
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1991 – 96

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, October 27, 1992.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 10.15 **a.m.** o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour L. A. **WEEKES**, G.C.M., J.P., (Speaker)
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. 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)
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, **LL.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

Mr. R. C. EASTMOND, B.A., **LL.B.**

Prayers were led by Fr. **Ivan Harewood**.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in session.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, October 20, **1992**.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. **Speaker**, I move that the Minutes of proceedings of this Honourable Chamber for the meeting that was held on **20th October, 1992** be taken **as** read and **confirmed**.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no observations, then let those Minutes stand **confirmed**.

MESSAGES FROM HER EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

"October 13, 1992.

Dear Mr. Speaker,

I shall be away from the island from 14th October to 1st November, 1992 on a visit to **Canada** and the United States of America.

In accordance with the provisions of section 29(1)(b) of the Constitution, the Honourable Sir Denys Williams, GCM, will perform the functions of the office of Governor-General during the period of my absence.

As the Honourable the House of Assembly will not be meeting prior to my departure, it will not be possible for me to use the usual formal Message to be sent down to the Chamber. I therefore request you to please bring my absence formally to the attention of the Honourable House of Assembly when it next meets.

DAME NITA BARROW
GOVERNOR-GENERAL."

CONGRATULATORY AND/OR OBITUARY SPEECHES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I must admit, Sir, that I am in a little difficulty here. I did indicate when we met last time that we would use this occasion to pay tribute to a former parliamentarian who passed away during the Recess, Mr. Wilfred Coward.

It was not my good fortune to have met Mr. Coward, but I knew a little of Mr. Coward and of the little I knew I can now speak, Sir.

Mr. Coward served in this House of Assembly from the year 1961 to 1966 and unfortunately he was not re-elected in the General Election of that year, 1966. As a matter of fact, that was not the only public service that Mr. Coward gave. I understand he was a Vestryman for the parish of St. Joseph, but I do not know if in fact he did serve Government for the northern section of Local Government.

Mr. Coward is best remembered, I believe, for two things. One, in 1958 he fought against the then might of the Barbados Labour Party in a bye-election to fill the seat made vacant by the removal, or the transfer, or the election of Sir Grantley Adams to the Federal Parliament. He fought a valiant fight. In those days I believe the party whips and so on, the party discipline, were not as strong as they are now and it is my understanding, Sir, in fact I do recall that he was ably supported at that time by the then sitting Member for the Barbados Labour Party against the Barbados Labour Party's candidate in the person of Mr. Glenroy Straughn. Needless to say, Sir, Mr. Glenroy Straughn for the Barbados Labour Party won that election.

In the 1961 bye-election, however, the tables were turned, except that Mr. Straughn, having served for about three years in the House of Assembly, did not seek re-election for the St. Joseph constituency, but in fact he

transferred his candidacy for the constituency of St. James and Mr. Coward was elected. Some time subsequently he joined the Democratic Labour Party, which may have been the cause, in 1966, for his defeat at that General Election for the constituency then of St. Joseph.

But I mentioned there were two things. The other one, Sir, is that Mr. Coward's name is well remembered as a business man, as a person who was the owner of some buses. I believe the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would know quite a bit about this, he probably was his legal representative. I am not sure about that, but the Leader of the Opposition himself had some connection in those days, obliquely, with public transport.
10.25 am.

Mr. Coward ran a service for many years, and offered public transportation services to the people in the eastern central sector of Barbados – not St. Andrew, not St. John, as far as I know, nor St. Philip – right through Hothersal Turning until St. Joseph. He was also known, as I understand it and my checking has revealed, as the father of the Bishop Wilfred Wood who is now resident in the United Kingdom and who is well known in Barbados and who comes to Barbados very often.

We often say, Sir, that there are not many of that kind left – a very hard-working gentleman as he was. I believe that his industry, his dedication, could be emulated by a number of younger and older citizens of Barbados. So, Sir, it is for this reason that I stand here this morning to pay tribute to the memory of Mr. Wilfred Coward. May his soul rest in peace.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, since I may be seen as part of a continuum to which Mr. Coward contributed in the sense that he represented the parish of St. Joseph in this Honourable Chamber and it is now my responsibility and privilege to do so during this Session, I want to join in tribute to his memory and his work and to put on record the appreciation of the people of St. Joseph for the service which he rendered and the contributions which he made. Like the Honourable Leader of the House it was not my privilege ever to have met Mr. Coward, but since I was a young man I certainly knew of him, because like Ms. Rock and the Massiahs of Enterprise, Christ Church and Mr. Trotman of Mapp Hill, he was then in the language of the day well-known as a private bus concessionaire. To all reports, he ran a successful and efficient service from Bridgetown through Horse Hill to Bathsheba. That was route 6 as it is now known. It was the route to which he had the concession.

He first came to national attention in 1958 when the First West Indian Federation was established and Sir Grantley Adams vacated that seat and went on to the Federal Parliament. He ran then as an independent, as

was said by the Honourable Leader of the House, and a very interesting situation developed which lead to a serious fracture in **the ranks** of the Barbados Labour Party which **took** many years to heal. Mr. L.E. Smith who made a very worthwhile contribution in this Chamber was then the Junior Member. In those days, there were double member constituencies and he supported Mr. Coward very strongly as an independent in that election when he ran against Mr. **Glenroy** Straughn who was successful for the Barbados Labour Party.

That was to sour **the** relationship between Mr. Straughn and Mr. L.E. Smith to the extent that after a stay of just 2 to 3 years in this Assembly the relationship had become so irreconcilable that Mr. Straughn left the Barbados Labour Party, saying the Barbados Labour Party had a duty to discipline Mr. Smith which duty they did not discharge. In 1961, when Mr. Straughn did not contest **on** behalf of the Barbados Labour Party, the Party embraced Mr. Coward and he won and was in this **Assembly** during the period 1961-1966.

The fact that Mr. Coward **ran** as an independent in 1958 gives us some insight into his political character because all those who knew him attest to the fact that he was really an independent in a way that prior to the 50's that expression was understood; that he was not the sort of man who could adjust to the discipline of the modern party machine. He always wanted to vote as he saw the issue and he found party discipline as we know it today far too onerous.

At the personal level, I have been reliably informed that he was a very approachable and generous man. A lot of people in rural Barbados, particularly in St. Joseph and in St. **Andrew**, would have benefited **from** his generosity and his humanity. He did serve at the community level as well in the old vestry system which preceded the establishment of the local government system in this country and for a few years in the Northern District Council as a councillor. He was the sort of man – and there were many like him in that generation – who made the sort of contribution of which we are the beneficiaries today that helped to build Barbados and make Barbados the sort of place that it is.

I am happy, Sir, **on** my own behalf and on behalf of the people of St. Joseph to join in paying tribute to his memory and I support the Resolution.

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to add my bit to the sentiments expressed this morning in tribute to the life of a true and genuine person. I had the privilege of meeting the late Mr. Coward in the mid 60's in a general way and found him to be one with whom you could converse on possible any topic that he felt he would want to speak on. It was not until the early 80's when I

began my political campaign in the constituency of St. Michael North East that I came even much closer to **him**. During that campaign, I did a personal canvass of himself and his wife and I recognised they were 2 people who had a genuine desire for service to people and, in that regard, they would give you every bit of admonition, every bit of encouragement, to carry your task manfully and meaningfully.

I can say, Sir, that with persons like the late Mr. Coward advising young men and women in any aspect of public life you could not go **wrong** if you followed as closely as you could to the admonition that was given. I do not believe that there is much if anything that could be said by anyone that could or would detract from the quality of service that Mr. Coward gave to the people of Barbados. I do not believe that it is necessary for me to extend the duration of these tributes which have been paid to this very great gentleman, a true **christian** person, and that I would have to go very much further to sincerely and genuinely express my condolences and to pay tribute to the life and work of this true son of Barbados.

I would like in this regard, as parliamentary representative, to offer to his wife and some immediate family whom I have come into contact with, my condolences and pray that God will continue to guide and to bless them for the service of our people.
10.35 am.

Mr. H. **deB. FORDE**: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to speak from a personal position. My friend and colleague Dr. Cheltenham has already adequately spoken on the political perspective of the life of the late **Wilfred** Coward. I got to know him as a young boy growing up principally through his close association with my adopted parents, Mr. and Madame **Ifill**. They were **all** engaged in the entrepreneurial endeavour of providing transport for Barbadians. In those days the transport system was virtually run by private enterprise and later with some Transport Board Central Government contribution. What is significant is that the owners of the private business were mostly black entrepreneurs, none of them born with silver spoons in their mouths. Mr. Coward, even when the business of public transport **became** uneconomical, yet persisted in helping in this service because he saw it as part of his public duty. Not only did he run a transport system but he also, of course, sold gasoline and petrol to the public of **Barbados**. That was the business side of him, Sir.

Mr. Coward was a very quiet gentleman who did his best for people in his Christian way. Himself and his dear wife, she was a teacher for many years, made their mark in a quiet, unassuming, humble manner and without seeking the spotlight. Even when he was in political life he tended **to** be very retiring, some may even say shy, but always approachable.

I would recall, Sir, the advice I got in those days from people like Wilfred Coward, Dan Blackett, J.E.T. Brancker and a whole host of them. A lot of them were associated with the Congress Party in some way but also associated with the Labour Party and the labour movement. One never saw in that group of politicians, although they were very often on the opposite side of each other, some of the enmity and personal disagreement that has crept into public life later. They were able to put their points of view from a position of principle and yet get on together. They taught me many things that I consider helped me through the years, honesty, integrity, appreciation for loyalty, friendship and above all, public service before self.

I want, therefore, to say on behalf of my family that we were privileged to have known a man who has lived out the **christian** principles and whose life heralded Christian virtues. I certainly would like to express our deep condolence at his passing. To his son Bishop Wood, I hope soon he will move on from there to higher things, as well as to his dear wife, we would like to express our deepest condolence.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I just briefly, Mr. Speaker, would wish to add my own words to the tributes paid by Honourable Members to the life and work of Mr. Wilfred Coward. In my capacity as a member of the Democratic Labour Party, I got to know Mr. Coward. I would like to indicate in very broad terms that our society has been dependent for its growth and development on the operations first of **all** of the rule of law, on the institutions public and private which are necessary for the **orderly** evolution of society, but above all, upon the qualities of our **citizenry** and upon those who in larger measure than the average citizen have been able to provide leadership at different levels in the society.

Sir, being myself a very shy, retiring and reticent person, I can certainly understand that style in politics. I would like to recognise a **kindred** spirit in the person of Mr. Wilfred Coward who in his life never sought the path of the contentious or the path of conflict but always sought to find that road to consensus, agreement and pacification.

I believe the development of our society holds a lot to those **kinds** of persons – I am **speaking** now of **Mr. Coward**, not of myself – who have helped through their special contributions, their reliance on integrity, dignity and on a **kind** of faithfulness to the principles upon which they place great responsibility and I think we should really take note of that **kind** of contribution.

Sir, today we have no institutions of Local Government as we had in the past but we have other kinds of institutions to perform the duties that such institutions provided in the past. Throughout our country from St. Joseph on one side to St. **James** on the other, and from St.

Philip on one side to St. Lucy on the other, we have had in our past those local institutions that have sought to look after the interest and needs of people at that local level.
10.45 am.

That we have been able to reach the stage we have in the development of our society is due, in no small measure, to the work of persons like Wilfred Coward who conscientiously devoted their time and their talents towards the work, not spectacular and not on the pinnacle of popularity but certainly on the basis of what is good for your neighbour and I think we should recognize that.

His contribution also in the House of Assembly has been quiet and dignified. I have from my recollections and my readings of the history of Parliamentary **life** in Barbados I have never known him to be in conflict or any serious conflict with the Chair. He always sought to **abide** by the rules but he would make **his** points and make them as **firmly** as possible.

I would like, Sir, to pay a tribute to the life that he lived and the contribution that he has made at local and national level to the development of our society. I would join in extending not only thanks for the life that he lived but also to his surviving wife and other members of his family condolence and the hope that they will continue in similar vein to make a contribution to the upbuilding of our society.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to associate myself with the tributes paid this morning by Honourable Members on the occasion of the passing of Mr. Wilfred Coward former Member of this House.

I have never had the opportunity to be close to him or in any way associated with him but from what I glean from people older **than** myself, I **think** the sentiments expressed this morning are well within reason of the late gentleman. In so doing I am going to ask Honourable Members to stand one minute in silence as we pass the resolution.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I give notice of a number of measures here. **First:**

A Resolution to approve the sale under section 5 of the Crown Lands (**Vesting** and Disposal) Act, **Cap.225** to Gweneth Hinds of land together with the building **thereon** at Black **Bess**, **St. Peter**.

Secondly:

A Resolution to approve the sale under section 5 of the Crown Lands (Vesting and Disposal) Act, **Cap.**

225 to Ernest Alleyne of land together with the building **thereon** at **Baywoods** in St. James.

Also, Sir

A Resolution to approve the sale under section 5 of the Crown Lands (**Vesting** and **Disposal**) Act, Cap. 225 to Wycliffe Estwick and **Elaine** Estwick of land together with the building **thereon** at Venture, St. John.

A Resolution to approve the sale under section 5 of the **Crown Lands** (Vesting and Disposal) Act, Cap. 225 to Daphne Dear of land together with the building **thereon** at Vauxhall, Christ Church.

Also, Sir

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at **Bourne's** Land, St. **Christopher**, Christ Church for the construction of an access road.

I also give notice of two Bills.

First:

The Barbados Investment and Development Corporation Bill, 1992, **as** well **as** the Barbados Foreign Sales Corporation (Amendment) Bill, 1992.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

On the separate motions of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. M. A. KING, the Barbados Investment and Development Corporation Bill, 1992 and the Barbados Foreign Sales Corporation (Amendment) Bill, 1992 were read a first time.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move, Sir, that Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, **42(5)**, 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of this sitting.

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

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

ORDER NO. 1 – FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF THE RESOLUTION TO TAKE NOTE OF **THE** REPORT OF THE WEST INDIAN COMMISSION

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, I think that the Moyne Commission of 1945 is probably the only commission report that is comparable to the one under present discussion in terms of its scope and in terms of its **aims** and intentions. I think that particular report led to significant changes in the Caribbean and is largely responsible for the structure, economic, political and otherwise, that **predominates** in the region today. There are several parallels, even in terms of the way how it is presented. The Moyne Commission had a substantial large document which was both descriptive and prescriptive. They had one document which really summarised the major proposals and it had a small executive summary and I think the Commissioners, probably, used that same style in terms of the presentation that they have given to us. I think anybody who wants to comment on the Report has to read the large document. One cannot depend on anything else other than the major document. I believe it is going to be a very important, and a recommended piece of reading for understanding the Caribbean as it is at this time. I think it is a very valuable report on the perceptions on a number of persons on where the Caribbean is at this time. It has a lot of valuable **insights** in terms of a snapshot of the region at this particular juncture of our development.

However, I think, that as a whole, the document fails us in certain very fundamental areas. First of all, the issue of Federation – political union. I think the document takes, on the recommendations of those who presented them, what I **can** almost consider to be a cowardly approach on a **fundamentally** important issue for Caribbean people and a moving away from the issue of political federation and political union, and abandoning that issue, I don't think that interest of the region is well served.

In 1986 I remember Dr. **Demas** addressing the Institute of International Relations in Trinidad, **making** the fundamental point that we **have** to move towards West Indian **nationhood**, we have to do it as soon as possible, because the longer we delay the less chance there would be for that success. I can understand the certain fear in moving towards federation, based on an analysis of those ventures that have been **tried** and have failed. I can understand that. It is human if you look at any kind of experiment or if you want to get involved in any undertaking that we look at the track record of

the particular type of institution that we want to become involved in. I think that fundamental fear that if you go that route that you will fail again, is still perhaps influencing our decision in this matter.

I think we have to **ask** a fundamental question. What do we, in the Caribbean, really want? If we are **talking** about working closer together, why? If we are **talking** about integration, but only to a certain point, why? What is the logic of integration to a certain point, but cut off there don't go any further? What are we going to achieve by doing that? I believe that almost every group has a particular reason, maybe even different, for the whole exercise. Perhaps for the businessmen they see an area where capital can move more freely and where there can dominate and make more wealth. That might be an interest of the business people. Quite frankly I have never heard any particular push coming from businessmen in the Caribbean about integration. They have to be out there **fronting**, taking on the whole issue. Maybe for sportsmen and cultural **enthusiasts**, they will get a bigger audience for **their** skills and so on. That might be the big issue for them. For the bureaucrats and the public servants you have a wider field that they can exercise their **skills**. There are some who believe and who would put abroad, and this is very popular in **terms** of bashing politicians in our region, that **the** politicians want a wider field so that they can mismanage more or something like that, or that they can have more power. That is **the kind** of thing you will be hearing these **days**.

I believe that the consequence of any attempts at integration, for whatever purposes, and for all of those purposes included, must result in a bigger area for governance. Once you want to come together, whether you want to do **that** for economic reasons or whatever reasons, the consequence must be that you are extending the area of governance and that you cannot be satisfied after a while to have a **kind** of part-time political input on an ad **hoc** basis, whether you are going to call it, Heads of Governments Meetings occasionally or Council of Ministers Meetings occasionally or whatever. That might be an initial stage but you have to move further than that. To me it is inevitable if we are serious about calls for integration in the Caribbean, that part of that integration has to be political **integration** and that **eventually** we have to keep on thinking in terms of a political union of the Caribbean region. Recognising the difficulties involved, but recognising also, that you cannot create a partial **kind** of integration for economic reasons etc. without understanding **that** in doing that you are creating a wider forum for governance and that you cannot avert the responsibility that politicians will have to take over and control the region. I have no qualms about that at all.

I believe we have the competence in the region to provide the kind of political governance that is necessary.

I believe that we are quite capable to produce a leadership from this region at whatever level of the political spectrum to do what has to be done. I believe that people of my generation, people after me, will demand of our leaders that we cannot give just halfway measures in these matters and believe that a partial attempt at integration will satisfy the needs, **first** of all to bring ourselves together in order to face those difficulties in the world out there, because as far as I am concerned, the opposite of that is a resignation to the fact that we will just be open entities for manipulation by other structures that will come into being and will be able to manipulate us easier if we remain in this **kind** of loose operation without that political **framework** that is vitally important.

I believe that the Commission is not sure whether it is reflecting the views of the people that it spoke to – I am not sure in this regard – or whether this is a position from the commissioners that political union, political federation, is not the thing. I am not sure when they went through this region and they asked questions, whether in fact, they are supposed to be faithfully reporting what the people are asking for or whether they have now looked at that, **sanitised** it, synthesized it, and given their views as commissioners. That is not always clear to me whether in fact the people are speaking through the Commissioners or whether the Commissioners are speaking for the people.
11.05 a.m.

That leads me to the second point, Mr. Speaker, the whole question about this West Indian Commission and where it should be. I think the Commission should be the ad **hoc** mechanism, **not** any ad **hoc** political leadership in the region. The Commission has done a good job up to this point in time and they must be called into being if we need them again, in a kind of target approach, go and investigate and report on other issues, but we need not incorporate them into any CARICOM Secretariat placing themselves very humbly in these proposals somewhere beneath the Heads of Government and beneath the Council of Ministers, but somewhere in there in the CARICOM Secretariat and co-opting **the** Secretary General to work with them. I believe that is a strategy, quite frankly I **see** a **kind** of trojan horse approach, that once they get in there in the structure, in fact, far from taking directions **from** the Heads of Government and the Ministers, I feel their intention is to start giving directions and controlling the political directorate. They make some statements sometimes that cause me a certain concern, as though they are coming in and not giving you everything up front. They hesitate to elaborate on the structure for the Commission. In other words, they have a ball game they already have in mind once they get in what they will now be putting forward to really elaborate their role within the entire system, the instruments of implementation they want to put forward. It is clear to me that they see themselves as the persons who will be taking over the whole exercise and that they will

be giving instructions basically to the political directorate. I am concerned about that and I believe that they have a clear responsibility to come up front and say what they really intend, because, **as** I said, I do not believe that we are getting the full details in terms of how they **see** themselves at this point in time. They want to get a little step in the **door** and then afterwards you will be hearing all sorts of elaborate ideas about how they **see** themselves **as** performing. Our fear, quite frankly, is that we **are** only elaborating a bureaucracy.

Let us understand what is happening in the Caribbean. You have a number of persons, distinguished sons of the Caribbean, who have already gone through the CARICOM Secretariat. They have been top persons there, or they have operated at the level, let us say, of the Commonwealth Secretariat. They have been top persons there or at other international institutions, so they do not feel they can come back **and** go into these bodies and operate and they have to find something that is on **top**. They have to find a niche now. They believe that they have skills, they believe that they have a lot to offer the region, and they believe they cannot do that within the normal existing **structures**, these are super human resource types in the Caribbean, a very elitist group, a group of intellectuals and **cognoscenti**, people who feel that they **are** above the rest and that they really now have to hitch the region to their wagon and pull the region along. These are some stallions, pure thoroughbreds, and they believe that they have this God-given role now to pull along all of these politicians and everybody else who do not quite know what to do, who do not have what they call political will and **all sorts** of other things and they are going to provide the motor, the engine, to carry the region along. It calls for a whole lot of "**chutzpah**", a whole lot of conceit, if you wish.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I believe it is in use. I am not sure if you will find it in the dictionary, but it is in common parlance. I am not sure if it is quite parliamentary, so I would say a lot of conceit, Sir. There is a lot of conceit operating here and I do not think we want to start on a venture like this at the level of conceit. I believe that we need to recognise that even though those resources are available for the use of the Caribbean, those who hold those resources must not **see** themselves **as** being contemptuous of the people's representatives. I **am** saying that coming out of a lot of the discussions and what I **am** reading is this criticism of governance in the region, **as** though **those** who have the political responsibility to control these **territories** are for some reason or other worse than, let us say, the bureaucrats and the public servants. They have a better record than the politicians in terms of delivering service to people, or the business people, or the intellectuals at the University, or any other group in our

society, and that the area of problems in the Caribbean is at the level of governance, **as** they would call it.

If there are problems in the Caribbean at the level of governance, it is because **governance** is not easy, it is a very difficult, complex area of human activity. That is why so few people get involved in it anyhow. It is much easier to stand off and criticise than to get in the **ring** in the area of governance, and you will make mistakes because you are **trying** very big things, and I do not **like** the kind of sneering approach I **see** sometimes coming through in these reports when they mention the whole concept of governance and so on.

Let us look at the question of the Caribbean Assembly of Parliamentarians, which is **along the** lines we are talking now. I support the concept of a Caribbean Assembly of Parliamentarians, not any debating society, not any club. I went through youth groups and clubs with some distinguished members of this Assembly before graduating to the level of becoming a parliamentarian. Once you get there you do not **see** anybody walking in because he belongs to some interest group and then he has equal say with parliamentarians. A Caribbean Assembly of Parliamentarians must be just that. You must have your views, your policies, your programmes. Go out there to the people and get elected, and **then** when you speak in **that** Assembly of Parliamentarians on behalf of those persons who put you there, then you can discuss all those myriad issues that have to be discussed at the regional, at the national, at the international level. There will be no difficulty in finding a programme of policies to be discussed within a Caribbean Assembly of Parliamentarians.

I am fully **supportive** of the concept of participation for **all** interest groups, but there must be a methodology to be worked out that interest groups will feel that they have full access to getting their views into that Caribbean Assembly of Parliamentarians. I would suggest perhaps the system that is used in the European Community, where you have a social and economic committee on which you will have business people, church representation, people **on** the gender issue or whatever, and they will get together and come up with opinions. Once they have discussed these opinions and they have a firm view of what they want to be discussed at the level of Parliament, they will send these on through Parliament, which will be discussed then, **and** once those opinions are accepted, then they can be legislated into being. You therefore have that relationship, that opportunity to participate, but you do not have to be in Parliament in order to get your views heard and expressed. You have to **learn** the skills of lobbying, working together and so on, but for me there should be a Caribbean **Assembly** of Parliamentarians which will do the legislative and other functions that one would expect in a region such as ours. I believe it is out of that body that eventually -

I do not know how long it will take – we will evolve the mechanism for that political union we are **talking** about. It will give an opportunity for parliamentarians from throughout the region, those in Government and those in Opposition, to meet often. It is vitally important to understand that when we are talking about a Caribbean Assembly of Parliamentarians we are not talking about only those in Government meeting, we **are** talking about representing the region. The Government side and the Opposition side must be able to send representatives to that Assembly to discuss the issues that are important at the regional level.

There is much talk within the Report also about a Charter of Civil Society. The European Community talks about a Charter of Social Rights, but the West Indian Commission has gone wider than that and has provided for what it calls a Charter of Civil Society. Quite frankly, I **am** surprised that it has to come to this because when I go through what appears to be the movement towards details in terms of what it wants to do, basically, all those rights that are mentioned **are** already covered by United Nations conventions in one **form** or another and the ILO conventions etc. **All** we have to ask for is that the Governments of the region ratify those existing conventions and apply them.

11.15 am.

This thing about a Charter of Civil Society – I believe I know for whom it wants to devise this. That is not for the present members of CARICOM. I think that this is why they talk about widening now. When they want to bring in Haiti and the Dominican Republic and a lot of non-democratic countries... I want to be very clear about this. I have strong views about widening CARICOM to bring in those countries that do not have a tradition of democracy. I believe in parliamentary democracy very much. I have said over and over again I **am** a democratic socialist and I believe in democracy. I do not want to be associated with countries that have a bad track record in **terms** of not following democracy. I do not want to widen CARICOM to put in any Haiti, any Dominican Republic and Cuba and those **kinds** of people. Let them get their act together first. I **am** very serious about that.

I will not be in a situation where the workers of Barbados **are** enjoying **certain** civil and trade union rights and it is costing our country and therefore causing wages to be fairly high and then those countries that do not have any rights **are** able to undersell us in the market by cheap labour. Talking about competitive advantage, the only advantage they **are** taking is advantage of the workers of those countries. I **am** not going to join in any league with those people until they establish basic human, trade union and civil rights.

I want to be very clear that the commissioners and **all** of those who have these romantic **notions** of this wider Caribbean because we have this geographical proximity, that we **are** some brothers and sisters, have to convince me that I **am** brother and sister to the people in the Dominican Republic or Haiti in any real or meaningful **sense**. I am not talking about any existential notions now. I **am talking** about reality. When those people get their **acts** together then we will be quite ready to welcome **them**.

Asides.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I **am talking** as a parliamentarian with a **certain** consciousness.

Asides.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: What I **am** saying to you, Sir, is that I can understand the notion in **terms** of which we want broader markets etc. when we widen; but I am saying that you must widen against a certain principle, and the basic and underlying principle that I consider **to** be vitally important is, what do we share in common in terms of notions of polity, notions of morality and the rights of workers? I **am** not romantic in this respect. While I **am** saying that I cannot close my mind to the idea of a wider Caribbean at some time, it does not seem to me **to** be something that I would want to hasten into. Let us **deal** with the entities that we **are** working with **now** and **try** to upgrade the conditions within them before we go out there and get involved with issues **that** I think **are** going to be herculean to change like **what** is happening in the Dominican Republic.

I do not **know** whether our members are aware, but even the United States of America has recently had **to** take very strong action against the Dominican Republic **because** they enjoy **certain** privileges **under** the GSP. The **United** States Government had to force the Dominican Republic to try to institute a minimum labour code. They are not sticking to that labour **code**. They **are** flouting the United States of America. The same thing is happening in some of the Latin American countries that we are supposed to be joining hands in hands with in a widening of CARICOM. **These are** very serious matters. These **countries** do not have a democratic tradition and it is serious if you **start** doing business with them. You have to understand what the ramifications of that will be. Let us deal with the core group we understand now and do not **run** into any question of widening the community at this time.

When I look at the economic **underpinning** of the proposals, quite frankly, the Commission is very conservative in its approach to the economics of the region. I **am** not necessarily criticising that. It seems **to** me that they **are** saying that we **are** into a situation where we have to go far the export-led growth and all of the prescriptions are in the normal direction – more savings, more investments

among local people, improvement of human resources. Fundamentally, what it is telling you is to get ready for **NAFTA** and **all** of those basic trading arrangements that are put in place.

I think that they **are** almost saying, "Make up your minds to be absorbed in the American system!" It is a surrender to the existing system, to make yourself as efficient as possible to be absorbed. To me, they do not **take** a challenging position in terms of how we are going to be dealing with our resources and how we are going to take control of them. Although they **talk** about entrepreneurial **skills** it seems to me that they deal with these things in passing because they have **to**. I would like to **see** a stronger approach in terms of using institutions like cooperatives and credit unions. I would like to **see** a more positive approach to pushing them as mechanisms for moving the region forward.

I would like to **see** them deal more **frontally** with things like the land question in the Caribbean – I think they **sidepass** these **things** – and questions of ownership and control of the **wealth**. I think it is just a very **blase** kind of approach to the economics of the region. I do not think **there** is anything to recommend it particularly. I do not see any concept of utilising the resources of Trinidad and Guyana and Barbados and blending and creating Caribbean multinationals or **transnationals**. It **seems** to me to be fairly **light** in this matter.

There are 2 **final** matters that I will be very brief on. They relate to the question of the **freedom** of movement and the single market for human resources. Again, Sir, they cannot **get** past a **kind** of elitist notion that you can move just the skilled people, just the university graduates and so on, the top persons. This cannot be real at this stage. They can give that in the interim report but when they put in the full report I expect them to be talking in a more meaningful way about the movement of people, not just people at the top but the movement of people in this **Caribbean**. This elitist report cannot be serious.

There are some things that I certainly will support because there **are** 200 recommendations but I cannot focus on all of them. I support the whole concept of the CARICOM Supreme Court. We were talking about a Caribbean Court of Appeal and they have tacked on to that the whole question of a Supreme Court with original jurisdiction for matters relating to CARICOM law and building up law relating to the Community. It seems to me that that is a support for a position that we have taken.

As I said, there are other good things in the document in terms of things like culture that I would not **want** to spend a lot of time on. I believe, Sir, that this document is useful, but in terms of the final positions taken, we have not been well served. I believe that we have to **look**

seriously at this document if it is going to be an action plan to guide us in terms of where we have to go in the future.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central, my long-standing and distinguished friend, reflected a perception which is fairly widespread in the region relating to this Report. It is that the authors of the Report have recommended structures which they hope in time themselves to populate. I think that that perception is very unfortunate indeed. Put differently, Sir, and perhaps more simply, there is a perception abroad that they might have recommended **certain** positions which they themselves hope to fill. I do not know myself that that is true but that perception **has**, I think, distorted the debate.
11.25 am.

Perhaps, they may do **the** integration movement a great service if even as late as now they make it clear that they, as authors of the Report, have no interest in any job which may be created as a result of their recommendations. I think **that** perception which is widespread has tended to distort the debate and to give it a kind of personality focus which we must do out utmost to resist and rise above.

Sir, like all Honourable Members who **spoke** thus far in this debate I too welcome this discussion. I lament the fact that we in this Parliament do not devote more time to discussion on the integration movement. We only deal with the integration movement tangentially, as it were when issues with regional implications come before Parliament. I think we almost have a duty to cultivate a public interest in the movement. To **that** extent I **hope** the Prime Minister of **the** day, whoever he is, either before going to **the** annual **Heads** of Government Summit, will initiate debate on the state of the integration movement, or alternatively, after he comes back from the Summit, so that the House can allow him to speak with more certainty by expressing our views and also helping, as I said earlier, to cultivate a public interest in the integration movement.

Over a century we in Barbados have been discussing what form of an association with the islands of the Eastern Caribbean at one point and at a later point the wider Caribbean economic, administrative and political should take. As has been pointed out by the Rt. Honourable Prime Minister last week in his contribution **the** attempt at confederation in the last century by Barbados and the Windward Islands failed. We all know that resulted in what has come to be known in our history as the Confederation Riots. But since then, Sir, there have been fairly serious attempts at a West Indian Federation comprising all the islands of the **English-speaking** Caribbean. That attempt reached its high water mark I think in 1947 at the Montego Bay Conference.

Even though we are over 45 years away from that Conference now we can still hear the ringing peroration

of Norman Manley, as he then was saying ~~that~~ if we do not leave the multiple vessels – and I am paraphrasing, Sir – of West Indian insularity for the larger vessel of West Indian unity, that history will condemn us as purblind. It was that momentum that reached its climax in Montego Bay that **took us** through to the first West Indian Federation in 1958. I need not recite the history of that, Sir. It was ill-fated and by 1962 it came to an end.

The point I wish to make, Sir, is the thinking that informed the move towards the West Indian Federation was that these small islands, with their fragile economies and small populations, with their inability to support **armies** and navies, consular and diplomatic staff in many of the world capitals, that we could not achieve dominion status except through the vehicle of federation. That, indeed, was supported by the thinking in the international community all through the 1940s and into **the** 1950s.

By 1962, as it **has** been described by one author, there was an outbreak of the virus of sovereignty in the world and 22 states joined the United Nations **as** new members. There was a new outlook so that when Norman Manley, then Premier of Jamaica, approached the then Colonial Secretary, Ian **McCloud** in 1962 and said, "Could **Jamaica** proceed to independence alone?" to which he replied, "Yes", that led to a remarkable piece of arithmetic, 1 from 10 leaving 0. So the whole attempt at federation and integration had collapsed Jamaica and Trinidad were to proceed to independence and within a matter of a few short years Barbados and Guyana, and subsequently all the islands of the Eastern Caribbean were to proceed to independence.

The point I am making here, Sir, is that with the collapse of the **West** Indian Federation, and the acceptance as it were, because I think it was **there** for the taking, of independence by all of these countries, a major inducement towards the integration movement was removed. But simultaneously, a major obstacle to integration came into being, namely, sovereignty. Where I think, however, the authors of this Report fell into error is ~~that~~ they misjudged the mood both of the politicians and the people in rejecting some form of federalism even **as** an ultimate aid.

I would contend that 10 years ago you could not talk to a West Indian politician about federalism. The experience of independence was **too** recent for them to abandon it and cede any of their sovereignty. But after 25, and in some instances 30 years, I think both the in-group of politicians in **the** region and the out-group, those in Opposition and those in Government, know now too well the limitations of sovereignty to the point that they are prepared and would be prepared to support some form of giving up of that sovereignty into some supernational body. I think at the heart of the Report is that weakness.

It is part of a contradiction which runs through the Report because quite often the recommendations and the conclusions do not support the premise or even the logic of the argument advanced in the Report. That is not surprising in a way because in the real world you have to think of something that will work. Often what will work is not what is logical but what is practical and sometimes practicality calls for compromise and inconsistency. There are some difficulties in **the** region which the Commissioners had to contend with.

For example they have had to contend with the fact that Jamaicans continue to be very ambivalent to West Indian Federation and West Indian integration. There are a lot of people in Jamaica, including people in the political class, that see Jamaica's destiny as tied up with North America. Equally, there are many who think they have some destiny and future in the Caribbean. That sort of ambivalence, I think, is reflected in some of the contradictions ~~that~~ run through **the** Report.

I think that in addressing the Report, however, we ought not to focus on its weaknesses even though some of them are striking, but to see the Report in terms of its totality and look at the backdrop against which **the** Report was commissioned and what it was intended to do. For the last many years the integration movement has lost its momentum. It has, as it were, run into the doldrums. It was felt urgently necessary that some new dynamic could be brought to the integration movement. That is the backdrop against which the Report was commissioned. It was felt that bold, new initiatives were necessary if the log-jamb almost was to be broken and if we were to move forward in a dramatic way in the West Indian integration movement.

The major proposal in terms of a new **structure** which is the Commission which they are proposing has **attracted** a lot of criticism in this House and, perhaps, rightly so. 11.35 am.

Its role has not been carefully spelt out both in relation to the major **decision-making** body which is the Heads of Government and also in relation to the CARICOM Secretariat. We are not too sure how the Commission, were it to be implemented, would relate to the Secretariat. Would it be another unrivalled bureaucracy or would the CARICOM Secretariat at present be integrated into the Commission? I think that that is an area that calls for further refinement in particular what will be the role in future of the Secretary-General? In my view he should become the Director-General of what in future will be a Commission. The bureaucracy will be the Commission and he should be the chief **decision-maker** and manager of that, the Chief Executive Officer. I do not quarrel with his being a member *ex officio* of the Commission but I think ~~that~~ we need to give more thought, there needs to be

more refinement as to the relationship between the proposed Commission and the Secretariat and the proposed Commission and the Heads of Government. But I am not for wholesale rejection of the idea. I only wonder whether a Commission that **has** no **supernational** competence can get the job done which it is intended to do. Regardless of the stature of these Commissions could they get decisions implemented simply by raking up the phone or visiting these constituent members of the integration movement and saying to a particular Minister or even the Prime Minister, what about that decision that was taken two years ago? When is your country going to move towards implementing it?

I think that they would need to be clothed with **supernational** competence in order to achieve that. Merely to establish a Commission and to populate it with some well respected wise men of the region I do not think would be enough. This is the fundamental contradiction and inconsistency in the Report that they have argued in such a way that we cannot do without giving up some sovereignty and having a **supernational** Commission. Yet nowhere do they recommend that.

But we ought not to see weaknesses alone. I **think** that we are all indebted to the Commissioners for the job which they have done in terms of complexity and scope and even in terms of depth analysis, it is in my respects an incomparable document. It has been likened to the **Moyne** Commission Report but in some respects it differs from that too because they gave us an external view of our future, **one** which reflected in large measure the views of people who were on the ground here and active. They came and they heard the evidence of people like Sir Grantley Adams, Grantley Adams as he then was and **many** other leaders across the region and the Report really reflected in large measure what West Indians thought about themselves and their future and what institutions should be put in place of a political, social and economic nature. It has been a document which has set the agenda for West Indian societies for almost 50 years. I have no doubt **that** we will return again and again to this West Indian Commission Report and that it would have that sort of impact on the integration movement for the next 40 or 50 years. But the significant different is that this has been a home grown view of our future. **All** the Commissioners were West Indians and what we have here is a home grown view.

In my view there are several useful parts of the Report which I think we need to comment upon very quickly. Part of the reason why the integration movement has fallen into the doldrums has got to do with the unanimity rule, the fact that the West Indian integration movement became like a convoy. It could only have gone forward at the pace of the slowest ship. And if it were possible as indeed happened with respect to the original agricultural marketing protocol, as happened with respect

to the Nassau Agreement, as happened in relation to the Common External Tariff that the smallest island **states** in the region, **Montserrat** for example with a population of only 12 000 to 15 000 people they were able to say no we are not prepared to go at the pace recommended or to make any decision or to honour even the Agreement which we agreed to and to that extent nothing could happen for many **years**.

To the extent that the Commissioners have recommended a new formula whereby for some decisions we will only need a simple majority, in some **cases** you will need a 2/3 majority and in some cases unanimity I think that they have perhaps arrived at a formula which will assist the movement in going forward at a greater pace and that the unanimity rule will no longer be the sort of obstacle that it has been in the **past**. I myself wondered whether it was **necessary** to have the 3/4 rule. I thought it might have been enough to define a large number of decisions where a simple majority would be enough and to just reserve a narrow area of subjects where it would be necessary to have full agreement. But they have made a recommendation which I think is helpful on that issue and I think that that is to be applauded.

To be applauded too is the recommendation that the CARICOM bureaucracy should have **an** independent **source** of funding. That has been a problem area for a long time and Barbados long ago made a proposal which has **been** accepted by the Commissioners in substance **and** that is **that** a certain proportion of our import duties should be devoted to the financing of the **CARICOM** Secretariat, It should be largely independent of the whims and fancies of particular Ministers of Finance who may decide for one reason or another this year not to advance any money depending on whether they are satisfied or dissatisfied with what may or may not be 'happening at the CARICOM Secretariat. I think that that is **an important** mechanism which will advance the process.

But I return to a **major** weakness and that is the absence of the **supernational** body to enforce rules and regulations and to make people honour agreements reached. I maintain that **the** proposal for **three** Commissioners without **supernational** competence cannot answer that problem. I must repeat myself in this regard but it remains a fundamental weakness of the Report that nowhere have they suggested that there should be a body that would have power to enforce the decisions to make them binding **and** effective. That could only happen if you clothe one of the institutions with some **supernational** competence.

Whenever there has been serious discussion about West Indian integration we have talked about freedom of movement. You will recall that in the **days** leading up to the **first** West Indian Federation there were these many Reports on the location, on Customs union and on

freedom of movement. That was always seen as at the centre of West Indian integration. For one reason or another not even in the first West Indian Federation did it come to pass. But over the years we in Barbados have known what freedom of movement means. So many fellow West Indians have come to live here and have been accepted in our shores.

What I find disappointing – and the point has been made by the last Honourable Member who spoke – is that even though I accept that we have to proceed on a gradual basis with respect to **freedom** of movement, we cannot just get up one day and say let 10 000 people go to Barbados and 40 000 people to Trinidad and so because that would cause a certain dislocation. So the approach has got to be **gradualist**. But I find it very difficult to understand why is it that the recommendation has to be that the graduate class should be allowed to move freely in the islands at the outset and not others. What is the case against the steelbender from Barbados moving freely across the region? It is a scarce skill. What is the **case** against the bricklayer? What is the **case** against the technicians, the machine technicians, that are in short supply across the region? Why can't we not start with those categories and why have we got to start with the graduate class from Mona, from Cave Hill and from St. Augustine? I find that hard to accept and I would suggest that in that respect that notion, too, needs refinement.

11.45 am.

I think that another **area** of **weakness** – and I hope that I have been **talking** about some of the areas of strength, in that respect and giving a balanced presentation – has to do with what the Honourable Member for Christ Church South spoke about last week. At the end of the day the integration movement, if it is to be meaningful, must have an impact on people's lives and particularly they would be concerned about their economic betterment. They want to know that there is an increase in intra-regional trade, they want to know that the integration movement has led to a higher standard of living for them all and the critical institution in the whole process is a payments mechanism. We had a good payments mechanism working until Trinidad allowed the fuel for Guyana to be passed through the mechanism, contrary to the Rules. That is the real reason why the Multi Lateral Clearing Facility collapsed. It remains a concept of very viable notion. It proved that it could work, and indeed it did work and whether we amend it or we put something new in its place the point is that we cannot have this increase in intra-regional trade unless we have a payments mechanism. In that respect the Report is weak because it does not sufficiently focus and come up with a **firm** recommendation as to the type of payments mechanism that we are to have as we **are** bound to have one if we are to finance **intra-regional** trade.

I regard **the** recommendations with respect to civil society as important. We too readily forget **the** extent to which strong men in these small societies can distort the democratic procedures and cause a reign of **terror** to set in. Only a few years ago that was the situation under Gairy in Grenada and I very well remember my friend Bishop having to come to Barbados in order to hold **press** conferences and appeal to a wider public opinion about what was happening in his country.

The people of Guyana who have lived for many, many years under **Burnhamite** repressions, **reacted** by migrating in their hundreds and **thousands** all across North America and across the Caribbean. But, they had no wider society to which they could appeal. **The** media was controlled, they had no means of expressing themselves and when a boss begins to terrorise a society, this can happen and it so often happens in small societies, even the judiciary is affected and all the means of **information** and broadcast fall under the **dictation** of the boss. So we have to have some moorings as they are referred to in the Report. We have to have a charter, we have to have a code for human rights, civil and political. We have to have an institution that interprets it and gives it meaning **and** enforces it so that I support at once the proposal for civil society and I also support the establishment of a Caribbean Court of Appeal with an **original** **and** appellate jurisdictions.

There will always be reservations about **the** Caribbean Court, but those of us who have appeared before Her Majesty's Privy Council and who are familiar with **that** body, we have reservations about **that too**. The reality is that there are reservations about all human institutions but I know of no good reason why we should prefer the Privy Council to a well established West Indian Court of Appeal. I know of no good reason why we should prefer it. We sometimes doubt the ability and the integrity of our own people and there is no reason, history has proven, why we ought to doubt that. We can find people, across the region, of enough learning, of enough independence of outlook, of enough stature to populate these institutions. About **that** I have absolutely no doubt.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think we have got to remind ourselves of the world in which we live **and the** real urgency in **trying** to lift the **integration** movement out of the doldrums and move forward **and** address the challenges confronting us. I believe **the** Honourable Member for St. George South, last week, addressed that question but it is important enough to bear repetition. The bi-polar world in which we grew up no longer exists. We have **seen** the **globalisation** of production, an important new **development** and the emergence of major trading blocs across the **world**. The fact that Eastern **Europe** needs to be supported in its search for a democratic way of life means that **the** major western donor agencies **are** more interested in

supporting that effort than in supporting us in the Caribbean. So we **are** in danger of becoming **marginalised**. It is an expression which is very **frequently** used but we have to appreciate fully what it means, **that** we would be a forgotten people **as** it **were**, in relation to these donor agencies and we have to **find** ways and means of pooling our resources and of **strengthening** our collective voice so that we cannot be ignored and among other things that is what **the** Commission's Report attempts to do, to point us in those **directions**.

I think that on the whole therefore, even though we legitimately must and should have **reservations** with respect to particular notions, that we should **accept** the Report in terms of its **thrust** and in terms of its emphasis but that we should also ask **that** particular areas be **refined** and we must be very **careful** not to lapse into the West Indian habit which in **part** contributed **to** the collapse of the attempt at the "Little Eight" and which plagued the attempt **too**, at the **first** West Indian Federation, had it not been the enormous **momentum** **that** had **been** built up at **Montego** Bay where we said, delay **the** implementation further and let us have some studies.

We have **been** overrun by studies in this region. There have been **too** many studies. There is need for refinement in particular areas. In my view there is **need** for **refinement** of the notion of West Indian Parliament or Regional Parliament. I would like to hear more and to see set out with more particularity its role, its function, its composition.
11.55 am.

I would **like to see** the notion of **the** Commission further **refined** both in its relationship to the Heads of Government and also in terms of its relationship to the Secretary General and the Secretariat, but in my submission **that** is no good reason for rejecting the proposal. I would myself appoint the **Commissioners** and **ask** them as their first responsibility to do the **refining**, but I think it is important **that** we respond to **the** challenges which **are** confronting us and that we do our utmost to rescue the Movement **from** the doldrums into which it has fallen. I would like to urge the Prime Minister to adopt that sort **of** **approach** **as** he addresses the items on the Heads of Government agenda in another few days.

I am much obliged, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, the point has been made over and over again **that** the Report of the West Indian Commission is useful if for **no** other reason than that it embodies in one document a whole host of issues which are necessary to be addressed if regional **integration** is to be achieved.

When one examines the very many recommendations of the Commission – and I understand there **are** some 225 or more proposals – it is evident at a glance that, if you just pick up the Report and **look** through the recommendations, the countries which make up CARICOM **are** more or less at some stage of dealing with some of the proposals which **are** embodied in the Report of the Commission. The countries **are** indeed at various stages of implementation of some of the **recommendations** of the Commission, so that there is a lot in the Report of the Commission which is not entirely new. **The** political leaders of the region and the thinkers of the region have from time to time grappled with some of the issues, although they may not have been able to reach solutions, and discussion is taking place on them.

The Commission itself: Mr. Speaker, has noted that some of the recommendations which they have made, such, for instance, as those on the establishment of the single market and economy **and on** the movement of labour, have been the subject of discussion by CARICOM Heads of Government. They recognise **too** the fact that at CARICOM Heads of Governments meetings specific Heads of Government have been **allocated**, as it were, portfolios on the issue of integration for which they have been charged responsibility to come up with solutions and programmes for implementation.

The Commission notes, quite properly as well, that some of the recommendations which they have made will require progressive action rather than immediate action. They identify the proposal calling for a regional cultural policy. They note **too** that **some** of the recommendations which they have made will **require** actions not by Governments but by agencies other than Governments, by the private sector, **trade** unions for instance, private business interests **and** they identify the recommendations in relation to bananas and **rum**.

What is abundantly clear from reading **the** Report of the Commission is that no one in his right mind can expect that the total recommendations of the Commission can all be implemented at one and the same time. Therefore what is necessary, and what I think everyone has to recognise and note is that in order for the process of **integration** to move forward, there has to be a properly planned and phased structure, taking into account from time to time as we go along the difficulties which particular countries will have in the implementation process from time to time and where possible and where necessary making allowances for those difficulties in a fairly well organised and **structured** programme for development

The Commission, **as** we understand it, is concerned with a number of core issues **as** immediate issues to be addressed. The mass of **recommendations** contain not the nuts and bolts, so to speak, of making regional integration a reality, but in the Commission's perception there **are** a

number of core issues which they feel have to be addressed and settled before the nuts and bolts, so to speak, are dealt with and put together. These are the areas which, **as** I understand it, they **are** hoping the **Heads** of Government will come to some decision on when they meet in Trinidad and Tobago during **the** course of this week. These are issues **which** they perceive to be central to the whole process of **integration** and to moving the integration movement forward.

At the **heart** of the Commission's recommendations about which all **speakers** so far have commented is the proposal to establish the CARICOM Commission. The argument which the Commissioners have used to support this call is that CARICOM Member **States** have not been able consistently in their relations to follow through **with** action on decisions which they have taken in furtherance of the integration movement. So in essence their rationale for the establishment of the CARICOM Commission is that they **find** it is a **necessary** instrument, or agency, **as** they perceive it, for implementing decisions which **have** been reached by Member States of CARICOM. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what we have to do is to strip this argument and lay it **bare** so as to discover whether there is any justification for the argument which they advanced.

In order to implement the decisions of the **Heads** of Government reached at meetings, what is necessary in national **jurisdictions** is that legislation has to be passed to give effect to some of the decisions, or in some cases **administrative** action is necessary on behalf of Governments. The problem invariably is not one of getting legislation drafted. I have never heard that that has been a problem for getting the decisions of CARICOM implemented. It is not a problem of getting legislation drafted, it is not a problem of getting the legislation approved in Parliaments, it is not a matter of getting the legislation to Parliament. The problem is not a lack of administrative skill, so to speak, in getting the necessary administrative action in place to trigger the decisions which have been reached by CARICOM Heads. The problem when **the** argument is stripped bare in all its reality is the stark reality that the **perception** of CARICOM leaders, after they have met at summits, is that when they return to their countries they rightly or wrongly come to a view that the decision which they have reached when looked at in **retrospect** are not likely to be in the best interests of their publics. **This** is a feeling which the leaders tend to have rightly or wrongly.

12.05 p.m.

You **only** have to look at 1 or 2 of the decisions which have **been** taken in relation to the Common External Tariff, in relation to the issue of freedom of movement of labour and to skills. The leaders, once they return home after they have met, have come to the view that the decisions which they have reached when analysed perhaps

will impact negatively on their people back home. So you ask yourself the question, "If this is the real problem, how does setting up a commission and establishing a CARICOM commission aid in that process of getting the leaders in the national jurisdictions to implement decisions which **the** leaders themselves feel are not in the best interests of their publics?"

There is a view that the people of our region want integration **and** that they yearn for integration and that it is the **politicians** and **political** leaders who **tend** to high-jack the process and put all **kinds** of difficulties **in** the way of integration. Sometimes I think we **need** to pause and ask ourselves whether this is really so and what is the truth of the matter.

In the political system that we have if politicians and their publics are out of sync on issues that **are** fundamental, the political process should under **normal** circumstances take care of that. If politicians **cease** to reflect **the** wishes and the aspirations and the hopes of their publics they should rightly and properly be thrown out of office. I have no difficulty about that.

The **Member** for Christ Church South in the course of his presentation **made** the point, and I do not quote him **exactly**, but I paraphrase him. He made the point that there was, what he called, a "common recurring experience" that Caribbean people are fed up with hearing that their representatives **make** decisions that touch their lives and that there is default in implementing those decisions.

I mentioned a number of areas on which decisions have been made and which have not been implemented, for instance, the Common External Tariff and the issue of freedom of movement. The Honourable Member also made the point that the Caribbean people must make decisions that what they want - I think he almost went so far **as** to say - is a supernational body to ensure that the decisions are implemented and that people must be fully conscious of the implications of the decisions that they make.

When you analyse these issues, I think what is **important** is that in the discussion which takes place on these issues we **need** to ensure that the debate is stripped of all the emotive language which can be introduced in debates of this kind. One only needs to talk in terms of free movement of labour in the region to recognise the emotion which can flow from analysis of that concept. I **daresay** if you get together any group of **Barbadians** and say to them, "Do you realise in the fullness of time that **what** freedom of movement of persons and of labour means in this region?" We have all talked in terms of the extent to which Barbados tends to accommodate the citizens of other countries. If you said it means that the citizens of all the countries of the region are free to come here if they wish and compete for jobs in the Barbadian market,

compete for the social services and compete at **very** level with Barbadians on equal terms. If you asked Barbadians, "Are you prepared to put up with that?" I wonder how many of them would say, "Yes. Let it happen."

Asides.

Hon. M. A. **KING**: When I say that one has to strip these issues of all their emotiveness and one has to denude them of all the political rhetoric **as** well, when governments, no matter which side, when one side or the other makes the point, this is the position: freedom of movement, freedom of labour, are important. I guarantee, Mr. Speaker, that you would tend in the democracy that we have whether or not it is one of the major political parties or whether it is one of **the** fringe parties or whether it is one of the fringe elements in the society, you **are** going to get the emotive and political issues being raised and people's emotions are going to be played upon. They will say, "Look at what those fellows want to do. Look what those wicked politicians want to do. They want to allow St. Lucians, they want to allow **the** Low Islanders, **as** they call them pejoratively, to come and take their jobs." That is the argument that is going to be used.

In order to get a sensible position on these issues I am saying that politicians have to mature and have to avoid using emotive and purely political arguments for the pure purpose of making political points. Now, the debate is going on in Jamaica about what is going to happen at the summit during the course of the week. Former **Prime** Minister Seaga has made his comments and he has said quite clearly that the Prime Minister of Jamaica cannot speak for Jamaica, or words to that effect, when he goes to the summit. Now, is that a political statement because an election in Jamaica is somewhere down the road or does he genuinely feel that way? Is there that dichotomy of view in Jamaica and are politicians throughout the region going to adopt the same attitude and take political issues and capitalise on the emotions of people rather than looking at the issues objectively and nakedly, in the interests of the region as a whole?

I do not want anyone to misunderstand me, I am totally in favour of regional integration. I would go so far as to support the view which my colleague the member for Christ Church East Central and the member for St. Joseph have articulated in terms of a federal union of the region, if we can achieve that. But there are certain difficulties which any attempt at moving in that direction will arise and which are going to be driven by forces in the region, by articulate opinion in the region, which for one reason or another will seize the opportunity to exploit a position.

I cannot keep repeating it, but if it is possible that a situation **can** arise where you **can** strip the issues of politics and emotions it is only then that we are going to make

some progress. The people **are** going to have to focus clearly on these issues and to understand the decisions which they make, the complexity of the decisions and what is involved in **all** the decisions which **are** being made.

The CARICOM Commission which **has** been proposed in the **Report** does not elaborate on how this proposed commission will endeavour to achieve what has so long evaded the grasp of the CARICOM Heads of Government in the implementation process. **They** have identified what they perceive to be the failure of the political leaders to honour commitments **as** a key factor of preventing CARICOM Governments from implementing the decisions which are critical **to** the **future** of the movement but they have not in any detail gone out to particularise how they themselves would effectively overcome this problem. The suggestions which have been made in the Report do not, in my view, Mr. Speaker, effectively deal with that issue.

12.15 p.m.

From my own perspective I think what is needed far more than the establishment of any commission is not the creation of any new **bureaucracy in the region but, perhaps**, if you wish, a renewed commitment of CARICOM leaders who have difficulties about the decisions which they have reached and a renewed **commitment on the** part of leaders to implement the decisions which they have reached at Heads of Government Meetings, and **as** a corollary to that, not to take any decisions which have not been first fully considered and supported by their national constituencies and which they feel they would have difficulty in implementing.

I think the point **was** made by the Honourable Member for St. John that you need to **have** some previous discussions and agreements on the **issues** with the assurance that when you go as a Head of Government to Heads of Government **Conferences** the decisions to which you commit your country are decisions which are acceptable to your constituency and decisions which can be implemented and which you are prepared to implement.

The Commission's Report does not envisage strengthening the existing CARICOM Secretariat because they do not see that as assisting and furthering the integration process. As far **as** they **are** concerned the Secretariat should be **sidelined** in favour of this new structure which they call the Commission.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. **KING**: They want to sideline the Secretariat. There is no question about that. Let us face it. If a new structure moves into place which plays a

dominant role I think inevitably the Secretariat will be **marginalised**. There is no question about that. They do not say that but I am saying that in practical terms that is what will happen.

I am of the view, Mr. Speaker, that a CARICOM Commission will not be able to achieve anything more than an appropriately restructured and strengthened Secretariat would. I feel that the additional strengthening must be given to the office of Secretary-General and that all of this can be done at a far lower cost than setting up a new bureaucracy in the Commission. Indeed, it may well be questioned whether the cost of this Commission which they set very modestly at U.S. \$1.27 million per year, whether that cost is justified at a time when all the countries in this region, barring none, **are** in a period of austerity, where you hear Heads of Governments at **all** Heads of Government Meetings **talking** about their serious reluctance of committing any more funds to bureaucracy. One may well argue whether it is appropriate at this time to think in terms of allocating money to new structures like that where, on the contrary, with a properly restructured, **redirected**, refocussed and a more dynamic Secretariat the same results *can* be achieved.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the measures which **are** proposed for the CARICOM Commission may, with the appropriate **modifications** and adaptations be applied to a new Secretariat. There are some duties which are envisaged for the Commission. Those same functions and duties can, in my view, be charged upon the Secretariat and so restructure, re-organise and reprogramme the Secretariat to **deal** with the new role which is expected of it.

Now, there is another proposal which they have considered central to the issues which is establishing Ministers of CARICOM Affairs. This would suggest a return to a situation which existed in some of our countries previously where there were Ministers of CARICOM Affairs. In the early days I believe those Ministers were invariably inclined to be Ministers of Trade who were the Ministers who made the Council of Ministers. They had total responsibility for CARICOM matters.

The idea, I suppose *can* be supported from the point of view that, at least, it lends a commitment to the advancement of CARICOM centralising in on the **Ministry** the responsibility for CARICOM and even if it would be useful from the point of view of ensuring that this Ministry coordinates **all** the working relations for CARICOM and puts together everything for CARICOM meetings and in the final analysis provides for the implementation of decisions of Heads of Government once those decisions have been reached.

Sir, I will not dwell on the establishment of the CARICOM Assembly. I believe the Prime Minister and

others have spoken on that. Our position has been that we support fully the establishment of a CARICOM Assembly of Parliamentarians. That **agreement** has **been** completed. It is open to signature. Only two countries have signed, as far as has been indicated. We believe that some effort should be made to ensure that that process works before tampering with it in any way bearing in mind we have the strong view that those who **form** the Assembly of Parliamentarians should be persons who have the support and the authority of the publics in their national jurisdictions.

Again, very quickly, Mr. Speaker, to the proposal for a two-tier CARICOM Supreme Court. You will recall that this idea has already been considered by the Heads of Government. They mandated some time ago CARICOM Attorneys-General to examine the **matter** and make recommendations. CARICOM Attorneys-General considered **the** proposals for a court having an original jurisdiction to adjudicate on disputes arising out of the Treaty of **Chaguaramas** and other disputes between Member States involving human rights **issues** and things of that kind.

The CARICOM Attorneys-General also considered the proposal for the court to have an affiliate jurisdiction as a final court of Appeal for the region thereby replacing the Privy Council. CARICOM Attorneys-General considered that the pragmatic realities of the time and of the countries of the region indicated that it was **unlikely** for the Governments and for the people of the region to agree at that time on having the **first** instance, the **inter se** jurisdiction of the court. And they felt that they **needed** to get the court established in some way and then allow it to grow and that perhaps the best way of getting **the** idea sold to the Governments and **the** peoples of the region is to establish the Caribbean Court of **Appeal** as a final Court of Appeal for the region replacing the Privy Council and that that was a programme and a course of action which was acceptable and which was achievable at the time and that in the process of time as time passed then perhaps the **inter se** jurisdiction could also be established. So that the **position** the Attorneys-General took was that in **principle** what is now the recommendation of the West Indian Commission Report is something which was acceptable as a matter of principle but pragmatic realities dictated that what was achievable for the present was that you establish a Court of Appeal and that incrementally we would move to the establishment of the Court of First Instance with **inter se** jurisdiction.

12.25 p.m.

Heads of Government considered the recommendation which was made by the Attorneys-General and in fact agreed to the establishment of the Caribbean Court

of Appeal as a final Court of Appeal for the region and the Agreement for establishing that court as indeed is the case in relation to the Assembly of Parliamentarians has been concluded and I believe is available for signature. Among the **terms** of that Agreement is **that** it will come into **force** when at least 3 countries sign that Agreement, one of those countries being Trinidad **and** Tobago. Trinidad and Tobago has been included because that is the country where it has been agreed would be the Headquarters of the Court. That Agreement has been concluded and where at least 3 **governments** agree the Court may be established. But the position is I believe that no governments have **as** yet signed that Agreement.

I may say that the countries of the OECS if I understood their position clearly is that they had no difficulty with the proposal that the Court come into being when at least three countries would sign because they felt that if the Court were established that – you will recall that provision **had** been made for accession by other countries as time went by and when they so choose. But the problem with some of them is that in order to become a party to the Court they need to have referenda in their particular territories and they have all expressed the view that they did not **think** that they could go to their peoples on that issue in a referendum. They were doing no more **than** echoing the concerns which **all** people have about referenda. We talk in terms about dealing with a number of issues which **confront** us by referenda.

But what one has to be cautious about when one is **talking** about the use of the **technique** of the referendum is **that** people when they vote in a referendum tend to express a view not on the issue which is before them but on the Government in office **and** on the political leader. That is what people do in referendum. That is what happened in **Europe**.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Switzerland has had a history. It would not happen in **Switzerland** because Switzerland has had a history. It is part of the Swiss **tradition** to take issues to referendum. We in this region are not accustomed to referendum. It is part of the Swiss' tradition. It is entrenched among them and this is how they deal with their Government and their politics. So they understand how to deal with referenda and how to vote in referenda. In these regions I suspect – and certainly **this** is the guiding concern I believe of the **leaders** of the OECS – that when you take issues on referendum people take the opportunity to pronounce on their governments. That is something which we have to be cautious about. That creates one of the problems in governments and leaders of government knowing exactly how people feel in issues, what **is** the barometer of opinion? Invariably **you** get articulate opinion saying the government is unpopular. How do you really test

public opinion? In **Canada** they use what they call the technique of – and this is not even an assured position – a non-binding referendum. You let the people vote but on the understanding that the way how people vote will not bind and that if a government loses a referendum it will not be forced to resign. But these are some of the issues which affect the region. How do we really sense the feeling **and** the will of the people and are those leaders in CARICOM who, when they go home and express concerns about how their publics feel, **are** those people really expressing the concerns of their publics? Are the members of the Commission more in a position to say what the people in the various national **jurisdictions** feel than what the politicians who represent those people feel? I have a suspicion, Mr. Speaker, that certainly the extent to which the members of the Commission may have been able to sense and gather public opinion may not be anywhere near as wide and effective **as** what politicians who daily run up against the whims and fancies and the vagaries of opinion in their countries, the Commission would be nowhere near as well organized to **form** a view on public opinion **as** the politicians in the countries themselves.

I realize my time is running out. I will be very brief.

Mr. SPEAKER: I **realize** the importance of the debate and I intend to allow members to complete their points. So you may complete your point.

Hon. M. A. KING: If I can just wind up. I wanted to make a few comments on the Charter of Civil Society and on the Association of CARICOM States but I **Q** **not** think I will dwell on those, except to say, very briefly, in relation to the CARICOM Charter of Civil Society that it is, I suppose, in keeping with the social **and** the political traditions to which Barbados subscribes. We have already got those principles enshrined in our Constitution **as** fundamental rights provisions. **Somebody** has made the point in relation to the United Nations Covenant on Human Rights, the Organization of American States **&** cetera and that we just need to subscribe in the region to all the appropriate conventions, those of us who are not yet party to them. I do not think that the Charter itself can present any problem for us in the region who accept the democratic framework in it. You **talk** in terms of just **institutionalizing** a Charter of civil rights. I have no great difficulty with that.

But altogether, in conclusion, just let me say, Mr. Speaker, the Report by all indications is a useful one. But let us recognize **that** there are tremendous difficulties which the Commission has had to deal with in trying to sort out the issues which have **bedeviled** political leaders and thinkers in the region for **all** these years. We have been asked to **note** the Report and those are my views, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, first of all I should like to thank the Commissioners for the very many hours they spent among the people of the Caribbean and beyond and also for the time that they spent in putting together this **Report**. As was said earlier by one of my colleagues, it is easily one of the most comprehensive Reports since the **Moyne** Commission and obviously, in a Report of this **kind**, there are many things which one would agree with and there are others that one has a difference of opinion with.

Before I start to look in detail at the area that I think I should cast some light on, I should like to make an observation. I think my colleague from Christ Church also made a similar observation. If I had to make a critique of the Commission I would **first** start with the composition of the Commission. As I see it, Mr. Speaker, the Commission was composed mainly, and quite rightly **too**, of outstanding academics in the area, people who have functioned in international organisations etc., people who have spent many hours looking at the Caribbean landscape and the integration movement. But I think the Commission was a little short of people who have had practical full time political experience. I will tell you why I think that the Commission could have benefited from that balance.
12.35 p.m.

The second point I would want to make is that the Commission did one thing. Having looked at the failure of federation in the Caribbean and despite the fact that the Commission is of the view that there is strong support within the region for the integration movement, the Commission started from a premise that federation would not work or that you could not go to the people at this time with a proposal for a federation. The Commission therefore went about **the** Report in what I saw as a way of trying to tiptoe around the federation situation, forgetting that the hard cold fact is that, whenever you come back, the political directorate of the region are the ones who would have to be asked to make the crucial and hard decisions. If you look at it, they tried to put in place kinds of machinery headed by technocrats so as to try and tiptoe around the political import of it and, in my opinion, that is where, I think, the Commission went off stream and that led mainly to the creation of the Caricom Commission which was proposed. Therefore I think, with that approach, there were certain things that were recommended that could not be taken up.

We must spend a little time, Mr. Speaker, looking at the areas specifically dealing with trade and industry as seen by the Commission's Report because, in reality, one of the main reasons for a Caricom movement is to develop and expand trade within the region and, by so expanding trade within **the** region, to be able to improve the livelihood of all of the people living in that region.

Now, the findings of the **Report** came up with certain basic findings. One that the Commission found is that there is strong support within the region for integration.

Secondly, they found there was a lack of significant progress towards integration because of the failure of member states of the Caribbean Community to implement decisions. This, Mr. Speaker, is the problem with the Caricom movement at the moment. The time between a decision and its implementation or between a decision being made and its non-implementation.

They also found, as they said, that there is considerable mistrust of political integration. Because of that finding, I have said, Mr. Speaker, because of their belief that there is considerable mistrust of political integration, they therefore sought other mechanisms to tiptoe around fundamental decisions that could only be made by the political directorate of the region at the time. Also, they made the observation, which is agreed by all of us, that integration is critical for the region's economic survival. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to accept the validity of most of the above findings or all of the above findings. Therefore we have no difficulty with that.

The recommendations of the Commission for the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Commerce, would be looked at under 3 broad headings – policy, the institutional arrangements needed, and the enhancement of the economic integration process.

During the reading of the Report, Mr. Speaker, we identified quite a few recommendations that should be taken at the policy levels for expanding trade arrangements. The main one is the observation that there should be a push towards export led growth by removing all biases and obstacles. Now this, Mr. Speaker, one has to look at this very carefully because, while we in Barbados have adopted this policy, we have to be careful that in adopting this policy one does not completely throw through the window the former policy of import substitution. The reason for adopting and recommending export led growth and removing obstacles is obviously because a major constraint of most developing countries is the shortage of foreign exchange. You can only earn foreign exchange if you have your industries so geared towards exports as to earn that foreign exchange. Previously, I would say the emphasis in some countries – Barbados, I believe, can be considered such a one – was on import substitution. But there is now a complete shift towards export led growth so much so that one, if you are not careful, would go to the other extreme to discourage completely any manufacturing or production for the domestic market.

My position, Mr. Chairman, is that there is nothing wrong in domestic production as long as it is efficient and competitive. It is very obvious that if there is no

domestic production, although they say it must be efficient, those goods and services that would normally be produced by domestic production would have to be brought into the country and, therefore, the moment you have to bring those goods into the country it is a further addition to the requirement for foreign exchange, and not only a further addition for the requirement of foreign exchange for it means that your unemployment situation must naturally rise, since those industries that would have been producing for the domestic markets would not be producing. They would be feeling that they cannot compete or produce and that exports would collapse. Therefore you have your industrial and manufacturing sectors contracting which lends itself to additional unemployment on the market.

So, I am in total agreement with that concept. But I must insist here right now that along with the export led growth industry should be, and must as well be considered for similar treatment, efficient production for local consumption to remove that additional requirement for foreign exchange and to generate employment locally.

The second one which they identified that I want to spend some time on is that there should be a move towards trade liberalisation and cognisance of the need to protect sensitive industries, particularly in the agricultural and **agro-processing** sector. I want to spend some time on the part of being cognisant to protect sensitive industries. Mr. Speaker, nobody who is living in this world, **at this time**, can otherwise but understand that trade liberalisation is being pushed and you are going to be caught up with it. It is being pushed even more vigorously now with the collapse of the communist system and the strengthening of the EEC movement. The fact is, let us be practical, America has to look for additional markets. America is now **at** the stage where they have their industries **all** set to supply their domestic market and, therefore, with their economy, their skills, their technology, their surplus production they need additional markets. So they are leaders in the trade liberalisation. What one has to be very careful of is that, in developing countries like these, and I am glad that the Report made mention of that, you cannot wake up overnight and move towards trade liberalisation without putting in place or having a transitional period to prepare your industries that were almost always domestically orientated, in our case, towards the **Caricom** region to prepare them for going on to the international arena. Therefore, I say that you need, Mr. Speaker, that transitional period to allow you to tune your industry, to bring **about** that awareness of productivity and to put in place legislation to prevent dumping into your country, as well as to improve your Bureau of Standards to make sure that goods coming into your country meet certain basic quality from a health point of view and that you do not have people dump surpluses in developing countries who might not have a bureau of standards equivalent, the

personnel and the **knowhow**. Therefore, **the operative** word in this is to protect sensitive industry, and, in my opinion, to have a sensible transition period moving towards trade liberalisation before you dismantle **all** of your protection systems.

12.45 p.m.

I will speak a little later on the CET and one of the situations for which we would use the CET, but I will get back to that.

One of the other policy decisions is that Government, the private sector and the trade union movement enhance contributions to human resource development, that is, skills development. This is absolutely necessary because, if we are to be able to compete in the international world, we not only have to develop skills but we have to introduce the latest technology to be competitive. So this is a policy decision that we have no problem with.

Another one is that **CARICOM** Governments should set targets aimed at the achievement of specific investment ratios to Gross Domestic Product. One of the observations made by the Commission, Mr. **Speaker**, is that the **CARICOM** people mostly **are** savers, that **they have** a fairly high ratio of savings to earnings, but the ratio of investment to earnings is not in keeping with the **ratio** of savings to earnings because most of the people in the region do not have a history of **investment**. They have a history of saving where they put their money in the bank, where they feel it is safe. But we now have to begin to teach them and make opportunities available to go into investment, therefore using their savings by way of investment to generate further industries and **employment** in the area. We at the Government level have no difficulty with that.

The other one is **that** Governments, collectively and in concert with other like-minded **countries**, should press for significant debt relief from the multinational institutions. This is an area, Mr. Speaker, that has to be considered, because we have now reached a situation in the developing world where there is a net transfer of funds outwards. The debt load is so high in **the** developing countries that there is now a net transfer of funds from the under-developed world to the developed world, and you will never break out of this vicious cycle unless some realistic approach is taken either for debt relief or debt rescheduling or something to allow the developing countries to have some little break in the **area**.

As I said, there are numerous recommendations in the area of trade. We are in agreement with most of them with certain provisos. Therefore I have no difficulty with the Commission's Report in that area.

In the area of recommendations for institutional strengthening, once again the whole idea of the

CARICOM Commission was being proffered as the solution to the problem. Many of my colleagues have spoken on this already. I only need, Mr. Chairman, to add the point that the basic problem at the moment is the non-implementation of decisions already made. The home grown truth is that the implementation could only be carried out by the political directorate of the day. I therefore cannot see in such a Commission, however high powered it is, whatever suggestions they have, that you could have community laws administered by this type of CARICOM court of appeal making certain things mandatory, or passing legislation making it mandatory to implement them. I still cannot see that the mere creation of a CARICOM Commission is going to remove the main stumbling block which is the non-implementation of decisions.

As my colleagues said earlier, the main reason for that, as the meetings are structured, is that you have a meeting of Council and the Council makes some decisions. Then the decisions go to the Heads and the Heads make the decisions. But 99.9% of the time those Heads and the Governments they head up would not have had the opportunity of even canvassing exhaustively their own parties or colleagues before they went off to make the decisions. They would not have had the opportunity of testing the feelings of their constituents whether or not these are the things they want. So in all good faith, believing that they are aware of the things which used to be done to push the movement forward, they take the decisions only to find when they come back to their constituents there is a groundswell of objection. For many reasons, when they are reviewed, their decisions, some of them, are not in the best interests of their constituents and therefore, like any political directorate who gets the view that a decision is not in the best interests of their constituents, implementation is either delayed or not carried out at all. Therefore, I cannot see the creation of a Commission being a magical organisation that would overnight solve those problems.

I think we need to look at some other mechanism, for example, if the Commission can be used to provide the kind of administrative backup to do liaison work with individual countries and provide the background information to allow the political directorate to sell the case to the people and therefore get an agreement. Maybe there is such a case for it.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have no difficulty with this one, that there should be a Minister of CARICOM Affairs. Most of the CARICOM countries have an area where there is a Minister mostly responsible for CARICOM Affairs. In some cases that subject is shared with the Foreign Ministry and we need to examine it to see if that would allow a greater focus on that situation. Therefore I do not see any real problems with this one.

One of the main recommendations coming out has to do with the creation of the Common External Tariff. I need to spend the next couple of minutes dealing with the creation of the Common External Tariff which was seen as a mechanism to do two things: one, to provide some protection for industry in the area against Third Country goods and, secondly, to provide a source of revenue for the country. It is fairly well known by now, Mr. Speaker, that even before the original CET was completely implemented there has been a call for a review of the CET. As a result, there are some new recommendations to be put before the Heads of Government meeting starting tomorrow. The working group has tabulated goods into the following categories for purposes of CET.

12.55 p.m.

They looked first of all at the selected exports which they sell as goods which are not traded inter-regionally. We treated agricultural inputs. We have introduced a cost of living/socio-economic bracket which allows countries to have the right in any item that they see as a cost of living item - rice, chicken backs, onions, etc. - to put their particular CET on that. Then they add a List C item which is a fairly sizeable item which allows countries to use that as a revenue-raising measure in that the CET would only set a minimum rate but the countries can then put whatever rate they want to use for revenue purposes. Then there was a List A and items in this category do not currently satisfy requirements of regional consumption which is qualified as an ability to meet 75% of the region's needs. But there are some countries that would need to be protected because they are moving towards satisfying regional quests of consumption.

Very quickly, Mr. Chairman, what the Council is recommending to the Heads of Government tomorrow is that there should be a rate between 0% and 35% with a special regime for agricultural food products of 40%. There has been a case put for special items like rice, sugar and citrus. Belize has been asking to have their citrus remain at 45%. Guyana is asking for rice to remain at 45% and Guyana and the other cane producers are asking to have sugar at 45%.

Asides.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: What I notice, Mr. Speaker, is that there is tremendous pressure. Despite the fact that Jamaica and Trinidad & Tobago sat in Council and agreed to a 0% to 35%, Jamaica has at the last moment registered its intention to have this moved to 30% maximum, with a proviso that there should be some consideration for time-tabling to move it from 30% to 20%. I would say that this has a lot to do with international pressures being brought to bear on some of these countries. Let me

give you an example which I think, Mr. Speaker, smacks fairly close to being immoral.

Let's take a look at rice. At the moment, the CET on rice is 45% and it is against the background that Guyana can produce the total requirement for the area. There is now tremendous pressure being brought to bear from the United States for a reduction of that CET on rice. But when we examine the situation, it shows that at the moment there is a subsidy of 49% given by the Americans to their rice fanners according to the GATT instrument dealing with agricultural subsidies. When it was brought to their attention that they are pressuring us to move from a 45% CET on rice to 30% at the most and that their subsidy helped their fanners, their reply was that they have to keep that subsidy because the European Community are subsidising their farmers to a similar extent.

So you get the situation where pressures are being brought, particularly on the agricultural area, to reduce the CET to such a level that you cannot compete with the tremendous production levels of places like America. Therefore, you are going to have a total collapse of a lot of those agricultural products as well as that the manufacturing sector in the region would be under serious problems. Therefore, we face a total collapse of the manufacturing sector with the consequential increase in unemployment and a consequential deterioration of the economy.

This is where we find ourselves. The Barbados position as quite bravely put by the Prime Minister is that, as far as Barbados is concerned, we would have tremendous difficulty in considering a CET below 35%. As far as I am concerned, my view has always been that the present CET was not given an opportunity to work and against that it is unfortunate that you have to review it. What would put further pressure on the revenue situation in Barbados if the CET were reduced to 30% is that competing intermediary goods would be moved from 25% to 20%. Therefore, there would be a further loss in revenue. As I said, we will have to examine it carefully from the Barbados position.

What we have in summary is a CET that is not so common. There is a List A, a List B, a List C and a List D. There are a number of derogations and a number of special items. As I see it, every country has put forward a shopping list to suit its peculiar situation, with preference being given to the OECS which has always been allowed to have a low tariff rate. We have now introduced an item called a cost of living, socio-economic list which allows you to put a tariff rate on anything that affects your individual cost of living items, like rice, potatoes, etc. Therefore you have a very uncommon Common External

Tariff. It is a CET with so many exceptions to it that it is very difficult to consider it as a CET.

You have it that one of the main vehicles which was considered a protection to your fledgling industries and to allow you to stave off international competition is now under very serious threat. In summary, Mr. Speaker, the documentation is useful and we have no difficulty with some of the recommendations. As for others, we have to consider the impact on our own domestic economy and the impact on things that will cause additional unemployment. Decisions will have to be made against that background but it has been a useful document and has brought together under one cover a series of recommendations spanning youth, culture, agriculture and trade and we can use it as an instrument, together with other instruments that we have, to chart a course forward for the Caribbean region.

Thank you.

SUSPENSION

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I am moving that this sitting be suspended until 2 p.m.

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

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

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER.. This sitting is resumed.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make some observations on this matter. As I understand it, we are debating these two documents put out by the West Indian Commission. The way this debate has gone so far it appears to me that there has been a measure of agreement even though the whips are off on both sides and that the work done by the Commissioners will be of inestimable value to Caribbean people in the years to come. It is but one of the few attempts that has been made on any scientific basis to try and understand the feelings, aspirations and desires of Caribbean people. Like any document that has been produced as a result of that kind of rapport with people, there will be some areas which lend themselves more easily than others to criticism or identification of shortcomings.

I think at the outset we must be magnanimous enough to congratulate the Commissioners for their resourcefulness, industry, insight and high degree of intellectuality that is evident in these two documents. The first area of criticism, as I understand it, from those who have spoken is that

there is among many people a concern about the establishment of this, if I may use the current language, mechanism called the CARICOM Commission.

I do not believe from anything that appears in the document that we can ascribe motives and personal desires to promote themselves to any or all of the Commissioners. I think it would be very dangerous to attack the proposal for the establishment of a CARICOM Commission unless there is sufficient evidence. It would be very dangerous to allege that the proposal for the CARICOM Commission in itself is a proposal for jobs for the boys so I am not going to share the views of the Honourable Member for Christ Church East **Central** in that regard.

The Commission has been very careful to say that the central directorate of this thing called the CARICOM Commission will be drawn from the region's public and political culture and emphasised that so that I understand in the three man team they want to put up will include persons who have been active in politics, who, perhaps, have held high political office...

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The other side obviously is very privy to information which I do not have. I said **drawn** from the region, public and political culture. I do not think we need to knock it down as to whether it is a mechanism to find a job for somebody. I think we have to focus on the principal of this. I think this is the question that has to be asked. Is the CARICOM Commission the kind of mechanism that will ensure speedy implementation of Heads of Government decisions and do the job that is presaged for it having regard to the experiences of the last 30 years? That really is the problem.

We are searching in the Caribbean for some device that will make sure that when decisions are taken in a collective way at a Heads of Government Conference, or even **at** the level of Council of Ministers, that these decisions can get speedy implementation in the respective **territories** or constituent territories that make up CARICOM. That really is a decision that has to be made by the Heads of Government. They are the best people who must tell the region why decisions that are taken **at** Heads of Governments meetings are not implemented in a timely fashion or, in some cases, not at all. They must know.

The Commission recommends that the Heads of Government should identify the team that is to comprise this CARICOM Commission. I quote "develop the structure with the aid of the Commissioners themselves" at page 476 of the big book. What the Prime Minister has to do when he goes to Trinidad in the next few hours and for the next few days is presumably to meet with his brothers as Heads of Government, to determine who will constitute this team

and then develop structures with the assistance of the Commissioners themselves. I do not like that **proposal** at all. I have to confess. They are saying, pick the team, then we will sit with you and we can work out something and you only have between now and January 1, or between now and the end of the week. I do not know who, when the Heads of Government Meeting comes to an end, will do this **picking** of the team and working out of the mechanism. To that extent I find the proposal for the establishment of a CARICOM Commission has been less than detailed as it could have been.

I would have thought that they should have worked out the structure in a more meaningful way and promoted that **structure** within the Report but they leave it in very vague terms. Knowing how Heads of Government Meetings work I think we can all anticipate that the Heads will not have the time to work out this structure. Other members have spoken on whether **this** Commission should be invested with super-national powers or otherwise. It seems to me that you have to discuss that aspect of the Commission with the proposal for the CARICOM Assembly. I wish to say I do not support the CARICOM Assembly of **Parliamentarians** without more. The Commission, I think applauded it as an idea but when we think of this structure, given the financial and economic problems of the region at this time, and the already over-bureaucratic systems that obtain in most Caribbean territories, I think that is going to be a waste of everybody's time. I do not believe it will come to fruition but a mechanism like a CARICOM Assembly at this time cannot find support from me because I do not believe the region has the money to invest in this. That you set up an assembly which is just going to give Parliamentarians, presumably, an opportunity to talk more and have little by way of action consequential upon their talk I think, Sir, is a waste of time, effort and money and I will not be supporting it. I speak for myself. I am not speaking for my party or anything. I am speaking for myself, Sir.

2.15 p.m.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am coming to that. When the Prime Minister whose brainchild I understand this is, when he introduced this Resolution we were not told what powers will be given to this CARICOM Assembly of Parliamentarians. Quite frankly, Sir, in the absence of information as to whether it would have any power beyond being a pure discussing body I think that again we are asked to discuss and perhaps applaud or support a concept, the elements of which are too nebulous and vague to evoke the kind of support that you have if you want all party support for that kind of device.

I think that the House is entitled, since this is one of the few occasions perhaps that we have had an

opportunity to discuss this CARICOM Assembly of Parliamentarians – to hear from the Prime Minister how he envisages that this Assembly will work. Otherwise it seems to me that you are going to have Heads of Government meeting, taking decisions, you could very well have CARICOM Assembly of Parliamentarians discussing among themselves some of those same decisions but to what purpose and neither one having the power to implement. This is where the CARICOM Commission is going to claim territory for itself and say, you give us the power to implement and we will implement what the two of them say. I think that is an excess of bureaucracy. I would be grateful when the Prime Minister replies, Sir, if he could tell us how perhaps he understands that these various bodies will work and will interlock with each other and not indeed cross the paths of territory.

I accept that Caribbean people need to know more about what is happening regionally at the highest level of regional **deliberations from** the representatives who attend regional meetings. If the CARICOM Assembly is to operate purely as a &vice to allow Caribbean politicians to discuss regional matters without it having any real teeth or power then I think that you **can** cure **that** lacuna that may exist at a far cheaper rate. If we are serious about integration, the time will have to come when we should have perhaps on the Order Paper an item providing for Ministers to report to Parliament on attendance at **regional** meetings so that as Parliamentarians we will be kept abreast.

There really is no good reason why a Minister **can** leave Barbados and say that he is going to attend the CARICOM Ministers of Trade meeting in let us say Trinidad. He goes down there for a week, decisions are taken which will affect business relationships, trading relationships, the Minister comes back to Barbados and nobody knows for years what happened down there. Sometimes what happened is implemented by way of Ministerial Order or Statutory Instrument and you may **see** something passed. But apart from that it is the norm that – I am not accusing any government or any member of the government of this. What I am saying is that there is a void in our system – but it is the norm that the Ministers go, attend the meetings, come back and they deal with the decisions within their Ministry and neither the public knows what has happened and their colleagues in Parliament certainly do not know.

I think that if we are serious about integration, if we are serious about communicating from one territory to the other, if we are serious about letting the people in the territories know what is happening in the various other territories then a very simple mechanism is to amend this Order Paper to provide, under Obituary Speeches or wherever you like, Sir, have an item there which says

Ministers' Reports. We have a heading now "Statements by Ministers", perhaps that could be used. You do not even have to include another Head. But we will have to develop a culture among Parliamentarians which will allow for the dissemination of information to Parliament and thereafter to the public via Ministers who have gone abroad and attended meetings, come back and tell us what has happened and do it in the form of Ministerial Statements. I have no objection to that But **that** certainly will go somewhere towards **better** acquainting Parliamentarians in the region of what is happening in one territory and the other. **All** the territories can adopt that. That is no big thing. They **can** all sit down and **agree** that we **shortchange** our public by not giving them enough information about what happens. Have it as a part of the Parliamentary process. Simple. You do not need to set up a **superstructure** of a Caribbean Assembly. How are you going to get them there, nominate them, elect them or what? I am only throwing out ideas as they come to me **as** I read the Report.

Too often, Mr. Speaker, I think that politicians are left to learn about the decisions at regional meetings **from** little titbits that appear in the press **under** a **CANA** signature and **that** really is not good enough. We have, as a group, to agree that we must be more generous with the gift of information to the public that we represent particularly about regional matters, especially where they bear on the survival of our people.

Sir, having regard to my special **shadow** areas I was particularly interested in the recommendations of the Commission for a CARICOM supreme court and of course the problems of law and order, youth and so on. For a long time there has been a dichotomy of view between those who support the retention of the Privy Council in England and those who would prefer a Caribbean court **as** a final Court of Appeal. For all **that has** gone **on** in our history and not only as a matter of emotionalism but for reasons that I think are soundly rooted in the spirit of the times no one **can** quarrel with the proponents of the view that there should be a CARICOM Supreme Court. I have particular opinions about the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The case that I **took** there in 1982 I won it and I was obviously very impressed with the level of intellect of the English Judges. In their report, the Caricom Commissioners refer to the intellect of the English Judges. The symbolism for Caribbean people having their own **final** court staffed by their own judges is very important to the development of the self confidence and sense of identity that the people of this region must have with their own institutions and their history and development. A Caribbean Court can operate at a similar level of intellectual capacity as the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council provided they pick the best brains to staff **that** court as judges and that is where the problem is. You cannot get the best brains to sit on the Bench, whether it is in Barbados, Trinidad,

Jamaica or St. Lucia, wherever unless the region makes up its mind, and these individual territories to pay **proper** salaries to attract **people** out of the private profession into the Judiciary.

2.25 p.m.

England gave this region the common law, a great gift and boon to the people of this region. **The** legal system we have, I think, Sir, is second to none. It is far more preferable than other systems and it has been serving us well. But having given us this great system of common law, England kept for itself and **has** never divested to its former colonies the method of appointing judges. Not one in England has ever come through the Public **Service** all have come from the private Bar. All have seen the law at work and in practise. They have kept that system for themselves and deprived us of it and the history of the way the judicial appointments have been made in Barbados and in this region is a kind of long service medal. It has nothing to do with scholarship or **intellectuality**. So we have to look at the method of appointing judges.

In principle I accept, and I say this, Sir, because I don't like to change my views too often, although I can be persuaded. I have been persuaded and I accept the decision of the Heads reached in **1988** to discuss the establishment of a Caribbean Court as a final court of appeal and I accept that this is where the aspirations of the region should aim but I say, Sir, that unless a number of impediments are removed we will probably end up staffing such a court by less than the best.

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of other things in the Report I wish to address. I am very glad to **see** that I have campaigned in this House ever since I first came in here in **1976** and I am glad to see that the Commissioners have recommended the abolition of what is really a nuisance and it is this. We talk when we want to sound intellectual and high flown about the need for cross fertilization of cultures and the need for Caribbean people to develop a kind of **Caribbeanness** in their cultural expression and the need to exchange and interchange this Caribbean expression of talent and yet as Governments, while at the same time trying to promote this exchange we seek to hinder it by the imposition of a nuisance **tax** which requires Caribbean artists performing in Barbados to pay a fee for a work permit.

I wonder if anybody, as Minister of Immigration, ever worked out how much Government collects from collecting **\$100** from a couple of musicians who come up ever so often from Trinidad. I will bet it does not exceed \$20 000 a year for Caribbean artists who come and perform in Barbados. I am not **talking** about Hammer. I am **talking** about Caribbean artists who come and perform in Barbados. It is a nuisance, an irritant. I know it, Sir, and I

feel irritated because in **1972** I had to pay the **work permits** for Sparrow and his band to **perform** at the Globe and **ever** since then I have **been** talking **about** it. **Eric** Sealy promoted it but I had better not go **into** it any **more**. I will just say I know about it from then. I am glad it was raised with the Commission and that they have recommended **that** this be waived. I don't think that will **mean** that you will have a flood of **all** the dub artists from Jamaica into Barbados or all of the dub artists from Barbados into Jamaica and the **calypsonians** and so on. **All** you want to do is **try** and protect your own **people**, protect your own culture and **that** is easily done, but **not** by the imposition of **\$100** per musician. **Just** say that as a **condition** of **performance** one Barbadian will have to perform with you. Nobody **can** quarrel with **that**. Not even the foreign **artists** can quarrel if it is understood and it is a **rule** of practice that if you perform in a different territory a local artist performs on the same show as you. I don't think that is a big thing. I don't even **think** the fee for work **permits** is a hassle, writing up the forms and carrying them in and going down there and then somebody **down** there, who is bureaucrat, telling you, "no, no this is not written out **correctly**, go back", the show is to **start** at 8 o'clock and you **are** still down there hustling at 6 o'clock. No, no, that is foolishness.

I am very glad that the Caribbean Commission addressed the question of the West Indian **diaspora**. Very seldom have I heard in here any concern expressed for Barbadian nationals who are resident in England, **Canada** and the States. I really feel, Sir, that there **are** people we have neglected over the years. I know there is the view - I have heard it at very high levels expressed in politics in Barbados - **that** once **Barbadians** emigrate they are the responsibility of that new host country and we have very limited functions. That view ignores the feelings of **the** Barbadian who has emigrated. We want to dump a fellow living up there in England for about 15 years and say that he is the responsibility of the British Government. **That** ignores that deep down in that fellow's stomach he still believes that he can relate to Barbados, that Barbados is a focal point for him in his being and that Barbados **means** a lot to him. You only have to go abroad any summer **on** vacation to New York, to London or Canada and talk to the Barbadians over there and you will **understand** that they still feel part of Barbados. They are concerned about where we are today as a country in terms of economic **recession**. They are concerned about the **crime** in Barbados **a** whatever. They would like you to know that a lot of them would like to come back here and establish **roots**, but **too** many of us **see** them only as people to go to in **the** summer and perhaps stay with as relatives or friends, **some** cheap accommodation, and see them as providers of foreign exchange via remittances to their families in Barbados. I think we have to be conscious, even though we are independent and all of that, Sir, of our **brothers** and sisters in metropolitan countries who feel themselves still part of the Barbadian heritage, indeed part of the Barbadian

system, and that we should where necessary target our policies, bearing in mind those hundreds of thousands of Barbadians overseas.

2.35 p.m.

Let me give you an example, Sir, of the kind of marginalisation – if ~~that~~ is a word, if not I am making it up now – of Barbadians. I was in **London** in August and I was given a prospectus issued by the Pine Hill Dairy advertising the sale of shares. Do you know that this group of Barbadians got that prospectus after the date for subscriptions **had** closed?

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Some here too?

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I do not want this debate to be **contentious**, but I think the member should have his facts **correct**. The **date** on which the offers **closed** was October 13.

Aside.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Well, it was extended, but the date for close of offers was October **13** and the Government indicated before that, that the offer would be extended and it was to facilitate those persons, Barbadians living in London, who this Government took **pains** to involve in the process of privatisation.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am very grateful for the Honourable Member's intervention. I perhaps was a little careless in the use of language. I ought to have said that the original **date** for closure had passed. My friend, the Honourable Member, acknowledged that by saying that the **date** was extended to October specifically to take account of those people. I hope he is aware of the problem then. He is nodding approval, as the Honourable Minister of **Tourism** would say, Sir, with approbation. He accepts what I said. The Honourable Member has made the point, but he must not take credit. We do not want to be contentious, but just for the matter of the record, he knows..... what time, what?

Mr. SPEAKER: I think Honourable Members **recognise** that I have that little **room**.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I know, Sir, but just let me finish. The Honourable Member knows **that** it was the Honourable Member for St. Peter who last year recommended that in the privatisation programme, such as was part of **the** Pine Hill business, the Government of Barbados should **try** and **attract** the attention of Barbadians overseas to become investors in projects in Barbados with

a view to the inflow of foreign exchange. It originated here, Sir.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

Mr. H. **deB.** FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, let me begin by saying that I **first** entered politics because of my deep belief in the integration movement, an integration movement which in my view should be **carried** to its maximum as soon as possible. I have not strayed **from** my deep and unwavering belief that the ultimate goal and destiny of **the** Caribbean people should be towards one nation. Like **Saul**, or the apostle Paul, I myself have kept the faith and I hope ~~that~~ there **are** many in here with me who were part of the Under 40s in the **early** 60s who have kept that faith as well.

I regret very much that it has taken the political leaders of the Caribbean and the peoples of the Caribbean such a long time to come to a reasonable system of Government which would offer **the** maximum opportunity to the abundance of talent which we have in this region to play even a greater **role** on **the** world scene than we have played. Whether it is in international affairs, poetry, **sport**, trade unionism, law, whatever field of endeavour it is, I believe that the Caribbean peoples **are** unique in having the ability to accomplish much, although we are so few in this wider world. ~~That~~ is why I am going to challenge the CARICOM leaders, as they meet in CARICOM, not only to recognise that this is the time for action but really for giving living reality to their often expressed sentiments and views that they **too**, like me, believe in Caribbean nationhood.

This debate for them comes against the backdrop in national and regional affairs that is none too bright. Everyone of us must recognise that the economies of the region are in crisis, some in deeper crisis than others; but in particular, the economies of the once major developing countries, the **MDC's** are now in deep and serious crisis. They have experienced this crisis after in some cases as much as **30** years of independence on their own. We have to recognise too what this economic crisis means for our people and it has meant primarily unemployment to an **unprecedented** level. Certainly, here in **our** country, Barbados, to a level not seen since 1975. It **has** meant, Mr. Speaker, in almost all of our countries, escalating crime to the extent that only **2** days ago my friend, the Prime Minister of Jamaica, Mr. **Patterson**, had to take special emergency measures in order to combat escalating crime in his country. Crime in which most of the participants are now **the** younger people in our community.

2.45 p.m.

The debate is coming, too, against the backdrop of deteriorating standards of living particularly in the most developed countries of **the** region. This must have for us

who **are** today in the fortunate position of having to make policy certain serious implications.

We have tried now for over **2** decades and in some cases almost **3** decades, independence. I am not going to gainsay the fact that we have made progress. Most of us have made progress in this period but we have not made the progress **that** our potential will seem to mark us out for. It seems to me that there is still **the** fear which persists among West Indian politicians in taking the bold step that is called for and I wonder why, Sir. I recall the fear that existed in **the** minds of many when we set out to break the colonial yoke some **30** years ago. I was a much younger man then but I heard the same noises that I hear now from my friend, Mr. Seaga in Jamaica, being made then. The fear of leaving the colonial yoke and the so-called sanctity of colonial domination and all of the fears as to what this means for **the** people – "You are going to be worst off! Somebody is going to dominate you! You can't hold your structures together!" They said then that we were **too** small to go to independence on our own or together.

We must recognise **as** well, Sir, that I cannot, **as** a Caribbean man, remain happy in the context in which there is still the colonial presence within the Caribbean today, within the very **CARICOM** itself. We have the small sister territory of **Montserrat** still sharing sovereignty, not with Caribbean brothers, but sharing sovereignty with Englishmen whose eyes **are** glued on Europe and not here in the Caribbean. Likewise, we share here in **the** Caribbean the continuing presence of the colonial domination and dimension, whether it is in the Virgin Islands or in a country near to us, **Anguilla**.

I say **that** Caribbean people must recognise that they have the ability together to be as good as anyone else any part of this globe. We have had some achievements in the regional movement. Those who have spoken before me have **adverted** to some of those achievements. Let me just mention a few. I think we have come to recognise each one of us, even the Doubting Thomases, particularly in Jamaica, that some form of integration is necessary. I think, **too**, Sir, **that** despite the fear, even the Doubting Thomases will recognise that since we have made the break with our former colonial masters that we have progressed faster than we have done at any time in our history.

The third thing I wish to point out is that we have a unique achievement in the Caribbean in that since adult suffrage between 1944 and **1951** the Caribbean countries have had over 100 elections; something like **105** elections have been held, free and fair elections, the last of which occurred in Guyana. I am pleased to **see** that that country has now once again recognised the need for free and fair elections. It is a unique achievement for our people. It shows that we can manage government and we ought not

to be afraid of therefore taking new steps in this regard. We have a lot that we can teach the world and therefore the integration movement, in my view, Mr. Speaker, must mirror or translate this priceless success into other fields of **endeavour**.

What are the arguments we hear against taking the step? There **are** still those who persist in saying that our economies are too fragile and **too** vulnerable and that we **are too** small. I say to them in reply that that is an unimaginative argument. It is outdated in an increasingly global economy where there are distinct advantages with our access through the electronic gateways into the knowledge industry. These perhaps provide us with the highest value added that we could possibly achieve in the future. I say that we have the human resources that will make us use those very gateways in order to improve the quality of life for the people of the Caribbean and give us the opportunity to participate fully **and** competitively within a global framework.

The second argument I hear is one that has been repeated again, particularly out of Jamaica, and it is the sovereignty argument. We continue to be bedevilled with this concept that there is something absolute about sovereignty and that if we were to cede or to share part of our powers and part of our rights and to impose on others and assume from others part of the duties that we ought to impose that somehow we are betraying our people.

Let me make the obvious point, Sir. It is a logical point. Closer integration comes because as sovereign nations we are prepared to **exercise** our sovereignty to achieve a further step in **our** development. So I argue very strongly **as** I have argued for **30** years that it is nonsense, **as** unfortunately **the** Opposition in Jamaica seems to be arguing, to say that by going into close integration, whether it is economic or political, **that** there is some cession of sovereignty that is destructive to the concept of our nation states. I do not accept this at all. I have never accepted it. **2.55 p.m.**

In any event, Sir, if we examine what has happened in the Caribbean and particularly in Jamaica and Guyana in recent years, it seems to me that the Jamaican Labour Party in particular, the Opposition Party, would prefer to see sovereignty go to the International Monetary Fund, the Inter-American Development **Bank** and the World **Bank** than to share sovereignty and be part and parcel of it with their Caribbean brothers. I am not going to mince my words in this debate and confine them to looking at structures only. Somebody must say to the Caribbean and talk over the heads, if necessary, of the leaders, that this is a colonial and outmoded attitude. These are yesterday's men with yesterday's clothes and yesterday's ideas.

I, very much **as** a Caribbean person listening to my Caribbean brothers from Jamaica, Belize and elsewhere

believe that Mr. Seaga is out of step and out-of-date with what is happening in the world. Why should we continue to genuflect in Washington and move at Washington's pace and Washington's mistakes and we be not prepared to share with our Caribbean brothers what we should be sharing now? Nothing is sadder for me than to think that the IMF, the World Bank, even the State Department has more say in how Jamaica and the others of us are going to be run than we Caribbean people have in how we should go in the future. It makes no sense whatsoever to me. I believe, therefore, that the Commissioners failed me when they were afflicted by the same timidity, and moved for a compromise position that now leaves themselves under **fire** because they concentrated on form rather than substance.

The question of political union and the pace at which we can move towards West Indian nationhood was a central issue in this debate and **the** Commissioners heard it time and time again in the region and outside of the region among Caribbean people. I believe they showed fear in not saying up front that this had to be a question to be faced before we exit this century. That is my major criticism of this Report.

Let me speak now, perhaps, as a Barbadian, Sir. I strongly believe that some country must give the lead. I even more strongly believe that Barbados is ideally placed to assume the leadership once again of the Regional Integration Movement. My party has never flinched from making **that** sacrifice. Sir **Grantley Adams** had the courage of his conviction to leave the sanctity and the safety of the Barbadian political landscape and move forward to **Trinidad** even although in the process his party had to go into **Opposition** for 15 years. But he had the courage because **that** was his conviction. That conviction has never left the Barbados Labour Party. I suspect that it has never left the Barbadian people, because even although the failure occurred it was only within a few years thereafter that the late Rt. Hon. **Errol Barrow** had the courage again to take another step, not the step that I would have loved to have **seen** him take in full, but he **took** a step first into **CARIFTA** and, secondly, into **CARICOM**.

Once again, I am challenging the Prime Minister who represents our interest in the debate starting tomorrow to have the courage, vision and the determination to lead the debate towards Caribbean integration in the fullest and to the fullest and at the fastest pace available, not at the pace of the slowest of our members. We must do that, Sir.

Let me say this, Sir, the position of our party on this matter is absolutely clear. We are not and must not wait for those who will come at the end of the 21st Century. Barbados must be prepared to integrate as fast as possible with those who will come with us as quickly as possible. I believe Barbados has to put on the table again within the Caribbean moving towards an **Eastern** Caribbean

arrangement and if Jamaica wants to go to Mr. Bush we will leave them in the forest for as long as they **want** to be. That is my view on it. Let us here in the Eastern Caribbean decide to move ahead and go as fast as we possibly can into the **maximum** amount of integration as may be possible. That is the stance I would like our Government to clearly take in this matter. If we have to face sub-groupings, let us face the sub-groupings.

Mr. Speaker, why must we not do this? If I look at Europe today, I wonder how could European countries that have had among themselves greater differences, in which there have been wars among themselves, the use of military might to divide each other, are now today moving at a greater rate of integration than we who have never fought among ourselves can possibly contemplate. Mr. Speaker, it is with that deep conviction that I therefore approach the Report.

Mr. **Speaker**, I want to compliment the Commission for reporting on several of the issues. I do not intend in this debate to go through the subjects on which they have reported in detail. I wish, if possible, **to** take the wider picture. I really would **be** failing in my **duty** if I did not advert to some of the criticisms **made** on the point of the CARICOM Commissioners.

I have heard the jobs for the boys argument being used against the recommendation. I have to be very fair to the Commissionets. I do not believe that **the** rationale for the recommendation that a CARICOM body of **Commissioners** should be **set** up is **because** any of the Commissioners was seeking a job. As a matter of fact, at the meeting at which the Report was presented to the 13th CARICOM Heads of Government on June 30, this is what the Chairman of the Commission had **to** say, Sir. With **your** permission, Sir, I will quote it and **make** the document a document of the House. It says:-

"I underline that our proposal is for a commission **that** is modest in size, a President and two other Commissioners, but high level in capacity and drawn from persons with standing in the public and political life of this region among whom, as I said to you in caucus last February, members of the Commission **Q** not see ourselves. I underline this again here to **free** your consideration of the proposal of any notion of roles for any of us."

I take them at their word, Sir. I think this ought to be said in the debate as early as we possibly can.
3.05 p.m.

And the second thing that I want to say, Sir, is that the idea of CARICOM Commissioners being interposed between the Secretariat and the **Heads** of Government and Council of Ministers is not a new idea. It surfaced before from the very Heads when the Heads suggested the

appointment of a CARICOM Commissioner. Because there is the recognition that for the last 15 years we have to recognize that decisions have not been implemented as far as they could be. The other argument which is being used is that the strengthening of the Secretariat is the answer to the problem and that if you merely strengthen the Secretariat that you would then **see** rapid implementation of decisions and it would make the need for a further body absolutely redundant. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not buy that argument. I think that the Commissioners themselves did their proposal an injustice, as I said, by approaching this matter as though it is simply a matter of implementation.

The malaise in CARICOM is not only a question of implementation of decisions of the Heads of Government. The problem is much more substantial than **that**. It is the willingness of the countries to give up and cede powers at this stage to some authority whether it be a Head of Government, a Council of Ministers, Commissioners, whatever you want, or the Secretariat; but to cede those powers in a meaningful way so that there can be some supranational body whose decisions – after it **has** run the gamut of **all** of the other decision-making bodies – **have** the force and effect of law within our own **territories** and jurisdictions.

Let me put it in a different way for you, Mr. Speaker, and bring it down to reality for the businessmen of Bridgetown, of Kingston and of **Georgetown** to understand. Very frequently we go to Heads of Governments Conferences or Ministerial Conferences and we take a decision, but we know very well that even when the decision becomes part and parcel of our administrative structures **and** even our legal structures **that** other people whom the decision impact on break that decision. We know that. We have no enforcement machinery so it is not possible for a manufacturer in Barbados who is suddenly confronted with a change in the exchange rate policy in Jamaica to complain meaningfully before the courts of Barbados or Jamaica or of **the** Caribbean and get a redress. The result is that nobody has any respect for those decisions. We have to take the decision therefore to cede sovereignty to a supranational authority, some person who can implement fully those areas that we **are** conceding.

I think that **the** Commission was extremely wrong to duck this issue **because** it is still living with the fear of what happened at the time of the Federal debate in **Jamaica**. It is extremely unfair for Mr. Seaga to say in the debate in the Jamaican Parliament that he had **no** consultations, that nobody spoke to him. I know for a fact **that** the Commission spent 3 hours with him. That is an excuse, Mr. Speaker, Sir.

I believe that there **are** still those in the Caribbean who prefer to look to the north and to the west than to look to the south and to look among their own brothers. I say to

them, you are entitled to **take** that decision but we also must go ahead without you.

I am appealing to the Government. It would have **the** full support of this Opposition if it understands that Barbados must take **the** leading **role** now in the **integration** movement and realize **that** as a matter of **self-preservation**, not sentiment, **that** as my friend the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central believes we must clear these things of pejorative language and emotive argument. I may sound emotional about the **matter**, Sir, but **the clear** economics of the position tells me that **Barbados** must move with its brothers into union if it has to have any place in the global **framework** of economic developments and reality today. That is what we have to **recognize**. It is being faced in the Eastern Caribbean. There **are** still some who think **like** Mr. Seaga **too**.

I cannot understand the position of Antigua. Why should it prefer **corruption** to coming into a properly integrated system where we have rules that we can follow? I really cannot understand their position on some of these matters. I really **find** it **difficult** sometimes to even understand the position of some of my **colleagues** who **share** with me **democratic** socialism within Socialist international who would take us **back** by believing that they, **too**, should not get into an **integration** movement.

The social democrats of Europe have been **the first** moving to bring the workers of **Europe** together in a **wider** union for their own economic well-being and protection and for social justice. It is no different **here** within the Caribbean.

That is why when the Honourable Member for Christ Church South, the **Honourable** Member for St. **George** South and the Honourable **Member** for St. **Peter** and I went to Trinidad in June ahead of the **last Heads of Government** Conference, from our perspective, we used **our** position with the meeting with **other** Opposition Leaders to insist **that** we should make representations to **that Heads of Government** Conference for the West **Indies** Commission to be debated in our Parliaments and dealt with early. We considered it **too** critical and **too** crucial.

I **return**, Sir, to the point of supranational powers. This is not merely a question of personnel. Unfortunately the Commissioners have done themselves an injustice by putting it in **that** form. It is more than **that**. It is a question of cession of powers and they must face up **to** it and say it and leave it to the leaders to do something about it. Because, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the pressure is building up from the people of the Caribbean who want to **see** us go forward at a faster pace.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to illustrate it in the language that we **all** know here and love so much,

the language of **sport**. When we combine our strengths **and** play as a **West** Indian team in cricket we **make** our **mark** on the world stage. When we go to Spain as individual units we run in last and everybody laughs at us. It is an absolute total waste of time and money in the process. And I **make** the point, Sir, there is no point my hearing how well someone from Trinidad ran, getting no medal, probably coming thirty-seventh of fortieth, that somebody from Barbados does not qualify and that we may have a Jamaican occasionally who may run and **win** a **bronze** medal. The Caribbean people want to win gold and strike gold. **That** is what we want to do. I **am** appealing to the leaders to recognise that it is not simply a question, **therefore**, of **personnel**, it is a question of ceding our powers and using our strength together in order to strengthen our respective weaknesses.
3.15 p.m.

I want, Mr. Speaker, Sir, to say that the way forward calls for the maximum amount of agreement between the political leaders and parties within our **respective** borders. **One** of the saddest things for me as a young man growing up in the Caribbean 30 years ago was to see how the political leaders focused on the integration question, not in what it would achieve for **all** of us but how it impacted on their individual electoral fortunes from time to time. So you will find that today's federalists when in Government became **tomorrow's** anti-federalists when in opposition and there was no consistency and I **am** strongly recommending to the leaders, particularly of **the** Eastern Caribbean and here in Barbados, that they must involve, in my view, the *position, from the start, in all discussions on matters of regional integration.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that we do not, in **our** Parliaments, come and lay, even the communique from **Heads** of Government Conferences. I regret that very much. If you are to get a Paper on what is happening you have to get it **from** a journalist or get it from – **not** even from a Caribbean journalist, sometimes. What is more painful for us who might be in the Opposition from time to time is to get it **from** a foreign Government who seem to know things that **are** going to happen in the region before they have even happened in the region. I am again **speaking** to the governing party in Barbados **and** say this, the Barbados **Labour** Party's position is quite clear. The Government and ourselves should have no disagreement in this **day** and age on the pace at which Barbados is going to move into an Association in the Eastern Caribbean or elsewhere. It is an issue on which **the** Government should be prepared to set up with us, proper procedures for consultations and we, when in Government, will assure that we will set up the **proper** procedures for consultations to keep each other fully advised and informed on what is happening within the **Caricom** region and on the steps we think **are** necessary to move fully into an integrated economy.

I want to say a brief word, Sir, on a few of the substantive issues. I believe, Sir, that the Report of the Commission when it dealt with questions of down-sizing of the Governments in the region is worth **reading** and is worth implementing. **When** it dealt with the role of the services sector and the effect that it **can** have on **all** of us, I think they made valuable points there as well, Sir. When it recommends an export propelled strategy to achieve the promotion of small businesses and self employment for correcting the imbalances in wealth and in income in the region I believe, once again, that we should pay early attention to some of their recommendations. I am a strong believer, Sir, in the single market and I **am** also a **strong** believer, Sir, in the Caribbean Court, **about** which my friend, the Honourable Member for **St. Thomas**, has spoken. I **am** even a strong believer in the maximum regional **integration**. I believe in sharing our police services, our judiciary, our customs services and I believe, Sir, that I, **too**, strongly support freedom of capital and freedom of movement of our people.

I was deeply disappointed to see that the recommendations for **freedom** of movement at present is limited to **graduates** of the UWI and journalists. It is a wrong approach; an absolute wrong approach to the matter. The road contractor, road technicians who are now **working** with C. O. **Williams** Construction Company Limited in St. Kitts will **find** it difficult to accept **that** recommendation. As a lawyer who has practised up and down the region I would find it difficult to accept that recommendation in the limited way in which it is has been made.

I believe that only when our economies **are** fully integrated, when our companies **are** cross fertilized, when our stock exchange deals with **all** of the public companies whether they are incorporated in Jamaica, Guyana **or** elsewhere, when we **can** move money and invest money where there is the best opportunity for it and move skills and use skills where the opportunity exists I believe that then and only then will the Caribbean make sense on the world scene.

I consider the Caricom should remain the inner core of our economic and political development initially. I **am** one of those who see the Caribbean in wider terms than the English speaking nations of the Caribbean. I do, however, believe that when we are taking these steps we must make sure that the other countries subscribe to some of the basic standards that must be there if an integration movement is to be meaningful. I would find it difficult, and the Barbados Labour Party would **find** it difficult, to commit itself in a widening exercise if it means simply that we **are** going in with countries that do not understand fundamental human rights and basic **freedoms**. Therefore, while I support very strongly widening the movement to include the **non-English** speaking countries of the Caribbean I think that that is a longer process that will come in due course.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to end. You have been very generous to me, Sir. I am going to end now, Sir. I want to end by saying this. Deeper integration at a faster pace is no longer an option, it is a necessity. It is no longer a privilege, it is a **matter** of self defence and self preservation for our countries and our citizens. I make the plea once again to the Caribbean and the Caribbean Leaders and particularly to Barbados to take the initiative. We must not wait until we are told by the World Bank and by Washington and by the IMF that we must move in a particular direction.

3.25 p.m.

I support most strongly the Report, I counsel that we do not reject the Report out of hand tomorrow, **Wednesday**, Thursday and Friday; that the leaders must rise above the defects in this Report and themselves show that they are bold men and women prepared to take the steps and not go into reverse, as sadly happened in the Jamaican Parliament. It is a **matter** of great regret to me, that under fire from the Leader of the Opposition in Jamaica the Prime Minister amended his Resolution from an approval to a mere noting. That means he goes with ambivalence, and we will find ourselves in a further compromise which can do us no good.

Sir, I say to the Caribbean, I have read the Maastricht Treaty which is now being debated in the European countries – in fact, I made a copy available to my friend, the Honourable Member for St. Lucy, to see. **Maastricht** is an act of faith, it is a bold step. Some will reject it, but, Mr. Speaker, do you see who is going for it? Germany and France, the countries that were at internecine warfare not too long ago; and I say to Barbados today, go for it! Take the lead, be bold and stand up for what we strongly believe in and are committed to.

Hon. D. W. BOWEN: Mr. Speaker, the general trend and tone of the debate has been in support of the move towards regional integration. However, it seems to me that the issue is one of pace at which, and the methodology by which, we should proceed. My contribution would vary somewhat from those speakers who have **preceded** me, in that I would **seek** to deal with a number of recommendations in the Report which relate to sections or sectors within my Ministry, and more specifically I will deal with the recommendations on culture, youth and gender issues, especially women.

I want at the outset to laud the Commission for the production of a very wide ranging and comprehensive document which, to a large extent, we all agree would be used several years from now as a reference source. I must hasten to add, though, that I have certain difficulties with a number of the recommendations in the Report and therefore my intervention might even seem to be a critique

of the Report. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it has been argued that the recommendation for the establishment of a **CARICOM** Commission suggests that we continue to **see** integration solely in **functional** terms around economic issues, functional co-operation around economic issues.

It is my submission that the Report is replete with bureaucratic and administrative solutions at the expense of political considerations. There are a number of general issues which I will deal with, especially the six recommendations for immediate action which have **been** fully dealt with and ventilated here, but I obviously have my own input and weight to lend to them, but before that I think pride of place should come to those matters which fall directly under the Ministry of Community Development and Culture, and therefore I will start with those.

To my mind the section on culture is the most gratifying for me, it is the most satisfying aspect of the Report. It is the part of the Report about which I am most enthused. Firstly, the Report speaks of the formulation of a regional cultural policy and I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that the 9th meeting of Education Ministers sought the formulation of a regional cultural policy as a priority area. The question for decision is the direction in which cultural development should be going. I think we all agree that in 1992 there are still far too many complaints about the notion of cultural penetration, and the formulation of a regional cultural policy I believe would strengthen the people in our native culture, especially the youth, and so reduce outside influences.

The Report also speaks to the need for recognising the importance of cultural factors in macro planning. Again, this is an area which I could support, because I recognise that Governments and other agencies know that developmental projects in the past, which did not take into account the cultural **makeup** of our people, have failed by and large. I can associate myself strongly with the recognition of the importance of cultural factors in **macro** planning.

The third area in respect of culture with which I would want to associate myself relates to the question of arts and crafts as part of the school curriculum. I believe that such a move would enable the youth to develop a strong sense of cultural identity and that countries will always have a cadre of artists capable of producing worthwhile products.

Some of the debate, and the last speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, spoke in strong terms of the fact that the Report comes at a time when all Caribbean countries are facing economic difficulties. I wish to state, as a corollary to that, that the Governments of the region must recognise that the marketing of culture can develop as an industry

in itself and there is empirical evidence to support this, that when a country is going through economic difficulties the **arts** tend to flourish. I believe the reason for that is because there is reaction by **the** people to display a level **of** creativity that generally is dormant in better economic **times**. I am, therefore, suggesting, Mr. Speaker, **that** the question of cultural development should assume priority at the **upcoming** meeting and that it should not be placed on the back burner.

Before I move from the issue of culture, I want to touch briefly on the future of CARIFESTA, a matter which I believe is dear to the heart of the Honourable Member for St. George South. I believe that regional Governments should ensure that the objectives of CARIFESTA are met through periodic exchanges of a smaller nature and that there should be constant interchange and exchange of artists and cultural workers throughout the region. I note with some dismay the response to **CARIFESTA** and participation this year was somewhat lukewarm, but I hope, in the future, that regional governments see and recognise the importance of CARIFESTA.

3.35 p.m.

Therefore, I end where I started by saying **that** the future of CARIFESTA needs to be discussed and decisions taken so that we can get the fullest and most **meaningful** participation in the future.

The section of the Report on youth and youth affairs is very descriptive and **makes** for good reading. A lot of **this** material in the Report can be held for posterity. We **can** read it and probably never get tired of reading it. A lot of it is really factual and I have no difficulty with endorsing and adopting most of the recommendations dealing with youth.

The recommendations dealing with youth generally suggest that youth programmes and policies must be part of an **overall** national plan. Very simplistic, but it must be seen as the starting point from which to launch any national policy on youth. The Report recognises that this would not **only** aid national development but that it will help to combat unemployment and will also enable the youth to be of service to **the** community.

Mr. Speaker, if there is one criticism on the section relating to youth it is that the recommendation seems to be from the top down. The recommendations do not take into consideration that they are placed on the table for the youth and the recommendations and the Report do not speak to the involvement of the youth in the decision making process but they have enumerated a list of **recommendations** which are aimed at fully integrating youth into the mainstream of social activity. That is **all** well and **good**, but I believe it is lacking in not identifying ways and means

for which the youth, probably youth organisations, could fully participate **at** the decision-making level.

The Report, Mr. **Speaker**, also refers to youth exchanges. As a matter of fact, the whole question of exchanges runs through the Report and in **regard** to youth it speaks of youth exchanges. I believe that these **are** desirable and they already **form** part of **the** Caribbean youth programme which is operating out of Guyana and some note should be taken of the outstanding work of the Caribbean Youth Service. You may wish to know **that** the CYC is also engaged in a number of other issues such as youth enterprise, job creation, health and welfare.

Finally on youth, **the** Report speaks about **the** question of a national youth policy. We, in Barbados, have commissioned the compilation of such a report and I am told **that** it should be ready by mid November. We await the recommendations of the Committee which is mandated to devise a national policy on **youth**.

The question of women's issues is also addressed by the Report. I have studied the concerns of the local Women's Bureau as well **as** other women's organisations relating to the **recommendations** and the concerns which they have expressed before the Commission while **the** Commission was in Barbados. I do not think that **the** women's grouping in Barbados **are** asking for the **reversal** of historical imbalances in their favour. What I believe they **are** asking for is a fair and equitable opportunity to participate and contribute to the further development of the country and the region **as** a whole. The recommendations at page 343 of Recommendation 3 of the Report is **very** apposite in this regard.

I must **hasten** to point out again, Mr. **Speaker**, that through the **CARICOM Ministers** with responsibility for women's affairs many fundamental disadvantages to women of the region have been addressed already. Many countries, of which Barbados is **no** exception, have established women's bureaus and in other **cases** are working towards the establishment of women's bureaus as a focal point mechanism.

I would want, Mr. Speaker, to **turn** to a number of general issues. I do not want to repeat a lot of what **has** been said but there are certain matters which I would want as my contribution and which relate to the 6 recommendations which **are** listed in the Overview **to** the Report of the West Indian Commission as a number of immediate action proposals.

A lot has been said about the permission for West Indians to travel freely throughout the region. Let me add, Mr. Speaker, that I support the 6 **recommendations** but I must caution that the method of implementation must be

carefully thought **through** and planned because we cannot detract from the fact that there is uneven development in the region and this would have implications for how a number of these matters are implemented.

3.45 p.m.

The question of free travel is going to have implications for the social services of any country. As I said, I **am** supporting it but we cannot detract **from** the fact that there are going to be implications **at** the social level and the educational level especially for those countries already densely populated. That is why I say that the implementation of this policy must be carefully thought through. Therefore this proposal seems more medium-term than something the Honourable Member **for** Christ Church West Central had stated in the scenario which he advanced. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe there is time for action but there is time for planning action with regard to this recommendation.

A lot has been said about the second recommendation regarding the graduates of **UWI** and other institutions to be identified. But again, the Honourable Member for St. Joseph identified steel-benders as a group that could be looked at. I am saying that in the region there seems to me to be a fairly conspicuous absence of that level of worker between the top technocrats and the artisans. I will give you an example, draughtsmen. You only have to check the Civil List to see how many vacancies exist in these area.

I **am** submitting, Mr. Speaker, that the Regional Heads of Government could look **at** the possibility of exchange visits for public workers especially at that level throughout the Public Service. This **can** only enhance and enrich the experience of the public officer if this is allowed on a reciprocal basis. I note that it already happens in the National Insurance Department where our system is used as the model and there are several attachments from the OECS to the National Insurance Department. I would like to see this expanded especially at the middle management and supervisory management level in the Public Service.

The third recommendation for immediate action speaks to the **point** of taking concrete steps towards establishing an independent Caribbean Monetary Authority. While I support this in principle, I have some questions relating to this recommendation. Are we working towards a common monetary policy? A common Central **Bank**? I suspect that the recommendation would be so pervasive that a common monetary policy would lead probably to a common fiscal policy and then to a common social policy so I have some reservations in that area.

At 4 - the launching of a Caribbean Investment Fund of **U.S.**\$50 million. Again I support this recommendation since it is desirable to provide risk capital for not only new

business but, certainly, for **businesses** which have potential for expansion. I believe it would also go a long way towards providing the incentive for **more** local companies to go public.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would want to **state** that, to a large extent, it is a question of political **will** that is going to inform and determine **the** pace at which we achieve regional integration. I fully **and** strongly support the move and comments on both sides towards a rapid **and** expeditious move towards regional integration but bearing in mind the reservations I have listed.

The Report **also** speaks **about** strengthening the CARICOM Secretariat. **The** area I would want to publicly call into question and which has not **been** addressed is why CARICOM has not fulfilled its mandate to **the** extent that it should have and why things have not **worked to the** extent they should have **and** this relates to the fact **that** there are **too** many important vacancies in **the** CARICOM Secretariat. I notice this has not **been** addressed. I **Q** not think it is a matter we **can** shirk the fact that there are several vacancies at the level of **the** CARICOM Secretariat and, therefore, it is almost impossible to carry out **the** mandate with those very important **offices** unfilled.

I would end where I started by **commending** the Commission for the work and the document which they have produced. I remain **firmly** committed to regional integration. I look forward in the very near future to a number of recommendations which **are** contained in the Report becoming a reality.

Thank **yw.**

Mr. **DeL. O. BRADSHAW**: Mr. **Speaker**, first of all let me go on record as **commending** the Commission for producing this Report though I would not want to be **on** record as supporting everything that has **been** recommended in the Report. Before that, I **think** it is only fair that I praise such bodies as the University of the West Indies which has been in the forefront of regional integration and the West **Indies** Cricket Board of Control which has **been** playing its part, a very important part, in **bringing** about regional integration. Another body which comes to mind is that of the Caribbean Examination Council, the **CXC**, which has played and continues to play a very significant role in the whole march towards realising full integration throughout the region.

The Commission has looked at ways and means of how we could bring about real integration furthering the movement, bringing about a oneness of the people and making this a reality. I think that is exactly what was **the** intention of the Heads of Government when they first considered establishing this Commission. Obviously **the**

Commission would have recognised some of the machinery **that** is presently in place and how successful they have been **working**.
3.55 p.m.

They have been looking at some of the areas that **are** yet to be explored and which the political leadership needs to look at with a view to exploring how best they could become vehicles in furthering about the integration movement. But there **are** some problems.

I want to state **from** the outset **that** it would require the political will by the political leadership to bring about whatever integration or the extent of integration that we **are talking** about. We **can** have all these documents. They might be all right for readership of our students of history but if we do not understand that there are some things **called** real and unreal and go about trying to establish and to accomplish the real rather than **looking** at the unreal we **are** not going to do anything **at all** in this direction as far as integration is concerned.

There is still some work to be done in the area of communication for example. What is all **this** talk about Caribbean integration, bringing a community together, **talking** about the Caribbean community when in truth and in fact we have got some definite problems which we have got to **deal** with first of all? Communication is vital towards effecting anything called community. We cannot have a community except we consider seriously aspects of communication. Not only are we supposed to **look** at culture **as** a form of communication, we must also look at transportation. How can we **talk** seriously or **ask** people to **take** us seriously about Caribbean integration when we **are** not addressing the problem of transportation within the region. Much focus has got to be placed on this particular aspect because we would need to move from one island to **another** and at **reasonable** cost since we are all divided by sea. We have to look at communication by **sea** or by air or both. That is why my one regret is that we have seen the **demise** of WISCO. I thought that that was one particular organization that could have helped significantly in bringing **about** Caribbean integration.

But what has happened is that we have seen here that some governments have reneged on their responsibility and have **treated** it with contempt and as a result WISCO has ended up on the **rocks**. How can we think seriously about Caribbean integration and movement of one people to another or having that sort of linkage when in fact we have not paid sufficient attention to a regional air carrier? We have to look at LIAT. From time to time LIAT has **been** faced with a lot of problems. The countries who **are** Directors in LIAT have not been making a contribution. I would find it very difficult to understand how heads of those particular countries, those countries that have not

been paying their share **as** shareholders in LIAT, how then could they be seriously supporting Caribbean integration? That would be my problem. I do not **understand** that. Because we have had a situation where rather than trying to develop LIAT **as** the regional carrier, set up in 1974 ... But we have had people who will not contribute. We need to think of how best we can develop LIAT.

We have to look at CARICARGO and see what has gone wrong. It seemed an attempt to cement the integration movement. But CARICARGO is left on the rocks here again. We have to look at these things, whatever the reasons. I am not **concerned** about the reasons. I have to point out what are the facts, **the** reality that CARICARGO was set up between Trinidad and Barbados but something has gone wrong. If we are going to talk seriously about West Indian movement we have to look at how best we can **correct** this particular problem. I said CARICARGO is one of them from which we can take stock. We have to look at that.

If we **are** not **looking** at LIAT we have to look at how best we can have regional carriers or carriers outside of the region coming into the region and when they bring passengers to the Caribbean area how best we can have them, let us say, involved in regional tourism. Because there must be a benefit when aircraft, let us say, come from **Europe into** Barbados or **St. Lucia** or at whatever point there is an international airport. We have to think how best we **can** maximize the benefit of this **tourism**. **That** takes me to another point because it is very closely related. In marketing tourism we need to fuse all these forces together. I know **that** there has been some attempts at **the** Caribbean Hotel Association and the CTO but even their attempt to market the region as **one** unit has met with a lot of hostility and lack of support **from** some of the governments because of this individualistic **approach**. And we have to watch that. **That** is why the Caribbean integration cannot be a reality. It should be a reality all like now. But because of these separate and private interests coming from sometimes the politicians, sometimes the private sector **too**, it is just a matter of being talked of and no reality.

Certainly the Caribbean would benefit greatly, the economic situation in the Caribbean area would be improved if we took a more unified approach in marketing our tourist product. That also goes for **trade**. You do not need every country in the Caribbean region to have a trade commissioner or an ambassador abroad. We **are** only fooling ourselves when we say **that** we are sending ambassadors to different countries. We have whisky mouth and mauby pocket. We know we cannot maintain them abroad. Because of this individualistic **approach** we **find** ourselves spending a lot of money, draining the Caribbean region because we want to set up an embassy in some **particular** country. My recommendation would be to look at how best we could pool our resources together in representing

the Caribbean community as a whole. I **think that** that would go a long way.

That leads me on to another point, the whole question of **sports**. I did, at the beginning, say that I would want to commend the West **Indies** Cricket Board of Control. But I would go a little bit further and say this, that we **too** must look at our image and how we **are** going to market the Caribbean region. It is now known that even if in the Caribbean region one country did go to the Olympics and did very well, like in the **case** of Jamaica that in the eyes of the world the Caribbean does not get the **benefit**. I think sometimes we have to understand how Europe and how bigger countries operate. In the recent Olympics you had – although the Russian States were separated, a united team – the Soviet Union. I **am** wondering why we could not – it would help us with cost and certainly bring some credit to the Caribbean region as a whole if we could put together a West **Indies** Netball team, a basketball team or an athletic team.

4.05 p.m.

Sometimes we don't even get mentioned. So, Mt. Speaker, I can understand why this Report has come in this form because there **are** some other things. Some people **look** at the son of class and the people in certain categories and that is reflected in this **Report**. That is why it is being criticised in some quarters, because there is a perception **that** this Report, in some way, addresses people of a social or intellectual calibre and it pays very little regard, as far as the recommendations are concerned, to the labouring class, the people at the very bottom. No one can deny the fact that people, graduates and qualified people, professionals, experience less hassle at the **airports** of countries than people at the bottom rung of the ladder. That is understood and therefore I would say that the Commission has not addressed the real problem when they recommend that you start at the top with University graduates. I **am** saying that is wrong. What they should seek to recommend is to build on what is going on. What about **the** people doing their little trade, **the** people going down to Guyana and the people who live here and the people in Jamaica? **Think** about them and expand that because those are the people who really carry the news from Ghent to Aix. That is exactly what it is. Those are the people. I am concerned about them. We must understand what we are doing. What are the signals that we are sending to people? We are talking in here and some of us **are** even, by the way we are putting it over, perpetuating what we condemn, the elitist approach to things. Nobody has taken time out to talk about the labourers who have to be imported into Barbados to assist Barbadians with cutting canes. I would like to see, since those people have come from neighbouring countries, from St. Vincent or maybe St. Lucia or Guyana, I would like to see some consideration given to them but the Report does not mention them. I **am** saying they must understand the problems because I don't

know how many people understand that last year and year before builders had to apply for work permits for workmen coming from Guyana to work here in Barbados because Barbadian carpenters were unable to handle the green heart. Now this is **an** area where skill and expertise are necessary.

Now, let us be realistic. Guyana owes Barbados money and we are thinking in terms of how best we can redress this problem. It has been recommended that you take some of the timber as a form of payment. What do we have? Guyana has been saying, we will give you the timber but we want people to come and cut it and we want to be assisted with the transportation. I know that is the case. Even if they can get the machinery to cut down the **trees** we still need a form of transportation. Hence I will go back to the point I was making earlier – WISCO transport, **Caricargo** No. 2. How are we going to talk about trade-offs? I am hearing this fancy language but I can't understand it. Let us get down to basics. You are **talking** about economic movement and all this sort of thing. You have trade agreements. Transportation is very vital. It is very, very important to the movement of trade but you have ignored it completely. What are you going to do? We have got to be serious. We **are talking** about implementing **all** this sort of thing but I would like to **see**, what integration movement means to me, is where people who have got a common interest, a common goal, a common heritage to relate to each other and understand that we are in truth and in fact our brother's keeper. That is what we have to get across. We have to understand that quite clearly.

I will say that one of the things we have to recognise, and the Commission has not gone far enough, the Commission should have recognised that one of the ways through which we were getting this communication is through men and women going to different countries, or through inter-marriages. Now, that is a premiss. I don't know why they did not address that. There are a lot of people who come **into** Barbados, and they call the Barbadians studs, **sorry** I had to say the word, but they go around and it has worked. It helped with the integration movement.

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is true. We have to build on what we have. There are some people who have applied for citizenship in Barbados, not based on birth but by descent and if we are talking about integration we have to acknowledge that and remove all those obstacles which prevent people from having access to citizenship. I **am** saying that these are things we have to look at. The Commission should have looked at them rather than talk about setting up another commission. I see the other commission, Mr. Speaker, as trying to work on those areas that need **refining**.

Now when I look at culture, another area, and the arts, that is a form we have to be serious about because I don't want to sound **as** if I am blowing my own trumpet, there is the Pinelands Creative Workshop, that belongs to Barbados, I do not want to take any credit for it although I am the patron and I was a founding member but I am proud and I am saying Barbados should be proud to know that that particular group has been travelling the length and breadth of the Caribbean exposing our culture and as a result there **are** people from **Trinidad** and from **the** other countries coming to Barbados to demonstrate their culture.

Now this is what the Commission has addressed and the Minister of Culture has talked about but he did not mention the **Pinelands** Creative Workshop which has gone even further afield than the Caribbean. They have gone to North America to show what talent we have, to show off what our heritage is all about. I am saying that in order to widen this, if you want to achieve this cultural penetration, we have been projecting North America and very, very little on our television screens about Caribbean culture. There is a little about Caribscope, just a half hour or so. We can go further than that. Half hour is not enough. I **am** saying that the Governments must understand, even the Barbados Government must recognise that it needs, if it wants to keep CBC, that they need to give them a licence that as a private company they can have Caribbean programmes. As it stands in Barbados ... Let us look at ourselves as we talk about integration, what are we really doing? Don't you **see** that when you have CBC in a strait-jacket they are unable to **carry** as many **programmes** as will help with the integration movement. That is why I am calling for the freeing up of, or at least the issuing of, another licence. We cannot continue to operate and **talk** about Caribbean people when you know you still control the television sets and the media. That cannot be right. You **are** blowing hot and cold. You cannot talk about putting a position, you must **free** up yourselves and say, look we have put in place these things and then you can invite your neighbours to join you; but you cannot go and put a position to them when at home your house is not in order. It is just like talking about women and talking about **integrating** women. I have seen the **Report**. The Report talks about that but we must ask ourselves if all the countries have attained the situation that we have attained in Barbados.

4.15 p.m.

Yes, we have passed laws, **thanks** to the Barbados Labour Party Government, especially the Leader of the Opposition who piloted and made sure that there was a Commission for women. We have come into this Parliament and passed laws which have seen women attaining certain rights, but we have to go a step farther. The race is not won yet. I **am** going to invite the Government, because we have to take leadership in this

position, to bring to this Honourable Chamber the equal opportunity legislation which has been drafted and is sitting in the Ministry of **Labour so** that women will be protected by law to apply and not be discriminated against in applications for jobs.

Aside.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I **do** not want to hear any talk, it was them since 1986 and **all** I am asking the Government to do is to bring it **down**. It will have the support of this Opposition. We **are** talking about everything equal and about women, but **at the same** time we have not brought the legislation to effect what we **are** saying, and we **are** going by convention. Everybody knows that convention and practices cannot be held up in a **court and** we have to be very **serious** about what we **are** talking about.

We have to start thinking in **terms** of the movement of some of these traders. Let me say this to the Commission as the recommendation relates to removing and having one line. That is not the point. No matter what signs you put up, the point is that you must remove once and for **all the barriers** to the movement of people within the Caribbean. That is exactly what it is. You will not have to put up any sign "Foreigners here" or "Foreigners there", people will come and go as long **as** they **are** CARICOM nationals. **That** is exactly what we have to look at, and we will have another line for people coming **from outside** the region. If you have that you will not have to put Barbadian, Trinidadian and citizens of CARICOM, so one has to be thinking about which one.

I do not know if the common currency is going **to** work, because everybody is thinking in terms of protecting their own currency. Why **talk** about CARICOM currency and waste time fooling the public about common currency, when we know the position in Barbados is that we do not want to devalue. Do not **care** what arguments are put up by the economists **or** people who know, they **are** being ignored, so **that** again is a **non-starter**. We know we had difficulty even with the Caribbean Traveller's Cheques. Some people do not **accept them**, so there is a problem with our currency. It is the perception of the politicians that they have to think in **terms** of themselves and they **are** not prepared to share anything. Although I would like to **see** Caribbean integration, I would **like** to see a Parliament where we can think of ourselves as Caribbean people with politicians **thinking that** way. I know there are lots of hurdles yet to be overcome. It is not a simple matter.

The Commission, **as** I said, has done a good job in identifying some of the areas, but it is a question of whether they have established the priorities. What is to be said about a Caribbean Parliament? You have to educate the people, train young people, **as** the Minister of Community Development has touched on, but what about

a common language? I saw, when I was in teaching, some attempt to have a Caribbean dictionary. No doubt **the** purpose of that was to acquaint **the** young Caribbean people with the sort of language that was used in other countries, so that we could understand each other. I do not know how far that has got, because I have not heard much more about it, but we could have expanded on **that** and I am sure that we would have advanced some 10 or 15 years by now. So we have to understand what **are** the basic problems to Caribbean integration, bringing the community together.

Let us be realistic. Within the Caribbean you either learn French, Spanish or patois, but within the schools you have to start with this language idea. If we are going to get people to understand patois, then we have to accept the fact **that** we have to invite people from Dominica or **St. Lucia** to come and teach it. We have to include **that** as a language and stop fooling ourselves that French and pure French is the only thing to be accepted. People have one country but several languages and we have to recognise it.

Mr. Speaker, it is not as simple as jotting it **down** in a book and saying we have a document for posterity. We have to be practical. Let us understand we have to build, and it starts with people. I **can** understand the Member for Christ Church East Central when he expresses concern **or** has some reservation about the involvement of labour **and** the fight they will have. I **can** agree with his position because I have sat down and studied this very carefully. When you have this integration movement you have to understand that people work standards differ in each country and you have to look at trade unionism and the representatives of trade unions and at the problem that will confront them. We in Barbados prize the **trade** union movement and hold it in very high esteem, but there **are** practices in some of the CARICOM countries that leave a lot to be desired. Therefore, you have to look at it **from** the trade unions' point of view and see how best you can involve them. There are still some problems, this thing is very complex.

Mr. Speaker, I agree that we must start somewhere, but we must not forget that there are some areas which **are** more advanced than others. We can take those up and **see** whether they could easily be implemented, build on them and leave those which we know can follow later. It is a matter of discounting some of the recommendations. They can be put on the back burner for now, but I **recognise** that there are some reasonable recommendations which we could implement. It would not be right to discard the whole thing. I think we can look at them, give them some in-depth study and I think we will be able to come up with something that could get the movement working once and for all.

4.25 p.m.

Mr. H. A. **BLACKMAN**: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief because I believe that most of the **recommendations** in the Report by the CARICOM Commission have **been** dealt with by the Honourable Members who have spoken last Tuesday and today.

I think, on listening to the **Honourable Member** for Christ Church West, I can sympathise and empathise with him because for years during the **60's** when **the** Under Forties were going **around** Barbados keeping their political meetings the Honourable Member for Christ **Church** West was in the forefront of that movement and even then he was an ardent federalist. Mr. **Speaker**, I **Q** believe however **that** the idea of federation is an ideal. It is a concept that all of us believe in but most of us realise will **not** happen in your lifetime or in mine. It is something that we hope and we wish for but we have to be practical.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker that those of us who believe that we can **start** with a political union in the Caribbean are going to be sadly mistaken. This is one instance **where** I tend to go along with the Commission's ideas. The Commission actually said that the reason why it **has** not pursued the federal concept was because of the question of sovereignty and with **all** due respect to the Honourable Member for Christ Church West I believe the question of sovereignty **has** to be looked at.

Mr. Speaker, the **mistake** that most of us tend to **make** is to **think that** it is the politicians who need to give up **that** sovereignty in order to make the federation work. We may discover that the people themselves may **not** want **to** give up some of the sovereignty that they have **at** the moment. What is happening today in the **European** Community – and that is not a federation yet; it is still a community – as has been shown by the Danes with the **Maastricht Treaty** is **that** they suspect it. The people in Denmark felt **that** the European Commission was having **too** much power over what was happening in Denmark and the other countries. You will note that since then the people in France have only by a majority of 1% agreed to **that treaty**. In Britain, it may be defeated in the House of Commons next **week**. So we have to understand that the **people** themselves **are** a bit concerned that they may lose their sovereignty.

It is not the politicians, as a lot of people **believe**, who are afraid and who do not have **the guts** to give up some of the sovereignty. It may be the people themselves.

I would recommend, as the Commission has recommended, that we **proceed** with all **haste** to put **the** economic part of this package in place, but **even** the economic package, you would have seen **within** the past couple of months that even with **that** you are having difficulty. Even with the economic package you **are** having difficulty, where you **are** getting **Barbados** to implement certain recommendations and other countries agreeing to implement other recommendations **and** many other

Caribbean countries refusing to accept the **recommendations** that have already been accepted by Barbados and some other countries. So when it comes to economic union you are having difficulties.

Take **for** example the Common External Tariff. There **are** still some countries in the Caribbean which have not implemented that. So I fervently do not believe that you **can** start with a political union in **the** Caribbean and expect that you **are** going to get anywhere with it. You **are** never going to get anywhere with a political union at this time. It is something that you **can** bear in mind and that you could look forward to but let us move forward with the economic union **first**. The monetary union **as** well you could even move on to that when the time is ripe once the exchange rates **can** be settled out and it does not entail too much devaluation in any country because again we just saw what happened with the economic union in Europe. So we **have** to tread very carefully.

I believe, **as** I said that we cannot go with the political union as has been suggested very fervently by the Honourable Member for Christ Church West. I believe that with regards federation the people of the Caribbean will have to be convinced first, not the politicians. The people **themselves** will have to be told in a massive programme what **are** the benefits of a federal system. They will have to be told what **are** the disadvantages of **the** same federal system and then it will have to be pointed out to them that the benefits of this federal system far outweigh the disadvantages in order to have any **firm** agreement.

I will keep the concept of federation in my head and in my heart as a concept and as an ideal. I am not living in a dream world to believe that tomorrow at the Heads of **Government** Conference in Trinidad or wherever it is held that you **can** just come out and say, "Let's move **forward** with the federal idea" and expect that that will happen. My view is, move forward **as** speedily as you can with the economic union then when the time is right you move forward with the monetary union and when those things have been put in place and **are** working well then I believe you may be able to sell the idea of a political union in the Caribbean.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like briefly, in my intervention, to touch on some of the purely economic aspects of this Report which have not yet been addressed in this very full debate; a debate which, in my judgment **has** canvassed most of the views thoroughly and a debate in which, certainly, Sir, a very strong case has been put for the integration of the Caribbean in a manner which is both **frank** and forthcoming.

Before I move on to the purely economic issue I think I really ought to underscore and support the stand that was **taken** by the Member for St. Michael South East to the effect that the implementation of **the first** recommendation of the West Indian Commission calling for Caribbean people to be permitted to travel in their region with freedom of **ease**, is a recommendation which is revolutionary in character and one which, if not implemented, will absolutely **frustrate** the integration process in the Caribbean. It is my judgment that I have never yet visited a Caribbean country that I did not like and I have visited a large number of Caribbean countries but the same cannot be said of the Caribbean people in general. The largest proportion of the people in the Caribbean have never visited another Caribbean country.
4.35 p.m.

As a result, Mr. Speaker, we **are** trying to superimpose **structures** on integration of people in circumstances where people do not know each other and in very many respects have an ambivalence towards abstract concepts of integration. This ambivalence is really borne out in the case of a very well known Barbadian character. If you were to watch test cricket in South Africa or Australia, you would **see** a Barbadian character who goes down to Kensington Oval with drums to support the West Indian team. Then he goes to his calypso tent and lambastes those of us who have carried the notion of regional integration **to** the fullest level by criticising people for marrying other West Indian citizens which I believe is representative of a situation where people in the Caribbean **are** at the fullest and sweetest form of integration. I really, Mr. Speaker, must make the point that the effort has to be made now to bring the Caribbean people closer together and bring them into a position where they **can** begin to understand each other.

I must express my great disappointment that the recommendation, as stated very simply, that Caribbean people should be allowed to travel in this region with freedom and **ease** seem to be a recommendation that Caribbean Governments are choking on. I would want to urge that every resource that can be committed in making this a possibility ought to be committed. Therefore, I really must underscore the point **that** was made by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South East who argued so strongly that the improvement of Caribbean communication is a necessary precondition for any effort that will be made at the economic and political level.

I really without wanting to tire the House, Sir, must speak to some aspects of the economic provisions in this document. It is my judgement that this document **marks** a very important line of departure in our appraisal of the prospects of Caribbean integration. The document is a very important document because it provides a very important line of **departure** in relating to how economic integration

should be undertaken in the future. To that extent I believe this document is worthy of widespread public support within the region.

You may be asking, Mr. Speaker, why do I believe **that the** economic aspects of this document represent a line of departure. The process of economic integration that you have in the Caribbean today has been based on an economic philosophy that the Caribbean people should look to **find** uniquely Caribbean economic solutions to a uniquely or what were imagined to be uniquely, Caribbean problems; that we should do so by pooling the resources, **that** we should live off our Caribbean resources, that our integration **efforts** should embrace a concept of regional and national import substitution, **that the** pooling of resources should mean, of course, that Jamaican resources should be used in collaboration with Barbadian, and so on, **that** the Caribbean should be inward-looking and that self-reliance, reliance on our Caribbean resources should be the basis of the integration **effort**.

In support of **that** philosophy, Mr. Speaker a **number** of regimes have been put in place. As you know the Common External Tariff has been one of the chief instruments put in place to support the notion of regional import substitution. You have had a number of regimes such as the incentive regimes, regimes to **allocate** industry within **the** region in **the** belief that we in the Caribbean were some special people who could find uniquely Caribbean solutions **to** our uniquely economic Caribbean problems.

I think the evidence now, Mr. Speaker, is showing **that** that approach to our economic affairs and that approach to integration in the Caribbean is a myth and has outlived its usefulness. The scope for import substitution in the Caribbean as the basis for employment creation is limited. There are very few things that the Caribbean region either collectively or on a national basis can do positively from the point of view of import substitution. There are a number of thing that might be beyond our capacity entirely.

In addition, Sir, the world is now beginning to **understand** that a **country** does not only have its resources to call upon in **order** to mount a development effort but **that** resources **are** available worldwide at a price and that there **are** countries like Japan and other countries in the world which are starved of resources, but which recognise **that** resources can be purchased at a price. The notion, therefore, in **the** Caribbean that we must mount a development effort on pooling only the resources that we have and living only on our **resources** in the belief that there is a unique Caribbean solution to a new unique Caribbean problem is a total myth and we have to understand it because it is what in part explains why Japan

and the Far East countries have gone forward. They have mastered the technique of taking other people's resources and using them to their advantage. But we in the Caribbean are labouring under the misconception that if we cannot build a development effort on what we have and by ignoring how we should use other people's resources, that if we do not do that, then we **are** not a true Caribbean **people**.

In addition, Sir, a lot of the economic institutions, the regimes set up in the Caribbean, simply have not worked because they have not been properly thought through. I am not going this evening to go into them in great detail but the incentive regime is flawed with many major difficulties. The Oil and Fats Agreement, the system for the allocation of industries between respective Caribbean countries are all **instruments** of integration that have not worked and have to be substantially revised.

When I say **that** this Report marks an important line of departure it is now telling the Caribbean people that we have to stop looking inward on ourselves. We have to depart **from** the philosophy that there is a unique Caribbean solution to unique Caribbean developed problems and recognise that we are part of a wider world, that there is such a thing called global production and **that** the present and the future of **the** Caribbean will depend upon how the Caribbean puts itself in a position to live as a group in an increasingly competitive world.

The message this document, therefore, presents me with in the basic strategy in this document as the line of departure is that contrary to all former approaches to integration in the Caribbean this document is saying, let us look to an export-led approach applied on a regional basis rather than the import substitution approach as the basis upon which the job creation effort and the development effort in the Caribbean should lie in the future. Conceptually and intellectually it is different from what has gone before. It therefore forms a very important baseline on which we should move in bringing a new approach to bear on the development of the Caribbean economy.

Having said all of that, Sir, the document has a basic flaw. Recognising that the export-led approach, our living as a competitive people in a competitive world is the way forward, recognising that it goes ahead, however, and deals only with instruments of integration that have to do with the import substitution approach so that there is a basic contradiction in the document. The thinkers have recognised that the Caribbean must go the export-led way but the **instruments** of integration that are dealt with at any substantial length of the document are instruments peculiar to the earlier forms of integration, the import substitution approach.

There are many fundamental flaws with **our trying** to resurrect a lot of the instruments which have shown

themselves to be dead on arrival as far as the integration approach is concerned. I will deal with the Common External Tariff. There has been a lot of discussion going on in the Caribbean. A lot of ministerial and technical meetings in the Caribbean **are** taking place. A lot of division is also being caused among Caribbean people on the question of whether we should have a common external tariff, whether that external tariff should bring between **5%** at the lowest on capital goods and **45%** on consumer goods as some countries want or as Jamaica wants, Mr. Speaker, zero to **20%**. A lot of controversy is being created about it. But I want to say this. The Common External Tariff was intended in **1974** to be the centrepiece of an integration strategy which says that the Caribbean should be import substituting and that we had to find a way of protecting our domestic industry from goods coming from the rest of the world. So that you do that by pricing those goods out of the market, by having a high tariff import duty on the goods that were competing with yours.

4.45 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the concern with the Common External Tariff today is a little bit quaint and ridiculous, because since the early **1970s** Caribbean countries have done a lot of other things in the process. Some countries that started with import duties have started to use stamp duties or consumption taxes. Even if you were to agree to a basic tariff of between zero to **35%** the fact that some countries can thereafter come and put on a stamp duty or put on a consumption tax and add to the import duty would make a complete nonsense of the tariff as a protective device. If the Caribbean people in Trinidad were concerning themselves with the standardization of all of the imposts on imports with a view to arriving at a common position that is to say standardizing import duties, consumption taxes, value added taxes or any other tax on imports **with** a view to, at the end of the day, having a common position I could see that the exercise would be worthwhile towards arriving at a common external tax on imports. But to the extent that there are many different taxes on imports and you are concerning yourself with only one when you are dealing with the Common External Tariff, you are wasting time.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, of course as you know, there are some Caribbean countries, particularly Jamaica, who have added an additional layer of protection for their goods by the use of the exchange rate. **Jamaica's** devaluation has made imports into Jamaica more expensive and therefore the exchange rate in Jamaica has been an additional layer of protection that is not obviously available to countries like Barbados which have not seen devaluation as the way by which we should afford any protection to our domestic product.

Clearly, therefore, Sir, to try to use the external tariff as an instrument of protection in circumstances where some

countries **are** using additional mechanisms for protection such as the exchange rate policy is to **make** a nonsense of the Common External Tariff exercise. I therefore say that the exercise that is taking place, and to which the **Prime Minister** has gone, would make **sense** if the Caribbean people were talking about a common protective policy rather than a Common External Tariff. The Common External Tariff looks at one, one way, the import duty, by which you can protect domestic industry. But there **are** a large number of other things which are not standardized and a lot of the confusion in **the** Caribbean as we know is precisely because those other things have been invoked from time to time. Jamaica sometimes uses exchange **rates** to get an unfair advantage over others. We have seen **Trinidad** use import barriers and so on. To the extent that we are going to have protection at all we must have a common protective policy of which the Common **External Tariff** will only be one aspect. But to spend a lot of time quarrelling about whether the thing **should** be zero to **20%** and zero to **45%** is a waste of time and is symptomatic of an integration process which has lost its way because in some respects people have created for themselves ministerial turf, **bureaucratic turf**, and then get immersed in discussions about whether the duty on, let us say, animal feed should be **25%** or **35%**. They live for **that** and they cannot see that **the** issue is bigger than **that**.

The point I am making **that** I do not want the House to miss is **that** this document has not articulated a series of measures to give effect to the export led strategy. It continues to rely on the principal instrument associated with the forms of integration **that** it wants the Caribbean to move from, principally the Common External **Tariff** and to that extent it can only be a baseline study. More work has to be done to these institutional and other **forms** to **carry** us in the Caribbean from the import substituting set of countries to countries **that are** viable as bone *fide* exporters. That work **has** to be done. I know that there are certain quarters in the Caribbean where the initial effort is being made but it would be to promise too much for the Caribbean people to believe that we would become an export led regional economy relying on an instrument such as the Common External tariff.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the question of a single currency has also excited a lot of interest in the Caribbean. It would be a wonderful thing. It would be a wonderful thing if Barbados in dealing with **its trade** with Jamaica did not have **first** to earn US dollars in order to buy Jamaican goods. Obviously a common regional currency would mean that the Caribbean countries could support a higher standard of living operating upon the basis of lower levels of foreign exchange reserves. Today in order to expand trade within the region, to buy from each other, we have **first** to expand trade with the rest of the world. The fullest value of a common regional currency in the Caribbean

obviously would be that it would free us from that balance of payments constraint to the expansion of regional trade that if we could buy from each other in our own currency, it would have the same effect as a man in St. Lucy buying from a man in St. Michael. We would not have to expand trade with America first to make that happen.

Secondly the value of a common external currency would mean that in circumstances where a **country** has surplus investable funds and another country was short of investable funds, as happened from time to time in the Caribbean, the existence of a common regional currency would mean that those imbalances in the future can be ironed out. But the management of a common currency and a common stable currency, I may also add, Sir, requires a number of **pre-conditions**. **First** of all, currencies have to be backed by some holding of reserves. Some countries such as the OECS countries back their currency by the holding of 60% reserves, that for each dollar of the currency issued they hold sixty cents in foreign exchange. In addition in order to get the common currency to work governments would have to accept limitations on how much they could borrow, how much of their deficit could be financed by the issue of credits from the common currency. In the OECS countries again the rule on that is strict, up to 20% – no more. The nonsense about government being able to exceed overdraft and so on does not exist.

The point I am making is that a common currency arrangement which I think is highly desirable would work in conditions where there is a high level of harmonization of fiscal policy and where countries follow uniform policies in relation, for example, to interest rates. There are real problems in the Caribbean where that is concerned. If you have differences in interest rates within a region – take Barbados and Jamaica today, the rates in Jamaica are 50%, the rates in Barbados are about 7% or 8%. A person could be able to borrow at 8% in Barbados, go and invest in Jamaica at 50%, make a killing and so on. Clearly therefore there has to be an equalization of interest rates and the reduction in differentials in things like interest rates in a region where to begin with those differentials are wide. The question, for example, is will Jamaica drop its rates to ours or are we going to raise ours to Jamaica or is there some happy medium?

I say **all** of that to say this – because I do not want to get too technical on the point – that before the Caribbean countries **can** move towards a common currency the principal economies, Barbados, Jamaica, Trinidad and Guyana who have been the source of instability in the region have to set up mechanisms to promote the practice of harmonizing their fiscal and monetary policies on a sustained basis. I want to repeat that, Sir, that before we move to the stage of a common currency, a common stable currency the principal economies of the Caribbean have to

set in place the mechanisms that allow us to **more** harmonize fiscal monetary **policies**. Because a **currency** can be undermined, as we know, by the sustained **indiscipline** of one or two members. Right now, Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is no system in the Caribbean really.

We have just seen in the case of **Europe** where the Germans have attempted to finance the **reunification** of Germany, not by taxing their people but by borrowing on the market. That has led to an increase in German interest rates. **Funds** have flowed into **Germany** in response to the high German interest rates but have **destabilized** some of the other countries bringing the **European** monetary system virtually to its **knees**. **All** you want in the Caribbean is for a similar set of financial **indiscipline** on the part of our major economic partner and a common currency will go through the **eddoes**.

4.55 p.m.

A common currency will only be **as** stable as is the monetary fiscal policy is stable but we do not have right now, in the Caribbean, a system by which – the OECS **countries** are cool, Sir – but the 4 major countries have to come together and work out **systems** to be able to support a common currency by having harmonised monetary and fiscal policies that would support that **currency** and also, Sir, to agree to the implementation of **uniform** policies particularly at the level of interest rates.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that is a lot of work. That is a lot of technical work the **back** of which, Sir, has not yet been broken and I therefore, while I am supporting the notion of a common currency, recognise some of the practical difficulties that exist. There is **an** additional practical difficulty which has arisen subsequent to this Report and I would want to **spell** it out **as** carefully as I can. The principal Caribbean economies of Jamaica, Guyana and one suspects Trinidad, are moving **more** and **more** towards the notion of **liberalised** exchange rate. **They** have now embraced an economic document that says that the exchange **rate** must be allowed to float depending on the availability of foreign exchange.

On the other extreme the OECS countries have a system of administered exchange rates that work for them. Now the question is, Sir, will the future of the Caribbean be the floating rate that Jamaica and others have allowed themselves to be persuaded is in their best interest, or is it the administrative rate, a fixed rate that the OECS countries know has worked for them. How do we now embrace within the notion of the development of a **common** currency the liberalised approach to exchange rate management that has been in vogue in recent times. I understand, Sir, the **desirability** of a common **currency** but the basis for it, Sir, has not yet been set and work towards it would have to be accelerated in order for a common currency to be brought into existence in the Caribbean within the time frame that has been **set**.

Mr. Speaker, **Sir**, the sixth recommendation that has been set for immediate action in this Report **sets** the need for Caribbean countries to have a single negotiating position and a single voice for international negotiations vital to a common interest. I believe, **Sir**, that we **all** can support that **as** a recommendation but I believe that we must add to it as well the notion that the Caribbean countries should participate or come together to put together a single negotiating position in dealing with international institutions. That is a very important recommendation which we can **all** in the Caribbean support. But we must also in the Caribbean, support the notion that we must find a way of coming **together** for the better management of our macro economic policies from year to year. I want to say that, **Sir**, for a specific reason.

The **real** problem with the economies of the Caribbean since integration, **Sir**, is that the performance of the 4 major countries in the region have been to such a large extent unstable that one does not, for sure, **know** whether the economic integration process can work or not. From **the** inception of **the** integration movement the Jamaican economy has been in problems, having nothing to do with the integration mechanism that was set up. Since 1974 the Jamaican economy has been in problems. Guyana's economy has been in **trouble** since 1975, and we have in the Caribbean, **Sir**, a very peculiar situation where for the entire period of integration process the countries which should have been leading the process of economic integration have been in trouble. We therefore do not know, **Sir**, if the fault has been with the mechanism or whether the fault has been with the macro policies. What I do know is this, that in order for the integration process to work in the future it cannot work if the 4 major economies **are** perpetually in trouble and we must find a way therefore, not only of negotiating with people abroad but making sure that through collaboration some sense of stability is brought to bear on the 4 major economies whose viability is necessary to provide driving force for integration.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, that intra-regional trade arises not only because of rules of origin, intra-regional trade arises because of **the** capacity of each **country** to be able to buy more **from** each other which depends on the economic viability. So the future of the Caribbean, in my view, depends upon our coming together, not only to negotiate with the World Bank and the IADB but in the same way that you have G7 people coming together each year to work out how the large economies that constitute the OECD region should function in their mutual advantage, each large Caribbean economy has an obligation to the Caribbean people to start collaboration to make sure that what has happened between 1974 and now does not happen for the next 20 to 30 years, that we must find a system in the Caribbean where the larger Caribbean economies can help themselves avert economic disaster.

Trinidad played that role to some extent, **Sir**, when it had cash to do so. There was a time when Trinidad **bankrolled the** Caribbean Economic Integration Movement and prevented some economies from going over the economic precipice sooner than they did. The problem, **Sir**, is not just a question of **bankrolling**, the problem is that the major Caribbean economies must **find** a way of exerting an economic influence on the macro economic policies being **pursued** by the respective countries to ensure that no one Caribbean economy is allowed again to remain in a state of sustained disaster as has been the case in the past.

I really believe, **Sir**, that that has to be worked out. That we must not see collaboration among ourselves at the economic level just purely in terms of putting together a **team** to negotiate with entities abroad but we must **see** ourselves as our brother's keeper, particularly in the region which has been **destabilised** by entities acting rashly, I think, without reference to the overall common good.

My leader, **Sir**, is suggesting that I should look at the implications of Barbados going with the OECS countries. The OECS countries have been an example to the rest of the Caribbean of what can happen if serious people put their minds together, act in **response** to a common threat of **survival** and proceed **as** a group. We speak about the impossibilities, sometimes, of having a common currency in the Caribbean; the OECS people have a common currency. We speak, **Sir**, in terms of the difficulties of having a common market in the Caribbean; the OECS people have moved towards a common market and they have set an example.

5.05 p.m.

They have shown the rest of the Caribbean that once there is a political will that a higher level of economic integration is possible. I do not really believe that the discipline so far that has been shown by this present Prime Minister should be allowed now to invade the OECS countries to their detriment. It is on that ground that I would not swiftly urge the Government of Barbados to be allowed to join the OECS unless the Government of Barbados change its economic ways. I mean that seriously, Mr. Speaker. Barbados must not be allowed to believe that there is refuge in the OECS unless it is prepared to be disciplined in the management of their economic affairs and I mean that seriously, Mr. Speaker.

Generally, as I said, this document brings new thinking to bear on our problems. It does not commit us to the old strategy of self reliance and I was very disappointed in the contribution by the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central that the Barbadians must go back to the ownership and control and that there must be protectionism and so on. That strategy in the Caribbean has not worked on a national basis or regional basis. This

document is refreshing to the extent that it excites the possibility ~~that~~ there may be a new way for the Caribbean and ~~that~~ new way for the Caribbean is to defend the ~~best~~ means of living competitively in a competitive world. I support it, Sir. I ~~sense~~, Sir, ~~that~~ this House supports it and ~~that~~ what needs to be done is concerted work to improve the document by identifying precisely the mechanisms that would allow a successful process of export led development to be at the core of the development of the Caribbean economy in the future.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

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

QUESTION TIME

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I move that Question Time be now taken, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question Time. Question No. 41, the Honourable Member for St. **Andrew**. He is not in his place. Therefore, the usual practice is to lay the question.

If there is no objection, ~~the~~ Honourable Leader of the House has asked for Government Notices to be re-opened. So please do.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I give notice of a Bill to provide for the regulation, distribution and censorship of films and for matters related thereto.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Sir, I move that the Bill to provide for the regulation, distribution and censorship of films and for matters related thereto be read a first time.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, November 3, 1992 at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, November 3, 1992 at 12 o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the sitting accordingly.
5.10 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES..... 2508

Confirmation of Minutes of meeting of Tuesday, 20th October, 1992.

MESSAGES FROM HER EXCELLENCY
THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Mr. SPEAKER.....2508

Letter from Her Excellency the **Governor-General** informing the House that she would be away from the Island from 14th October to 1st November, 1992 on a visit to Canada and the United States of America.

OBITUARY SPEECHES

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE **WILFRED RUTHVEN COWARD**, FORMER MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT AND CONDOLENCES TO HIS FAMILY.....2509

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 2509; Dr. R. L. Cheltenham, 2509; Mr. L. L. **Brathwaite**, 2510; Mr. H. **deB.** Forde, 2510; Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 2511; Mr. Speaker, 2511.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES.....2511, 2549

1. Resolution to approve the sale of land at Black Bess, St. Peter to Gweneth Hinds.
2. Resolution to approve the sale of land at Baywoods, St. **James** to **Ernest** Alleyne.
3. Resolution to approve the sale of land at Venture, St. John to Wycliffe Estwick and **Elaine** Estwick.
4. Resolution to approve the sale of land at Vauxhall, Christ Church to Daphne Dear.
5. Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Bourne's Land, **St. Christopher**, Christ Church for the construction of an access road.
6. The Barbados Investment and Development Corporation Bill, 1992.

7. The Barbados Foreign Sales Corporation (Amendment) Bill, 1992.

8. Bill **to** provide for the regulation, distribution and censorship of films and for matters related thereto.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES..... 2512, 2549

The Barbados Investment and Development Corporation Bill, 1992.

The Barbados Foreign Sales Corporation (Amendment) Bill, 1992.

Bill to provide for **the** regulation, distribution and censorship of films and for matters related thereto.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES.....2512

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES..... 2512

Suspension of **Standing** Orders 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44 for the remainder of the sitting.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 1 - RESUMPTION OF DEBATE ON RESOLUTION TO TAKE NOTE OF THE REPORT OF THE WEST INDIAN COMMISSION..... 2512

Mr. R. L. Moms, 2512; Dr. R. L. Cheltenham, 2516; Hon. M. A. King, 2520; Hon. W. **O. Franklin**, 2525; Mr. D. A. C. **Simmons**, 2528; Hon. D. J. H. **Thompson**, 2532; Mr. H. **deB.** Forde, 2532; Hon. D. W. Bowen, 2537; Mr. **DeL. O. Bradshaw**, 2539; Mr. H. A. Blackman, 2543; Mr. O. S. Arthur, 2544.

SUSPENSION.....2528

ADJOURNMENT.....2549

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 2549.

SPEAKERS IN **THIS** ISSUE

ARTHUR, Mr. **O.** S. (St. Peter)

BLACKMAN, Mr. H. A (St. Phiip South)

BOWEN, Hon. D. W. (St. **Michael South** Central) '

BRADSHAW, Mr. **DeL. O.** (St. **Michael** South East)

BRATHWAITE, Mr. L. L. (St. Michael North East)

CHELTENHAM, Dr. R. L. (St. **Joseph**)

FORDE, Mr. H. **deB.** (Christ Church West)

FRANKLIN, Hon. W. **O.** (St. **Philip** North)

GREAVES, Hon. P. M. (St. Michael North)

KING, Hon. M. A. (**Christ** Church West Central)

MORRIS, Mr. R. L. (Christ Church East Central)

SANDIFORD, Rt. Hon. L. E. (St. **Michael** South)

SIMMONS, Mr. D. A. C. (St. **Thomas**)

THOMPSON, Hon. D. J. H. (St. John)