Grenada was the Governor-General. The constitutional law experts are unanimous that the Governor-General was in a position not only to legitimise the enterprise but to legitimise it retrospectively had he not been approached before hand. That the entire intervention is legal, I suggest, there can be no serious doubt.

5.45 p.m.

I know that that has proved very reassuring for many persons whose interests are constitutional, and I am glad that they recognize that, in this matter, the Government of Barbados and the Governments of the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States, and the Government of Jamaica, lived up to West Indian reputation for liking to have all the legal niceties tidied up.

Well, that was the Friday, the Saturday and the Sunday. As a matter of record, the staff planning proceeded between representatives of the Regional Security Forces, and the Jamaica Defence Force and of the United States. Major General Kris of the United States Marine Corps came to Barbados. We provided him and a small staff with an office. Joint planning was indicated. Places were identified in Grenada for occupation by the Caribbean Forces, places were identified for the assaults by the American Forces and so on.

No reply was received from the British. Indeed, no reply has been received. Some small technical explanation, I may perhaps offer for the fact, is that it has been stated that no formal request in writing was received by the British.

Throughout the planning, our attitude was that the formal request in writing would go when the oral request had been answered. And since the oral request was never

answered, as it could have been — and most requests for intervention are oral — the formal written request was overtaken by the operation itself.

The operation was carried out, it was successful, it was particularly successful in avoiding loss of civilian life, it was welcomed by the people of Grenada. Even on the day of Maurice Bishop's death, some in the crowd were holding banners saying, "America, we love you." I have not heard of any banners saying, "Barbados, we love you" but I think they look on us as one of the family, despite the exacerbations of the last few years.

The intervention has been welcomed in the Eastern Caribbean. It has been welcomed in Trinidad and Tobago and it is now being welcomed, even among those nations who, some through ignorance, some from hypocrisy, others dishonesty — and no amount of respect for the bonds of CARICOM will cause me to abate that last description. In the case of one member only one refused to support it in the beginning. Even those nations who at the United Nations condemned the United States for its intervention, are now beginning to realize what all of us in these parts have always known, that Grenada was a wrong that needed righting.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have set out the narrative, as is necessary for me to do in the House. I will deal again with a few specific points. There is no requirement, nor would it be wise for any country to so require that a military operation has to be brought in advance to Parliament. It is bad enough, in our case, having had to carry it to CARICOM. It could not be exposed in Parliament nor, on reflection, would anyone seriously expect something involving human life to be risked by pre-approval procedures, fact-finding missions and the like.

When in Trinidad, we were told that we should send a fact-finding mission and that the focus of that mission should be the Governor-General, I could only be amused when I heard about it, because the Governor-General knew all about it and was only waiting, not for the fact finding mission, but for the real mission to come to Grenada. This type of operation cannot be handled in that way.

There may be a few other points that honourable Members will raise, small points that I have not covered: "Who drafted the request to the United States?" and these trivialities. Some I would rather not expose too much; some I am quite willing to answer.

But I want to deal with the wider issue. The wider issue, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is not whether you liked Maurice Bishop's Government or its potential successor on ideological grounds. The wider issue is not whether you wanted to please any third country. The wider issue

is that the people of the Eastern Caribbean have a lot of freedom and democracy which expressed itself in wanting freedom and democracy restored.

All countries are unique. No two countries are exactly the same, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And it is a grave and serious error for the countries of the world to fall into believing that our small countries of the Eastern Caribbean are just like any other Third World countries for whom certain privileges of the rich white countries of North America and Western Europe do not exist. We are as entitled as France and Germany, Spain, Portugal and Italy, as Canada, Australia and Malta, to want our freedom and to seek what means we can of obtaining that freedom.

I have had to say to European journalists that if the Government of Holland were overthrown by a brutal faction in army, the Prime Minister and half his Cabinet slain, and of the other half one or two locked up, the Queen made a prisoner in her own palace, no one would possibly object if, under the NATO Treaty, troops of France, Belgium, Britain and the United States entered Holland to restore order.

But those who voted against us at the United Nations would look on Holland and Luxemburg and other small countries in Europe as allies. Caribbean states could not be allies and could not have the same privileges! Sometimes, I think that the expression, "ally", is reserved for countries where white people live. The expression "puppet" is reserved for countries where black people live. So very large countries and very small countries in the second category have their politics examined on the basis only of whether they are said to be friends of the United States or friends of the Soviet Union.

But there is a range of countries in the world which are allowed, in their own perception, to have independent policies. I believe that, this issue apart, not one of the twenty-seven Members of this House goes to sleep governing his actions by whether the United States will approve or disapprove, or whether the Soviet Union will approve or disapprove.

Our problems are those I spoke about earlier: the Transport Board, old age pensioners, the industrial estates. That is what we worry about, Sir, economic progress for our people. We do not want to be in international politics. We have no wish to be forced to take the side of one superpower or another. All we ask is to be left alone to pursue our own independent policies towards economic progress and development. And I am confident, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the steps which Cabinet authorized, the Government took and the public has supported to deal with the problem in Grenada will be endorsed by the verdict of history.

There are a great number of side issues: Were the British told or not? Should the British have known or not? That I am going to ignore completely! If the British had had sufficient respect for their former colonies in the Caribbean, they would have listened to John Compton and to me.

The officials in the Foreign Office in London, who I firmly believe received information from officials here, should have woken up their Minister and told him what the islands of the Eastern Caribbean were saying. They could not take us seriously enough perhaps, because we are small islands, where unimportant people live. They have only themselves to blame if they did not grasp, at all levels, what was going on.

5.55 p.m.

The French voted against us in the United Nations. The French, who have intervened more often than any other nation since World War II in the affairs of independent countries — formally, that is; the French who have stationed troops abroad to support or put down governments, always by invitation, could not respect the situation of the Governor-General of Grenada, the only legal authority in the country, who lent to our troops and those of the United States the same, or indeed a higher authority than some of the war lords and bandits who have called French troops into their territories in Africa. The French have found themselves in one country in Africa, intervening on both sides at the behest of two different people, who, subsequently, found themselves quarrelling with each other.

Other countries of Western Europe have had the grace to acknowledge that in the early days, obviously the safety of the Governor-General depended upon the concealment of his wishes, and to say now that they recognize that they did not know sufficient of the whole matter at the beginning.

I am not going to quarrel with our Latin American brothers over their votes. I addressed a meeting of United States Congressmen and I asked them, once and for all, to separate entirely in their minds any belief that, in dealing with the Western Hemisphere, there is a community of interest, other than geographical, between Central America and the Caribbean or Latin America and the Caribbean.

Geography brings us together and we are partners in many international institutions. But we in the English-speaking Caribbean are a different people, with a different history and different traditions from the traditions of Latin America. I am not decrying theirs — not in any way. We may have much to learn from Latin America. But there is this distinction on this issue. The English

speaking Caribbean has never been threatened by the military power of the United States. There has never been any occasion where the United States have had a military occupation against our will in an English-speaking island.

The Americans, I believe, are a part of the English-speaking family of the world. I think there is a community of spirit between Australia, New Zealand, the cricket playing countries of which we are familiar, fellow Commonwealth members, the United States, Britain, based on the common language which we share, which necessarily means elements of a common culture, and we have never had any historical reason to fear the United States. This is not so in Latin America and, therefore, I understand the vote.

I am not quarrelling. Democratic countries, such as Venezuela and Columbia, are good friends of Barbados, yet they found it necessary to issue a warning to the United States against any act that could be construed as a return to traditional interventionism in Latin America.

To many of our African brethren, I say that I also have no quarrel. Many countries have found it necessary to swallow the politics of non-alignment wholesale. I think there is a movement against it. I think that the spectacle of President Castro describing himself as non-aligned, when non-alignment started as a movement independent of the Soviet Union and of the United States, began a division in the Non-Aligned Movement which will become increasingly evident and obvious as time passes. But at the United Nations, more than one nation got up and said, "As a member of the Non-Aligned Movement, I must support this Resolution", including some of the greatest and mightiest in Africa, whose speeches, I think, may clearly be summarized in that way.

I have no quarrel with our African brothers. They are wrong in their judgment that this is a matter of United States imperialism, expansionism, or aggressiveness — in their public judgment, that is. I believe that many of them in their private judgment quite correctly agree that the small states of the Caribbean were entitled to seek whatever help they could in restoring peace and tranquility to the region.

More distant countries, perhaps not familiar with the Caribbean, can also be pardoned if they go along with the majority.

You know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are very few close vote in the United Nations. It is nearly always 10 to 1 in favour or 10 to 1 against. There are certain Third World Resolutions and the Third World, the Non-Aligned Movement, mistakes a Resolution of the United Nations for action, and thinks that a Resolution of the

United Nations, or a success of the United Nations, can cover up a multitude of abuses and a multitude of sins to which blind eyes are continually turned.

For my part, I welcome the fact that perhaps the majority of democracy of the world did not vote in favour of the motion. Many abstained, and a number voted against — 7 voted 'no' — and to me, those votes were the votes that were important and which mattered. It is their voices, when added to ours in the Eastern Caribbean, which will be the voices of import in the perspective of history.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was unexpected that this debate in here today would be a broadcasted debate, although I think that all of us are aware that we were speaking for the Record. I want at the end of this debate to be able to thank all honourable Members for the patriotic spirit which they have shown in supporting the Government and people of Barbados in this matter. I think there are few occasions when the people have looked to us for leadership as important and momentous as this one.

The Government has done its part, and we are continuing to do our part. The Government has taken the decisions which we could not know were popular or unpopular at the time they were taken. We were heartened by the words of the Leader of the Opposition, who is unfortunately unable to be with us today. We are heartened by the words of the Christian organizations of Barbados and of the people of Barbados. I take this opportunity to thank the many hundreds of people in Barbados, the rest of the Caribbean and North America, who have written to me, and to whom I intend to reply personally. But it will all be in vain, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if we show division or show lack of confidence in ourselves. This matter, above all, has been one of confidence — confidence in the sincerity on the leadership of this country, and I use "leadership" in the widest possible sense.

I am glad of the opportunity, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to move this Resolution which stands in the name of the Government of which I have never more keenly felt the honour of leading than in these past few weeks of trial, tribulation, and final triumph.

*Applause.*

6.05 p.m.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to second this Resolution and reserve my right to speak. It is customary on these important occasions to give the Opposition the opportunity to voice their opinions at an early stage.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Michael South.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I rise as Acting Leader of the Opposition to intervene in this debate, to put the case for the Opposition and to state my own position on these very important matters. I can perhaps do nothing better than to recall the words of that blind, puritan poet, John Milton, who in his great work "Paradise Lost" said:

Of Man's First disobedience, and the Fruit  
Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste  
Brought death into the world, and all our woe,  
With loss of Eden, till one greater man  
Restore us, and regain the blissful seat,  
Sing Heav'nly Muse.....

I intend to try to rise to the height of this great theme, and I must start by saying that, generally speaking, the right honourable Prime Minister and Member for St. Thomas (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams) has in his speech set out the facts, reciting the circumstances in a very statesmanlike and positive manner, even though generally he was not telling us anything that has not been revealed before in the Press. But I must say his speech was free from personal invective and personal attacks, as far as I can recall, and I think it is a tribute on this occasion, generally speaking.

I, too, would like to look at the facts as have been reported, and related in here today as well, and perhaps put them within context and perspective as seen from this side of the House.

I start in the 1960's, when indeed we were looking at the sad history of a very beautiful country which perhaps has had more than its fair share of political instability and political problems. As I recall it, the British Government, as the colonial master, was forced to intervene in Grenada, and I believe suspended the Constitution and deprived the then Premier of Grenada, Mr. Eric Gairy, of certain civic and constitutional rights. I believe that was in the squandermania scandal which prevailed at that time. But it was intervention by the colonial master, Great Britain — I am told it was the second time — in the affairs of Grenada.

However, in the 1970's, through the ballot box, Mr. Gairy again became Premier of Grenada, and he was the Prime Minister of that country until some time in 1979 when he was overthrown in a military coup, miscalled a revolution. He was removed by an illegitimate act!

I hold no brief for the Gairy regime. In my view, it was a politically and morally bankrupt regime, and perhaps that is why the people of Grenada themselves

appeared to welcome the removal of Gairy. Many forward-thinking people in Barbados and elsewhere also welcomed the removal of a regime that was not well liked, even though the action was an illegal and an illegitimate action.

Now today, some three or four years down the road, that illegitimate regime of Maurice Bishop and the New Jewel Movement has itself been removed by another coup and through another illegitimate act. So we have had illegitimacy upon illegitimacy.

I think it is necessary to view the particular tragic events in Grenada against this kind of background in order that the positions which we take can be fully understood and fully appreciated.

I well recall, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when from the sides of the Democratic Labour Party some criticisms were made of the then Premier of Grenada, Mr. Eric Gairy, we were accused by certain forces in Barbados of being disrespectful and of calling that particular premier a bandit whoever was being referred to! Those were the facts of political existence at that time.

The question then arose as to what steps Barbados, the people of Jamaica and the people of the Caribbean generally, should take in order to help the people of Grenada in their hour of need. The question of intervention therefore arose.

We must really look at the grounds which have been given, not only by Barbados but by other countries as well, either for the intervention or against the intervention. I have had occasion to review the statements that have been made both in the Security Council and in the General Assembly of the United Nations, as well as to hear in other international fora the views expressed by a wide cross-section of countries of the world.

The position, as I see it, is this: that the legitimate, though politically and morally bankrupt regime of Eric Gairy was overthrown by the illegitimate actions of Maurice Bishop; and that an illegitimate regime was therefore established, which was in turn overthrown by the illegitimate actions of Coard and Austin. The situation rapidly deteriorated into one where there was a deep blood bath, carnage and destruction such as the Commonwealth Caribbean has been unaccustomed to in recent years.

6.15 p.m.

I was out of the country on parliamentary business in East Africa when I heard the news that there had been an intervention by a number of countries, including Barbados, into the affairs of Grenada. The information was coming through indirect sources and I will admit that

I was sceptical at the start, because I could find no legitimate basis for Barbadian forces, or other forces, being in Grenada at the time.

I was searching for the legitimacy of the action but, apparently, all of the information was not coming through on the official waves. However, I soon learnt that there was a request from what was perhaps the sole surviving legitimate authority in Grenada, that is the Governor-General, Sir Paul Scoon, a request to the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States, and to friendly countries in the Caribbean, and to the United States as well, for help by means of an intervention; and that call was acceded to.

As I indicated, I was out of the country and I was attending a meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. And it was a happy coincidence of circumstances because the very mandate, the mission and the special purpose of that Commonwealth Parliamentary Association is:

"to promote knowledge and education about the constitutional legislative, economic, social and cultural systems within a parliamentary democratic framework".

I want to say that is what we are talking about, parliamentary democracy; and that is what I support; and that is what my Party, as a democratic party, supports, the existence of parliamentary democracy in those countries where the people themselves want to be ruled under a system of parliamentary democracy.

I therefore wish to take this opportunity to say to the people of Barbados in general, and to my constituents of St. Michael South in particular, that I am in full support of the action taken by the Government of Barbados in co-operation with certain Governments of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States and of the United States, together with the Government of Jamaica, in intervening to restore democracy and to prevent a further deterioration of the situation in Grenada.

*Applause.*

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: That is my own personal position on this matter. I say further that this Opposition and the Democratic Labour Party believe that something had to be done, and therefore we are going to vote for this Resolution.

As far as the evidence goes, I certainly believe that there was a legitimate request — according to the information available to me at the moment, a legitimate request — coming from perhaps the last duly constituted authority remaining in Grenada; and I believe that that was enough to justify assistance being brought by friendly countries to a neighbouring CARICOM and neighbouring Commonwealth Caribbean country.

Indeed, I wish to state that the position of the Democratic Labour Party on this matter had been crystal clear and was drawn in very broad terms very early in the situation: I wish to refer to a statement by the Leader of the Opposition, the honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow). This was a statement issued following a meeting of the Executive Council of the Democratic Labour Party, which approved the statement. It reads as follows, and I will make it a document of the House, Mr. Deputy Speaker — so that there can be no misunderstanding at all about the positions taken by this Party on these matters.

"At its first meeting, the Executive Council of the Democratic Labour Party approved the following statement:—

"The Democratic Labour Party wishes to express its deep shock over the callous and brutal murder of Mr. Maurice Bishop, his colleagues and other Grenadian leaders and citizens, and demands that the perpetrators of this vicious crime against the people of Grenada should not go unpunished.

The D.L.P. will support any measures calculated to bring the criminals to justice and calls for immediate international action to relieve the Grenadian people from the scourge of Stalinist dictatorship.

The criminal action in the streets of Grenada today is one of the most inhuman and disgraceful events in the history of the Caribbean and it is vital that the instigators be ostracised from the rest of the Caribbean and be given no succour or shelter anywhere within its shores.

The people of Grenada were beginning to make significant strides under Maurice Bishop's leadership, and would have fared even better whenever he re-established constitutional government as he promised, and seemed prepared to do.

The D.L.P. condemns unequivocally this savagery, which amongst other things, confines women and children, the sick, the hungry and the incapacitated to their homes for four days or any other period without access to the normal amenities of existence such as food, water and medical care or from even burying their dead.

No self-respecting Barbados Government of any political persuasion should have anything to do with a regime of the kind that has been inflicted on the unfortunate people of Grenada."

6.25 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it really grieved me when it was reported to me that there have been comments to the

effect that the Democratic Labour Party has been silent on these matters, when in fact this very broad statement was made very early. Indeed, even before the Government of Barbados had come out and said what it intended to do, the Democratic Labour Party was on the record indicating its position.

At that time, as I heard the Prime Minister recite in here, the Cabinet was still meeting and still trying to decide what position they should take, but the people of Barbados themselves had not been taken into the confidence of the Government at that time; it was all very secret and "hush-hush". You could not tell the people of Barbados and you could not tell the Parliament of Barbados what the Government was going to do, but the Democratic Labour Party, with a wise man as leader, the wisest political brains still in this country – I refer to the right honourable Member for St. John – came out and set out the position of the Party in respect of this matter.

Therefore, I hope that this will be the last that we will hear of this so-called deafening silence on the part of the Democratic Labour Party. We were on record, and we were on record first of all in this matter, and we referred to all of the aspects of the matter.

Can the people of Barbados have any doubt that this is a Party, the Democratic Labour Party, that is well aware of its responsibility, that is fortified within the framework and base and bedrock of democratic principles, and is a party which is ready to provide the leadership for this country that it needs in very trying times?

Indeed, after that, having made our statement, we then left the Government to proceed with the matters relating to national security and the public affairs, regional and international affairs of this country. Not once did we criticise the actions of the Government. We were very patriotic in all this, and still we are being accused.

I wonder what more does the Barbados Labour Party expect from the Democratic Labour Party? What more do they expect from us? Our members have been accused of all kinds of things, but I suppose this is the lot of the political life, and we will bear these stripes until the people themselves have an opportunity to say we too support the positions taken by the Democratic Labour Party, and followed by the Government of Barbados, in terms of those actions which have occurred in this country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have stated the position of the Democratic Labour Party and I have said that we are going to support this Resolution. This does not mean that we have been satisfied with the way in which all of these matters have been handled, nor does it mean that there are not massive problems facing this country at this

particular time arising out of this and other related situations.

Let us be clear about it. And also let us make no mistake and let us not fall into the trap of believing that because someone does not agree with the Prime Minister, or does not agree with the Government of this country, that that person is necessarily unpatriotic, or that that person is guilty of treason or treason felony, or misprision of treason, or sedition, or of any other kind of accusations that may be laid. If we make criticisms from this side, the criticisms are such as we believe are in the interest of the good government of this country, and our highest considerations is not to the Barbados Labour Party Government, but to the people of Barbados. We consider it as our role to point out those errors as we see them; and no amount of criticisms, accusations or even ridicule coming from any quarter will deter us from making our position clear as we see it.

I said that there are a number of problems resulting from the action taken. And it must be clear now to everyone in this country that there has been massive criticism and condemnation of the intervention into the affairs of Grenada by the international community. This is clear from the votes in the Security Council, and in the General Assembly of the United Nations, and from positions taken by certain members of the Non-Aligned Movement. Even in the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference there were many voices raised in criticism of the action taken by Barbados, the particular countries of the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States, Jamaica and the United States of America. The criticisms were coming even from some very interesting quarters. I believe even Tanzania criticised the intervention and a little ripple of mirth went through the conference when some delegate pointed out that Tanzania had itself intervened in Uganda to restore Milton Obote to power.

We have to examine these matters. I have said that there is this international criticism, and we cannot sweep it under the table. I can well understand the motives from which the Prime Minister tried to downplay this situation here today. I believe he is trying to rise to the heights of his statesmanship and is preparing for a big international conference which may be coming off in Asia shortly.

The fact is that there is a problem, and you have a massive body of international opinion against Barbados, against the intervening countries, and against the United States, and we just cannot ignore it. We have to do something about it, and I must confess that I believe that it was a failure on the part of this Government, a failure on the part of the United States Government, a failure on the part of all intervening Governments, not to explain their positions thoroughly prior to the debate in the United Nations itself.

It is one thing to take action; it is an entirely different matter to ensure that the necessary information base is available to others who may have to comment and to take decisions on those actions. And whether we like it or not, the kinds of actions that were mounted after the debates, and after the discussions and after the votes perhaps, should have been taken earlier.

All of these coast to coast hook-ups, all of these star roles on the international television and radio in my view came too late. They should have come much earlier. Indeed, one could almost say that even this debate which is taking place perhaps should have taken place somewhat earlier, with adequate notice given within the framework of true parliamentary democracy. So the Government of this country and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs have a massive job on their hands, because they have met with massive condemnation by the international community in their foreign policy and diplomatic initiatives.

6.35 p.m.

It is my view that the international community is wrong on these matters. It does not, however, remove the fact that it is a fact that the condemnation is there; and that is how people have spoken and how they have expressed their views about what has happened. And they have been seeing matters within the classic framework of a large country, an imperialist country practising Hegelianism, as the Chinese would call it. My friend, the Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig) would be well aware of the positions of the Chinese on these matters!

*Aside.*

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am into China. I am not into Kenya at all. I am not into Kenya. I am into China. And I am saying that the Member for St. James North would be well aware of the positions that the Chinese take on these matters.

If I can get back to the theme, the intervention is seen in the international community as an action taken by a big country against a small, helpless country, and that kind of intervention is not to be condoned in any way.

Let us face it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, those countries which voted in the organs of the United Nations on this matter, in the Security Council and the General Assembly, were speaking within the context, as they saw it, of the high themes of the Charter of the United Nations, which speaks in terms of the principle of the self-determination of people, in terms of the territorial integrity of all countries, in terms of the political and economic independence of states and in terms of the principle of non-interference and non-intervention. These are things set out clearly in the Charter of the United Nations and we cannot get away from it. It is a fact.

It is a fact that there should not be intervention; and it is also a fact that forces, including the military and other forces from Barbados, were intervening in Grenada. That is a fact. We cannot get away from it.

It is also a fact that the political integrity of Grenada was also invaded by those forces which went in. It is a fact. Nobody can get away from it.

(Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Rescued, not invaded.)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: We will have to find out how our case in the international community must be put, because on the face of it, it is a contravention of the Charter of the United Nations. But we have got to appeal to some higher law, or indeed go to some other aspect of the Charter of the United Nations where it speaks about the self-determination of people. And we have got to say that in Grenada there was no opportunity for the people of Grenada to say what they felt on these issues since 1979 and the coup of that day by Maurice Bishop and the New Jewel Movement. That is a fact. As I have said, it was an illegitimate regime.

It is also a fact that when the coup d'état by Coard and Austin occurred, if you had waited to send in fact-finding missions and to take all kinds of other methods of consultation and to try to solve the matter by other means, by that time, that particular regime would have established itself, would have been the government of the country, and would have been able to mobilize whatever additional support it wanted both from inside the country and outside of the country! Then, any attempt to set Grenada back on the path of constitutional democracy, constitutional parliamentary democracy, would have been lost for several years to come, perhaps for ever, who knows!

Therefore, it is in those circumstances, as I see it, that I support the actions of the Government, but can also realize that there is a massive problem on our hands.

I do not think we could take the right honourable Prime Minister seriously when he says that all Barbados wants to do is to think about its old age pensioners — and what else?

(Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: He did not say that.)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: He did not say that? And to improve the standards of living of the people, and to be left alone.

(Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: He said those are some of the things that concerned us.)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Oh! Some of the things that concern us. Thank you. I stand corrected on that.

I really wonder though, if that is the position which we are in — we are not really interested in these big international matters — why is it then that you were raging all of these international campaigns, which helped, in the right honourable Prime Minister's own words, to burst the Conference Vote? Why were we so much interested in getting this seat on the Security Council, which, by definition, is the place where all of these international events are discussed?

Perhaps, it is a sobering thought that if on this occasion Barbados has been catapulted from its normal position of relative anonymity in the world.....

(Hon. H. deB. FORDE: No man, not since 1976.)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: .....to the front page of the pageant of history, we should perhaps try to step back and realize that we are only a small island, just 166 square miles. And we should perhaps get back to those areas where we are looking at the internal development of our people and hanging our hat in those institutions where we are talking about the economic and social development of the peoples of this country, and stop over-reaching ourselves in a kind of a vaulting ambition that might very well fall on the other side, as Shakespeare put in his play, I believe, Macbeth. That is one bit of advice which I would also leave with the Government.

I leave the shambles into which the diplomatic and foreign policy initiative of the Government finds itself at the moment, but I expect that the Government will take steps to correct that image which it now has in the international field. I want, in the final minutes which I will speak for, to refer to this question of democracy again.

Over the past few years, most of my speeches have harkened on the theme of democracy, to the extent that some of my parliamentary colleagues, on that side of the House, have asked me why I am speaking about democracy so much. It is because I realize that in these small countries we can have democracy today but we can wake up tomorrow and find something we never thought.

6.45 p.m.

It is not too difficult for the adventurers of the world, with the modern weapons at their disposal and the methods of espionage and surveillance that they have at their disposal, to completely subvert the security and the integrity of small countries such as Barbados. It means that we must therefore be ever vigilant. It means also that democracy cannot or may not be subverted only by external forces, but it can also be subverted by a gradual attrition of the very principles and procedures which should oil the engine of democracy.

That is why I am very confirmed in the view that this Parliament, which in some six or so years will be

celebrating 350 years of existence, should not merely be a shell institution, and *ad hoc* institution, but must be a vital and vibrant institution at the heart of the political life and public affairs of this country. And when we talk of going into another country to set that country back on the path of parliamentary democracy and to re-establish a regime in which fundamental human rights are observed, I want us to be quite clear in this country on this matter.

It is my confirmed view that this Parliament is losing its pride of place among the public institutions of this country. We may look to score a little political advantage now, one side over the other, but please remember the damage we may be doing to the institution itself and to the country. Because when there is not that stability, when there is not that belief that the parliamentary system is based on a general respect both for the exigencies of Government and the requirements of Opposition, it is that much easier to subvert our country. And within this context of parliamentary democracy and within the context of a regime of fundamental human rights, let me say that we are fundamentally opposed to any action on the part of any government which may infringe the fundamental rights of people in this country.

I believe that the people of this country, within the context of the Constitution, have the right to express their views on matters of national, international, or private issues for that matter, without being threatened, without being harassed, and without in any way being molested. I believe that the journalists of this country, within the framework of the fundamental rights have the freedom to give opinions and to receive opinions. I believe that within the context of the Laws of Defamation they must be free to give expression to their views. And I believe that just as in Britain it was once said that when once a slave had set foot on British soil he thereby became a free person, I also believe that within the framework of the Constitution of this country, its fundamental rights and freedom rights clauses, and within the Laws of Defamation, any non-national in this country should also be free to express their opinion. Thank God, we are not yet, I believe, in a fascist country. But if actions are taken which deprive the people of this country — or indeed the representatives of the people even — of their fundamental rights, then we might well be on that road. I hope that that day never comes.

I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of the Opposition to express condolences to the people of Grenada, to the relatives and families of those people of Grenada, to the United States, to Cuba and of any other country on the loss of their lives in the blood-shed in Grenada. I think that it is only fitting that this should go on record.

The tragic events in Grenada, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have indicated that there is a role for the military in this

country because the territorial integrity of the country must be protected. It must be protected.....

(Aside)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable Member would like to continue his speech and would not like to be disturbed at this point please.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that on all sides — on the Government side and on the Opposition side — it must be accepted and realized that there is a role for the military in this country. The military, of course, must be subservient to the civilian power — and I did take some heart in seeing General Adams at the airport in some photographs next to the Brigadier. I do not know if there was some fear in his face, but I did see him up there at the airport in the thick of things.

But let me make it clear again. This particular incident highlights the fact that if there is external incursion into the territory of Barbados, or indeed if there had been internal insurrection or insurgency we must rely on the military and defense forces in such circumstances. I make no bones about that, and I have responsibility in the shadow cabinet for Defence and Security matters.  
6.55 p.m.

But, you know, all of this only highlights the wisdom of the honourable Member for St. John, and the Democratic Labour Party, which took that bold step to set up a Coast Guard and to set the necessary small military force in being in this country. I very well recall, and I know the people of Barbados themselves must recall, that the Opposition then, the Barbados Labour Party, was opposed to the actions taken by the Democratic Labour Party on that occasion. I ask you this now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, were it not for the wisdom of the Democratic Labour Party, were it not for the wisdom of a wise political leader at that time, the first Prime Minister of this country, were it not that we laid the base, what is it that General Adams would have been calling on in these circumstances to go down to Grenada?

I will place the matter before the people. I just say it and place it on the Record, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because it needs to be said on this occasion, when I am paying a tribute to the military in this country, that it was the Barbados Labour Party which said:

"There will be no need to maintain any standing army or other defence force."

That is the BLP in its Manifesto only in 1976! That kind of statement was being made then!

"A Coast Guard at this time is not a priority."

I go no further. I am only making the point, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that at a time when we are calling for national unity, indeed the Democratic Labour Party supported that particular position at that time — support you on this occasion — but perhaps we are a bit too maganimous — and then we left that particular matter alone! I believe I can leave the matter alone where it is for the moment, but the people will be able to understand the points I am making.

I close on this point, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Democratic Labour Party has given full support. Very early in the matter we said nothing or did nothing to break national unity on this particular issue. But we are concerned that there are many grave issues remaining. And we urge the Government to carry out a serious analysis of the present position in which it finds itself, and try to repair the damage — not further exacerbate it but try to repair, by proper diplomatic and political initiatives, that damage which has been created within CARICOM, within the region and within the wider international community.

I thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

#### SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I am going to move at this point the suspension of this House until 7.45 p.m. so that we can talk about the soldiers' boots.

I beg to move that this House be now suspended until 7.45.

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

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

#### ON RESUMPTION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Just before the suspension was taken, the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central was about to speak.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to second this Resolution, and I wish to say, Sir, at the very outset, that the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford), who just concluded his address, spoke in the vein in which I expected the honourable Member to speak.

Those of us who live in this part of the world are fully aware of the difficulties in which small States in the

world find themselves. In particular, we on this side, and a large proportion of the members of this community and other communities in the Caribbean area, were ever conscious of the need to fashion for ourselves some form of association which would permit us to help one another in periods of difficulty.

There can be no doubt about it. International opinion not being close to the situation in Grenada, not being close to a very, very large extent to small countries, can never appreciate the tremendous pressure which this Government and the whole community in Barbados was under arising from the several requests for help from Grenadians living in Grenada, Grenadians living in Barbados, their relatives in Trinidad, their relatives all over the world. Few people can appreciate the tremendous feeling of the utter need to make up one's mind about a decision in these circumstances.

Barbados will have to live with this international opinion, which, I am very glad to say, as the events and the facts come increasingly to light, a great deal of is moving towards a position of support. Now that it can be truthfully reported that the Government in this endeavour has received the full support of the Opposition, I am confident that this will help, too, to quell and stem the tide of the criticisms which we had to undergo.

Like the honourable Member, I concede that the facts of these events in Grenada have placed, and will place for some period of time, some strain on relationships within the Caribbean Economic Community and, indeed, on our relationships with others.

I am very glad to see that little attempt has been made, indeed no attempt at all, to deal with the unjust accusations by some of the members of the Caribbean Community. Little attempt has been made to deal with the insulting language that has been used by one member in particular. I think the weight of public opinion throughout the Caribbean is such that that opinion stands in isolation and it is unrepresentative even of the country in which it has been expressed. Had the people been free, they would have expressed a different opinion. I do not today intend to dignify any statement emanating from that quarter or that person by making any further reference to it.

I believe, as I said earlier today, that the Caribbean Economic Community and the Treaty of Chaguaramas is not in as great a danger of dissolution as some people are saying. I do not believe, Sir, that differences of opinion between Prime Ministers or Heads of Government, or indeed Governments in the Caribbean Economic Community, at this particular juncture in its history will be sufficient to cause the dissolution or collapse of that community.

I note, Sir, that other economic integrated movements are today undergoing much the same strains, although for different reasons, as our Community, and that they have devised mechanisms, and that the inherent strength of those communities have been such as to sustain the divisions.

We in Barbados, on both sides, are fully cognisant of the need for the continuation and the preservation of the Economic Community and of the Common Market, and of the other institutions falling under the Treaty of Chaguaramas. I have no doubt that not only at the political level but at the commercial level, at the social level, at the cultural level, the combined strengths of our collective efforts will help to preserve the community. I wish to give the community, the people in Barbados who are strong supporters of the Integration Movement, the assurance that the Government of Barbados will be working steadfastly to preserve the progress that has been made in the Integration Movement, and, indeed, will continue to give encouragement to those who hold the viewpoint that this Integration Movement is only but a step along the road to a further and deeper integration not only at the economic, social and cultural level, but at the political level, which is inevitable.

A lot has been said about the legality or otherwise of the intervention. I think the evidence is now clear that, in addition to the invitation which was made by the last legitimate authority in Grenada, there was in existence in all of these States, which are almost contiguous to one another, which have had a long history of association, firstly, as fellow colonial territories; secondly, as part of a defunct federation and, thirdly and presently, as part of an integration movement, there was a genuine fear that as a result of activities taking place in one Member State, there was sufficient evidence of arms build up and external prodding which could lead one to the conclusion that each of the States in the eastern Caribbean were threatened.

7.55 p.m.

There can be no doubt about it, the size of the Army, the amount of armaments which were found in Grenada were of a sufficiently large quantity to cause serious concerns in all of these territories. As the honourable Member for St. Michael South has pointed out, we in these small territories do not have the financial resources to buy comparable quantities of arms, to hire comparable intelligence, nor to continuously keep in good condition the equipment necessary to at least stall an attack on us.

We also have another very important problem to deal with, the problem which arises when, because of our love of freedom of speech, our love for freedom of expression, our love for our other Caribbean people, we

allow them to reside in our country, to earn their living in our country, but what we get in return is not what we expect — we get people who use the opportunities provided by our liberality to exercise associations, and to have associations and to collaborate with people whose sole aim is to destroy a system of government which permits that liberality which they enjoy. We have to face it. There can be no doubt that there are people who have been given special opportunities in this country, who, before the Grenada situation and during the Grenada situation, abused their privileges in Barbados for the purpose of perpetuating things we do not expect, and for the purpose of collaborating with people whom we do not expect they should collaborate with.

The Barbados Government can be accused of being arrogant, we can be accused of being hostile of criticism, but Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to give the House the assurance that this Government will not tolerate people whom the Government, through its liberality of outlook have allowed to exercise their calling at whatever time in Barbados, to use their residence in Barbados for the purpose of collaborating with people who have as their object the destruction of freedom and democracy which we all cherish. All of these difficulties that we have to face now are difficulties that we cannot run away from. We cannot run away from these matters. I think the Community as a whole expects that at this period of time there would be a serious examination of these matters.

I think we must all understand that the freedoms we talk of have limitations. No community can allow people, who have no respect for freedom, so much freedom that they can destroy the institutions that create the freedom. And whether you work for a university, whether you work in a church, or in any other profession, the position is exactly the same. If you do not believe in freedom, if you wish to use the freedom which the State guarantees you for the purpose of subverting the very State, then it is your duty to go and live in countries with the philosophy you hold.

It is okay, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for large countries to exercise a super abundance of liberality in this respect. They have the resources to continuously monitor the activities, day by day, of these people.

As the Prime Minister said, our prime concern in this country is with trying, in this world of uneven distribution of resources, to see how we can provide daily for the people of Barbados as much as the economy can possibly produce. Our prime concern, as he said, was with our old age pensioners, our young people and employment and moving our economy ahead.

We do not wish to create an army of intelligence people to be constantly monitoring the activities of people in this country. But if we do not, with their known

inclinations, we are in grave danger of finding ourselves in the position of waking up one morning and finding that all of us are overtaken. This is a very, very serious matter, and I think the Community, the Government, the Opposition — all of us must ponder very seriously on this.

All of us as politicians have had in the course of our political life to receive a tremendous amount of abuse under the guise of freedom of speech. We have taken it; we have used the law of libel when in our opinion the abuse had transgressed the law of libel. But, Sir, when you are dealing with people who wish to destroy democracy because it is their belief that democracy is the wrong system, you cannot, in my opinion, continue to treat those people in the same light in which you treat other people.

8.05 p.m.

A perusal of some of the Minutes of the Meeting which took place among certain organs of the so-called party in Grenada will reveal what I am speaking about.

(Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Let us hear them.)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The attitude of mind of people who have these belief is there for all to see. Their actions are there for all to see.

I trust and hope that the whole of this community will understand when action has to be taken to prevent this little country from being subverted by people who have no interest at all in this country, that we will not hear that we are intolerant or that we are arrogant. We are neither intolerant nor arrogant. We are sensible and we are believers in democracy, and we know that unless special steps are taken to protect and preserve democracy in these small countries, it can easily be subverted.

I would hope that arising out of this incident, unfortunate as it has been, the West Indian people, particularly in this part of the Caribbean, will come to the realization that they are pursuing a hopeless task when they think they can survive without some form of deeper integration; indeed, some form of political association!

*Applause.*

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: All of this argument about interference in the internal affairs of each other's country would not have arisen if we had only clothed our association with the stamp of legality in the form of a federation. But West Indian people — and this is where the British Government and some of the British people may never have been able to understand our attitude — are accustomed to relationships in which the feelings of the people in the relationships are as deep and as strong as if they have been clothed with legality. That is our history. When we heard the call, whether on the

telephone, whether it was by letter, whether it was by messenger; when we heard the call from the people of Grenada that the country was in chaos, that there was no Government, they needed help, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was not a question of legality that motivated us. It was a question of our feeling that they were one of us and we were bound in duty to go and help them.

*Applause.*

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: That is a proper statement. I agree with you on that. Not a question of legality!)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: So it is hard for me to follow the attitude adopted by some people in the Commonwealth. We have our kith and kin, too! We have our way of life to preserve, too!

(Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Hear you!)

*Laughter.*

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: We have our feelings, too!

A dictatorship is a dictatorship, whether it is in the South Pole or in the Caribbean. So we understand that we have to solve this problem.

We, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will therefore, have to exercise our energies in the immediate future to the improvement of our mechanisms of co-operation. I trust and hope that the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States will become closer and closer. I had the privilege of witnessing some of their consultations during the course of this crisis, and it filled me with some feeling of hope when I saw how every man and every woman involved, was trying to devolve a consensus from their operation.

I am sorry, very sorry, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that as a result of this action, some countries in the Eastern Caribbean have found themselves in disagreement with the action. But I hope that as time passes, all of us would realize that this action was necessary, that this action was timely, and that arising out of this action, the Caribbean has emerged into a stronger and stronger entity.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

*Applause.*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Christ Church West Central. But before he begins, I would like to draw honourable members' attention to Standing Order 30, which deals with the time limit of speeches on a matter of this nature.

I believe everybody would like to have their say this evening, and I would implore honourable Members

to stick as closely to the time limit so that as many persons as possible will be able to have their right — half an hour. I wish everybody would have a chance this evening to make their views known on this very important matter.

Thank you.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Deputy Speaker, perhaps sordid, brutal murder and the subsequent inhuman events that took place in Grenada on October 19 provides the moral justification, and some may perhaps say even legal justification, for whatever steps were subsequently taken to ensure that the brutal murderers who performed the nefarious acts did not reap the benefits of their ill-gotten gains, and perhaps did not forever thereafter continue to inflict their will on an unwilling population.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is a body of opinion in International Law, albeit a minority opinion, which says that, on moral grounds, certain States are justified in intervening in the affairs of other States where the actions of Government are so brutal and heinous as to become traitors of perhaps what one may consider to be the Laws of God; contrary to all morality. But it does seem, however, that the majority opinion in International Law does feel that third States, even in those circumstances, may not be justified in intervening, and that the people in the country itself have the ultimate responsibility for their affairs and to decide what is right, and how, perhaps, they may rid themselves of the menace which inflicts them.

8.15 p.m.

The tragedy of the world today, and one of the serious limitations of International Law perhaps, is that it is unable to deal effectively with the problems which arise in many circumstances of this kind, and, in many cases, to punish Governments which have been responsible for some of the most offensive and heinous acts against their own citizens, in their own States.

So, for instance when the Soviet Union brutally invaded the people of Afghanistan and murdered the Government officials, the rest of the world was powerless to intervene and prevent what happened then, and what in fact today is still an occupation of the sovereign country of Afghanistan. Equally so, when the United States of America, through its Central Intelligence Agency, was largely responsible for the overthrow of a democratically-elected Government in Chile and the murder of its Head of State, the rest of the world was equally powerless to do anything about that situation.

So we find that in situations of this kind especially when the superpowers, are involved, it does seem that might is still right in International Law and has to a large extent a direct impact on what eventually does take place.

If we take the position even closer to us in Suriname, when the present leader of that country carried out a bloody coup, which resulted in the murder of those who were responsible for the administration of the affairs of Suriname; when he took over and continued to administer the affairs of Suriname, there was no cry about intervention to restore democracy in that country. Those are some of the problems which we face in the world, some of the real problems which we have to deal with in situations of this kind.

The instances of intervention by Third World countries in the affairs of others, and non-intervention in the case of Suriname, are legion, and could cite at length the many problems which have arisen because of the intervention or non-intervention, as the case may be. So in all these cases, we have to look at these issues in their proper perspective.

It so happens in the Grenada situation, fortunately for us, that the liberation of the people of Grenada coincided with what is essentially the geo-political wish and interest of the United States of America. Make no mistake about it, that if the geo-political interests of the United States of America were not consistent with the liberation of the people of Grenada, I think that we may have had to reverse the high praise we are now singing about America, the liberator, and perhaps take a different view.

I say all this to suggest that we should not necessarily become over emotional about these issues and regard the United States for all times as the Liberator. We are thankful for what has been done and that the people of Grenada have been liberated from what could have been a most inhuman and brutal tyranny over the years to come. But I am saying at the same time that we must not lose perspective and sight of reality and think that, in all circumstances then, intervention by mighty and huge powers are in all cases justified in the internal affairs of small and, perhaps, defenseless States.

The point has been made that in the case of Grenada, the countries of the Eastern Caribbean, and Jamaica and Barbados, by themselves would have been powerless to bring the tyranny of the Austin regime to heel, and therefore it was necessary to have the assistance of the vastly superior might of the United States of America, which was the country closest and most easily available to deal with the matter. But the important point I am making is that we must not lose sight of reality in all of this and become over emotional and clap our hands at all times when intervention in the affairs of small States is concerned.

What we have to be concerned about is that small independent countries, especially small countries which have become newly independent and which have recently

emerged from the shackles of colonialism, have got to be concerned about the intervention of what were former colonial powers, about the intervention of their trading partners who have superior economies, superior military strength; about the intervention of super powers in the affairs of their own countries. Because after all, irrespective of the fact that countries may be small, it must still be important that they have their dignity to preserve and their sovereignty to protect, and that wherever possible, they always want effectively and jealously to guard their sovereignty and independence, which, in many cases, they have so struggled to win from their colonial masters. So when concerns are raised in international organizations about the intervention of large powerful countries in the affairs of small States, it is a concern which is legitimate, a concern which is real, and a concern which small independent and weak countries have got to be very worried about.

On the situation in Grenada, we on this side were concerned in the initial stages that the information which was available to us was not what we consider to be as full and sufficient as possible. The Resolution which is before this Honourable House at this time has certain paragraphs in the preamble which set out the premise on which the operative parts of the Resolution rest. Once the facts set out in the premise to the Resolution have been established, we obviously cannot complain about the actual text of the operative paragraphs, because from the earlier stage we expressed our unreserved condemnation of the series of acts which created the situation in Grenada.

That was never an issue with us, it was always our position and we were always of the view that action should be taken as quickly as possible to prevent further loss of life in Grenada, the abuse of human rights, and to restore tranquility and order to the people of Grenada. But our criticism of the Government on this issue is that we felt that we were not given sufficient information on the whole background to the matter which would allow us to make the meaningful analysis and commitment which we need to make.

8.25 p.m.

Our concern has also got to rest on another consideration. I, myself, was a little concerned about the rhetoric which was from time to time being uttered. We heard talk of an intervention to restore democracy in Grenada. That to me was not the best approach to the matter, because I certainly do not believe that the intervention of the United States of America was to restore democracy in Grenada. History does not necessarily establish that.

The concern of the United States was to ensure that there was not a Government in the area — which was hostile to the interest of the United States of

America. This is the geo-political interest of the United States which I say was co-existent and which coincided with the interest of the people of Grenada in ridding themselves of the tyranny which the Austin regime was in the process of inflicting on them.

So the rhetoric about restoring democracy in Grenada tended to mislead, especially in the light of history. You are aware that in Chile, for instance, the activities of the agency of the United States Government was an effective instrument in destroying the democratically elected Government, and there is to this day still a military and autocratic dictatorship of the right in Chile.

Once we get past that rhetoric and do not allow ourselves to be influenced by that kind of emotive consideration, when we look to the real issues we can get over the hurdle which that type of mental block can create.

Other concerns which we would have had from this side would be concerns about whether the United States, in the pursuance of its own geo-political interest, was not in any case bent on removing the regime in Grenada, whether Austin had done what he had done or not, because it was, in the context of the United States foreign policy, a Government which was hostile to the United States, a Government which the United States would prefer to see not in the Caribbean.

When we consider the statement which was made by the United States Ambassador to France, which he said was a statement made out of turn — I do not remember how he put it — when he talked about the intervention having been planned weeks before — that statement was made and subsequently retracted — at the time it was made it obviously did raise concerns in the minds of a lot of people as to whether the interest of the United States in invading Grenada was not a plan which had been organised and had been on the drawing board long before the incidents which in fact were the immediate cause of the intervention, whether what the Ambassador said was not in fact the justification rather than the subsequent events that took place on a subsequent date.

When you weigh all of that with what we know to be the obvious approach and concern about the United States Government in its world wide attempt to roll back the spread of communism in as many countries in the world as possible, especially in those countries in the world which fall within what the Americans consider to be the American sphere of influence, that is to say, Latin America, the Caribbean, North and South America; when one is conscious of the United States approach on this matter, the articulation of the Monroe doctrine, one must raise the question whether what in

fact did take place was not part of that overall American policy which was designed to roll back the spread of communism in the region.

If that is so, it raises the question for us, do we accept as a people that we have a right, or that States have a right to determine what sort of government people should have? If, for instance, we feel that we do not like communism, we object to the communist form of Government and to anything which is Marxist-Leninist, do we feel then that the United States, for instance, has a right to go into Cuba and destroy a Marxist Government in Cuba? Do we feel that that type of intervention is justified? These are the questions which one can legitimately raise when you are considering this whole question of an intervention.

I am saying that those issues do not arise in the Grenada issue, because as I say, the interests, although they could be divergent, were consistent at this point. That is why we on this side are able on this occasion to support the Resolution which is now before this House unreservedly — because our basic and total concern has to be what the people of Grenada feel and want in this whole matter.

The evidence seems to disclose that the people of Grenada are thankful for the intervention by the United States and the other countries of the Eastern Caribbean. And let me say that it is not for us in Barbados or in any other country of the Eastern Caribbean, or in any part of the Caribbean, to decide for the people of Grenada what is best for them. It is for them to decide that, and if that is what they wish, then it is our duty to support it. As I say, the evidence disclosed seems to support that, and that again is another reason why we have no difficulty in supporting the operative part of this Resolution.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the right honourable Member for St. Thomas (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams) in his statement on the matter gave a recital of the events which led up to this unfortunate series of incidents in Grenada. He talked about the fact that the statistics show that there was no economic progress in Grenada under the Bishop Government for the last four years. He said that the sole area of growth seemed to have been in the Army and that there was no other area of job creation. That may have been so. We do not have access to those analyses ourselves.

On the question of whether education and health services in Grenada saw a distinct improvement in the Bishop era, I am not in a position to comment on myself from direct experience, but I have heard statements that certainly the education and health services seemed to have taken a step for the better over that period of time. What we have to consider in all these cases is that in Grenada, as in so many other countries in the Caribbean,

there was much negative growth in the last four years, because by virtue of the nature of the economies of these countries, they would find it difficult to progress unless you have in cases like Grenada, Dominica and St. Lucia, massive support from the international communities and from friendly Governments and investment in meaningful and productive areas. So the problems which confronted Grenada over the last four years could conceivably be the problems that could confront any Government of Grenada over the last four years.

8.35 p.m.

What we in this region have to consider is that out of every crisis and out of every problem there can come some good. At least it should make the Governments of the west and those who are close to us, and who are able and in a position to assist the development of this region, realize that they should not wait until countries in this area turn to the far left before they find it necessary or expedient to begin taking an interest in the region.

We are here in the Caribbean, close to the United States of America. The interest of the United States of America is self interest, like the interest, in my view, of all the major powers in the world. I am not one of those who are caught up by all of the ideological hangings on. As far as I am concerned, those who support the super communist countries get no further than those who support the super imperialist countries. Both sides are interested in their own political, economic and social development, and if they see that it is in their interest to assist, they are going to do so. If it is not in their interest, they are not going to concern themselves about the smaller and the least dependent economies of the world.

Some years ago, we had a phrase getting some currency in the United States, that the countries in this region should be treated with some kind of "benign neglect." Once you have that attitude and that kind of approach to the Governments, to the peoples and to the problems in this area, and are prepared to respond only when you feel that your geo-political interests are being affected and invaded, I say that that is the wrong motivation for the participation and interest by any large or major power in the affairs of the people of this region.

It is time that all of us should stop playing the ideological game. We should realize that we are a people. We as a people have to look after our own independent development. We ought not to play puppets and lackeys to anyone, whether it be the United States or the Soviet Union. We have to recognize that we have a community of interest to the people of the Western Hemisphere of the Americas; we have to get through to the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and those friendly disposed to us in the area that we should be treated with dignity and not as beggars, and that we have

to respected as a people; and that the sooner they begin to treat us as equals, the better for all of us, the better for the major powers themselves in the pursuance of their own international interest.

With those few comments, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I support the Resolution, particularly once we are satisfied that the premise on which it has been established has been sorted out. Let there be no doubt that we raise no further concerns about the matter at this time.

*(Applause)*

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Deputy Speaker, if one thing has emerged from this.....

*Asides.*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Honourable Members are somewhat worried about the facilities which have been provided by CBC for the transmission of the debate. I particularly told them that they should have suitable equipment ready for the Honourable Chamber. I would hope in the future that they would not abuse the privileges granted to them and cause the discomfort of Members in this Chamber. If the media cannot fit itself out properly, they will find that the courtesy would not be extended to them to the detriment of Members of this Chamber.

The honourable Member for St. Andrew will now proceed.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am grateful for your observation and I hope that the media will take your remarks as you have given them.

I wish to open my remarks on this Resolution by stating that if there is anything which is clear to us, it is that we are our brothers' keeper, and that we cannot isolate ourselves from the problems which exist within the region. It is not so much an ideological question and a question as to who is taking up the cudgels on behalf of the United States of America or the Soviet Union. It is a question of how Caribbean people must think and how Caribbean people must act.

For myself, I have no masters in terms of ideology. My masters are in the constituency of St. Andrew and the people of Barbados as a whole, and while the Opposition has given us to believe that they are willing to support this Resolution, to me it is more in the nature of a critical support rather than a total support.

The Opposition premises its critical support on the basis that it did not have sufficient information leading

up to the action which the Government took to bring about peace and tranquility for the good and unfortunate people in Grenada.

I do not believe that we acted illegally in the steps which we took, but at the same time, even if it was a question of an illegal act to bring about the rescue of 110 000 souls, I would be all for it. I believe that the people in Grenada, like the children of Israel, wanted to be free from the bondage of the Pharaohs that was inflicted upon them. And if they are in Barbados they concern the other side, and they are friends of the other side, not this side.

We have got to be practical in our approach to things. The last speaker on the Opposition benches spoke about the question of improvement in health and education in Grenada. I do not know if it is because Russian teachers were brought in to teach them scientific communism, which was responsible, in my respectful view, for the negative growth in the economy, because they were not moving forward. To me they were more in the reverse gear than any other gear at all, if the gears were not entirely mixed up.

8.45 p.m.

Grenada has not moved forward one quarter of an inch from the time Gairy left — neither in education nor in its health services. They were too busy reading up and learning up the Communist manifesto and the works of Marx, Lenin and Engels, and to me that is not what the Caribbean people are looking for. The Caribbean people are looking for an identity of their own, and I am not here today to praise Bishop nor to bury him. He has been the maker of his own undoing. If you live by the sword you will die by the sword. You cannot expect to come in by the gun and not go out by it.

I have a very deep concern about all the events leading up to the happenings of 1979 and October 19, 1983. It must be of great concern to Barbadians and to democratic and peace loving people not only in the Caribbean but in the entire world. It is not a pleasant thing to think that leaders whose lives are at risk, and it must be admitted that it is so, will be in office today and gunned down tomorrow.

This type of attitude is not what we have been trained to expect in our democracy. It is not what Barbadians believe in. It is not, in my respectful opinion, what the Grenadians had grown to accept. They had Sir Eric Gairy and the Mongoose Gang. They tried to live with it and tolerate it. The New Jewel Movement came on the scene, they thought that the Messiahs had come only to find greater devils or at least equal devils, and their task and problem were not any different from what they were under the Gairy regime.

I recently went to Grenada to see how the situation was and to see what improvements were made since I last went there over twelve years ago. The country has not moved forward one inch beyond the airport at Point Saline, and I tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it is cause for grave concern that in little Grenada you can have such a build up of arms down there. What was the purpose of Grenada being a storehouse of arms? Was it for the protection of the Grenadians? Protection against whom? Or were they trying themselves to conquer greater lands? And conquer the lands for whom? These are the questions which I would invite the Opposition in Barbados to deal with.

It is unfortunate for the Opposition to seek to only give critical support to this Resolution. In giving critical support you seem to the country suspect in this whole matter. When I say that I do not bring all members of the Opposition along, because if I had to trust my fate in the hands of certain members of the Opposition in office I would not be worried about that. There are democrats over there, and good democrats in my view. But there are some people over there who will take the same course that Bishop took, and Coard and Austin, and that is what worries me. These are the problems that the country faces.

When the country is aware of some of the remarks that were made in the past by members of the Opposition, and the type of encouragement given to Bishop and his cohorts, the country must be concerned and be suspicious of any critical support that you give to a Resolution of this nature. Let us make no mistake about that. Not only the Barbadian public but the Caribbean public, even in Guyana.

I am going to say a few things about Guyana as well, and I want to make my position abundantly clear that I speak for myself and as the conscience of my constituents. The time has come, and to me it had come long ago, when the Governments of the Caribbean should have taken a positive step not only against the human rights policies of Grenada, but against the human rights policies of the Government of Guyana as well. If you feel that the Government of Grenada under General Austin should have been isolated, you should also examine the attitudes of the Governments in the Caribbean on Field Marshal Burnham.

I think we need to look very critically at the situation in Guyana as well, because, make no mistake about it, if Grenada is tainted with a bad brush, the whole Caribbean is tainted. Whatever happened in Grenada on October 19 this year and subsequent to that date has affected the whole Caribbean. They see us as one, not as separate units; and anything that affects Guyana, even though they claim to have a continental destiny, will no less affect us, because we are also close to them. We

work together, we have always worked together, we have always seen ourselves as people of one destiny, and therefore whatever affects Guyana must of necessity affect us.

It is my considered view that the Government acted very correctly in taking the stand which it took to bring peace and tranquility to the good people of Grenada.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Opposition said that the Government did not take them sufficiently into its confidence to discuss matters. When you are dealing, as the Prime Minister quite rightly pointed out, with a question of people's lives, a question of treaties, matters of grave importance, these are not things that you can come into Parliament and discuss and have whipped up in the newspapers. Even when you bring in an Ambassador to discuss with him the problems which confront you and ask him to relay a message to his Government, you find there are problems there. And that is one man! You find that whenever you have to discuss a matter in the most private way in the hope that you will not put the lives of people at risk, for some reason or another some quivering is involved somewhere along the line.

We in Barbados are fortunate that up to now we have had no casualties among our men, but it would not have been impossible — to have had a number of casualties while you entered to save the situation in Grenada.

The American people are always very quick to get attacked, and we heard the attack coming from the last speaker on the Opposition benches tonight. He couched it very cleverly on the question of America: Uncle Toms, lackeys, the same language Bishop used when he was attacking the Prime Minister of Barbados; lackeys of the United States of America and what have you. But the Americans sent in their own soldiers, their own people, and not so much in the interest of the United States as was said.

I do not believe that if the Americans had to get rid of the Cubans there would be any problems. They would lose some lives, but America has the military and technological capacity to wipe out any State within the Caribbean region or any part of the world if it wants to risk a holocaust. They have the capacity to do it and it can be done.

So do not think that when the Americans moved into Grenada, they were just doing Grenadians a favour or the Caribbean a favour. Rather, they were doing themselves a favour. They were trying to rescue a people who were imprisoned, a people who were put in chains by a vicious and wicked Government. They were trying to protect them and to save them from that bad situation. 8.55 p.m.

I think that the Americans should be congratulated for having come in at that time. They were not supposed to come at all, and the Austins and the Coards would still be

at large and reigning over those poor people in Grenada tonight. The Grenadians, by their outpouring of thanks and praises for the intervening process, have demonstrated their gratitude to the forces who went in. Therefore, who are we to question the rights of the Grenadians to ask the people who went in to come?

I am very happy that the Opposition, at the moment, have allowed themselves to be convinced that there is need to have some form of defence within our territory. You cannot get away from it today. The time was when Barbadians were so contented to live in peace within their borders that nobody had particularly to close their windows at night. Today, it is not that easy.

Many people have got to put up the iron bars on their windows and doors, as you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And you not only have to protect your doors and your windows, but you have now got to protect your shores. Barbados has a lot of open shores and these have to be protected as well.

It is not a job for the police alone. It is a job for a Defence Force to do. Soldiers are trained to do very tough work. Policemen are good for the protection of crime and policing the streets and policing the country. But that alone is not all. You need men who are tough, men who can face the invading forces, as soldiers are trained to do. And it is my view that it is very necessary in this day and age that we have soldiers and a Defence Force to protect our land.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sorry that the front put up here today is not as solid as I would have wished to see. I would like to see it go forth, not only to the Barbadian public, but to the whole world, to the whole Caribbean, that we are united in this matter. There are times when you have got to close ranks. This is the time when you have got to do it. The public out there expects this. The Caribbean expects this. Scoring cheap political points will not help now.

What is for you, you will get. But you will only get it when the time comes and not before. You will gain greater respect and admiration, you will gain greater support from the public, if you work in a positive way, demonstrate your support for the Government, and not to give the impression that at this stage you are only giving critical support.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is my contribution and support to this Resolution.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Michael West.

MR. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise with a very heavy heart as we debate this particular Resolution. I say heavy heart, Sir, because, quite frankly, I

would prefer that we would not have to debate a Resolution of this kind in this country and in this region. And I must say that the final words of the speaker who just sat down have done nothing to assist me in coming to this debate with the kind of equanimity that one should like to have when giving support.

I do not understand if he is suggesting that like three blind mice, we must come and see how they run and run how they see. I do not understand if the principal spokesman on this side of the House indicated that we are going to support the Resolution, why is it considered necessary and desirable by any honourable Member on that side to suggest that we are putting up a front. Does he genuinely believe that this is a matter on which individuals in their capacity as men and women would put up a front?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not wish to put up a front. As I said, I would prefer not to have to debate this Resolution. But I would take a few minutes to explain to him why we give critical support and not what he seems to consider total support. Total support for him apparently means that you get up and say, "I agree, right or wrong, correct."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is well known now that soon after it became apparent that Maurice Bishop and some of his Ministers had been murdered, the Democratic Labour Party, which on that particular evening happened to be in the middle of an Executive Meeting, considered the matter further and made what could be considered to be the strongest statement made by any political party anywhere on an issue of this kind.

We used words, Sir, in the mouth of the right honourable Leader of the Opposition (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow), which can only be described as strong. I would just quote one paragraph, because my colleague has put this matter into the Record already. We said, Sir:

"The Democratic Labour Party will support any measures calculated to bring the criminals to justice and calls for immediate international action to relieve the Grenadian people from the scourge of Stalinist dictatorship."

We made that statement before the Government said a word — and then we have an honourable Member who comes to this House and says that we are putting up a front!

Well let me tell him why we are putting up a front. Let me say, Sir, that we have not said a word since, not because there was not a word that could have been said, but because, having held a Government, we recognize that in all the circumstances a Government needs room to manoeuvre. We recognize in all the circumstances that

despite the fact that all of the countries other than those who had actually participated had found that we had acted contrary to our concept of the Rule of Law and their concept of the Rule of Law, that this was our country and that we, as an Opposition, could not be seen to be giving assistance to the enemy, even if that enemy was merely uttering words.

We make no apology for having been quiet, because were we in the same situation, we would have wanted the Opposition, whomever it might have been, to give us the opportunity to manoeuvre. But unlike the Government, when the operation was finished, we would not have required an Opposition to keep its mouth shut and not notice anything which had gone wrong, or might have gone wrong, in the operation.

Furthermore, Sir, the impression has gone abroad, and we allowed it to stay abroad, that the Government consulted with the Opposition. We never allowed a single person, in or outside of Barbados, to believe or feel that we had not been consulted — even though we chafed under the obvious discourtesy of not even being consulted at the level we are required to be consulted on some of the matters.

9.05 p.m.

The reason is because we are Barbadians and we are patriotic, and we do not go in the face of the people whom we represent; and we recognize that the vast majority of the people of Barbados, caught for the first time in a new situation, were perhaps not only afraid but genuinely apprehensive. We, too, were apprehensive, because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we had moved out of the little league — we had moved into the big league.

It must not be misunderstood, as a number of people in this country appear to be misunderstanding, the consequences of the acts that we took.

When I see the Prime Minister of Barbados coming back from Grenada with a trophy, a helmet, when I see certain people in this country having a cocktail party to celebrate, and then we have AK-47 rifles mounted and they are being bandied around, it appears to me, Sir, that we even now do not understand the enormity of the action we took. We are supporting the Resolution, we are supporting the action but we are not going to condone or support the antics, which can only lead us to destruction in the long term.

Do not misunderstand the support of the Opposition. The support of the Opposition is for Barbados and the people of Barbados. The support of the Opposition is saying to the people of Grenada, "yes, we were with you." But again, Sir, there are reasons why we have difficulty and doubt, and why, for the Record, we must place them where they can be seen.

This Resolution recites, and we heard the honourable Member for St. Thomas reciting a series of events as they were unfolded in his recollection. Mr. Deputy Speaker, many reasonable people have had a number of questions concerning information, which have come through reasonable sources, which varies and differs from information which we have been given. We have preferred not to put that kind of information out into the public domain, because we do not believe that this is an issue which ought to have been made a political football. But we are dealing with the lives of the people of Barbados as well, and to the extent that we are not satisfied with the information which has been put to us, we reserve the right, as representatives of people of Barbados, as an alternative Government in this country, to take a position which can be called critical support.

I will make no apology for the fact that some of us have questions to be raised. We have to question the veracity of certain statements. I give you an example, Sir. We have seen in the newspapers that a college, the Grenada Medical College, is going to be in Barbados "temporarily". The people of Barbados consider that in all the circumstances of what is happening in Grenada, this college could properly be moved to Barbados on a temporary basis. This is information that has been put out. That information has apparently been put out at the same level that all of the other information concerning Grenada has been put out.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I happen to know that it is not true, and that they intend for it to be a temporary move. I happen to know that arrangements have been made, and are in process, for the medical college to be permanently established in Barbados. I happen to know that the right Honourable gentleman, when he was acting in his capacity as Minister of Health, made a decision to accept the proposal that the St. George's Medical College would be placed in Barbados on a long term permanent basis. (And I hope that no one in the Government will challenge me to produce the information to demonstrate that what I am saying is absolutely correct.) In the face of that kind of information, how dare any honourable Member on that side raise questions about our inquiries concerning certain statements made.

I give you one example, but I do not intend to make my contribution to the debate one of dissecting every statement that has been made concerning this issue, because I will not approbate on the one hand and reprobate on the other. I will not say that we held our fire and our tongues because we wanted to give the Government time to manoeuvre and then come here in a public broadcast and say to the people, these are the reasons and this is the dissection of what has been said.

I will issue this warning to some honourable Members. It does not fall well out of the mouths of us in Barbados to pretend that we are going to ignore the

concept of the Rule of Law while giving this service to the Rule of Law. I was very pleased to hear the honourable Member of Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. John) say tonight that it was not a question of legality, it was a question of gut feeling. On that level, every single person in the Caribbean can support the action the Government took. It is when you try to found on international law, it is when the Prime Minister turns, like some who are less enlightened or ought to be less enlightened, and suggests that all the 109 countries who voted against Barbados are hypocrites, that we are swimming in waters that are so deep, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we ought to get a life raft along with us.

We must quarrel because we are not on the side of the majority. We must quarrel, apparently, because everybody does not agree with us. Let us look at it this way, Sir. Sometimes when you are driving a vehicle, you go around the corner and you find something in the middle of the road, or on the left side parked — you come to it suddenly and you have to go over on the wrong side of the road. Now you are on the wrong side of the road, and if at that time you come into contact with another vehicle, there is no question that you are on the wrong side of the road. But no one, who heard all of the facts and knew the circumstances, would hold it against you because you chose to go on the wrong side of the road to avoid an accident.

That is the analogy to provide some moral legitimacy for the action that was taken by the Government of Barbados. That is the framework within which I am able with my colleagues to support the action. And it is based on our acceptance of the scenario that has been painted for us. For make no mistake, Mr. Deputy Speaker, should the occasion arise when the information which is vouchsafed to us demonstrates that we have been misled, we reserve the right to take our position fully against the action of the Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the O.E.C.S. Treaty, which we have sought to use as a basis for the invitation, is something which has been so elusive. We tried to find it so we would understand the basis on which the decision was taken, and it was only tonight that I was able to get a look at the Article (8) which is prominently displayed in this Resolution. If I had seen it before, I would have advised the government not to bother to include Article 8 in the Resolution as a basis for its action.

I understand the decisions which has been taken in the international forums. I understand them in the context of which they have been taken. I do not necessarily agree with them, but I understand them.  
9.15 p.m.

There is a point made by the last speaker which also has to be taken. I raised the question of consultation

and he spoke about the United States. In the United States, Mr. Reagan and all of the Presidents before him, and the ones who will come after him, understand very well that they are, or were, heads of democracies. They are required by convention and law to consult with the leaders of their Congress. They do it, more or less. Not every President has told the full and whole truth while consulting with the leaders of his Congress, but nonetheless he has consulted with the leaders of his Congress, because should he fail to do that, the people of the United States, on becoming aware of it, would find that the President had acted not only unwisely but illegally.

It has not, as far as I know, been the privilege of the Leader of the Opposition to be consulted by the Prime Minister at any point along the way in this matter. It is my understanding, as we heard in the narrative, that a number of Ambassadors were consulted.

I do not understand if the honourable Member who just sat was saying that the Leader of the Opposition, who himself was the head of a Government for 15 years, could not be trusted with this information for fear that the secret would come out. But we were trusted with sufficient integrity as not to reveal this information before now that we have not been consulted in these matters, and yet we will give you the support.

I go further. I draw to your attention that in the United States there is a man called Senator Joseph McCarthy. Senator Joseph McCarthy in the 1950's took the same lines that we have been hearing in recent times, and McCarthy called a number of people in the United States communists.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the final analysis he may have identified one or two communists, but he destroyed the lives of hundreds of innocent Americans, and he did it by the cleverest and most pernicious way, by the propaganda route. He said of people that they were "pinkos". He tarnished them with the pink brush. There was a witch hunt in that democracy and a large number of people met their doom, psychological sometimes, physical sometimes, but all of them died in one form or another.

I issue a caution to the Government, and I issue a caution to some people in Barbados who seem to feel that we must go on a witch hunt. It is not right that a person in Barbados cannot express a view if that person happens not to have been born in Barbados. And it is not right that if a person born in Barbados expresses a view that differs from the vast majority, that that person is to be hounded, and searched and followed and have his telephone tapped.

I say to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there are young Barbadians in Barbados today who are suffering those indignities, and apparently their only crime so far is that they have a viewpoint that is farther to the left than the viewpoint of the vast majority of a number of citizens.

I say that the essence of democracy is the protection of the minority. The absolute essence of democracy is protection of the minority, because today you are in the majority but tomorrow you could be in the minority. It may be leftist today but tomorrow it may be brown-eyed baddies.

(Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: What about fifth columnists? How do you deal with them?)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member is asking me *sotto voce* what do you do with fifth columnists. You take them before the courts and let the courts decide. No Cabinet in Barbados, especially a Cabinet that says it is in favour of restoring democracy in another country, has the right to make those kinds of judgments.

At the political meeting that was held in Sandy Lane recently, I heard the Prime Minister say that it was not a question of legality, it was a question of judgment. I put it to the honourable Members on that side, through you, Sir, that a Cabinet does not have the right to make judgments in regard to law. We have courts in this country, we have a system of the Rule of Law, and you cannot be heard to be saying that you are going to Grenada to restore democracy, and when you come back to Barbados, having restored democracy there, you are having a little difficulty with maintaining democracy in Barbados.

I do not accuse you of it now. I warn you that enthusiasm has a way of burgeoning into an avalanche, and I warn you that the democracy which both of us on both sides of this House wish to preserve, must be preserved in its entirety. We cannot have democracy for the people we like and something else for the people we do not like. Our best test is how we deal with those we do not like.

I heard the honourable Member referring to those who work at the university. There are some people who work at the university whose views are not in keeping with the mainstream view in this country. But again, Sir, the essence of a university, the whole concept of a university, is that the individual who goes into that institution must be exposed to all kinds, all shapes, all sizes and all colours of opinion.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I agree with you, but not subversive activity. There is a distinction).

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member is saying *sotto voce* not subversive activity. I repeat, whenever you suspect subversive activity, do your job and put them before the courts, but do not make a judgment yourself. You cannot be the judge and the jury as well.

That is why, Sir, when we had the Emergency Powers Bill before us, we were so concerned. And in the

light of the narrative which we heard from the honourable gentleman from St. Thomas today, we now know that from 1976 a whole network of observations by that honourable gentleman might have in fact led to the understanding as to why he needed the Emergency Powers Bill in the form it was presented. Thank God this small, motley group that is accused of putting up a front was able to help in consigning that onerous, wicked and vicious piece of legislation to the heap where it belongs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to remind this Honourable House that the Leader of the Opposition, as he then was, the now Prime Minister of Barbados, the right honourable Member for St. Thomas, once said in this House that the only way you could remove Dr. Eric Williams was by revolution. Was he a communist then?

Now we are hearing names being called in terms of the Caribbean Community. Mr. Deputy Speaker, some time ago we had a consultation at the political party which I have the great honour to represent, and we had some people there and we presented some papers. In the course of one of the papers I presented, I had this to say — I will make it available to the Table, Sir — I am following in the footsteps of the honourable gentleman who likes to quote himself:

"When we established the Caribbean Community, we were seeking to ensure a cushion against the ravages of world depression and certain patterns of trade. We believed then as we believe now, that Caribbean people can fashion a higher existence level out of their own resources coupled with their own ingenuity and their will power. The Japanese have done it; and collectively we have more natural resources than they have. What we need most is the political will and the developed skills."

I went on to say:

"That is why we have called consistently for a Heads of Government Conference. That they were two since we last met, and that results from them are promising only strengthens our view that the salvation of the Caribbean people lies within the Caribbean and more specifically a successful CARICOM. Our need to trade first with each other and then with third countries is no longer open to serious question. Trade provides material means indispensable for economic development. Even more important, trade is the means and vehicle for the dissemination of technological knowledge, the transmission of ideas, the importation of knowhow, skills, managerial talents and entrepreneurship. Trade is also the vehicle for the international movement of capital, especially from the developed

to the developing countries. That is why we provided the framework of a trading community to spearhead our development."

9.25 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am submitting that our views cannot change very drastically from that position. The Caribbean Community is the salvation. The Caribbean Integration Movement, especially in terms of our economic development and trade, is the salvation of the Caribbean people. Any attempt by any Caribbean leader to isolate one particular country from the rest of the Caribbean countries is a disservice to the entire Caribbean.

It was the attempt to isolate Grenada which has lead and assisted in the activities which we are now debating. If Grenada had not been isolated in the manner in which Grenada was isolated, perhaps we would have no need for this Resolution tonight.

Now as we tried to solve the problem in Grenada, the same people, the Chairman of the OECS, the distinguished lady from Dominica, the Prime Minister of Jamaica, and regretfully, by inference our own Prime Minister .....

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Why do you say "by inference"?)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I have to say "by inference". He speaks in such a way that even Ambassadors do not understand, so I am not sure that I understand everything he says.

I am saying and by inference our own Prime Minister, has got themselves into the position now where they are talking about the isolation of Caricom countries. We cannot be so intolerant as to suggest that the Prime Minister of the sovereign State of Trinidad and Tobago does not have the right to hold a position!

We heard today that that perennial nuisance, Sir Eric Gairy, has been considered by an honourable Member as having made a significant contribution to the development of Grenada and he is accorded a certain status when he comes into Barbados. And yet, we are suggesting that because Prime Minister Chambers has taken a position which differs from our own, there is something fundamentally wrong with him!

We say further that the Prime Minister of Guyana has been guilty in this region of a number of activities and utterances which do not please a number of people in this region. They do not please me all the time. But he is the President of Guyana, the same President which our Prime Minister took a plane to go and visit with not so long ago after the Rodney affair.

You see, Sir, we have to be consistent. We cannot pretend, when it suits us, that we are going to have one position and broadcast to the people of this country and make them believe that that is the position coinciding with the position of God, and then, when it suits us, take the opposite position.

Let me give you an example of what I am talking about. Anyone who reads the speech of our Foreign Minister at the United Nations in 1982 and sees the position which he took on Lebanon, must be amazed at the position we took in 1983 when the whole issue is closer to home.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope that what I have said will act as stimulants for persons to do some thinking, and that we do not go head-long, rushing like mad devils, towards the rushing seas of destruction.

I believe that we have to recognise that the Government of the day made a decision. We may not have made the same decision. But this is our country, the people of this country support the decision, the people of Grenada support the decision, and so we are supporting it because we are representatives of those people. But we must not at the same time allow ourselves to become so carried away, allow ourselves to become so enmeshed in our own rhetoric that we do not see the wood from the trees.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

*Applause.*

Hon. H. deB. FORDE (Christ Church West): Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is obvious that the electoral process has more or less enclosed the attitudes of the Opposition. I was very interested in the last statement made by the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taïtt): "We may not have made the same decision.....the people of this country support the decision."

I do detect a certain degree of political opportunism, rather than of conviction, in the attitude certainly as adumbrated by the honourable Member for St. Michael West. I really wonder how seriously the honourable Member's heart is in the rescue mission and all that it involves for the people of the Eastern Caribbean. I really would wish him to say whether or not he considers that the decision was really correct, not whether he may not have supported the decision. This is the time for all good and true men to stand up without reservation and say that the Eastern Caribbean countries took the right step, at the right time, and for the right purpose.

I would not bother too much about what certain well known dictatorships in Latin America, Africa and the Far East think on issues such as this. Most of them have never had a touch of parliamentary democracy, and very

few of them are in a position to talk about free elections in any event.

I hope that, after this debate is finished, the honourable Member will ban his reservations. He has nothing to fear. I do not know why he has any fear at all. He has not got any doctrinal position to defend on this issue. The only thing he has to fear is that he may make the wrong statement and lose his seat in the next election. But I detect that his ears are very finely attuned to what the people of this country have been saying.

I do not want to go over the grounds that have been traversed by other honourable Members in this debate. I probably will look, historically, at what has happened in Grenada and remind honourable Members of this House very briefly of perhaps where the Caribbean countries have fallen down where we as Caribbean people have fallen down and why, to some extent, the events which have occurred in Grenada not only had their genesis a long time ago, but also had their genesis in the silence which manifested itself on the Caribbean scene for too long.

There is no doubt that violence was introduced into the Grenadian political and electoral scene by the last Prime Minister — I am not talking about Maurice Bishop — the last constitutional Prime Minister of Grenada, Sir Eric Gairy. And Grenada has not, even up to now, I believe, recovered from that dose of violent medicine.

9.35 p.m.

This is something for which we have a duty to find a cure. But very few people, because of the protocol, were prepared to speak out on this aspect of West Indian politics which, in my view, should be banned forever from the Caribbean.

We move from that to the stage where there is no doubt that the electoral process in Grenada was not properly run, and the Opposition, both the Grenada National Party and the New Jewel Movement, and the other political parties, felt that they had not got a chance. This in turn led to unorthodox politics, and in turn, it gave people who believe in the Communist doctrines, in Leninist theories, an opportunity to look attractive in the eyes of right thinking people. Eventually, I believe that in 1979 we faced an unprecedented situation in the history of parliamentary government in the Caribbean.

It is too easy for us to gloss over the events of March 13, 1979. At that time, many people in Barbados saw the sole issue as an issue of recognition or non-recognition of the People's Revolutionary Government of Grenada. Those of us who had to deal with the events of

those days saw the wider issue of preserving the democratic traditions of the Eastern Caribbean States, preserving human rights, recognising that dissent had to be allowed a role if we were truly to be free, particularly in small nation states. We also recognised a very serious problem, that small sovereign countries had to defend themselves internally from insurrection and from violent overthrow, and we recognised the inability which we had to get support on the international scene for constitutional government.

If I look back now four years, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it is correct to say a few things went wrong, some of them regionally and some of them in Grenada itself. Whilst we were negotiating with Mr. Bishop for a firm undertaking on elections, unfortunately two of our CARICOM partners were more intent on egocentric trips, rather than looking after the long term interest of the Eastern Caribbean States.

In the case of Guyana, its primary concern was what the Opposition in Guyana was thinking and what was the view of Mr. Jagan and his party. In the case of Jamaica, it was a question of whether they would be the first on the international scene to recognise the new Government and pose with the leader of the Caribbean and of the non-aligned, what they call, progressive forces in the Caribbean. But in the case of St. Vincent, in the case of St. Lucia, in the case of Montserrat, in the case of Antigua and in the case of Dominica, the fundamental question was whether this Government was going to come back to the constitutional path of fair and free elections and maintain the parliamentary democratic traditions.

It was difficult for our neighbours and our colleagues in Guyana and Jamaica to understand that, and the failure in 1979 not only to get a firm undertaking to ensure that Grenada did return to the constitutional path must to a large extent be blamed on the attitude adopted by the then Guyana and Jamaica Governments. And I make no bones in saying that whilst we were negotiating on the position, Mr. Burnham's Government was flying in arms for the then revolution.

At the time I heard quite a lot of criticism on the hesitancy with which the Barbados Government came to recognition, but we had to be explaining Mr. Bishop's own position to the Eastern Caribbean and try to argue that this was a temporary aberration in very difficult circumstances and it would not be long before Grenada returned to constitutional rule.

Perhaps, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there was also one other set of events that I should recall in this House. It is a fact that the suggestion was made to Mr. Bishop and to Mr. Preudhomme that perhaps it would be good to keep Sir Paul Scoon as Her Majesty's representative and as a constitutional link. Mr. Bishop accepted that. I think

the suggestion was first bruited by either the honourable John Compton or Mr. Shridath Ramphal, subscribed to by myself and the Prime Minister and accepted by Mr. Bishop. We tried to persuade Mr. Preudhomme, who was the acting Prime Minister, to tender his resignation to the Governor-General and it was agreed that the Governor-General would have selected one of the then sitting members of Parliament to lead a caretaker Government and elections would be held. Mr. Bishop wanted them in 49 days; we thought that three months were more reasonable.

Unfortunately Mr. Preudhomme did not recognise that he was in no position to negotiate — he was at the barrel of a gun — and he held out then that he had a sacred trust from Mr. Gairy and he was not prepared to do any such thing.

Well, he was given until 6 o'clock that evening. He took legal advice. As I understand the events, some time about 5.50 p.m. he changed his mind, by which time his lawyer rang up Mr. Bishop to be told that Mr. Bishop was not available. So the effort to restore a bit of decency in Caribbean political life was frittered away either on the egocentric trips of a President and a Prime Minister or on the overwhelming lack of ability to analyse the situation by an Acting Prime Minister, and, of course, by those who were close to Bishop, who had a different view of their aims and objects.

At the time this Government took a battering internally, and from some of my friends and colleagues in the Opposition, at the stand we were taking. But we saw clearly then that if the coup in Grenada was not brought back to some proper form, it would be out of step and out of tune in the systems of Government that small States must ultimately rely on for their own salvation and safety. That is why those negotiations of 1979 were difficult.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us state that the position of the Government of Barbados has been consistent since then. The right honourable Prime Minister and myself were in the forefront of calling for electoral politics and parliamentary democracy in Grenada. Very frequently we spoke out to be abused. Sometimes, of course, it got as rough as being called yard fowls, as happened to the right honourable Prime Minister. Relationships were sometimes extremely strained.

We heard from the distinguished Leader of the Opposition that elections were not important in those days, and that was on record — a failure to understand that small fragile democracies like our own cannot afford the luxury of bottling up dissent in our country and ruling by the epigram, I think that is what it is called, "one man one gun". If we go the route one man one gun in

You see, Sir, we have to be consistent. We cannot pretend, when it suits us, that we are going to have one position and broadcast to the people of this country and make them believe that that is the position coinciding with the position of God, and then, when it suits us, take the opposite position.

Let me give you an example of what I am talking about. Anyone who reads the speech of our Foreign Minister at the United Nations in 1982 and sees the position which he took on Lebanon, must be amazed at the position we took in 1983 when the whole issue is closer to home.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope that what I have said will act as stimulants for persons to do some thinking, and that we do not go head-long, rushing like mad devils, towards the rushing seas of destruction.

I believe that we have to recognise that the Government of the day made a decision. We may not have made the same decision. But this is our country, the people of this country support the decision, the people of Grenada support the decision, and so we are supporting it because we are representatives of those people. But we must not at the same time allow ourselves to become so carried away, allow ourselves to become so enmeshed in our own rhetoric that we do not see the wood from the trees.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

*Applause.*

Hon. H. deB. FORDE (Christ Church West): Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is obvious that the electoral process has more or less enclosed the attitudes of the Opposition. I was very interested in the last statement made by the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taïtt): "We may not have made the same decision.....the people of this country support the decision."

I do detect a certain degree of political opportunism, rather than of conviction, in the attitude certainly as adumbrated by the honourable Member for St. Michael West. I really wonder how seriously the honourable Member's heart is in the rescue mission and all that it involves for the people of the Eastern Caribbean. I really would wish him to say whether or not he considers that the decision was really correct, not whether he may not have supported the decision. This is the time for all good and true men to stand up without reservation and say that the Eastern Caribbean countries took the right step, at the right time, and for the right purpose.

I would not bother too much about what certain well known dictatorships in Latin America, Africa and the Far East think on issues such as this. Most of them have never had a touch of parliamentary democracy, and very

few of them are in a position to talk about free elections in any event.

I hope that, after this debate is finished, the honourable Member will ban his reservations. He has nothing to fear. I do not know why he has any fear at all. He has not got any doctrinal position to defend on this issue. The only thing he has to fear is that he may make the wrong statement and lose his seat in the next election. But I detect that his ears are very finely attuned to what the people of this country have been saying.

I do not want to go over the grounds that have been traversed by other honourable Members in this debate. I probably will look, historically, at what has happened in Grenada and remind honourable Members of this House very briefly of perhaps where the Caribbean countries have fallen down where we as Caribbean people have fallen down and why, to some extent, the events which have occurred in Grenada not only had their genesis a long time ago, but also had their genesis in the silence which manifested itself on the Caribbean scene for too long.

There is no doubt that violence was introduced into the Grenadian political and electoral scene by the last Prime Minister — I am not talking about Maurice Bishop — the last constitutional Prime Minister of Grenada, Sir Eric Gairy. And Grenada has not, even up to now, I believe, recovered from that dose of violent medicine.

9.35 p.m.

This is something for which we have a duty to find a cure. But very few people, because of the protocol, were prepared to speak out on this aspect of West Indian politics which, in my view, should be banned forever from the Caribbean.

We move from that to the stage where there is no doubt that the electoral process in Grenada was not properly run, and the Opposition, both the Grenada National Party and the New Jewel Movement, and the other political parties, felt that they had not got a chance. This in turn led to unorthodox politics, and in turn, it gave people who believe in the Communist doctrines, in Leninist theories, an opportunity to look attractive in the eyes of right thinking people. Eventually, I believe that in 1979 we faced an unprecedented situation in the history of parliamentary government in the Caribbean.

It is too easy for us to gloss over the events of March 13, 1979. At that time, many people in Barbados saw the sole issue as an issue of recognition or non-recognition of the People's Revolutionary Government of Grenada. Those of us who had to deal with the events of

those days saw the wider issue of preserving the democratic traditions of the Eastern Caribbean States, preserving human rights, recognising that dissent had to be allowed a role if we were truly to be free, particularly in small nation states. We also recognised a very serious problem, that small sovereign countries had to defend themselves internally from insurrection and from violent overthrow, and we recognised the inability which we had to get support on the international scene for constitutional government.

If I look back now four years, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it is correct to say a few things went wrong, some of them regionally and some of them in Grenada itself. Whilst we were negotiating with Mr. Bishop for a firm undertaking on elections, unfortunately two of our CARICOM partners were more intent on egocentric trips, rather than looking after the long term interest of the Eastern Caribbean States.

In the case of Guyana, its primary concern was what the Opposition in Guyana was thinking and what was the view of Mr. Jagan and his party. In the case of Jamaica, it was a question of whether they would be the first on the international scene to recognise the new Government and pose with the leader of the Caribbean and of the non-aligned, what they call, progressive forces in the Caribbean. But in the case of St. Vincent, in the case of St. Lucia, in the case of Montserrat, in the case of Antigua and in the case of Dominica, the fundamental question was whether this Government was going to come back to the constitutional path of fair and free elections and maintain the parliamentary democratic traditions.

It was difficult for our neighbours and our colleagues in Guyana and Jamaica to understand that, and the failure in 1979 not only to get a firm undertaking to ensure that Grenada did return to the constitutional path must to a large extent be blamed on the attitude adopted by the then Guyana and Jamaica Governments. And I make no bones in saying that whilst we were negotiating on the position, Mr. Burnham's Government was flying in arms for the then revolution.

At the time I heard quite a lot of criticism on the hesitancy with which the Barbados Government came to recognition, but we had to be explaining Mr. Bishop's own position to the Eastern Caribbean and try to argue that this was a temporary aberration in very difficult circumstances and it would not be long before Grenada returned to constitutional rule.

Perhaps, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there was also one other set of events that I should recall in this House. It is a fact that the suggestion was made to Mr. Bishop and to Mr. Preudhomme that perhaps it would be good to keep Sir Paul Scoon as Her Majesty's representative and as a constitutional link. Mr. Bishop accepted that. I think

the suggestion was first bruited by either the honourable John Compton or Mr. Shridath Ramphal, subscribed to by myself and the Prime Minister and accepted by Mr. Bishop. We tried to persuade Mr. Preudhomme, who was the acting Prime Minister, to tender his resignation to the Governor-General and it was agreed that the Governor-General would have selected one of the then sitting members of Parliament to lead a caretaker Government and elections would be held. Mr. Bishop wanted them in 49 days; we thought that three months were more reasonable.

Unfortunately Mr. Preudhomme did not recognise that he was in no position to negotiate — he was at the barrel of a gun — and he held out then that he had a sacred trust from Mr. Gairy and he was not prepared to do any such thing.

Well, he was given until 6 o'clock that evening. He took legal advice. As I understand the events, some time about 5.50 p.m. he changed his mind, by which time his lawyer rang up Mr. Bishop to be told that Mr. Bishop was not available. So the effort to restore a bit of decency in Caribbean political life was frittered away either on the egocentric trips of a President and a Prime Minister or on the overwhelming lack of ability to analyse the situation by an Acting Prime Minister, and, of course, by those who were close to Bishop, who had a different view of their aims and objects.

At the time this Government took a battering internally, and from some of my friends and colleagues in the Opposition, at the stand we were taking. But we saw clearly then that if the coup in Grenada was not brought back to some proper form, it would be out of step and out of tune in the systems of Government that small States must ultimately rely on for their own salvation and safety. That is why those negotiations of 1979 were difficult.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us state that the position of the Government of Barbados has been consistent since then. The right honourable Prime Minister and myself were in the forefront of calling for electoral politics and parliamentary democracy in Grenada. Very frequently we spoke out to be abused. Sometimes, of course, it got as rough as being called yard fowls, as happened to the right honourable Prime Minister. Relationships were sometimes extremely strained.

We heard from the distinguished Leader of the Opposition that elections were not important in those days, and that was on record — a failure to understand that small fragile democracies like our own cannot afford the luxury of bottling up dissent in our country and ruling by the epigram, I think that is what it is called, "one man one gun". If we go the route one man one gun in

the Caribbean, we will be all dictatorships, and the freedoms which the Opposition and which the Government cherish would not be long with us. I have no hesitation at all in saying that.

9.45 p.m.

My colleagues in the Cabinet saw this clearly and I believe we were very saddened, not only by what had happened in 1979, but by the failure to use the occasion for getting Grenada back into the democratic fold.

We come to the events of 1983. Those have been recited in here and they are fresh in the minds of every one of us. I do not want to go through the gruesome details of murder and political intrigue. I want, however, to highlight some of the fallouts and some of the implications for the Caribbean of the events in Grenada.

First, there is no doubt that the communist doctrine will not remain within its own borders. As I understand communism and Marxism, Leninism, the intent is that that philosophy will be spread like christianity, regardless of whether you need it or not, or whether you want it or not. And whilst democratic countries are prepared to allow people who hold those views to express them freely within their own borders, there is no reciprocity of treatment within communist countries for those of us who believe in parliamentary democracy.

I once asked the Foreign Minister of Cuba, Comrade Marietta, whether he would allow me in Havana to talk on the platform about parliamentary democracy and freedom of elections. He laughed and he said, "My friend, my colleague, you know we would allow you almost anything but you are asking the impossible." That was a lesson to me. Obviously, he had a long cigar. he was enjoying himself.

A communist can only believe in democracy and democratic freedom if you give it to him. But there is no way that he is going to give it to you. That is not his intent at all. His intent is his ideology — regardless!

Whilst we appreciate all that Cuba has done, particularly for small States, make no mistake about it, Cuba's interest in the Eastern Caribbean is also an interest of ideologues devoted to spreading communism and changing the system. Ideological pluralism will exist between us and Cuba, but it is not going to exist in Cuba. And the talk about ideological pluralism must be allowed to flourish is to mistake the intent of communism and what it has in train for all of our states. Sure we recognize this, but we must be prepared to argue with it and to safeguard our own freedoms.

In this whole Grenada affair, one must recognize the role of Cuba. It is nonsense only to see it in terms of the superpowers, Hegelianism of the United States and the Soviet Union. That superpower rivalry has come into the

Caribbean, long since and before this day, I think. It will continue to be spread in the whole of the Caribbean and we must be able to contain it and see that we are not swept up in the whirlpool of the battle of the ideology.

There is perhaps, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a much more painful fallout for us out of these events which has not been adverted to in any detail this afternoon. It is probably the fallout of the CARICOM states themselves.

There is no doubt that some of the basic rules of CARICOM relationships have been seriously breached. Not even in the days of the coup of March, 1979 has a CARICOM country ever taken the role of leading international criticism against another CARICOM country. Even although we did not approve of the methods by which Maurice Bishop came to power, none of us, either in the United Nations, in the OAS, at UNESCO, at ILO, ever saw fit to move a Resolution which was critical of the Government and people of Grenada.

It is to the eternal shame of Guyana that they had the indecency, not even to recognize where their true interest is today, that in the United Nations, they could spearhead, deliberately, a Resolution that was critical of the CARICOM States, and pursue their vendetta into UNESCO — to the extent of ensuring that Dominica was not elected to that body.

I make no bones about it, Guyana must be told that there is not one set of rules for Mr. Burnham and another for other people. He must understand quite clearly that if he is going to move Resolutions against the Eastern Caribbean, his human rights policy is not for exposure in any international organization. And he cannot take to scrutiny!

As a matter of fact, it is about time the leaders tell Guyana to clear up its house. Let him have proper electoral politics! Stop the fraudulent election that is keeping him in power! He must be told that, if he wants to remain within the CARICOM fold and make a proper contribution.

If he comes to power fairly and squarely as a Marxist, we have to live with him. We do not have to live with him when he comes to power fraudulently and poses in the international scene as though he is a teacher in moral philosophy. Burnham can teach Barbados, Dominica, St. Lucia, St. Vincent no lessons in morality. And the sooner it is said, and said loudly and understood clearly, the better for all in the Caribbean.

It is a tragedy that matters have to reach this stage. But I do not believe Barbadians owe anybody any

apology on this issue. If Guyana wants to pursue that type of line, then Barbados is not afraid of dealing with it. We would prefer not to. We believe that the interest of the English speaking Caribbean people is much bigger than Mr. Burnham, much bigger than Mr. Bishop, much bigger than Mr. Adams, much bigger than Mr. Coard. We believe that there is a serious problem in preserving CARICOM and Caribbean integration. But at the same time, Barbados cannot always expose the other cheek. There are some times when Barbados must recognize that it has a duty to itself to speak firmly and, if necessary, to take the appropriate action.

I was amazed! I am sure the President of Guyana was mis-represented as talking about people who owe him money. We have carried that country in many ways than one. In fact, part of our own problem here in Barbados is probably due to the fact that we were too generous in helping him in his economic difficulties. The Deputy Prime Minister has sought to help him in his trade difficulties in Europe, in sugar and other things.

I do not know, I believe that the Guyanese appreciate this, but Mr. Burnham does not appreciate this at all. I think he has had and used our friendship, his friendship with the right honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow), his friendship with us, and he has stretched us to the limit. It is about time we sent the signal to him clearly, you either recognize that you have as much interest in showing that you are a true CARICOM partner, or continue to pursue to your continental destiny, of which we used to hear so much in the Forties and the Fifties from you.

There is another lesson for the future that is important for us to learn. Small mini states have blossomed on the international scene in the last fifteen to twenty years at a greater rate than the international community has been able to comprehend. In terms of security, the problems of the small mini states are new. I do not believe that enough attention has been paid to them. They cannot be dealt with in a Security Council that is more intent on exposing the vices of the super-powers, nor indeed in the United Nations, in which it is the thing to appear progressive and to mouth the right words rather than to take the moral and correct decision.

Frequently, in the United Nations, when I spoke on behalf of the Government and people of Barbados, I used to have to criticise both sides. One of the tragedies of that great institution, which in the Forties held so much hope for mankind, is that it has become an institution for posit and taking up positions, rather than dealing with issues. The amount of paper, the amount of verbiage, the lack of action, the lack of determination of the United Nations today is, I think, a burden for the small states. And we wonder how long the world can go

on with a situation where once you mouth the right words, you are recognized as contributing to progressive forces; but if you do the right thing, you are supposed to be retrogressing.

How many of them can teach us about democracy? Even with the limitations of our own system, which is not perfect, which is not ideal and which there is room for improvement, how many of them in the United Nations can tell us that they run their affairs better than we do? I am amazed that I can find countries in Latin America asking Sir Paul Scoon to hold elections, when they do not even allow trade unions to function. Can you imagine Poland voting for an election and criticizing the actions of the Eastern Caribbean States, and at the same time really keeping an independent trade union completely under the sickle and the hammer? Lech Walensa must be showing the ironic sneer that he is capable of. Think of Afghanistan, where the Soviet power extends to the drawingroom of everyone. That country voted against Barbados, Dominica, St. Vincent, St. Lucia on an issue such as this.

I do not pay any regard to the United Nations vote at all on this issue. I know my distinguished and erudite colleague, the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) has said that it is something to which we should pay attention. In passing, let me say that you could not provide the diplomatic effort for the Security Council debate whilst the action was going on. But I do not think that Barbadians or Eastern Caribbean people should be too concerned with the state of play at the United Nations. Our diplomats will tell you that on the floor of the Assembly, outside the formal voting, many of the people who got up and condemned us by their vote were telling us in the corridors that we did the right thing. That is supposed to be political lie or the hypocrisy of some international nations.

We small States have to recognize the double standards, the double talking, that goes on in these institutions. And what we must recognize is that when our vital interests are at stake, we cannot listen only to the votes that are tallied up on the notice board in the United Nations. We must keep our eyes firmly on the principles to which we hold, and do our best, in a world that is not hospitable to the small countries, to uphold those principles and to fight for them with all of the respect that these poor countries deserve, because they are truly free, freer than some of the monolithic powers that stroll across the world scene.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have no difficulty in supporting this Resolution. Barbados has always been in the fore-front of fighting for freedom, whether we were fighting the colonial masters, whether we were fighting for the United States in their War of Independence for the right to carry our goods in the ships we wanted to, whether

we were fighting against slavery, whether we were fighting to uphold democracy in other countries, whether we were fighting the world wars against Naziism, even although people laughed at us and said that we said, "Go ahead Britain; we are behind you." That may give cause for division.

This country's history is studded with people who have made a contribution in defense of the fundamental principles which we hold so dear. There is only one thing that I regret sometimes, that the good Lord did not make us as big as Guyana, with the resources of Venezuela. Then, perhaps, the Caribbean and Latin America would be truly free, with the spirit and determination of this great country of ours.

#### SUSPENSION

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, it is now 10.05 p.m. and I beg to move that this House be suspended until 3.00 p.m. tomorrow.

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

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

#### On Resumption:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have two Resolutions which I would like to give notice of. I crave the indulgence of the House to give notice of the two Resolutions now. We will have to revert to the appropriate item under Orders of the day.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: As I understand it, Government can give notice of any matter at any time which is convenient. If there are no objections to notice being given, leave will be granted.

#### GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I take it that leave is granted, Sir. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$634,150 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1983-84 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1983-84 No. 10 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$166,300 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to Supplement the Estimates 1983-84, Part II Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1983-84 No. 11 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Those are the two Resolutions, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take it that we are resuming the matter under discussion from yesterday.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: That is my understanding, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have been allowing Members to speak on either side of the House in order to give a balance to the debate which is before the Chamber. I believe the last person to speak was a Member from this side. If there are no other persons wishing to exercise their right to speak, I am prepared to put the question.....

*Aside.*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: But obviously if you are speaking, somebody should indicate that they want to speak.

Mr. L. A. WEEKES (St. Michael North West): Mr. Deputy Speaker.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have been informed that the technicians have made connection with the radio system in the House and there is no necessity to take note of the two standing microphones.

Mr. L. A. WEEKES: Much has been said on the debate so far on the question of the intervention in Grenada. I would like to begin by saying that if we in the Caribbean believe in one's destiny and one people, I believe that as a people it is very much impossible for us to ignore the events in Grenada over the past few weeks. I stand by the statement made by my own Party in which we share the concern of many citizens of Grenada.

I believe the controversy will continue as to whether the information given is accurate, but I will stand by that information which we received in this Honourable Chamber yesterday. With that in mind, I have no intention then of repeating those statements, or even the historical and legal background of this particular matter. I want to spend a bit more time on the much more serious aspects that are likely to arise from such an event.

Where there is action, Sir, there is always a reaction, and I am sure that this will not be the end of the matter.

I am almost certain that there are likely to be other chain reactions to whatever has taken place and whatever has been done to try to assist in this particular problem.

This intervention has now added another dimension to West Indian politics, which I think many of us were not prepared for. I believe it is about the first situation which has arisen in such a particular manner. And I am sure that the efforts to try to bring some measure of happiness and co-operation to the area — the intervention — may not signal the end of one problem, but it can mark the beginning of many more problems, which I believe are likely to be with us for a long time.

I want to say from the outset that the destiny of us in the Caribbean does not necessarily lie with the ultimate right or the ultimate might, but I believe our solution lies in a unique approach which must bring to bear the existing conditions and the wishes of the people, so that in the long term we might be able to dwell together in unity. I believe that ought to be the very purpose of such an intervention, that we may not become more divided but we may be driven closer together.

I want to state, in contrast, that one does not accept that you can impose any solution, but whatever is done must be done with the Grenadian people at heart. Certainly, like many other ex-colonial territories, independence has been misused, and from the information available, one gets the impression that such is the case in Grenada, where there was much suffering, where people actually lost some of their freedom and we had some deaths in the midst of it. This then, in my view, encouraged the intervention, to return some measure of constitutional government, to the country. It is on this basis, bearing in mind the possibility of the deterioration of human rights, that I will support a Resolution of this nature.

I could never countenance that the purpose of a Resolution of this sort is an opportunity to gain any political mileage. It would be very unfortunate if we took an event like this, in which we are supposed to think solemnly and deeply, and become deeply concerned about that country, and seek to do that. So I take it that this Resolution will not be seen, or even develop, into a kind of discussion where one feels that we are seeking to build an image, a Party image or any such interest. I believe, Sir, that if we are genuinely interested we must remove from our minds any such local inclinations, but be concerned seriously with the development and the possible outcome, and, in the final analysis, what is probably best for the whole Caribbean.

3.10 p.m.

I have not on many occasions entered into debates dealing with defence of any country. But once again we see, as an ex-colonial territory, the heads of some armies taking to themselves the serious attempt to destroy what

we have known to be democratic institutions. Bearing in mind, Sir, that one of the OECS countries has made sure that it has disbanded one of its forces, this ought to be a lesson for some of us, because Grenada gives us an opportunity once again to look at the role of such institutions and how useful and how beneficial they can be.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it comes to my mind that during the time of the intervention when the local forces were in the country, they were referred to as policemen. I am very concerned that in a serious problem such as this, in which we are attempting to bring some stability in a country, the local forces can only be termed as policemen.

I do not believe that the Government of the day in Barbados will try to have two Police Forces in one country, and I feel that the time has come, in the light of this particular problem, to assess the role which any Defence Army in these small countries can play. They are totally ineffective, Sir. I believe that good judgment must have prevailed. I do not have any information as to how the intervention was mounted, what kind of inside information they had, but it was clearly demonstrated that as small as Grenada is, none of these local forces would have been able even to scratch the surface to have the kind of successful operation that I understand had taken place in Grenada. I want our Government to take a very serious look at the expenditure which we have been spending on our Defence Force and come to a reasonable conclusion as to what is its role. We cannot defend ourselves with these small armies.

Another question arises as well, Sir. It just happened that the States which were involved in this intervention were States interested in democratic government. Had we had a different situation, possibly the intervention of another power, the result might have been different. I am saying all of this to make this most important point: Was the intervention intended only to restore democracy in Grenada? Or is it another way of trying to say to the people of the Caribbean: "We are not interested in other ideologies and we are going to make sure that this does not happen?"

I have no deep interest in these matters, no more than that I have seen democracy practised in Barbados for as long as I have lived. I have accepted it as my way of life, and I am satisfied that in my own country, if it became threatened, I too would do as much as I could to make sure that this kind of form of government be retained.

We must realise that not everyone wishes things alike. Many of these ex-colonial territories have suffered at the time of gaining independence for the lack of proper financial assistance, and in many instances, they were left without proper infrastructural development. It is because of some of the difficulties, the low standard of

living in some of these countries, that people become attracted to what they believe would offer them a happy living.

The one thing we have got to keep bearing in mind is that there will always be people who would be satisfied to take an opposite view, an opposite stand, and they will fight for it. My colleague yesterday made a strong case that in a democracy there are minorities, but I am satisfied that where the majorities have been able to fulfill some of the aspirations of our own people, the minorities will never be a threat to us.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this intervention will also bring about other problems in other areas. We have already heard about some of the ripples that have reached into CARICOM, and we already believe that if quick action is not taken, we may very well in the end defeat the very purpose for which I believe the intervention could have served, and I make a strong plea that we endeavour as hard as we can to make whatever institutions we had before the intervention function effectively, and continue to do so in the interest of the region.

I also feel here at home that, in as much as there is almost total support for the action, many of us will not be blinded by certain of the consequences that are likely to spin off from such. We have taken a stand which will bring us into focus in the world bodies, and some will probably be thinking how best to give us a hard time in those areas. We at home believe that the Caribbean should be a peaceful place and should not be a place for war-mongers, and we believe that every effort should be made to make sure that it remains a peaceful place.

We have heard very often about other problems which I would not want to say could be alarming, but I would tone my words to the point where we must be vigilant that saboteurs may not be willing to prove that such action is wrong, and they are likely to do everything to give that impression. This also means that our security in general must be tightened to the point where we are satisfied that we can deal with any of the problems that have arisen.

3.20 p.m.

The Government must make sure that we have the feeling in our own country that we are still liked by our neighbours, that the present impasse is only a passing phase of this problem, and that in the long run, we may find it comfortable to dwell among our neighbours in peace and happiness and to produce the kind of image that is so vital for us in this area.

I support the Resolution because of the seriousness of the problem that had developed in Grenada. Any human loving person could hardly sit idly by and allow, without even raising a voice, such an inhumane act.

I hope that this will be an opportunity for us to watch the developments through change, because change is something which is constant, and that we will handle the changes in such a way that we may prevent a similar occurrence in any one of our existing countries if we can.

It is with those remarks that I hope very much that the effects of this rescue operation, whatever unpleasant effects it might have had, may only last in the interim, but in the long term, we should be able to see the benefits of the sacrifices that have been made.

Thank you.

*Applause.*

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW (St. Michael South East): Mr. Deputy Speaker, on March 13, 1979, we heard the news coming out of Grenada that a group of men, some politicians and a number of Grenadians, had seized power from what they regarded as a wicked Government, headed by Eric Gairy.

We all listened patiently. Some of us welcomed the events of that morning because it was felt that tyranny should not be allowed to rule; and it was anticipated that some form of democratic government, surely some acceptable government, would have prevailed in the beautiful country of Grenada. The Caribbean Governments hesitated a bit, but in the end gave their support to the new Government.

During the years 1979–1983, the eyes of the world watched Grenada and some people felt that, because they had heard of the progress made during those years by that Government, it was some sort of model for us in the Caribbean and elsewhere to follow. But progress, or the return of progress, was not all.

What we have seen, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is a situation where the group of men who formed the Government could not live with themselves and allowed power to get to their heads. The events which led up to the intervention by a multinational force, assisted by the United States Government, showed that these people who believed in an ideology did not take into consideration the wishes and aspirations of their own people. The infighting among themselves culminated in the destruction of their membership. It is now history that the leader of that Government perished at the hands of his colleagues.

What we must reflect on during the aftermath of the crisis in Grenada is what really contributed to climax that particular situation, and what we must do to avoid a similar situation. We must take this as a lesson and learn from it so that we who survive, the Governments, the politicians and the people would do everything in their power to avoid such a calamitous situation.

The doctrine of democratic socialism is one which I have heard from the mouth of some fraudulent politicians on that side. I have heard how the doctrine of democratic socialism has led to the situation in Grenada, how it was practised and how it was supposed to be brought about, a system where the leadership of the Government should be shared. That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, started and triggered off that terrible situation. 3.30 p.m.

Having heard members on that side voice their interest in what is called democratic socialism, I do hope for my good and for this country's good that during the course of this debate they will seek to dissociate themselves completely from that form of government or doctrine. As I understand it, and as we have all come to understand it, it is the sort of government where power must be shared, and we have seen that where attempts were made in Grenada to share power that everything collapsed and brought about a crisis.

I do not understand or know what it all means, but I do hope that I will be hearing a total denunciation or dissociation from that form of philosophy or doctrine. You can call it scientific socialism or whatever. I know what a large number of people in Barbados and I have heard.

But we must look at other things, the actual intervention by the foreign forces into that country. Some people have criticised the intervention on the grounds that countries must be left to settle their differences. But we must be guided by something other than that, a principle which has been bequeathed to us by the Supreme Being, to point out and to intervene when we see wrong things being done. We could not be called a Christian people, a God-fearing people, if we were to see wrong things happening to our neighbours and did not raise a hand to assist them.

We feel that as Barbadians, as a Government, we could not sit idly by and allow murderers to continue in our neighbouring country of Grenada: allow the brutal murder of Cabinet Ministers and a Prime Minister; then the people of Grenada subjected to an almost inhumane monster-like regime under Austin and the like; confining people to their homes for hours, the like of which we have never heard; people unable to go on the streets and being threatened that should they go on the streets they would be shot on sight.

I am sure we all were moved. Tension ripped Barbadians and Barbados and the entire world that was listening. We could not understand what was going on, and alas we heard of several innocent Grenadians being murdered, cut down by military tanks. Blood flowed in the streets of Grenada and Grenada mourned the loss of sons and daughters. The country was in absolute chaos, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the world expected more grief to follow.

And events unfolding themselves during the past couple of days revealed that there were moves afoot to extinguish a number of persons who were held in detention by that wicked and vicious regime.

Amidst all this, we in Barbados and in the CARICOM region became more and more alarmed, and in an effort to save our brethren and to save the lives of several people, the Governments of the OECS, Jamaica, Barbados and the United States decided to go to the rescue of the Grenadian people, invited by a Grenadian, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the man responsible for making law and order, in whose hands the destiny of the Grenadian people lay. The Governor-General extended an invitation to these forces and they responded in a manner befitting decent, honourable people, people interested in mankind and in humanity, and in seeing that injustice does not continue or is not allowed to continue to prevail.

Hence, we have a situation now where some of those persons who have been critical of the forces going in and assisting our brothers in Grenada are now back-peddling. They are now saying that they support the intervention. We must ask ourselves a number of questions. Why did some of these so-called spokesmen, or bodies, or Heads of Governments, or spokesmen for their countries not wait or ask simple questions before they put their mouths in it. After all, we who were near to the action, we who were near as neighbours, understood what was going on. They could have sought to ask us, but unfortunately they proceeded to voice their disapproval. But we have seen them changing their tune rapidly, and they now support the assistance by the forces.

Yesterday I listened very attentively to some of the speakers on this particular Resolution. I was somewhat amazed, somewhat confused; confused in the sense that I could not understand how several months ago during the debates in this Honourable Chamber we had honourable Members from that side being severely critical of allocations for the Defence Force. We had heard them time after time being critical of the Defence Force, although they were the initiators of such a Defence Force.

Although yesterday one spokesman for the Opposition did claim that they did support the action, I must ask myself one or two questions, because I am aware that a statement was made by the Opposition Party saying that all avenues must be explored, including international support, to bring that regime in Grenada to its knees, I did not hear any specific mention of whether it was to be military force, or verbal force at the U.N. or some other international body. I did not hear that.

What I want to go on record as saying is that I have heard several organisations and Governments, including

the spokesman for the Opposition, condemning the murder of Maurice Bishop and his Cabinet colleagues, but I have also heard most of these organisations come out after the mission to Grenada saying how they supported the forces and the mission in relieving the Grenadian people.

3.40 p.m.

We had not heard the members from that side. It was only yesterday that we heard them. What Barbados expected from the Opposition on this occasion was they coming out and saying, "We support the action taken by our Government." The people do not want to hear that they made a wishy washy statement, which could have meant anything. We wanted to hear them. This is a time when we all should realize that there should be a national effort.

(Mr. P. M. GREAVES: We wanted to hear you too.)

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: No one has anything to lose. It is not an issue on which the Government or the Opposition should hope to gain any political mileage. We have gone beyond that. Therefore, we would have expected them to come out and say how they support the efforts of all concerned.

Turning to the question of the Defence Force, let it not be denied by them that they have contributed to the abuse and the criticisms levelled against the Defence Force in Barbados. We can now see who do not have the foresight and who have the foresight, because were it not for the good leadership and the foresight demonstrated by our Prime Minister and the Government, we would not have been able to assist in any rescue mission in Grenada. We contended and we maintained that we should have a Defence Force well-trained and well-equipped to meet any emergencies. And we have seen now where our contention and our policies are justified.

But we must also look at another thing. Yesterday I heard persons seeking to condemn the Prime Minister for having had to denounce an Ambassador on a particular matter. But what one must also bear in mind is this that the Prime Minister is held in very high esteem around the entire world, and by countries that matter, countries that practise democracy.

We do not mind the criticisms coming from those authoritarian Governments, those dictatorships who do not have any respect for humanity or the democratic principles that we cherish for a lifetime, and that we have now come to realize are part of our heritage. The countries which matter believe the Prime Minister; those who did not believe have now come to believe and understand that he was telling the truth and that Barbados' position was well represented.

We must ask ourselves another question. Who have contributed to some of these criticisms and some of the

things that have been hurled at us? I remember a statement coming from the Opposition — I stand corrected when I say from the Leader of the Opposition, who promised the country that should the Democratic Labour Party be re-elected that they will bring the Constitution of Barbados from the United States.

(Mr. P. M. GREAVES: From the IMF)

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Barbados, under this Government, is not an appendage of the United States. The United States recognizes Barbados as an independent and sovereign country. This country's present leadership has not mortgaged its manhood or its statesmanlike qualities, like some leaders have done in the past.

Our leader was able to discuss the rescue mission with the President of the United States of America, and he responded. I am tempted to say that I doubt very much that after the criticisms and abuse hurled at that Government by the Opposition in the past, whether they would have been able to send a representative to sit down with President Reagan or a representative of the United States Government and would have had any positive response from them. We must look at all of this.

Barbados is involved, and was involved, in that rescue mission. We need not apologize for it. The Grenadian people have demonstrated, they have said loudly and in a clear voice, that they welcome the Barbadian forces, they welcome the OECS forces, they welcome the Jamaican forces and they welcome the United States forces. The rescue mission was not only to restore democratic government, but to free those Grenadians from what could have been perpetual bondage, under the hands of some military monsters.

We must see this whole situation in the context in which it should be placed. We must not forget that this is a unique situation. It was not, as some people sought to make it out, an unnecessary intervention, but one based on the love of humanity, the love of freedom, the love for seeing people being able to express their wishes and to have their voices heard, the right to assembly, the right to demonstrate, the right to tolerance. All of these things are what motivated the combined forces to go into Grenada.

I regret, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this had to happen in Grenada. I regret it had to happen with people whom I knew. I sat with them. I knew almost all of the revolutionary leaders. I came into contact with them during the times I had the honour to represent my country at international meetings, even going to Grenada on three or four occasions.

One could not recognize the monsters in some of these men. But on several occasions when I had the privi-

lege to speak to some of the very Cabinet colleagues and some of the persons closely connected to the Cabinet colleagues of the then Prime Minister, they did say that if there were going to be any trouble, if there were going to be any counter revolution, the man Coard was certainly the man to bring it about. It was no secret. They knew that the eternal wrangling would have prevailed.

Before I sit, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to say that we have before us a terrible situation. It is hoped that the people of Grenada can once more settle down and address themselves to re-establishing their confidence and rebuilding their country. Every encouragement, every help should be given to those people. They deserve a better break in life.

3.50 p.m.

It is my fervent wish and hope that the rescue mission would have served to help them to earn the respect and development that they richly deserve. I hope that those persons who continue to lurk in the hills and about and outside of Grenada who give comfort to the Guerilla movement, to the destabilisers, to those anti-democratic ideas and concepts, will on this occasion leave Grenada and allow Grenada to join us and enjoy the democratic way of life.

The peoples of the Caribbean should be living in a zone of peace and tranquility. That was the wish of the former Prime Minister of that country of Grenada. That should be the objective of all Caribbean leaders. We have an opportunity to effect that zone of peace. Let us all, whether we have other political, religious or cultural persuasions, not forget that Grenadians need our support.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member will have to wind up his speech.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: We all should continue to work towards assisting them in re-establishing a proper democracy under which they will be happy to live in. We who have gone to their rescue, and those who did not but are well wishers, will be happy to see them return to a better standard of living and a country full of peace and tranquility.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

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

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on my way to this Honourable House, I said to myself that speaking today would be an easy matter, because those persons who know me very well know that I have a gut feeling about the intervention in Grenada. They know

that I support that mission wholeheartedly. After listening to the speeches in here yesterday, I was still of the opinion that the speech would have been an easy speech to make. But having heard the honourable Member who just sat down, I have to say that he has made my speech very, very difficult.

Until he spoke, the debate was, in my opinion, on a very high level. But the honourable Member who just sat down, despite the fact that he stated that he does not believe that political mileage should not be made out of the debate, then proceeded to do nothing else than score political points on the Democratic Labour Party. I would be failing in my duty if I did not respond to some of the errors and misrepresentations made by the honourable Member.

He went down the line on democratic socialism. He said that he has heard Members over here on my side saying that they believe in democratic socialism. I have heard Members over there saying that they believe in democratic socialism, but that is not the point. The point is there is nothing wrong with democratic socialism as long as it is doing what it is supposed to do, that is, looking after the masses. What is wrong with democratic socialism, communism, capitalism, as long as it is looking after the masses?

What I find very strange, Mr. Deputy Speaker is that the youth arm of that Party to which that Member belongs, the League of young socialists, is a member of Socialist International. I cannot understand how he can relate to these two things; how he can go down the line on democratic socialism, and his party is a member of the Socialist International. Your youth arm is the League of Young Socialists! You have been going overboard!

He said that the speech made by the leader of my party was a "wishy-washy" speech. I would just like to say one thing, and I will quote here just part of a sentence.....

(Asides)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just a minute, please. Irrespective of whether any speech has been made in this House no Member of this House is entitled to quote from a newspaper report. You cannot use a newspaper to quote in this Assembly. Those are the Rules of the House. We do not know whether the reporter has reported exactly what was said in here, and the Rules specifically prohibits quotes from a newspaper.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: The President of my Party said: "The DLP will support any measures calculated to bring the criminals to justice." That is what the President

of my Party said. But what you have to understand is, having made that statement, the Barbados Labour Party is the Government of the day, the Government of the day has to decide what measures they should use. We cannot tell you what measure to use. We say that we will support any measure. You have to decide on the measure. That is the difference. Do you want us to tell you that we are going to support the measure and then turn around and tell you what measure to use as well? We are not the governing party.

I go further. He said that he heard from Members on my side that if we regain the government, we will bring back the Constitution from the United States. That statement was never made by my Party. What the President of my Party said was that if the Democratic Labour Party regained the government of the country that they will bring back the Constitution from the I.M.F. There is a difference.

The honourable Member, in his effort to discredit the Democratic Labour Party, made a lot of misrepresentations and errors. I just thought I should set those things straight.  
4.00 p.m.

As I said at the beginning, supporting this Resolution, as far as I am concerned, is a gut feeling and is easy. It has nothing to do with Party or anything, I know how I feel. But I have to make a few criticisms of the Government first.

The honourable Member who just sat down would realise that if Parliament had been called early to debate this issue, then the outside world would have known before that there is unanimity in the Barbados Parliament for this action. That is one of the criticisms I have. I believe that Parliament should have been called before.

I too do not believe that in an issue like this anyone should be trying to score political points or mileage on anyone else. I also believe that more information should have been given to those 109 countries who voted in the United Nations against the intervention in Grenada. I do not believe, and I am not saying, that you should give them the secret information, because whenever you are carrying out any military adventure, there are things which are secret that you cannot even divulge to other members in your Cabinet. But I am saying that if certain information, which has been forthcoming since that vote in the United Nations, had been forthcoming before, I am sure that 109 countries would not have voted against the intervention.

I am against any party celebrating — and when I say party I mean holding parties — anything that has happened in Grenada, whether we think it was a success or not. I

believe that at a time like this, there should not be any celebration of anything. I believe that a time like this is too serious, that it is a time for sober reflection and thinking about the future, what could happen and what is likely to happen. I do not believe that this is a time for any back tapping.

The final criticism I would like to make of the Government — and I have made it in here several times — is that whenever one of the Members on my side gets up and makes a criticism, the governing party seems to think that we are unpatriotic or that we are getting at somebody. I do not believe that this is so. I believe we have a job to do, and I believe that to every coin there are two sides. I also believe we are to search out the different angles in certain things and comment on them. We are not getting on anybody, this is genuine criticism, and the Government has to understand that, as long as it is the governing party in Barbados, it will be criticised. If we were over there, we would be criticised. That is what I have to say.

I get, finally, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to what I intended to say from the beginning, before I was sidetracked by the honourable member who just sat down.

I will start by saying that as far as I am concerned I have one group of people to please, and that group of people are the people of St. Philip South. I do not have to please the Marxists, nor do I have to please what the Marxists call the imperialists — only the people of St. Philip South.

It is unfortunate that previous United States policies of intervention in countries have been against the wishes of the people. Whether they were wrong or right, they were against the wishes of the people. For example, it was done in Haiti against the wishes of the people; in Chile, although it was not directly from the United States, it was CIA instigated, it was against the wishes of the people; and recently in Iran the United States were supporting the Shah against the wishes of the Iranian people — although, I may add, that subsequent events have proved that the Ayatullah seems to be a hundred times worse than the Shah. That does not matter, the point is that the people wanted the Ayatullah and the United States was still supporting the Shah.

That is why I say that in this issue it is unfortunate that previous United States policies were against the wishes of the people. I believe the Grenada situation is different. I believe that, for the first time in a very long time, the United States intervention in Grenada was in agreement with what the people wanted. When ten thousand people can demonstrate and march on behalf of one man — and let me say from the outset that I hold no brief for Mr. Maurice Bishop — in the manner in which the ten thousand demonstrated that they wanted

him, there can be no doubt that the person they wanted was Maurice Bishop.

The people decided that they wanted Mr. Bishop, but the people who were against him murdered him. What that did to the Caribbean was to bring a new dimension to politics in the Caribbean. Since that action, it means that political differences are no longer settled by talking, reasoning or things of that nature, but political differences have to be settled by brutal murder. I am saying, and this is why I support the intervention totally, the moment that Maurice Bishop was murdered, and the other persons with him, Grenada had returned to the jungle and those people wanted liberating. That is my view.

In this context, I find the statement of the Caribbean Conference of Churches given out immediately after the intervention, to say the least, very very strange, because part of that statement said that the people of Grenada should have been allowed to decide what they wanted. I would like to ask the Caribbean Conference of Churches; how were the people in Grenada to decide what they wanted when, just the day before, ten thousand of them marched to demonstrate what they wanted and were shot at, and their leaders executed? How were they now to decide what they wanted?

What is happening, and what has been happening in Barbados for a long time, is that from the time Barbadians hear the word "church", you have to keep off. If you say anything about the church, you are gone! You know what I mean. But we are beginning to see now what the Bible said, that there is going to be false prophets, and there are a lot of false prophets today masquerading as church leaders.

I am making no bones about what I am saying. There is not everybody who is in the cloth that is of the cloth. Barbadians have to get up and understand that everybody who masquerades as a church leader, and as a preacher, and as a reverend, is not fit to be that sort of person, is not fit to have that calling.

What has happened with the Grenada situation since the intervention is that no longer are people thinking about the people of Grenada. It has suddenly become a matter of ideology. If you support the intervention, you are an imperialist. If you are against the intervention, you are Marxist.

4.10 p.m.

No longer are people thinking about the welfare of Grenadians. The Marxists are thinking that their system has taken a setback, a massive setback. But if you support the intervention, you are imperialist; that is the word!

I have said it once, and I will say it forever, I have no one to please, no Marxists to please. I am nobody's puppet, but I believe in freedom; I believe in complete freedom. I do not understand why it is that if Marxism is so good, we do not hear about anyone risking their lives running from Barbados and running to Cuba; why you do not hear of anybody running from the Western democracy and running to Russia — but you hear about people scaling the Berlin wall and being shot at. Only two days ago you heard about a pilot who flew his plane out of Red China into Taiwan, and when he landed, he only had one minute left of fuel in the plane. But you do not hear it in the other direction.

When I am speaking to the Marxists, they have to tell me where they are coming from. Why is it that, to the Marxists, everything as far as the United States is concerned is wrong and nothing as far as Russia is concerned is wrong?

I recall that about three days before the intervention or the mission in Grenada, more than 250 service men of the United States were killed in Beirut. From the moment that the United States went into Grenada, there was not a single word again about the massacre in Beirut, not another word. Right down the line newspapers were filled up with what is happening in Grenada! No one mentioned the 250 service-men that were killed in Beirut.

If the Marxists want themselves to be taken seriously, you have to criticise Russia, the leftist policy, just as much as you criticise the United States because both systems have their short-comings, both of them.

The Russians went into Poland in 1956. The Marxists did not say anything! They went into Czechoslovakia in 1968, and to Ducek's undying credit, he told the masses not to resist them. If the masses had resisted, thousands would have been killed, as they were in Poland, when Imre Nagy was executed as well. They went into Afghanistan! Did you hear the masses cry out that it was wrong? They just shot down a 747 jet with over 250 people in it! Did you hear any of them say that it was wrong?

So you have to understand where you are coming from. That is why I say that this Resolution should never have gone down to that level to which it was taken. As long as you are thinking about the people in Grenada, there should be a gut feeling, and it should never descend to that level.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have no qualms at all about the Resolution. I have said it from the beginning. I gave my view at my branch meeting about three days after the intervention so that the constituents in St. Philip would know where I stand on the issue, and I believe this Parliament knows where I stand on the issue.

Thank you very much.

*Applause.*

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON (St. Michael West Central):  
Mr. Deputy Speaker, we in the Caribbean, small, insignificant, mainly black, share a common heritage, a heritage which I sometimes fear we have never fully understood.

I say this because wherever there is a history of free democratic institutions, particularly in an emerging territory like the Caribbean, the tendency frequently is to take that freedom for granted and to indulge oneself in a sense of ease that would suggest that there is nothing in the democratic system which we need to safeguard. We hold the view that in as much as we have had a very long period of tranquility and political quiet in this hemisphere, that that freedom, which we have cherished over 300 years, is never in any great jeopardy.

In 1976 when this Party came into power, it was difficult for Barbadians to conceptualise something which it was trying to say to them, that there was a very significant wind of change blowing in this area, a wind which we were not accustomed to feeling. It was not the trade winds with which we have become familiar, it was the first harbinger of a far more devastating terror that was to threaten this hemisphere.

Subsequent to the Cubana disaster, we had instances where some persons, who had been characterised as insane, made incursions into this area with stated intentions of disturbing the political institutions of our country.

I do not believe that today we would have the same difficulty convincing Barbadians that the freedom which we hold, and which we have enjoyed for these many years, is a freedom which we will now have seriously to regard as something to be cherished very, very dearly indeed.

In 1979, when Maurice Bishop's group seized power in Grenada, some persons who had felt that Eric Gairy posed a serious threat to this region lauded his removal and gave legitimacy to the Maurice Bishop regime. I have never been able myself to regard Maurice Bishop as anything but what I have always maintained him to be, that is a villain who was prepared to use force to disturb the legitimately constituted Government of Grenada.

When we are dealing with matters of principle, we have to come firmly to the conclusion that in no circumstances can we say that the ends justify the means. The fact that we were able to feel comfortable or to some measure be comfortable with the Maurice Bishop regime, said in effect that we were unhappy with Eric Gairy. But the fact that we were unhappy about Eric Gairy did not mean that the method employed by Maurice Bishop to remove him from power was a legitimate method.

4.20 p.m.

I think that we have to be in a position to call transgression or error by its right name. I do not believe that wrong can ever be right, and in the circumstances I believe that the fact that the events in October, just a couple of weeks ago, happened, is a clear indication of the fact that we have to be extremely careful when we seek to welcome new episodes in the history of mankind.

I do not think that there is a single student, who has ever done particularly the history of other social sciences, who has not at some stage been exposed to Marxist concepts. It is part of the learning process that professors will introduce their students to, new concepts in socio-political institutions, and it is a measure of one's development and maturity when he is able to assimilate these new tenets of learning without necessarily himself becoming a convert.

What happens when people expose themselves or are exposed to these concepts, is that frequently they do not learn enough about the subject, and a little learning has always been a dangerous thing. On the other hand, there are some persons who are intellectually naive. As a consequence, they embrace to their bosom every new concept that emerges and they seek to posture as intellectuals by spouting new theories about which they have not paused long enough to learn sufficient. These are what I would like to describe as the impressionistic pseudo-intellectuals.

There are these persons, impressionistic, half-learned and, as it turns out now, godless, who come back to their countries and unleash their new concepts on unsuspecting persons whose trust they start off with, and they betray the trust which is invested in them. These are little Caesars, thirsty for power and stopping at nothing to impress upon the minds of those around them that they were born to lead.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin) seldom speaks anything in this House that is worthy of note, but today he made a point which I feel.....I am sorry, the honourable Member for St. Philip North always speaks things worthy of note. I was referring to his colleague from St. Philip South (Mr. H. A. Blackman). The honourable Member for St. Philip South speaks some strong doses of nonsense in this House from time to time, but today he departed slightly by making a point which I feel is worthy of some notice.

The point he made was that people who claim to have studied Marxist concepts never seem to be able to be affected by the fact that they cannot point to one model of Marxism so potent and so convincing in its operational style as to allow people to freely gravitate towards it. You will always discover that, where Marxism abound, there is always a strong exodus or tendency towards exodus, and the only way you can stabilise that tendency

is by use of force. On the other hand, democratic institutions guarantee a measure of freedom, which even the Marxists relish, and they would leave their bastion of Marxism, leave their barbed wire behind, and gravitate towards unfenced boundaries of democracy.

Sir, I am a tolerant man, an extremely tolerant man normally, but I have absolutely no tolerance for Marxism, and I make no apologies to any man when I say that the freedoms that people in democratic societies have fought hard to preserve and to place at the disposal of its citizens and the rest of the world, those freedoms and that environment ought not easily to be offered to persons to come in and sow seeds of discord that would seek to undermine and to destroy the very foundations of that democracy which we all ought to cherish.

Some time ago, we had an expatriate, a young man, from the islands describing himself as a scientific socialist, a euphemistic name for communist. We have some others who describe themselves as journalists. That, unfortunately, seems to be becoming a new spawn or nomenclature for communism as well.

I have to mention to the people at the Press Table that I am not by any means casting any shadow upon that noble profession, but there are a number of masqueraders who seek to clothe themselves in the cloak of journalism to speak all kinds of undisciplined utterances when we seek to describe the frontiers of our freedom. Those persons, Sir, in my view, must not be offered succour in these hallowed environments in which we have the freedom to operate.

I would like to suggest that we are in a society that is free, and I believe that when you look at the situation in Grenada, there ought not to be any question in the minds of any Barbadians that we live in a free society, with freedom to criticise, freedom to express, freedom to explore, freedom to live life to the fullest. But there are people who come in among us, strangers, aliens in their own land, who would seek to come to Barbados and criticise us for not offering them succour when they seek to place mines and dynamite under our own houses, and I say that metaphorically.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Grenada is a beautiful country, and I believe that during the past two weeks we in the Caribbean have come to understand that we all share a common destiny, in a way which we have not been able to understand it ever before. We have, out of a sense of expediency, sought to fashion out a model of co-operation which we have described as CARICOM and that model has been geared to our own economic and social well being. Sometimes it operates satisfactorily and sometimes it does not, because in the final analysis, each territory is seeking to advance its own position, even within the context of CARICOM.

But even the recent events in Grenada brought us to a rude awakening to the fact that we are living in perilous times and, even in the Caribbean, in perilous places, and as a consequence it brought into very sharp focus indeed that we all belong essentially to the same territory. Grenada is Barbados, Barbados is Grenada, Grenada is St. Lucia and St. Vincent, Barbados is St. Kitts, Nevis and Anguilla. These are the geographic, socio-political realities of the times in which we live.  
4.30 p.m.

I believe that these lessons which we have learnt are particularly instructive in helping us to come to a realization that we need to forge a new togetherness out of what has happened in the past. We have to put away this narrow territorial parochialism and seek to reach out towards a new vista of inter-island co-operation, recognizing that we all are part of the same mainland.

I have heard some voices speaking words of despair because of the fact that so many persons condemned what, to any thinking person, or any sensitive or caring individual, can only be described as an act of mercy.

It ought not to surprise anybody that the actions which we take, actions towards ensuring freedom, are to be condemned by persons who themselves are always enemies of freedom. I do not know why we should ever expect that a Marxist individual, schooled as he is in the art of confinement, in the art of taking advantage of persons who are not in a position to look after themselves, should offer words of congratulations to any group of people that move in to stop one group of people from taking advantage of another group.

Russia moved into Afghanistan without a twinge, not even the slightest sense of guilt. They can shoot down a civilian aeroplane and give justification for doing so. They can export arms and terrorism to the rest of the quiet world and feel that they are doing noble deeds.

Nineteen eighty-four is upon us in a way that we would not have imagined. George Orwell has proved to be particularly prophetic when he predicted in "1984" that war will be peace, hate will be love, life will be darkness. It is upon us.

Long before George Orwell had anything to say on that subject, another book had long predicted what would come to pass in these times. I refer to the book penned by human hands, but given under the inspiration of God himself.

The United Nations is one of man's last desperate attempts to bring together a society that has been torn apart for many generations. We have had the Babylonian Empire holding together, we have had the Persian Empire holding together, we have had the Grecian

Empire holding together, we have had the Roman Empire holding together; and ever since the fall of the Roman Empire, mankind has been making desperate efforts to see if he could forge together out of some common ideological base, a new form of empire. The United Nations seems to be that kind of attempt. It is an ideological coming together of various disparate groups of persons whose differences would not ordinarily allow them to dwell together in unity.

It is no surprise to me, Sir, because I am privy to the prophecies of Daniel 2, which predicts that, "never again on the face of this earth will empires ever forge together". We live in a time, post Roman Empire, when we will have chaos and confusion at every side. Even when men sit together in the halls of the United Nations, and give voice to the noble intentions of its Charter, they are committing acts of tyranny that give a strong and burning light to what it is they hypocritically postulate in the chambers of the United Nations. So it ought not to have been any surprise to anybody to discover that the General Assembly was able, almost to a man, to condemn the action taken by the combined forces in Grenada.

We would have thought that even our neighbours in this region would have been able to feel some sense of involvement. My grandmother used to always have a saying that when your neighbour's house is on fire, it is not a bad idea to start wetting down your own, helping to put out your neighbour's fire, because it is going to catch yours, sooner or later. That fact is as real in the mouth of my grandmother as it is in the new and modern sophisticated politics of our day. Because once Grenada ignites, I do not believe that it is going to be possible for any Barbadian to go to sleep, secure in the knowledge that he is going to be waking up to find his world the way he left it the night before.

I do not intend to become political, because I do not really believe that the circumstances of this debate are such that they would allow anybody to score any political points, cheap or otherwise. It is a grave matter. It is a matter steeped in tragedy. It is a scandalous testimony to the cowardice of men who aspire to political power that they would take innocent school children in uniform and unsuspecting women and put them at the forefront of what they describe as a liberation action to free Maurice Bishop, who himself had kept people imprisoned for over four years without even describing to them what it was that they were imprisoned about. I do not think that we would ever be in a position to fully understand or know the depths of that tragic event when so many children, women and other young people were cut down in the flower of their youth for a cause which they really were not in a position to understand.

I believe that it is fortunate that Barbados was involved in the forefront of that exercise. When the

Cabinet met to consider the options available to it, it could not have known, our Prime Minister could not have known, whether or not a sudden turn of events would have put public opinion against us. As a matter of fact, when he finally decided to move, he could not have predicted at all what slant public opinion would have taken.

If there was a time when I was proud to belong to the Barbados Labour Party, it was on this occasion, when on a point of principle and without pausing to measure the fate of any of us, we were able to take a decision which fortunately, has turned out to be a right decision.

But it is a measure of the importance and of the true nature of leadership that when action is taken, it is not taken against a background of whether or not it will be something that the masses will embrace to their bosoms. If it is right, that is the course that should be followed.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) yesterday indicated that he was for it because the people were for it. Well, that means that he is for it, only after he has discovered what the public attitude to it would have been.

*Asides.*

4.40 p.m.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: That is what the honourable Member for St. Michael West said. Never mind what the statement he read out said. He said he was for it because the people were for it. That means he only discovered what the people were for after the action was taken, and therefore, *ipso facto*, he is for it.

I listened with a measure of sadness to my good friend, and a man for whom I have a great measure of admiration, the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) who is usually a sound, scholarly commentator. I suppose all of us have our low points, and yesterday he allowed himself to sink to depths that would have allowed him to say that the Democratic Labour Party has always been in the vanguard of the thrust to setting up of a Defence Force. Those are points I do not think we need to pay a great deal of attention.

One of the recent statements coming from the Leader of the Opposition was that as soon as he regains power, he is going to sell the Trident, and the Trident is only but one of the items that comprises the Defence Force of Barbados. And he was saying that against the background of his own view that Barbados is not really in need of any Defence Force such as we have.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) has made some very strong and famous

comments about the Brigadier, whose duty it was to command the combined forces in Grenada in this very glorious episode of rescuing the people of our sister country. His words were that he should go back to Jamaica and kill black people, as he is accustomed doing.

As I said, these are unfortunate statements which fully describe the attitude of the other Members on that side to what we on this side have regarded as something we should concur in, that any small country, particularly in these times, must have some defense capability. Otherwise, it is at the mercy of all the forces that are at large in our world today, forces that are bent on destruction, forces that are bent on supplanting the freedom which we enjoy with their own perverted sense of what human servitude is.

I strongly endorse the actions taken. Sometimes I am described as a militarist, because I suppose in the Honourable Chamber I am perhaps the only Member who has ever been under orders, having served in the United States Army.

*Asides.*

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: I am sorry. The honourable Member for St. James South (Mr. N. K. Simmons) was in Her Majesty's Royal Air Force...

*Asides.*

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: The honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow), I am now reminded, also served under orders in Her Majesty's Royal Air Force as well. Perhaps I can modify it to say that I am the only one who served under orders in the United States Army. I believe that might be accurate.

But, Sir, it is not militarism. I do not think it is fair to categorise any man who is asked to leave his wife, children, mother, and friends to go to some uncertain fate on some distant battle field of which he knows nothing, as a militarist. I think the average soldier is a man who has strong family connections, such as all of us have, and the members of the Barbados Defence Force, when they were given orders to move out to Grenada, would know what it feels like inside, that gut feeling, that emptiness, that dryness of the lips when you have orders saying to march to an uncertain fate.

I happen to know, having spoken to some of the men who are serving in Grenada, that when they were airborne from their respective bases they did not have any idea of where they were heading. They did not know they were going to Grenada, nor for what purpose they were being airborne, and that is the way the Army works. They do not tell you where you are going until after there is no possibility of defection. They let you get

aboard the aeroplane, crank up the engines, and hand you orders saying that you are now bound for Lebanon or to some battlefield.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have to interrupt the honourable Member and remind him of Standing Order No. 30 and my comments yesterday.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Yes Sir, I am going to wrap up now. I will close by saying that I am one hundred per cent in favour of the Resolution that has been brought. I would like to say a general word of thanks and appreciation to all the forces that fought in the Grenada episode and to pay a special word of condolences to the relatives and surviving friends of those persons who laid their lives on the line, and who died that we can continue to enjoy the freedom which we now enjoy.

Thank you Sir.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES (St. Michael North): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I begin my contribution in this debate on a personal note. I have known Maurice Bishop and his family for some time. In 1971, Maurice Bishop's father, Mr. Rupert Bishop, whom I met that day only for the very first time, hosted a dinner for me in St. George's, and that was the first time I met his son, Mr. Maurice Bishop.

Rupert Bishop was a very genial man and the manner of his death was the very first blotch on the political scene of Grenada. It was after his death, shortly after my visit that I was able to assist Maurice and his family in obtaining some refuge here in Barbados from the very brutal regime.

I well recall the day before Maurice returned to Grenada. He came to my house to thank me for what I had done for his family and informed me that he was returning home the following day. I asked Mr. Bishop if he was prepared mentally, physically, and psychologically for his return to Grenada and for what he was certain to encounter on his return there. He assured me that he was, and added that he had to return to the people of Grenada.

4.50 p.m.

I last saw Maurice Bishop in Grenada in 1976. I have not seen him since. The only other member of the New Jewel Movement that I knew reasonably well was Mr. Kenrick Radix. Mr. Radix lived on the same street in which I lived in London in the 1960's, only a very few houses away from me, and we used to visit each other on those occasions.

I have very often wondered to what extent it was that Maurice Bishop was really in control in Grenada. Perhaps the Minutes referred to yesterday by the right hon-

ourable Prime Minister was merely to formalise the situation that existed in that country for a very long time.

From the time the news broke in mid-October of Mr. Bishop's house arrest, I, like every other Barbadian, like every other West Indian, listened to every radio report, to every snippet of news to see how the whole scenario in that country was developing. I certainly could not believe the horror that took place in the Caribbean. We are not schooled in that way, at least so I thought. The sheer savagery of the events of October 19 filled me with disgust, and I was left with no doubt then that some action had to be taken. The question was, what?

The Government of Trinidad and Tobago, we are told, imposed diplomatic and economic sanctions. That, of course, is the slower method, but that was certainly in accordance with international law and respect for international obligations. We chose, along with others, the bold and big stick — perhaps for the lack of another word, but that is really what it was — method, which was a quicker method, and it turned out to be a very effective one as well, and by so doing we have drawn upon ourselves the opprobrium of the world at large. The fallout from our actions will probably be felt and be with us for a very long time, but what was important in the whole exercise, and what is still important, is the people of Grenada.

The tone of the announcement by Mr. Austin announcing the curfew on October 19 was chilling. I certainly was left with the impression that the people of Grenada were in for a very tough time. I was not on the scene, and if that indeed was my feeling, I believe that the people of Grenada felt no different. As a matter of fact, I believe they would have felt so much more cruelly than I would have, so let us not congratulate ourselves, but rather let us be concerned about the people of Grenada.

We must not be deluded into believing that we have solved the problems of Grenada. The problems of Grenada might only very well be now beginning. If the action of the invading forces brings no measurable benefits to the people of Grenada within a very short space of time, they might very well be wondering what the whole affair was all about. It might well be a matter of exchanging Tweedledum for Tweedledee.

When the honourable Member for St. Andrew (Hon. L. B. Brathwaite) observes that we appear only to be giving the Resolution critical support, the honourable Member is right. We support the action because we believe that swift action was called for. It was a job that had to be done and we elected to do it quickly. What is conclusive is that the people of Grenada have welcomed it, but let me here interject a word of caution. The objective test of whether or not they welcomed the intervention cannot be when the occupying forces are still

around, but indeed when they are gone they could very well have a very different opinion, although I very much doubt it.

We are critical, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because I believe that the conventional way of uniting the nation in a time like this is by having consultations with the Leader of the Opposition and bringing him into your confidence. If we are going to appeal, as we often do, to the Westminster model, this is precisely what should have been done.

The Prime Minister says he called in the Ambassador for Trinidad, the Ambassador for Canada, the Ambassador for the United Kingdom — but at no time did he consult with the Honourable Leader of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition. So we are critical, because not only must we do the things that ought to be done, we should certainly not leave undone things that ought to be done.

*Certain remarks made at this point by the honourable Member for St. Michael North were ordered by Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER to be expunged from the Record.*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will remind honourable Members of this Chamber that these proceedings are being broadcast live, and in their own interest they should behave as parliamentarians should.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: That is well taken, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it took the Government 22 days from committing our forces here to the foreign adventure to bring this matter here before our Parliament. We would not ask that any prior approval should be obtained from Parliament before committing our forces in such an adventure. That would indeed be unreasonable, but this was a matter of the utmost gravity. We were, in fact, going to war with Grenada, and Parliament should have been summoned earlier. I know, Sir, that you were out of the country and that other honourable Members of this Chamber were out of the country, but that was no reason for not summoning Parliament to put this matter before the Honourable Chamber and get its approval for the action that the Government was at that time undertaking.

5.00 p.m.

The Trinidad Parliament met immediately to discuss the crisis. If we want to say that Trinidad was not a participating force in the action, the same cannot be said for Jamaica. I think it was the day after the intervention, almost certainly around that time, indeed within the early days of the intervention, that the matter was brought before the Jamaican Parliament and the Jamaican Parliament, as far as I understand it, approved the action that was taken at that time.

We in this country did no such thing and the Parliament of this country was not treated with the respect that it was due. That is why, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are critical.

Again, we are members of the United Nations. We have subscribed to the UN Charter but we have by our action wilfully and knowingly breached one of the rules that the member countries hold very dear, and it is unreasonable to expect them to be silent on this issue.

What we have to do is to explain our actions quietly in the corridors of the halls, or wherever any international meetings are taking place, and we have to carry out a grand and concerted reconstructive work on our diplomatic image. We ought not to leave it to those who are in the diplomatic missions abroad, or even to those in Government, to do this work. This is indeed a big undertaking and I would say that we should think of other persons to do this work. Persons who spring to mind are the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) and Mr. Cameron Tudor, persons who I think have that natural skill in this regard. So let us engage them and put them to work.

One further criticism, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was the comparative absence of news coming out of Grenada after the start of operations. Barbados was used as the centre for assembling military personnel and equipment. It was used as a centre for news gathering and dissemination. We recognise that there has always got to be a very delicate balance between what we can publish and what we ought not to publish in circumstances such as this, but I submit that on this occasion, in many instances, we fell down.

I remember that we heard for the first time one piece of news from the British Broadcasting Corporation, that had itself got it from a statement made by the right honourable Prime Minister of Jamaica, Mr. Edward Seaga, who had got that information out of Barbados. The Jamaica Government had placed two Ministers here in Barbados, Mr. Neville Gullimore and Mr. Eric Abrahms, who collected the information and passed it on to their Government, and I do not believe that we should have had to depend on news from Jamaica that we in Barbados here were holding to our breast.

Furthermore, Sir, the leaving out of the international journalists and one correspondent from the action has led to some suspicion. War correspondents are usually in the thick of the action. They know the dangers involved and, like soldiers, are prepared to take the risk. Therefore, it is difficult to understand why such persons on such an occasion were not brought in at the very beginning, as is normally done. They go in on their own. It is difficult to understand why they have been left out. It has only permitted countries like Cuba and other persons to say that weapons found in Grenada were indeed planted there.

Sir, there are other things which I think that the Government of Barbados should know. They should know that there are some people who believe that the Grenada adventure was planned long before the arrest of Maurice Bishop. The point of the presence of Eric Gairy here in this country between the months of August and September and to some pronouncements made by him during that time that the regime of Maurice Bishop would fall before the end of October. People had interpreted his presence and such statements as some promise held out to him in terms of his return to Grenada and to power.

Some persons have said, too, Sir, that some sections of the airport here, the Grantley Adams International Airport, were placed under the control of the Defence Force quite some time before the intervention. They have also interpreted this as having some connection with the operations that subsequently took place.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am bringing these matters to the attention of the Government. I think they should know of these matters because, in my opinion, these are matters to which they should respond frankly and fully.

One question that interests me is how Grenada is going to extricate itself from the constitutional knot it has found itself in at this moment. Under what constitution is Grenada operating now, if any at all, as indeed I suspect. I suppose that is a question that we should leave to the international lawyers.

We must leave it to the people of Grenada to provide solutions to these problems. I am committed to the principle that any State, whether large or small, should have the right to chart its own course and decide its own path and its own destiny. I would be opposed to any intervention, say, in Haiti, to restore democracy in that country unless the people of that country patently called for it. If what the people of Grenada want is democracy as we understand it and practice it, then this is what they should be free to choose. If they want a different system, they should also be free to choose a different system. We should not impose anything on them and they should not seek to impose anything on us, or on anyone else for that matter. Then, Sir, they can be a threat to no one.  
5.10 p.m.

On the topic of democracy, I was very surprised to hear the honourable Member for St. Michael South East (Hon. DeL. O. Bradshaw) speak of democratic socialism in the terms in which he spoke about democratic socialism. I have heard the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) on several occasions state unequivocally that his Party is a Party that is wedded to the principles of democratic socialism, so I do not understand what it is the honourable Member for St. Michael South East is saying about democratic socialism. I am beginning to wonder if, in fact, what he wants is

undemocratic socialism, when his party, being a member of Socialist International, espouses the cause, I assume, of democratic socialism.

The people of Grenada deserve a chance to choose. They have had a very turbulent history over the past thirteen years, from when Mr. Eric Gairy first came on the scene, and here is a chance now for them to wipe the slate clean. That is why, Sir, I support the intervention and that is why I support this Resolution.

One thing that struck me, and struck me very forcibly, during the whole crisis was the response of Barbadians to the crisis. It was indeed very warm. Both radio stations responded very well. I think these are things that should be said. The people of Barbados poured out their hearts to their brothers and sisters in Grenada. I am indeed pleased and proud to be a Barbadian on such an occasion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will close at this time by again saying that in this whole situation it is not whether we did a good political thing. The question is whether we were able to assist the people of Grenada and whether the people of Grenada wanted us to assist them. In my opinion, I do believe that the people of Grenada called for that assistance, and that is why I support it, but I want it to be clearly understood that this is a Resolution that we are supporting critically.

#### SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 5.30 p.m. so that Your Honour can have a fifteen minute break.

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

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

5.15 p.m.

#### ON RESUMPTION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

When the suspension was taken, the honourable Member for St. Michael Central was about to speak. He may now proceed.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I stand here as a very proud Barbadian this evening in support of this Resolution. This Resolution states that since there was no nationally or internationally recognised Government in Grenada save the authority of the Governor-General of that country, that there were serious violations of human

rights and the occurrence of bloodshed; and that since the other member Governments of the Organisation of the Eastern Caribbean States, of which Grenada is a member, strongly held the view that the conditions then existing in Grenada were likely to undermine the political, social and economic stability of the region and could have extremely dangerous consequences for the preservation of peace and security in the OECS sub-region as a whole, the OECS decided to take action by requesting assistance from friendly countries to provide transport, logistics support and additional military personnel to assist the efforts of the Organisation to stabilise the grave situation within the Eastern Caribbean.

This Resolution which we are debating today deals with the legality of the entire operation, because the Government of Barbados was made aware that the Governor-General of Grenada was desirous of receiving multinational assistance. And contrary to the statement made by the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taft) when he said that the Prime Minister in an address at Sandy Lane Hotel last Sunday evening stated that it was a question of judgment and not one of legality is not entirely representative of the truth, the Prime Minister on that occasion did say that it was a question of judgment, but he went on to say that it was entirely legal as well.

Consequently, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is with pride that I support this Resolution this evening, and I would like to congratulate the Government in responding quickly to the request of the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States to prevent further loss of life and abuses of human rights, and to restore conditions of tranquility and orderly government for the people of Grenada.

Sir, over the last few years a lot has happened in the Caribbean, and although October 19, 1983, is the day on which Bishop was reported to have been shot, it did not indeed start there. Way back in the early Sixties, when it was very well known that under President Forbes Burnham elections in Guyana were being rigged, and then in the early Seventies in Jamaica, under the Michael Manley regime, when Jamaica took a turn from right of centre or centre to left of centre, and then Grenada in the late Seventies under Sir Eric Gairy, a dictator who violated human rights and trampled on the rights of the Grenadian people, what in fact did the Caribbean do when all these things transpired? These were situations to which the Caribbean was totally unaccustomed, and a policy of "hands off" and non-interference in the internal politics of another Caribbean territory was adopted, because these changes, or apparent changes, came under the guise of elections. Things took a turn for the worse in March 1979 when there was a coup by Mr. Maurice

Bishop and the New Jewel Movement; but that is all history at the present time.

In 1976 our Government stated in its manifesto that there was no need for a Defence Force in Barbados. As a result of events, first of all in Barbados, then in Grenada and the left wing Governments of the Caribbean, including Jamaica, our Government made a change in direction and implemented a Defence Force.

Subsequent to that we produced a document called *Promises and Performance*. We printed 40 000 copies of that document explaining our position as to why we changed from our stance in 1976 as stated in our manifesto, and in our manifesto of 1981, when we went to the people in the General Elections of 1981, we stated why we had changed our stance and what we proposed as far as the defence and security of the country was concerned. From then onwards, Sir, Members on the other side, and more specifically the honourable member for St. Michael West and the right honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow), came out very strongly against the formulation of the Barbados Defence Force.

5.35 p.m.

I will deal with the main spokesman on the other side, the Honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) specifically because my time is limited. I cannot deal with what all of the other Members have had to say from time to time on this matter of Defence and Security. But the whole issue of defence and security in this country has been used as a political football by Members of the other side.

I am pleased to see that on this occasion, they have changed their minds and have supported — though they may say critically supported — this particular Resolution. They can now see the wisdom of this Government in formulating a Defence Force. Because of the events of Grenada, because of what is now unfolding to the eyes of Barbadians, members of the Eastern Caribbean and indeed the world, we see that Grenada was a threat to the small democracies that existed in this part of the hemisphere.

Sir, I would like to quote the Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford). I would like to quote from the House of Assembly Debate, Tuesday, January 25, 1983, page 2 678. The honourable Member for St. Michael South said on that occasion, and this was dealing with the Memorandum of Understanding that was signed by Barbados:

"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....."

That was the stance that the Democratic Labour Party took on that occasion.

This debate took place on Tuesday, January 25, 1983, under "PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS", when the honourable Member for St. Michael South brought a Resolution condemning the Government for being a signatory to the Memorandum of Understanding.

On page 2 679 of the same debate, the honourable Member for St. Michael South said:

"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."

This just goes to show, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this Administration plans, not necessarily a month or two months or six months in advance, but we plan years ahead. If one kept in tune with what is happening in the Caribbean in the days of January 25, 1983 and subsequent to those days, one would have realized that it was necessary for any sensible Government to make an approach to form some sort of defence security pact, and indeed a Defence Force, or create a Police Force in order to maintain the intervention of or the violation of the people of their independent countries.

On the same page 2 679, the Honourable Member for St. Michael South continues:

".....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....."

Again, Sir, it just goes to prove that we on this side were able to anticipate and to plan. We could not state emphatically what would have happened. No one on this side claims to be a magician. But if you are a Government, elected by the people of Barbados, to lead and to govern, then one must be realistic; one must look around, one must see what is happening in the world, and one must plan for every eventuality that may occur. In this case, we have planned and we have been successful in our planning, despite the fact that the Democratic Labour Party, the honourable Members on the other side, have

criticized us for the formulation of our Barbados Defence Force.

On page 2 680, which is my last quotation dealing with the same contribution made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South on the Memorandum of Understanding, he said:

"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?"

I do believe that the events of the last few weeks would have answered that question most adequately, and again would prove that when the Barbados Labour Party sets about on a particular policy, it does so after a great degree of deliberation and consideration. We do not enter into any sort of policy without delving deeper than the ordinary individual into the circumstances that could possibly happen or occur, before we formulate a policy.

As I said before, if we are to lead the country, we must consider every possible eventuality. We must consider that these things can happen. They have happened in the past, they happened in Grenada, and it is quite possible that it could happen in Barbados.

We understand, of course, that in Barbados, being a small country with no natural resources — we are proud of the fact that our only resource really is our people, with the highest literacy rate in the world, and that we depend a great deal on tourism, agriculture and exports of manufactured goods — our expenditures on defence forces and the military have to be controlled. But when one spends two or three per cent of one's internal budget on defence and security, I do not think that that is too much to spend, not when one takes into consideration all that has happened in the past.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have before me a letter which I would be very happy to make a document of this Honourable House. It is on the official paper of the Ministry of Health and Housing, St. George's, Grenada, and it is dated 17th October, 1983 (9.00 a.m.) I will read from this document because this document explains a great deal of the circumstances prior to the death of Maurice Bishop recently on October 19. It reads:

"News cannot get out of Grenada and I am making an effort to let the outside world know what has brought about this crisis in Grenada. I am a member of the Central Committee and so

far I have not been suspected as not being in disagreement for a joint leadership. But due to certain threats, I have to show that I am in agreement. I am not in the Government or Party for personal gains, and I am very disappointed in Bernard Coard and his wife who appear to be there for personal gains, and is promising other weak members certain personal gains if they support the Resolution for joint leadership."

5.45 p.m.

"The main reason for the passing of the Resolution at this point in time is that the Soviet Union and Cuba are putting pressure on the New Jewel Movement to declare Grenada a communist state before the opening of the international airport. Only a few members of the Committee know the full story because no one man in the party has the full details on any one story. Phyllis and Bernard Coard were working very hard with the PRA to whip up support for a joint leadership in that Bernard Coard would take care of policies and Bishop would keep the people together, and that Coard would make his decisions without Bishop on policies and vice versa. Phyllis and Bernard Coard told the people, in trying to get their support, that Bishop was moving too slow regarding policies. The whole idea of Coard wanting this Resolution passed is that when Bishop makes his next trip, which was supposed to be soon, he would have had power to make a decision on policies alone, and he was going to declare Grenada a communist state. Bishop knows that the people of Grenada do not want to go communist and that the people of Grenada do not like the Cubans around. Grenadians do not even observe a Cuban. They are hated by Grenadians, also the Russians. And apparently he was waiting to see if the minds of the people were showing communism. But I know and all the Central Committee know, that Grenadians do not want a communist society and it seems to me that Bishop was going to give the people what they want, free and fair elections and a return back to democracy, (not the communist democracy). The Cuban Ambassador and the Russian Ambassador are behind this move of joint leadership and specially want Coard to look after policies, and that speaks for itself. Coard and his fragment of the Central Committee feels that since Grenada was included in the CBI and discussions are to be held shortly, that Bishop is looking on the other side, the right, and this is his way of trying to prevent discussions with the CBI. There was a plot to assassinate Bishop, the details of which I do not know. But persons who were delegated to carry out the assassination told others in the PRA. The plan apparently came from the Soviet Ambassador and the Cuban Ambassador to Bernard and Phyllis Coard. This assassination was

supposed to appear to come from the CIA. Then Coard would make the people believe that the CIA killed their beloved Maurice and turn the minds of the people to Russia and Cuba and then declare Grenada communist. Hudson Austin made an announcement from the Central Committee at 12.04 a.m. on Monday morning and again at 7.30 a.m. on Monday morning, and if you ever did hear it, and you read between the lines, you would see it all falls into place. At the meeting of the Central Committee to decide on the release, it was decided that the release should not reach the outside and that the broadcast should be only heard in Grenada. I am not a radio man and I do not know how this would be done, so if you did not hear it, that is the explanation for it. Selwyn Strachan did make the announcement that Bernard Coard was the new Prime Minister and that himself was Deputy Prime Minister to an angry crowd of Bishop's supporters. The crowd reminded him where he came from in Woburn as a fisherman, dirty and stink, and called Coard a criminal and said they do not want Coard. Selwyn went to the Free West Indian to print pamphlets for distribution by 11 a.m. that day and to declare Coard as Prime Minister. Also one Gellineau Charles told agricultural workers that they would hear the new Prime Minister speaking on radio by 2 p.m. They are a set of liars and criminals.

Coard resigned from the Government but not from the Party. This is a big question. So as it stands in Grenada, Hudson Austin says the country is ruled by the Central Committee of the New Jewel Movement but Coard is ruling the show, because according to communist law the Party is what rules, not the Government. We need help. Grenadians are very angry but are powerless because the guns are in the hands of Coard and his men. I put this on a Government letterhead because I know they would say this did not come from Grenada. Please see what publicity you can get for us on radio, newspaper, etc., etc. Thank you. I feel very sick at this moment so I will try to get this off to you and to as many as possible. Please help us."

It is unsigned.

This, Sir, was dated October 17, 1983, at 9 a.m., a copy of which was handed to me earlier today. I am sure that other Members who, if they have not as yet received their copy, by tomorrow will receive one.

I need not say any more, because the letter is self-explanatory, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It goes even further to show the reasons why we, Jamaica, and the OECS, backed by the United States of America, had no alternative but to go in there and intervene. It was legal — I

have repeated myself on that — because the only legal constitutional authority left requested that we come in and intervene and restore some sort of order to Grenada. We in the Caribbean knew that by ourselves we could not possibly win the battle, and we are very pleased that the other countries, apart from the OECS — Jamaica and the United States — backed this very successful intervention.

In closing, Sir, because I am aware of your ruling and my time has practically run out, I would like to say that I am very proud to be a member of this Government and to be part and parcel of a Government which made a decision at a time when no one knew what that decision would be, whether it would be popular or unpopular in Barbados, the Eastern Caribbean or indeed in the world. We had a group of people in the Cabinet of Barbados who put aside their feelings of politics and decided that they would have to make a stand for what they believed to be right, what they believed to be in the best interest of the Grenadian people. There are not very many people in politics today anywhere in the world which can make such a decision, bearing in mind that the political ramifications of such a decision could cost the Government if they would return to the population during election.

5.55 p.m.

We, Sir, made that decision. I was not party to it as a back bencher, and I suppose, as to most honourable Members on the other side, it came as a surprise. It came as a surprise to me and indeed a surprise to the entire world, apart from those persons who were involved. A great many secrets were kept in this country. We were able to prove to all and sundry that we in the Caribbean, small democracies though we are, have dignity and pride in our countries, that we are proud that for over 350 years we have had a parliamentary democracy in the Eastern Caribbean, that we are proud that we can stand up and fight with great powers, and that we can stand up and make a decision regardless and irrespective of the political ramifications involved, based on what we feel instinctively in our hearts is in the best interest of all people concerned. I am for that, Sir, and I take my hat off to the right honourable Prime Minister and his Cabinet. They are to be congratulated.

In closing, I would like to add my personal thanks not only to the Defence Force of Jamaica, but to the Armed Forces of the United States of America, because without them we would not have been able to accomplish what we set out to do. The intervention would not have been as successful. Perhaps we would have lost more lives, perhaps we might have failed. Who knows? The point is that when we were in trouble and we shouted for help, the United States of America came to our support, and we are eternally grateful to them for assisting us, these small democracies in the Eastern Caribbean, helping us to preserve our democratic heritage.

It gives me great pride, Sir, to support this Resolution, and I am very proud to be a Barbadian and to be serving under the Barbados Labour Party and under the Cabinet which made such a decision, a decision to liberate the Grenadian people.

Thank you, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to speak to this Resolution which has two operative components to it, the first one calling on this Honourable House to record its unreserved condemnation of the series of acts which created the anarchical conditions in Grenada, and the second part calling on this Honourable House to record its approval of the action of the Barbados Government.

Perhaps, Sir, the wording of the second part of the Resolution can be improved by inserting the words "to assist in restoring conditions of tranquility and for orderly Government" because from the general trend of this debate, it would seem to me that the policy objective of the Government was not to restore a Government in Grenada but to create conditions whereby an orderly Government could exist.

This may seem to be a small point, but it is important, particularly as this matter is very much in the international arena and the objectives of the Government would be very closely scrutinised at the international level.

It is a matter of deep regret, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Parliament of Barbados was ignored in this matter until yesterday, when clearly as an afterthought, when the Order Paper for this sitting was circulated, and when subsequent to that due notice was given of additional Resolutions, this Resolution was only handed to us at the beginning of the session yesterday.

We in Barbados must be very concerned about maintaining our own democratic processes here, which must be based on the principle of free and fair elections and an active Parliament. Indeed, it is matter of concern that in the United States, where clearly the concept of democratic government has taken root, that not only was the position of the Executive examined by both Legislatures in that country, but a fact finding mission came to Grenada, left Grenada, returned to the United States, and we in Barbados, who have been at the centre of the action, are now debating this matter in Parliament.

The United States had soldiers there. The British Government had no soldiers in Grenada, but this matter

was debated in Parliament. In Jamaica, where Parliament is given a very high priority in the affairs of the running of that country, this matter has been debated. In Trinidad, it has been debated. Even in Guyana, the matter was brought before Parliament. But we in Barbados find ourselves in the situation where not only was Parliament not brought into session, despite an earlier call by me at the beginning of October for Parliament to be convened to discuss other matters, but we had no opportunity as representatives of the people to discuss a matter that is of critical importance to this country, when indeed many of our citizens, as soldiers and as policemen, have been posted to Grenada, and whose lives might be in danger.

It is absolutely essential that we here in Barbados respect the democratic processes. I have repeatedly pointed out that the Executive in this country is assuming powers and gradually reducing the authority of Parliament, which has not met in this country until yesterday, for a very long time, apart from the occasion when we listened to the Throne Speech.

We have no difficulty whatsoever in supporting the first part of this Resolution, which speaks to a condemnation of what happened in Grenada. In my view, the murder of the Prime Minister of Grenada, some of his Cabinet colleagues and other leaders in that country, and many citizens on October 19 is an indelible stain on the history of the Caribbean people, and there is no doubt whatsoever in my mind, or in the mind of anyone on this side, that murderers of that kind should be and must be removed from power. We cannot have a situation where people can commit such terrible acts of brutality and remain in power in any Caribbean country.

There has been much talk about ideology. The Caribbean people cannot, should not, and will not tolerate any political ideology which may result in that kind of savagery which took place in Grenada on October 19. What we saw there was an act of gross lawlessness, mass murder, and indeed rooted in a ruthless struggle for power such as the Caribbean territories have never seen before.

I was very disappointed and hurt when I learnt today that the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation last night said that the Democratic Labour Party broke its silence for the first time.  
6.05 p.m.

Since after the murder of Maurice Bishop was announced in Barbados, the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation and the Voice of Barbados called me at home asking for a statement from the Party. I pointed out to them that it was a matter of foreign affairs, it was a serious matter, and it was a matter which the Leader of the Opposition would have to deal with.

I contacted the Leader of the Opposition, and the statement was drafted and finally approved by the Executive, because he himself thought it was so important a statement that he should have the approval of the Executive before that statement was released.

The Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation called me about four times on that particular night, and I myself directed them to go down to the Party headquarters where the Leader of the Opposition would be to obtain that statement from him.

That statement, and it is important that all Barbadians should know this, is already a document of the House, and this is what the Democratic Labour Party had to say.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: May I interrupt the honourable Member. I hope the honourable Member would not read the statement again. It would be repetitious and it would be a breach of the Rules.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not reading it again.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the honourable Member would let me finish, please. It is already a document of the House. It has been put in by a Member of that side. It has been read in the House already. Please!

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The point is that the public should know that the Democratic Labour Party made it absolutely clear that it deplored, condemned, was shocked in every way by that particular outburst of brutality in Grenada and called for immediate international action to relieve the Grenadian people from the scourge of a Stalinist dictatorship. It is important that the people of Barbados should clearly understand what the position of the Democratic Labour Party has been.

Many people have asked why have we not made a statement subsequent to that. It was a simple matter. Barbados was in a state of war. It would have been improper for the Democratic Labour Party, as a political Party, to be issuing any statement that might be in conflict with the position taken by the Government of the day. It could not be in the interest of our Barbadian soldiers in the interest of the people of Barbados for us to have done that. We are speaking now that the first opportunity has arisen for us to put the position of the Democratic Labour Party to the people of this country.

The people of Barbados are not accustomed to war, but it is a tradition in many countries where, when the countries are at war, then you do not get involve in partisan political policies. That is the reason, in the highest possible tradition, that no further statement was made by the Democratic Labour Party.

One further matter of deep regret is that there was no consultation with the Leader of the Opposition in this matter.

I knew no member of the Grenada Government, none of them. I have said that on several occasions, and despite all the distortions, it is a matter of fact that I have never met any member of the Grenada Government, those who have passed away and those who are still alive. But that did not in anyway affect the deep and profound feeling which I, as a physician, as someone who has subscribed to the Hippocratic Oath, as someone committed to the preservation of human life, had. The revulsion that you feel when your daily life is involved in the preservation and relief of suffering, the degree of shock, was almost incredible!

I would just like to issue a note of caution. There are many people in the Caribbean who espouse to Marxist-Leninist ideology. It is important that they must clearly understand that such imported ideologies are foreign to the Caribbean people. I cannot conceive of any circumstances where any Caribbean country would elect a Marxist-Leninist Government, and therefore, almost by definition, for such a Government to install itself in the Caribbean, it would have to be done by force.

Therefore, whilst I am not joining in any witch hunt to be calling people communists or indeed to stop people from expressing communists ideas, I believe that those who have those ideas and subscribe to those beliefs must be free to express them, must be free to write to the newspapers. But at the same time, they must understand that they are against the current of popular thinking in the Caribbean and that they will not be permitted to impose their views on people who have other philosophies.

I myself, Sir, am a member of a Party that not only believes in democracy but has ruled this country for 15 years. During those 15 years, we saw a strengthening of the democratic process with the acquisition of independence.

But sometimes, Sir, when you make criticisms, you often get such distortions by the Barbados Labour Party that indeed you find yourself in a position where you do not take a stand in public life that you should take. I said this in this Parliament yesterday, and I am going to repeat it now; I will always feel that I have failed this country and failed the Caribbean in some way because I never went to Grenada to see what was going on there.

And why? Because sometime ago, the Prime Minister of this country, from the house of a junior diplomat of the United States, made a statement, in undiplomatic terms, calling on Mr. Bishop to hold elections. I said that

it was the wrong place and the wrong time. I further said that the way in which the call was couched was inappropriate. That was twisted to suggest that I was supporting the Bishop regime or taking sides with the Grenadian Government.

This is what happens in this country, and this is why you have to watch the way the propaganda machinery of the Barbados Labour Party works. It was just like yesterday, when we complained about the language used in relation to the Ambassador to Barbados from Trinidad, automatically it was said that we were supporting Trinidad against Barbados. But it is a matter of shame.

I say that I feel that I was less than a man in the entire matter, because I believe that every Caribbean person who had any sort of influence in the area should have taken the opportunity to try to influence the Maurice Bishop regime in probably a slightly different direction.

6.15 p.m.

There can be no doubt that we in this Party have always been concerned about suppression of the Press, very concerned about the incarceration of people without trial in Grenada, and very concerned about the state of the law in that country. But indeed, Sir, we have always taken a firm position in the matter, but we have I think allowed ourselves, and I say I have allowed myself, not to speak out in certain areas or not to get involved in the Grenada matter to the extent that I should have a long time ago.

There is one other point I want to make. We cannot create democracy in Grenada. We mourn for the Grenadians who have lost their lives. We have tried to help them, but the Grenadians must understand that there must be some reason why, despite the fact that on two previous occasions when the British Government intervened in that country in order to relieve them of the tyranny of Eric Gairy, then they turned around and voted him back into power.

So my concern may well be that the Grenadians themselves have to show the same vibrant attitudes and concern for democracy in their country as others. Unless that is done, then all the efforts made on their behalf might well be in vain. I think it has to be said. There has got to be a reason, and that reason, I believe, may well lie in the fact that Grenadians over the years have not taken the whole question of parliamentary democracy in their country as seriously as possible, because it would seem to me that they accommodated quite readily for some time the excesses of the Gairy regime and also accommodated the non-parliamentary democracy of Maurice Bishop.

Whilst we are offering critical support to this Resolution, it is important that we must understand that there

are serious consequences that will flow from the actions in which we got ourselves involved. First of all, there is the impact on CARICOM and the divisions created as a consequence of one line of action being decided by the Heads of Government in Port-of-Spain and another line of action being determined here by Barbados, Jamaica and the OECS countries.

We must be very concerned about our trade relations with Trinidad, which have been made worse by the undiplomatic outbursts by the Prime Minister of Barbados. We must be concerned, Sir, that at the United Nations and in the Security Council this particular action by the United States and a small number of countries have had very significant condemnation. We must be concerned in relation to questions of international law, which forms the foundation for the survival of small states in this world of ours today. We must also be concerned over the implications of an open invitation to any one of the superpowers for intervention in the region. There may have been no alternative, but it should be a matter of concern to all thinking people, given the history of the geo-political considerations of superpowers in the regions which they designate to be their immediate interest.

I was abhorred yesterday when I saw in one of our major newspapers that the Barbados Government would be accepting payment from the United States for the use of facilities at Grantley Adams airport. I would urge the Government of Barbados that it would be a major diplomatic blunder if they were to accept money for the use of these facilities.

The United States came here at our invitation, and that is the position that we have taken in the international councils of the world. If you now find yourself in a position where you are accepting money from the United States for the use of your facilities, then the impression might well go abroad that you are being paid to facilitate them in their objectives, which might well happen to coincide with the emotional and gut-felt objectives of the people of Barbados and the people of the Eastern Caribbean. I believe, Sir, that that particular situation might well damage us even more internationally than we are already damaged.

We also have to face the fact, and this is very important, that there have been many conflicting statements in the International Press; the Plessey report on the airport in Grenada as far as its military status was concerned; conflicting statements by at least two Heads of States in the OECS; conflicting statements from within the State Department; conflicting statements at least between the Government of Barbados and the Government of Trinidad; conflicting statements by the British Government and indeed a very damaging statement by the United States Ambassador to France, who, I gather, subsequently withdrew the statement, but who suggested that

plans for the operation and plans for the invasion were made well in advance of the events in Grenada.

Now given this situation, and given the monumental diplomatic effort which the Barbados Government is going to have to make to explain the events to the international community, because we have to continue to live on this globe — we have to continue to live and we have to try to recapture the friendship of most of the countries in this world that we enjoyed before — what I think is the best thing we should do, given all the variables, given all the various conflicting statements and so on, is for Government to call for an international commission of enquiry into all matters pertaining to Grenada. I myself feel that such an international commission of enquiry would go a long way towards assisting the Government of Barbados in dealing with the particular diplomatic problems that it has.

I believe that the Prime Minister of Barbados might have an excellent opportunity at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference, scheduled to be in New Delhi I think next week, to canvass the idea. I do not know whether the Commonwealth or whether the United Nations might be the appropriate agency through which this should be done, but I believe that the findings of such a commission would be of great importance not only to the position taken by the Barbados Government, but also be very crucial in helping in some way to cover, if I may say, what I termed earlier as an indelible stain on the Caribbean people.

Another area of concern to me is the question of small Armies in these developing countries. It seems to me that irrespective of the cultural background, the political background, irrespective of whatever kind of Army you have in a small country, sooner or later they turn and slaughter the Governments, the Oppositions, the civilian populations. We have had two examples in this region recently, and indeed, Sir, if you were to take the last twenty years, one would see that the vast majority of these small Armies eventually turn on their populations. And sometimes for the most trivial of reasons, like a Sergeant taking over a country because of a pay rise dispute with the Government and that kind of foolishness! It does not happen in big countries, and I believe it is because you have counter-balancing influence where you have a Navy, you have your Marines and you have your Air Force and so on.

I believe that in the Caribbean we may well have to be looking towards some counter-balancing situation, and the time has come when, perhaps, we might have to be looking into the area of a Caribbean High Command or something like this, where when any of these local Armies turn on the civilian population or the civil authority, they know that the next day they have to face a regional Army as well. I think that this is something which might

well come out of this entire situation. One recognizes the need to have some sort of Force in order to maintain your territorial integrity and to maintain law and order.  
6.25 p.m.

But at the same time, one cannot go overboard in relation to the escalation of militarism in these small countries. Nor can we allow this situation to be one in which we permit the spread of McCarthyism abroad, calling people communists, persecuting them and that kind of thing. We cannot allow that to happen because we would simply be over-reacting to the situation.

Finally, Sir, I want to again urge that Government stick to diplomatic language when people are presenting their case, even under situations of stress. The best case can be destroyed by injudicious language.

This Resolution, in fact, adds up to the fact that Government is asking us to condemn a Stalinist purge in Grenada. We have no difficulty with that one, because the Government is now joining us in what we already condemned.

The first part of the Resolution is formally stating —

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have to remind the Honourable Member of Standing Order 30.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am winding up, Sir.

We support the first part of the Resolution, because it is simply a matter of your agreeing with the position that we took. In relation to the second part of the Resolution, we have already said that we are giving critical support to you on that. That is our position in the particular matter.

Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

*Applause.*

Mr. L. L. SISNETT (St. Michael North East): I have sat through this debate over the past few hours with a view to giving support to the Resolution which is before the House.

I honestly believe it is the time when parliamentarians should show a united front in supporting the circumstances which have taken place in Grenada over the past few weeks. If this impression could be given to the world at large, I think that we would be in a position to lessen some of the criticism which has been levelled at the Government.

The bone of contention is whether the Government acted correctly, in consort with other Caribbean Governments, in asking for assistance for one of our CARICOM

countries. And it is further complicated by the fact that the Opposition is saying they were not notified. My personal belief is that Barbados, with other member countries of the OECS, was caught in an emergency situation, and you would certainly agree, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that emergency situations demand emergency actions.

Canada can rightly say that they were not notified. The United Kingdom could also say they were not notified in time. Other CARICOM countries, in particular Guyana, also Trinidad and Tobago, would hold a similar view that they were not notified of the decision to ask for external help in quelling what was to be considered a regional problem.

I do not hold fast to those accusations, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for I believe that the actions taken by the Governments of Jamaica, Dominica, Barbados and St. Lucia met the criteria of the situation as it was at that point. It was dangerous, and it would have been more dangerous for the Governments to have delayed the actions that led to the rescue of the people in Grenada, as it was deteriorating at a rapid rate.

What has happened in Grenada is all now history. We cannot turn back the clock. We must look forward to making the most out of what was a chaotic situation, in which there was some loss of life, which would have been greater if we had stuck to the accepted principles of the law of the day.

Parliament should have been called, the Opposition is saying; more information should have been given. Perhaps, in normal circumstances, yes, Parliament should have been called and a full debate on the situation should have been canvassed here as to the input the Government should have made. Be that as it may, the Barbados Government was concerned about the state of conditions in Grenada, violations of human rights, the occurrence of bloodshed, the conditions existing under the tyranny of the revolutionary counter-coup, which were not conducive for Caribbean peace and security.

I would like to think that if in the history of this nation there was a time when Barbadians at home and Barbadians abroad were united it was the occasion when the Government decided that it would ask the United States Government for help in rectifying the situation in Grenada. Barbadians of varying political persuasions were united. They felt they had a right to be involved. They felt that if these other countries which know what freedom is all about could not move in to rescue the Grenadian people, who were helpless under the existing conditions, then who would?

6.35 p.m.

In one of the speeches I made on Defence and Security some time ago, I made reference to the coup

of March 13, 1979, when the Maurice Bishop faction took over the Government in Grenada. I mentioned in my speech that the history of the Caribbean would never again follow the same path that it has followed throughout history, because I was of the opinion that one coup would eventually lead to another coup. In any country where terrorism has risen its head, it would almost be impossible for subsequent Governments to again exercise the freedom which they were once very proud of.

Many people perhaps never took the 1976 planned invasion of Barbados, when Sidney Alleyne and Banks were mentioned as the leaders of a group coming to overthrow the Government of Barbados, seriously. It was all felt that it was a figment of the imagination of the Barbados Labour Party. But when we saw in a few years that Dominica was threatened with a similar threat of invasion, and when we further saw what events were taking shape in St. Lucia, and when we remembered that not so long ago in Trinidad and Tobago there were some uprisings, we should have certainly not pass lightly the threats of Banks and Sidney Alleyne.

But I suppose that it is because Barbadians are used to last minute escapes from things like hurricanes. When the nation was all prepared and all buttoned down for the onslaught of *David* and *Allen*; we were miraculously bypassed. So we believe that these occurrences transpire in foreign countries. Coups are things for Bangladesh and Suriname, and the people of Chile; such things cannot happen here!

I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it would have only been a matter of time before one island after the other in the Caribbean would have been under some form of seige by communist infiltrators. One thing I remembered quite clearly was the mathematical formula which the late Dr. Eric Williams computed for the Caribbean, and indeed for Caribbean peace and unity. That computation was, simply put, "one from ten leaves nought." A nought means nothing, and in the Caribbean sense, the freedom, peace and security which the Caribbean people aspire to would be taken in the process of time by those who have vision in their minds of what the Caribbean would look like under communist dictatorship.

Maurice Bishop, as Prime Minister, I suppose, means good for his country. He had visions of what he wanted for the Grenadian people. I believe he was sincere. I join with many Grenadians and many other Caribbean people in condemning the way in which he lost his life at the hands of his once bosom friends and comrades. It makes me think of the old adage that we have here in Barbados "it is only your friend who can do you harm." It was those people with whom he sat in Cabinet who did him harm — Coard, Austin. Time will tell what fate they will eventually meet.

I think the occurrences of October 19 will put the Caribbean many years backwards in the progress which we want for our countries. I do not believe that the Government which will run Grenada in the next couple of months would be in a position to quickly retract the ground which it has lost following the assassination and wilful murder of those gentlemen who ran the Government. I believe that Grenada has been put at a disadvantage because of those circumstances.

If I can look ahead and say what Grenada would be like in five years' time, I would think that some form of government is going to be re-established. But whether those persons who had intentions of establishing a communist regime would let lying dogs lie, I am not clear that this is going to be the case.

There have been demonstrations in other countries certainly in Europe, the United States and Canada against the OECS countries and the United States. I believe that these demonstrations will continue and that the common enemy will still be the United States and all the Caribbean countries that invited the United States to rescue the people in Grenada. I do not feel that the Jamaica Government, or the Barbados Government or the Dominica Government, or the St. Lucia Government can rest assured that in the next couple of years everything will be all right, that they will not be made targets of terrorists in foreign countries. These countries now would have to be more than careful in protecting their properties in foreign countries — the United States, Europe, and in the United Kingdom — because the works of the communists have now really begun.

I sensed just before the death of Bishop, following the destruction of the Korean airliner over Russia, that from the open condemnation by Grenada — Grenada was one of the first Caribbean countries to oppose the shooting down of that airliner — something had gone wrong in Grenada. Mr. Bishop himself said that he did not support the shooting down of that aircraft with 269 persons aboard. Mrs. Charles of Dominica also came out and condemned the shooting down of that aircraft and Barbados followed shortly, but it was from that moment when Bishop condemned that incident that I detected that all was not well within Grenada.  
6.45 p.m.

Maurice Bishop, it is said, was making some overtures to the United States and other Governments. He wanted to be a little more moderate in relation to the United States, but his political masters detected this and they were bringing pressure to bear on him and advancing two others to deputise for him, and certainly to take over the role of Prime Minister in that country.

The result is now history. Bishop has gone, and the radical elements which for a short while took over have

been silenced, and some form of Government is going to be established.

I would want to give the Resolution, and the Government, all the support for the events leading up to the rescue operation in Grenada, to congratulate the initiatives of the Prime Minister, and the other Prime Ministers — Mrs. Charles, Mr. Seaga and Mr. Compton — and to let the world know that, contrary to the protests which have been held within and outside the Caribbean, the people that matter, the Grenadian people, were more than joyful for those initiatives which rescued them from that situation.

The Opposition here is now claiming that they back the Government's initiative in Grenada. As I said, I do not believe it is a contentious issue. We would have welcomed it if they were more vocal in their support of the Government under the circumstances. Indeed, Sir, I would have been happy, along with most Barbadians, if the Opposition had come out with the same vigour and fervour as they did on issues like the International Monetary Fund. They left no stone unturned in telling the people of Barbados and the world that Barbados had fallen into the hands of the IMF. Most Barbadians would have been a lot happier if the Opposition's support for the rescue operation in Grenada was equal to that when they were critical of daylight saving time. They were vocal, they made their position known. One could equally say that they were very vocal when the issue of salaries for parliamentarians was being discussed here. Across the length and breadth of the country they kept the people informed.

But something tells me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, even though there was some kind of support initially, that in this matter they were playing a little hide and seek game, a little hanky panky thing. I believe it would have been a different story tonight if any one of the Barbadian Forces in Grenada who had gone there had suffered any damage. I think it would not be the same kind of support that they want to tell the people that they are giving the country tonight. I do not believe it. I might be wrong. It was a wait and see tactic to see whether any of the Forces would have been harmed in Grenada. If that had happened, I believe it would have been a different kind of story.

I am proud of those Barbadians who volunteered to go to Grenada. If their services were ever needed, such as the nurses in Barbados. I understand that a number of them had volunteered when the Government had decided that they were going to assist Grenada. I am equally happy to note that some 27 teachers are going there to lend support to the Grenadian educational system. I believe that Barbadians generally are very happy at the response of other Barbadians when they of their own

come out and give this total support to what the Government initiated in its support of one of our CARICOM countries.

I was privileged last week to be in North America, where it was not clear whether the Americans were welcomed in Grenada or whether they had forced their way into Grenada. The Canadians, in particular, were following the policy of their Government, that the Americans had taken advantage of a tiny developing state and had invaded a helpless Caribbean country. As a result, our tourism figures from Canada are taking a dip, and I believe it is the responsibility of all Barbadians to really, in detail, try to tell North Americans who do not understand the geography of the Caribbean that the Caribbean is not one land mass as they were saying, and that what was going on in Grenada was not affecting Barbados.

We were able to tell them that it was impossible for journalists to go into Grenada because of the airport situation, and there was only one airport. Most of the stories going to North America and the world were dated Barbados, because of our infrastructure here and very good telecommunications, but we had to tell them that Barbados was indeed not connected to Grenada, that you cannot drive from Barbados to Grenada, you have to take an aeroplane. That was the ignorance expressed.

I was asked what part of Grenada is Barbados, or what part of Jamaica. Barbados will have to undertake an on-going public relations exercise to satisfy the people that the rescue operation was at the request of the Grenadian people, and certainly that the Americans did not enter that country and try to take over just because they were considered to be a super-power.

But I ask, Mr. Deputy Speaker, since you are going to criticise the United States and accuse them of invading Grenada, who really were the invaders of Grenada? Was it really the United States? Or was it not the Hungarians, the Russians, the Cubans, the East Germans, the North Koreans who had gone there, allegedly in peace, to help the Grenadian people, but who had taken with them artillery and armoury in their quest to assist the country? The kind of machinery they had taken there certainly was not in defence of the situation inside Grenada, so who first had gone to invade whom? What was the necessity for the large cache of artillery and arms that was discovered inside Grenada? Was it America who had gone there to invade, or was it not the communists themselves who, under the guise of instruction experts and technicians, had themselves first planted the first seeds of the invasion?

6.55 p.m.

As a Barbadian, I am sorry for the state of events which took place in Grenada; I am sorry about the loss of life. I am glad that Barbados was in a position to send

its forces there in a peace-keeping role, despite the criticisms that we should not have a Defence Force. But it is common knowledge now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that if the Heads of Government of the OECS had not taken the decision to ask for external help and had imagined that they, through our peace keeping forces, would have been able to rectify the situation there, one could see the massacre of our Caribbean men, who would have gone to Grenada with the impression that they could have quelled the forces from the communist countries which were there.

I support the Resolution and I hope that the situation in Grenada will not again repeat itself in any one of these countries we call the Caribbean. Just as united as we are in cricket, I think we are united in peace. I think we want to have peace as a hallmark for all Caribbean countries, and we do not wish the intervention of communist ideologies or the intervention of any other countries in our affairs. Let us keep it the way we want it as a Caribbean Community.

I thank you.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to lend not critical support, but full support to a worthy Resolution which resulted from a worthy cause. But before I set out to make my contribution, I would like to clear up a few charges made by none other than the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes).

The honourable gentleman charged that the Government acted in a high-handed way by not having any consultations with the Leader of the Opposition.

Let me make this abundantly clear. I have the fullest confidence in the Cabinet Secretary of Barbados. He has served three successive Governments, from the days of the Colonial Secretary through the administration of the first Barbados Labour Party Government, then the administration of the Democratic Labour Party Government, and now this Government. He must therefore be a person of the highest regard in the community, and whatever he says to me, I have no doubt in my mind that it is going to be as accurate as possible, and I hope I will be able to represent his statement equally as accurate.

I am informed by the Cabinet Secretary that he tried to get in touch with the Leader of the Opposition before the invasion had taken place, and he spoke to a Mr. Morrison at the Leader of the Opposition's Office and was told that the Leader of the Opposition was unavailable. His message to Mr. Morrison was that the Prime Minister and he, the Cabinet Secretary would like to speak with him urgently.

A few hours after, the honourable Leader of the Opposition called. The facts were not told to the Leader of the Opposition over the phone, but he was asked if it was possible for him to meet with the Prime Minister to discuss a very important matter. The Leader of the Opposition told the Cabinet Secretary that he was not well and therefore it was impossible for him to meet with the Prime Minister, but he would not mind if he were to convey to him by letter what his business was on that occasion.

The only charge made by any Member from the other side of high-handedness by this Government is by the Member for St. Michael South Central, an avowed communist. I am going to tell you what a communist is, and I am going to send out a warning to all Barbadians tonight.

Secondly, he had a query on the Regional Security Pact. It has been agreed in principle that there shall be the setting up of a Regional Army, adding the Armed Forces to the Regional Coast Guard and a study is now being carried out by the Regional Headquarters on the format. It is expected, Sir, that St. Kitts will be invited to join, and Grenada, as soon as that country has an elected Government.

The plan envisages, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a Regional Defence Force stationed at a number of locations — some of the islands, not every island — with the headquarters to be in Barbados. The United States' contribution to this will be to supply us with vertical air lift capacity, helicopters and the like, and to give us training so that at some future date, if we have to, we will be able to keep the claws of the Russian bear from entering into these little beautiful islands of ours.

Now I am going to make a charge here very early. On the floor of the House yesterday Dr. Haynes, I think the Member for St. Michael South Central, Sir.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the honourable Member for St. James North listen to what I am going to say? It is not parliamentary in our system to refer to a Member by his name. It is customary for us to refer to him by his constituency. I would be very grateful if the honourable Member would bear that in mind and refer to honourable Members by their correct title. We are dealing with things we are accustomed to and therefore we must maintain that standard.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir.

Only yesterday that honourable Member and distinguished physician and scholar, admitted here on the Floor of the House that he visited Russia with an International Union of Students to attend a conference. I go further, Sir. It was on more than one occasion, and I shall be producing documentary evidence to this effect. At that time

he was being indoctrinated into the movement which he believes in, the movement of communism.

7.05 p.m.

In recent times he has been visiting Mr. Britt, the Editor of the *Morning Star*, a communist London-based newspaper, and he has visited Grenada on several occasions and has been met by Mr. Julien Ritsco.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I rise on a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: (On his feet) Do not shout at me. Please take your seat. If you are rising on a point of order, tell me the point of order; but you are not going to make a statement which is not a point of order. And please do not shout at me; I will not shout at you.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the point of order which I rise on relates to the basic understanding of this Parliament and all Parliaments that Members must be truthful in their statements and I am submitting to you that I know of no one called Mr. Britt. And I will submit my passport, which I have held for eight years, I think, to the Press tomorrow to show that I never visited Grenada.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member will please take his seat. The honourable Member is creating a dangerous precedent which he has been accustomed to. That is no point of order, and I will not entertain interventions like that. The honourable Member has his view and he has a right to make his statements, but he cannot accuse another honourable Member of lying; it is unparliamentary.

Will the honourable Member for St. James North continue?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Thank you very much, Sir.

There has been a charge made in here, Sir, that Parliament was ignored, and that Parliaments throughout the Caribbean, and as far flung as Europe, had met on this matter. Parliament was adjourned on October 17, two days before the unfortunate eruption in Grenada started with the slaying of Prime Minister Bishop, and there were swift events, and very swift decisions had to be taken by the Cabinet of Barbados. Am I to understand that Parliament should have been summoned to come and discuss a matter which is within the prerogative of the Prime Minister to decide on for the security of this country and even of its neighbours?

I do not believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that if you were to go across the length and breadth of the Caribbean territories, outside of a few hard line leftists like the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Sir, Standing Order No. 28 (6), (7) and (5)! Rule (5) says it shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting language about Members of the House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am submitting that the indication, bearing in mind the atmosphere in which this debate is taking place, that an honourable Member of this House has been participating in activity which itself turned out as activity considered inimical to the interest of this country, is insulting language unless that is verified for Your Honour's consideration. I am submitting to Your Honour that the language being used in relation to the honourable Member may be considered insulting language under the Rules.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not hold with you. I have been very careful to do a research of May's Parliamentary Procedure on these very points. If an honourable Member is accused of an act which is clearly criminal, it is unparliamentary and must be withdrawn. If Members make statements which in themselves are not criminal or not insulting, they are accepted. There have been precedents in which Members in the British Parliament were called communists and all kinds of names that have been allowed, and I do not intend to create any precedent for which I cannot find the necessary base for so doing.

I will ask the honourable Member to be as restrained as possible in his delivery.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I am, because only today the same honourable Member for St. Philip South (Mr. H. A. Blackman) on the Floor of this House, in this very debate, said that there are all sorts of "isms"; communism, imperialism, democratic socialism, all the "isms". All of a sudden the word "communism" is a bad word.

I do not know about Marxist or Leninist theories. I came along with one doctrine and that is the Christian doctrine, and that doctrine is to help people wherever I can, and to do whatever I can for them to the best of my ability. That is the doctrine I believe in, the doctrine of christianity.

I can say, Sir, that I speak with mixed feelings on this matter, feelings tinged with sorrow and tinged with glory. Tinged with sorrow because Grenada seems to be politically accident-prone, and people like the honourable T.A. Marryshow, who served so well the West Indies and his native Grenada, must be turning in their graves at

people like Eric Gairy, whose foreign policy was primarily based on flying saucers, and whose domestic policy was one of terror and repression. When Maurice Bishop came into power there was not a drop of blood, and the Grenadian people came to the conclusion that this was a new dawn for a beautiful country with beautiful people. But again, by accident, they ran into two terrors. 7.15 p.m.

Let us not forget the brutality that was administered to people placed in jail without trial, the worms eating their skin, tortured, beaten, under Maurice Bishop's Regime. Let us not forget that, it was not in two or three days, there was a mass movement of arms into Grenada. It was not on the 15th the 13th or the 12th of October, it was while Mr. Maurice Bishop was Prime Minister of his native land that there was a build up of some nine million rounds of ammunition. There were RD aircraft guns, which I saw, because I went to Grenada to see them myself, armoured tanks, armoured cars, AK-47s and some old guns which the Americans call goose guns, Russian helmets — and Cubans fostering at Point Salines preparing for the communist destruction of these territories, under Mr. Bishop's nose.

I know Mr. Bishop was not a fool. He was a man with a legally-trained mind, charismatic, was able to woo the sympathies of the Grenadian people. But when you live by the gun, you die by it. And when two elephants clash, only the earth suffers; and it was Coard and Bishop that clashed.

What was the outcome? What has been the outcome for the humble, poor Grenadian folk who had thought that they had ushered in a new dawn, a new leader was born, the messiah? Under our nose, here in the Caribbean, there was a mass build up of the big Russian claws, with eyes of communism and tongues of destruction!

We on this side took very long, very long. Sir, you will recall, you were in the Cabinet on that occasion, when the Maurice Bishop Regime came in. We were hounded down by the other side, and the then Attorney-General and Foreign Affairs Minister, the Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) was attacked on the Floor of the House for not recognizing Grenada immediately.

We had our suspicions. We took our time. Let us not forget that, Sir. You sat in the Cabinet. You were one of the people who went along with the decision. Well, Sir, one gun has turned against another gun. The people perished.

Here in our own little country, when a plot was attempted by a paranoid madman by the name of Sidney Alleyne, note the events how they lead up — a friend and member of the Democratic Labour Party when they

were in power, a madman, who gave directives and made speeches at the Drill Hall, calling for fire, bullets for those who did not believe or went along with the views of the then Government. There was no condemnation by one single person on that side of the speech made by Mr. Sidney Alleyne, because some of them believe in bullets.

Unfortunately or fortunately, we won the Government of the day. Sidney Alleyne was found drifting or sailing towards Barbados, and found himself off course, with God moving in a mysterious way, into the French waters. We came in here, and the Prime Minister went on television and he warned the country. He had in his possession information of the plans of Mr. Sidney Alleyne, a friend and member that must be very important – of the Democratic Labour Party. It was out of that, Sir, that the idea of improving, increasing, equipping and training the then Defence Force of Barbados was given serious thought.

Dominica had its problems at the time. There was George Odum in St. Lucia, who created chaos in that country. George Odum, another Cuban-trained mind! And let me say this, that there is another Member on that side whose love for the Cubans, his love for Fidel Castro, has gone so far that he has named his son, Fidel Castro Simmons. These things must be stated. Such an admiration for Fidel Castro's doctrine that his son was named Fidel Castro Simmons. I make reference to the Member for St. James South (Mr. N. K. Simmons).

*Laughter.*

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Do not tell lies on the little boy.)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The Defence Force of Barbados came under heavy, heavy weather while you sat on this side on the front bench. An attempt was made to divide the Defence Force by conveying to the Royal Barbados Police Force that the soldiers were the blue-eyed boys of the Prime Minister, and that the Royal Barbados Police Force should get all the barracks, should have the best of everything, that they were treated badly. They were undermining the Defence Force. It came under heavy attack, Estimates after Estimates. How many million dollars! Your priorities were wrong! On and on about \$14 million for Defence and Security, which includes the security guards at the airport.

When the MS TRIDENT was bought through a loan from the British Government, they were on the platforms throughout the country saying that rather than building houses and creating employment, we were buying a battleship. All of these things undermine the Defence Force. And if you continue to say something to somebody all the time, they eventually believe it. What came

out of the heavy attack on the Defence Force of Barbados and Brigadier General Lewis? Not only in Barbados were these attacks made, but in the *Globe* and *Mail*, a newspaper in Canada, Peter Morgan, a man who came here on a yacht and was able to make himself, I believe, a millionaire, because he had two fires.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not want to interrupt the honourable Member....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir. But there were two fires at two buildings that he owned.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have exactly three minutes more.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Three minutes! I will get into that debate on another occasion.

Peter Morgan wrote a vicious letter to the *Globe* and *Mail* attacking Brigadier Lewis in his capacity as Chief-of-Staff and Commander of the Forces. Even on that occasion, the Christ Church boys were at work.

And out of innocence, and I believe ignorance, and lack of patriotism and understanding for what is meant in these trying days, there was a calypso which almost won the Road March, a calypso which I love to dance to and jump to, the lyrics written by a potential candidate of the Democratic Labour Party, as it was already announced in the papers that he was going to contest the City seat, a young man who we all know as Mighty Gabby. He came out with a savage attack on the Defence Force and those young men who set out to serve their country and serve the Caribbean who on this occasion, because of the Cuban snipers in the bush, have their lives at stake while trying to keep the peace and restore democracy.

Listen, Sir, to what Gabby sang:

"Is it necessary to have so many soldiers in this small country?"

They would say: "No, no, no,"

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sing it, do not talk it.)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Hudson taught me to sing, man. And you know what Hudson was.

"Is it necessary to shine soldiers' boots with taxpayers' money?"

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, no, no!)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: That is true.

"Well, don't tell me", says Gabby, "Tell Tommy", and he does not mean Tommy Miller. He goes on to say "Unemployment high and the treasury low".

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: True, true!)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: So you will be able to call for an increase in pay as you have been calling for one all the time. This is the verse that really hurts me:

"Was it right to have them soldiers put out a fire?"

"No, no, no!" "Was it right to give weapons they claim were unloaded to shoot Vincentians."

You hear the viciousness that comes out of you all!  
7.25 p.m.

Here is a young man who has written this, out of ignorance, because I believe he is a patriot, because of the propaganda, because of the viciousness of your public platform and your utterances in here, led by the leftist for St. Michael South Central, a man who has been indoctrinated with communism, who has told me on more than one occasion that some day we are going to see blood flow through these streets. He told me that at a place called "The Eagle" in the presence of Miss Hope, who was at the time working for the G.I.S. He said that soon after he came back from England. She is now at the Tourist Board.

*Aside.*

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am coming home, Sir, just a minute.

It is unfortunate that when history is written and the playwrights have an opportunity to produce a cast, they, I am sure, would produce a cast like this: it would be Mr. Osbourne from Montserrat, Dr. Simmonds from St. Kitts-Nevis and Anguilla, Chambers would play the role of the decision-maker, Miss Eugenia Charles would have the role as a co-star, you have Edward Seaga also outstanding, and the star of the cast would be the Prime Minister of Barbados, the man who master-minded the days that saved Grenadians, a man whom I believe all Grenadians would be proud of.

But that is not all! There are two people who would also be involved in that play.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have to put them in very quickly.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir.

Those two people would be the President of Guyana, he would be playing the role of the scamp, and the Member for St. Michael South Central, who would be playing the role of Dr. Castro.

I am happy to salute the Americans. We have had the opportunity of seeing the big eagle warship come and snap up the big Russian bear claws from out of this hemisphere.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Time has expired.

*Applause.*

#### SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I know, Sir, that you have been in the Chair for a very long time. We had agreed earlier to finish the debate just after 7 p.m., but I had to conclude my speech.

I beg to move that this sitting be suspended for dinner until 8.15 p.m. this evening.

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

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

7.35 p.m.

#### ON RESUMPTION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. The honourable Member for St. Philip North.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no victory in blood. There is no place in the hearts of Christians for malice. There will be no development for Barbados in the divisiveness of the people in Barbados.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this debate started yesterday, against the background of the blood of Grenadians, Cubans and Americans running into the fertile soil of Grenada, where in the West Indies maybe for the first time there was a unity among the people, a unity that was brought on by the sufferings of our people and friends in Grenada at the brutal hands of people with an ideology that had allowed them to stamp out all dissent in the country.

The debate started in the vein in which it should have been started, it continued in that vein, a vein of seriousness, a vein of soul searching, a vein of the import of the moment, a vein which saw history being created in Barbados, with one or two exceptions which I will draw to your attention, until unfortunately the Leader of this Honourable Chamber, the Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig), the Christian gentleman that he is, allowed the people of Barbados to hear revealed in his speech that ended in the seeds of division, the obvious contempt in which some of us on this side are held, and has caused me the greatest pain I have had since I have been a Member of this Chamber.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was so sure that the honourable Member for St. James North would have risen to the situation, knowing that he was addressing the people of Barbados, the people who must have collectively during the week leading up to October 19, and after, sent up millions upon millions of prayers for the people of Grenada to relieve them out of their calamity.

What did we get this afternoon? He started by saying he was guided by his Christian feeling. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this particular Resolution luckily held no problems for me, and luckily my colleagues saw with me on this one. There comes a time when there is a greater law than the law of the land, or the law of man, and I believe in those times that that greater law is dictated to one through one's conscience and through one's inner sense. This is one of those occasions when my conscience and my inner sense communicated to me that greater law, and that greater law said to me that the people of Grenada must be relieved from the tyranny that had overtaken Grenada.

I spoke to my colleagues immediately. I told them how I felt, how I still feel and how I will always feel on the occasion. Thank God, that despite the opinions of a lot of them on the other side, who figured that in the ten Members that make up Her Majesty's loyal Opposition are reposed in the bodies that we carry brutal hearts, callous minds, a craze for blood, and people who could not in any way have sympathy for the people of the Caribbean, and therefore they were sure that we would come to this Honourable House and oppose the Resolution and the action of the present Government, we have demonstrated great patriotism in supporting the Resolution.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are often accused of being unpatriotic. Let me start from the right in the chair that is usually occupied by the Leader of the Opposition, who is not here present, but I will still call him.

*Certain remarks made at this point by the honourable Member for St. Philip North were ordered by Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER to be struck from the Record.*

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: The honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow), who has devoted a considerable amount of his life and time to the people of Barbados, who has brought Independence to this country, who has seen this country develop into a nation respected in the entire world, can he be classified as being unpatriotic?

The honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) spent considerable time forming the characters of the young people of this country, functioned as a Minister and performed with distinction.

At no time did he in any way betray his country. Can he be unpatriotic?

The honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) served with distinction for his country in America and as a Minister of Trade. Where are the persons on this side unpatriotic?

The honourable Member for St. Michael North (Mr. P. M. Greaves) served in other Caribbean countries for a long period in educational systems, came to Barbados and continued that service.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes), who was singled out today, has devoted his entire working life to the healing of the sick in this country, has served with distinction in the Public Service of this country, is serving with distinction in this Parliament.

What sins has he committed here today? He has committed two sins. He has said that, he visited Russia — more than twenty-five years ago. Because of this, in a situation where the blood in Grenada, the harassment of the people of Grenada, the horrendous situation in Grenada has sensitised the people of Barbados to the word "communism", the word which every Barbadian now looks on with horror, it is on this occasion that the honourable Member for St. James North who has accused the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central of being an arch capitalist on numerous occasions, now calls him a communist.

Because the island is now sensitised to the horror of communism, he is branded as a communist, an avowed communist, because he has had the distinction to visit Russia as President of the Federation of West Indian Students' Union in the United Kingdom and Europe some twenty-five years ago.

It is my understanding and my knowledge that the right honourable Member for St. Thomas (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams), the Prime Minister of this country, has also visited Russia. We on this side did not seek at this time when this country should be unified, united, to brand him a communist because he has visited Russia. Where is the patriotism of those on the other side?

What is his other sin? His other sin is because he said that, in his opinion, the Leader of the Opposition was not consulted at the appropriate time. The intervention took place in Grenada on 25th October, Maurice Bishop was killed on 19th October, if my memory serves me right. I invite the Leader of this House, the honourable member for St. James North, to find out if it is not a fact that Mr. Anderson Morrison was in the United States of America from the 17th September to the 29th October, and only returned to his post as Assistant to the Leader of the Opposition on 31st October.

*Aside.*

*Certain remarks made at this point on the Opposition benches were ordered by Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER to be expunged from the record.*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I want to warn members of this Chamber that "shame" is deemed to be very unparliamentary, and I do not want to hear it again in this Chamber.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I invite the Leader of this Honourable House to check this, because it is on that one statement made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central that he was held up to ridicule in the entire nation of Barbados over the air waves, branded a communist — because he made a simple statement that the honourable Member for St. John, the Leader of the Opposition, was not consulted at the appropriate time!

8.30 p.m.

The honourable Member for St. James North said he believed the Cabinet Secretary of Barbados and he was informed by the Cabinet Secretary of Barbados that he spoke to Mr. Morrison. The invasion of Grenada was on the 25th of October. The contention is that there was no consultation before the invasion, and the Leader of this House, in order to ridicule the Member for St. Michael South Central, brought this to the attention of this Chamber.

*(Certain remarks made at this point by the honourable Member for St. James North were expunged from the Records by Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER).*

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the same Member for St. James North came back here from Guyana and said he endorsed the Guyana blue-print. He brought it back to Barbados!

The same Member for St. James North said that if your name is Douglas Leopold Phillips, you must starve in this country. That is the Member for St. James North, Mr. Deputy Speaker! That is the depth of feeling he has in his heart for us on Her Majesty's Opposition bench!

The Member for St. Andrew, in his speech yesterday, said that "on this Side there are some democrats, but there are also some Coards and Austins on this side."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the entire nation of Barbados by now think of Mr. Coard and Mr. Austin as brutal, callous, murderers, horrendous, inhumane characters who were prepared to see the blood of their brothers run on the streets. I would like him to identify the Coards and the Austins on this side.

It is unfortunate that a debate that started at such a high level, a debate for the first time that I know of in my knowledge, that has seen the unanimity of feeling in this Chamber for the action taken by the Government of the day, should have been brought to this low by one of the most senior parliamentarians in Barbados, the Leader of the House, one who should know better. He has reduced this House over the air waves to the laughing stock of the nation of Barbados. But I leave the decision of your fate to the people of St. James North.

*Aside*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. James North must not make such comments.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are also one or two other things that I heard yesterday that I am a little worried about. The contribution made by the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. John) was a very measured contribution, statesmanlike, but there was one thing that has caused me a little concern, which I want to draw to his attention.

He has made reference to the fact that it is costing us a lot of money to man the Security Forces in Barbados so that we would not be overrun by the leftists, and such people. I only want to say at this point that we are all aware of the situation in Grenada. Most of us feel as strongly as you over there about any situation or ideology that would lead up to that. But I want to be assured that we do not allow a situation like this to colour our feelings to the point where we cannot appreciate the voice of dissent and allow different opinions in Barbados.

I will tell you why I am so concerned about this. Some six years ago a friend of mine called me frantically informing me that he understood the security people of Barbados wanted to see me. I said, "See me?" When I inquired, it turned out that one of the supposed leftists in Barbados was living in St. Philip, and it was reported to them that they saw my car somewhere in St. Philip, nearby, on one or two occasions. They frantically wanted to interview me because I expressed my democratic right to be in St. Philip! That is why I am so concerned about the freedom in this country and the intolerance of any other opinion beside those that we share in this country.

I am saying that the essence of democracy is to allow an alternative opinion. I am also saying that they have the right, as long as they are within the bounds of propriety, to express their opinion. I would be a very sad person if we took this opportunity or the situation in Grenada to remove some of these fundamental rights from the citizens of Barbados.

I wonder how they could accuse us of being unpatriotic? Mr. Deputy Speaker, one of our colleagues was away in Nairobi on the business of this Parliament. I heard that there was going to be a debate on the Grenada situation. I, at my own expense, telephoned my comrade to update him on the situation in Grenada, and to let him know the feelings of the people of Barbados and the Opposition's deep feeling on the matter, so that he would be able, not being in Barbados, to translate the feelings of the people of Barbados. I did this out of my patriotism to Barbados. And you accuse us of being unpatriotic because we had the right to differ from you on one or two occasions!

It is not right for any of you to abuse any honourable Member of this side, to call him communist, avowed communist or arch communist and all things like that because you know that at this present time, the people of Barbados, if they were not as sensible as they are, would lynch him when he goes outside there.

The type of divisiveness that you want to introduce in this community, I have warned you about time and time again. It is in this Chamber that we have to put aside the kind of divisiveness that has caused problems in Jamaica, that has seen the crime rate in Jamaica.

We have not introduced it. When you introduced the Duffus Commission in Barbados, those were the first signs of divisiveness in Barbados. And you continue to agitate the people of Barbados and try to divide them, the Christian people in Barbados! And that speech is the type of stuff that you get.

This debate should never have been of this tone. This debate is a debate over the blood and bodies of people of Grenada and the tone should be sober. There should be a very sober tone in this Chamber, the tone that the honourable Prime Minister started in, when he spoke in a very collective, statesmanlike manner.  
8.40 p.m.

I have made my views quite clear. I figured that the events in Grenada were such that action had to be taken, and I was present when the release by the Leader of the Opposition was given to the radio station. I knew the feeling of all of us at that Executive Council meeting that night. There were many parliamentarians at that meeting and I knew their feelings, and I cannot understand how the people of Barbados, including the Press, can say that we have said nothing on the matter. This Opposition is an Opposition that cares for people. It is an Opposition of honourable persons. It is an Opposition that would never betray this country that we have built for fifteen years, because at some time this Opposition will have to carry this country forward.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is not usually the tone of my debates in this Parliament, but my feelings run deep. I

am a fairly simple, sincere person and I speak how I feel. I do not have any envy in my heart. I am not one of those people who can sit down and contrive and plot.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would the honourable Member for St. James North please keep quiet in this Chamber. He has had his time, he was not interrupted, and I would be grateful if he would give the honourable Member for St. Philip North a chance to complete his debate.

Thank you.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

For the information of this House, the name of the son of the honourable Member for St. James South (Mr. N. K. Simmons) is not Fidel Castro Simmons, but Fidel Keith Walton Simmons, and Fidel means "faith."

The speech here today has quite rightly deeply affected the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, and in order to vindicate himself he is prepared to make his passport available to show that he has never been in Grenada at any time under Bishop. The passport is here, I need spend no more time on that.

All I need to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that this is an occasion when honourable members of the Democratic Labour Party, considering the situation in Grenada very carefully and examining our inner selves, are in agreement with the action taken. Quite rightly, we are also aware of the implications of the action taken. Some of us have taken the time to make the Government aware of these far-reaching implications and the fallout, for which we were openly taken to task. But it is our solemn duty to make the Government of Barbados fully aware that they are not all the people that agree with the action taken by Barbados, and they must understand their obligation to take the necessary action to clear up the situation of Barbados in the international world.

My conscience dictated me, and I am happy to inform you that on this occasion I can support this Resolution.

Thank you very much.

Mr. J. G. ODLE (St. George North): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very pleased this evening to join with all honourable Members of this House in supporting this Resolution which has been brought by the Government.

However, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I must at the outset make a brief comment on the remarks made by some of the honourable Members on the other side and in particular those of the honourable member who has just taken

his seat, my good friend and colleague, the honourable Member for St. Philip North.

I find it passing strange that at a time like this, when this country of ours is more united than it has ever been before in all its long history, that the honourable Member can find it possible to suggest — he has taken a whole lot of his speech on it — to the people of this country that we on this side are the architects of division in our society. It is very, very strange.

I will not go to any depth into this, because I am not going to get involved in this thing, but I must point out that I very well remember, I believe about 1975, when I recall an honourable Member from that side, I believe it was my very good friend and colleague of high prominence in the Democratic Labour Party, talked about depressurising the Opposition. And I well recall times when I heard remarks from honourable Members on the other side, at the time when they were trying to reap the sugar crop, comments which certainly did not tend to unite this country. But I will say no more about that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am pleased at the very high level of co-operation which I have discovered — I knew it was there all along — among West Indian people, and the display of the deep bond of love which binds us. I recognise, as we all do on both sides of this House, the seriousness of the threat to our independence and to the peace and security of this area, by those who espouse the Marxist-Leninist ideology, and I take note, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of the United States of America, which now stands out among the Nations as the one most willing to help us maintain our independence, and indeed our freedom.

Events moved very quickly. There are some people who expressed dismay at what occurred and at the intervention by the Forces from Barbados, Jamaica, the Eastern Caribbean and the United States. I can understand and to some extent appreciate the reason behind the arguments of those who say that we should sit down and, maybe, talk around the table, and those who spoke of using economic sanctions. I can understand those things, but Mr. Deputy Speaker, at a time like this where, as I said, events were moving very quickly, I cannot support that, because as we can all see and understand, political time is now very compressed, history is moving too fast to permit traditional delays. There was no time to sit down and talk to the Coards and the Austins. That would have been a honeymooning of a kind that would only serve to give them more time to hide the evil and infamy of which they were the purveyors.

The Governments of Barbados and Jamaica, along with those of the Eastern Caribbean States, had to deal with events that were taking place with great speed, and

they had to act with speed. It is to the everlasting credit and glory of America that when we asked for help they responded positively and with speed. It was this swiftness of events which caught the Governments of Europe, North America, Canada certainly, England and India, and politicians, completely offguard, and which, I believe, was the reason for the confusion that overtook them and caused them to expose their naked indifference to and ignorance of the aspirations of the people of these West Indian Islands.

8.50 p.m.

I cannot understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how so many people, who should have known better, appeared willing to condone the actions of men who brought the crisis upon Grenada, and expect us, free men and women, to see the Coards and the Austins fall from the wreckage which they created with guns — AK-47s in their hands — to tell us Barbadians and others from the West Indies that it is time for us to solve our problems and that the only way to do so is by getting rid of our Parliaments, that they are obsolete, and we must get rid of these old institutions and get rid of our freedom as well. We will have none of that!

We seek rather, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to expand our freedom and to safeguard it. We shall have to do like the American founding fathers of two centuries ago and create new means of expanding and securing our liberty.

I am happy to know that the President of the United States of America and the Administration in Washington at least appear to understand how we think and feel. They know of our love of peace and freedom and we shall be forever grateful to them for their help. The voice of the people of Barbados went up to God in prayers and their prayers were answered. We now pray that those who did not understand, and those who were fast to criticize, would soon see the light and know the truth.

We in this area stand firm in the correctness of our actions and are pleased with the timely intervention of the Forces of the United States of America. People in other parts of the world must understand that we in this part of the world do not effect change of Government by murder and guns or by brutality. It is not our way of doing things. And we want to keep it that way, at least in this area.

And when I say, "we" I refer to the teeming masses of people in the West Indies who seek to own a house and the land on which it stands. I speak of the people who seek work and gainful employment, those who want to share in the good things of life, those who seek shelter. Give us roads, give us education, give us teachers, improve our technical know-how. Let us show love and understanding, but keep the guns and ammunition away.

We regret that this episode in Grenada occurred. We regret the loss of life, the brutality and the violence, the assault on human dignity. But I am proud of my country, and I am proud of the response of our Barbadian people.

I can only say, Sir, in ending, let us not forget how to pray, because I maintain that it was the prayers of the masses of the people that brought us through.

I thank you, Sir.

*Applause.*

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

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I had no intention whatsoever of speaking on this particular Resolution. But as I sat here in my seat this afternoon and listened to the honourable Member for St. Philip North, (Mr. W. O. Franklin), it really shocked me that Members from the other side praised the Prime Minister of this country for playing such a decisive role in the Grenada crisis, then for him to get here and behave in the style that he behaved, so I have to express myself and relate a few things on this Resolution.

*Applause.*

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very proud to be a Barbadian and to be led by a Prime Minister in the category of the right Honourable Member for St. Thomas.

Yesterday, I admired the honourable Member for St. Michael South, Mr. L. E. Sandiford when he got up and commended this Resolution. But I always admired that honourable Member. He always tries his best to try to say something which would sound reasonable to put the Democratic Labour Party back in a fairly good position. I agree with that.

A few months ago, you heard that members of the Democratic Labour Party were visiting Mr. Bishop in Grenada. And now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, every one on that side have turned their backs on Mr. Bishop. I thought this afternoon that someone would have been pleading for Mr. Bishop. I am sorry that he is not around to see how his good friends, his best friends, tried to react this afternoon and tried to disown him.

*Applause.*

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: I believe that if Mr. Bishop had taken heed from the Prime Minister on three or four different occasions when he told him to go to the polls, I am sure that he would be alive today. But whensoever Mr. Bishop was planning, you would see

members from that side going down — and they might have been making their arrangements to do the same thing. I was very surprised and I was then against that. But the Lord moves in a mysterious way, His wonders to perform.

I do think that all over the world people are praising the Prime Minister for a job well done. The prayers of the people of Barbados are making some movement. You can see that the Lord is working on his side. Everything that he puts his hands to is prospering.

I am wondering, if, hard luck, the Member for St. Thomas had sent those soldiers to Grenada and by chance one of them had lost their life, what would happen. I wonder how the Democratic Labour Party would react to that. It would be something different, because I know they would run through the length and breadth of this country and say, "Look, they took this lady's son and sent him down to Grenada and he lost his life" and things of that nature. But now this afternoon, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they are trying to manoeuvre and trying to praise him, and at the same time trying to say something bad about him. I cannot understand it, Sir.

9.00 p.m.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South said that Grenadians had started to make some strides under the regime of Maurice Bishop. Well, I had the privilege of visiting Grenada, and if that place had started to make strides, I would have liked to see it before it started to make strides. Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no motor car that can drive more than 20 m.p.h. in Grenada for the potholes! You look all around the place and you do not see any kind of land being cultivated. You do not see any houses being built. You do not see anything! When you look around everything there seems like a bankruptcy of ideas. Nobody has any drive. You pass and see the cocoa and nutmeg on the trees. Nobody is picking anything whatsoever, and people are trying to give the impression that they are trying to make strides! But I would like to let the honourable Members on that side know that I know one thing that cannot make any more strides in the West Indies and that is communism. I thank God for that.

*Applause.*

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: The honourable Member for St. Michael South spoke about secrecy in going down to Grenada. I believe that if it could have been a little more secret, we would have not lost any lives at all. Some people tried to make it a secret, but I do not believe that it really was a secret, because the Cubans seem to have friends in the West Indies who could let them know how to set themselves beforehand. I believe that if certain Members knew about it before, more people might have known more about it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was more than surprised to hear honourable Members now praising a Defence Force, saying that it is a good thing that we have a Defence Force. But that is only because of the wisdom of this honourable Prime Minister that we have here. You do not wait until the rain stops falling to put out your bucket to catch water! If we now had to plan, recruit, or improve our Defence Force, what would have happened to the poor people of Grenada? All now there would have been blood flowing there on the streets! But we had a Prime Minister with a vision, a man who realized that something like this could have happened.

I was more than surprised at the Prime Minister of Trinidad. He is a man whom I always admired as a soft-going man, but I was more than shocked by the things that he said because Grenada is closer to Trinidad than it is to Barbados, and I thought that it would have been in his interest to see that things were going as good as we had them going. I was more than surprised at the Prime Minister of England, but I believe it called for a better explanation. I do not mind Mr. Burnham, the Prime Minister of Guyana, because we know his stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very happy and I hope that the Lord will continue to give this side wisdom so that they continue to lead as they are leading. As the good book says, "Blessed are the peacemakers". Someone asked, what right did Barbados have down in Grenada? Barbados was there to help restore peace. We all are our brothers' keeper, and I would say that if you have to deal with the people in Grenada, you can be a very proud man. They would like to know now if they could have our Prime Minister for a little time to help them bring their country back to order.

The honourable Member just brought his passport back here to prove that he never went to Grenada because the passport does not have the stamp. I went to Grenada, too, and nobody ever asked me for a passport.

*Laughter.*

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would not try to detain you on this. Yesterday afternoon when the Deputy Leader of the Opposition got up and made such a wonderful speech and said such nice things about this side, I could not believe that you have other Members on that side who would try to make the commotion that we have had in here this afternoon. But I am glad to know that we have an island with people who are educated and know right from wrong.

When you note the ability of the Barbados Labour Party Government and the work and things they have done to transform this country completely, everybody can see that on every side, it makes me feel happy, as you would say, to know that Barbados is just a dot and

everyone today is looking to Barbados for leadership. You could think about such places as Guyana, Jamaica, and Trinidad who look to little Barbados. The thing that makes me feel real happy is that all the big planning and movements were here from Barbados. That just shows you the kind of Prime Minister that we have, and I feel that all of us in here, on both sides, should be praying that the Lord will continue to give him wisdom to lead this country right.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thank you.

*Applause.*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If no other Member wishes to exercise his right to speak, the Prime Minister will now reply.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to thank all honourable Members on the opposite side of the House for the tone of the debate which, with few exceptions, has been most informative and instructive. Most of the points which, I imagined, would arise to be answered have been dealt with.

The honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig) very competently reported that the security situation for the future ought to be such as to minimize the risk of coups and counter-coups, of Army brutality or even Opposition disloyalty.

The point being dealt with was one raised by the honourable member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes), who made a very sweeping statement that most Armies in small countries have overthrown their Governments at one time or the other. This is not true, Sir. A very small number of Armies in islands or former colonies, such as ours, has betrayed their military oaths and demonstrated disloyalty towards the Government that created them. But it is not the pattern in small island States that Armies overthrow Governments. Indeed, Oppositions have more than once overthrown Governments, and we even had an instance of a Prime Minister overthrowing the Government, of which he was a part, and making himself a President in the Seychelles.

It is not every violent overthrow of Government that is a result of an insurrection in the Army or the Police Force, and, it does no service to the Barbados Defence Force, or any other Defence Force in the Eastern Caribbean, to suggest that Armies always rise up in small countries. Every time it is repeated, you destroy just a little of that confidence that should exist between a Defence Force and the population which it serves. In my view, all these statements that alienate the military from the civilian population, themselves contribute as much to subsequent insurrections as any ideas the military might have of their own accord.

9.10 p.m.

We have recently had a Minister of a Church, not a Barbadian, although he has lived and worked here for some years, preaching vigorously against the Defence Force and the National Youth Training Scheme. It is these mischievous interpolations that separate man from man, divide the Army from the people, that may lead to the destructiveness of Army revolts in due course.

In any event, it is to be hoped that with a Regional Security Force, responsible for Army functions throughout the region, whether it is stationed in each island or not, we will go so far as to minimise the dangers as to meet the point made by the honourable Member. I will not dwell on it, because it is still a matter of study and negotiation at the present time. But I certainly will tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and tell the people of Barbados, that I fully support the idea of regionalising our security system, both on land and at sea, as it is at present.

Another small point to be dealt with, Sir, relates to the situation on the St. George's Medical School. The St. George's Medical School has been unhappy in Grenada for a number of years. That is an open secret. It should also be quite well known that we have done nothing to encourage it to come to Barbados. There have been applications and discussions about the matter over, not weeks or months, but years.

In the present circumstances, an application was made for students, who until recently had been in Grenada, to come to Barbados to continue their studies. I am on record, when I was Minister of Health, as stating on the file that we should do absolutely nothing to take advantage of Grenada at the present time, such as seek to divert the economic value of the medical school from Grenada to Barbados. But the officers of the medical school indicated that there would be nowhere to teach the students in Grenada, and therefore we agreed for some of them to come here. I believe that there is an intention, in any event, of expanding the school.

The other point I will take this opportunity of dealing with is the point made by the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners, a completely irrelevant point, since the medical students are not going to be using any medical facilities paid for by the taxpayers of Barbados. We have always said that, we have always made it clear that we could support medical schools coming here only if they did not seek to use the facilities at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, which we are reserving for the University of the West Indies.

Another point covered in the speeches of honourable Members opposite and of honourable Members on this side relates to the situation in Trinidad and Tobago and the very narrow issue of my request to Prime Minister Chambers to withdraw his Ambassador. The language used has been tempered from that which

was current early yesterday morning when, in the debate on another Resolution, the Opposition lived right up to its customary reputation of being the friends of every country but their own, and of taking any stick to beat the Prime Minister and the Government, however much comfort it may have given to those who seek to demean and drag down Barbados.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, I am very glad to say, did not disfigure the broadcast debate by his accusations that the Prime Minister is not a gentleman, that he was beneath contempt, or some such phrase; I cannot exactly remember it. I would only seek to say that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central often seeks to demean others and he does not always realise that he is demeaning Barbados, and, above all, demeaning himself, in his abusive approach to public issues, his personalising of those issues, and is seeing nothing but instant Party ambition, instant advantage to satisfy his own overweening ambition for the power which he covets and lusts for so obviously in this Chamber and elsewhere.

I would hardly dwell on this point at all, Mr. Deputy Speaker, had not the honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin), a very honest debater and a very honest politician, I believe, commented how divisive we were on this side. The honourable Member is honest, but honesty does not prevent you from being wrong. The great divider in this society is the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. The great promoter of hatred is that honourable Member. And if there is something that astonishes me, it is that the Government should be accused of dividing the society! A whole General Election was fought in 1981 on the basis of encouraging one group in society to hate the Government and hate people who said they supported the Government.

I particularly resent the accusation that this Government, which, above all, has sought strength and unity, should be accused of dividing the country. I have no apologies to make for the language which was used in connection with the High Commissioner for Trinidad and Tobago. The only reservation I might have had was whether he himself was the guilty person, and since Prime Minister Chambers assured me, gave me quite exceptional assurance, that my message had not been conveyed to him, I could come to only one conclusion, and that conclusion is a highly unsatisfactory one, which, as I said in my Second Reading speech, was that a High Commissioner decided to offer the Head of the Government to which he was accredited the unprecedented diplomatic insult of suggesting that he was lying. Because that is what he basically said about my consultation with the gentleman.

Now, on a matter of another consultation, the consultation between the Leader of the Opposition and the

Government, particularly the Prime Minister. On a date which is well remembered by the Cabinet Secretary and myself, I asked him to get in touch with the Leader of the Opposition so that I might apprise him of what was intended. Indeed, I asked the Cabinet Secretary to make an appointment for me with the Leader of the Opposition, and in the evening to make an appointment for me with His Excellency the Governor-General. The Cabinet Secretary rang, and, according to his report to me, spoke to a lady several times, attempting to make this appointment with the Leader of the Opposition. Finally, the lady said she was afraid to ring the Leader of the Opposition further, that he could not keep the appointment, and that he might be a little annoyed if he were further pressed.

Since we are being accused of not carrying out the procedures, I am forced to expose the entire transaction. I believe that there were three telephone calls. Now, I am not in the slightest annoyed with the Leader of the Opposition and fully accept that he was indisposed and was unable to keep the appointment that day. I do, however, believe that within 24 hours the Leader of the Opposition knew exactly what it was I wanted to see him about, and exercised an understanding about the situation greater perhaps than that of his colleagues on this occasion.

9.20 p.m.

On a later occasion, after the initial tumult and shouting had died, I again tried to get in touch with the Leader of the Opposition. On that occasion, the Cabinet Secretary spoke to Mr. Morrison, who had by now returned from the United States of America. On that occasion it also proved impossible to get together.

I agreed to write a letter, which the Leader of the Opposition had hoped to receive before he went to Trinidad for medical attention. The Leader of the Opposition indicated that he was getting a medical opinion at 1:00 o'clock on a particular day and if the opinion was in a certain direction, he would need to have the letter that day because he might be going out of the island. Regrettably, the draft of the letter was inadequate. I wished to give him more information than it contained. He had to leave the island. I was not able to make the corrections in time. I believe he went to Trinidad with the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. The letter has only recently been completed and, I hope, is in the hands of the right honourable Member for St. John, the Leader of the Opposition.

I trust that that will put pale to all suggestions that there was either discourtesy or lack of a sufficient consultation about the matter.

Honourable Members must really recall that this was intended to be a swift and sharp operation. Maurice Bishop was murdered on a Wednesday, and it was the

following Monday night that Forces assembled from all over the Caribbean and from an American carrier Task Force and from the United States concentrated at Grantley Adams Airport and on one or two naval vessels, and launched against Grenada. Within that time the staff officers of the Caribbean Security Forces had to sit down and prepare a plan. That plan was co-ordinated with a plan prepared by the American military authorities. There was a great deal going on. There were diplomatic negotiations going on within CARICOM. I could not speak to the Leader of the Opposition before the situation was clear, and I had proposed speaking to him before I spoke to the Governor-General. I was going to speak to the Leader of the Opposition before I received President Reagan's reply and explain to him what was in the air and the timetable for the remainder of the day.

*Asides.*

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am reminded that I should say at this point, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was also out of the island and we did not know who to recognize as number three in that particular pack.

I must say that I miss the presence of the Leader of the Opposition in this debate. He would have added tone to the debate from the Opposition benches. It is true that despite his years of experience, he has never been called to deal with the security problems that we have now had to meet four times in seven years. Barbados has never had that kind of problem. He could not have had it during his days of Premier and did not have it during his nine years and nine months as Prime Minister. We have had the Cubana airplane at the same time as the Sidney Alleyne invasion threat and the invasion threat backed by South Africa and Dominica — once again Sidney Alleyne. We had the St. Vincent insurgent and now we have had a major military operation.

But I think the Leader of the Opposition's general wisdom might perhaps have tempered some of the remarks which we have heard here today. If critical support can be given as ungraciously as I have heard in the speech of the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt), I really would like to know how an uncritical Opposition would have shown its head. I have seldom seen support given with such bad grace as in one or two speeches, although I must say that this is not true of the majority of speeches. The speech by the honourable Member for St. Philip South (Mr. H. A. Blackman) could very easily have been made on this side of the House.

Now to the situation itself. I can add very little to what has been said in the debate arising out of the points made. I think that, even as we have been speak-

ing, events have been developing. The Grenadian people will choose in the end, and they have been given some evidence to point them in the direction in the way in which their choice should lie. Those in Grenada who take the view that the intervention should not have taken place, the rump of the New Jewel Movement plus the dissidents of the New Jewel Movement, have put forward arguments which can only persuade the rest of mankind that what was done was very well done and that all of them are a pack of undeserving criminals.

Mr. Radix, who appears in the Minutes of the Central Committee as a bourgeois deviationist, an individualist, a person lacking in Marxist-Leninist application, a person whose position in the Party must be seriously considered – and the arguments were whether he was a full bourgeois individualist, or only a petty bourgeois deviationist – Mr. Radix has now declared that we should not have intervened, although his name was on the execution list – we should not have intervened, we should have left them to sort matters out with a Civil War! And he and Mr. Louison have concurred in this view that they should have been allowed to have a Civil War and they would have won. But at the expense of how many Grenadians? With the blood of how many women and children of that island, obviously intended by Radix and Louison to be made even more miserable?

I condemn them in the same terms as honourable Members on both sides have condemned Coard and Austin. The revulsion of right-thinking people against the defeated revolutionaries should now be complete when they hear that Radix and Louison hoped that in a wash of blood that they would have succeeded. Instead, in a swift operation, for I must tell you that the operation was virtually over in the first day – a swift operation, few deaths – Grenada has been restored to law and order.

It may have seemed that it took some time for the entire island to be cleared. The reasons were only a deliberate intention of making haste slowly. There was no intention of occupying Grenada as if it were an enemy country, driving up the road, guns blazing, as would have happened in Vietnam, every tree, every house being levelled to clear a field of fire from a roadway in order to achieve objectives.

9.30 p.m.

The troops moved slowly; the Americans moved ahead; they avoided killing citizens. The Caribbean Security Forces had particular targets; those targets were met. Very, very few persons were killed. The operation really, basically, was over at once. It was over once the Cubans had fired off the ammunition in the trenches at Point Salines, this wonderful civil airport with deep anti-tank trenches and anti-aircraft gun emplacements, with barracks for 600 people, large warehouses with several

thousand AK-47s in them, four million cartridges, enough to kill everybody in the West Indies, this wonderful civil airport that the British firm that is building it says is in no way military. God bless a country that has construction workers who can put down the shovel and pick up the AK-47 and give a good account of themselves! Once the wonderful construction workers had finished, that was really the end of it. So it was an easy swift operation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, recognition of the fact that it was an easy, surgical operation is now pouring in on all sides. The Government is conducting a very active diplomacy at the moment to convince the world of the facts of the situation. I myself am writing to the Foreign Minister of the Organisation of American States where we have some hope of an improved understanding. I am writing to a great number of Prime Ministers and Presidents, in many cases thanking them for the understanding attitude they have shown; in other cases setting out the arguments which moved the OECS, Barbados and Jamaica and eventually the United States.

I have written a long letter to Mr. Trudeau. I have written to thank Mr. Muldoon in New Zealand, whose country abstained in all the critical votes, supported the amendment at the United Nations calling for free elections in Grenada, voted with Barbados and the rest of us in seeking to prevent closure of debate on the main motion.

It may not be known, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but they actually moved the guillotine on us at the United Nations to stop all the little Caribbean countries from putting their case. It was carried by five or six votes. Other than that, the debate might still be going on now as far as I am concerned, but they moved the guillotine on us. New Zealand supported us very loyally.

I have written to the Prime Minister of Fiji. I have written to the Prime Minister of Australia, the glory in fact that Australia voted for the motion, setting out our case to Australia. I have written to him as a fellow leader of a Party which is a member of Socialist International, which is holding a meeting in Brussels next week, at which our Party will be represented and the Government will also be represented by, as a Special Ambassador, who will be appointed a Minister for the occasion, the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon H. deB. Forde).

I have written to President Mitterand again at length, since France, as a Caribbean power, I feel should have given us greater understanding. And it is noteworthy that France appears to be virtually the first country in the Caribbean that has now had to bear the brunt of the counter-attack. Because for all France's supporting the Resolution in the United Nations, it is in France the first

bombs had exploded. There are 100 French soldiers and policemen now in Guadeloupe where terrorism has broken out within these last days.

I have appealed to President Mitterand. He and I, in fact, were delegates to the Socialist International meeting at which the New Jewel Movement was admitted as a member, and we are particularly seeking France's understanding as an eastern Caribbean power that has intervened in the past. The French Minister on the Security Council did make it clear that France recognised only two circumstances which legitimated the intervention: one was invitation and the other a United Nations resolution. We are pointing out that we were invited and that this should be as sufficient for France in the case of Grenada as it has been in the case of Chad and other African countries.

I have written also to the Prime Minister of Portugal, Mario Suarez, who was also at that 1979 meeting in Lisbon of Socialist International under the Prime Minister of Spain, another fellow member of Socialist International.

We are also going to give thanks to all those countries with which Barbados has diplomatic relations, which either abstained or voted with us at the United Nations in the matter. These include Belgium, Haiti, Turkey, Japan, Israel, West Germany and Luxemburg.

I would particularly single out Belgium. The Belgium delegation at the United Nations moved an amendment to the condemnatory Resolution, seeking to include therein a clause calling for free and fair elections in Grenada after the invasion. Some countries, including Guyana, voted against discussing the Belgium amendment. Some countries, the Communist countries mainly, voted against calling for free and fair elections in Grenada. Some countries in the Caribbean, believe it or not again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, even abstained on the call for free and fair elections in Grenada, and I much regret that among the countries abstaining was not only Guyana, but also the Bahamas and Trinidad and Tobago.

In conclusion, I just want to offer thanks to all those associated with the entire operation, including the members of the House of Assembly and the Democratic Labour Party, our Party and so on.

The Leader of the Opposition deserves thanks for the immediacy of his forthright condemnation and his call for international intervention. He faltered just a little bit, because at ten past one on the evening in question, I with my own ears heard a question put to him on CBC as to what exactly did he mean by international intervention, and he did not say anything about getting together Caribbean security forces. He said "Oh, U.N. sanctions", or something like that. So the Opposition need not take

claim for the intervention as well as for the Defence Force.

I thought I had heard everything, but when I heard the speech of the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford), in which he said that the D.L.P. created the Defence Force and that the Barbados Labour Party was against it, I really thought that the world was being stood just a little bit on its head. And I could not help noticing the honourable Member for St. Michael West wincing as the blows were delivered. But the honourable Member for St. Michael South has always been consistent in one thing, his recognition of the fact that St. Anns Fort and 300 soldiers lie within his constituency.

Thanks have to go out to the Defence Force itself; of course to Colonel Lewis, who has been breveted as a Brigadier under the provisions of our Regulations. We have no rank higher than Colonel in the Defence Force. The highest paid post is that of Colonel. Honorary ranks can, however, be given, but the Regulations do put a time limit on the period for which the honorary ranks are normally awarded. But I will say that, so long as Colonel Lewis is in charge of the Regional Security Force, I shall advise His Excellency, the Governor-General to maintain the rank of Brigadier. I think that some recognition should be given to this distinguished officer for the organization of the Regional Security Force, for establishing confidence in the Regional Security Force, both in the general public and the political directorate.  
9.40. p.m.

I have had the opportunity of being able to assess the staff work of the Regional Security Force, because they produced their own plan for the occupation of Grenada. I was very glad to see, and happy to say, that it resembled in all material particulars the plan eventually followed. So even if the two plans were arrived at independently, at least they met the criteria of the greatest general staff which has ever been known on the earth, which is the Prussian General Staff, where it was always said that any two Prussian General Officers would arrive at the correct plan for dealing with a military situation.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Is he a Prussian?)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If you call the Americans Prussians.

Be that as it may, the Brigadier of the Defence Force deserves our particular gratitude, congratulations and thanks.

I am not going to call any other names in the Defence Force. But I would say that there is an officer of the Defence Force whose role was that of intelligence,

and he was assisted by another officer drafted into the intelligence role. I believe that they appear in *Time Magazine* described as two Grenadian intelligence officers who discovered the whereabouts of General Hudson Austin and kept him located there until he could be captured. I think that these feats should elicit some recognition in due course. But I intend to name no names other than that of the Force Commander himself.

I would also like to thank my fellow members of the Defence Board. The Defence Board consists of the Brigadier, the honourable Member for St. George South (Hon. L. R. Tull) and Mr. Algy Symmonds, Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Defence and Security, along with myself. Many late nights were spent by the four of us in one function or another.

The honourable Member for St. George South, in his capacity not only as Minister responsible for Foreign Affairs and for the Police, but as Attorney-General, was able, by his diplomatic approach and his drafting skill, to smooth over many a difficulty that loomed large during the negotiating stage. He was always on hand when nervousness on the part of some threatened even the tenor of proceedings.

I am very amused when I read in the *New York Times*, in the otherwise highly accurate column, of the draft which came down from the United States of the formal request which they wanted. I do assure honourable Members that the ultimate request which went to the United States was drafted entirely by the honourable Member for St. George South, assisted by his officers.

I would particularly like to thank Mr. Errol Chase, the Deputy Chief Parliamentary Counsel, for the long hours which he spent on legal work associated with the operation; Mr. Babb, the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, who was in on this matter some hours before, even I was, and who remained in on it until the end; the Cabinet Secretary, Mr. Frank Blackman, and my Private Secretary also, Mrs. Shirley King. I know it is unusual to have this parade of names of public officers, but these people, Sir, carried more secrets than any Barbadian public officers ever had to carry that I can think of, and were placed under more pressure of an international kind than I think anyone in our Public Service has ever before faced.

I have already thanked the churches, people, the Opposition. I am glad that the honourable Member for St. Philip North was able to reach the honourable Member for St. Michael South in Nairobi and warn him of the depth of feeling in Barbados, the depth of support for the operation, to ensure that he would not say anything to embarrass him on his return.

*Laughter.*

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It only remains for me now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to call on all persons to support the Interim Government in Grenada, to support our Forces in Grenada, which, for some considerable time, will be giving law and order and security protection to that country.

I want all of us to support our policemen in Grenada who are trying to teach the Grenadian people what a Police Force is all about after, not four years, but perhaps ten years of not knowing what policing is all about in that country. All of them are volunteers, and if at first, they did not volunteer to sleep in Mr. Gairy's house, I for one can hardly find fault with them. They are certainly going about their jobs in Grenada in a manner that would please Barbadians.

There is still a long way to go in Grenada. We have decisions to make, we in the regional security area, the members of the OECS, and Jamaica. But we can do no more than offer guidance, because we are not there as conquerors any more than the Americans are there as conquerors. We are there as guests, the Governor-General's guests, and we do not intend to exceed our role.

The Chief Electoral Officer of Barbados has already been alerted by me, and he will very shortly be producing documentation to lead towards the full registration of the Grenadian people. I am suggesting that it be done on a full photographic basis, so that they will have a National Population Register and will be able to use it, not only for electoral purposes at a single election, but for future elections as voters come of age, and for general assistance in the management of the economy and of Government within the island.

We have also to attempt some reconciliation with those Caribbean countries which did not initially join in the operation.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Hear, hear!)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It will be very difficult to have any reconciliation with the President of Guyana. He has come to the crossroads. He has decided, basically, that his Government is not one that could find it possible seriously to condemn the murderers of Grenada, or to vote for sanctions or anything else. He has not found it possible to support the idea of free and fair elections in Grenada. The reconciliation will have to come from that direction. We have no steps to take in Guyana's direction at this present time. The Government of Guyana.....

9.50 p.m.

*Aside.*

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I hear a *sotto voce* remark saying that we must exclude the people. Our love for the people of Guyana is unbounded. Our sympathy for the people of Guyana is even more unbounded. But we cannot move towards that Government. It has abused us unmercifully. It has disrespected democracy and disregarded decency in the Caribbean. Not Guyana!

Belize, the Bahamas — I have already written to Mr. Pindling — he is the first person I wrote to — Trinidad and Tobago, we will draw them back into the fold, as they, too, come to realize the wisdom and propriety of our action during the past few weeks.

Mr. Deputy Speaker that concludes my speech. In two days' time I will be going out for the Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting in New Delhi where I have no doubt that these matters will be canvassed at great length. I pledge that I will represent faithfully the sentiments of Barbadians, and the support of the Opposition, when called on to deal with the problems of Grenada at that Commonwealth forum.

I beg, Sir, that this Resolution do now pass.

*Applause.*

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

#### SUSPENSION

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is going to be a debate on the other side on this measure which I was about to introduce. In the light of the time now, I will not proceed any further with Government Business. Therefore, I move that this sitting be suspended until November 17, 1983 at 4.00 p.m.

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

*The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the House accordingly.*  
10.00 p.m.

#### ON RESUMPTION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. Order No. 4.

#### THE SPECIAL LOANS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1983

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Special Loans Act is one of the bits of legislation in Barbados which provides the means whereby the Legislature exercises control over the ability

of the Executive to borrow money without reference to the Legislature.

It is resorted to when the object of the loan is for projects of a reasonably large nature, the sources of the loans are external funds, and the terms of the loans are long term. It is also used when the projects are not the subject of specific authorisation for borrowing for the particular project. I can give an example of that. When the Deep Water Harbour was built, there was a special Bill which was brought, which authorised the peculiar funding for the Deep Water Harbour.

Of late, neither under the previous Administration, nor under this Administration, has there been the practice of bringing a special Bill for a specific project. Over the course of the years, the limits under this Special Loans Act have been increased from time to time. The Act now limits the amount to some \$200 million.

There have been a number of extraordinary projects in the course of the last three years which have fallen to be financed and rather than bring specific Bills in respect of them, resort was made to this Act. At this time, now that a number of these projects are nearing completion and their permanent funding has to be regulated, it has been thought appropriate that legislative authority be sought to increase the authorisation of Parliament in relation to these projects.

If I may just highlight a few of the large projects which have fallen to be financed over the last five years — I am calling them not necessarily in relation to their importance or cost, I am calling them just in relation to the way they are set out here — they are: the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic, the Airport Terminal Building, the Spring Garden and St. Barnabas Road, the Sewerage Plant, the World Bank education school building programme, the Heywoods Holiday Village, and the Cement Plant, and others.

I think it would be fair at this stage to tell honourable Members something about the state of the National Debt, and the state of the foreign debt as opposed to domestic debt. The National Debt at the end of July 1983 was Bds. \$837.3 million; the local borrowing was \$496.6 million, or 59.3 per cent of the National Debt. The proportion of short term borrowing as a percentage of total borrowing has remained relatively constant as a percentage of the relative total debt over the years and, that is between 35 and 40 per cent.

The percentage of National Debt should be looked at in relation to our ability to repay the same, and that is the debt service in relation to our foreign exchange earnings. These are well known ratios. In addition, the proportion of the National Debt to GDP is an important component. In particular, what is equally more important and of more significance, is the foreign component of the National Debt to the GDP, and that is a relatively safe figure of 15 per cent.

When we talk of National Debt in Barbados, it is also important to recognise that since about 1971, there has been no Local Government, so that much of the expenditure in other countries which would be part of the local authority debt is now categorised as national debt in Barbados.

If there are any questions that honourable Members would want to ask, I am perfectly willing to see whether I have the information here.

The servicing of debt as a percentage of revenue, I will draw to honourable Members' attention, is 19.5 per cent of current revenue. Here I will draw honourable Members' attention to the fact that any drop in interest rates in the world is of some importance and some relief to developing countries, Barbados and others.

The final ratio I will draw to honourable Members' attention is that the debt service as a percentage of our GDP is 5.3 per cent in 1982.

I think honourable Members will have noticed that, over the course of the last two years, the Government exercised tremendous prudence in the capital development programme in Barbados. We did our best to reschedule as many projects as we could, having regard to the legal consequences of changing the terms of the building and other contracts.

4.10 p.m.

We also placed a limit on the number of new projects that were started. We segregated and concentrated our attention on the projects which, in our opinion, were of a capital nature and at the same time of a nature which, in the future, would be vitally necessary either to the health of our community and indirectly therefore to our economic improvement, or the projects which would in the future earn foreign exchange to pay for themselves.

I think that all honest commentators would recognize that, in the face of the international recession that dominated the economies throughout the world, the developed as well as the developing, we in Barbados have been relatively lucky that our landscape has not been plagued or blurred by a large number of unfinished projects. Some might not have been completed in the time span we would have liked them to have been completed in, but the point is that we do not have monstrosities hanging in the air, in which no work is going on and none will be going along in the foreseeable future.

I want the honourable Members to go around Barbados and come up with those projects where nothing is happening. They will only be able to come up with one or two housing projects, which were rescheduled, and which, I am confident, will be completed, and on which work will be restarted in this financial year.

*Asides*

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I am trying to cut short the debate.

All the other projects would either have been completed or are well on the way to completion, adding grace to the landscape in Barbados, adding a future stream of income to repay the debt incurred, providing permanent employment for thousands more, and increasing more GDP. There is only one difficulty in that the better these projects do, the more difficulty we face in the international arena trying to convince bankers and others that we are not so well off.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, on this Bill to amend the Special Loans Act, giving as it Objects and Reasons the need to extend the limit on the sums of money that Government may borrow from any bank, corporation, company or other institution for purposes to be approved by Parliament and increasing that limit from \$200 million to \$375 million, I wish to state right at the beginning that this Opposition has been extremely concerned over the years about the very rapid escalation of the public debt in Barbados, in particular the foreign component of the public debt. So we have come to the decision that the time has come where we have to send a clear signal to the Government. We are not only prepared to plead with them to avoid this excessive borrowing, which will have to be repaid some day and which will be a major strain on this country, on the working population yet unborn, we intend to send this signal today by voting against this particular Bill. The reasons, for that decision, and signal will be set out very clearly by me in my capacity as principal spokesman for the Opposition on financial matters.

We have been told that the National Debt of Barbados at the end of July was the massive figure of \$837 million — in a small country like Barbados! I wish to let it be clearly known that the way these figures are computed, they do not include the public guaranteed debt, and in Barbados it is very difficult to be sure of the public guaranteed debt at any given time. In fact, we would not have known if it was not included in the IMF documents, which were made available to this House, and which I published elsewhere, some time in 1982. Since then, there would have been a considerable amount of drawdowns on those loans which were publicly guaranteed.

One cannot say what the exact figure is, but that figure might well be approaching somewhere in the region of \$175 million to \$200 million; or certainly by the end of this financial year it would be somewhere in that region. The projections by the IMF have indicated that they would be somewhere in that region, bearing in mind the massive drawdown which would have been made by the Barbados Light and Power Company despite the cutback on its programme, as indicated in the Public Utilities Board hearing earlier this year.

We can safely say that the true public debt of Barbados is approaching \$1 billion. We can say that with certainty when we add the domestic debt, the public debt, as recorded in the Central Bank's statistics, and we add to that the public guaranteed debt, which is not included in these statistics.

It is also very important to note that, in terms of the public guaranteed debt, most of that debt is an external debt. It consists of loans made almost in their entirety to public institutions. So it is just a question of a change of name as to who is responsible for the debt.

When the Barbados Development Bank makes a loan, which is guaranteed by Parliament, that becomes a public guaranteed debt, but, in true fact, it is part of the public debt. What has been happening here is that a lot of the public debt is being concealed by allowing the debt to be committed by totally-owned subsidiaries of Government and then giving a Government guarantee. Then, that debt, of course, is not reflected in the National Debt.

4.20 p.m.

In other words, Sir, if when the debt is contracted the loan was made to Government and then on-lent to the statutory board it would reflect in the public debt as put out by the Central Bank of Barbados. If it is loaned directly to the statutory board and guaranteed by Government, it is not reflected in these statistics. So the external debt of Barbados would be much higher than the amount stated by the honourable Deputy Prime Minister.

That level of indebtedness is totally unjustified, Sir, because what do we have in Barbados today? We have seen an escalation in public debt. But this is the same country with high levels of unemployment, indeed with contrasting opportunities for many of the young people of Barbados, particularly in the area of job generation and so on.

Let us look at the public debt. I am reading from the Central Bank of Barbados Economic and Financial Statistics, August 1983 at page 59: "The external component of the public debt of Barbados was a mere \$50.2 million at the end of 1976." Did you hear the year, Sir? At the end of 1976. At the end of 1976 major develop-

ment projects had taken place in this country. From the beginning of Barbados until 1976, the external debt was a mere \$50 million. By the end of June of this year, that public debt had risen to \$336.5 million, a rise of over 600 per cent in the external debt of Barbados. What permanent benefits can you see in Barbados as a consequence of that?

I did not make a note of the July figure which was given by the honourable Deputy Prime Minister in his submission, but the figure which he gave was significantly higher than the \$336.5 million which I have just quoted. Now you can add to that a substantial amount of foreign debt which has been publicly guaranteed by the Government of Barbados. And out of that total package of guaranteed debt, a very small component is for private enterprise; the overwhelming majority is for totally-owned subsidiaries of the Government of Barbados.

When you look at the total debt, when you add the domestic component to the external component, the figure is equally shocking and horrendous. Indeed, Sir, you are talking of a total debt of some \$258.8 million in 1976 which had risen to \$831 million at the end of June 1983, and at the end of July to \$837 million. It is important for us to sit back and reflect. We just cannot continue borrowing money at this sort of pace.

Now we are being asked to increase the limit under this Bill from \$200 million by \$175 million, almost 100 per cent. Earlier on, I made a public statement that this Government had been negotiating or seeking to negotiate a package of loans to reflate this economy through borrowed money, in the same way in which they did in 1978 and 1980, with the calamitous effects in 1981. I have identified all the public institutions and even private corporations which have been approached around the world; the first bit would be flowing in in the area of that housing loan. And the object of bringing this particular piece of legislation is to facilitate borrowing for the reflation of this economy for election purposes.

Sir, let me tell you something else. There are big problems with borrowed money; not only the question of repaying it, but also the stresses and strains that it places on the economy, because you must remember that this debt has to be serviced. A year ago, we spent almost \$100 million servicing the debt of this country. This year we will spend probably nearly another \$100 million, except that that would be decreased somewhat by the falling interest rates and by the fall in the Treasury Bill rate.

But the point is this. You have a situation where for every \$5 that is paid into the Treasury of Barbados \$1 goes to the service of debt, and indeed a significant proportion of that dollar would go to the servicing of external debt, thereby generating employment for people living overseas. That is what happens, because in the

final analysis, when you contract debt of this kind, it represents a net outflow of resources from the country unless the debt is used domestically for the purposes which would generate income in the short, medium and long term of such a nature as would service that debt, whilst at the same time meeting other domestic demands that are made on the external earnings of this country.

That did not happen, and it has not happened over the past seven years. What has happened in Barbados over the past seven years is that a lot of money that was borrowed was in fact put into projects which are not generators of foreign income, either in the short, medium or long term.

There are several projects the money would have been sunk in. In fact, many of these projects have made significant demands on current revenue. The projects have pre-empted current revenue whilst indeed making less of the foreign exchange that we earn overseas available to maintain the standards of living in Barbados that are so important. The point I am making is that the Government has not only been borrowing money indiscriminately, but they are not planning the projects for which they have been borrowing money in accordance with well recognised principles. There must be a spread of the projects, to which you commit foreign debt in such a way that they earn income in the short, medium and long terms so that they would be self-servicing as you go along.  
4.30 p.m.

Another major problem, and a very serious problem, is that this kind of borrowing to reflate the economy to meet electoral deadlines usually results in the clustering of debt payments. We already have a serious problem to encounter in 1985 and 1986, when we are going to be faced with the repayment of a large amount of debt that was contracted in the 1980-81 period, with a four year moratorium and with principles and interest payments commencing in the 1985-86 period.

You are going to have a problem. In 1981, you were able to print money to find the domestic currency to assist in the repletion of the economy. You are now in an IMF programme, which is going to significantly limit your access to the Central Bank of Barbados. But you have implemented a diversion tactic now, where you are now pre-empting National Insurance funds.

This is a very serious matter. When one looks and sees the extent to which Government has been borrowing from the National Insurance Board, one sees that the way this has escalated over the past year or two is quite extraordinary. It is creating a very serious problem in terms of liquidity within the banking system of Barbados, because the Government is so actively competing for National Insurance money that you would note very carefully that the growth of deposits within the banking system

in Barbados has been unexpectedly low during this period. And despite the fall in interest rates, there has not been the kind of response in economic activity which you would expect to flow from that fall — because of the unavailability of liquidity within the banking system of Barbados.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Thank God, they cannot buy motor cars. Thank God.)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Look at the National Insurance Board, same document, page 40. You have to look at these things very carefully so that you will see exactly what is happening. Sorry, Sir, page 59 is the page. I am trying to find the amount borrowed from the National Insurance.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: This man is not specific at all, he is judgmental.)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The figure is not there, but I believe it is moving towards somewhere in the region of \$100 million. I would like to be sure of that figure. Excuse me.

*Asides.*

(Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Sandy is a classical scholar. He is not in that department.)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I will check that later, Sir, and correct it, if necessary.

*Asides.*

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, I understand it is on page 42: Treasury Bills, National Insurance Board.

Let me give you an example of what I mean, and you will see exactly what is happening here. In 1976, the Treasury Bills, under, "Assets and Liabilities of the National Insurance Board", were somewhere in the region of \$11.2 million.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: That was a mini economy then, man.)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: In 1981, when we had this massive explosion in the economy, according to them — they say it was a mini economy when we were there — but even up to 1981 when you were printing money, the Treasury Bills were only somewhere in the region of \$27 million. Comes the IMF into action and they cannot print any more money, they are restricted to access to the Central Bank of Barbados, and you see now that the Treasury Bills would reach \$102.7 million! So a major source of Government borrowing and Government financing in Barbados is now National Insurance funds.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: It is the people's Government.)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It is the people's Government, but yet they are Insurance funds, and the Government has the responsibility to ensure that those funds are properly invested in the widest spread and in the safest forms of investment. It is not money from taxation. It is insurance money. It is not money that the Government can appropriate. You can use it, but you cannot appropriate it.

But you also have an even higher duty than this, that is, too make sure that the investment portfolio is used in the long term, in the interest of the insured persons in this country. And we have a situation in Barbados where many people, who fall into a situation where they qualify for National Insurance benefits, have to wait for long periods of time before they can get any money from the National Insurance Board, whilst the Government is using \$109 million of National Insurance money! And you tell me that this is good management!

You are now beginning to thread on a very serious area of national life, because you have been forced to back off the Central Bank of Barbados. And it was at this time in 1981 when it was discovered that you had printed the money, and it was during a similar debate, if my memory is correct, to increase the amount of money that Government might borrow under a similar Bill, to \$200 million or maybe a lesser sum, that it was first revealed in this Parliament what had taken place during the period December to June, 1981.

Now, Sir, to the questions we have to ask ourselves. Has that increase in the National Debt been reflected in improvements in the standards of living of the people of Barbados? Has it been reflected, Sir, in the generation of permanent employment opportunities in this country?

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Ask yourself that.)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The answer is, "No".

People in Barbados are becoming progressively worse off. Let us face it. More and more people are becoming unemployed. No matter what kind of statistics you give me, I know that there are more people losing their jobs every day in Barbados than getting jobs in Barbados. There are as many people in Barbados today unemployed as there were in 1976, if not more.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Nonsense! Twenty-five percent down!)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You are even contradicting your own Prime Minister now, because he himself said that it was about 13 per cent when they come to power,

when it was 26 per cent in 1974 and 1975. You are contradicting him now.

I am glad to hear the honourable Deputy Prime Minister say that it was 26 per cent, because the Records of this House would indicate that the Prime Minister of this country, on more than one occasion, revised his opinion of unemployment at that time and fixed the figure somewhere in the region of about 13 per cent, two per cent lower than the official figures of 15.6 per cent. He fixed it two per cent lower.

I would think that the level of unemployment today is about the same if not more than in 1976. So unemployment opportunities have not increased as a consequence of the borrowing.

Has there been a significant increase in the productive capacity of Barbados and is that productive capacity functioning in a manner which will reflect this massive escalation in the National Debt? The answer to that, Sir, I say is, "No".

There has been some inappropriate and ill-timed expansion of the tourist plant in Barbados, one of the principal earners of foreign exchange which will repay the debt which is contracted. So the tourist plant is considerably under utilized to the extent of about 50 per cent or thereabouts.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Fifty percent?)

*Aside*

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Forty-five percent. Sorry. 4.40 p.m.

*Asides.*

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: .... I said has been to the extent of about 45 per cent, according to the room utilization rate figures, which you will find in the Central Bank reports or in the statistics of the Barbados Hotel Association.

The honourable Deputy Speaker might have figures that may indicate 100 per cent occupancy rate. I do not know if he has those figures. All that I am saying is that the figures coming out of his Ministry and the figures put out by the Central Bank of Barbados do not indicate that the hotel plant is functioning at that kind of capacity.

Indeed, it is interesting to note that very little of this public debt, as designated in these records, would have gone to the hotel plant. These records do not include the public guaranteed debt, and the financing of the hotel sector with foreign funds, guaranteed by the Government, has been done through the Barbados

Development Bank, and would not form part of the \$837 million referred here today.

I want to make my statement clear, because I know that as a rebuttal, the honourable Deputy Prime Minister will get up and say that I said that none of the foreign money which was borrowed went into the hotel sector. What I said is that very little of the \$837 million which appears here would have gone to the hotel sector, because that money would have come through the Barbados Development Bank, and most of their borrowing, as you know, has been from places like the European Investment Fund, with funds guaranteed by the Government by Resolutions approved by this Parliament over the years, with a small contribution from the Central Bank, which would not even appear in the domestic component of the debt. It would appear in the assets of the Central Bank of Barbados.

So when you look at employment, you cannot see any advances. When you look at the hotel sector, you cannot see how that borrowing has so far impinged on the capacity of that sector either to earn foreign exchange or generate an increase in employment. The only one, Sir, I believe would be at Heywoods Project, and we know what has happened to that. We know of the massive overruns. But I will deal with that when I deal with another aspect of the misuse of borrowed funds. I will deal with that later.

Look at the manufacturing sector. How much of this borrowed money has gone into the manufacturing sector? I would say very little. Again, Sir, you will find that most of the external funds which have gone into the manufacturing sector would be funds guaranteed by Parliament, and on-lent through the I.D.C. (Industrial Development Corporation). There have been at least two World Bank loans since I have been a Member of this House, where the House was called upon to guaranty loans from the World Bank to the I.D.C. for the purpose of industrial development in Barbados, for the construction of factories – either to the I.D.C. or some other organization I am not quite sure. But when we guarantee the money, we do not borrow it directly from the World Bank. It was guaranteed money, so it would not reflect here.

I want to go further. When you look at public sector activity, which forms an important part of the GDP of Barbados, what have you got? You have got new roads being built, whilst all the old roads go into severe disrepair. You have got increasing in potholes so that the designation "potholes" is no longer an appropriate description for the holes in Barbados. You have got a situation where you have had buildings built – non-productive in many instances, certainly not earning foreign exchange; people being employed for a short period during construction and then laid off thereafter.

So this kind of capital development programme which the Government has been pursuing can be designated as the most costly form of a crash programme that you can think of, because it is not determined on economic and financial principles, its basis is rooted in the political requirements of the Barbados Labour Party.

Despite all this debt the people in the Public Service have not been earning wages consistent with the rises in cost of living in Barbados. Job opportunities in the Public Service have been contracted over the years. It has not been expanding at the rate at which it expanded previously. It is a fact that throughout the Public Service people have been laid off. The layoffs have been considerable. I do not need to go from department to department. So I want you to tell me how the money was well spent. Do not talk to me in general terms. You have to identify and quantify to me how that \$837 million, an increase of some \$600 million, has resulted in permanent improvements in the standard of living of the people of Barbados.

I have dealt with employment, and I am quite sure, beyond a shadow of doubt, that the unemployment rate in Barbados today is no different than it was in 1976. I am quite sure that if you were to take the wages of people and relate that to prices, you are going to find that people are no better off. They are certainly complaining more in Barbados now than at any time in the history of this country that I have known. Let us face it. I have been around for 47 years now, and I have never heard so many people complaining about their financial positions.

By borrowing money in this sort of way, and by linking it to political objectives, it compromises the management of the projects and the management of the deployment of the borrowed funds.

I am sounding a warning to the Government now. We on this side really feel terribly upset at the way borrowed funds have gone down the drain due to lack of project management. Anytime you come to Parliament for money for any project in the future, we will be insisting that we have some knowledge and some indication as to how that project is going to be managed even at site. Unless you have control at site, as has been discovered now in many cities throughout the United States, you cannot really control public expenditure and make sure that it goes in the right places, unless you start off planning from zero in terms of expenditure on the particular project and make sure that you control every single element of that particular programme.

You have to do that, Sir. Think of all the overruns at Heywoods, millions and millions of dollars. With typical cynicism, probably \$100 million have gone down the drain over the past six years due to mismanagement

at project level and elsewhere. They say that it is no longer overruns; it is "revised cost." That is total cynicism, because if any private individual had run into the kind of overruns that the Government has been getting into, they would go bankrupt.

So any money that is borrowed for the purposes of public projects in Barbados requires the most careful scrutiny, Sir, and it requires the most detailed planning, and there is a duty which the Government should realize that it has to ensure that those funds are properly spent.  
4.50 p.m.

The disastrous expenditure over CARIFESTA; it hurts me, Sir, when you think that we are borrowing \$20 million for housing now and we threw away over \$20 million on CARIFESTA! Does it not hurt you, Sir, to know that my children and my grandchildren would have to find money as a consequence of this squandermania of this Government for electoral purposes? Imagine that! When you take decisions in relation to borrowing money, it is a very serious decision, and we just cannot allow ourselves to put political objectives way ahead of the true long term objectives of this country. We must improve our financial management.

Their concept of financial management is limited to more and more taxation, more efficient means of collecting taxation, including harassment of property owners, and unlawful activities in many areas; and, on the other hand, refusing to spend the money on the social services in this country, running down health, education, welfare and every social service in Barbados. That is their concept, to come back and tell you that they have a surplus on current account. That is what they tell you, and then borrow money and pour money down the drain in terms of all their capital projects!

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Are you not tired repeating yourself?)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Tired? I will never be tired! I realise that the future of this country is already seriously compromised by incompetence and the squandermania that has taken place, particularly during the pre-election period of 1981.

We have gone now to the Central Bank of Barbados. The honourable Deputy Prime Minister argued with his colleagues for years that that sort of expenditure is unjustified in Barbados. I can say that as a matter of fact. The Deputy Prime Minister was against it. I want to hear him get up and justify the spending of that sort of money on that Central Bank building, because that money will also be financed by borrowings which will not be reflected in the national debt again, it is going to be reflected in the accounts of the Central Bank of Barbados.

Let me tell you how it is going to be paid. It is going to be paid out of the profits of the Central Bank. And you know what would normally happen to the profits of the Central Bank? Normally the profits of the Central Bank are paid into the Treasury of Barbados. The pre-appropriation profits of the Central Bank under the Central Bank Act are payable into the Treasury of Barbados, and what is going to happen now is that instead of realising somewhere between \$7.5 million to \$15 million a year, the Central Bank will find itself over the next ten, fifteen, twenty years having to service an even greater debt. Therefore, its pre-appropriation profits will be correspondingly reduced, that amount of revenue less will be available to the people of Barbados, and therefore that much more taxation would be required of the people of Barbados.

It is a classic example of showing how there can be a serious escalation of the true public debt of Barbados without being reflected in the \$837 million. The \$837 million you see here is money that has been spent by Government, not spent by all these agencies and so on.

I want to go to one or two other things. I am pleased, and I must say this, that for the first time, apart from the Member for Christ Church East (Hon. Dr. R. L. Cheltenham) on one occasion when he was on the back benches and therefore was able to speak a little more freely, the honourable Deputy Prime Minister has come in here and pointed out that your debt service, particularly when you are speaking of your foreign debt, has to relate not only to your export earnings, but of critical importance is that relationship to your Gross Domestic Product. It has always been my submission in this House, and honourable Members will remember this quite well that I have always argued about the dangers of looking at the percentage of your debt service in relation to foreign exchange earnings.

We have had the classic example of it here in Barbados. If you go along using your capacity to borrow, or judging your capacity to borrow, by relating your debt service to your foreign exchange earnings, you can run into a whole lot of trouble. In all these open economies you can all of a sudden get a situation where you get a dramatic drop in your export earnings, as has been the case in Barbados with the non-enclave sector of manufacturing declining, if you were to correct for inflation. One of the unfortunate things about the manufacturing sector is that its performance is not measured in volume terms, it is measured in dollar terms. Therefore, you can see a lot of dollars up there, but that does not mean an expanding manufacturing sector. That can easily happen.

When you have sugar, tourism and a major part of your manufacturing sector in trouble, and you have gone along over the years saying you are going to repay that

debt easily, because it is only X per cent of your foreign exchange earnings, when all of a sudden you find your foreign exchange earnings have dropped and then you do not have the capacity to pay, what happens to you? Exactly what is happening in Barbados now, that this country is now living substantially on capital inflows through borrowed money!

You only have to look at the statement of the Central Bank of Barbados which was issued on November 3, 1983. The main brunt of that is that the main source of capital inflows into Barbados has been through borrowed money, and very interestingly, Sir, lots of money coming in from the International Monetary Fund. That means that we are getting deeper and deeper involved in that arrangement rather than extricating ourselves, as I thought was the case in March of this year.

Make no mistake, you are living largely on National Insurance money and money you are borrowing overseas. That is what is keeping the country largely afloat at the moment. And it would not surprise me if you are not partially meeting your overseas debt commitments through borrowing money, or certainly the borrowed money is making it possible for you to meet the overseas debt commitments.

That is the very curious situation we are having now in Barbados. And when you get this kind of rosy story, talking about your external debt service in relation to your foreign exchange earnings being such a small amount, it is totally unrealistic. Because what has happened, with the contraction of the Barbados economy, is that if you are to take our public debt and public guaranteed debt as a percentage of the Gross National Product of this country, it is higher than most non-oil producing small developing countries.

5.00 p.m.

You cannot fool me with those figures, because the Central Bank Report clearly indicates what is happening. And I make bold to say that if you were not getting those capital inflows through the IMF and borrowings, you would have trouble in meeting your overseas debt repayments right now, and meeting the services of this Island.

The facts are clear. With the contraction of the public sector projects, with many projects coming to an end and you look at the escalation of the foreign debt that is taking place simultaneously with that contraction, then it must mean that a lot of that money which is coming in is going to service various areas where foreign exchange is needed. That is the kind of problem you are faced with.

You have landed yourself in that problem, and no amount of cosmetics, no amount of talking is going to

alter the situation. You can borrow money and temporarily influence the amount of cash that is in the pockets of the people before an election or in an election year, but it is only through the planned use of borrowed money that you can make sure that that cash remains in their pockets over a long period of time. That is where the problem is!

I say that most of that \$600 million have been thrown away through mismanagement, and it is going to create problems in the future. Any future Government of Barbados is going to find itself in the same situation in which this Government found itself, when it succeeded itself in 1981 and declared the Treasury was broke or thereabouts.

When we are returned to Government, and I want to signal this to the nation from here, what we can offer to the public is going to be compromised severely by the \$800 million in debt or so contracted by the Barbados Labour Party up to now, that is the public debt and the public guaranteed debt. If we have to continue to function within the western community of nations and within the western banking system, then the repayment of that debt becomes a first charge on all earnings of Barbados. Therefore, the wages and salaries and the standards of living which the people of Barbados can expect for themselves in the future, for their children and their grandchildren, would be permanently damaged by the incompetence of this Barbados Labour Party administration.

It is seldom that an Opposition takes a position where it is voting against a measure like this. After considerable thought, after considerable examination of this matter within the inner councils of our Party, after looking at what has happened in Barbados over the past seven years, after looking at the borrowing requirements as projected by the IMF, in better financial circumstances and with a prediction that sugar, tourism and manufacturing would have been performing better than they performed in 1983, when we took all the matters into consideration and examined all of the aspects of the whole question of the National Debt, we came to one conclusion. That conclusion was that the first time an opportunity arises in this Parliament where this Government seeks an opportunity to come with a measure which could lead to a substantial escalation of the public debt, including slush funds for electoral purposes, we would make our position absolutely clear to the public of Barbados and let them clearly understand that we are here taking this decision, not only in the interest of those Barbadians who are now retired, those who are now unemployed, those who are now at work, but we are taking this decision particularly on behalf of the children of Barbados, to ensure that their future is no longer compromised by a Government which has refused again and again to put Barbados first in the management of public financial affairs,

but always puts the electoral needs of the Barbados Labour Party well ahead of the interest of Barbados as a whole.

Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is not a matter which I am quite able to put it across as the economists, these bunch of people who walk around and have the entire world in a tailspin — we call them economic wizards and all of these terms — and my contribution is going to be relatively short.

I recall that when I was in the Opposition, we used to quarrel about the National Debt and we would attack the then Government, which is now the Opposition, about how the National Debt was escalating, getting out of hand. We are in Government, and therefore I have no doubt in my mind that you will hear such a cry coming from the Opposition bench and their spokesman on Finance, because it appears to me that this is the type of argument that the Opposition puts up about the National Debt of a country — it is causing great problems and, as I have heard today, the Government being charged with squandermania.

I have before me, as quite rightly stated by the spokesman on Finance on the other side, that the National Debt as it is right now has increased by \$258 million over the past seven years, from \$258 million in 1976 to \$837 million up to the end of July, 1983, an increase of 223.5 per cent over a period of seven years. The argument which I understood from the Member on the other side is that this is the result of mismanagement, and he said that the children and those to come would have to pay this debt.

5.10 p.m.

I go beyond this, because I believe that in another fifteen to twenty years the unborn children will have to pay even a greater National Debt. Whatever money is borrowed by the Government of Barbados, either overseas or locally, is for the purpose of creating projects that are necessary for the very children of tomorrow, who are going to see the St. Barnabas Highway, the Spring Garden Highway, the Deep Water Harbour, and we are still paying back that part of the National Debt, which was criticised by the then Leader of the Opposition, and I remember the late Captain Fergusson saying that even the Deep Water Harbour was being built in the wrong place.

Well, the Government of that day had to borrow money to build the Deep Water Harbour, but I am told by the experts that if we did not invest that money, which had incurred a greater National Debt, we would have been in an awkward position, because we could not afford to compete with our neighbours in Trinidad who had a natural harbour. That is a project which was built nearly twenty to twenty-five years, and you, Mr. Deputy

Speaker, and I, and my children, today are paying back that part of the National Debt.

I believe money has been borrowed, for example, to assist with the agricultural scheme which they have in the Scotland area, for the purpose of containing the lands which have been sliding over a period of years; the planting of fruit trees so as to improve your crops; the scheme which you have in St. Lucy whereby young men and women are now working as much as I think eight to ten acre lots. I believe money was borrowed to build the Polytechnic. Money was borrowed to build the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I believe money was also borrowed to build the international airport and all the polyclinics. All the schools that the Anglicans and the conservatives during those years were able to put together what little money they had to build them, they have fallen into a state of disrepair, so we are now borrowing to repair some and build some, as they borrowed money for the Sewerage Plant and agreed at the time they were borrowing the money that the water rates would have to go up to help pay the cost.

I believe that money is borrowed for such things. When you increase your National Debt, as they put it, it is not for me, but for my children and your children and your grandchildren. They will enjoy the projects, and therefore they are expected to pay for it.

What puzzles me also, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is this. I believe that if I went to a bank today — I am not an economist but this is my little knowledge — to borrow \$100 000, the bank is going to ask me to submit whatever security I have, all; you have to take all your papers to be inspected. Then you are going to be asked what is your occupation and how much money you are working for when the month comes, to determine if you can afford to pay back the amount of money, if they decide to lend you the money. In the meantime, they are going to hold the papers for security.

All these financial institutions that set out to lend Barbados money have been examining, I believe, the country's economic performance, the stability of the country, the ability to repay in years to come and the ability that it has showed that it was able to pay before. It is on all these factors that they make their loans.

I do not believe that some of the countries in the Eastern Caribbean would have a National Debt of this magnitude, because when you examine their ability to pay, what they have to offer, the infrastructure of the country, such as what they can manufacture and what they can sell, their tourist industry and how viable it is; they are found wanting. But it is on those factors that the financial institutions come to determine if and what money they can lend a Government.

Look what we are here talking about.....\$837 million, which is about US\$400 million, to provide for generations to come. I do not believe that anybody is going to get one of these pneumatic drills and go and dig up the Deep Water Harbour, or you are going to fill in the Careenage or the shallow draft, or knock down the polyclinics. I believe the Polytechnic is there as a landmark to prove what we have been able to do; and you had a hand in it too, so that you can be justly proud of it. You laid claim to the very project. I do not believe anybody is going to go and dig up the whole of the Oistins Development, and these arguments which I hear coming all the time from the spokesman on Finance for the other side, when he says that the national debt of the country is getting out of hand, kind of galls me.

I will say this. I believe, after working for some 22 years with the present Prime Minister and Minister of Finance of this country, that the word "squandermania" cannot be attached to him. If you say he is very, very cheap and he does not like spending a cent, I can support that, because I know it as a fact of life. He would hold a dollar until it is hollow. Only today at Cabinet I heard one of my colleagues battling and fighting him tooth and nail to get a piece of change to do something, and he wanted to find out from "a" to "z". You, Sir, would know as Minister of Transport the battle you had to get a piece of change from him. He does not spend the public's money that easily, and therefore when he is going into anything that is dealing with public funds, I have the fullest confidence in him, and I believe that is why the country will respect him as a Minister of Finance for his attitude towards the country's finances.

Now you really cannot accuse the Minister of Finance of squandermania; not this Minister. I would not even accuse the former Minister of Finance of squandermania. It is true he may have had his priorities wrong I may probably say, but not squandermania. I would not accuse that Minister, the late Dr. Cummins, or any of them who at one time held the portfolio as a Barbadian, because a Barbadian by nature is a relative conservative individual. If you were in Trinidad, that is a different ball game. You can talk about squandermania! Gairy! That is a different thing, buying a piano to put in his house and having the best of liquors.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will say this now. You will recall that when he was Leader of the Opposition all he used to keep in the fridge over there was a pint and a half bottle of water and he would send and buy a flask of rum. He is cheap. I am not discrediting him, but this is using the analogy to prove that he is not that kind of individual.

I would like once again to deal with this Central Bank building because a few evenings ago on a call in programme, "Feedback", I heard a caller, obviously

anti-Government from his attitude, say that the Government of Barbados was able to build a Central Bank that is costing \$60 million, yet the poor people in Barbados cannot get any houses or good roads.  
5.20 p.m.

When it comes to good houses and good roads I am saying this, in all sincerity, that Barbados is unmatched in its housing programme and its network of roads in the entire Caribbean. Unmatched! They are like the untouchables!

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Until Bradshaw became Minister.)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You only have to go to St. Vincent, Dominica, Antigua, Trinidad, Jamaica. Sometimes it frightens me when I hear people in Barbados calling in on "Feedback" saying that they cannot get a bus. I heard a man, about two weeks ago, saying that he has to walk about half mile to get a bus, that the 6.00 o'clock bus came and then the 7.00 o'clock bus stopped somewhere else. Half mile to get a bus! We only complain about these things because we have looked at the structure of our society and we compare it with our North American brothers and the highly industrialized countries.

I say that the Barbados National Housing Corporation can boast of an outstanding housing stock. I am not saying that this Government alone is responsible for it; your Party played a major role in that also. Can you imagine a three-bedroomed house in Barbados out of stone, with water toilet, bath, a paved guardwall out of stone, then the Government is called upon to maintain the area, for something like \$25 or \$30 a week? Fifteen US dollars a day for a three-bedroomed house! In Trinidad, if you want a Government house, you have to get it by way of a lottery!

I am not saying that everything is perfect in Barbados. It is impossible. We have our weaknesses, we have our strengths. But to be accusing the Government of spending the taxpayers' money badly and having our priorities wrong, I surely, Mr. Deputy Speaker, could not support that argument.

Am I to understand that we are to dig down the Community College? The Government is now planning, as I understand the Throne Speech to build a proper Law Courts in the country, something which I have heard both sides complain about from the time I have been here, some seventeen years ago. There is the Cement Plant venture with Trinidad, the acquisition of lands to get to the Cement Plant for the purpose of building roads — the Government will soon be constructing a road from Greenland to Checker Hall — and improving on the Spring Garden Highway, moving from the junction at Highway One along Warren's Road to the airport.

What am I to understand? That you consider that squandermania? I really do not understand very clearly in my mind the argument put up all the time by the spokesman on Finance on the other side about the National Debt of the country.

I would agree that there are some countries, and I believe my colleague may want to cite a place like Brazil and Mexico, which owe away millions and millions of dollars. But that is not because of any mismanagement. The oil crisis from 1974, I think it was, is responsible for the economic downturn in all the countries throughout the entire world. Many of the countries had to resort to borrowing and going to the International Monetary Fund to control their finances.

(Hon. H. deB. FORDE: It has created that.)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: We have and are still weathering the storm. We can still give the police an increase, civil servants, Members of Parliament.

The Barbados Workers' Union can still, during these very hard times, take Harmony Hall and turn it into Solidarity House, something that I am proud of. Now what are you going to say? That Frank Walcott squandered the people's money? That is something there for generations. That is the handiwork of the late Sir Grantley Adams and his vision. Hear the word, "Solidarity", bringing the workers together — born out of this very Party, carried on by Frank Walcott, and will be carried on by people when he is gone from the scene.

There will be a place in this history for him. No one can deny him that. I do not say these things about him because I am a member of his fan club. These are the facts of life. There is also going to be a leading role in the history of this country for the Leader of the Opposition, because of his ability at the time when he was Minister of Finance to handle the country's economic affairs in the manner in which he did.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill which is before us has my wholehearted support. I regret to hear that the Members on the other side plan to vote against it, but that is their democratic right, and that is the principle of democracy and the freedom which we all enjoy.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise in support of this Bill to amend the Special Loans Act in order to extend the limit on the sums of money that the Government may borrow from any bank by amending the Special Loans Act, Section 2, and deleting the words, "two hundred million" and substituting the words, "three hundred and seventy-five million".

I did not expect that sort of reaction from the Opposition's spokesman on Finance that we had this afternoon. The speech which he made this afternoon is a speech which he has made on several occasions over the last three years. As has been said by the last speaker, it is unfortunate that he does not get tired hearing himself say the same things over and over again. It just brings us into repeating again what we ourselves have said previously to counter the arguments which he has brought.

We know that the National Debt is \$837.3 million; the foreign component is \$340.3 million and the domestic component is \$496.6 million. But one cannot deal with the National Debt in isolation. I have said before, and I will say it again, when one is looking at the balance sheet of a company, you cannot only look at the liabilities, one must look at the assets. You cannot look only at the expenditure, one must look at the revenue. So to deal with the National Debt in isolation can be extremely misleading to the people of this country.  
5.30 p.m.

To say in a very loud voice, and to shout, stamp and thump on the table, "Now we in Barbados owe \$837.3 million," is absolutely saying nothing. The fact is that in spite of the fact that the National Debt has increased from \$258.8 million in 1976 to \$837.3 million in July, 1983, and in spite that this represents over 223.5 per cent increase, to say that alone does not mean anything.

Whereas in 1976 the domestic borrowing accounted for \$208.6 million or 81 per cent of the total debt, the situation had changed considerably in 1983, when local borrowings, even though at \$496.6 million, represented only 59.3 per cent of the National Debt. So although the national debt has risen in terms of percentage in relationship to the debt, we are still doing very well. We are doing better than we did in 1976, because it was 81 per cent of the total debt, whereas today it is only taking 59.8 per cent of the total debt.

The short term borrowing as a percentage of the total borrowings has remained almost constant. In 1976, this represented 38.9 per cent. Today it is 40.5 per cent. It is almost constant. So to shout from this Parliament that the national debt has grown to \$837.3 million really is misleading the public of Barbados .....

*Aside.*

Mr. A. TRUSS: The *sotto voce* remarks say that I cannot say that. I must say it, because the truth must be represented.

If one has assets of \$5 million and liabilities of \$3 million, the net value of that person is \$2 million. But if

you get up and say that a person owes \$3 million without saying what the person's assets are, you are misrepresenting the facts. So to get up and say that \$837.3 million without dealing with the revenue, without dealing with the GDP increase over 1976, is saying absolutely nothing. The honourable Member for St. Michael South West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) knows that. The honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) a Minister of Education for eight years, a Barbados Scholar, knows that, too. The chief spokesman of the Opposition on Finance, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, above everybody else knows that as well.

He talks about cheap politics while increasing the national debt in 1982. Yes, I know that. But the time has come when we must stop making cheap political gains. We are a developing country, and in order to do the things to employ young people and to generate foreign reserves, we must borrow money and invest it wisely.

If we borrowed money to pay the civil servants' salaries, as the DLP did in 1975, then the country would be bankrupt. If we borrow for capital projects that will in turn generate money, not only to repay the money which you borrowed in the first place, but to earn an income, then I say that we are on the right track.

The increase in the national debt must be seen in the context of an expanding economy, and a number of comparisons are relevant. You cannot deal with the national debt in isolation. I repeat that. In 1976, the GDP at factor cost was \$788 million. By 1982 this had increased to \$1.804 billion. So what about the national debt? The national debt increased from \$258.8 million in 1976 to \$837.3 million in 1983. GDP increased from \$788 million to \$1.804 billion in 1983. So what about the national debt? The total debt outstanding as a percentage of GDP over the same period was 32.8 per cent in 1976 and 42.1 per cent in 1983, just slightly higher in terms of percentage. These are the facts.

He talked about the printing of money, as he did a few years ago, and now he harps on the national debt. I can see now the caption of the headlines in the newspaper tomorrow; "Barbados' national debt too high, says the Opposition spokesman." But other factors are relevant and they must be taken into consideration, and the honourable member for St. Michael South Central knows this; or if he does not know, he should know it. I have a great deal of faith in the honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow), and if he made the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central the chief spokesman on financial matters, I will have to assume that he does know and he is trying to score cheap political points.

In the 1976-77 financial year, the total debt service payments, which included interest in principal repayments,

amounted to \$21.6 million, whereas the total current revenue was \$216.8 million. In 1982-83 the total debt service payments were \$96.7 million while the total current revenue was \$496.9 million.

*Aside.*

Mr. A. TRUSS: You cannot tell me that there is not a relationship between the two. You cannot quote the national debt of 1976 and compare it with that of 1983 without quoting the total current revenue.

In the two years under review the debt service as the percentage of GDP moved from 2.7 per cent in 1976 to 5.3 per cent in 1983. When you shout about \$837.3 million as the national debt, it sounds like a lot. Look at the percentages! You have to take into consideration the total current revenue. If you are going to look at the expenditures, you must look at the revenues.

Domestic exports and net tourism earnings amounted to \$287.9 million in 1976. This increased to \$885.9 million by 1983. How can you leave that out when you are dealing with your national debt?  
5.40 p.m.

In tourism alone, one small part of the economy, we have increased our performance from \$287.9 million in 1976 to \$885.9 million in 1983, and the chief spokesman of the Opposition on Finance makes no mention of these matters at all. It is as though they did not exist. The revenues have remained the same in 1976, the national debt has quadrupled.

I say to this Honourable Chamber that the Member for St. Michael South Central is not being fair in his analysis of these matters. If one is going to try to be constructive in his criticism, I would be the first person on this side to get up and agree with him, but be constructive. Do not be destructive in your criticisms in order to catch the headlines tomorrow and fool the people in Barbados that this small island owes \$837.3 million, when you refuse to tell them that we have expanded the economy and our GDP has increased 400 per cent to \$1.80245 billion.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central said that the DLP had major projects going, but he did not mention one. Do you know why, Sir? Because none was going. It is very easy to make the statement that you had projects going, but name one project that was going in 1976. They had talks, they had meetings, they may indeed have had drawings. They had promises in their manifesto but they had nothing going, and I challenge the honourable Member to get up and tell us in this Honourable Chamber what the DLP had going, not just say they had projects going. The public of Barbados and I want to know what they were. I am sure the

members of the Democratic Labour Party want to know what they were as well.

He said one must invest money in such a way that it would earn foreign currency. Sir, that is an academic argument. My ten year old son, now preparing for the 11 plus examination, would answer that. The average Barbadian understands that he must invest his money and get a return on the money invested, in the form of interest, by way of deposits to a loan, or investment in a business, or otherwise. So what is he saying when he says that? He throws that remark out and leaves it hanging there for the Press to pick up.

That is exactly what we have been doing, Sir. We have been borrowing money and investing it in projects that would earn us foreign currency and create jobs. We have been building factory space. Our exports of goods and services increased from \$1.157 billion in 1981 to \$1.217 billion in 1982, an increase of over 5.1 per cent. That is what we have been doing with the money we have been borrowing.

The entire world is suffering as a result of this international recession and we, in our own way, because of good, proper and prudent management, have been able to increase our exports of good and services over the last year. Not only that, Sir, our imports of goods and services have declined. We have reduced our imports from \$1.381 billion in 1981 to \$1.255 billion in 1982. They add up to the same thing, because if you improve your exports, you earn foreign currency; if you reduce your imports, you save foreign currency. So the argument put forward that we must invest money in projects that would earn us foreign currency is academic.

The honourable Member does not read the Economic Reports put out by the Central Bank, otherwise he would not be making those statements. He has already stated in here categorically that he accepts the Reports of the Central Bank as being fair and honest.

He talked about what we are doing with our money, as I have mentioned. In manufacturing alone, last year the IDC provided an additional 5 270.3 square metres of factory space, and they recently completed an additional 9 776 square metres of factory space. Why are we building factory space? We are building it to create employment for Barbadians, to bring more business to Barbados, more factories to Barbados that would export more goods and services, that would earn more foreign currency, that would employ more Barbadians. These are the facts.

Last year investment in the Industrial Development Corporation alone totalled \$6 million, 14 new enterprises were granted fiscal incentives, 21 enterprises were assisted

by the IDC, and there is a total of 9 226 persons employed in industry in this country. The Barbados Development Bank made available to small business substantial credit, \$10.7 million was distributed last year to small business people, \$2.964 to the small business private sector, separate and distinct, from the \$10.7 million, and an additional \$455 200 for 13 small loans. For what purpose? To employ people, to manufacture goods and services, to export to CARICOM and outside CARICOM, to earn foreign currency. That is what we are borrowing money for, Sir.

Applications approved by the Chief Town Planner for the provision of building space, and I am dealing specifically with factory space, totalled 1 448 last year alone. If we provide the money, Mr. Deputy Speaker, through the Barbados Development Bank, through the IDC for fiscal incentives in order to invite people to come down to Barbados and build their own factories and/or rent from the IDC, you cannot tell me there is not a relationship between the applications put in to build a factory and what the Barbados Government is doing.

He talked about hotels. We invested over \$1.5 million in hotels alone last year, building an additional 406 beds. That does not compare anyway near our performance in 1980 or 1981, but nevertheless, we are doing what we can in our own way to ensure that the money which we borrow is channelled in the right direction to ensure the employment of our people, that we can earn foreign currency, and by so doing protect our foreign reserves.

Our investment in agriculture is clear for all who have eyes to see. Non-sugar agriculture and fisheries grew by \$6.8 million or 11.5 per cent. The honourable Member for St. Michael West should make notes because these are the facts. Non-sugar agriculture and fisheries grew to reach a total of \$65.9 million and, for the first time, exceeded sugar production.  
5.50 p.m.

We have channelled the money in tourism. We have channelled the money in export promotion. We have improved our production in cabbage, carrots, cauliflower, egg plant, onions, tomatoes, yams. That is what we did last year in agriculture.

Part of the increase as a result of this particular Bill to move from \$200 million to \$375 million, part of that money will go towards borrowing money from the Venezuelan Investment Fund, commonly known as the FIV. The FIV makes available, through the facility of the Central Bank of Barbados, money to be loaned for oil exploration for 20 years at 2 per cent interest. We are getting 20 years in which to repay this money at 2 per cent interest. Now that is what we call a soft loan.

We borrow this money, we improve on our oil exploration, and that has an effect on our foreign reserves, as the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central very well knows. If we produce more oil, we import less oil; and if we import less oil, we safeguard our foreign reserves and we spend less money. It is simple and straightforward. So when you talk about investing money in such a way, you can invest it in such a way not only to earn, but to reduce on the expenditure of the foreign reserves.

That is the salient point, to reduce your expenditure on your foreign reserves, not only to earn more. The country must be geared to earn more foreign reserves but it must also be geared to reduce the pressure of the expenditure on foreign reserves. And if you can borrow money at 2 per cent interest from the Venezuelan Investment Fund, I would like somebody in here to get up and say we should not do that.

The honourable Member said that he believed the people of Barbados were better off in 1976. That is always a matter of great debate. But I beg to differ, and statistically I can prove why I can differ.

He mentioned housing so I will deal with that. In 1976, the Democratic Labour Party allocated less than \$70 million to housing. Last year the Barbados Labour Party allocated \$203.2 million to housing. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central had the audacity to come in here and say that we are not doing enough in the area of housing, when the Democratic Labour Party spent less than \$70 million in 1976 on housing and last year we spent \$203.2 million in housing.

He said we are worse off now than we were in 1976. In 1976, there were less than 30 000 telephones in Barbados. Today, there are more than 50 000 telephones, and in spite of the fact that last year in the Budgetary Proposals the Prime Minister put a 10 per cent tax on overseas calls, overseas calls last year increased by 29.5 per cent. Do you believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that Barbadians made 735 980 long distant telephone calls last year? Nobody made overseas telephone calls in 1976! These are the facts. Social indicators, comparative figures when carefully analysed, can always indicate if a country is better or worse off, regardless of what anyone wants to say on any side of this Honourable House. But I will give you a chance.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, water. Last year, in spite of the fact that we were faced with the international recession, we were still able to make 2 011 connections, making it a total of 73 500 water connections in Barbados, practically every house in Barbados. Some 97.8 per cent of housing in Barbados have running water.

The per capita income in 1976 was U.S.\$1 100, Bds\$2 200. Our per capita income now is approximately

Bds.\$7 500. We have been able to improve our per capita income from \$2 200. That is when you take your Gross National Product and you divide it by your population. In other words, when you take the average salary that the Barbadians earned in 1976, it was \$2 200. The average salary Barbadians earned in 1983 is \$7 500.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman has now reached the time allocated to him under Standing Order 30.

Mr. A. TRUSS: I will finish in 30 seconds. Electricity. In 1976, there were 54 541 consumers of electricity in this country. In 1983, there were over 63 000, an increase of over 10 000.

You cannot tell me, Sir, that, based on the figures I have just given over the last 30 minutes, someone can say blatantly that he believes we were better off in 1976 than we are in 1983. Anyone can make that statement, but it must be substantiated, and I challenge the Member to substantiate such statements when he makes them. I feel that my contribution to this debate can prove without a shadow of a doubt that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is hung up on how much money we owe, what the gross national debt is, and does not take into consideration current revenue.

Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I really had hoped that I could observe this debate without participating, because the sides would have been put in such a manner that we would have had their position and our position.

I see that the honourable Member for St. George North (Mr. J. G. Odle), who had the decency to applaud when his colleague sat down, has now decided that he had done his good deed for today. I really do not understand why the honourable Member for St. Michael Central (Mr. A. Truss) allows himself constantly to parade himself in such a manner as to have people say of him that he looks like he has a lot of information. He writes it down, but he does not understand it.  
6.00 p.m.

I would just take one quote from him. I will assume that he was in the flight of his input and he said something like this: I am quoting him exactly. "In tourism alone, one small part of the economy, we have increased....." Now any man who says, "In tourism alone, one small part of the economy" is obviously totally confused.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of elucidation, if the honourable Member would give way, I was dealing with tourism in relation to foreign reserves.

We are aware that, out of every tourist dollar that is earned, 27 per cent of it remains in Barbados, whereas in agriculture, out of every dollar that is earned, 80 per cent remains in Barbados, so it is in relation to foreign reserves, in relation to the protection of foreign currency, that I was aiming my statement at when I said "small".

Thank you very much.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I really do not know if he has not made the point even clearer that he does not understand what he is talking about. Tourism cannot be a small part of the economy where you are dealing with the domestic debt, the national debt or the foreign debt.

I do not think that I wish to spend any time destroying the honourable Member for St. Michael Central (Mr. A. Truss), but he left the impression that things are wonderful in Barbados in 1983. I am going to quote for him from page 11 of the Central Bank Annual Report, 1982:

"1982 was the second successive year of the economic decline following the 1976-80 period, when the economy recorded an annual average growth rate of 5 per cent."

He spoke of GDP, the Gross Domestic Product. I believe that any first year economic student understands gross domestic produce, and he sought to suggest that the Gross Domestic Product must be taken in relation to the national debt. Well I am going to take the gross domestic produce and the national debt and show him why we have to stop borrowing, because with the borrowing which they have done to take it to \$837 million, here is what the Central Bank had to say about the Gross Domestic Product. I am quoting again from page 11 of the Annual Report for 1982, and I am quoting particularly for the honourable Member for St. Michael Central. "Real Gross Domestic Product declined by five per cent." The debt rose, his own statistics, so as the debt was rising, real gross domestic produce was declining for the second successive year. It declined by 5 per cent and that is why any prudent economic analyst would examine how come we are borrowing so much more money while the Gross Domestic Product continues to decline.

You see, Sir, economics is a very strange discipline studied by some very strange people and understood by a few, and the trouble with economics is that a lot of people like the sound of saying that they understand economics and they believe that trotting out figures is understanding economics. I do not propose, Sir, to demonstrate any peculiar ability in the discipline, but I understand it. On the same page 11, you see again that total visitor arrivals declined by 49 000 to 303 795 and cruise ship passengers were some 30 000 fewer, all the time while we are borrowing more money.

In fairness, let me put something on the other side of that equation. You do not borrow money for current expenditure. You borrow money for capital development. A country may have deficit spending. I am not one of those people who believe that deficit spending is dangerous for a developing country. Indeed, I believe that developing countries ought to have deficit spending so that succeeding generations can help pay for the projects which will benefit those succeeding generations. That is good economic strategy, which became current in the Fifties and Sixties and which is still relevant to countries such as our own. It is in the management of the projects, the scheduling of the projects, the amount of money which you borrow and the cost of that money in relation to your revenue base which helps to determine, to a large extent whether your borrowings are reasonable or unreasonable.

When you find that the honourable Member was able to say of us that the per capita income in Barbados in 1976 was US\$1 100 and the per capita income in 1983 is Bds \$7 500, half of which is roughly \$3 500, and then you see he does not seem to understand that you have to get the inflation figure .....

*Asides.*

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Do you mean I can put that in?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable Member speaking to the subject before the House, or is he having a running commentary on what the honourable Member said?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No no. I am speaking to the matter before the House, and I am explaining the matter before the House so that the honourable Member who spoke before will not make that error again when this matter comes before the House.

You see, Sir, it is very important that all the other honourable Members in this Chamber understand the simple elementary matters concerning this matter before the House. We are dealing with the national debt, and it is very important that we explained in a, b, c terms to those who cannot understand, who by their utterances demonstrate that they do not understand.

Now, Sir, he must understand that you have to put the deflator in. This is a matter which has come up which is very important. If you do not put the deflator in, then you have just the figures and you have what you may call a simplex comparative analysis, which is not in quite the same vein as a complex comparative analysis. A complex comparative analysis requires that all of the aspects of the particular problem be brought to bear in terms of the particular direction in which you are going, so that when finally you do a comparison, you are comparing like

with like. So if you just take the figures and you trot out what the figures were in 1976 and then trot out what the figures are in 1983, and thereby because the 1983 figure is higher than the 1976 figure say that you are going better in 1983, then you are misleading yourself.

He gives as an example of prosperity in Barbados the number of water connections. If you take the water connections, if you took one condominium in Barbados, one single condominium would have more water connections in a year than all the houses in Barbados for four years, if those houses are related to the lifestyle of Barbados. So the honourable Member must understand that you cannot take these kinds of statistics and trot them out and demonstrate thereby that you are doing well. You have to look at the quality of life index. If you start to do an analysis of the quality of life index in Barbados, then you will understand the gravamen of the point which the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) was making with painstaking care to this Honourable House.

6.10 p.m.

You have had a continuous inflationary situation from the time the Government came into power in 1976 until February, 1983. For the first time, in February, 1983, we saw the inflation rate start to go down, and that happened as a result of the rapidly falling interest rates in the rest of the world. But those falling interest rates also demonstrated a rapid contraction and because we are not a manufacturing economy in the context of the United States or Japan, the impact on an economy like ours is sudden, it is swift and it is devastating.

He talked, for example, about the number of factories which we have built and the number of applications for space. When I *sotto voce* raised the question, he said there were a number of applications.

I will take another opportunity to deal with the Industrial Development Corporation in detail, because that is a major debate which must occur in this House, the Industrial Development Corporation. But I say, as a matter of fact, the moment in Barbados we have an excess capacity in the factories in Barbados that is second to none anywhere else in the world. We have built more factory space in Barbados that is unoccupied per capita than anywhere in the world. And we have borrowed that money from the World Bank at high rates of interest.

Furthermore, we have demanded of the few people, who were trying to make a living in those factories that are occupied, what has been termed "an economic rate". But that economic rate is not related to the particular building that they are in, it is related to spreading the cost across the entire loan. As a result, the people who are managing the same factories are finding it economically difficult to survive, and the country, as a whole, is carrying what may be termed "industrial white elephants."

I invite the honourable Member, instead of going to any department and getting the figures from paper, to go into the industrial parks and see the amount of excess capacity which is there.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is awful is that the mismanagement of the Government has ensured that not only will that excess capacity be there, but we are going to have a continued increase in the excess capacity, because of a number of factories in Barbados, which will not be able to find an outlet for their products, necessarily will close their doors and large numbers of people will go home. That is a fact of life in Barbados today.

We have excess factory space. If you use factory space as a measure of your progress, you think, and you are likely to say, as the honourable Member unfortunately said, that you are making great and rapid progress. If, on the other hand, you deal with the utilization of that capacity, you will realize that we are in a state of decline.

In many ways, when this Democratic Labour Party becomes the Government at the next General Election, we are going to have a gigantic task of reorganizing and re-orienting the whole industrial sector; indeed, the entire economy. We are going to have to redistribute in this community a whole series of ideas on how we can develop and get this country moving again.

You are trotting out statistics, just as you have done in certain places in the international community. You have gone to certain places in the international community and you have attempted the same bamboozling technique, only to discover that (a), the people in those institutions do not accept what you submit, and (b), what you submit, if taken on its face value, puts you in a category where the very purpose of your going to these international institutions is now lost. So Barbados finds itself in the peculiar position where it is neither fish nor fowl, or even good red herring. It cannot borrow at the level where it belongs — and at the level where it has been put, it is not entitled to borrow.

I will say no more for the time being, but there is a time coming, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I give warning to the honourable members on the other side, when we will have to reveal all of the shenanigans which have occurred in the official presentations of this country in certain international institutions, and the kind of reverberations which have come around and which are now affecting Barbados in a fundamental way.

I speak fortuitously, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for reasons which, I am sure, honourable members will understand. But it is the same nonsense of taking statistics, taking numbers, and trotting them out, and trying to suggest that those numbers indicate growth in

a community, when the Central Bank itself is telling you how the people in this country have difficulty in living.

Let us take the same page 11, Sir:

"Unavailability of mortgage and bridging loans reduced private construction activity."

And yet we have an honourable Member who comes in here and says that they allocated \$203 million to housing! Two hundred and three million dollars, more than half the Budget! Sir, if they had \$203 million for housing in any given year in this country, they would have built enough houses to take care of the entire Caribbean!

The honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig) was a Housing Minister, the honourable Member for St. Michael South East (Hon. DeL. O. Bradshaw) was a Housing Minister. Two hundred and three million dollars! I would invite them to have a quiet word with the honourable Member for St. Michael Central and urge him that when he gathers this information, he should bring it before you and ask for an analysis before he comes to this Honourable House and opens his mouth, in an attempt to make the Government look good and finally succeeding in reducing the Government to shambles. Two hundred and three million dollars for housing, he says!

Whilst castigating the Press and suggesting that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was speaking for the Press, he talked about \$203 million, and if the people in the Press were silly they would go and print that. The Budget last year was about \$500 million, and he said that they allocated \$203 million for housing! A man who quotes statistics ought to understand those statistics.

He asked us in this Honourable Chamber what were the projects going in 1976. I do not believe that any honourable Member who was alive in this country would ask that question. I believe the honourable Member is tired of being in Parliament and tired of the Government and the Government's shenanigans, and he is asking us those questions so that we can lambaste the Government and so that the people should chase them out. Because even the honourable Member for St. George North, who could legitimately complain that there was not a great deal of activity in St. George North in 1976, would not agree that there were no projects going.

The very Post Office which this Government has not yet completed was in train. At that time, the Deep Water Harbour was being extended. The airport was being extended. Do you mean these are not projects? It was in 1976 that the airport was being extended. The monies came from Canada.

I would like to ask the honourable Member, when is a project begun? At which point does the project begin? Is it when the carpenters put in the first nail or is it when the drawings are made? He said there were drawings. He then accused the honourable Member for St. Michael South in connection with the Sewerage Plant, after saying there were no projects going.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am not paying attention.)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I know you were not paying attention when the honourable Member for St. Michael Central was speaking, otherwise you would have stopped him.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I mean to you.)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You would not have allowed him to go down the road and make a shamble of the policies of the Barbados Labour Party, which you have professed.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: He is trying to make a shamble of them?)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes. He succeeded where the Democratic Labour Party has not been able to succeed. He has been able to point out in a manner that the Democratic Labour Party could not, because we do not operate at the level which, apparently, he has been able to operate at. When we read the statistics, unfortunately we interpret them in the same way as everybody else. But he has this new technique for interpretation of statistics, he and the Minister of Finance, which allows this new and dynamic approach in 1983. Everybody else in the world says that 1981 and 1982 were a shamble, but the honourable Member comes in here today and demonstrates that they are all wrong, and he can show by statistics that the country has been moving forward.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would have never thought that anybody would have used statistics in tourism to show that we have been moving forward. At least it has been conceded on all sides that tourism declined. But no, Sir, he says that in tourism there has been a tremendous increase. The Central Bank says that total visitor arrivals declined. The Central Bank says that total revenue from tourism declined. The hoteliers say that even those visitors who came in spent less money. We know that the hotels were forced to reduce their rate in the winter time in 1982 and that some of them have still maintained reduced rates in 1983. We know that the Tourist Board has finally come to understand that they have to spend additional money and do some tremendously improved promotion in the North America market. We recognize that tourists coming from Europe have declined so substantially that it needed a 69 per cent increase in tourism from the United States in order to show a 3 per cent increase overall. We know that. But the honourable Member says "No." He says that there has been an in-

crease in tourist statistics, so there has been an increase in tourism. I sometimes feel, Sir, that they ought to have a bell that could ring everytime certain honourable Members would get a thought to utter words in certain subject matters.

The sugar industry was heavily in deficit throughout 1982, despite the late receipt of \$14 million for sales made in 1981.

I tell you now, to be a little more specific, why we cannot approve the special borrowing level which they have asked for. They usually ask for increases of \$25 million to \$50 million. They have come for an increase of \$175 million — and they have not told us what they propose to do. We have almost no information on what we are going to be borrowing this \$175 million to do.

The honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig) touched on the Central Bank. I think that one of the worst attempts of a hoax placed on the people of Barbados is this concept of the money from which the Central Bank is being built does not come from the people of Barbados. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that myth should be laid low once and for all.

A substantial part of the money which the Central Bank earns, by law, must go to the Consolidated Fund, and the Minister of Finance may determine what part of the rest will go to the Consolidated Fund. So to the extent that the money is diverted into the purchase or construction of a building, that money is diverted from the Consolidated Fund; and if it is diverted from the Consolidated Fund, it is diverted from the people of Barbados.

I believe we should put that to rest. Let us recognize that the Central Bank expenditure is public expenditure. If public expenditure comes from the pockets of the taxpayers of Barbados, then let us recognize that the Central Bank is being built from the pockets of Barbadians.

I think if we can accept that, we could then go on to have argument about whether it is desirable or undesirable. But I think it is a terrible untruth and hoax on the people of Barbados to suggest that the money is coming from somewhere else. Is it coming from Mars? Is it coming from the United States? Where is it coming from? It is the money from the people of Barbados.

When the Governor of the Central Bank or honourable Members in this Chamber are able to say that they should tighten their belts in the months of November and December 1983, after saying in September or October 1983 that we can afford the \$60 million or \$80 million for the Central Bank, I think that that is cruelty. We cannot allow this sort of misinformation to go forth into the com-

munity. And then you come immediately after to this Legislature and say that you want to borrow an additional \$175 million, and you hear the honourable Member saying that \$837 million of debt is no debt.

I understand the honourable Member for St. James North, because when he says \$837 million is no debt, his concept of what ought to happen is visionary. In the evening of his days now, he has vision of how Barbados ought to be, and believing that \$837 million is not a lot of money is in keeping with people who think in those ways. But the younger members of this community have to recognize that the amount of debt bears some relationship to the quality of life which we will have, and which our sons and daughters will have, and we are saying that even if you use the classic debt ratio .....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: And I am going to say that the honourable Member's time has expired.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: May I wind up, Sir?

Even if you use the classic debt ratio, the most dispassionate observer would agree that in a society of this size, in an economy of this kind, that a debt of \$837 million between 1976 and 1983 from \$258 million is too rapid an increase, inflation notwithstanding. So we have to put our stand here, especially if you bear in mind that there may be as many as \$200 million in contingent liabilities which are not accounted for in this figure of \$837 million. We say that what you have asked for is too much and we cannot allow it.

Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for your indulgence.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to speak on this matter; I will not be too long on it. I however, wish to express my own concerns and my alarm at what is happening in this country in relation to the national debt, and I think that I would be failing in my duty if I did not use this opportunity to express those concerns.

6.30 p.m.

It was in 1981, as I recall it, that the Special Loans Act was amended. The purpose of that Loans Act — I believe it is Cap. 105 — is to authorise the Government of Barbados to borrow sums of money up to a certain limit from any bank, corporation, company or other institution for purposes to be approved by Parliament.

In 1981, the maximum stood at \$100 million. In that year the Barbados Labour Party Government amended the Special Loans Act to increase the maximum amount which could be borrowed by the Government under that Act from \$100 million to \$200 million, a whopping doubling of the maximum that could be borrowed, 100 per cent increase. Some two years later,

we are now in 1983, a short two years later, the Government of Barbados is again coming to this Honourable Chamber to seek permission to increase the maximum that may be borrowed under that Special Loans Act from \$200 million up to \$375 million, almost another 100 per cent increase. So we had a doubling in 1981, and in 1983 virtually a further doubling.

We have got to stop and ask ourselves the question, why this substantial borrowing within a short period of two years? Is it an indication that our economy is doing well and that the funds are required to stimulate the economy further? Is it that we are doing badly and therefore the money is needed to patch up the disarray into which the economy is slipping? Or is it, as the Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) is arguing, that there is some deep ulterior purpose behind these borrowings that it is part of the scenario that leads up to an election where the Government is taking its guard right now and coming for this heavy, massive increase, so that when we come near to the election they will not have to come and ask for these amounts?

I ask this Honourable Chamber to consider all of these possibilities. I think we have to rule out the first one, because there are no economic indicators to point out that the economy is in high gear and that things are going well either in the manufacturing sector, in the tourism sector, or in any of the other productive sectors of the economy. We are left, therefore, with the other two possibilities, and I will let that matter rest there. Those who can analyse the situation may come to a conclusion that one or the other of the alternatives is in fact the correct one, or both of them may be the answer to the questions which I have posed.

The second aspect of this matter which I wish to consider relates to the whole terminology that we are using. We are talking, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about the national debt, and perhaps the impression may go abroad that this is a total amount of money which the Government owes in respect of the activities which it conducts under the particular Act which authorises it to carry out these activities. In fact, when we talk about the national debt, we are in fact using a kind of a misnomer, because the national debt only relates to the debts of the Central Government departments. Perhaps a more appropriate term which we should be using is the public sector debt, which would include not only the debts of the Central Government departments, but also those debts incurred by the Statutory corporations, which I believe may be causing Government more problems even than the borrowings of the Central Government.

Sooner or later we will have to have a full scale debate on the operations of the public sector — and by that I mean particularly the statutory corporations — in

this country to find out, in fact, how efficiently they are operating, whether the services that they are providing could be provided at better economic cost than those corporations are providing them.

The third aspect of this matter which I wish to examine relates to the question of — how shall I put it, Mr. Deputy Speaker? — that public debt, of the public sector borrowing requirements, and of the Government's fiscal stance in this whole matter.

Now, what do I mean by fiscal stance? I refer to the whole planning strategies and projections of the Government in relation to its projected expenditure, in relation to the amount of money it will raise by taxation, and to the amount of money that it will require by means of borrowing. When we take those three factors into consideration — expenditure, taxation and borrowing — the balance between these three factors gives us what, in terms of the economists of public finances, we call the fiscal stance of Government.

In any properly run financial administration in relation to public finances of a country, it is really untenable that, just after midway in the financial year, we can have a request to Parliament for an increase, almost a doubling, of the maximum national sector borrowing requirements. I cannot call it public sector borrowing requirements, it is the national sector borrowing requirements. It is a doubling, and no indication of this was projected or stated, to the best of my recollection, in the Budget. Something has got to be wrong with how we are handling our public finances in this country.  
6.40 p.m.

Now I am not talking about squandermania or anything like that. That has already been dealt with. What I am talking about is actually the management of the public finances, and I ask myself the question, how can we manage our finances adequately and efficiently when some six months after the start of the financial year we are here debating in Parliament a whopping increase in the maximum amount that may be borrowed and very little, if any, projection of these requirements was given in terms of the Budget presentation?

It is time that we put an end to this kind of *ad hoc* approach in these particular matters to the management of the public finances. It is for these reasons, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I am deeply concerned about what has been happening to the public debt, the national debt in this country. Therefore, the Opposition and I will have to use an appropriate measure to indicate its great concern over the way in which these matters are being handled.

I thank you, Sir.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I think that I should reply to some of the very stringent statements. I would not call them criticisms because they sounded more to me like propagandizing on the part of the other side than criticisms.

It is clear that the Democratic Labour Party cannot have its cake and eat it. It cannot accuse the Government of not wishing to address the problems of Barbados and at the same time deny the Government one of the means which every country in the world has to use in order to alleviate such problems as unemployment and growth in the economy.

A country is no different from any household. In either case can one spend more than one earns except people give you money, you win money or you borrow money? You either earn it, or you borrow it, or somebody gives it to you, or you have a lucky windfall.

It is clear, also, that in these kinds of small countries, like we are, the Government is very often the largest employer in the community, and if there is to be employment creation and economic growth, the Government has to take the lead.

We were criticized in a very general way by the spokesman for the Opposition. He has made a number of points and I think I should deal with them. He has accused us, first of all, of borrowing money on this occasion. He says, "in order to start off an electoral campaign for the next General Election."

Sir, the public sector capital expenditure of the Government of Barbados is set out very clearly annually in our Estimates of Expenditure, and we try to do a little forward planning and set them out in our Development Plan. Everyone knows that we are at the end of our first Development Plan, we are now at the beginning of a new Development Plan, and that it is likely to be published in the very near future. So the first point I would like to categorically rebut is that this authorisation that we are asking the House to approve now has anything to do with any forthcoming election.

It is simply as we said, to allow the Government to convert some short-term borrowing which has occurred over the course of the last Development Plan into long-term borrowing, and to provide a little leeway for the Government to borrow on a long-term basis for the Development Plan that is now being considered by Cabinet.

It is easy for the honourable Member on the other side to say that over the last seven years the people in Barbados are no better off, that we are in a worse position, or at least in no better position than we were in 1976. I dispute that. The evidence does not support such

a contention. The evidence is clear that, whatever measure or indices, or index on economic performance you use, the people of Barbados are better off than they were in 1976.

I have a few little points here which I will draw to the attention of the House. There are 10 000 more electric connections than there were in 1976; 12 000 more telephones than there were in 1976, and approximately 11 000 more water services than there were in 1976. It is strange to me that if there has been no improvement in the standard of living of our people that that number of additional amenities, or necessities in the context of Barbadians, have been applied for, installed and paid for monthly.

I want to say, as I have said on many occasions, that the essential distinction between the previous Government and this Government is that whereas they may have thought of a number of schemes to improve Barbados, they never had the courage nor the determination, nor indeed, as I understand it now, the capacity to implement the decisions which were necessary to carry these schemes to fruition.

Honourable Members on this side have set out a catalogue of the projects which have been completed. I do not need to repeat them. They have a high visibility content. The public can see them, from St. Philip to St. Lucy. From St. Philip to St. Lucy you can drive on any of the roads and you can see visible evidence of the projects completed, all of which require an expenditure of money, and some of which, Mr. Deputy Speaker, come under the terms of the borrowing which we would hope will be authorized by this House.

I think we will have more than one opportunity to debate this matter in the future. In view of the fact that we are now in a position where we are debating here this matter after two or three days of debate, I need not belabour and repeat the points made.  
6.50 p.m.

The Government is perfectly prepared to face the electorate on its performance, on its project management on its implementation, on the improvement in the services to the people, improvement in the terms of employment and wages, when the appropriate time comes. It is not now, so the honourable Member need not have any fear that this is an attempt to create terms and conditions for a snap election. This is only the Government seeking to have legal authorisation to carry out a programme for the betterment of the people of Barbados.

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

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

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

*Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.*

*On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill 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 Bill was read a third time and passed.*

#### THE RATE OF INTEREST (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1983.

*Order No. 3 was called — To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Rate of Interest Act.*

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a short Bill and the object is to provide flexibility to the machinery for fixing interest in Barbados. In order to allow great speed of adjustment to the machinery, it is proposed that the Minister of Finance delegate the power to the Central Bank and that the Central Bank exercises the power, but, of course, that in the exercise of their powers they will have to make the recommendation to the Minister of Finance. It is purely a piece of machinery which will allow control, but also introducing flexibility.

Many countries now rely on market forces to control these matters. We in Barbados do not feel that in such a small society and such a small market one can allow complete flexibility to be achieved only by the market forces. But we do feel that there is a case for removing some of the legal rigidity that is in existence at the present moment.

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

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Deputy Speaker, obviously one will not contest this. I just want to ask the Minister something. If at the moment the Minister of Finance is responsible for it and then he is delegating the authority to the Central Bank — it does not say to the Governor incidentally, it says to the Bank, then the Bank will seek the permission of the Minister — I do not understand, and I am not being contentious. I just wish to understand how it is proposed that it will work.

If the Minister has the authority now, and he delegates it to the Bank, and the Bank can only exercise the authority with the permission of the Minister, then the Minister is still retaining the ultimate authority; so it must be a mechanical problem. I do not know what the thing is.

The Minister did not go into detail and I wonder if he would just explain, because when one is criticising the movement of the interest rate, one would wish to know exactly what is happening. I wonder if he would explain that phrase.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: There are certain interest rates that the Central Bank can fix now with the approval of the Minister. There are other interest rates that the Minister can fix by Order. What we are doing is to put all the interest rate fixing at the Central Bank. Just as at the present moment with respect to those categories of interest rates that the Central Bank itself makes an Order — it does not have to come to Parliament; the Central Bank makes the Order under the Central Bank Act — you are equating all the rates of interest in that way, but the responsibility is not going on the Governor, it is going on the Central Bank, and, of course, the Minister, in order not to be in a position where the Central Bank makes an Order without reference to him, has to approve it. That is all. We are putting all within the confines of the present Central Bank in respect of those special categories that they can fix.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: I just wanted to find out from the Deputy Prime Minister if he is aware that within the last couple of months the commercial banks have been using the spread allowed by the Central Bank to push up the rates on loans for consumer durables to the point where the real lending rate is some 21 per cent now.

What has been happening is that the rates have been coming down for the prime loans, those for the big businesses are controlled, and on the other hand, they are taking back what they are losing out of the small people who have to borrow to repair their houses, buy a little sewing machine.

It is within their right, because they are allowed the spread, but the spread has been used to the disadvantage of the working-class people. I am wondering if the Minister is aware of this, and if there is anyway they can control that type of activity by the commercial banks to make sure that the intention of the Government is not frustrated.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I am not aware of the facts as mentioned by the honourable Member (Mr. W. O.

Franklin), but I take it that the honourable Member has investigated these cases. There are two things that I will deal with. Under the rate of interest regulations that we have, all borrowers must know the true rate of interest. They are entitled to get the true rate of interest from whoever lends them the money. If it is 21 per cent that sounds to me to be unreasonable, and the best sanction against that kind of conduct is not to borrow it. The Government is quite satisfied that, in respect of certain classes of loans in this country, the best method of controlling them is to encourage the people to join credit unions and to leave out the banks altogether.

7.00 p.m.

We have allowed the Development Bank in Barbados to enter into loan transactions in relation to a much wider scope of business than formally. Their interest rates and terms of repayment is certainly more favourable.

We have also given statutory encouragement to the formation of credit unions. I have lived to see where credit unions are rising in importance. I look forward to the day when they will be the chief rivals to the commercial banks in Barbados. As far as I am concerned, commercial banks should only exist, if they are going to conduct themselves in that way, for the purpose of bringing in foreign loans and lending money in foreign loans in Barbados.

The other point that I would draw to the honourable Member's attention is that what is the governing rule in Barbados is not a specific loan for a specific type of activity, but what is called the average lending rate. If there is a problem in relation to a specific productive purpose that the honourable member has, I think that, having raised this point, I will raise it with the Central Bank.

As far as housing is concerned, we have attempted to take all of the unfairness out of house lending by a number of measures. Not only have we tried to improve the security, so that there will be classified as mortgages, which is controlled, but we have also tried to provide an alternate source of money with a stipulated interest rate and we have tried to widen the lenders of that

money to include the credit unions. I think that these packages that we have thought up should go a long way towards mitigating the impact of the type of conduct the honourable Member speaks of.

We do not propose, other than to make people aware of the true interest rate, to exercise any regulation in that field.

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

*On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.*

#### COMMITTEE

Mr. J. G. ODLE: The House is in Committee.

*Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.*

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

*On the separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.*

#### ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: That brings us to the end of Government Business. I beg to move that this House do now stand adjourned until Tuesday, November 22, 1983 at 12.00 o'clock noon.

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

*The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.*  
7.10 p.m.

## CONTENTS

### MINUTES

|                                                               |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Confirmation of the Minutes of Monday, October 17, 1983 ..... | 20 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----|

### ANNOUNCEMENTS

|                          |    |
|--------------------------|----|
| Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER ..... | 20 |
|--------------------------|----|

Accounts and Statements for the month of September, 1983 from the Accountant General.

The Annual Report on the Immigration and Passport Department for the year ended 1982-12-31.

### PAPERS LAID

|                        |    |
|------------------------|----|
| Hon. L. S. CRAIG ..... | 20 |
|------------------------|----|

The Wireless Telegraphy (Video Tape Rental Service) Regulations, 1983.

The Wireless Telegraphy (Video Tape Machines) Regulations, 1983.

The Wireless Telegraphy (Amendment) Regulations, 1983.

The Wireless Telegraphy (Satellite Television Receiver Antenna) Regulations, 1983.

The Annual Report of the Chief Medical Officer for the year 1982.

|                             |    |
|-----------------------------|----|
| Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW ..... | 21 |
|-----------------------------|----|

The Annual Report and Financial Statement of the National Assistance Board for the period 1st April 1982 to 31st March, 1983.

The Annual Report of the Child Care Board for the period April 1981 - March 1982.

|                        |    |
|------------------------|----|
| Hon. L. S. CRAIG ..... | 21 |
|------------------------|----|

(On behalf of Minister of Finance and Planning, (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS))

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1983.

Report of the Accountant General for the Financial Year 1982-83.

Statement of Account of the Transactions in Rum in the Several Districts for the period July - September, 1983.

The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 9) Order, 1983.

The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 10) Order, 1983.

|                           |    |
|---------------------------|----|
| Hon. H. B. St. JOHN ..... | 21 |
|---------------------------|----|

The Annual Report of H. M. Prisons for the year 1982.

### GOVERNMENT NOTICES

|                        |        |
|------------------------|--------|
| Hon. L. S. CRAIG ..... | 21, 80 |
|------------------------|--------|

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at the Ivy, St. Michael for Housing Development.

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Oistins, Christ Church for Road Development and other purposes connected with the Oistins Redevelopment Scheme.

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Cheapside, St. Michael for Road Improvement.

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Holetown, St. James to provide accommodation for Rates and Taxes Division and for a Public Health Inspector and for a Post Office.

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Bush Hall, St. Michael for Housing Development and other Community Purposes.

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Queens Street, Speightstown, St. Peter for the construction of the Speightstown By-Pass Road.

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Fontabelle, St. Michael for the purpose of Road Improvement.

Resolution to amend Resolution No. 80/1982.

Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1983.

Resolution condemning the conditions in Grenada which led to the multinational intervention on 25th October, 1983, and approving the action taken by the Government of Barbados in participating in the rescue mission.

A Bill to amend the Health Services Act.

A Bill to amend the Immigration Act.

A Bill to repeal and replace the Schedule to the Expatriate Pensions Act, 1980.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$634,150 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1983-84 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1983-84 No. 10 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$166,300 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1983-84, Part II Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1983-84 No. 11 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Hon. H. deB. FORDE ..... 21

Resolution supporting Government's initiatives for the new Session.

#### FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG ..... 22

A Bill to amend the Health Services Act.

A Bill to amend the Immigration Act.

A Bill to repeal and replace the Schedule to the Expatriate Pensions Act, 1980.

A Bill to amend the Special Loans Act.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS ..... 22

#### GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

MOTION RE ORDER NO. 5 ..... 22

Mr. Craig, 22, 23, 24; Mr. Sandiford, 22; Mr. Taitt, 23; Dr. Haynes, 24.

(Order Postponed)

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1983-84 No. 7 .... 25

HEAD 16 - PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE. .... 25

HEAD 19 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING ..... 25

HEAD 35 - MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS ..... 25

Mr. Taitt, 25, 26, 30, 31, 39; Mr. Adams, 26, 33, 43; Mr. St. John, 28, 38; Mr. Forde, 30; Dr. Haynes, 35, 42, 44; Mr. Craig, 41.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1983-84 No. 8 .... 46

HEAD 73 FINANCE AND PLANNING ..... 46

HEAD 77 - FOREIGN AFFAIRS. .... 46, 47

Mr. Taitt, 46; Mr. Adams, 46, 47.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1983-84 No. 9 .... 47

HEAD 15 - CABINET OFFICE ..... 47

Mr. Adams, 47.

RESOLUTION CONDEMNING CONDITIONS IN GRENADA AND SUPPORTING STEPS TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT IN PARTICIPATING IN RESCUE MISSION ..... 50

Mr. Adams, 50, 114; Mr. Sandiford, 58; Mr. St. John, 63; Mr. King, 66; Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 69; Mr. Taitt, 71, 106; Mr. Forde, 76; Mr. Weekes, 80; Mr. Bradshaw, 82; Mr. H. A. Blackman, 85; Mr. Johnson, 88; Mr. Greaves, 91; Mr. Truss, 94; Dr. Haynes, 98, 105; Mr. Sisnett, 101; Mr. Craig, 104; Mr. Franklin, 108; Mr. Odle, 111; Mr. R. E. Brathwaite, 113.

SPECIAL LOANS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1983. .... 120

Mr. St. John, 120, 139; Dr. Haynes, 121; Mr. Craig, 128; Mr. A. Truss, 130; Mr. Taitt, 133, 134; Mr. Sandiford, 137.

RATE OF INTEREST (AMENDMENT) ACT 1983 .. 140

Mr. St. John, 140, 141; Mr. Taitt, 140; Mr. Franklin, 140.

SUSPENSIONS. .... 35, 48, 63, 80, 94, 108, 120

Mr. Craig, 48, 49; Mr. Taitt, 48, 49; Mr. Deputy Speaker, 49.

---

ADJOURNMENT ..... 141

**SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE**

ADAMS, Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. (St. Thomas)  
BLACKMAN, H. A. (St. Philip South)  
BOLDEN, His Honour C. L. (St. Joseph)  
BRADSHAW, Hon. DeL. O. (St. Michael South East)  
BRATHWAITE, Hon. L. B. (St. Andrew)  
BRATHWAITE, R. E. (St. Lucy)  
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)  
HAYNES, Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central)  
JOHNSON, Hon. V. L. (St. Michael West Central)  
KING, M. A. (Christ Church West Central)  
ODLE, J. G. (St. George North)  
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)  
TRUSS, A. A. (St. Michael Central)  
WEEKES, L. A. (St. Michael West)