
THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1991 – 96

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday October 20, 1992

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 o'clock on Tuesday, October 20, 1992.

PRESENT

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK, **B.Sc. LL.B.**, (Deputy Speaker)

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A., (Econ.), J.P., (Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs and Minister for the Civil Service)

Mr. H. deB. FORDE, Q.C., M.A., **LL.B.**, (Leader of the Opposition)

Hon. B. M. TAITT, B.A. (Hons.), M.P.A., **LL.B.** (Hons.), (Minister of Health)

Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Q.C., B.A., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Public Works, Communications and Transportation and Leader of the House)

Hon. M. A. KING, **Q.C.**, **LL.B.**, (Attorney General and Minister of Foreign Affairs)

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, A.I.C., M.I.A.S., J.P., (Minister of Trade, Industry and Commerce)

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS, (Minister of Justice and Public Safety)

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN, **B.Sc.** (Econ.)

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR, **M.Sc.** (Econ.)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Q.C., LL.M.

Hon. C. V. WALKER, (Minister of Education)

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees)

Hon. E. E. GREAVES, G.C.M., B.A., **Ed.M.**, (Minister of Housing and Lands)

Hon. W. W. HALL, G.C.M., H.B.M. (Minister of Tourism and Sports)

Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN, M.A.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS, B.A., Cert. Ed.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON, U.B. (Hons.), (Minister of State, Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, **Q.C., LL.B.**

Mr. L.R. TULL, **Q.C.**, M.A.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, **Q.C.**, M.A., **M.Sc.** (Econ.)

Mr. J. O. TUDOR

Hon. D. W. BOWEN (Minister of Community Development and Culture)

Mr. G. W. PAYNE

Prayers were led by Rev Father Ivan Harewood.

The absence of His Honour the Speaker was announced by the Deputy Clerk.

His Honour the Deputy Speaker took the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The House is in session.

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minutes of Tuesday, August 4, 1992.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday, August 4, 1992 have been circulated and I move that they be taken as read and confirmed.

Hon. M. A. KING: I beg to second that, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let those Minutes therefore stand confirmed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have to report that I am in receipt of the Accounts and Statements for the months of May 1992, June 1992 and July 1992 as prepared by the Accountant General.

PAPERS

Rt. Hon L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay:

The Annual Report of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation for the year 1990 and I am also commanded to lay the Reform of the Indirect Tax System prepared by the Fiscal Affairs Department of the International Monetary Fund.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Annual Report of the Barbados Marketing Corporation for the period ended March 31, 1989.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Annual Reports of the National Housing Corporation for the Financial Years 1988 - 1989 and 1989 - 1990.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Tourism and Sports I am commanded to lay the 13th Annual Report of the National Sports Council for the Financial Year April 1, 1990 to March 31, 1991.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Christ Church West in respect of the Resolution dealing with the maintenance of democracy.

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

WHEREAS the maintenance of democracy requires the utmost integrity, order and good management in all aspects of government and public affairs:

AND WHEREAS there are no adequate provisions in our law for the avoidance of conflicts of interest by persons engaged in governing, guiding or administering the public affairs of Barbados, for monitoring the assets and other relevant interests of persons in public life or, in other forms, for mandating and regulating integrity in public life:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT this House appoint a Committee:

- (1) to formulate proposals for the establishment of an Integrity Commission to receive declarations in writing of interests of Members and such other persons as may be appropriate, to maintain a register of those interests and to supervise such matters connected therewith as may be prescribed,
- (2) to formulate proposals for the enactment of legislation to achieve and sustain the aims of this Resolution,
- (3) in consonance with those aims, to receive written and oral representations on matters within its terms of reference and
- (4) to report its determination to this House accordingly.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Christ Church West.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I give notice, with leave of the following Resolution:

WHEREAS it is the right of the people of Barbados to receive information particularly on matters of importance to their political, social and economic well being:

AND WHEREAS communication of debates of this House by live broadcasts on radio and television is an effective way to give meaning, definition and respect to that right;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House support live broadcasts of all debates of this House on radio and television and that a Standing Committee of this House be set up to implement and monitor the application of this decision.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Peter. His question re consultants engaged by Government as advisors on sale or divestment of Government assets.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, to ask the Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs -

1. Will the Minister please state whether consultants or other persons were or are engaged by Government as advisors on the sale or other divestment or disposal of:
 - (1) assets of statutory boards and
 - (2) Government shareholdings and other assets or interests?

2. Will the Minister identify any consultants or other persons referred to in the foregoing paragraph and particularise their terms and conditions of service?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Peter in respect of the applications for tax concessions or waivers for land development.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, to ask the Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs:

1. Will the Minister list the persons who have sought tax concessions or waivers towards development of property to:

1. to include golf courses; and

2. for other purposes

from 1st January, 1990 to date and identify such applications as have been rejected and the bases for rejection?

2. Where, from 1st January, 1990, tax concessions or waivers have been granted in respect of any properties with the right to create golf courses contained in planning consents for those properties, will the Minister state:

- (1) the principles applied to the granting of such concessions or waivers; and

- (2) the details of such concessions or waivers as have not been gazetted or are not required to be gazetted?

12.25 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Peter in respect of the indebtedness of Government agencies to the Barbados National Bank.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, to ask the Minister of the Finance and Economic Affairs:

1. Will the Minister please state the separate amounts owed to the Barbados National Bank on August 31, 1992, by individual statutory bodies and other enterprises in which the Government of Barbados holds a financial interest?
2. Will the Minister also please state what arrangement Government proposes to or has put in place to discharge the indebtedness of these bodies to the Bank?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Peter in respect of the Transport Board and the National Insurance Department.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, to ask the Minister of Public Works, Communications and Transportation:

Will the Minister please –

1. state the total indebtedness of the Transport Board to the National Insurance Department for overdue and unpaid statutory contributions on 31st August, 1992;
2. specify what arrangements if any have been made by the Board with the Department to discharge its outstanding liability to that Department; and
3. if no arrangements for settlement have been offered by the Board or agreed with the Department, what are the reasons for that continuing default?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Peter in respect of the proposed move of the Community Development Department to privately owned premises.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: To ask the Minister of Community Development and Culture:

1. Will the Minister state the terms and conditions of the lease or other contract between Government and the owners of the premises in which the Community Development Department and Welfare is expected to be relocated shortly at Pine Plantation Road, Saint Michael?
2. Especially in view of the state of the nation's economy will the Minister further state why the Community Development Department will occupy privately-owned property and not government-owned property as it has so far done?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Peter in respect of the redemption of Japanese debentures.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: To ask the Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs:

1. Will the Minister please state why, contrary to the provisions of section 111 of the Constitution, and according to the September, 1992 Economic and Financial Statistics published by the Central Bank of Barbados, no provision has been made after September, 1990 for Sinking Funds for Foreign Debt?
2. Will the Minister also state whether the provision in Appendix D of the Barbados Estimates

1990-91 for the redemption of the \$80.4m. debenture issue 1988/93 raised in Japan, remains available in a Sinking Fund and for that purpose?

3. If the foregoing provision is not available, will the Minister assure the House that the Japanese debenture issue will be redeemed by the due date, May 27, 1993, and identify the source for funding of that redemption?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Peter in respect of the rules on the sale of assets by Government, including Statutory Bodies.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, to ask the Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs:

1. Will the Minister state when Government proposes to establish rules under Section 39(1) (f) of the Financial Administration and Audit Act Cap. 5, so as to facilitate orderly sales and/or transfers of securities or other property of the Government and statutory bodies?
2. If no such rules are proposed under Cap. 5 which is a statute governing such sales and/or transfers, will the Minister please state the rules, criteria and policies which have been employed by Government since 1st April 1991, to govern the sale and/or transfers of its securities, shares and other property and those of its statutory bodies?

REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to report that the Theft Bill, 1992 which was referred to the Select Committee, has been passed with amendments and I hereby do lay the Report.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

On the separate motions of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. M. A. KING, the following Bills were read a first time:

1. *The Bill to amend the Consumption Tax Act, Cap. 63.*
2. *The Betting and Gaming Duties Validation Bill, 1992.*
3. *The Bill to amend the Pharmacy Act, Cap. 372D and the Corporate Affairs and Intellectual Property Office Act, Cap. 21A.*

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I give notice that the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 41, asked by the Honourable Member for St. Andrew, is ready.

CONGRATULATORY AND/OR OBITUARY SPEECHES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, during the recess it came to our attention that a former member of this Honourable Chamber, Mr. Wilfred Coward, passed away. I want to, serve notice, that Honourable Members who might want to speak may prepare themselves, that on the next occasion of the sitting of this House, probably next week, we shall pay the appropriate tributes to the passing of the late Wilfred Coward.

12.35 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am moving that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43, and 44 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

Hon. M. A. KING: I beg to second that.

The question was put and agreed to in the affirmative without division.

ORDER NO. 10 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE LEASE OF CROWN LANDS AT PRESCOD BOULEVARD TO MILL REEF COMPANY

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, from time to time the House is asked to approve Resolutions relating to the lease of various parcels of land in different parts of the Island to individuals and indeed, at times, to businesses. This particular occasion, we are seeking the House's approval for the lease of 1,631 square metres of land at Prescod Boulevard in the City of Bridgetown to Mill Reef Company Limited.

I believe Mill Reef Company is the parent company of Chefette Limited, and you will recall that sometime earlier this year this Honourable House approved the sale of an area of land to that company. Part of this particular lease has to do with a further arrangement with that company for the easy management and development of business. The terms of the lease are set out in the Addendum to the Resolution. Basically the conditions of the lease which Cabinet has agreed to offer the company, and the company has also agreed to accept, are as follows:

- (1) That the lease shall be for a period of 25 years;
- (2) That the rent payable shall be at the rate of \$15,000 per annum;
- (3) That the rent payable shall be subject to review every five years; and

- (4) That Mill Reef Company Limited shall be responsible for the payment of all **taxes**, utilities and other outgoings arising out of the use of the land.

That, basically, Mr. Deputy Speaker, constitutes the arrangement for **the** lease. The plot of the area of **land** is available for the scrutiny of Honourable Members. I therefore beg to move that this Resolution **do** now pass.

Hon. M. A. KING: I beg to second **the** motion and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. **DeL. O. BRADSHAW**. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Members on this side would not object to this Resolution, but I wish to state that we have been in the bad habit of bringing these resolutions before Parliament and asking Members to be acquainted with a particular acquisition just on the **day** that the matter is being brought before the House. I want to suggest very strongly – I don't want the Government **or** the Minister to feel that a bad habit needs to **be** perpetuated. I would like to **make** a worthy contribution on most of these matters because land and property are very important assets. Therefore, I would want to **see** in future a copy of the plans circulated to Members, not myself alone, but **all** Members so that we will be able to know their exact location.

Aside.

Mr. **DeL. O. BRADSHAW**: I take the point, but what I am saying is that I would **like** to study them. It could help the Government because it would take me some time to look at the plan to know exactly whether the land is to the west, the north or the east. We would like to know that so that we could suggest to the Government that there is **an** alternative site to the one that is proposed. **All** these **are** factors that must be taken into consideration.

All I am saying is that I know that in the past it was customary to do it this way. We must realise that we have members who are interested in giving positive suggestions to the Government **and** sometimes the plans are not accurately described. Sometimes they have the grids in the wrong place. I know this from experience. Sometimes I would want to know the amount of money that is decided upon. There is a formula that is used. I would want to **see** it to know the valuation of the land, to check to see if the money that we **are** asking reflects the true price of the land.

I hope that the Minister in future will make available these plans to us. On the other hand, I want to make it quite clear that the Barbados Labour Party's policy was to make available lands along that area to persons who had businesses there or who wanted to expand them. There was some land which was in the hands of **the** Government **and** we felt that it should be offered to persons who had businesses there. That is why I said from the outset that the

Opposition would have no difficulty in supporting this, but as I said it is **very** important for us to have these plans in future. Then I think we will get more informed debates as a result.

With that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I associate myself with the Resolution.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will be very brief. **The** Honourable Member on the other side who spoke stated that it is the policy of the Barbados Labour Party to **make** lands available to people who have businesses in that particular area. The fact that we are here today indicates that this is the policy of the Government. So we **are** *ad idem* on that. Indeed, I **am** told by the Deputy **Prime** Minister who was Minister responsible for **Lands** in the period **1971-76** that this was the policy which had been pursued by the then Democratic Labour Party Administration. So I do not think that we have a problem in agreeing on this particular approach. I did say in my introductory remarks that this land adjoins land owned by **Chefette** Limited and it is in the area, as I understand it, around a property which is owned by N. E. Wilson and it is to provide the exit off **Fontabelle** and the further expansion of Chefette there. That, basically, as I understand it, is what the matter is all about.

With those remarks, I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

12.45 p.m.

ORDER NO. 11 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE LEASE UNDER SECTION 5 OF **THE CROWN LANDS (VESTING AND DISPOSAL) ACT, CAP. 225, TO CARIBBEAN AIRWAYS LIMITED OF LAND AT GRANTLEY ADAMS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, CHRIST CHURCH, TO ERECT A MAINTENANCE AND OFFICE FACILITY FOR AVIATION RELATED PURPOSES**

Hon. **E. E. GREAVES**: Mr. Speaker, you would recall that in a previous debate when we came here with the Resolution to lease land to British Airways, it was generally accepted by both sides that the land which is situated at Grantley Adams International Airport we should try to maximise the benefits and, indeed, the income which the Government could derive from leasing these areas of land to companies which are connected with the airline industry and, generally speaking, which would have business operations at Grantley **Adams** International Airport. I did indicate we had a number of requests. This is the second one. We did the one with British Airways

and now we have had a request from Caribbean Airways for the purposes described in the instant Resolution.

Basically, again the terms **are** set out in the Resolution. We are **seeking** to lease an **area** of land at Grantley Adams International Airport in the parish of Christ Church. The land is about 2 537.2 **square** metres or thereabouts. We **are** seeking Parliament's **permission** to lease this land to Caribbean **Airways**. The land is for the purpose of erecting a building to accommodate maintenance and office facility for aviation related purposes. The lease shall be for a **period** of 15 years with an option to renew upon terms and conditions to be **agreed**. The rental **rate** shall be \$24 000 **per** annum subject to review every five years and the other general conditions which we put into these leases with certain responsibilities which are imposed on the lessee. Those **are** the terms and conditions which, generally, apply in areas of this nature.

I therefore would want to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. P. M. **GREAVES**: Mr. Deputy **Speaker**, I am going to second **that** particular motion. I **also** want to say here that Caribbean Airways is operated by a company that operates commercially and **successfully** now. The land the airline requires will be used for the general expanded **work** of Caribbean Airways. Caribbean Airways has recently formed a handling company. **That** handling company requires space. It is also handling cargo. **The** intention is that we will put up **a facility** there that will handle the aircraft which it has contracted to handle as well as for cargo purposes.

I also want to say **that** it is a land use plan prepared by the Canadian **Airports** Project Team that was here a couple of years ago. The use of this land corresponds with the plan **as** prepared by the Canadian **Airports** Project Team and approved by the Government. Caribbean Airways, as I said earlier, **operates** successfully. It also facilitates charters **that** originate out of other countries. For example, Sir, I think right now it is being used by **Air** Tours. It is using its call signs and name. It is either Air Tours or Sun Tours. I cannot exactly remember but it is using its name to **facilitate** a service **between** Barbados and some European countries. Caribbean Airways has recently expanded and formed a new company called the handling **company** which handles a number of airlines now **operating** at Grantley Adams **International** Airport. This lease is in furtherance of the work of Caribbean Airways.

Hon. H. B. St. **JOHN**: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would have thought that today the opportunity would have been taken by the Honourable Minister of International **Transportation** to enlighten the House and the public about the aviation policy of the Government and, particularly, to lay on the Table of this House the **accounts** of the lessee, Caribbean Airways, because I doubt one can take the word

of the Honourable **Minister** in respect of the success or otherwise of Caribbean Airways when in truth and in fact people know that there **are** outstanding severance payment claims awarded by the Severance Tribunal which, my latest information is, all have still not been paid. I am very glad to hear **that**...

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. **JOHN**: I **am** not declaring an interest. I do not have an interest. I **am not** an employee of Caribbean Airways. I have never been an employee of Caribbean Airways so therefore, I worked against Caribbean **Airways** when they denied a person his legitimate right to severance and I had to take it up to appeal. You now remind me of something.

Mr. **DEPUTY SPEAKER**: I trust it is within the four walls of the Resolution which is before the House.

Hon. H. B. St. **JOHN**: I will be **as** relevant **as** the **Honourable** Member who got up in here and said that Caribbean Airways was a success and that it has now formed a handling company. I do not know what that **has** to do with the lease, Sir.

Our position is that I would **like** to know when the Government is going to tell this House and the community via the accounts of Caribbean Airways so **that** we would be able to see and discover for ourselves and not on the say-so of the Honourable Member **about** its success or otherwise. Quite clearly, this is one type of activity the Government has been able to carry on contrary to the declared policy of the **Ministry** of Finance in relation to privatisation in Barbados. It is quite clear that the inconsistency between the Government's operations in respect of commercial activities is borne out in this area for on the one hand an office of privatisation has **been** created to privatise Government's assets and on the other hand we have Government Ministers coming before this House and informing it that they **are** enlarging the operations of this entity.

The truth of the **matter** is that Caribbean Airways **does not** at the present moment perform the function and role of an airline. What it **does** is that it exploits the route rights **that** belong to the Government of Barbados and its intimate connection with the Government for financial gain, the terms and conditions of which **are shrouded** in mystery because this is a public company **that** uses the Government's route rights. The route rights **are** the Government of Barbados' to sell to other airlines and the terms and conditions of the sale or the franchise fees are not **known** to the public because we do not have the accounts. We do not know how they charge them. Nobody knows how they charge them.

12.55 p.m.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Sir. We are not charging any franchise fees to anybody and we are not receiving any franchise fees from anybody.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I have no difficulty with this, Sir, because he would not understand this area although it is his Ministry. He says that **people** use the call signs and so forth. Is he telling us that **they** are used for free?

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: My **definition** of a franchise is paying for the right to use any intangible property belonging to another person. I call that a franchise fee. It is not difficult for me to appreciate the Honourable Member's difficulty even though it is his Ministry.

Sir, the position is that money is **extracted** from airlines for the use of the name of Caribbean Airways, the licences of Caribbean Airways and the call signs of Caribbean Airways. I will say this for them that the money, as I understand it, comes into the Treasury or into the accounts of Caribbean Airways.

Certain remarks made by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN and Hon. P. M. GREAVES were ordered, by Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER, to be expunged from the record.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I **am** asking the Honourable Member to stay within the four walls of the Resolution.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I **am** going to stick to the Resolution, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: If we knew the financial position of the lessee we would be able – if the Honourable Minister on this occasion had come to this House and informed the House and the public about the financial condition of the lessee... Here it is that we have the Government **saying** that they are leasing Government land to an entity all the shares of which are owned by the Government and the Honourable Minister under whose portfolio that particular company falls gets up and says that he is happy to assure the House that Caribbean Airways is now a success. I **am** glad that it is successful, extremely glad because I look forward to the time where its success is such that it will help reduce the **draconian** taxes that we have to pay.

But the basic position is that he does not give us any information about the viability and I am not trusting anything the Honourable Minister says. His word means nothing to me, not even a row of pins. If he has the accounts, let us get the accounts.

I want to know what is the policy of the Government in relation to the land in this area, because I believe that the Development Plan of the Airport and the commercial exploitation of that land is a major asset of Barbados. We have been particularly fortunate that successive Governments had the foresight to acquire large areas of land not for sub-division for housing but **for** public works and for commercial activity. Our political party played a major role in that far-sighted decision when we acquired **so** much land in that area of Christ Church for the future development of aviation in Barbados.

But what we want to know is what is the policy of the Government? Every now and again I see a lot of **ad hoc** leases coming in here. I want to know what is the policy of the Government in relation to the leasing of land there? Not only this particular area of land, but there is a lot of land around the area which is not useful for building of buildings but which is utilized by a number of small people in that area and you in particular, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will appreciate this point because I **am** sure that you have been besieged like me, by these people about the extent and the exact and precise area which falls within the area that cannot be used for anything at all.

I have been fortunate to visit many airports in my period of time. I know that around airports a multiplicity of activities of a farming nature takes place. The Governments and the airport authorities lend **all** possible assistance to people to participate in activity around the **airports** which is compatible with airline safety so as to ensure that that area of land that is not being physically used for immediate airport activity is not a waste land of bush. That is the problem that we have around Grantley **Adams** International Airport. There is a lot of area that is bush and could be exploited by **farmers**. But the Government does not have a policy in respect to that.

The previous Government had a definite and distinct policy made known by the former Minister of Housing, Mr. L. B. **Brathwaite** with respect to the leasing of land, a well-known policy with respect to the leasing of land and with respect to licensing in respect to **that**. What is the position? There are people who wish to farm in that area, in areas where there can be no possible danger. They did farm in my time. Some of them are still there. The unemployment rate created by the Honourable Member's Government is so high now that there is a multiplicity of people who never farmed before who now want to farm because they have no choice but to do that, if not they would starve, and they do not even have any welfare and assistance to prevent them from starving.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Resolution please.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I **am** **talking** about the Resolution. I **am** talking about the policy in

relation to leasing land which is not being used now. The Government should get up and announce and say what its policy is and let the people in Christ Church and in St. Philip and in that surrounding area come forward and make use of some of that land. They want to use it. Fairy Valley – I know the areas very well and I am sure the Honourable Deputy Speaker knows it very well too. All in that area. People want to use it. They want a little security in the form of a letter from the Ministry of Housing saying that they are at least agricultural tenants and that you cannot throw them off once they have a licence under the Agricultural Tenants Act. You do not need **any** big time lease like this. You want a little licence under the Security of Tenure Act that they mean they must get 6 months and if they are agricultural tenants they have to give them 6 months expiring the 31st May so that they know. But we want to know the policy, Publish it. I challenge the Government to publish it. It goes right back down now.

There is another related area that goes back down to Gibbons. Part of the land belongs to Government, part does not belong to Government. When we left office there was an argument as to the extent of the noise zone. A specific review was taking place about the exact boundaries of the noise zone because there were a number of people in the Parish Land **area** who wanted to exploit their land and some of that land was Government's land. I would like an update on that. There are a lot of things that we need an update on. We are going to have to update on the accounts of Caribbean Airways. We still **have not** heard yet what is the major role that the Government is going to use Caribbean Airways for. We know they have a handling company. This is only an opportunity to provide a job for a few people. We know that. It is a handling company – we know that – with American Airlines and with LIAT. Do not trouble me about these points.

I would like to know for instance whether Aero Services is going to be handled by Caribbean **Airways**? I would like to know **that**.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I do not know what is Aero Services. There is no Aero Services. Aero Services does not belong to the Government and has not belonged to the Government for the past 3 or 4 years. I cannot make a second speech. All I am doing is just correcting, on a point of order, what the Honourable Member has said. Aero Services does not belong to the Government. It has not belonged to the Government for the past 3 years. All Government retained was 18% interest in Aero Services, 82% belongs to the private sector. Therefore the Government was not in a position to take any decisions on Aero Services unless it had the concurrence of the 82% Shareholders in Aero Services.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You see what I mean, Sir.
1.05 p.m.

It is very fortuitous **today** that we have this major disclosure that the Government has sold its shares. How much did the Government sell its share for? They gave away the shares to the private sector who in turn sold them for treble the price.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: The Honourable Member had lost his seat in the last Government when I stated here that Air Services was sold. He was not a member of the House. If he does not want to **take** an interest in what is going on in this country it is a matter for him. He was not in the House when Air Services' shares were sold. This should not have happened in the first place, because that Government allowed **Barclays** to off load on them Air Services, that they should never have had.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Both Honourable Members have had enough time to diverge as much as they possibly wanted to. Now, let us take the Resolution, please.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, it is a matter of profound importance to the people in upper Christ Church, including Christ Church East, to know exactly what is their position, particularly those who have aspirations to rent land from the **Government**. It is a very important point, Sir. That is **not** a diversion. I want to know about that land along **Grantley Adams** Airport that I know, stretching from Gibbons Hill, running right up to St. Philip, very near **to** the dump, which belongs to the Government. I just don't want to know that only a special privileged few can have access to that land upon terms and conditions. So therefore, Sir, I want all of these things clarified.

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Only a few. I just don't want it to be like that because once the Honourable Member has anything to do with it that is how it will go. The position is very clear.

Now, Sir, the second point I want to know. The Government should have told us about this new role, in addition to call signs, that **they** sell. **You** have to pay to use **the** call signs in addition to this handling company that they do. I believe they still have counter space. I understand that in conjunction with some of the private sector that they have **incoming/inbond** stores. Caribbean Airways has **incoming/inbond** stores now. When you come in the arrival hall at the Airport I understand that Caribbean Airways now sell them there. When you come in at the Airport Caribbean Airways is the proprietor of an **inbond** store.

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: It isn't a mm shop, it is a duty free store when you come in. There are no

counters there that you can sit down and drink, Sir. It is a position, Sir, and presumably, soon, Lotto will soon be in there. The position is, I would like to know whether it is a joint venture and if it is a joint venture I would like to know with whom it is a joint venture. I would like to know whether it is a fact that Caribbean Airways has an interest in this **inbond** store.

These are very important points that we must know **because** I find it difficult to understand, and I **am** finishing on this note, Sir. I find it **difficult** to understand how it is that the Government can proclaim to the world at large that it is ridding itself of its activities which are of a private sector nature and at the same time they are coming before this Honourable House and bragging and boasting that they **are** expanding their activities which are of a similar commercial nature. **That** is **all** I want to know. That seems to me to be slightly inconsistent and I would like to **know** what are the particular reasons why you can have these exemptions because this programme that we are operating under does not seem to have any clear set of principles. It seems to me that it is a lot ad hocism. That is my position, Sir.

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

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it has come to my attention recently, Sir, that Barbadians who are leaving Barbados to go abroad are being denied the privilege to purchase duty free goods at the **airport** to take with them out of Barbados. Do you understand me, Sir? It is my information that if I, as a Barbadian - and it happened subsequent to the **10th** August when I last left Barbados - am leaving to go abroad I cannot purchase duty **free** items at the **airport** to take with me. I wish to **know**, Sir, if that is true. In other words, if my information is correct, why has the ban been placed because what has happened is ...

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: **If** you stop me from purchasing a bottle of perfume or a bottle of **cockspur** to take with me on my trip, to give somebody overseas, that is a ban. It amounts to a ban. What has been happening is that Bee Wee has been very happy, particularly about this arrangement, because you can buy **all** of your duty free on Bee Wee now, they get the revenue and Barbados loses it. It would seem to me to be symptomatic of a kind of madness that is affecting the Government in its decision making. I have not called them mad people, Sir. I said a kind of madness. I can't understand. It does not make sense, but since the Minister is saying that he does not understand it and he is agreeing with me, I **am** going to insist now, since he knows of it and he is professing ignorance, I am going to insist that now that I have

enlightened you, do the necessary to restore the **status quo**. Thank you, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I **think** I should respond to the last point because I know it is a matter of some concern. The Honourable Member for St. Thomas I am certain knows what the law is and very often there are exceptions or traditions or conventions or practices which develop. I think that you would be aware that **under** the law the benefits in relation to duty free shopping should not accrue to Barbadian citizens.

Now, the point is that for a long time, as I understand, it has been going on and the Comptroller of Customs has a discretion. It is not something that a Minister can intervene and say to the Comptroller of Customs or anybody else that he must exercise his discretion under the law in a particular way. However, what I will say is that it does impact significantly on the sales of the operations at the duty free ports. In addition to **that**, when one looks at it, it is possible that Barbadians will take that same money and convert it into foreign exchange and go elsewhere and buy the same good. So it is not something that Government is oblivious to. It is not any confusion. The point is that you can check what the law is and I think you know what the law is. There are countries in the Caribbean, for example Trinidad, when I was a student there, for me to purchase a duty free item, I was required to show my passport and ticket. That is also so in St. Lucia and in other countries where the citizens are technically not to benefit from that, but there are practices that develop and when Governments are not under pressure to enforce those regulations, particularly when people are not trying to get around the system or the laws that exist, sometimes practices develop which are not directly in conformity. Everybody knows that there **are** Barbadians who have friends who come from overseas and they send them in Bridgetown to shop for duty **free** items. That is a common thing.

1.15 p.m.

Technically speaking, the concept of the duty free concessions which exist where Barbadians are shopping is not in conformity with the law, so the whole matter is being looked at because the Government is very conscious of the importance of duty free shopping. **As** the Honourable Member for St. Michael North would be able to **say**, in response to the Honourable Member for Christ Church South, a major development has taken place at the airport recently in relation to duty free shopping and it is hoped that over time Government may be able to expand other aspects of duty free shopping and ensure that Barbados becomes the port of positive duty free operations for the persons who visit Barbados. But the guiding

principle, as all of us know, is that as Barbadian citizens there is no provision for us to benefit from duty free concessions. Those concessions are really exclusively for visitors to the island.

I just thought I should explain that, because that is what my understanding of the law is. I do not have the provision of the law now, but let me conclude by saying it would not be possible for a Minister of Government to direct the Comptroller of Customs or the Commissioner of Police, or any other functionary in Government who is there to enforce the law not to enforce it. Unless there is some change or the Convention can re-apply, perhaps it would resume the natural scenario that was existing before.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would have expected the Minister of State to have stated how soon the change would be effected.

I visited the airport very soon after the opening of the three new stores and the investment of over \$1 million by the private sector in that exercise, at the request of the Government, and I had the unfortunate experience of hearing Barbadians who were going overseas, principally to visit relatives, quarrelling with the staff of these three enterprises for their failure to sell them a couple of bottles of perfume to take as gifts to relatives. The argument degenerated into the allegation that the staff were discriminating against these Barbadians because they were black people, and were it not for the discreet manner in which one of the young ladies in particular handled this incident, it could have blown up in the faces of all of us.

I believe the Government has had enough time to deal with that problem. All it called for – if some enthusiastic Customs official had now, after all these years, discovered that there was legislation – was for the Government to come down and change the legislation. The items, if the Honourable Member had done his research would know, that Barbadians who are travelling abroad mostly buy are cigarettes, some liquor to take for their relatives – I believe those are still being sold – some fish, photographic material and perfumes for relatives. Very little of that stuff will return here to Barbados and therefore it seems to me absolutely foolish for people to stop the practice where what is happening is that the same money is being spent in the air now on British Airways or some other foreign carrier. It is therefore a matter of urgency that the matter should be attacked.

Sir, I really am concerned about it in the context of the Government having a Foreign Exchange Committee, with the private sector that has just travelled abroad to St. Maarten and elsewhere and reported back to the Foreign Exchange Committee on the benefits that can be gained from duty free shopping in Barbados. Where are we going? At least the Minister of External Affairs should have read

the Foreign Exchange Committee Report and Minutes. If he has not, I will lend him my copy from time to time so that he could see it. It is my duty as Leader of the Opposition to monitor the Government, so I am entitled to everything the Government has and I will make sure that I get my copies legitimately. There is no reason why the private sector should have it...

Aside.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: ...you are on the Committee, I think you should have it, and the Leader of the Opposition does not have it, so I will get it. Do not ask me how I got it, I got it legitimately, Sir.

I am saying that the reports have made it quite clear that there is a tremendous business that Barbados can get in keeping at home foreign exchange and attracting additional foreign exchange without having this archaic, closed door policy towards what we do at our main ports. I am going to ask the Government to stop delaying on areas like this and just stop coming and telling me an official has done this and has done the next, because the policy is very archaic.

Sir, I have to raise a point made by the Honourable Member for Christ Church South which I think we ought to pursue. The lease calls for an expansion of areas in which Caribbean Airways will be acting. I think the Government has to be quite clear where it is going in relation to its intervention in the future within the economy. I really am finding it very confusing. The signal is that we are going to close down our investment that was paying us in the Barbados Mills, or the investment that was paying us in Bartel, or the investment that was paying us in the Light and Power Company or the Barbados External Telecommunications Company, but we are going to expand an investment in Caribbean Airways in many areas, put pressure in competition with other companies which may have needed some reform, and in competition with them to the extent that workers at the existing companies have been laid off and put under pressure.

There is something wrong with our policy thinking on these matters and I am very disturbed by the lack of co-ordination that is shown between the different Ministries as they approach the restructuring exercise, because in my view if there was need to cause reform to take place at Seawell Air Services and the other company that was operating there, then there are several ways, by virtue of the licences and what not, to put pressure on any bad practices and to force them in any event to widen their own shareholding in the way that Government wants. But I have had people who have been laid off at the airport who are disturbed that they find their jobs going and the same work is going to another hand to clap, and I am being told at the end of the day that American Airlines and somebody

else are coming in. Do you know what is going to happen, Sir? I **am** going to give you the prediction, because it happened here before and you always have to recite the history. I have seen it happen before when we have allowed this to happen. Within a couple of years one company buys out everybody and somebody makes a tremendous capital gain, goes through the door, the **security** of workers has been undermined, the cost factor goes back up and Government is no better off.

1.25 p.m.

I **am** warning the Minister **about** this. The Minister says that you have laid off one way and you employ somewhere else. But to whose advantage? The point is that what has happened is that they have laid off people at the companies that have been operating here and people have lost their jobs. They have no job **security**. People have been thrown out of work. A few have been taken on somewhere else and I am not sure even that some of them are recognising the rights of the Union in some respects because they are finding all sorts of ways around the position to date, and in my view, it is weakening, in the long term, social cohesiveness and economic advancement.

I do not agree with the Government policy on this matter. I do not believe that in the long run they are approaching the reform that must happen in a proper manner. I **am** not against Government intervention from time to time in the economy. Let me get our position clear. There are certain areas. If the Minister is going to say, sitting down in his seat, that **he had** complaints that the other people were sending up charges to the airport and the airlines were complaining there is a way to deal with that. He is the Minister. You don't deal with it in a way that you are smashing something that is existing and then trying to rebuild something else.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, nothing has been smashed because the company that was operating is still operating. It services British Airways. It **services** Air Canada and it services a number of other airlines. All that happened is that there is no longer a monopoly at the airport. **That** is the important thing.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: The Minister will know. I am telling him that eventually what will happen is that somebody is going to make a capital gain and take over. The Minister has the history there. There was a way to deal with the monopoly position. Now the Minister is going to say in one breath that his reason for dealing with this situation is because there was a monopoly in the prices. Why does he not deal with the monopoly of Mobil Oil which has been extracting...

Asides.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Why does he not open Mobil Oil to similar competition? I am saying that it was done in

such a way that it has caused distress to the workers and it has not improved any efficiency or cut down any significant cost to anyone. That is why I **am** quarrelling with the Minister's misguided policy which he is pursuing at the airport.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that the Honourable Member for Christ Church South who spoke on this matter and who during the administration of the Barbados Labour Party had responsibility for the airport and whom we generally recognise as a person who **has** more than **passing** interest in this area ought to know that there is an Airport Development Plan and the Plan incorporates the kind of development which is supposed to take place within the airport boundaries.

I am sure that he also knows that that Plan has been updated and the Honourable Member could be privy to the Plan. I do not think it is a secret plan. I cannot say at this point as to whether the Plan has been made a document of the House but I will try to pursue this matter to find out where it has **gotten**. In any event, it is a document which is available. Added to that, of course, the Town and Country Planning Department has certain regulations in place relating to the noise effective zone and in respect of the flight path.

I recall sometime ago when I introduced a resolution in here for the lease of land in that area I made the point that it has been discovered now that airlines are becoming more and more conscious of their safety that there are developments which have taken place in the flight path zone which are causing considerable problems to the aircraft as they come into Barbados. We have therefore **to** be very clear about this and not try to mislead people or make people believe that any kind of development can take place within the **curtilage** of the airport or indeed, on the path which the airlines take coming into Barbados. We have to be very clear on this and people have to be told in no uncertain terms what has to obtain there.

I **am** sure that this information is available and we will endeavour from the point of view of a public service, through the Government Information Service, to make this information available generally speaking to the public.

Now the Member for Christ Church South made reference to farming in the area of Grantley **Adams** International Airport. As I understand it, a lot of the land surrounding Grantley Adams International Airport is owned by the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation and there is farming on those lands. I am not sure if he meant lands within the boundaries of the airport. What I do know is that on a visit to the airport some months ago I was talking to the Director of Civil Aviation and he was making the point that within the airport and

surrounding the area where the aircraft take off those lands can be farmed in the **kind** of activities which will not provide any kind of difficulty to the aircraft but which would be used as an enhancement to the general environs of the airport and the **tarmac**. Such activities would probably involve the growing of fodder for animals which could then be cut and sold.

I think that one has to understand very clearly that not every **kind** of activity can take place within this particular **area**. As I said at the beginning, both Governments have come to the point that there are developments which can take place within the airport and the **kind** of activities which are related to airport development, and we are pursuing this particular area. As I said, we had a lease for British Airways and this is a lease now coming up for **Caribbean** Airways. I can give the Honourable House the assurance that very shortly we will be coming for permission for another lease for another development which will take place within that particular area and I would hope that at that **time** we will be able to speak in greater detail about the overall Development Plan and we would set that particular one within the context of the particular Resolution which we are seeking. That also would be the context in which this Resolution would be placed.

With those remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

ORDER NO. 12 - RESOLUTION TO LEASE
A PARCEL OF LAND AT **WILDEY**, ST.
MICHAEL TO THE BARBADOS LAWN
TENNIS ASSOCIATION FOR
ESTABLISHMENT OF A
TENNIS CENTRE

Hon. E. E. **GREAVES**: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this particular Resolution has a fairly long history. As a matter of fact, I think that this matter goes back to somewhere in the **1980's**.
1.35 p.m.

On August 15, 1985 the then Cabinet took a decision to lease approximately 1.21 hectares of land at Wildey, St. Michael, to the Barbados Lawn Tennis Association. On that occasion, as I understand it, the period of time they leased the land was for 10 years. The Barbados Lawn Tennis Association was unhappy with this period because they felt that if they were going to be investing the **kind** of money to build the **Centre** then 10 years would be **too** short a period for them to amortise their investments and to get out of the red. This matter was reviewed in 1987. On August 27, 1987, approximately two years after, the Cabinet took a decision to review the 1985 decision. We therefore

extended the **lease** from 10 years to a period of 25 years. Basically, what we are now seeking to do is to establish the conditions of this lease which are set out in the Second Schedule that the land be used only for the establishment of a Tennis Centre, that the lease be for a period of 25 years with an option to renew, and that the rental be at a rate of \$100 per annum, subject to review at the **10th** and **20th** years of **the** lease.

Sir, you are aware of the fact that this particular development and **arrangement** fits into the general approach of the Government towards establishing sports as a very important aspect of our national life and also the possibilities which can emanate from linking sports with tourism as we have done, and as the Minister of Tourism and Sports would indicate the fusion between these two areas. There are tremendous possibilities in this particular area. This is just one of the many sporting activities which are planned for that whole complex there in **Wildey** with the gymnasium, the Tennis Centre, the Swimming Association, the development of cricketing facilities there and it will be a total complex.

We believe that in our efforts to **promote** this and give encouragement to the Barbados Lawn Tennis Association, that a 25-year lease option is a reasonable one. You would note also that the rental is a peppercorn rent, **\$100** per annum because this is the kind of support which the Government finds it necessary to provide in order to give encouragement to the **development** of this kind of activity here in Barbados.

One would hope that with the kind of facilities which we **are** providing our young people and sportsmen would recognise that the Government is playing its part. What we would want to see forthcoming from our sportsmen is the kind of tenacity and commitment which is so very important if one is going to succeed in any kind of activity and most of all, in the area of sports. **There are** too many people who think that they can become top flight sportsmen by just turning up on the **day** of the particular activity. They do not get into serious training. They pay little or no attention to their general diet and **kind** of living habits. With that kind of approach then, certainly, they cannot succeed. Sporting activities are a very hard taskmaster if we want to make a success of it. If we are making sport then one can understand that. But I think there ought to be a serious approach to our sports in Barbados to enable our sportsmen to do much better. Certainly, the Government in creating this **kind** of environment is **making its** contribution. We would hope we would be able to provide that **kind** of inspiration for our sportsmen.

With those remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. V. WALKER: I beg to second that, Sir, and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, here again the Opposition wishes to associate itself with the Resolution but there are a few things that must be said less this Chamber be left to feel that the present Government initiated this idea about a sports programme and having a **sports** complex.

The idea of a **sports** complex came from the Barbados Labour Party Government. The area of land that is identified in Wildey was identified by the Barbados Labour Party's Government during the time I had the honour to serve as Minister of Sports. I wish to repeat it because I am hearing people trying to take credit for work they have not started and trying at the same time to convey to the public that the project is one that was initiated by this Government.

The Barbados Lawn Tennis Association was experiencing difficulty where they were at the Garrison. In fact, they used to complain to the Government then that the courts were not placed the right place, and the Barbados Turf Club felt they should be moved. But the Barbados Lawn Tennis Association had no money to put up for any project so despite all this complaining by the Barbados Lawn Tennis Association about the length of the lease, I want the Minister to dismiss that as a very strange allegation coming from them.

When the Barbados Labour Party Government recognised that lawn tennis should be developed and encouraged as a national sport, it was the Government that took the initiative to sell the courts that belonged to the Government. The Barbados Turf Club gave \$100 000 to the Government and the Barbados Labour Party Government placed it at the disposal of the Barbados Lawn Tennis Association. We gave them the first \$100 000. At that time representations were made to me that they had no counterpart funds to build the complex in Wildey. It was not a matter of complaining that they had a problem with the length of the lease. What was taken into consideration at that particular time was the fact that we wanted to encourage them to have more facilities, more than two courts. The plans had to be drawn and they did not have the money to pay for them. As I understand it, one of the members of the Association assisted them with the plans.

What I would like to see done is that Government takes a closer interest in the development of that particular area because a lot of things can happen here or we can have a development that is not well organised. It is not sufficient to say we are going to give the Hockey Association or this association a little bit of the action or allocate an area. I feel that the Government must come up with a plan and let these organisations fit into the plan. I

do not believe in giving the Lawn Tennis Association this. We had to do that because the land was totally undeveloped but now the Government should have its own plan for the area and let them fit into that plan.

I would go as far as to say this that I feel Government, despite the fact that it is allowing the Barbados Lawn Tennis Association to erect buildings there, should have some say. I do not believe that they should be left to operate like a private business. Sport should not be. You are going to find a development where they feel it is their business and it is not going to serve the purpose for which the Government set out to have it. That is one of the reasons why the Government made the input.

1.45 p.m.

The Government and the taxpayers' money is in the Barbados Lawn Tennis Association. If the land is leased to them for, I would say, ~~pepper corn~~ money then the Lawn Tennis Association must understand that we expect them to assist in developing sports and doing just like the Swimming Association. When I made the point that we have to be very careful that some of these organizations do not think that they own and that they can shut out the public we have to look at what is going on. It is true that the Swimming Association has developed that complex. They are making it available to the schools. I am satisfied with that arrangement and I am looking forward to hearing the Barbados Lawn Tennis Association declare a similar policy where our youth can benefit from the facility there. I demand that. It is a right which the young people have. We are not asking them. We feel it is their duty to provide it since we the taxpayers have made our input in it.

There is something that concerns us about this complex and I am going to touch on the gymnasium too because I feel that there is still room for developing the gymnasium. There are some things that disturb me about it. It is all right to talk about the disciplines that we will have at this particular facility. But what we must notice is that at any one time only one sport, one discipline can be played at a time in that gymnasium. You cannot play netball and basketball at the same time, only basketball or netball can be played. It is something you have to watch. Ask yourself if you can fill up that gymnasium with basketball or netball enthusiasts alone. My answer to that is no. We are going to have to think how we are going to fill that particular gymnasium at any one time so that it could pay for itself.

Aside.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: No, no. Do not say I. There was a limit. The present Government expanded and increased the capacity. Do not tell me that. That is what I am worried about. If it is not filled I am telling you, you have to work very hard - and I think the

Minister is listening – because it is up there lying down. We have to be thinking all like now how best we are going to have it filled so that we can realise the money to pay for it because the operating cost is very, very high indeed. The Minister knows that.

It is not sufficient to tell me that you are going to bring the Chicago Bulls or whatever team here to give us exhibition matches. After they **have** gone I want to know what programmes are being put in place to ensure that we have got a capacity crowd there to fill it because without the crowds the Government cannot **run** it.

Aside.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I think the Minister understands and is taking note very carefully. The Minister of Education does not seem to understand what we are talking about. It is a very serious thing. The Government has to maintain that. The **operating** cost is going to be very, very high and it is going to require a lot of technical people to operate it. All I want to know is the concerns of Barbadians, how are you going to get the money?

I am going to say this. I hope the Minister will think very, very seriously – it is not too far gone – about this cricket **academy**. I have had my reservations **on** this cricket academy. I want to know what use is it going to serve Barbados? It sounds big. It **sounds all** right. But Barbadians and cricketers in Barbados have emerged, even the Minister of Sports will tell you he did not go to any academy and we did well. I am worried about the money. Let me tell you why I am worried about the cricket **academy**. What about the gymnasts? I would like to **see** us have a facility where we can have gymnastics. I am asking the Minister to consider that. That is what we should be looking at not cricket. That is not a priority.

Aside.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: You cannot perform any gymnastics inside the gymnasium up there. Do not come and tell anybody that. You know what I am saying. It is limited to certain sports not gymnastics.

What I am saying to the Minister is that despite the fact that he has gone on record as saying **that** he is going to build a cricket academy, I want him to look carefully at that and see exactly what purpose it is going to serve. He still has enough time to look at that programme and look at that sort of complex. I think it is a waste of time, a waste of money at this point in time. We have to think of our priorities.

When you look at other countries in the Caribbean, fellows are getting on to the West **Indies** team and they do not have any cricket academy. Certainly those who are on

the West **Indies** team were not involved in any cricket academy. Do not let us fool ourselves. Stick to what you are good at. I am saying it is going to be a waste of time and I am expressing my concern because I as a taxpayer and the taxpayers out there have to pay for it. We have to get our priorities right. This is no time to think because you may be **sympathetic** to a particular discipline that you are going to **talk** about putting up a complex and **that** is good enough. I am concerned about that.

There is **another** thing I heard the Minister who introduced this Resolution mention. Let me say this. I have heard him talk about developing sport. Sport is in chaos in Barbados. I want the Minister to get up and deny the fact that there are problems within the Barbados Netball Association. I want him to get up and deny the fact that the Barbados Football Association has big problems. How are we going to develop and **talk** about the development of sport when these Associations have got big problems that they cannot solve on their own?

I am inviting the Minister to allow the Sports Council or to investigate what is going on in sport. What **are** we developing? There is chaos in the Athletic Association as well. There are problems and we **all** know them. We all hear about them. I am asking the Minister to investigate early and let us put sport in Barbados **on track** once again.

What is the sense of building facilities? Yes facilities were built. The Barbados Labour Party built more **than any** other Government. But that is, not the point. The point is to ask ourselves – **yes** the Barbados Labour Party went to Gall Hill in St. John. I was the **Minister** when I refurbished the pavilion up there and provided you with a proper playing facility. It was the Democratic Labour Party that put the lawn tennis court up there that was uneven and the young people could not play on it. I know that.

You **see**, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we want to develop sport. I have heard the Minister talk about **Sports/Tourism**, linking sport with tourism. A very good idea. But we must ask ourselves, what are we projecting? Are we accomplishing anything? The Netball Association, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was offered....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are specifically dealing with a resolution on lawn tennis and the establishment of a tennis centre. I know you want to talk about sports so I gave you some latitude but come back home.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I was responding to remarks made by the mover of the resolution. What I am saying is – and I **think** that these are concerns that are welcome by the Minister and by the Government – that \$100 000 was offered to the Barbados Netball Association. They have only **taken up** \$50 000 but we need to develop this.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are talking about lawn tennis.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I am asking the Minister if he can get the other \$50 000 to help the Barbados Lawn Tennis Association. The money is ~~there~~ not being used and I am asking the Minister if he can get that money drawn down so that he can help the Barbados Lawn Tennis Association to provide at least another court. That is what I am saying. We want to have only the development of sport.

Aside.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: You cannot tell me about any sport. You are not in this sort of thing. You are in cricket. I have been hearing all of this thing about tell me, let us hear this and all of this big set of thing about sport/tourism and who appointed who.
1.55 p.m.

I have been hearing all of that, but what I do know is that there are problems in Sport and the Minister is not addressing them. The Barbados Lawn Tennis Association must put up facilities. I have not heard or seen any plans about where they are going to put the parking. They will need parking. He must tell us how they are going to provide parking because he too has problems with parking up there.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is very important. I have seen facilities going up there and they are now trying to get money to get adequate parking. I know the area very well. All I am asking, is if there is adequate parking for the people who use the Barbados Lawn Tennis Association. I want to know that. I also want to know if there are going to require additional land to expand because they will have to expand from time to time.

In closing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want the Minister to be aware of the problems in Sport generally and I want him to realise that we can have a development in that area. It is next door to my constituency and I have to be concerned with the sort of development that takes place in that particular area. It is not a simple matter because you are going to put up this and you are going to put up that and you are going east, right up to Fort George. I have been hearing all of that coming from the Minister. It does not make sense to me. I want the Minister to have a proper plan and let us be subjected to the input of the people who know about Sports. I cannot rely on the Minister to give me a proper coordinated plan for Sports any longer. He has failed me and failed the public of Barbados.

SUSPENSION

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On our return from the luncheon recess we have to consider Item No. 1 from the Order Paper. Sir, I understand now that the Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central wants to speak and he will be speaking for more than 10 minutes. At this point, Sir, I am going to move the luncheon adjournment, and return after the adjournment and complete this matter before we move on the Resolution dealing with the West Indian Report.

I am moving, Sir, that the House be suspended for one hour until 3.00 p.m.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I beg to secon'd that, Sir.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly at 2.00 p.m.

RESUMPTION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The sitting is resumed.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to support this Resolution and to say that the Government has allowed the Barbados Lawn Tennis Association an opportunity, like the Barbados Swimming Association to have six wonderful courts at Wildey.

As you know, Sir, the private sector in Barbados raised many thousands of dollars and were able to build a swimming complex. There was a time in Barbados when all the swimming races were swum off the Yacht club and indeed even water polo was played there and also at North Point. Ever since we have had the stadium at Wildey, hundreds of young Barbadians have been able, not only to swim in their own age group in Barbados but have swum many brilliant races representing Barbados overseas.

The coaching programme, Sir, alluded to by the Member for St. Michael South East is done by coaches, not only brought here by the swimming association but the National Sports Council's coaches do a lot of work in coaching the youngsters that attend the various schools throughout Barbados and so it will be with the tennis courts at Wildey. The members of the Barbados Tennis Association have, for many years, been begging for facilities which would allow them to coach their youngsters in large numbers.

In sports, Sir, it is necessary when you are coaching youngsters to have them in happy and congenial surroundings. It is also necessary that you be able to have them in the type of facilities that their parents will be happy to bring them? and then come back for them later. I think this is very important and so the

Lawn Tennis Association with some 5 or 6 courts at the Wildey Sports Complex, I am sure will see many youngsters playing the game of tennis.

During the 1940s and indeed in the fifties and sixties, Sir, lawn tennis was a game for the privileged. That is a fact. So often we used to see people with no **hand/eye** coordination at all. They would throw a ball in the air and could not even hit it once in 10 times. Such a man is the Member for St. Michael South East. The coach at the **Hilton** Hotel, a good coach, spends many long hours coaching youngsters in this discipline. The coach at **Rockley** spends many hours coaching our youngsters and, Sir, I believe that now that the Lawn Tennis Association will have their own home they would be able to encourage many Barbadians, who are doing well overseas, and who are very well qualified, to come back home and show the youngsters the rudiments of the game.

I do not wish, Sir, to talk at any great length about the game of tennis except to say that I am quite sure that the members of the Lawn Tennis Association are all rather grateful to the Government for this lease of 25 years so that they can get on with their programme.

There was a time when tennis was played at the Garrison Savannah and, Sir, I remember with horror when the Davis Cup match was played there and there was this great accident and many of **our** people were injured. As you know, there were no stands, just a make-shift contraption where our people were hurt when the scaffolding came down. I believe that the day will soon come when the Barbados Lawn Tennis Association will be able to put on the **Brandon** Trophy and the Davis Cup at their own home, rather than going to the courts at hotels like Paradise, **Heywoods** and the like, Sir.

One must not forget the courts at Paragon. For many years the gentleman up there has given yeomen service to tennis in Barbados and I am quite sure that the Honourable Attorney General will definitely agree with that.
3.10 p.m.

I just need to have the record straight, Sir. When we demolished the small pavilion at the Garrison Savannah, the Barbados Turf Club agreed that they **would** pay the Barbados Lawn Tennis Association \$100 000 in exchange for their moving. I wish to say that it is not true to say that the \$100 000 was paid before 1989, for I remember in the dark days when the Barbados Turf Club had no money and they had this \$100 000 price over their heads, subsequently, Sir, with the advent of the Lotto and its accompanying riches, they were able to pay \$25 000 allocations to the Barbados Lawn Tennis Association. Those are the facts, Sir. They were able to pay the \$100 000 in four \$25 000 allocations and **so** it is totally untrue to say that the \$100 000 was paid before 1989.

I also wish to say, Sir, I remember quite well, because it was necessary, in order to have safety in racing, to stop the Barbados Turf Club from having **7½** furlong races. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South East would not know about racing. The **7½** furlongs – and for his elucidation, 1500 metres – were rather dangerous races, because having started at a giddyap pace you found that before you **could** even lengthen your stride, the horses were round a very sharp turn. As you know, Sir; the Garrison Savannah has a sharp and undulating **surface**, the Honourable Member will not appreciate those racing terms. I only wanted to make the point that the Lawn Tennis Association was quite content to move **from** the Garrison Savannah so as to allow the jockeys to ride proper races and go to 7.8 furlongs. That is historical, Sir, that is a fact, so I do not wish any Honourable Member to come in here and say that he knows about the \$100 000. That is not true. He does not know about it, he heard about it.

Sir, I wish to further comment on a few points, or non-points, made by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South East. I wish to assure the Honourable Member that we have a plan for the **Wildey sports** complex. What is more, Sir, I wish to further assure him that the Associations will fit in it. I have been all over Barbados talking about the comprehensive sporting plan we have for the Wildey sports complex, where we will be playing hockey – it is true that we have been saying this for four years – where we would have two fields for hockey but one will **be an** astro turf. The reason for this is that Barbadian hockey players are about the most skilful in the world. They are among the most skilful in the world, but no sooner than the Barbadians get to championships, they are coming off a grass and bumpy surface into the very level astro turf and this upsets their pattern. The Australians, the Dutch, the Pakistanis and the Indians are the top nations on the ground. I will be very happy the day when we will be able to play hockey on **astro** turf at Wildey.

Also, Sir, I just have to say that we will have a cricket field up there, simply because I do not like the idea, even when we have the West **Indies** team here, as we do **now**, every day they **have** to go to Wanderers or in the **Park** or they have to go down to Kensington Oval. As you know, the practice wickets down there become rather impaired when the rain comes. The Honourable Member wants to know about the complex. The cricket ground up there will give our youngsters the opportunity in Barbados to play on a decent wicket instead of **having** to go all over the country and play on impaired wickets, and it would also help us in terms of facilitating our major teams here.

There will be a football pitch there too. He asked me to look into the Football Association. I do not know what he means by that. There have been many rumours

about the 10 000 people going to a game and not seeing the corresponding money. If he wants an investigation into that, Sir, when I get the facts I will deal with it. I cannot deal with rumours.

I wish to talk about the Academy, Sir. The Member for St. Michael South East said it is a waste of time to have a cricketing academy. I will not wish to get into an excoriation that will boggle his mind, but I wish to say that the West Indies cricket team have been world champions for 16 years. They have not lost a series since 1976. West Indian cricket has done more for Caribbean integration than a lot of politicians I know, Sir, and it really upsets me, it is sacrilegious to hear a member get up in this House and say that to have an academy is a waste of time. I know a lot of things are a waste of time, but I cannot say them here. I feel that one has to consider that in Australia there are academies.....

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Not follow pattern. In the pursuit of excellence one has to do the right thing. Perhaps the member wishes us to send our youngsters to the Alf Gover School in England every year, a thing that has happened since 1945, as the Member for St. Thomas will tell you, Sir. It is all right to be in a jocular frame of mind, but if you are going to speak about the history of West Indies cricket and its impact on our society, it is no joking matter. To suggest that an academy in Barbados is a waste of time, I say is sacrilegious, for want of a better phrase. I would like to say something else, but I am very serious about that. Not only should we have an academy, but we have to seriously look at a hall of fame.

3.20 p.m.

The Honourable Member will obviously kick that through the window too. I can understand his dismay, but we have to look at honouring our heroes. Wherever we go, all over the world, we see halls of fame. Sir, for instance, I had the honour to be inducted in the Hall of Fame at Hartford, Connecticut.

Asides.

Hon. W. W. HALL: I have never heard of a famous Bradshaw. I wish to say that I am very serious and I wish that someone from the Opposition will get up and disassociate themselves from those remarks. When the history of West Indian cricket is written, one will remember that a member of this august Chamber said on October 20, 1992, on such an occasion – a watershed, as one of my friends would say, in West Indian cricket.. It constitutes a watershed, Sir. It was criticised by the Member for St. Michael South East. Viciously attacked by him.

I am saying the youth of Barbados will benefit in no small measure, and as you look around Barbados.. I am not going to get into any arguments because this is surely not an afternoon for jejune rhetoric. I will tell you this, Sir, that wherever you go in every parish in Barbados, you can see the youth playing cricket and football. In the last finals, Sir, you saw Youth Milan, a team from down yonder in St. Lucy playing in the finals against Empire; Kimberley, Nascimento. If you go to volley ball you will see people playing from as far as Drax Hall and St. Philip – the Well House Pirates. These are people who would have had no chances whatsoever 20 years ago when there were no facilities.

As an ex-Minister with responsibility for Sports I am amazed, and it is mind-boggling, that a former Minister of Sports could get up – it is a tragic loss to the human race – and criticise an Academy for Cricket in this country. No wonder the great West Indian players as they leave the field of play and go beyond the boundary feel the way they do because they know that the very minute they stop being a hero on the field there are some people who would believe that they were non-existent.

Sir, I speak on behalf of our sporting heroes. I say that apart from Suki King the great Go-As-You-Please champion of the world who is a Barbadian – and some people do not recognise it – apart from our body-builders who have won four world championships, I say that our cricketers have conquered the world. I do believe that if we were to put an academy here and encourage our many luminaries in sport to come here and teach the youngsters the rudiments of the game we will be unbeaten for another 20 years. The Honourable Member said that I played West Indies cricket and I was not coached. That is true, Sir. When I left Combermere at the age of 18 I had never bowled a ball in my life. That is true. I might have played for the West Indies before I played for Barbados. That is unique, but then there are not many people who can do that. You have to look and see that there are people and there are other people. Therefore, I wish to say that most people need coaching and to know how to play forward and how to play back. When you watch cricket sometimes you notice that they have not seen the difference.

So, Sir, it really upsets me when my good friend thinks that the youngsters in the Caribbean do not need coaching. Only yesterday, Sir, I went to Kensington Oval and one of our young cricketing luminaries did not particularly recognise that when playing forward the hand should not really be at the front of the bat but the wrist should be behind in order to have a solid defense. He was not aware of that. With different coaching he would have been able to recognise that. So, Sir, I feel that the youth will benefit immeasurably not only from the academy but from the coaching.

I would love to see the day when all of the West Indies great cricketers will come to Barbados on contract and we bring hundreds of youth from England, from Pakistan, from Australia to be coached by them. That is a dream which in the future is going to be a reality. It is not an unrealistic dream.

In wrapping up, I also wish to say that the trouble that we have had in netball is a simple one. The **netballers** feel that they should just serve for 1 year, have a good time and drop out. I have just spoken to them at their annual meeting and I gave them **10** commandments, not the normal biblical **10** commandments but **10** commandments that they must follow in order to be good. I also told them that they should not have **an** awards ceremony when they have more trophies than people. That is what is wrong with them. No organisation! They need to serve for a 2 or 3-year term so that they can see the fruits of their labours.

While I am at it, Sir, it is again a very sad commentary when in the year that Barbadians are champions in netball and in a year when Barbados has beaten Trinidad for the first time in history that one can attack the Netball Association as an organisation that is worthless.

Asides.

Hon. W. W. HALL: The Honourable Member said that, aided and abetted by the Honourable Member for St. Joseph.

So, Sir, in closing, I would like to congratulate the Government on making this dream a reality. I am sure that when the Lawn Tennis Association completes its centre court in another month and it moves to complete its pavilion, the facility at Wildey will be among the best in the Caribbean. I believe in wrapping up that I should say that the Sports Complex at Wildey will encompass **17** sports and I hope that, I will be given the opportunity to illuminate the dark corners of the mind of the Member for St. Michael South East when I excoriate on the virtues of planning sporting development.

Thank you very much.

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

ORDER NO. 3 - THE THEFT BILL. 1992

Hon. M. A. KING: Sir, you recall that this matter had been referred to a Select Committee. The Select Committee met and a Report has been laid. It met under the Chairmanship of the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East. The Report indicates a number of amendments were made in the course of the Committee and I move that the Report be adopted.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I beg to second that.
3.30 p.m.

On the separate motions of Hon. M. A. KING, seconded by Hon. P. M. GREAVES, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ORDER NO: 1 - RESOLUTION THAT PARLIAMENT TAKES NOTE OF THE REPORT OF THE WEST INDIAN COMMISSION

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to address this Honourable House on **the** matter of the Report of the West Indian Commission. It will be **recalled** that the West Indian Commission **was** established in **1989** as an independent body to advance the goals of the Treaty of Chaguarmas and the Commission was expected to report to Heads of Government prior to their meeting in **1992**.

The Commission made **an** interim report. The final report was not ready in good time for consideration by the Heads of Government at the **1992** meeting as arranged and, therefore, the heads of Government have set aside a time next week for consideration of the Report by the West Indian Commission. The meeting takes place from October 28 to **30** in Port-of-Spain. I **will** be leading the Barbados delegation to that meeting.

All Honourable Members have been circulated with copies of the Report. It is a virtual compendium. It is a very thick document. There have been, I believe, two precis of the Report which have been circulated for **ease** of reference. I would like to say at the outset that from this side...

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I would **like** to say at the outset, Sir, or if I can take the comments being made by the Honourable Member for St. **George** South, near the outset early in my speech that certainly on this side we are not applying any whip. Members can speak freely and I **can only** make that commitment for this side of the House. The Honourable Member for St. **Philip** South speaks freely all the time so I do hope this House can lay partisanship aside and really speak on matters of regional integration as Members see fit. I hope we will have a free vote on this particular matter.

The Resolution, therefore, that is before us calls upon the House to take note of the Report of the West Indian Commission. It provides Members with the opportunity to debate any or all aspects of the Report or if there are things in the Report **that** have not been mentioned, under our guidance, Sir, and the Rules of this House,

members are free to comment. I will listen very carefully. I can assure you that the comments made will be taken into account. I do not necessarily say I will accept them but they will be taken into account and will certainly have some bearing on our own approach to the matter. If I do not speak at length in this opening statement I think you will understand I believe this is **not** an opportunity for me as Prime Minister or as Leader of the Government to lay down a particular position but we are genuinely debating an issue and hoping to reach some kind of approach to the problem.

I would like, Sir, to express appreciation to the Commission for the work it has done. That work, it appears to me, has now come to an end because the Commission was established in order to do a certain specific task and to make a report. It has made that report and it is now for the Heads of Government to consider that Report and take the process from there. As I understand it, the work of the Commission has virtually come to an end, that is, the Commission that was set up by the Heads of Government.

I would like to place on **record** our appreciation for the work of the Commission. None of us really envisaged that work would have been so great in scope, that the investigations would have been so wide and that the Commission would have, with such facility, been able to attract financing for its operations that have not placed too great a strain on the Governments of the region. I think I can say without fear of contradiction that this is the widest ranging examination of regional issues collected in one place, and an examination and investigation that sought to explore, on a very wide basis, the feelings of West Indian people as it relates to **the** issues involved in the process of regional integration.

3.40 p.m.

I am grateful to the Commission too for their interpretation of their mandate which has permitted them to travel not only within the Caribbean but also to other parts of the Caribbean diaspora. I was recalling the words of one Commissioner, I believe – because this is not the first Commission that has been established to examine the question of Caribbean integration or federation or whatever the issue, however it may be styled. I believe in 1922 there was a Major Wood, E. F. L. Wood who investigated and he said he could not have travelled **throughout** the Caribbean to **carry** out his colonial office mandate unless a ship had been placed at his disposal. Our Commissioners during the period 1989 to 1992 have used quicker methods in order to travel in the Caribbean, North America and I believe in the United Kingdom as well. Those are the places that I am aware of and they have really sought, genuinely sought to plumb the depths of the thinking of peoples of Caribbean descent on this matter that is so dear to the heart of all of us.

I think it is true to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that down through the years there has been a fairly consistent position in Barbados in favour of openness in respect of the other countries of the Caribbean and beyond and in favour of regional integration. I believe there are two exceptions that I can recall. One **was** in terms of the confederation issue when an attempt was made to extend the Leeward Islands Federation to the Windward Islands and the elites of Barbados were not in favour of being included in any such extension.

I believe that the second occasion would have been within our own time when there was the famous equation that came out of Trinidad and Tobago that one from ten leaves zero and Barbados was being urged to lead, I think it is called a little eight federation. But we are not going into the controversial aspects of that. I said this is non-partisan so I merely recall that those urgings were not acted upon at that time.

Apart from that, in most of the efforts embracing most of the countries of the region Barbados has been very positive in its approach to the integration movement. I do not wish to retrace in any detail the history of integration movement in the Caribbean. I think that by now these may be well known. One effort certainly was some time early in the Eighteenth Century when the Leeward Islands Federation itself was first set up or some form of federal or confederal system was established but that collapsed after a period of time. A second effort was made in the Nineteenth Century I believe and when an attempt was made to extend it that led to the confederation riots to which I have already made reference. There have also been attempts to bring the Windward Islands together. And there have been other kinds of attempts at integration. I recall in particular the effort to bring the Windward Islands and Tobago together – it was not only an attempt, Sir, I think it was a fact that there was an arrangement established but it was more military than political because the military headquarters for that particular operation was here in Barbados. I do not think it is generally realized that at one time Tobago was governed from Barbados.

We have had many attempts, in many forms including federation, and our experience is the experience of the world is that federation has been one of the most difficult forms of Government to administer even though it attempts to solve the problems with which we in the Caribbean and elsewhere are confronted. Because it is a problem of trying to keep in separate territories those aspects of Government which the territories would wish to remain within their own jurisdictions and those aspects which good sense, common sense and economic reality may suggest should be dealt with under a central government.

But when we review the history of federations whether it is the East African Federation, the

Central African Federation, the attempts in West Africa in our own time, whether we **look** at the attempts, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics which has collapsed – that was a federation.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am not being partisan. When we look at that, when we **look** at Yugoslavia we see the tensions that are created. In Canada itself, Sir, a confederation we have tensions. That is a matter for the Canadians to resolve how they will deal with their own confederation and the tensions that are set up. I believe that by referendum they are seeking to resolve some of the tensions **inside** of that confederation.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: The United States started out as a confederation also. They had a confederation and tensions developed. But that is perhaps the successful example of a federation.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: And Australia, Sir, I think on both sides of the House, and I am going on the record, Members on both sides of the House have announced their commitment to regionalism and whether in Government or in opposition have **advocated** the case for integration and I don't think the **position** is any different now. We are committed, and I certainly am committed to regional integration, committed to the strongest possible form of integration that can find agreement among the **territories** of the region. That is where I stand, Sir. I would hope that this House in the expression of the Members, **as** they speak, could give that renewal of commitment to the concept of regional integration. So both this Government and when the other side, formed the Government, gave expression by our actions in support of regional integration. 3.50 p.m.

What we have to do, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is to seek to find those things that we need to work together on in common and those things which we wish to retain **as** the responsibility of our separate Governments. We have to start at some point. The question therefore is not whether we are committed to integration but what form that integration will take and I have indicated on a previous occasion, not in this House, that what we are seeking to do in the Caribbean is to increase our per capita income **as** a region. We are seeking to provide for balanced development and we hope that the economies of scale **which** might be effected, which might lead to greater efficiency in production, as well **as** the goal of improving our bargaining position, that all of these objectives might be achieved through a larger grouping.

There are the other **areas**, Sir, that through exposure to a common historical tradition and with a common history and also to some common cultural influences that all of these things will shape our outlook towards the integration movement. Barbados in particular, because of its openness and its need to trade, to exchange goods and services, both within the region and beyond will require us to be particularly committed to this question of regional integration.

It is against this background, Sir, that the Report of the West Indian Commission is to be welcomed and against the background that it seeks to suggest and propose certain approaches towards the further development of the integration movement in the Caribbean.

In arriving at its conclusion and preparing itself for making its report, the Commission talked to many groups in business, in government, among the cultural workers and elsewhere and it has come up with certain proposals. If therefore, I express differences in respect of some of the recommendations, it is therefore not that I am unappreciative of the work of the Commission **but** that I believe that the way forward for this region must be mapped out with clear perceptions and with deep circumspection.

In our effort to complete yesterday's work we must not create further problems for today's children and tomorrow's administrators. It is against that background that I will make my comments.

The major recommendation of the Commission relates to the establishment of another Commission and that is a body of some 4 commissioners I believe headed by a President Commissioner, a commissioner who will be President of the Commission and 2 other commissioners and then the Secretary General of the Caricom is accorded the status of Commissioner *Ex Officio*.

I am not going to go into any lengthy exposition on this matter. Let me say that the very concept of the creation of this body of commissioners to me raises more questions than it answers.

First of all, Sir, the Commissioners will have their own secretariat. A small secretariat they say they will have. Then, in addition to that the Commission will be the conduit by which recommendations will **be** made to the Heads of Governments. The Caricom Secretariat becomes a secretariat also responsible to the **Commission**.

The Commission is envisaged as relieving the Heads of Governments of some of its work. Sir, the Commission has endorsed a concept, I have not said the concept, a concept of an assembly of parliamentarians but a role **is** even envisaged for the President of the Commission

there. He can appear – this is a suggestion – before the Assembly of Parliamentarians and make something akin to a state of the union message.

Sir, then in addition to all of that there is another concept floating about an association of Caribbean states which is meant to be a widening ...

Asides.

4.00 p.m.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, then it is this Commission that will play a leading role in negotiating with the States outside of Caricom on this question of the wider regional movement, the extension. It seems to me that the question has to be asked: What is really the relationship between the Commission and the Heads of Government? There are many questions that will have to be asked in that particular regard. We would have to ask ourselves, Sir, should we be creating within Caricom another level of bureaucracy not anchored in the electorates of the Caribbean, but selected through some specific process? Sir, I do not wish to put it any stronger than that.

I have serious questions about that, especially in the light that the work of the Commission will obviously downgrade the position of the Secretary General and of the Caricom Secretariat. I say there are more questions than answers. We have to ask ourselves why do we have to do that, or why should we do that? We can give the Secretary General ambassadorial status without having to make him a Commissioner. That is referred to somewhere in the Report, so I assume that he does not carry that rank. I believe some country might have to give him that status.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: We would have to appropriate him here to give him that status. Contrary to what is said, my own belief is that we should seek to strengthen the Secretariat and give it the capability, just as we will have to provide it whatever mechanism is set up, to carry out the functions the region wishes the Secretariat to carry out.

I am sure there are other questions centering around this whole area, but I will leave that to be explored....

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: That is important. I hope you would develop that when you speak. The Member for St. Joseph has had considerable dealings with Caricom matters in a former capacity as a Minister of the Government of Barbados.

So, Sir, I would say that at this stage I am not persuaded of the need for the establishment of any Commission interposed between the Heads of Government and the Caricom organs.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: It is the centrepiece of the recommendation. That is a problem, and not only that, there are over 200 recommendations and the mechanism that is being suggested, the *modus operandi* that is being suggested, is that we should set up the Commission and then let the Commission work out how other recommendations should be put in place and implemented.

In addition to that, Sir, I believe that the cost of the Commission itself is immodest, something like U.S. \$1.7 million or some number like that, but we will check the figures. The question is, should we be looking for extra money in that quantity to support a Commission about which there are still so many questions? I think it were better if we pragmatically strengthen the Secretariat and the role of the Secretary General rather than setting up this body which will cost us some additional sums of money at a time when all of our economies are experiencing difficulties in financing our existing commitments.

Sir, that is as far as the Commission is concerned and, as I have said, I am not persuaded at this stage, but maybe during the course of this debate I could be persuaded. I keep a mind that is not entirely closed on this particular issue.

4.10 p.m.

There are other areas, Sir, relating to the integration movement and the recommendations of the Commission, that I would like to express a viewpoint on. One relates to the CARICOM Assembly of Parliamentarians. I will not be long on that, Sir.

The concept has been accepted by the Heads of Government. The appropriate..

Asides.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: ... Sir, the figure for it was US\$1.279 million which is just over BDS\$2.4 million. I don't know what that would be in Guyanese dollars or Jamaican dollars or Eastern Caribbean dollars. I cannot translate it into the many currencies that we have within the Caribbean.

An agreement for the establishment of the Assembly of Parliamentarians has been drawn up and it is open for signature. To date two countries have signed. That is Barbados and Guyana. The convention is open for signature. We believe that this would be a body

that is anchored in the elective process because it draws upon the parliamentarians of the region, both Government and Opposition, to share in the deliberations of matters relating to the integration movement. We believe that this is valuable and we believe that it is a first step in the development of arrangements within CARICOM that would further transform an executive and bureaucratic arrangement into one that provides a stronger link with the peoples across the Caribbean through their elected representatives.

I really do not know what are the arguments against that as a democrat, as one believing in parliamentary democracy, we believe that this is a step forward; but what the Commission has done is to note the representations of groups in the Caribbean communities which are designated by the acronym NGO – Non-governmental Organisations – which have been pressing for greater participation in the process of governance and in order to take into account some of the views that have been expressed by NGO's, the Commission has seized upon the concept of an assembly of parliamentarians to transmute it or transform it into a kind of debating society. It seeks to bring these NGO's and other interest groups into what is supposed to be a deliberative parliamentary assembly and it is to that body that the Commissioner would in good presidential style make a state of the region address.

I would not like to be mistaken on this. I am in favour of groups in the society, including those designated as NGO's, to be able to have an opportunity to make representation in respect of their special interests. That goes for all sectional interests in the society, but I **believe** that our parliamentary systems, the Assembly itself, can establish the mechanism through a committee system much as is advocated and, I believe, generally accepted by some members on both sides of this House, that we should have that kind of committee system to extend in our circumstances the parliamentary process in which there can be hearings and people, interest groups, NGO's or whoever can come and make representations to the Committee on its particular viewpoints on issues and then the Committee can report back to the Parliament and Parliament can then take its decisions. That is the direction in which I would wish to see our own Parliament develop to create and strengthen our own committee system and I believe both the Member for St. Joseph and I think the Member for **Christ Church West** – I would not like to be mistaken...

Asides.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Yes, we have had a discussion on that from the 70's.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: So, Sir, while the concept is good I do not think that the CARICOM Assembly of Parliamentarians can be extended in that way. I should perhaps let the Honourable House know that I did receive a comment or a note from certain non-governmental organisations expressing their disagreement with the approaches of the West Indian Commission on certain matters.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: There were certain non-governmental organisations, Sir, organised under the umbrella of the Caribbean Policy Development Centre and I have received a copy of their response to the West Indian Commission's Report and they are in disagreement as far as I can recall with the role envisaged for the Commission. They are against the economic policy model proposed and I think against other approaches.
4.20 p.m.

There are a couple of other points I would **wish** to make before I take my seat. One relates to some of the major issues in the region. I have dealt with the Commission and the Assembly of Parliamentarians. There is one relating to the Multilateral Clearing Facility because this was an attempt to facilitate economic relationships within the region.

I would only wish to state that at the heart of the integration movement is the need to develop greater economic activity. At the end of 1991 the sum of \$8.2 million was owed to Barbados in arrears. An understanding was reached that Guyana would pay the interest on the amount outstanding and then, in due course, would start repaying the principal. Under the arrears situation the sum of some \$7.8 million has been paid and on the arrears for 1991 those were paid, I think, in 1991 and the arrears are now being built up on the arrears of some Bds. \$421 926 which is owing for 1991. This year the sum of \$5.8 million is due as arrears on interest outstanding for this particular year. The countries have sought in good CARICOM spirit to work out an arrangement that would enable Guyana to **meet** its commitments. We hope this arrangement will ensure that what has been termed liquid assets will no longer attract that particular designation.

In respect of the Common **External** Tariff which is another major matter relating to the integration movement, this also is a matter that will come up for consideration at the Heads of Government Conference. I would wish to say at the outset that Barbados is in favour of a policy of trade liberalisation, that we recognise such a policy of liberalisation as well as a policy for a common external tariff that both are prerequisites for a

functioning integration movement with relations with other integration movements in other countries.

We believe, however, that the working towards these objectives must be done with all deliberate **speed**. We have to work out what that maximum rate will be. We believe that an appropriate place must **be worked** out. This is not something that can be done tomorrow, or the next year, simply to follow a timetable to get something done before a particular year. But we have to give the commitment to the principle of the Common External Tariff, to the principle of trade liberalisation and we have to work toward those objectives allowing the various sectional economic interests and other interests to adjust to the changing regimes so that we would be able in time to achieve our objectives and we do not have to throw out the baby with the bath water. I believe it should be possible to work out appropriate arrangements. We will certainly take the position that we are committed towards moving to the lowering of the Common External Tariffs with appropriate phasing.

I think, **Sir**, that in the end, we **are** all committed to the integration movement but we have to make sure that in embracing the commitment we are able financially, governmentally as well as in terms of our diplomatic and other resources to meet the commitments that integration itself entails.

With those words, **Sir**, I would like to commend this particular Resolution to this Honourable House. I would like to pay tribute to a number of persons with whom I have consulted on this matter. In particular I would like to express appreciation for the comments made by one of the academics at Cave Hill for some very useful **insights** into the work of the Commission. I understand our Rules do not permit the calling of **names** without giving...

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. **SANDIFORD**: I heard my Minister of Tourism & Sports saying that he did not want to call any names. I refer to Dr. **Duncan** of the University of the West **Indies**. He, of course, is not responsible for any viewpoints I may have expressed in this debate. I commend this Resolution to the House.
4.30 p.m.

Hon. M. A. **KING**: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just rise to second the resolution at this stage and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. **DEPUTY SPEAKER**: The Honourable Member for Christ Church South.

Hon. H. B. St. **JOHN**: Mr. Deputy Speaker, **Sir**, I rise to make my own contribution to this debate. I have been

assigned the responsibility in this House of Caribbean Affairs. Quite apart from that, I think my entry into politics a long, long time ago arose chiefly because of my interest in the future of Barbados and its relationship with its neighbours in the Caribbean particularly those that it had a long, historical association with.

I have had the experience of working over the last 25 years both in the legal profession and in the political field for a number of people who were involved in studying the institutional framework within which Caribbean unity could best be **achieved**. There is no doubt, in my mind, that within the Caribbean there is a substantial body of opinion particularly within the Eastern Caribbean that the destiny and the achievement of the peoples in this area can only take place within the context of some form of Caribbean Association. It is because of that that throughout our history various attempts have been made, some by way of imposition at a federal mechanism and since independence by way of what is known as the integration process as set out in the Treaty of Chaguaramas.

It is because of our dissatisfaction, I believe, with the existing instruments that we have and it is because, in particular, of the widespread feeling that there needs to be an improvement if we are to achieve the fundamental objective that, periodically, the political directorate have felt it necessary to entrust to Caribbean citizens the **task** of performing an examination of the existing forms of Caribbean unity and reporting to the political directorate and indirectly to the citizens of the Caribbean.

So that in the 1980s we had the Report by a group of Caribbean experts. They became known, in the course of time, as the Report of the group of Wise Men. It was not as exhaustive as the present Report but nevertheless in the early 1980s the Council of Ministers of the Common Market received the Report from the Demas Community. That Report contained an analysis of the Treaty of Chaguaramas and a review as to its defects and a review also as to whether it was relevant to perform the role which, in the opinion of the Wise Men, the people of the Caribbean wanted it to perform.

In the 1990s we have had a decision of the Heads of Government' mandating an independent West Indian Commission to carry out the exercise which has resulted in this Report which we are now debating. I think that if one peruses the two Reports, one will find that there is a lot of similarity particularly in the diagnosis of the disappointment of the Caribbean people with the existing forms at instruments of integration and their failure to effect the purpose which the Caribbean people want them to carry out.

We on this side on both occasions in the 1980s and recently, before the West Indian Commission

provided in clear and distinct terms, written terms by way of documentatry and oral presentation the views of the Barbados Labour Party on Caribbean Integration and on the defects which we saw in the existing institutional arrangements.

I personally was deligated with the task of appearing before the Wise Men and again in 1991 when the Party presented through its Party Leader, the Honourable Member for Christ Church West the written submission of the Labour Party I also had the opportunity to be part of that delegation and gave oral evidence and answered questions.

The commitment of the Barbados Labour Party to furthering the cause of Caribbean unity cannot be questioned. But I must say, Sir, that as I read these Reports and as I give support to some of the recommendations made in the Commissioners' Reports and in particular as I read the analyses of the defects and deficiencies in the workings of the existing structure I must make it clear that that support for some of the recommendations can only justly be described as critical support for some of the recommendations, in my view, do not deal with some of the fundamental problems which we know to exist and which for some reason or another, as West Indians, we fail to apply tried and well-known remedies but seek to provide substitutes whatever their origin but which we know in our hearts of hearts will not provide the adequate solutions.

There has been a problem for a long period of time with the workings of the institutional arrangements in the Caribbean Economic Community arising from the failure of the political directorate to honour their commitments solemnly arrived at, repeatedly reiterated at all levels of meetings whether they be of officials, of Ministers or of Heads of Government.

4.40 p.m.

It is a common recurring experience that the Caribbean people are profoundly fed-up reading and hearing that their representatives have arrived at decisions which affect and touch their lives in one form or another and when the time comes for implementation of those decisions then there is a consistent reneging and default in implementation.

The greatest defect in the existing arrangements, in my opinion, after years of study of the workings of the Treaty from the very beginning and 10 years of practical experience as a constituent part of the machinery for making the decisions and implementing them, is the failure of the Treaty to provide for the situations in which the decisions are taken and they have not been implemented. The decision making process in all forms therefore was deserving of the most critical examination.

It seems to me, Sir, that there is another area that our experience had taught us that had to be addressed. It was

this area and it was this problem. How is it possible, in an integration movement, for member states, having committed themselves to the objective of the achievement of a trading regime, and the harmonisation of their fiscal and monetary policy and trade polices, particularly in relation to third countries and the coordination of their trading relations to third countries, how was it possible for the Treaty to survive a situation in which member states were free to pursue monetary policies and fiscal policies which were diametrically opposed to the achievement of those objectives.

Sir, the Caribbean is really a remarkable place. There is no integration movement in any part of the world which could have survived the situation which we have in the Caribbean in which we are bound together by the obligations of the Treaty to pursue harmonisation of certain trade objectives, fiscal and monetary harmonisation – to achieve those objectives – and we started off 20 years ago with a currency relationship of one thing and today, 20 years after, we have 2, 3, 4, member states who have changed the values of those currencies to such an extent that the totality of the free trade element and the element of protection in relation to third countries have been completely and absolutely distorted. That is a fundamental point.

When all of us joined Caricom there was a parity of relationship between our currencies and the American dollar. Today that has so fundamentally been disturbed that it is no wonder to me at all that any effort in relation to third countries and a common approach to third countries is stultified and that there is this dissension that has arisen with respect to what should be the position with the Common External Tariff.

Now, this is a fundamental problem and I want to explain this because I believe that a disservice to the West Indian people has been done by the academics in that there has been few analyses by the economists as to the impact of the respective policies pursued arising out of individual member states pursuing their own individual interests, particularly exchange rate policy.

I know, Sir, that I had the experience in the 1970s of being a Trade Minister, having to deal with trade policies which arose out of exchange rate policies in which 2 countries, to protect their balance of payments, had introduced intra-regional trade restrictions. I remember the debates that took place at the Common Market Council of Ministers as to machinery within the Treaty of Chaguaramas to deal with that and it was felt at the time that the Treaty envisaged a short-term, and short-term only, measure that could be taken by individual countries to protect their balance of payments. We were always advised at that time that those measures could only be short-term, because if they were not short-term they would

have had the effect of distorting free trade within **Caricom** and would be inconsistent with the concepts of a common protection policy and our coordination of our trading relations with the said countries.

Now, where are we today? Let us look at the simple arithmetic of a few things. If you **have** a 20 per cent rate of duty on an import from a third country and when you calculate that 20 per cent duty on the goods and your currency is 2 to 1, if it costs \$100 for example in Barbados where the relationship to the U.S. dollar is 2 to 1, the 20 per cent would bring in 20 per cent of \$200.
4.50 p.m.

If you are in Guyana and it is \$100 to 1, 20 per cent will bring you in \$200. Similarly, if you are in Jamaica and you are 28 to 1 and you apply the 20 per cent, it will bring you in a different figure. The truth of the matter is that once there is this freedom to change the exchange rate there is going to be a distortion.

Sir, it is no surprise to us therefore that we have the position of a review of the Common External Tariff. I want to say, Sir, that in my opinion that part of the Commission's report which deals with this area of the workings of the Treaty of Chaguaramas cannot, in my opinion, be regarded as its most brilliant part. I believe they duck the issues. I believe that they failed to explain in simple and clear terms to the Caribbean people that, if we are to have in truth and in fact a viable and workable integration movement in which its life supports are going to be as is set out, the creation of a single market, free movement of goods and things of that kind, there has got to be a corresponding change in the freedom to manoeuvre by individual countries in relation to their fiscal and monetary policy.

Sir, much has been said also about the Caricom Multilateral Clearing Facility. I have not had the opportunity of speaking in this Chamber about that and I am going to speak frankly and freely about it. Once again, I think the record in this House of Assembly should be made clear about what really took place in respect of that very noble attempt by successive Caribbean Member States to grapple with the issue of providing a mechanism to ensure that in so far as inter-regional trade was concerned scarce foreign exchange would not have to be used on a **day** to day basis, but that periodically only the debtor countries would have to hand over to the creditor countries their scarce foreign exchange. This was a mechanism that worked for many years and it saw its objective achieved over a long period of time. It only collapsed when there was a fundamental change which took place and distorted all of the mechanisms. What was the change? The rules of the Multilateral Clearing Facility made it abundantly clear that only certain commodities were eligible to be traded upon the basis of not having to pay for them in U.S.

dollars. All was accepted from the Multilateral Clearing Facility because when it was set up the oil facility of Trinidad and Tobago was a mechanism provided to ensure that oil would flow from Trinidad and Tobago to those countries who bought from Trinidad and Tobago upon terms and conditions outside of the Multilateral Clearing Facility. Barbados was not buying oil from **Trinidad** and Tobago other than a very small proportion of aviation spirits and things of that kind. We paid for our oil in U. S. cash and for years this trading went along without any distortion.

There came a time when the oil facility ran out and there was no more money in the oil facility to finance the sale of oil to Guyana from Trinidad and Tobago. I am saying it here for the record, that the 'agent of the Multilateral Clearing Facility and the authorities in the Central Bank of Trinidad and Tobago passed Guyana's oil through the Multilateral Clearing Facility and distorted all of the rules, and that is a fact. They passed the payment of oil through the Multilateral Clearing Facility because the oil facility had **run** out. So Barbados, a creditor in the Multilateral Clearing Facility, ended up having to pay for Guyana's oil via the Multilateral Clearing Facility. Those are facts.

Now I feel that the West Indian people should know these matters. Why is it that our institutional arrangements are such that the truth of these matters are never brought out? There was nothing wrong with the Multilateral Clearing Facility. It was perverted to suit a purpose. Now these records are very clear because, contrary to popular belief and a lot of the myths, this was part of the frustration that built up that led to the Pitt incident. People do not remember that. But I will say this, Sir, that I believe that had events not occurred at the time of the death of Dr. **Williams** that this matter would have been solved. The Heads of Government Meeting in Port-of-Spain in 1983 held at the **Hilton** Hotel worked out a mechanism to deal with this matter.

Now one of the things we should not in the Caribbean do is that we should not easily give up institutions and attribute failure to them without a **thorough** and clear analysis as to the cause of failure. I have had the privilege to represent Barbados and the Caribbean on many occasions in a number of international forums and I know that the integration movement in the Caribbean and, in particular, the workings of the Multilateral Clearing Facility payment system was the cause for wonder and admiration among many in the African and Pacific groupings, because they were trying to do like us. The East African Community had collapsed and there were other attempts at integration movements and people were constantly wondering how it is that the Caribbean was able in its instruments to **survive** through the 1970's and into the 1980's.

I would hope, Sir, despite the failure of the West Indian Commission to have frankly dealt with that matter. I remember right here at the Dover Convention Centre when we gave our evidence – we specifically **raised** it – we specifically spoke about it and we specifically asked the Commission to pay careful attention to those matters.
5.00 p.m.

I regret to say, Sir, that sometimes in the Caribbean we seem to love to avoid the truth because the truth may be painful or it may cause us to have to raise matters which may hurt somebody else. You cannot approach an integration exercise of this nature and of this importance without a rigorous examination of the institutional framework that we have.

I now come to deal, Sir, with the question of the commissions. There is no doubt in my mind, as I said, that this is nothing but another attempt by Caribbean people to create an institution which will be painless in the **sense** that it is a palliative to deal with an important problem which is in existence. Heads of Government agree, Ministers of Trade agree, Ministers of Health agree, Ministers of Finance agree and there is no mechanism to ensure that that agreement is translated into law in the national island states. Because we are an integration movement – we are not a federal movement – we do not have institutions which can pass laws with legal effect throughout the region. So they create a **commission**. **This, unquestionably**, is the weakest part of the report. I have never seen so much ambivalence. There is a shallowness of thought. Honestly, Sir, when I read pages 20 to 22 – I am not going to detain the House on this in any way, Sir – because this thing tells us that the object of the Commission is to carry into effect decisions that have already been agreed to by the Heads of Government but which have not been **carried** into effect, because the Heads of Government are not able when they return to their particular countries to persuade their Cabinets and the respective Ministers to formulate the enabling legislation to implement what the Heads have agreed to.

Do not let us think that that is not possible, because I can relate the experience in **1984** with the Nassau Agreement in which it was unanimously agreed that in the light of the Report of the Wise Men to the council of Ministers that there should be a radical shift in trading policy, that trade liberalisation should **commencé**, that the principal instrument of protection to manufacturers was going to be the Common External Tariff, that there would be a phasing out of licences and quantitative restrictions, both as against intra-regional trade and extra-regional trade, so as to bring the Caribbean into the mainstream of **structural** adjustment which was taking place at that period of time. We all agreed and we came back to Barbados as usual, and I can say, Sir, it is only recently that I can hear the accusation made that Barbados does not carry out its

commitments to **Caricom**. They went back and the lobbies in the individual island countries were so powerful that Heads of Government cowered and did not **carry** out what they solemnly agreed to.

In my opinion, Sir, with the greatest respect, there is no commission that has been appointed, there is no commission in **the** Caribbean that can be appointed which will prevent that. The only way you are going to prevent that is if you take the fundamental decision that we have reached the stage where we must create a supranational body with legal authority to carry into effect these laws. Are we ready yet for that? That is a fundamental decision and that is an analysis that the Commission, in my opinion, should have made very clear in their report for the benefit of the Caribbean people. The power, Sir, to create such institutions may lie nominally in the Members of Parliament, but the real power comes from the people, and the people must understand that that is the commitment they have to make, that they must push their politicians, their elected representatives into the viewpoint that the people want that supranational power vested in some body, we have to educate the people to understand the dynamics and the inevitable consequences of an integration movement. If you wish to have the decisions arrived at implemented, you have to set up the machinery to ensure that they are. It involves that delegation there and it also involves, in my opinion, the creation of machinery to police it and to enforce it, so you must have some kind of judicial structure to enforce what has been agreed on. Those are two fundamental points that have to be faced.

Sir, I **am** not saying anything here that I have not said before. I had the opportunity of speaking at the Black Rock Cultural Centre and I made this point very clear. It is actually at pages 28 and 29 of the Overview. "Bridging the Implementation Gap." I commend that chapter. I commend that chapter to serious students of the language of evasion. You will understand what that means, Sir. It **says here**:

"A central element of the Commission's rationale is its facilitation of the implementation of Community decisions. We need to say a word about how this is to be accomplished through the operation of the Commission. **Essentially**, we have to devise machinery by which CARICOM decisions can be translated into action with a minimum of delay."

5.10 p.m.

It says that you should give them the power.

"... Members should agree under **the** Treaty to give effect to rights and duties within their states arising under Community law. For the most part, those rights and duties will be as set out in Instruments of Implementation drawn up by the CARICOM Commission and themselves approved by CARICOM' Heads of Government or by the Council.

The Instrument of Implementation will be declaratory, not statutory. It will enunciate the decision in terms that are operational; but it will not itself have the force of law. However, the revised Treaty should stipulate **that where** a decision is duly taken, either by the Heads of Government Conference or by the Council, Member States accept an obligation to give legal effect to it under their domestic law."

That is the assumption at the present moment. I share the criticism and I agree with the criticism of the Commission as envisaged here, but what I say is this, Sir. It is my view that the Caribbean people must grasp the nettle and they must decide in their minds. I feel the time has come, particularly for Barbados, to advocate the viewpoint that in certain narrow areas which we have identified that it is in our best interest that they are done better together – and I believe that the whole trade policy is one such area. I believe the Common Market is one such area and the Multilateral Clearing Facility is another such area; that in respect of those **areas**, some machinery must be established with supranational powers so that when once we have decided upon it and it is unanimous the decks are cleared for the implementation of it. Otherwise, we are wasting our time.

Now, Sir, there are a number of other areas – the Caribbean Assembly of Parliamentarians. As a federalist, Sir, I believe that again one must grasp the nettle. If we are going to create a Caribbean Assembly of Parliamentarians we must decide in our minds what role it is to perform. Is it going to be a deliberative body, a consultative body or a legislative body? This is an important point because if we are saying that we have reached the stage where we need as **part** of our integration process to have a Caribbean Assembly of Parliamentarians, immediately I ask myself the question what is the role it is going to perform.

All over the world, Parliament, once it is created, must have some territory. It has power. It must have the capacity to legislate. Are we going to say that we do not want the Commission but that we will have a Caribbean Assembly of Parliamentarians which has the power to ensure that decisions once taken by the Heads of Government and consonant with those decisions the parliamentarians should have the right to pass legislation within the scope of the mandate which arises from those decisions? If that were the decision, there would be a tremendous amount of merit in having such an Assembly.

I really feel, and this is the crux of the matter as far as I am concerned, that we know that we want something different from what we have. That is the truth. Down here in the Eastern Caribbean we know that we need something more than what we have but we seem afraid to say what it is we want. We are afraid to tell the public what it is we want. So we are going around in a circuitous way trying to

grope for an institutional framework in the Eastern Caribbean – I must stress that, Sir – to effectuate the objectives that we want, that we really need, that we know we need, that we know that we are comfortable with. That is our problem, Sir. So we must continue with this.

I am very glad that we have an opportunity to debate this matter because in this free debate I think the frankness will do a world of good to the integration movement because the evasion of these issues cannot go on forever. These issues are being evaded and it is for the legislator as we debate it to explain in clear and absolute terms to the electorate – the people out there, the wider community – that if you wish and if you know that it is your understanding of your needs that you must have an integration movement, you must look at the framework to ensure that the framework that you have created is a framework which is consistent with the carrying into effect of the objectives which you wish.

Now, Sir, we have had some other recommendations in relation to the Charter of Civil Society. This is one that really has caused me some concern. I admire the analysis of the Commission. I do not understand nor do I approve of the report on the Charter of Civil Society. With the exception of a Member State which really and honestly did not have a record or a reputation for **free** and fair elections and for the respect for human rights embodied in its Constitution every member state of the Caribbean Community has enshrined in its constitutional law **fundamental** rights with access to the Courts and to the Judiciary right up to the Privy Council. So I find it difficult to understand, with that as a background, what this charter is. I agree it has other components but it is easy to settle these other components, but the components that it has, like the United Nations Declaration, can have all of these value judgments but the practical machinery for the definition and the enforcement of these rights is a much more difficult exercise and, again, like the Instruments of Implementation of the Commission they will only be declaratory. That is the truth. Page 41. I have gone through all of this and I find great difficulty in understanding some of these things.

It seems to me that sometimes what happened with the Commission was that it had so many submissions before it, **particularly** from non-political organisations, that it felt that it was under an obligation to make recommendations with respect to some of these matters so as to convey to these various disparate bodies that they took them seriously. **That** seems to me to be it. My understanding of the people's **interest** in this area is that they want to know about the **integration** movement and freedom of movement of people. They want to know about the integration movement and their ability to go to another country and set up business and things of that kind. The businessmen are interested in movement of capital.

5.20 p.m.

Again, Sir, while I am pleased to note that attention was paid to this aspect of the instruments of integration, I must say again I can only give critical support to some of the recommendations in this respect. I do not understand how it is possible to say that graduates of the University of the West Indies and a few other graduates are to have the right of establishment and free movement. What about the rest? Only last week, Sir, I believe I read of the Prime Minister speaking to the Association of Tertiary Institutions which included our Community Colleges. Are we to say that the graduates of the Community Colleges right through the Caribbean are to have different rights from graduates of the University of the West Indies?

I would say this, that of all of the countries in the Caribbean which have to a large extent been both the beneficiary as well as bearing the burden of the concept of freedom of movement Barbados is pre-eminent. We have accepted more people for our size than any other country in the Caribbean. All over my constituency I can carry you, Sir, every race in the Caribbean is in Barbados. As a matter of fact I can tell you that if you are a Lebanese, we have them, if there are Syrians we have them, if you are a Muslim, we have them. Whatever it is, if you are from Guyana, Jamaica, a Dominican Carib, everything, we have them.

Barbados has been really one of the countries that has experienced this psychological hurdle. I have seen with my own two eyes a man deported from Lodge Road at 6:00 o'clock one morning by the first LIAT and I went back there in the afternoon and I saw the same man walking down the road. It was a long time ago so nobody needs to be offended. He was friendly with an immigration officer's sister. I have seen that. These things happen. If you go on any construction site in Barbados you hear St. Lucians and Vincentians. That is another area that the practicalities of the aspirations of the people have to be dealt with. We must deal with it. I could understand that some parts of the Caribbean integration community far up to the North and to the West...

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The Bahamas is not a part of the Community although if you go to the Bahamas you will see a very well established Barbadian community. We went there in 1984 and they had a very good party for us. They are doing quite well.

It is one of the points that was made very strongly by the Labour Party in our day, that we must accept in the integration movement that there is nothing inconsistent with some parts of the constituent members going at a faster pace and in a deeper way than in other parts. It seems to me that in integration movements when you study them you see that sometimes you have crises. In the European

Economic Community they have it right now. There are groups of members who wish to proceed at a faster pace and there are other groups who, within the context of the overall objectives, do not want to give up their membership but they just feel that they need to have a slow pace.

I think in debating this Report we in Barbados, and certainly, my viewpoint is that we should look at our position in the integration movement. With all of our frustrations and disappointments with it we ought to be able to put forward a position in respect to the Multilateral Clearing Facility, the Common External Tariff, trade policy, freedom of movement and coordination of our foreign policy. We feel in these areas we can proceed faster and we should look for like-minded people within the Caribbean Integration Movement. We should look for them and see how we can proceed. The institutional framework should take place. It should be such as to accommodate this position. The institutional framework has to be flexible enough to accommodate this.

The last area I want to talk on, because there are going to be a number of other areas that Honourable Members are going to take on because we have divided up this matter, is the area of security and the need for joint action in this area. In 1985 and early 1986 I tried to emphasise to all of the members of the Caribbean Community my own viewpoint that the menace arising from the drug barons within the Caribbean was such that the Caribbean countries could not deal with them on the basis of individual islands alone. As early as that there was strong evidence that there was a coordinated and cohesive organisation in existence which was operating as though it was a Caribbean multinational corporation with outlets in each of the Caribbean countries and indeed with outlets in metropolitan countries in Britain, the United States of America and in Canada – the evidence was clear – and that the Eastern Caribbean was but an entrepot. That is a fact. At that time it was clear that we needed a Caribbean intelligence core operating in this area of the highest order. I remember in particular speaking in St. Lucia of the need to use the Regional Security System and the instruments we had there to make sure that was the institutional framework that would help us in this area.

I trust, Sir, that this area in our discussion will not be neglected. There is absolutely no doubt at all about it that at this time in the Eastern Caribbean, in particular, just as in the history of many countries, the fear of external aggression has propelled and motivated the derogation and the delivering up of some sovereignty by States, so too, this is an area that is compelling and is going to push the sheer weight of the cost. The danger is such that it is going to push decision-makers in the Eastern Caribbean into the position in which they have to decide they can only fight this monster together. It is impossible to fight them

individually. It is a very important area. I would say that the Commission does address it and they are quite correct in highlighting it.

Now, Sir, one last word about what should happen. I feel we are really under-estimating our people in the Caribbean if we feel that **this** big document and the recommendations are matters that they do not understand or appreciate or that we should not look to them for some guidance as to the position we take. I really do commend that part of the Report and in particular the methodology of approach in which there was **such** a wide consultation.
5.30 p.m.

I believe the Commissioners tried desperately to organize themselves in such a way – and they were very, very **fortunate** in that I understand that the friends for the Caribbean in the form of members of the Commonwealth and others were very generous in their contribution to the coffers of the Commission to permit them such a wide consultation. These things cost money. I think that that is one of the good things that has happened, because I believe sometimes that politicians fear the reaction of the electorate or the perceived position of the electorate more than is **necessary**. In an exercise such **as** this, Sir, it is vital that the politicians act in consonance with what is the real feeling of the electorate. We do not have referenda as **part of** our political process. To me as a student of constitutional forms I sometimes grope, I sometimes **try** to find out why it is that we do not **try** to use that mechanism in a few very, very important areas. I do not mean a public opinion poll nor do I mean the selective interviews that take place periodically, instantly, in the newspapers after some serious decision is taken.

I feel there are certain areas, very selected the Swiss have been able to devise a system which has proved quite workable for important decisions in given circumstances to be **tested** and to let the decision be made by the people whom it is going to effect. I know we fear referenda in relation to the devolution of sovereignty and things of that kind, But some of these matters are **areas** that perhaps we should look at as a possibility.

The academics who we pay to think about these things, with all of the luxury of time and things like that, should be coming up with a mechanism saying for instance, instead of the Commission let us have in certain important areas referenda in particular in all of the countries about certain decisions and if in a particular country those decisions are accepted well then implement it.

I am only groping and I am only throwing out thoughts in relation to this. That is all I am saying. But, Sir, I welcome this opportunity to speak on the Report of the Commission. As I said personally I regard some areas of the Report **as** being acceptable. I say that as a whole I

can give critical support to the Report. But I do feel that in a number of respects that the fundamental issues which bedevil the workings of the integration movement were not dealt with in that free, frank and analytical manner in which I would have expected them to deal with them. But I hope that the Caribbean Community will accept the overall theme that it really is time for action.

We live now in a completely different world. As the Commission itself says this is a world in which the maps and economic groupings have changed greatly. There's no doubt there **are** larger and larger blocks emerging and we in the Caribbean have to decide how we are going to operate. In my opinion, certainly here in the Eastern Caribbean, and I believe also in the rest of the Caribbean, that there will have to be closer, **much** closer association within the Eastern Caribbean. I believe myself that there will be a widening of the integration movement from the point of view certainly of trade with the rest of the Caribbean.

But we are lucky in the sense that we have a geographic position between North and South America. We have members of the Caribbean Economic Community in South **America**. We have members in Central America and we have a very, very large community of our Caribbean people in both Canada and in the United States of America. So that with all of that background I do feel, Sir, that once we have our institutional framework right that we will be able to survive and we will not be marginalized.

Thank you, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John.

Hon. D. J. H. **THOMPSON**: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the House is indebted to both of the previous speakers both of whom have had the opportunity to serve at the highest decision-making level in CARICOM and therefore have brought some useful **insights** to this particular debate. I have never seen the Heads of Government in operation. I may never see it myself. Perhaps by **the** time persons like yourself, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I would have had that opportunity such entities would no longer exist. Maybe other **forms** of structures of integration with a broader base and perhaps operating at a tier different from the Heads of Government would have come into being by then to strengthen the implementation.

I think we owe a great debt of gratitude, too, to the Commissioners and the large number of other people over the years who have laboured on Commissions of this sort throughout the history of our region for their intellectual contribution, their dedication, their tenacity. Perhaps it was not **as** difficult for the members of this West Indian Commission because by and large there is a fund

of goodwill which supports the objectives of Caribbean integration. The reason why I say this is because the concept of nationalism which was at its height in the sixties has receded into the background and young people like myself probably do not place a premium on the features of nationalism which our predecessors in politics, particularly those who served in the sixties, placed on it.

You would not find a lot of young people in this age feeling the same way about independence as our parents feel. Therefore the philosophical development of these young people seems to hinge more on the question of some regional unity. I think those who have had the opportunity to study at the University of the West Indies, which has been one of the most positive forces to impact on the minds of young intellectuals, would know that that is the case.

This Report, however, presents a great dilemma for me as a politician. If I were not a politician the dilemma would not exist. If one agrees with the report it would have the impact of diminishing the role of elected representatives, the relevance of elected politicians and also to some extent the relevance of the people who elect them, if you accept some of the major recommendations of this Report. However if you disagree with the Report, contrary to the opening remarks of the Honourable Member for Christ Church South – I am not being contentious – but my own view is that knowing the way people approach issues of this sort, knowing the way that they view politicians we would be characterized as timid and indifferent, demonstrating a lack of commitment and being power hungry in not wanting to give up any element of sovereignty and ignorant and all of the other epithets which were applied to politicians during the course of the deliberations of the Commission. I saw some of those epithets being applied. I do not think the blame rests exclusively, not even in a large part in my view, on all of the politicians.

Let us take the Heads of Government. The Honourable Member for Christ Church South makes the point that implementation has been difficult because Heads of Government have come back home and found that the welter of opposition has been too great. They had no right leaving home without taking a sounding from the people whom they are supposed to represent. This is one of the problems that may exist when you have an entity which seeks to place the burden of the decision-making on a small group and then seeks to have the impact of that decision-making disseminated through the system.

5.40 p.m.

A lot of Heads of Government have not had the courtesy of either explaining to the people in their own political parties, far less those in their own Parliament, far

less the people they represent, any of the issues that relate to regional integration.

I have had the opportunity to be in one of the Eastern Caribbean countries, when the question of OECS unity was raging, for the election campaign. I went to a large number of meetings and I can tell you that at not one of those political meetings was the issue of OECS unity raised at all. Never, it was never raised. Neither by the Heads of Government nor by any of the other persons who professed, on different occasions, to be interested in the future of the region. So, if the leaders leave without a message and go and deliver the wrong message at Heads of Governments' meetings and then cannot implement those decisions, that is their fault. Fortunately that has not been the case in Barbados. Maybe it says a lot for the role of Prime Minister in this country and the influence they have on the system, but that has not been the case in Barbados but it has been the case in many other countries and perhaps when we look at the issue of implementation we need to see why the decisions cannot be implemented.

Now I want to deal with some of the issues as I see them. I am not going to deal with many. I had my own doubts when this Commission was established that it would have been possible for any group of leading statesmen or intellectuals in the region to produce a document which would be overly creative because since the 1920s, as the Honourable Prime Minister has pointed out, there have been a whole range of reports. Even the Moyne Commission Report itself deals, to some extent, with issues that have been constantly rehashed over and over and recycled. However, the difficulty was probably a difficulty that the Commissioners had and not a difficulty that the people in the region would have had, because many of them are also people who have been saying the same thing to the same people for a long time. Therefore it is difficult for them to come up with something new. What is of more importance is that many of the people who sat as commissioners are people who have never had to justify to the electorate any of the positions they have taken on anything. That is why it was so useful that they met with such a wide cross-section of Caribbean people.

I agree with the Honourable Member for Christ Church South because I thought it would have been another scenario where people who have never had to face the music in elected politics would sit down and regurgitate view points that they have held and positions that they have held for a long period of time. However they did seem to go a step further in the process and do some of the things that many of us who seek to take positions on issues on behalf of people should do, and that is, meet with people, exchange ideas and sound out their views.

The question of integration in the region is not as short term an exercise as some people seem to make

it out to be. In conditions of under-development, issues of integration are going to be a long term process, they cannot be short-term because the opportunity cost for one territory as against another is always going to produce tensions and clashes which don't necessarily occur where there is an advanced state of development. That is just my view and I can see that many of the issues that have arisen, the question of exchange rate adjustments during the period and so on, are really the central analysis that can explain the difficulties of the integration movement as it revolves around the tensions created by the different opportunity costs for the different actors in the process of integration.

This Commission is to be very strongly supported in its recommendations in Chapter 8 of the overview and I would urge the people of CARICOM, I am not urging anything **on** the Government now, or any Government, to spend less time struggling with some of the difficult issues that they raised in the chapters relating to deep structures of unity and look at the question of definition of ourselves as Caribbean people, from the perspective, not of what is happening outside. It is immaterial to me when people speak of Caribbean unity to know what is happening in Europe. That is maybe an academic exercise or it is good for comparative analysis but until we define ourselves **as** Caribbean people in **all** that we do, then we are not going **to** be able to move the process forward. That is why those recommendations that relate the institutionalisation of creative arts, whether Government sponsored or not, the promotion of artistic activity for employment as part of a wider economic development strategy, but more importantly the mobilisation of the print and electronic media resources **as** an antidote to cultural penetration and **as** an instrument of the promotion of cultural identity, the promotion of religious ecumenism and the enhancement of the cultural imperative in the regional educational system are all very important issues that I think need to be addressed first of all. I think once we start to reflect ourselves as Caribbean people through what we see of each other and how we communicate to each other and the way we project our own cultures, then we will move the integration process a lot further along.

These are the areas that can bear immediate fruit because they don't call for direct Government intervention and they don't necessarily call for the kinds of resources that the other structures which are recommended in the Report call for. They will also impact directly on the consciousness of people and will strengthen the Caribbean identity. This seems to me to be where we must start and this is where the central thrust must come **from**.

The major consideration, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I think needs to be looked at is the question of sovereignty. It does not seem to me that it is possible for you to have any discussion about the future of the Caribbean without discussing the issue of sovereignty and I am very

disappointed that the Commissioners seem to avoid this particular issue, not skirt it. They said up front that when people raised it at the meetings they told them they were not discussing that issue. I hear people say that they pursued it or discussed it. They did not discuss it and there is nothing in this Report that I have read, unless you are just **saying that** by mentioning it you have followed it. That demonstrates to me that they didn't even raise the issue.
5.50 p.m.

They themselves say that "we indicated that this is not up for discussion". So it means in a sense that part of the Report was written before the consultation. Federation is not on the agenda. We have to ask what is going to be surrendered by the people of the **Caribbean** in their individual nation state. That has to be the critical issue that we have to address and it is tragic that the Commission declines to address it and therefore, the very relevance to this exercise will have to be questioned. That is my view.

They say at Page 20 of the Overview this: "We are too close to the Federal experiment' that raised so many hopes yet failed at its first, major political hurdle. We do not recommend federation, federal structures or federal concepts **as** the way forward to CARICOM. It is important that these exclusions be understood not only to avoid misunderstanding, misrepresentation and misinterpretation but also because of the importance of the conceptual basis of the alternative that we are proposing. Both federalism and other forms of political union involve a surrender of sovereignty in part or in whole to a Federal or Unitary Government."

Therefore, they have to address that issue. I cannot see how **you** can say that that issue is not on the agenda at all and you are going to super-impose on the region some other loose arrangement which does not address the central question of what areas we are going to say that CARICOM has some supremacy over.

They also go on to say that no such political climate exists across the board in the region **in** relation to this matter and they make it clear in their consultations that they were not advancing proposals along the line of a return to federalism. This point is made at page 20 and questions the very effectiveness, in my view, of the consultation.

When I was at the University, one of the Members of the Opposition came to deliver an address and she said that she is an unrepentant federalist. I thought to myself that sounded like the words of a dinosaur. I am not applying that epithet to her. But it seemed to me that for somebody to say that they are a federalist, that seemed to be old-fashioned or something **like** that. That was my fust reaction. I am not saying that I am an unrepentant

federalist, **but** I do believe that the ultimate goal has to be a federation and the process of getting there is something else. I will work towards that goal. It may not come in my lifetime but it may come in my children's lifetime. But it sounded at the time when it was said to be something strange to hear somebody say that they are an unrepentant federalist.

We invited the late **Errol** Barrow to address the students at the University on "The Contribution of Federation to Political Development" and he spoke, I think, for about 10 minutes and then said afterwards that he thought that was the most stupid topics that anybody could ask him to speak on and he preferred to speak on something else and he did so. He felt himself that the Federation **made** absolutely no contribution to the political development of the region. I do not agree with that. I think it did. It taught us some very useful lessons and perhaps what has happened is that we have not learned the lessons. We have not bothered to learn because we felt it was a phase that had ended and therefore we should say goodbye to it.

I say that is the ultimate goal and I do not need anybody to tell me what superficial escape routes exist to avoid it. We say it is the ultimate goal. It may not be attainable in my lifetime or yours. But that is where we eventually want to go and all **that** we do must be incremental towards that ultimate goal. So **at** this stage our Government needs to **determine** which areas of sovereignty they will surrender in the collective interest of CARICOM and that is the key issue. Because it will solve part of the matter of the implementation. It will consolidate the institutions that are going to be implementing the decisions of CARICOM and it will also remove the need for this non-accountable super-national institutions of Caribbean intellectuals or public and political figures, as they call themselves, and the elite who will tell the elected representatives how best they can serve their people. Therefore, I do not support that concept and I think we need somebody to initiate the discussion on the issue of sovereignty in this debate. I know the Honourable Member for St. Joseph probably wants to do that and I am certain that I can expect that from him.

Regarding the issue of implementation, the Americans nowadays use the word "**gridlock**". Everybody is throwing that out in the political debates. The **sophisticated** Caribbean Commissioners call it the "Achilles heel" of the integration movement and the Overview at page 19 states: "Neither **Carifta** nor the CARICOM Secretariat is designed or empowered as machinery for implementation of the innumerable decisions that are the **bedrock** of integration." **They** say that their view is that the solution is not tinkering with the Secretariat, but that is not the solution. Tinkering with the Secretariat is definitely out. But **what** **they** have recommended really is that the Secretariat should wither

away and be replaced by the CARICOM Commission, a Commission of West Indians charged with the task and endowed with the authority to make integration work. They have to be exclusively engaged in this **task** 24 hours a **day**, 7 **days** a week. They have to be drawn from the public and the political community of the region.

My own **view** is this. **There** are people who are already doing this job or supposed to be doing it. Not only the Secretariat, but the Chancellor of the University of the West **Indies** is paid out of the collective coffers of the Caribbean people and one of the principal mandates of the University, in my view, should be to advance the cause of regional integration. The President of the Caribbean Development Bank is included. You can list them. There are people whose job it is already to advance Caribbean unity through their respective institutions. It is as though all that exists in this region is the Secretariat and because the Secretariat cannot implement some of the decisions of the Heads of Government that one has to turn on the Secretariat and sub-plant it with something else.

I am saying that more of those other institutions and more of those senior public officials who **are** paid out of the collective contributions of taxpayers in the region have to commit themselves to this task. We do not need a new set to do it. Bring more of them on board in the decision making and implementing process. They are already receiving salaries for that task and I think they need to focus their attention on **furthering** the integration effort. This recommendation and the way in which it is framed is really a stunning indictment on that **Caribbean** bureaucracy that exists. I do not mean the Secretariat. I mean the other institutional arrangements because it really does not credit those institutions with the contribution that they should be making in terms of Caribbean integration. What is it that they, therefore, have been doing for the past 40 years in these institutions? That is a valid question that we also need to ask.

I want to **ask** a question following on that which the Prime Minister asked about the Commission. What makes 3 or 4 men who are already subject to the decision making of Heads of Government, who in themselves are first among equals in their own respective territories, better placed to implement decisions that are taken? If as we said, the Heads of Government have difficulty in bridging the implementation gap for whatever reason, the fact that they left home without a message or some other deficiency on their own part, what is it about the Commission that is going to give them any greater mandate to achieve this? In addition to that, the establishment of a Commission is almost symptomatic of the very Euro-centric approach that the United Nations like to impose on countries. I remember when it was the Women's Decade. They said form a bureau. Some people sat down and wrote out terms of reference. Then they tried to get a checklist of

things that one must do during the year and so on. But I am not sure that those institutions really have any impact on the people whose lives they are supposed to change directly. There has to be some other element in the process which gives life to those decisions and it really is symptomatic of a kind of top-dog approach to development which originates from that **kind of** thinking.
6.00 p.m.

It is perhaps one of the reasons why many of the UN institutions themselves do not function as effectively as they should, because they are almost tied to that **kind of** approach to decision making and also to development.

The last **point** I want to make **relates** to the question of the region's institutional framework. This Report cannot be faulted for pulling together a very useful institutional framework. Except that I have strong reservations about the Commission, I support the concept of the Charter of Civil Society. I think it makes sense. We already have Bills of Rights, it is true, but what I think the Charter tends to do is to seek to give life to the goals of human society in the Caribbean.

There are a number of issues that can be addressed via the Charter. The free flow of information throughout the region, the guarantee of **fundamental** rights and **freedoms** to citizens of other Caribbean countries when they visit other territories and a whole range of other issues which I think are important – I am not giving it any greater priority than it needs – but it is an interesting concept that I think has some usefulness.

I support the CARICOM Assembly, but I believe that those who want to sit in the Assembly must do like me or anybody else and face the electorate. They must be accountable, they must justify their viewpoints to the public and there must be no succour given to this viewpoint nowadays that every interest group that can apply some term of art to describe its existence must be given an opportunity to come in on deliberations and influence public **opinion**. If the artists wish to sit in the CARICOM Assembly, well let them nominate candidates in general elections, let them do the things that each of us in here has to do to justify our existence for the five years we are elected and that would be the process by which they will reach the CARICOM Assembly.

This Report says that elected representatives are not the sole representatives of the people. That may sound reasonable, but it does not also say that the people who are elected in here are not exposed or **interested** or in the vanguard of viewpoints which represent interest groups as well. The Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central represents a trade union viewpoint from time to time, there are people here who represent the views of the Anglican Church, the Honourable Member for St. George

South pretends every now and again to represent the viewpoints of the artists and the poor, the legal fraternity is represented. We have people who add different facets to our lives and we are not elected simply on the basis of our professions, nor are we exclusively professional politicians, we have other interests which are represented and if there are other people who think that they can make a contribution, they should face the electorate.

There is no higher element, in my view, of satisfaction that one can get out of life than knowing **that** every five **years** the people who pay you can tell you to go home, you will not get any other perks, you justify yourself. There is no Service Commission to protect me from anything, there are no clerical laws to keep me in office longer than I should be in office, there are no other benefits like what the private sector people get that keep me functioning beyond my time. As a Member of Parliament, every five years I am required to say to the public: "This is what I have done," and the system frees them up to tell me that I have not done it and I can go in peace and they can go in peace.

I am not supporting any arrangement, whether it is proffered by statesmen who were former politicians or the Caribbean bureaucracy or any other quarter which **seeks to** place a premium or any paramountcy on arrangements which sideline elected politicians or marginalise elected politicians. This **task** is too difficult for us to feel that we must take second place to any other arrangement. The politics of inclusion is important, but in relation to making decisions, voting and taking positions on behalf of people there is only one basis on which you can do that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do, however, agree with the concept that there are processes by which an Assembly of Parliamentarians, or the Heads of Government for that matter, can gather specialised opinions from special interest groups either by having them as **observers** or setting up institutions which give them the opportunity to feed their ideas into the system.

On the question of the CARICOM Supreme Court, which the Honourable Member for **Christ Church West** wishes to hear me on, I believe he knows my view. I am in support of it. I believe in the abolition of appeal to the Privy Council. I cannot think that there is any statistical or other basis on which we should continue with that arrangement. I believe that the CARICOM Supreme Court should be the final court of appeal and should be in place as soon as possible, and I am also attracted – I think it is a very useful suggestion that there are some matters for which it should have a regional jurisdiction. Some of those matters may relate to issues that arise under the CARICOM Charter and some under the Treaty. I think that is a useful development and is something that we should aspire **to**, but in the initial phases I believe the Government's

position on the establishment of the CARICOM Supreme Court has been given support.

Those are the major issues I want to deal with, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I wish to say that the Report, I think, of all that have been printed so far, is the most positive in outlook. People who live in the Caribbean who have looked to the north – well, that is where we normally look, United States of America, years ago to Britain and to Canada – can now open the pages of this Report and I think see the concept of the life that they would wish to live in this region encapsulated in the pages of the principal Report. 6.10 p.m.

I think that exercises such as this are important to the region because of the fact that as we go through economic difficulty there are still a lot of people who seem to feel that the solutions to their problems may lie on the outside and that there are not in existence in this region people who care enough about their future and the future of their children to look at issues of this sort and try to map out a strategy for their survival. I believe that the federal goal is one that we should have as a guiding star and principle and that any step that we take along this way is incremental.

There is one point that I forgot to make on the issue of implementation and it was a critical point.

The CARICOM Secretariat, in my view, should have access to **national** parliaments. I do not believe in any **supranational decision-making** body. Once Heads of Government have left their territories, based on the advice they have received and the support they have got from their respective assemblies or interest groups or whatever and a decision is made, the Secretariat should be able to access the national parliaments. Cabinet or the executive institution should be by-passed, or the Minister, however you put it, but it must have direct access. The CARICOM Secretariat should not have to wait on the Executive to set the item on the parliamentary agenda. There should be some process by which it can reach the parliamentary agenda directly.

I also think it is very important that we set a wise precedent here in permitting a free vote on this issue. It is a very wise precedent for which **the Prime** Minister should be commended. When those items from CARICOM reach the parliamentary agenda a free vote should be permitted. You have private members' business and you can have CARICOM business. It can reach the agenda of Parliament directly and members can be entitled to have a free vote, a non-partisan exercise, in which we would develop a tradition of dealing with CARICOM matters in that way. I think it is too important to have them subsumed in some of the partisan approaches which exist in individual territories.

I do not know if it is possible. It is going to require a decision on the surrender of sovereignty in respect of

those matters **which** the Heads can make a decision on. Parliaments are going to have to agree that that process is the process by which they will become law. The implementation of those decisions requires parliamentary support and I think the best way to deal with it is to have the CARICOM Secretariat have access to the individual parliaments of the territories of the region. You would solve the problem of political leaders coming back home without the commitment or determination to have the matters which they agreed upon and ratified and signed in the caucuses and the meetings of the Heads of Government not being implemented subsequently.

Those are just my ideas and I have not sought to develop any approach in concert with anybody else on this and I do not think anybody else would wish to say that they have done that with me because I have not been able to think through that last point with any certainty. The important point we have to make is that the process is not going to be a quick one and this particular report seems to rush in with some recommendations which want to replace a time-consuming exercise in decision-making with a very speedy arrangement but they have not thought **it** through carefully enough. I would give the members of the Commission full marks for their consultation and the ideas that they have raised and I hope, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that in your life-time and mine that the goal of a federated Caribbean or West **Indies** will come to fruition.

I give my support to the Resolution before the **House**. Thank you.

Mr. L. R. TULL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Report comes at a time when a lot of dramatic changes are taking place in the international community and for that reason the timing is an excellent one. I have a number of problems with the Report, but there are a number of very positive things about it. The main thing about this Report is the implementation. At the heart of everything is the implementation. It refers to 15 years of decisions of Caribbean Heads of Government – if you look through it carefully – where there has been no implementation. I have written down those of 15 years, those of 14, 12 and 13. I do not have them with me but if you check you will see that.

What I am saying, Sir, is that it is a good time because so much has happened in the world – the collapse of the bi-polar world, the fall of the **barriers** in Eastern Europe, indeed, the fall of Communism – which has made a number of changes that are significant to the Caribbean. For instance, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the weapons of war are no longer missiles. They are trade arrangements and there are a number of mega-blocs emerging. The North American Free Trade area with Canada, the United States and Mexico, the New Europe as it spreads its borders further east and takes in traditional Western

European countries like Portugal and Spain and Greece. Now even looking further afield to the countries of Eastern Europe that were formerly Soviet controlled. We also have in the **Pacific** the newly emerging power houses in the Pacific rim countries led by Japan and which, from the signs of the times, will eventually be led by China. With a market of 1.2 billion people **and the opening of, China** to massive investment **from** the United States, Europe and even the Pacific countries, China will no doubt in a very short period of time be one of the major players in economic war.

The whole geopolitical situation is changing and the development of these blocs to which I make mention, incidentally speaking, the Caribbean will become more and more **marginalised** and principally not so much **because** of the forming of blocs but because of the change in the bi-polar situation. The United States for instance no longer has to even pretend that it has to do anything in the Caribbean because there is no Nicaragua, there is no Grenada nor even Cuba because the teeth of Cuba **are** being pulled and they will soon be out. I want to make reference to that later in terms of the extension of CARICOM. I hear a lot of **talk** about the Eastern Caribbean and so on and we **are** talking about a few small islands but, obviously, if the Caribbean is serious it has to **look** at a relationship with Cuba. **All** these things point to the fact that Cuba will not before a long time be fitting into the other order of things and that the catch word of the **1980's** - ideological pluralism, would be something that will be relegated to the old books for historians and students of politics.

That is all going to change and it is foreseeable that if Cuba eventually comes into the mainstream that there is going to be massive American investment in Cuba. The Cuban American influence goes right through the **country** from the tip of the Florida Keys right up to Washington and there is going to be a tremendous amount of investment poured into Cuba. Therefore if we are talking seriously, not just confining ourselves to a number of recommendations based on things that have been going on for a **long time** we have to think in terms of widening the CARICOM and dealing with Cuba because an association with Cuba now is going to be fruitful for the future. We have to open our eyes and look ahead.

We have to look at Mexico. Mexico has long wanted respect in this region. Mexico is a big country. It has a tremendous amount of resources. Those of us who have been dealing with foreign affairs matters would know that one of the things that always nettled Mexico was that it was not getting the respect it felt it should be getting. It saw countries like Brazil, Venezuela and Argentina put on a higher plane than they have. They have seen themselves as the poorer neighbours of the United States. They have been struggling over and over to get some respect. I **believe**

that the Caribbean has to look at that and use Mexico. Give it the respect it deserves. It is looking for it and if that respect is given maybe we can use Mexico as a gateway into the United States out of this North American free trade area.

6.20 p.m.

The same way we spent a long time, about a decade, thinking in terms of attracting investment from the Far East, for instance, the Pacific, and indeed from countries in Europe to get into joint venture operations in Barbados so that we can benefit by having jobs, managerial and other expertise coming into the country, we could benefit in that way and they would be able to benefit by duty-free access in the United States and therefore both sides would benefit. I think we should now be looking the other way where we can use Mexico to **see** whether an arrangement with them, either bilaterally, or through CARICOM relationships, can allow the same of entree into the North American **free** trade region because these things **are** not cast in bronze. They are not etched in stone. What is today is something else tomorrow.

In the North American Free Trade Area it is likely to be a horse of another colour within another year or two. We in the Caribbean have been flattered and fooled with a lot of words coming out of the mouths of the United States Government, like the Caribbean Basin Initiative, of what was a monumental duping of the people of the Caribbean. There was nothing in it but it kept people in these regions feeling they were getting something for a while and they would keep them quiet.

We have a great deal of respect for our relationships with Canada. It has been good over the years. It still is but again their CARIBCAN arrangement did not work any wonders.

We are **talking** about enterprises for America. I do not understand what it means because I have read the documents over and over and I cannot understand precisely what they are saying. The Caribbean now **has** a number of important positions to date and I am disappointed with the Prime Minister, contrary to the Honourable Member for St. John who feels that a free vote is the answer. **You** cannot have a free vote on something as important as this in the sense that the Government should come before Parliament **today** with a clear and precise position on Caribbean integration. The Prime Minister had a duty in speaking in here today to come and spell out a position that the Government of Barbados will take in any **Heads** of Government meeting and speak for the people of Barbados, not at this stage, a few **days** before the Prime Minister goes off to the meeting to say, "Well, let us talk about it. Let ideas contend. Talk around. Let me hear everybody say what they have to say".

Aside.

Mr. L. R. TULL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when you are trying to make the point the jackals are at bay. I do not **understand**. I am disappointed at that.

The issue of Caribbean integration and its importance to Barbados is far too important particularly at this period for us to sit down in a national Parliament, a week before the **Prime** Minister goes to an important and historic meeting to talk about, "Well let us throw around ideas and so on." At the end of this debate, unless the **Prime** Minister uses mental dexterity and acuteness to listen to all that we have said, and by the end of this debate he can walk back in here and say, "I have heard everybody, now here is the position of the Government of Barbados which I want the people of Barbados to know I **am** taking to Trinidad and Tobago". But if the Prime Minister is going to take only what he said in here today I think this debate is as sterile as many of the discussions on Caribbean integration heard throughout the region for a very long time.

Now, having said that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think the Prime Minister will do well...

Aside.

Mr. L. R. TULL: I do not understand, Sir. They are **almost** a bunch of human ciphers who cannot appreciate the importance of these matters **and** all **they** do is make noise.

The Prime Minister would do well to ask the Clerk of Parliament to give him very quickly a copy of the contribution made in this debate by the Honourable Member for Christ Church South today and use that as the basis of a position to take in Trinidad and Tobago. You cannot go wrong if you do that, and I hope you do.

Now, I want to make some other points in relation to the Commission. I myself have some difficulty with the Commission in its present concept. I do not at this stage know whether the issue of a **supernational** body is the one that is required or whether it is merely a strengthening of CARICOM. But I have a **little** difficulty in understanding how this Commission is going to work.

I know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by my **association** with these things over the years that the problem really is, yes, that of implementation. It is not only from what has been said by the Honourable Members for St. John, or Christ Church South, that the Heads go to meetings, they make decisions, they come back home, then they are subjected to a great deal of pressure by pressure groups and sectors in the community, and they renege, they back off. I do not think that is all. I have been to these meetings and I know how they operate.

The agenda for Heads of Government meeting is always too crowded. There is a lot of minutiae, a lot of trivial things that should be dealt with at a lower level that clog the agenda of Heads of Government. Thirteen Heads should not go around the Caribbean and sit down in hotel suites, spend a lot of time wasting on whether there should be **hassle-free** travel, and all the little things that should be worked out 'at another end. I believe that Heads of **Government** would do well to set the agenda **far** in advance of meetings on one or two major issues where they can have **all** the work done beforehand, well briefed, because that does not always happen. I am not speaking for Barbados now. I have seen all of them operate where quite often at the Heads meeting they do not understand the issue they are discussing. I have seen it I have seen them at meetings and they do not even understand the implications of the issue they are discussing. That is because there are so many things to discuss. I believe these things need to be addressed.

I would like to think the Prime Minister would use his position to cut out this annual meeting where the Heads want to do more work in three days than the Ministers of Trade, Education, Agriculture, Health and Labour have done in a year. I would like to see an agenda that is sufficiently small that you can concentrate in detail on them and they can be properly briefed. Talking about the strengthening of the Secretariat, that is part of what is required in this. Whether there is a commission or no commission the Secretariat needs to be strengthened..

A number of useful suggestions have so far arisen out of our discussion here today. There is one in particular I need to mention. Again, this is from **observation**. There is not the institutional capacity in many of the States of CARICOM to translate decisions of the Heads of Government into action. They do not have the where-with-all to implement them. I have seen in some of the territories where they did not even have the human resources to prepare a feasibility study for the Government. They were so short in skills in that area. But the Heads make decisions in very intricate **and** difficult areas, and then they have to go to **territories** and get their legal **draftsmen** to draft legislation **to** take **to** the national Parliaments. But the **drafting** skills in many **territories** are **not** very good and apart from that - and I **am** not speaking in any pejorative way about any territory, I am just taking a factual situation. But apart from **that** the people who are required to draft legislation arising out of Heads' decisions do not understand what it is that the Heads have decided. Because the Heads come back and they say we decided to go down this road, full stop, Go and draft legislation.
6.30 p.m.

I think that what is required, Sir, is a strengthening of the CARICOM Secretariat providing the skills from the meetings, not after, where people have to ask

around and phone around to **ask** the implications of decisions - drafting people involved - and that the Secretariat with its own special skills will do the draft legislation arising out of Heads' decisions and then pass them through the territories rather than leave each individual territory to do its own thing because quite often what is put together in legislation arising out of decisions of Heads is not the same in one territory as it is in another. I am very strong, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, on the question of providing a strengthened Secretariat to do the work.

The Honourable Member for **St. John** has suggested that the Secretariat should have access to national Parliaments. I am not agreeing with that. Are they going to come in here and make speeches? What access do you mean? If you mean access for individual Parliamentarians to talk to them that is no problem. That happens anyway.

The fact that the graduates of **the** University of the West **Indies** - the Right Honourable Prime Minister is part of that team, I do not know if he encourages them in this. I do not know if he encourages them or not. It is not an accusation. To say you may have freedom of movement for graduates of the University of the West **Indies** and those of us who did not go to the University of the West **Indies** do not matter. Fortunately it is not a personal point I am **making** because I do not want any work in any other **territory**. It is not a personal point.

But you **see**, Sir, the people who work in the CARICOM Secretariat are, to a very large extent, graduates of the University of **the** West **Indies** and they have their network. There is a lot of passing of information. I am not **talking** about confidential information but briefing and informing people around the region of what is going on. But I **think** that that has to be institutionalised where they have the **kind** of Secretariat where **at** the end of Heads of Government they can send their envoys out of **Georgetown** or wherever the Secretariat will be to the individual territory and meet with Ministers of Government and Prime Ministers if necessary with a view to getting the decisions taken at the last Heads meeting implemented. You cannot sit down in **Georgetown** or wherever and get it done. They have to move around and deal with Ministers in the region.

I want to mention several things in relation to the Assembly of Parliamentarians. The Assembly of Parliamentarians as proposed by the Right Honourable Prime Minister **at** a Heads of Government meeting was characterized by its vagueness. It did not spell out with sufficient **specificity** what it is he wanted. So I find it interesting in here to hear this afternoon that what the Commission is recommending in this document **vis-a-vis** the Assembly of Parliamentarians is vague. The vagueness arose out of an earlier vagueness. But I would like when the Prime Minister is winding up this debate as I hope he

will that he will tell us some more of what is involved in this Assembly of Parliamentarians. What is its relation **to** national Parliaments? As was asked by the Honourable Member for Christ Church South, will it have legislative powers and if so, in what area? If it is merely consultative or deliberative what is the point in having it then? If it does not have legislative powers I am saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it is not worth it at this time. These are hard times. You know in good times you can **try** a lot of things because there is some extra money to spend and something might work out. But these are not times to be spending money on 'something unless you can **see** what **you** are going to get out of it.

I want, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to say one or two things about the Report in a general way. The **Report** as I said has a number of positive things about it. One or two things are uncertain but it is a document that is very strong in analysis. The analysis is good. It has looked at the thing and given it a lot of analysis. Where it is not very strong is in recommendations for action. The recommendations in themselves are not. There should be an action programme.

I believe that the Commission should have set out a short-term set of recommendations, things that should be done in the **short-term**, things that should be done in the medium-term and things that should be done in the long-term. As it is at the moment there would only have been recommendations and the individual territories would have to **see** how to deal with them. But they have not done that and therefore with these hundreds of recommendations we do not **see** where their priorities are. After all the work they have done we do not see where those priorities lie. I want to **ask** another question.

Aside.'

Mr. L. R. TULL: Is this Commission going to be a Commission of implementers or monitors? I do not understand it. Are they going to implement something and if so, how? If they are just monitors do you really need **to** set up a high powered Commission and Secretariat to monitor it?

I believe that when I was in the Ministry of Trade I had an officer of middle **rank** who could monitor all these things in the Ministry for me without having any high powered Commissioner to do it and you always knew exactly where you were in relation to your own programme of implementing for Barbados and that officer could also tell you what was the position in respect of other **territories**.

I want also, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to say a word about this derogation of sovereignty. The Honourable Member for St. John in an otherwise useful statement on this debate got himself confused over the sacred role of elected representatives of the people. I got a little

difficulty with that, Sir. I believe that people who are Members of Parliament must not get to feel that they have any sole right of speaking about issues and influencing them that they are in fact other representatives, not representatives in Parliament, and that we have to move on to a new form of governance in these territories and that we **cannot**, as I said only a few days ago, hope to solve today's problems by using yesterday's **tools**. We have to be constantly looking at ways of adjusting the way people are governed and the relationship between people and Government and the way to get the best out of it. We have a nation that is far better educated, far better informed, who are tuned in to what is happening in the country, the region and the world and who understand the nuances of the issues and decisions that are being taken and they want to be involved in some way in their own governance. For us to keep holding on to this old shibboleth that people who get elected to Parliament are the ones who must run everything ... We must stop the exclusive nature of Parliaments so that more people can come in into decision-making. To be otherwise is to be **mired** in the past and has very little foresight in it.

6.40 p.m.

Now they are asking me what is my position. One big Government! They have come in here this afternoon and have made not one single recommendation over what position they are going to take on Caribbean unity and they are asking me **what** is my position. My position is, in effect, if the Attorney General would **listen**... If you want to draft me into the Government as a consultant, at the proper fee, I would come, because there seems to be a certain gap of expertise and ability in certain areas.

You cannot continue to talk about the politics of exclusion and to feel that only the people who are elected must have a say in the governance and in the determination of issues in a country. That is old fashioned. That is dated. So in that particular **area**, Mr. Deputy Speaker, while I do not agree with the concept of an Assembly of Caribbean Parliamentarians... I am sorry, not of Parliamentarians, the Assembly of Parliamentarians is the idea of the **Prime** Minister. The concept of this Assembly of Caricom comes from the intellect of the Commission of the West Indian Commission and they want to include farmers, the youth and the aged, the unions and so on.

Aside.

Mr. L. R. TULL: Why doesn't the Attorney General listen if he wants to learn? That is so forced that I can't understand what it means. How do you determine these things? Do they not mean, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for the Government of Barbados and the Governments of Caricom to find a means of getting the views of the wider sector of the community outside of the Parliament and involving them in decision making then by following what I consider,

a very awkward **recommendation** in this document by the people who prepared this report.

I want to say one or two things quickly about human resources. In this Report, Sir, the Commissioners have said that we have good education in the region but it is old fashioned – that is the essence of what is said in this report – and that **there** needs to be some changes. Again, I have always been moved to say that the education industry is the most reactionary **industry** in Barbados. I don't go beyond that. They are **rooted** very much in what was good a long time ago and they find it very difficult to come forward. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when there is so much change and when it is happening at the rate at which it is happening you would expect that education would be in the forefront of that change preparing people for change, but they are travelling behind it. One of the ways that perhaps you can get around that in Barbados and in many of the territories is by having a regional approach to a number of areas where we can't get people to move in respect of the territories and hide behind it.

One of the things I **am concerned** about **is** that with the world shrinking and we have to look beyond now to work with other regions, particularly Latin America, that we still remain one of the few regions in the world where a highly intelligent, well educated and literate people, speak only one language. There are very few places in the world where you have people who are well educated, who are literate and intelligent who can only speak one language. **Try** as you may – the Right Honourable Prime Minister he may **try** – to get the system to understand that in the world in which we live you cannot now continue to operate on one language and that we have to start from the beginning, from the time the **kids** go to kindergarten or nursery school to get them ready, since we seem to be having a severe road block in Barbados to move in that direction. I am giving that as one example that a regional approach to a number of matters relating to education might filter down into the individual territories to get places like Barbados to benefit.

Take the whole question of development of science and technology. I believe that although a **number** of efforts have been made in **Barbados** to **reorient** our school system towards an appreciation and an understanding and a readiness for the cataclysmic changes being made in science and technology and gear our people for those kinds of changes that we are only making very modest steps. Perhaps this is an area where a **regional** approach would work for the benefit of all the individual territories.

It is recommended in the Report that there will be a coordination of the work of the University of **Guyana**, the University of the West **Indies** and the other post secondary institutions, a very strong recommendation with which I **am** sure all of us will agree. I believe we can use

that as a means of working in areas like science and technology that could filter down to places like Barbados and get us to move in a way in which we have not been moving. I was talking about derogation of sovereignty and used the expression but did not go any further.

Now, there is talk, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about old political federations and I believe most people have accepted, at this time, that that is a non-starter and it has more difficulties than one can **think** of in a night, but there has to be a new **kind** of **economic** federalism. Economic federalism entails no less derogation of sovereignty than political federalism. This is something we have to consider. To what extent **are** we prepared to suffer some derogation of sovereignty in Barbados for the development of Barbados and for the region. Certainly if we **are** going to go the **economic** federalism way some economic derogation of our sovereignty must be involved. That is what I would have expected the Prime Minister to come this afternoon and tell me.

The **Prime** Minister is going to Trinidad to **talk** for me. I am a Barbadian citizen, I vote here, and I live here and he is going to speak for me. I would like him to tell me what he is going into Trinidad to say for me.

I heard the Honourable Member for St. John say he does not want to hear about these heads who go to Caricom Heads meetings and come back home and change because they did not understand. They should not wait until they come back to get the pressure, they should tell the people before they go.

Asides.

Mr. L. R. **TULL**: I **am** repeating what the **Honourable** Member said. I **am** saying that the Honourable Member for St. John said **so**. I **am** **asking** the Prime Minister to **heed** the word of his junior Minister to tell the **people** before you go what you are going to say.

Asides,

Mr. L. R. TULL: Since the Minister of Foreign Affairs wants to get into the debate so much, let us **talk** about the question of diplomatic representation overseas. I hope he will get up, since he wants to talk so much, and tell us about that. Things have changed. Every country in the region is now, when it talks about diplomatic representation, it is talking about economic change. We **started** off in 1966 talking about political representation overseas at United Nations and so on which is still important but the emphasis now, articulated by the Government which we support because that is our position **too**, we have articulated it, they have articulated it and we **are** agreed on that, that since economic matters, matters of investment and trade are paramount and those are the

things that our missions must be concerned about. I understand that **the** Government is even getting ready to appoint another Trade Commissioner, a man from St. **George**. But that is the direction in which we must go. The Caribbean has to understand that in areas relating to trade, investment, tourism and the like that the Caribbean has to have a common voice in many parts of the world and we cannot have a lot of mini-missions with people saying different things all of the time. We should search for investment in tourism promotions and in trade matters. The Caribbean has to move away from this old traditional concept of **everybody** has a mission and everybody has an Ambassador and a First Secretary and Second **Secretary**. If they **are** serious about Caribbean **integration**, they will **see** if they cannot pool resources, apart from **the** fact that it will work for **the** benefit of the country at that higher level in terms of capturing investment and better trade and conditions and so on. It will also cut substantially the cost of foreign representation. By the way, I heard that they re-appointed the man in London. It would save a lot of money if that is done.

6.50 p.m.

Aside.

Mr. L. R. **TULL**: The Prime Minister, unlike a lot of **people**, I regard him in some things but in some things he really lets me down. But we were talking though about the Caribbean integration of **the** overseas representation. For instance, we have not been missing any meetings of the United Nations which deal with disarmament and all **kinds** of outlandish things. But we missed a lot of meetings relating to UNCTAD and **GATT** and **the** things that really **matter** or we have sent along one person who is not conversant with the issues just to put a body there. In other words, we **are** saying one thing and we **are** doing something else. The Government should not **take** my comments as criticisms of them, because when I want to criticise them they know that I will. I **am** **trying** to assist the Government in **areas** where I have had some small measure of exposure, I do not put it higher than that, to bring **the** benefit of my exposure to the Government so that if they consider that my head is screwed **on, properly** and that I do not always talk foolishness, they can benefit from that exposure so it will assist them in coming up to a reasonable **position** to take not only to a **CARICOM** Meeting in Trinidad, which I believe there will be a lot of talk anyway, but to inform them when they are making policies to take the benefit of these things into consideration.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is my contribution on this matter. **Thank** you very much, Sir.

Hon. M. A. **KING**: Mr. Deputy Speaker, after consultation with the other side, we think that this

is an appropriate moment that suspension of ~~the~~ House should be moved.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. **KING**: Mr. Deputy Speaker, first of all, let me move that further consideration of this matter be **now** postponed.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question that further consideration of this matter be now postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. A. **KING**: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 27th October, 1992 at 10.00 a.m.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 27th October, 1992 at 10:00 a.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the sitting accordingly.
7.00 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES.....2466

Confirmation of the Minutes of Tuesday, 4th August, 1992.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR
THE DEPUTY SPEAKER.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.....2467

1. Accounts and Statements for the months of May, June, and July 1992, prepared by the Accountant General.
2. Report on the Audit of the Accounts of the Sugar Industry Research and Development Fund for the year ended 31st December, 1991.

PAPERS

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD 2467

1. Annual Report of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation for the year 1990.
2. Reform of the Indirect **Tax System** - Prepared by the Fiscal Affairs Department of the International Monetary Fund.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES.....2467

Annual Report of the Barbados Marketing Corporation for the period ended March 31, 1989.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES.....2467

Annual Reports of the National Housing Corporation for the Financial Years 1988-1989 and 1989-1990.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES.....2467

Thirteenth Annual Report of the National Sports Council for the Financial Year April, 1990 to March 31, 1991.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. H. B. FORDE 2467

1. Integrity in public life.

2. Support of live broadcasts of all debates of the House of Assembly.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR 2467

1. Advisors on disposal of assets by Government including statutory boards.
2. Application for the concessions or waivers, for land development.
3. Indebtedness of Government agencies to the Barbados National Bank.
4. Rules on sale of assets of Government including statutory bodies.
5. Transport Board and National Insurance Department.
6. Proposed move of Community Development Department to privately owned premises.
7. Redemption of Japanese debenture.

REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE.....2469

Report that the Select Committee on the Theft Bill, 1992 had passed the Bill with amendments and laid the Report.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES.....2469

1. Bill to amend the Consumption Tax Act.
2. Betting and Gaming Duties (Validation) Bill, 1992.
3. Bill to amend the Pharmacy Act.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES.....2469

Notice that Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 41 asked by Mr. George Payne was ready.

OBITUARY SPEECHES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES.....2469

Notice that he would pay tribute to the late Wilfred Coward, former M.P., at the next meeting of the House.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE LEASE OF LAND AT PRESCOD BOULEVARD TO M U REEF COMPANY LIMITED.....2469

Hon. E. E. Greaves, 2469, 2470; Mr. **DeL. O.** Bradshaw, 2470.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE LEASE OF LAND AT **GRANTLEY** ADAMS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT TO CARIBBEAN AIRWAYS LIMITED.....2470

Hon. E. E. Greaves, 2470, 2476; Hon. P. M. Greaves, 2471, 2473; Hon. **H. B.** St. John, 2471; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 2474; Hon. D. J. H. Thompson, 2474; Mr. H. **deB. Forde**, 2475, 2476.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE LEASE OF LAND AT WILDEY TO THE BARBADOS LAWN TENNIS ASSOCIATION.....2477

Hon. E. E. Greaves, 2477; Mr. **DeL. O.** Bradshaw, 2478; Hon. W. W. Hall, 2480.

THE THEFT BILL, 1992.....2483

Hon. M. A. **King**, 2483.

RESOLUTION TO TAKE NOTE OF THE REPORT OF **THE** WEST INDIAN COMMISSION 2483

Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 2483; Hon. H. B. St. John, 2488; Hon. D. H. H. Thompson, 2494; Mr. L. R. **Tull**, 2499; Hon. M. A. **King**, 2504.

SUSPENSION.....2480

ADJOURNMENT.....2505

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 2505.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, Mr. **O. S.** (St. Peter)
BRATHWAITE, Mr. L. L. (St. Michael North East)
BRADSHAW, Mr. **DeL. O.** (St. Michael South East)
FORDE, Mr. H. **deB. (Christ Church West)**
GREAVES, Hon. E. E. (St. Lucy)
GREAVES, Hon. P. M. (St. Michael North)
HALL, Hon. W. W. (St. Michael West Central)
KING, Hon. M. A. (Christ Church West Central)
SANDIFORD, Rt. Hon. L. E. (St. Michael South)
St. JOHN, Hon. H. B. (Christ Church South)
SIMMONS, **Mr. D. A. C.** (St. Thomas)
THOMPSON, Hon. D. J. H. (**St. John**)
TULL, Mr. L. R. (St. George South)