
THE SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1986 – 91

THE SENATE

Wednesday, April 15, 1987.

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Public Buildings at 11.15 a.m.

PRESENT

His Honour Senator F. L. Walcott, O.B.E., (President);

His Honour Senator M. deL. Jordan, (Deputy President);

Senator the Hon. Sir James Tudor, K.C.M.G., (Minister of Foreign Affairs) (Leader of the Senate);

Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, (Minister of State, Public Service);

Senator A. Morrison;

Senator F. G. Smith, Q.C.;

Senator N. W. Boxill;

Senator D. A. Comissiong;

Senator V. C. Fraser;

Senator G. L. Eastmond;

Senator A. J. N. Phillips;

Senator T. A. Prescod;

Senator B. A. Miller;

Senator L. R. Tull, Q.C.;

Senator J. C. W. Wickham, M.B.E.;

Senator the Rev. Canon I. McK. Jones;

Senator L. A. Ward, G.C.M.;

Senator C. A. Blackman, Q.C.;

Senator P. Y. Forde;

Senator J. S. Goddard;

Senator Dr. L. L. Shorey.

Prayers were led by Rev. Dr. Lionel Crawford.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The Senate is in session.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I am commanded to lay the following:

The Barbados Economic Report, 1986.

The Annual Report of the Barbados Industrial Development Corporation for the year 1985 – 86.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION INVITING A STATEMENT OF THE FOREIGN POLICY OF GOVERNMENT

Order No. 2 was called – to move the passing of a Resolution inviting a statement of the foreign policy of Government.

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: Mr. President, I have the privilege of introducing the motion which invites the Government to make a statement on its foreign policy. In the circumstances, as it is today and its origin as a Private Members' Motion, I would like at this stage to crave the indulgence of the House, through you, for the suspension of Standing Orders Nos. 32 and 32(a) in order, given the terms of the motion, to allow the Leader of the House and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, who, happily, on this occasion, reside in the same person, to reply, in the first instance, to the introduction, and to respond as well to any questions which may arise in the course of the debate.

This motion, as you will observe, Mr. President, is presumed to be non-contentious, and is designed, certainly, on my part, to throw some air on the question of foreign policy. I hope to be able to introduce some kind of tradition which provides for a regular annual debate originating in this Senate, and probably best among private members, on foreign policy. I hope, during the course of my introduction, to explain the rationale of my proposal.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: At this stage I am craving your indulgence for the suspension of the Standing Orders I have mentioned, 32 and 32(a), to allow the free latitude for the indulgence of free opinion for the discussion.

Mr. PRESIDENT: There being no objection to the suspension of Standing Orders 32 and 32(a), I take it that these Standing Orders are suspended. The Senator may proceed.

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, this motion, which I have the privilege to introduce, has its origin in a number of, for me, very disquieting concerns. For a long time, longer than I find comfortable, I have wondered about the future of Barbados and the future of the Caribbean, and their relation to the world. You may wish to remind me, Mr. President, that there are millions of people wondering about the future of the world. You might wish to suggest to me that if all I am wondering about is Barbados, and the Caribbean, then my state might not be so bad. But Barbados and the Caribbean are all that I have as a reference, and I cannot help being concerned about them.

There was a time when we could pretend in Barbados, and in this part of the world, that we lived in a back water; we used to say, "cultural back water". We used to live in an atmosphere which used to be protected by our colonial status, when large, international decisions did not come from us, which we could leave to other minds and other imaginations to deal with. That time is no more. In 1966, we ventured out on our own not perhaps fully recognising all the responsibilities which we were taking on, but in the 20 years since then, we certainly have.

My problem, really, is that I do not sense in our political arrangements a concern about the affairs of the world and how they affect us. World affairs do not play any significant part in our election campaign. Our Press and our public media give us snippets of news, especially about confrontations and disasters, but hardly any analysis, and all the time events in the outside world close in around us. This omission is probably shared by most ex-colonial territories, but we in the Caribbean, as we have now come to know, are in a particularly sensitive region, and we should know more, everybody should know more, about what is going on than we do. We only have to think about the Falklands crisis, the Cubana crisis, and about Grenada. We are no longer in the back water. We are, in fact, as Eric Williams once said, "in the cockpit of world affairs".

11.25 a.m.

The recent publication by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of "Diplomacy and Development", which has been made available to us, is one of the first indications that an overall look at our foreign policy and the steps which took place since 1966 were of importance, and I am greatly indebted to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, who, happily, is with us, for the information which this document contains.

Mr. President, a word about the motion itself. It asks for a statement on foreign policy, but I ought to say that this request was originally in a previous incarnation, you might say, of a request for papers, and a Private Members' motion was simply a parliamentary device to secure debate on a matter which is not intended to be controversial or to divide the House, but to ask the Government to attend to the matter by opening up the question that has been attended to by the publication of this document.

During the last quarter of a century or so at least those of us who were watching have witnessed what some have called the "outbreak of a rash of independence" in countries of former colonial status. The wind of change, which Prime Minister MacMillan saw in Africa in 1960, was blown across the Atlantic, in the same direction, oddly enough, as the slave ships which brought us here. We can pick whatever significance there is from that geographical fact.

One of the most interesting and, Mr. President, if I may say so, instructive acquisitions of these last 25 years of nation watching in the Caribbean is a perception that when a Caribbean country wins or otherwise arrives at a state of political independence, it almost never does so with a free and generously given consensus among the parties representing the people in whose name and on whose behalf that independence is said to be achieved. Innocent people like myself, Mr. President, are inclined to think that if there ever was the simple subject on which all the people's sentiments should be in accord, and on which all their representatives could wholeheartedly agree, it would be on that of independence, but we see a very different state of affairs. We notice that agreement is always hedged by ifs and buts, by reservations and opposition, and it is always tarnished by a debate which is often schoolboyish and nearly always undignified.

Another observation which forces itself on the notice of those of us who keep an eye on the behaviour of the people's representatives is that one of the very first actions to be taken in a newly independent country is the establishment of a national agency for the conduct of its foreign relations, its relations with other countries. In fact, the arrangements and preparations for the Ministries, and the selection and training of staff, often pre-dates the actual formal assumption of independence. In other

words, Mr. President, the need for attention to and a face looking outward at the world beyond the shores of home are seen as prime requirements of the new status:

These two pieces of observed behaviour, themselves contradictory and, in fact, hostile to each other, say a great deal about our attitude to the question of foreign affairs. On the one hand, the status of independence and the right to seats in the Councils of Nations are not seen as deserving of unstinted and unconditional consensus, and, on the other, that very status and that very right are the first to be expressed when independence becomes a reality. It is an attitude which suggests, Mr. President, that our interest is in the trappings of independence and not the reality. It is an attitude which suggests that we do not believe that the way in which we conduct the business of our independence, and in which we express ourselves in the company of other nations, is of major importance to the people. There is no other conclusion to be drawn from this strange reluctance of our Governments to establish, as a permanent feature of our parliamentary and other calendars of discussion, debates on our foreign policy.

The opportunity of the annual debate on the Estimates is taken by members, as we know, to raise questions and focus attention on a very wide variety of subjects, from the number of tourist arrivals to the numbers of the unemployed, from apartheid to high rise apartments, and there is even sometimes a condescending nod in the direction of culture. But on foreign affairs, there is never a word. We do not seem to regard this subject as worthy of attention.

But Parliament is, after all, Mr. President, only a reflection of the concerns of the wider society, and I do not recognise in our Press or other forms of public expression any noisy outcry for debates on foreign affairs. In fact, the national attention to these matters is directed mainly to such happenings as disasters, confrontations between super powers and to statements of positions, and only very infrequently to analysis of our own international position or that of our Caribbean neighbours.

On the ground that Parliament must not only reflect but also lead, my motion is directed to the need for an arrangement which would ensure at least one full length debate each year on our country's foreign affairs, and I hope to be able to persuade the Government, first of all, in the person of our Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Leader of the Senate, to go along with my sentiments.

Mr. President, there are those who will say that there is nothing in the present arrangement and provision which forbids the initiation of a debate on any subject, and that the very fact of the present motion is evidence that there is no need for any special provision. I want to submit that this would be a narrow, negative and

unrealistic view of the matter. The fact is, as in all other matters of public concern, that Government is expected to take the lead to demonstrate the importance of the foreign affairs aspects of its administration, to draw attention to the foreign affairs component in our trade policy, our tourism and our development strategies. There is at present no strong contention to support this action or to bring it about, and I am suggesting that it is the business of Government to take the first step towards establishing the practice. This has not been done, and I hope that this present motion will go towards the establishment of a precedent which will result in the systematic inclusion in the Order Papers, in the name of an independent Senator, of a motion for a debate on our foreign policy.

11.35 a.m.

I well realise, Mr. President, that a former Minister of Foreign Affairs made an attempt to establish a parliamentary committee on the subject, but the soil on which that seed fell was less than fertile. It may well be that, in the cooler atmosphere of this Chamber, the reception may be more hospitable than the scene of the original proposal. And I look forward, therefore, with some degree of hope to the response which my suggestion would receive.

I ought to spend a little time in expressing my own reasons for believing that our foreign policy, especially at this time, deserves a wider attention. I believe, Mr. President, that geography is an overwhelming determinant of the way in which nations develop and of the forces which direct that development. I believe that geography carries its own logic, a logic which is not disturbed by even the massive reach of the long range missiles of intimidation and destruction. It is true that we are now seeing in the deployment of certain national forces some strange illogicalities in alien presences on both sides of the Atlantic, but I believe that, in the long run, the logic of geographical proximity will prevail.

The basic reason for the eventual withdrawal of the European presence in the Caribbean is, in my view, that geographical uncertainty began to express itself in a number of ways, in the same way the absurdity of the Falkland Islands as a lonely British colony in the south Atlantic Ocean has been shown to be both embarrassing and costly. Eight years ago, the Barbados Minister of Foreign Affairs made substantially that point in an address to a Conference of Heads of Overseas Missions.

"There are objective factors,"

he said,

"that influence the foreign policy for Barbados, and I suggest for us the geographical and historical factors are of overriding importance. Barbados is a small island in the Caribbean within the under belly of the United States, one of the two conten-

ders for world power or influence. Barbados is moreover only one of a long chain of small islands whose history is still dominated by the colonial experience at the hands of either European powers or the United States, sometimes in consort and sometimes in conflict. Today the United States has undoubtedly emerged as a paramount power filling that vacuum which for centuries it had shared with the United Kingdom, France, Spain and Holland. Barbados is a state which has only recently emerged from colonialism. Ours is a multi racial society, the majority of whose people have been brought from Africa."

That single paragraph, Mr. President, contains all the elements of paradox and congruence which must necessarily condition or dictate our postures in the area of our foreign policy.

We live next door to the United States. We are members of a Commonwealth of Nations with British connections. We share a geographical environment with states which have languages different from our own, and different cultural patterns, and although the majority of our population is of African descent, some of us have arrived, and are arriving still, from other sources. These factors illustrate the enormous complexity of our political situation, highlighted by the Falklands crisis and war, and our responses to them have dominated the Organisation of American States as well as of the United Nations. They also speak very clearly of the need for their articulation in the clearest possible accents.

Members of the Senate may wish, in this context, to look at page 33 of the document "Diplomacy and Development", in which the reference to the Falkland Islands is contained, mainly. The part I want to quote really is the part which begins under "ARGENTINA":

"Barbados' principled stance was based on prevailing international law....."

and it goes on, this is into the penultimate sentence:

"This position was, however, widely misconstrued by Latin America, and interpreted, regrettably, as a failure on the part of Barbados and other Caribbean countries to show solidarity with a Latin American brother at a time of crisis. Worse yet, it led to direct challenges to the Caribbean's solidarity with the region and to charges that the Caribbean still took its foreign policy instructions from its erstwhile colonial master."

So you see, Mr. President, the kind of what the Trinidadians call "tight boots" which we find ourselves in. But whatever we may say, and to whatever guiding ism we may give our allegiance, there are hard facts with which we have to contend. Yet, Mr. President, I have not seen any continuing analysis in our Press, nor heard any local comment, to point out that the Caribbean Basin Initiative is no more than a logical successor to the

doctrine enunciated as long ago as 1823 by a predecessor of the President of the United States now in office.

I believe that public airing of such considerations as I have hinted at would help us to understand great questions of importance, and to convince us that Barbados is not an island entire of itself. We are no longer the charges of colonial power. We are expected to face the world on our own and to make our way in the world. That way is beset by the thorns and the sharp rock of international politics, and negotiation is not a simple matter.

In the relatively short period since we have assumed responsibility for the arrangement of our own affairs, we have had to work out positions on policy on, for example, relations with our hemispheric neighbours. The Organisation of American States is a scene of interest. Two Decembers ago in Cartagena, Barbados played a crucial role in bringing to a head a matter which has prolong, bedeviled relations between the Caribbean and the Latin American countries. The result of our Government's initiative was a consensus which would make Guyana and Belize eligible for membership in December, 1990, if certain provisions are met. I hope, Mr. President, that the Honourable Minister of Foreign Affairs will feel inclined to treat this Chamber to a fuller report on that significant diplomatic triumph than I am able to give.
11.45 a.m.

I do not need to stress, Mr. President, the influence and effect of the United States on our affairs. No one who has observed the events in Grenada, the developments of the Caribbean Basin Initiative or the creeping domination of an electronic media by American cultural products can fail to be aware of the need to exercise the greatest care in our relations with the most powerful nation on earth.

There are other matters which bristle with difficulties of which our people ought to be made aware: the problem surrounding the law of the sea and its application to a group of islands such as the Eastern Caribbean, our relations with Commonwealth countries outside of the Caribbean raise a number of contradictory loyalties, and what are the implications of our membership of the Non-aligned Movement — a membership which, in the words of Mr. Michael Manley, stretches from the semi-feudal monarchy that is Saudi Arabia to Marxist Leninist states like Cuba and Viet Nam. There is an overall need to support the United Nations in the face of all the attack to which it is exposed from time to time, in the recognition of its importance as a forum of nations.

I want to say a word, Mr. President, about CARICOM. Members will not need to be told of the problems which come from this source. There is difficulty, or was difficulty, in trade matters with Trinidad and Tobago, the

settlement of the Multilateral Clearing Facility with Guyana has not, so far as I know, been resolved, and there are regional defence agreements with the OECS, Guyana's boundary dispute with Venezuela and the stance of the cricket members on the question of apartheid in South Africa. There is no doubt in my mind that Barbados is playing, and will continue to play, a signal rôle in the affairs of the Eastern Caribbean. That sentence was written before the result of the St. Lucia election, and I am still wondering whether that result at first had anything to do with Mr. Compton's, as I say, laying it on the line that the future of the OECS was a matter of prime concern.

Time and again we have seen that events of world importance, some of them sensational, have taken place here. This has not been by chance. It is not by chance that for, example, Thor Heyerdahl's *Ra II* made its landfall here. It is not by chance that Ronald Biggs had some adulation here. It is not by chance that so many international organisations have their headquarters here. All these circumstances are products of our history and our geography. It is not an accident that Barbados is expected to play an important part in the arrangements for regional security, nor that out of favour political aspirants find our public communications media useful for the expression of their points of view, nor that ordinary citizens of neighbouring territories find life more comfortable here than in their own parishes. These are not accidents.

It seems to me, Mr. President, therefore, that these functions and aspects of our geography and history have very strong political implications, and that they are capable of useful exploitation, in the best sense of that word, for our own benefit as well as for the benefit of the Caribbean as a whole. But these implications are not obvious to the victims of *Dallas* and *Days of Our Lives*, nor to the average consumers of the social page fodder at in our newspapers. If, however, they are brought to attention by reasoned and intelligent debate and discussion, if they are explained to the fullest extent of their meaning without controversy, without the polarisation that sometimes attends debates on other aspects of our social life, I believe, then, that the same average man and woman can be led to a healthier respect for their own worth and place of being.

The presently unknown diplomatic triumphs of our ambassadors, if drawn to public attention, would, I am sure, restore a sense of pride in ourselves which is almost always too lacking. And even if we fail, an awareness of our failure would bring us to a sense of the hard reality of life in the big, big, bad world.

Mr. President, may I be allowed to conclude my introduction to this Motion by quoting the final para-

graph of that same address of the Foreign Minister to which I have already made reference:

"An effective foreign policy depends, finally, on an input from an informed public. The support of policies and public understanding are necessary as the Government looks for answers to the complex problems confronting us."

Mr. President, in expressing my hope that I have said enough to persuade members of this Honourable Chamber to support the motion before them, I also say that I am more than ever convinced that unless we begin to understand our relations with the outside world, unless we begin to understand what it means when our representatives of the United Nations vote for Israel or an Arab country which at the moment seem remote from us, unless we begin to understand what is the position of the Barbados Government on the British attitude to Ireland, unless we begin to understand we are not doing the best for ourselves. What do we think of the proposal to explode nuclear weapons in New Caledonia, what do we think of New Zealand — a small territory's attitude in preventing the use of its facilities by an American warship, the instrument of a Government which refuses to say whether it carries nuclear missiles? These subjects are of supreme importance and we need to know. I hope that I may be able to convince my fellow members that we are on the right road when we accept the tenor and spirit of this Motion.

Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: Mr. President, with your permission I would like to second the motion and reserve my right to speak.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, before I say anything else at all I would like to thank the distinguished Senator, and I believe I speak for all of us, for the way in which he has led us into this debate, for the use by him of his customary clarity and insight into great public matters and also for the clever way in which he has used an old device in this Chamber to initiate this most important debate on an aspect of Barbados' life and destiny.
11.55 a.m.

In the old days in the Legislative Council, a motion of this sort which moved for papers, as he put it, was a device to elicit some response from the Governing Authority, some statement of policy if need be, or some reaction to a matter of public consequence. I do not apologise for taking him literally that his movement for papers really produced papers.

I have to thank him for something else, too, that until he asked for this debate, I was not as well informed — I have no hesitation in admitting this — about the tremendous ramifications of our foreign policy as I should

have been, simply because I had been away from it for a whole decade and only just come back into it, and had not had time to familiarise myself with all that had accumulated during the period I was away from public office.

But what I did do when I came into office was to ask my staff to devise with me some method of frequent consultation, not as frequent as we all would like, but certainly from time to time — perhaps every week, when it was convenient, every two or three weeks when not — so that we could review the main events in the world at large which impacted on the conduct of our foreign policy. So from the time we started to have these internal meetings, we were, without knowing it, getting ready for the challenges of this debate, and the reason why so much time has elapsed — five months, I believe — between his asking us for this debate and today, is that he set us to work, and I wish to pay public tribute, as I have paid private tribute, to all the members of my staff who, above and beyond the call of duty, though not beyond the call of their pleasure, have produced "Diplomacy and Development". I have already conveyed to them the thanks of the Cabinet, all of whose members found it quite valuable in their respective ministerial responsibilities, because information which they would have had to be searching for in a thousand different places, and perhaps in just as many documents, has been collected for them in a single document, and not only for them, but for the general public as well. So I am very grateful to Senator Wickham, because he has enabled me to do my work better, he has enabled my staff to be more supportive of me and he has enabled them to show to the public of Barbados what can be done by people whose names may not be known by the general public, but who, far from the glare of publicity, do the work of this country in respect of the conduct of its foreign affairs.

Having said that, I wish to proceed now to give the Senate some insights of my own, for which I take full responsibility, I dare say that my colleagues would agree with most of what I am saying, but even if they do not, I still have to say them.

I do not believe that, generally, elected public officials in this country pay enough education to the foreign relations of the country. They do in a general way, but that general way arises from the occasional specific instance of some impact on Barbados of some international event. What I am looking for is the continual and unremitting study of our place in the world and how we are to hold that place, and how, if I might put it in a more graphic way, it is the business of all of us Barbadians to try to repeal the law of the jungle, which is another description for the international society. I, therefore, would like a situation in this country in which the whole population involves itself in the conduct of the

foreign policy of the country and not only the Government, and certainly not only within the Government, the people constitutionally vested with the authority to conduct it. I should like it to be clearly understood that every single citizen of this country conducts, in his or her own way, the foreign policy of the country.

I had an experience last week of conducting the country's foreign policy at a level not of officialdom, but at the level of the ordinary citizen. I was driving into St. Philip when along the road I saw two non-Barbadians, white, standing by the side of a jeep and looking as if they were experiencing some distress or inconvenience. I stopped and asked if I could be of assistance. It appeared that the jeep had run out of gas and they were not quite sure of the geography of St. Philip, so they did not know how near it would have been to walk to a gasolene station. I said to them "you just stay here, my chauffeur and I will go to the nearest gasolene station and we will bring you back some." We brought them some gasolene in two, what they called pop bottles, but they were two Coca-Cola plastic containers. They asked who I was and I said my name was Cameron Tudor. I did not tell them that I held public office. They both thanked me and said "well, this is something nice about Barbados". I was immensely pleased to be able to do that for them without having to tell them what position I held, because I felt that I am after all, in addition to holding a public office, an ordinary citizen of the country, and I have to conduct its foreign policy not only in Culloden Road or here, or when I go abroad, but as I go about the country. The point I am making is that all of us do for Barbados in a general, and in most cases in a specific, way what we expect elected officials to do constitutionally.

The next point I want to make in this range of my response is that if all the public affairs of Barbados at the political level were conducted with the same consensus which appears to be the case of the conduct of foreign affairs, I think that our public life would certainly run much smoother and we would get much farther with it. I wish to say here publicly that except for the very peculiar, very new and very challenging situation which arose out of the Grenada episode in 1983, I cannot find either from recollection or research, any grave divergencies of views in any of the important foreign policy matters between the two parties of this country. I have read as widely and as diligently as I could since I have returned to office, and from the positions taken by my immediate predecessors since I demitted office in the early 1970s, I cannot find that we have been so far apart in centralising and in defending the interest of the country.

12.05 p.m.

The single exception of Grenada is, perhaps, understandable, because that was a new thing. It was, perhaps, as much a defence and security concern as it was a diplomatic concern, and it took us all by surprise. I have my own personal views about it, as everybody does, but

it is behind us now, and even in referring to it in this document, we have not treated it in any controversial manner. We have only stated how it affected Barbados and how successfully we all came out of that episode.

I would like to see a heightened consciousness of all our citizens in the way in which they can help Foreign Affairs Ministers and that part of the Public Service, generally, which conducts the foreign affairs of the country. There is a peculiar feeling, for instance, among some of our citizens, that if they go abroad mostly on private business, and in a free society citizens must be encouraged to travel as widely as they might, and they return from abroad, that is an episode which is over, it has been enjoyed, and it does not appear to them to have any implications for their country. Now, I would be the last person to ask any citizen of Barbados to go abroad and snoop, but I am saying that it would help all of us who conduct the foreign policy of the country if when citizens go abroad and they return and they have had experiences, not necessarily bad ones, experiences of enlightenment, of broadening, they would care to come and ask to see me, or any of my officers, and say, 'Look, there is a new technique even for making shoes in Philadelphia. I happened to be spending a week-end there, they took me to a factory, and I now see that a pair of shoes can be made in six hours less time than it normally takes somewhere else.' That is information of technology that is useful to us. Now, that is at one level.

Another level is if when you go abroad and come back and you say to some of us who conduct the country's foreign policy, 'Look, the newspapers in the last week or so carried quite a lot about some difficulty in which the country I was visiting is having in Timbuctoo. You might wish to know that from the way how the editorials, have been put out, there is likely to be some continuing difficulty. You may want to watch this.' I say this because there is a tremendous amount of information which foreign policy practitioners need in order to fill in the gaps in their knowledge. It is true we get information from our people abroad, our embassies, consulates or whatever, but we need to know more of what there is going on.

Because I have an abiding interest in these things as always, whenever I have been abroad in the years when we were out of power, I have invariably, when I returned, asked to see the Foreign Minister — I have done this with Mr. Forde and with Minister Tull, and I relayed some information to Minister Barrow — because I felt that it would help them tremendously if I shared with them insights which I had picked up from being abroad, although I was never, in those instances, the official representative of the country. Therefore, if any of you go out on CPA matters, or on your own personal business, I would take it to be a great honour to me if when you

come back and you ask to see me, you could share with me some of your expressions of what you have seen abroad and personalities you have met, because it helps to fill in that great continuing mosaic of foreign policy which we have to be continually building.

When I was last here in this Chamber, I think it was when we were doing the Appropriation Bill, Senator Tull took the opportunity to bring me up-to-date on a visit which he had recently been paying, I think it was to Austria. I was very interested in it because, again, it filled in a gap which was missing in my own up-to-date knowledge of what was happening regarding the position in Central Europe, Austria and the allied countries. He did that because he realised that, as Minister, and as his successor, I would need to have at my disposal whatever helpful knowledge he could give me. So the appeal I make to all Senators is, if you go abroad on occasions, mostly personal, but also on parliamentary business, and you see people at all levels of the societies in the countries which you may visit, when you come back please do not hesitate to ask to see me. I will be available to you just to hear your experiences, because they help me to build that fund of knowledge which I need in order to do the work of the country in the particular respect in which I have it to do.

Let me clear up next, to me not very important, but, perhaps, to the country at large, two very significant difficulties which people seem to have. One is, of course, the perception of the constitutional framework in which the foreign policy of a country is structured. The Minister of Foreign Affairs does not — does not — appoint ambassadors, Heads of Missions or diplomatic personnel. That authority is constitutionally vested in the Head of Government and, historically, of course, it arises from the prerogatives of the Crown. Conduct of foreign affairs of the other countries is historically the relationship between one sovereign, and another and in the devolution of our Constitution, the Prime Minister, in that particular respect, has vested in me the prerogative of conducting the foreign affairs of the country, and, therefore, of appointing the Crown's representatives to foreign states. On the other hand, the day-to-day conduct of the foreign policy of the country is vested constitutionally in the Minister and in his department. It is a very sensible division of labour, and speaking for myself, I am immensely glad that I do not appoint ambassadors. I do not wish to, and if my advice were asked as to whether that particular authority ought to be vested in the Minister of Foreign Affairs, I should always be inclined to say "no, let it stay where it is."

12.15 p.m.

I have one good reason for making this point. The questions which I am usually asked would not be asked of me in this Chamber, because in this Chamber there is

a clearer perception of these matters, but when people I meet socially and on the streets, on whatever occasions, have raised a foreign policy issue with me, it is never about what is it that is going on in Ruthenia or why does Barbados have to trade or does not trade any more with whatever place it is. Nobody asks me that kind of question. All I am asked is "Who are you putting in Washington?" "Why have you put this person there?" "Why have you not brought back the next person?"

I can concede of no more boring and silly question than the question of who is ambassador and who is not. I mean no disrespect to the distinguished personalities involved, and I think that we are very well served by the people who serve us, but to me it is less important to know who is Head of a Mission than to ask of the Foreign Minister what are your conceptions, given the present state of the world, of how Barbados can reap a securer harvest from the efforts it is putting out in the international arena. This is how I look at it. So while, perhaps for obvious reasons, I have to answer questions from time to time about personalities, I would like it to be known that I do not in any way regard these questions as having any significance for me. I should like to be asked about policy, about conceptualisation, about the strategies of our diplomacy, and I should like to keep myself as well informed on these issues as I can.

I have to say this to the media. You, too, can help to conduct the foreign policy of the country if you would only understand certain things about it. If you read or hear that somebody says in Guyana that they are coming to Barbados to set up an Embassy, do not ask me to react to that, because I may not have heard it. Ask them if they have said it, because if the news is that Ruthenia says it is going to set up an Embassy in Barbados, the sensible thing, in my judgment, to do is to find Ruthenians and say "Why do you want an Embassy in Barbados?"

I had this experience only a few weeks ago in respect of the Nicaraguans. They had published, I believe, in the Guyanese paper that they were sending a mission to Barbados, with the objective, so they said, of setting up an Embassy here. I wish to say, in fairness to them, that they have not asked us this, nor have they discussed it with us, and, therefore, I am not obliged, even in this instance, to give a reaction to something that has not been asked. When that time comes, I shall know how to reply to them, and to set my reply within the context of what my judgement is that the interest of Barbados requires.

But if you ask me to respond to something that somebody else has said of which I may not have heard, I cannot give you a sensible answer. You then — and when I say "you", I do not mean you, Mr. President, I mean the members of the media will believe that I am hedging, that there is something going on and that I do

not want to speak about it, and that we are conducting a hole-in-the-corner diplomacy. So you can help us by a positive attitude to these things and by making yourselves as informed as you can before you ask your own Government for its reaction to matters which have been put out by agencies of other Governments.

In connection with this, just let me utter a small defence of my own attitudes. When I am asked by agencies of radical or extremely left wing elements in this region about my opinions on this or that matter, I answer as truthfully as I can, that the interest of Barbados comes first with this Government, and, therefore, I cannot react to hypothetical positions but only to practical things with which I have to deal. Because I answer in that way, there is a perception that the Prime Minister of the country is the great radical who would sell the country down the drain to all the left wingers here and there, but that I, the Foreign Minister, am standing in his way and will not allow him to do what he wishes.

Mr. Churchill once described something as "a terminological inexactitude." I do not know if that is strong enough for me. I would only like to say that it would be impossible to state the opposite of the truth with greater precision. He is the stonewaller, if there is anything, and I have to try out all my policies with him to see if they will get past him, I tell you, nothing, and I say this for him, nothing that appears to him to be inimical to the interest of Barbados will he ever allow. I tell him that perhaps his colleagues would be happier if he would write down whatever he wishes to say, and he always says that he is not a good writer, but he knows exactly what he wants to say and that he is quite prepared to be misunderstood.

12.25 p.m.

I did, once, succeed in getting him to write down what I thought he ought to say on an important occasion. He took my advice and he produced what I still think is one of the best speeches he has ever made, although it has not gotten the publicity which it should have got because of the confused circumstances at the time. I want to quote a few paragraphs of the speech which he made at the beginning of the Constitutional Conference in 1966 when we were negotiating independence. He started off by saying:

"The small territory whose fortune and future we are here met to decide is unique in many respects. It came into association with the Crown of England neither by conquest, nor by purchase, but by settlement. It is interesting to note that Barbados began its association with England at the time when English political institutions experienced their severest strain.

"When in 1639 your own country had been governed without a Parliament for eleven years, the English inhabitants of Barbados settled the Parliament for themselves and thereby created the legislative institutions which we have since, without disturbance, enjoyed. In this respect, Barbados shared only with Virginia Massachusetts and Bermuda the solid comforts of representative Government."

Actually, he is a better writer, I think, even than a speaker:

"In 1651, when Englishmen were cowering in their homes under the whip of Cromwell's Major General, and when they who had locked off the heads of a King sought to enmesh the people of Barbados in their saintly tyranny, Barbadians stubbornly defended their respective institutions from Cromwell, and in the famous Charter of Barbados which they signed, they have managed to preserve for three centuries the supremacy of Parliaments and the liberty of the subject. A century and a half later the genius of Thomas Jefferson distilled from this Charter that heavy wine of sovereignty which we now know as the Declaration of American Independence."

And he continued:

"The people who now enjoy these blessings feel a natural affinity with, and are grateful to, those Englishmen who in 1639 built better than they knew. They laid the foundations for that free society, a small part of which we already experience, and the greater portion of which we shall establish after Independence. Our relations with the Crown have always been warm, and it is the unanimous desire of our citizens that Her Majesty should be Queen and Head of State of an independent Barbados."

This is what he said then, and from all I know about him, this is how he feels about our country. But he exercises the right of free speech not only as a citizen, but as the head of our Government and guiding our affairs, to put in the perspectives of his own thinking how he feels about the country of which he is a principal citizen, and of which, from time to time, he has been called upon to administer. There is, therefore, no question of any difference of opinion between the Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs on the conduct of the foreign affairs of this country. We are *ad idem*, totally and sincerely, on what we have to do with the responsibilities which have been placed upon us.

I have great satisfaction in this Chamber to continue to make a contribution to this debate on the foreign policy of Barbados. That there is to date no established tradition of regular parliamentary debate on foreign affairs is, in my view, a matter for serious preoccupation.

This continued lack of attention to a crucial dimension of Government's business, in an increasingly interdependent world, serves only to reinforce that unhappy and widely held notion that Barbados' foreign policy is, at best, of marginal concern to the average citizen, and, at worst, a useless and expensive pastime best left to the dilettantes of diplomacy. So I trust that one of the consequences of this debate will be to play its part in removing and correcting the omissions of the past.

I should also like to say that I see no reason why this Chamber should not, whenever it finds it convenient, constitute itself, or part thereof, to a standing committee on foreign affairs. And I see no reason why, having done that, it should not invite the Other Chamber to join with it, from among its own membership, and have a joint parliamentary committee on foreign affairs. Thirdly, I see no reason why such a joint parliamentary committee should not, on its own initiative, institute procedures for discussions with foreign ambassadors and foreign representatives of international organisations on a regular basis to interchange ideas and to learn from mutual experience what is required in the conduct of the foreign policy of this country. So as far as I am concerned, I think, and I think my colleagues would feel the same way, that if we wish to take this initiative, we certainly can.

In order to inform and guide this debate, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has prepared a comprehensive review of our foreign policy from Independence to the present. This had not been done previously, and it seems to me that no systematic research had been made to document the highlights of our foreign policy decision making over the years, although the material was, of course, there. So we considered it vital to the success of this debate that the total picture, so far as we could get at it, be compiled and presented.

Mr. President, many interesting facts came to light during our initial research. One of the most striking, and one which will no doubt surprise members of the public, as I dare say it has astonished Members of both Houses of Parliament, is the fact that, far from being an extravagant, spendthrift arm of Government, the Foreign Service of Barbados in the past year accounted for only 1.6 per cent of total Government Current Expenditure and 1.4 per cent of Capital Expenditure, and succeeded in running a headquarters division and nine overseas posts within this budget, with a modest complement of only 59 diplomatic and administrative staff and 91 clerical and support staff. You may even find it worthy of note, Sir, that with these limited resources, the Government of Barbados nevertheless manages to maintain relations with 73 countries and to represent the country's interest in over 60 international, regional and sub-regional organisations, from which considerable benefits have accrued over the years.

Our national and economic development has always been the main goal of the conduct of our international relations, and the strategies of our foreign policies have therefore largely been directed towards these objectives. I now list them for ease of reference and recollection:

1. The promotion of beneficial trading relationships with third states and economic grouping, and protection of Barbados' interest within the framework of international, commercial and economic policy making.
2. The procurement of concessionary financing for Barbados' development efforts.
3. The attraction of investment capital for industrial development in prescribed sectors of the economy, and, more recently, in the promotion of Barbados as an offshore financial centre.
4. The promotion and expansion of tourism and connected hospitality services.
5. The preservation and protection of national sovereignty and security.
6. The strengthening of regional integration movement and the promotion of the concept of Caribbean unity.
7. Strengthening ties with traditional allies and fostering new ties with friendly countries based on the principles of peaceful co-existence and of the sovereign equality of states.
8. Collaborating with like-minded countries to advance the concepts of morality, justice and respect for human rights in international affairs.
9. Pursuing in international behaviour the goal of peaceful relations among states, and seeking to create, through constructive collective action a new social, political, and economic order.
10. Lastly but by no means least, the protection and promotion of the interest and welfare of Barbadian nationals abroad.

12.35 p.m.

At this stage, I want to share my views on a matter which is, from time to time, of great concern to Barbadians, as it should be — our relations with the United States of America. Let me say, before I say anything else on this, that our relations with the United States of America are extremely good, and I say this without equivocation or qualification of any sort. But I also have

to say this — all countries in this world not excluding the Soviet Union, have to deal in their foreign policy with two different concepts of the United States. With one of these concepts, almost no country has any difficulty, with the other concept, almost all countries have difficulties. So when you are talking about relations with the United States, you must distinguish between which concept, one from another.

There is the United States with which all democratic countries, indeed most countries of the world, have shared values — the country which is the bastion of freedom, a country whose Government is a Government of laws, and a lot of them, a country within which the citizen is free not only to criticise his Government, but to compel his Government to obey the wishes of the vast majority of the population, the country which is first to rush to the aid of other countries in distress, a country whose bounteous generosity feeds the starving and rescues, if I may use the words of the hymn "the perishing". Those aspects of the United States is the country we all love and wish to see prosper, and to which we rightly accord a private place as the leader of the free world. With that country almost nobody, except those who are deeply motivated against the concept of even human dignity, can have any quarrel.

There is, however, another United States. There is a country which is governed by selected interests, a military-industrial complex, it is called, whose main preoccupation is with the geopolitical confrontation between itself and the Soviet Union, and which, therefore, seeks to drag the rest of the world willy-nilly into the confines of this confrontation. Some of us have to resist from being drawn into this. So when you hear me or Mr. Barrow say we wish the Caribbean to be a zone of peace, it is not saying that we deny the legitimate interest of the United States in this region or its right to defend and protect its security, but we are only saying we do not wish to be drawn into your quarrel with the Soviet Union, although we certainly know whose side we are on when you are in the right, and what puzzles us about you is that you sometimes behave like the Soviet Union is expected to behave, when, in fact, you are not the Soviet Union, and we expect a higher level of international behaviour from you. It is that United States we criticise.

The two are not the same in our view, and, therefore, when you hear us say that we will defend the sovereignty of this country, and that we will take whatever steps we need to make it known that the foreign policy of Barbados is based on not being a satellite of a great power, but friends of all, we mean exactly what we say. But please do not expect of us to join willy-nilly every conceivable contention which the United States may have with the Soviet Union, when, in

fact, those of us who conduct the diplomacy of a lot of countries know that relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, at bottom, are much better than the relationships which exist between some of us in the Caribbean and some other countries.

The Soviet Union and the United States take great care not to harm each other. When there is a nuclear accident in the Ukraine, the United States makes available to the Soviet Union all its resources, technological, scientific and otherwise, to assist the other super-power in minimising the damage to itself and its citizens. When a Soviet submarine gets into difficulty within the territorial waters of the United States, all the resources of the American Government are placed at the disposal of the Soviet Union in order that the other super-power should suffer no harm to its prestige or to its personnel. There is a continual dialogue going on between those two great powers. They help each other. As a matter of fact, if certain developments which appear on the horizon should continue to bear fruit, I would not be surprised if you see, within the next few years, a tremendous turnabout in their international relations, with those two great powers finding more common cause among themselves against this horde of poor and hungry nations which want, in their view, to impoverish them by setting them at war with one another. So we have to be very careful.

But, unknown to a lot of people, almost everyday the Government of Barbados and the Government of the United States are in close contact on a lot of matters of mutual concern, and I wish to pay public tribute to them for the help they are giving us in this troublesome and very dangerous matter of the sprawling, spreading, and wicked illegal drug trade. We are getting tremendous help from them, and they are helping us in ways in which we could not help ourselves. We have expressed to them our appreciation for this and have told them that, to the extent anything this Government can do to assist them in controlling and mitigating the effects of this evil within their own territory, they can count on the resources, such as they are, of the Government of Barbados.

We have also said publicly that, far from there being any hostility on the part of Barbados towards the United States in respect of its legitimate interest in this region, we have given the assurance that so far as we are concerned, and we think we speak for all the people of Barbados in this respect, we are not — not — ever going to allow our own territory to be used for any hostile manifestation against them. Within that ambit, if the other United States, the geo-political one, says anything that we do not like, we will tell them that we do not like it. If that one wants to press upon us policies that we know are not in our national interest, and not in the interest of this region, we will say, 'No, we are not going to support that.' But if it is the other one, the real one in whom we have shared values, the leader of the free trade

world, that great country which the whole world depends on for so much and which is so prodigal of its help and its resources to the needy and the hungry in every quarter of the globe, that country is our friend, and that country will always have our support and can always call upon all the people of this little island, no matter by whom they are governed, for solidarity and friendship whenever it may feel it stands in need of it.

12.45 p.m.

Sir, I am grateful to be able to make these introductory remarks. I hope that we will have as wide and ranging a debate as possible. If in the course of their interventions Senators have specific concerns which they wish to raise, or specific criticisms, I wish them to feel free to bring them to my attention, and I shall ask the leave of the Senate at the end of the debate, before the introducer of this motion replies, to answer those specific questions to the best of my ability. I have a full battery of my advisers here who, more often than not, tell me "But Minister you must not say that." When I want to talk like a politician, they tell me I must talk like a diplomat. But they are here, they will find out the answers to questions you ask if I do not know them, and we shall have a very helpful time with each other.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Would Senators like to break for lunch now?

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 2 o'clock.

Mr. PRESIDENT: There seems to be no objection to the Senate being adjourned until 2.00. The Senate stands adjourned until 2.00 p.m.
12.50 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. PRESIDENT: The Senate is in session.

SENATOR L. L. SHOREY: Mr. President, like other Senators I welcome the opportunity for debate on the topic of Government's foreign policy, and I would like very early to express appreciation to the Leader of Government Business in this Chamber for his very ready willingness to accept responsibility for making the arrangements for this debate, and also for providing us with a very insightful document with a very useful overview of Government's actions in the past and clear trends for actions in the future.

The mover of the Resolution, Senator Wickham, covered a broad canvass, as did the Leader of the House. I wish to be much more modest, but I think, in some respects, perhaps more specific. I do not wish to repeat

the general principles underlying external policy which were adumbrated by the Minister, and indeed summarised and presented in the document "Diplomacy and Development", so I shall pass those over very quickly. I would only wish to add that they all appear eminently desirable objectives.

I share the view, which I think comes through quite clearly in the document, that one of the most traumatic experiences of this country in recent times was the whole Grenada, shall we say, episode, and Barbados' own involvement in it. For the record, I would like to state that I am very glad that the Government of the day took the action that it did.

Overall, the foreign policy is clearly designed, and has been designed and intended under both Governments to promote the interest of Barbados where the word "interests" is interpreted as widely and as generously as possible. But there are a few things, Sir, that I think deserve our special consideration, at least which have caught my attention, and I wish to share them with the members of this Honourable House.

Coming out, I think it is a fair thing to say, as an indirect result — I do not think there is any doubt that the two are related — of the whole set of actions in Grenada — causes and consequences — there increased an awareness of the need for regional security, not to mention other well known threats to Barbados in the past. I am not convinced, Sir, that Government's declared course in connection with, and so far as, its relationship with the OECS countries is concerned, is the soundest one in the interest of Barbados. It is clear that — and this comes through very clearly in *Diplomacy and Development* — that the Government's policy is to accept, as I understand it, continued involvement so far as the Memorandum of Understanding is concerned, but that the Government refuses, and has categorically stated — I do not think that is too strong a phrase — that it will not enter into a treaty. It would seem to me that this is an unwise position to adopt.

Since I am on this matter of some aspect of regionalism, I think it but appropriate to pay tribute to the present Government when it was previously in Government, that is, prior to 1976, for its involvement in the initiation and development of CARIFTA, transformed later into CARICOM. I think that, as a citizen of the country, it would be less than just to ignore the contribution which the country, through its respective Governments, has made in establishing and helping to maintain the functioning of such regional organisations, whatever their shortcomings might be.

However, Sir, when one looks further afield, particularly with respect to non-English-speaking countries in

the region, I encounter some things that I find both strange and almost inexplicable. I am going to try to deal with these very quickly.

2.05 p.m.

Take, for example, the matter of diplomatic relations with Cuba, I am not knocking that. I am only saying that when one looks at the statements in *Diplomacy and Development*, one finds an explanation of why we are not involved in Chile: "Government cannot foresee an amelioration in the relations in the prevailing circumstances because of questionable human rights policies." Fair enough. My question is, do we have any concerns about the same kinds of human rights and policies in Cuba? If we do, I would be glad to get some kind of explanation as to how one makes that kind of decision.

I also find in *Diplomacy and Development* a statement to the effect that there can be no meaningful diplomatic contact with four of the five Central American countries "because of the non-democratic and repressive nature of their Governments." Again, I ask, does this mean to imply that since we have established diplomatic relations with Cuba, as I understand it, we are not concerned that these things do not exist? That we see them as a diplomatic country and that we do not perceive them as oppressive? I am just asking.

When I turn to comments about Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala again, the statement is, "the policies of those countries in the sphere of human rights and political freedoms" does not encourage close contact. Once, again, I am at a lost, because, to me, there is marked inconsistency in these dealings. I hope that one could get some enlightenment on this, what I would call, strange estrangement on the one hand and acceptance on the other, where, as far as I can see the available evidence suggests that the same conditions basically hold.

I move next, Sir, to something which, for a long time, has been a matter of both interest and concern to me, the involvement at membership level of our country in the Non-Aligned Movement. When it was first mooted, and, indeed, the involvement made, during the former Government, I protested then, and I have neither heard nor seen since anything that has significantly served to diminish my unease. I would call it to the 'so-called Non-Aligned Movement', because if one thing is clear, from its own documentation is that it is very clearly aligned.

When one makes statements like that, one does open oneself to the charge that if you make the statement, you must produce your evidence, and, Sir, with your permission, I propose to produce my evidence. My evidence is drawn from a document put out by the same organisation called "Two Decades of Non-Alignment." It is a document of about one and a half inches thick, and

that document sets out, as it is easy to find, the presumed objectives — promotion of peace, opposition to apartheid, opposition to internal interference in the internal affairs of another country, non-alignment with the great powers. There is a very clearly stated one, support for co-existence, and it goes on.

When one looks through the document, one finds some very extraordinary things. For example, when I looked at the index, I found nine page references to the Soviet Union. When I looked for references to the United States of America, I found 65 references. What is interesting is that when one starts to look at what is in those references, and turns backwards or forwards, depending on how one wants to go, at what is said in the document, one finds consistent specific indictment and criticism of the United States of America, but no similar indictment of the USSR. This is in an organisation whose name is "Non-aligned", and one of whose specific and stated objective is non-alignment with the great powers!

The closest I get to what one could interpret as an indictment of the USSR is call, and I am quoting "upon the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic to forthwith resume talks" on the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. But one finds repeated and repeated specific indictments of the U.S.A. Consider the 1982 Conference, and I am quoting now, "The Ministers condemned the United States misuse of the veto." Anybody who has even a passing acquaintance with what goes on at the level of the Security Council knows that the Soviet Union has exercised its veto, if my recollection is correct, far more often than the USA has. But there is not a single reference, even passing to the use of the veto by the USSR!

Consider, I quote again: "The Ministers expressed their support for the right of the people of Puerto Rico to self-determination and independence and urge the Government of the United States of America to comply fully with the Resolution on Puerto Rico, 1980, by the United Nations Special Committee on the colonisation." Would you believe that when, quite understandably, in terms of my interest, I looked up the matter of Afghanistan, Mr. President — and Soviet troops are still in Afghanistan — do you know that there is not a single reference to the Soviet troops in Afghanistan? There is a passing reference to a call for withdrawal of foreign troops, but no country is mentioned, and if one did not know the facts, one would not have a clue as to whose troops are in Afghanistan. And can we seriously compare whatever we may feel about the rights and wrongs about Puerto Rico, whether they wish or wish not to be directly connected with the U.S.A., with what is happening in Afghanistan. Can we, in any real sense, compare the two situations?

As I said, I remain amazed, and this goes on and on. Take this particularly beautiful one. "The European Economic Community and the United States even export tens of billions of dollars worth of arms annually." Need I add that there is no reference — no reference — to the Soviet or Communist countries' sales of arms?

Sir, when I read that, I find it very difficult to entertain a perspective which suggests non-alignment. One could go on. I genuinely wondered, when I was making my note, that if what was found in that 20-year span of reports represented non-alignment, wonder what form alignment would take. Incredible!

I am, therefore, perturbed when I read statements such as, and I read from another document, "the seeming anti-Western and particularly anti-U.S. stance of the group". There is nothing "seeming" about it. It is demonstrable, and easily so. For those reasons, Sir, I have reservation about Barbados' involvement.

2.15 p.m.

I am aware of arguments that may be put forward for its involvement, that we are linking ourselves with other Third World countries in the so-called North-South dialogue, or, if you want another term, north-south confrontation, that we need to solicit the support of other countries. I am prepared to accept some of those arguments. I can only say, Sir, that I feel uneasy and I still remain unconvinced that direct involvement in this organisation is in the long term best interest of Barbados.

I recognise, being something of a realist, I hope, that extrication of ourselves from this situation may be a lot more difficult than it was getting into it. But I seriously would urge the Government of this country to give consideration to a matter of reviewing our involvement in the organisation, because, as I said before, I remain unconvinced that it is in our long term best interest.

Let me turn to another matter involving foreign policy very clearly, and this is our participation in the UN and OAS, and I am thinking particularly now of the involvement in the OAS. Our connection with English, as well as non-English, speaking countries in this organization is, I believe, a very desirable one, but I would like to add a little emphasis, if it is, in fact, needed, to Government's own awareness, as expressed in the document which forms the basis of our debate today, that we need, I think, to seek to get more of our nationals not on the narrow basis of a country like Barbados seeking to get its own nationals, but on the wider basis of a community of English-speaking countries to have their nationals, as a whole, at much higher levels in that organisation. I can claim, Sir, a small measure of direct knowledge, since, for a matter of a year, I served as Deputy Director in the Department of Educational Affairs in the OAS, and what certainly came through, and what,

I believe, I made a point of emphasising to the Government of the day here, was that we needed far more people at, if you want to call it, executive decision making levels. I would urge, as one of importance, that it is not enough to say that we have nationals in the organisation. What is far more important is the level at which those members operate. Unless one is at the level of Director, Deputy Director or what is called the P.5, that is the topmost level of the professional staff, the likelihood of direct involvement, of actually knowing what is going on on the inside, so to speak, is minimal, Sir, and I would urge strongly that not only, as the document suggests, do we need to push for greater membership in the organisation at a functional level, but that those functionaries should be at a level that has a direct pay off for us and we should not merely count heads in the organization. I am not implying that the Government is doing this, I am merely wishing to strengthen the Government's clear statement that it recognises the need for that kind of involvement.

Sir, there are yet other matters which I think cannot help but be perturbing, and I am not certain that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs can do much more than serve as a facilitating agency in this respect, but if one looks at the trade figures given in annexes, I think 14 to 51, quite a considerable number of annexes, it is fairly clear, Sir, that there are some countries with which we have a tremendous negative trade balance, and a few countries with which we have a noticeable positive trade balance. I am at a loss to suggest just what specific measures may be taken, but I do not think that one can help but be concerned that if one looks at Venezuela, I think my figures are correct, we have imports of the order of over \$59.7 million, nearly \$60 million, and exports of under \$6,000, \$5,448. I am quite certain that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, like the Ministry of Trade, and indeed like the Government as a whole, must be very concerned about that, and it seems to me that these will continue to be matters to which as a country, we shall have to give close attention.

Let me move on sir, to something else of an entirely different order. The document was enlightening and informative, if one could use those two words which are so often bandied about, but use them very accurately in very many ways, but I think, sir, that there were implications coming out of the structure and content of the document that I do not think at least I hope, were intended. For example, at the back of the document I found four addresses, and Sir, not one of the addresses was by any member who served as Minister of Foreign Affairs or as Prime Minister during the previous Government.

Mr. President, I find this extraordinary, because the document is a statement of diplomacy and development, a review of the foreign policy of Barbados. It starts from the earliest days, and it includes a chapter, or a section,

on "The Evolution of a Barbadian Foreign Policy", and I find it extraordinary that we should produce a document on this subject and put in four statements by Ministers of the present Government, incidentally all of them in 1986, although that is not surprising, but no reference I can find, certainly no significant quotation, from members of the previous Government. I would find it very difficult to believe, and I am pretty certain this is not what was meant to be implied, that the previous Government made no contribution to foreign policy.

We have indeed circulated today, and I am much appreciative of this, a statement of foreign policy by the then Minister of External Affairs, the Honourable H. deB. Forde in 1979. I only regret, Sir, that there was no greater evidence of balance. I remain uneasy about a presentation which does not do justice to the Governments of this country as a whole. I am unsympathetic to a view which pretends or seeks to imply that the former Government did nothing, just as I am unsympathetic to a view which suggests that this Government has never done anything in the past. Neither of those bears any relationship, to the realities of the 20 years of Barbados' existence, and I should like to suggest that if this is intended to be a review of foreign policy of Barbados over a 20-year period, half of which the country was under the direction of one party and for the remainder of which it was under the direction of another, surely somehow that must be reflected. I regret that the document fails, I think, very significantly and disastrously in that respect.

2.25 p.m.

I sense what I would call an air of unreality. Maybe I am unduly pessimistic. I think it is naive to suggest that the Soviet Union has any real interest in retaining the Caribbean as a zone of peace. I see nothing in the history of that country's activities, nothing at all, to suggest that it has ever, other than for matters of moment, turned aside from what many people perceive to be the ultimate objective of ensuring that its kind of doctrine should hold sway over the earth. I see nothing to suggest that its activities have been anything other than means of expediency to achieve that goal, however indirect the action. I would suggest that the statements, though one may hope that they could be realised, are a little bit on the naive side in terms of expectations.

The policies of the Government are often enunciated by different persons, and with due respect to the Minister of Government who spoke for the Government, the Leader of Government Business, I am uncomfortable — I believe that I have said this, certainly I have implied it before, but I think one needs to say it — at times by some of the statements made by very, very, very senior Ministers of Government. I accept the statement that the relations between our country and that of our big neighbour to the north west are good. I believe, Sir, that it is

not as easy to pass off and shrug off what I can best describe, at the least level, as inappropriate and injudicious statements — one could use stronger terms — by some members of the Government about that country and about the leader of that country. I have reason to believe, from information that I have been given, that whatever may be the official response of that Government as a Government, those statements have militated against investments that might have otherwise come to the country. That is the information I have, and I pass it on for due consideration by the present Minister of Foreign Affairs and, through him, to the Government and its cabinet.

In conclusion, Sir, I think it is fair to say that this document has brought home to us the importance of a far-sighted foreign policy as critical to the development of a small nation like Barbados. It is fairly evident that there have been a lot of shortcomings over the 20 years, across the two parties, but, then, we are human. What I think deserves undoubted credit is the equally great evidence that there have been consistent efforts to improve the standing of Barbados in the international community and through its Ministry of Foreign Affairs, to establish links and maintain procedures which would facilitate the growth and development of this country. I believe, Sir, that whatever may be the other shortcomings, and whether, indeed, one agrees with a particular policy at any one point in time, or with the implementation of a given policy at a given point in time, is really relatively minor compared with the, I think, just commendation which both Governments which have served our country deserve for the way in which they have sought to handle the foreign affairs of this country.

Applause.

SENATOR M. deL. JORDAN: Mr. President, quite recently I had the opportunity to speak in this Chamber on matters pertaining to the foreign affairs of this country. I am therefore happy to find the answers to many of the questions which I asked at that time in the document "Diplomacy and Development".

The importance of the pursuit of an independent foreign policy cannot be over emphasised, so it is heartening to learn of our relations, on the one hand, with such super powers as Britain, Canada and the USA while, on the other hand, we have established diplomatic relations with Cuba and the People's Republic of China. This, of course, is in keeping with our policy of being "friends of all and satellites of none". I express again, therefore, my anxiety to see a re-establishment of diplomatic relations with Haiti and with Suriname. I think I mentioned this in this Chamber a little while ago. Both of these countries have in recent past experienced political unrest, and it is very likely that this could have been the reason for our not having the diplomatic ties re-established at this time. The Honourable Minister, Sir,

may wish to tell us of any plans which Government is contemplating with regard to these countries.

Let us turn our attention next to the country which is the largest on the South American continent. I had something to say about Brazil quite recently, and I return to that country. It is important that we strengthen our ties with this country by placing more funds at the disposal of whoever is serving Brazil, whether it is being done from Caracas or elsewhere. It is important that we maintain strong bilateral ties with Brazil. We now have direct and indirect airline links with that country, and we need to strengthen our cultural ties as well. In fact, I hope to see the establishment of a Consul or Embassy there as soon as our finances will permit. Will the Minister also inform us what is the Government's plan in this regard and if we can look forward in the near future to seeing some improvement of our diplomatic relations? I am not suggesting that they are bad, but I am concerned about the establishment of some embassy or mission.

Mr. President, within recent years there has been considerable increase in the traffic between Barbados and Venezuela. I can testify to that. Successive Governments have considered it desirable to have different levels of representation in this country since independence, but it seems to me to be evident at this time that there is need to strengthen the embassy there, and I must repeat my pleas for the purchase of a suitable building to house the embassy in Caracas. From my personal experience in Caracas recently, I know that we could do very much better, and we should take advantage of the present value of the Bolivar in relation to the dollar to establish a permanent home at this time. Will the furnishings of a previous residence be adequate now that we have just moved the embassy to another building? What I saw in the building from which we have just moved would seem to make it clear that we ought to try and get our own building because it does not seem as if landlords are particularly anxious to comply with the requests of the Government of Barbados. We fully appreciate the financial constraints, but it would seem to me as if we may be a penny wise and a pound foolish if we do not acquire our own building in that city.

I have already expressed the view, Mr. President, that in New York, where a new lease is being considered, it may also be just as well to consider the desirability of purchasing our own building. Will the Minister disclose any plans in this regard?

2.35 p.m.

To return to our foreign policy again, Mr. President, I should like to see all Missions placing greater emphasis on the promotion of trade with perhaps the appointment of a Commercial Attache. We have seen how much has already been done in Canada, and while I should like to

compliment the recently appointed High Commissioner to that country and his staff, I am quite confident that a lot more can be done, and not only in Canada, but wherever we do have Missions. I know that I have drawn attention to the fact that we must operate within the rather confined perimeters of our finances, but in my opinion surely a really competent Commercial Attache can more than earn his keep.

We are represented in a number of international fora, Mr. President, and it would be of great interest to learn how far is Barbados likely to go in support of the policy of the abolition of apartheid in South Africa. Shall we as a nation, the majority of whom have got ethnic links with Africa, for example, be willing to continue our stance, even though it may mean Britain withdrawing from the Commonwealth? How effective does the Minister see partial sanctions continuing in the manner in which they are applied today? How effective are they really?

It is heartening to learn that two of our CARICOM partners, Guyana and Grenada, have expressed an interest in returning to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. Does Barbados envisage any difficulty in their re-admission, or does a return to a democratic-type form of Government ensure re-entry into this body?

Let us turn our attention to Cyprus, Mr. President, and I should declare an interest where Cyprus is concerned. There is the Cyprus Problem. I know that Barbados enjoys good diplomatic relations with that country, but their problem has been complicated by foreign intervention and has grown into a major dispute endangering peace in the sensitive Middle East, with repercussions felt almost all over the world. As I see it, a similar fate could befall a small island such as Barbados, Mr. President, because we are so strategically placed geographically, and then we would certainly need the assistance of all our allies. How vocal has been the support of Barbados for a unified Cyprus when addressing international assemblies?

Mr. President, let us turn our attention to the European Economic Community. Much good can result from its representation in Barbados. However, as I said in a recent debate, I doubt that our nationals are being made fully aware of these opportunities. I think I have given examples of the benefits which we can derive, because I have experienced this together with others who have been to the EEC. I am confident that many local projects could benefit significantly if members of organisations were told of the procedures required to participate in several ventures. Can the Government Information Service be of assistance in this regard?

Let us examine another multilateral forum, one in which Barbados has played an active role, Mr. President.

I have heard another honourable Member of this Chamber speak of the Non-Aligned Movement. Our membership of this organisation has provoked much controversy. Much has been said, Mr. President, of the composition of the Non-Aligned Movement, and it would be gratifying to be told more about the work, aims and objectives of this organisation so that our presence there can truly be perceived as being in consonance with our expressed commitment to a policy of complete independence.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Applause.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: Mr. President, the subject of Foreign Affairs gives me some difficulty. I do not know if it is, because sometimes I believe that, living in a small state, most of us would like to express ourselves with a certain degree of freedom, but find it extremely difficult because of the paternalistic behaviour of some of the world powers. I believe that we have a duty to our people to speak honestly about how we feel, but I am also aware of the constraints and limits in which we speak. Therefore, sometimes in justifying certain areas we have to use what people call diplomacy — some describe it as duplicity.

I am not going into these sensitive areas, because I am fully aware of the serious ramifications, especially when there is limited time to explain your feelings and concerns about various matters in the international arena. But I have to respect the sovereignty of Barbados, and in 1966 when Independence was given to this country by the Right Honourable Errol Walton Barrow, the opportunity was provided for us to chart our own destiny. The American Government, one of our paternal links, sought to have their independence in 1776 through different methods. However, the fight in the Caribbean, which I am mainly concerned with, was a fight to disintegrate the shackles of the Colonial powers over us, and we are faced in this 20th century with the difficulties of avoiding the threat of what one of my colleagues here usually refers to as neo-colonialism, a new brand of colonial exercises through financial institutions and different agencies.

Mr. President, I want to express some strong personal feelings, which I hope will fall in line with the Government's particularly in looking at the problems which we face in the region. In the Caribbean, we seem to exercise great concern over each other simply on the grounds of trade. I believe that apart from the bread and butter issues, and the connections between Barbados and Trinidad over trade, or Jamaica and Trinidad, there are other deeper roots which we must take into consideration. I believe they were described before as the roots of consanguinity, the roots of affinity. These are important

links, since throughout the Caribbean Barbadians can be found in prominent positions in the various islands.

2.45 p.m.

Our foreign policy must now move much further as we seek in the European Economic Community to embrace other aspects of life. We have to take into consideration political unity among our leaders. Despite the former regime's commitment to what is described as ideological pluralism, sometimes one gets the impression that positions that were taken were taken on the basis of other countries having different ideological backgrounds. One of the means of escaping this is to argue that some of the countries within the Caribbean refuse to respect democracy in the form of having democratic elections, known as free and fair elections. I believe that if we are to espouse positions and argue that we have great respect for ideological pluralism, then we should not try to get around other countries and inflict hardships on them through sanctions, through strong language, by using the method of those countries not moving in to have elections as a means of carrying out your policies. That is why I believe that our duty is to restore to the Caribbean people a stronger sense of unity than that which we have seen under the previous regime.

I do not care if it is partisan or how it is classified. That is how I feel about it, because I have heard voices before now, shortly after the Grenada invasion, calling for elections in Guyana, and it gives me the impression that it was based strictly on ideology, and I am of the opinion that this Government has to restore the confidence in the Caribbean people that Barbados respects them as brothers and sisters. We can say that we have been successful in coming out of the Grenada crisis, but we all know that we feel the serious ramifications of the language that was used on that occasion by the late Prime Minister while the Minister of Foreign Affairs remained silent and the blood of innocent people was flowing on the streets of Grenada.

The regional Governments must take an example from the European Economic Community and fight to bring about unity among Caribbean people, and I want to re-emphasise that point. We can continue to talk about the problems in Nicaragua, we can talk about the problems in South Africa, which I am very concerned about, and it makes me feel uneasy sometimes when we have to couch things in special language in order not to provoke the anger of other people. When Senator Wickham introduced this Resolution he indicated that he would like it to be conducted in a very placid and lucid manner. As a result, I will try to deliver my feelings about South Africa as composed as I can, but we need to move in a progressive way.

Apart from that Sir, Barbados is experiencing great difficulties in the area of unemployment, and one of the

discoveries from observation is that when we go to international financial institutions, I get the impression that there are certain conditions, the conditionality of the agreements is usually one-sided. It appears that the international financial institutions stipulate the condition for these loans while, at least, I would say, being insensitive to the problems of some of the Caribbean people in the area of employment. I have come to this conclusion on the basis that here we are with a serious problem of unemployment and most of the time when the loans are granted for Capital projects, they seem to be capital intensive, and as a result we remain over and over with these serious problems. I hope that whichever body is responsible for persuading these international financial organisations in the area of negotiations would take the considerations of the working class people of Barbados into consideration if the argument holds that our foreign policy is an extension of our domestic policy. I suppose that our domestic policy must cater to the needs of the people of Barbados, so if you are making any steps in the future in negotiating with some foreign donors, I believe that emphasis should be placed heavily on the conditions which are supportive to the unemployment situation in Barbados.

The United Nations is another special problem. There seems to be some restructuring in the Security Council as well, the Security Council having fixed membership for quite a long time, which is unlike the position in the General Council. I am speaking subject to correction on this matter, but giving the major powers the right of veto seems to be one of the concerns, in talking to many people in Barbados, and I believe that we should try to persuade the United Nations — I do not know if it will come through the General Council or not — to use similar methods to those which are exercised within the General Council in bringing about some changes so that other people would have an opportunity to serve on the Security Council. I believe that as long as the USSR and the United States retain their strength in the Security Council, it will be extremely difficult for small states such as Barbados to have any great impact on certain serious matters within the Council.

We were making some inroads some time ago in these international bodies and I believe it was around the time when Mr. Val MacComie was there, but as a result of the pre-occupation with the invasion in Grenada, there seems to be a fall back in terms of Barbados succeeding in a credible way on these international bodies.

2.55 p.m.

That brings me to the point of the importance of principles and morality in terms of foreign policy. If we exercise principles and morality when dealing with foreign policy, I believe we would be able to avoid the spin-off that we experience now in the Caribbean islands and,

instead, have the kind of cordiality that we are trying to restore to the Caribbean Islands.

Mr. President, we in Barbados cannot remain silent on the issue of apartheid. Any problem that affects the African diaspora relates to me in some way as a black man, and if we continue to watch on CNN and to read in the newspapers that the Botha regime continues to inflict hardship and pain, and continues to murder innocent people in the streets, then we are facing in Barbados the difficulty of a black and white crisis as well. We have to use all forces that are available to express our strong feelings since we cannot give any physical assistance on the South Africa position. I am extremely happy to see that the Government has symbolised in a benevolent manner its great concern for the liberation of the black people in South Africa by making a monetary contribution, but our voices must be heard in every area as it relates to the South African position. No longer can we remain behind the scene and pretend that we are friends of all. We cannot be friends of a South African Government. It cannot be applied in that extensive way. We have to let them know over and over in any international forum that the Botha Government must go.

African people in their own country are denied the right to live within urban areas, to travel on certain vehicles, to vote. That is the mother country of the black people of the world and, therefore, every black man who has been given the opportunity to stand in a forum where policy decisions are taken must allow his voice to be heard. The African state has been balkanized for quite a long time, and the African people must come together as well, and we will continue in our support.

Mr. President, as I said earlier, it is extremely difficult to defend positions even in the area of principle, because, if you advance an argument, you do not know how far the interpretation will be twisted, and it could affect you in the public domain if reports are made in distorted form, which are so often done. But examples were made about the USSR's position in a number of matters, and I wonder what the position would be like if we talked about the freedom, and the amount of interventions throughout the world by the U.S. Government. I believe that we would be stepping on some very strange ground, and, therefore, I do not believe anyone can speak with total freedom on these matters. We are fully aware of the sensitive nature of the smaller states, and I believe that this Government will do everything within its limited power, in terms of its foreign policy, to see that justice is carried out and its commitment to ideological pluralism remains.

I recall that, some time ago, when the Honourable Prime Minister left this country and went to a conference in Cuba, he was classified as totalitarian, and all types of pejorative remarks were made about him. I have had the privilege in my lifetime, just a few days or so ago, to

see Margaret Thatcher touring the USSR with a friendly face, and no charges from the media or any politician were levied against her. It is a clear indication of what I am trying to say to you. We argue and struggle in the Caribbean against each other under the pretence of economic problems when some of us know, and in particular, the Opposition party, that they are not committed to ideological pluralism. It is simple rhetoric.

Senator Tull was the Minister responsible during the invasion of Grenada. His voice was silent on the matter, and the Prime Minister of the day took the initiative in assisting, plotting and scheming, from his clear pronouncement before Whiteman left the airport, when he sent Glyne Murray to warn him not to go back to Grenada. He knew what was going to occur in Grenada.

(Aside: SENATOR L. R. TULL: Who?)

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: Whiteman, one of the persons who was assassinated as a result of the act.

I cannot be happy when a country could believe that the Tom Adams regime played no part in the murder of hundreds of black people on the streets of Grenada.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Prescod, be careful. Do not get into using that kind of language.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: Mr. President, I consider it as murder.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Murder means people. You are in the Senate.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: Let me generalise it, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Do not generalise it. Do not use that kind of language up here. Up here is for more elegant language.
3.05 p.m.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: I believe that I can use more elegant language, but I believe it is justifiable to use the strong language because it was a very serious act, and people lost their lives.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The Honourable Senator must use parliamentary language up here.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: So "murder" is unparliamentary? We are not arguing about it. If you want me to withdraw the word "murder", I will withdraw the word.

When a Government can assist in taking the lives of innocent people

Mr. PRESIDENT: Again I do not want the honourable member to have a problem in rephrasing killing. Taking the lives of innocent people has the same connotation as the words used earlier. Take your time and use language that is parliamentary. This is Parliament, this is not the street.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: I am fully aware I am a street man, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You cannot call people's names and at the same time associate them

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: I have not called anybody's name.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You said "Tom Adams", and you cannot in the Senate associate persons' names with criminal acts. Get that clear.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: I believe I should conclude my speech here, Sir, since, in my introduction, I clearly explained the vacillation in dealing with foreign policy. When we are dealing with foreign policy, it appears that we cannot speak freely, because we fear that we may offend other persons. I believe that the word is appropriate, but I will withdraw it because it is clearly described by you as unparliamentary.

Mr. PRESIDENT: If you challenge my ruling, I will have to ask you to withdraw that, because you cannot, with these subtleties, begin to challenge the ruling that I gave.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: I did not challenge your ruling.

Mr. PRESIDENT: But you are using the other language now. Senator Prescod, I have been very patient. I do not want to be harsh with you, I would have to invoke the rules and I do not want to invoke the rules, so you had better take it easy.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: In winding up this debate, Sir, I want to say that the Democratic Labour Party will use no devious means in getting around the principle of ideological pluralism. We are committed to the freedom of all people and the right of these people to chart their own destiny. I am extremely sorry, Sir, that I have offended you in some way by what I have said, or by using unparliamentary language, but I believe that this is a clear demonstration of what I attempted to establish in the introduction to my contribution on this particular motion, and it is my hope that the Government of the Democratic Labour Party, which has been given a mandate to chart new policies at a parochial as well as

international level, will conduct the affairs of this country in a lucid and humane manner, and restore the type of cordial and fraternal relationships that are necessary for restoring Caribbean unity.

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

Mr. President left the Chair and Mr. Deputy President took the Chair.

SENATOR D. A. COMMISSIONG: Mr. Deputy President, in listening to one of the contributions to this debate a little while ago, I do not single out which one, I thought to myself that if I closed my eyes, I could well have imagined that I was not in the Parliament of Barbados, but that I was somewhere in Washington DC on Capitol Hill perhaps.

Mr. Deputy President, I cannot speak in those terms on foreign policy. I have to approach any debate on foreign policy from my own peculiar perspective, and my peculiar perspective is the perspective of a black person, a Third World person, a member of a race and a people who have experienced hundreds of years of colonialism, of exploitation, and a citizen of a country that is still poor and struggling in a largely hostile international environment. That is the only perspective from which I can view foreign policy in this country and speak to it.

Mr. Deputy President, I believe that foreign policy is crucial to the well-being of the people of Barbados, and I believe that there is a need for the Government of Barbados, to adopt an aggressively independent foreign policy based firmly on the principles of self-respect and self-reliance. I think that this is crucial to our psychological emancipation and development as a people. Some people may say psychological emancipation and development is really an abstract and esoteric term, but I also think that an aggressive, independent approach to foreign policy, based firmly on self-respect and self-reliance, is crucial to the very practical goal of Barbados' economic development and transformation.

I believe, Sir, that the masses of Caribbean and Barbadian people are capable of achievements in any field of endeavour at the highest order. I believe we are capable of the greatest achievements in politics, economics, in our social structure and in technology, and I believe that we Caribbean people have a capacity to really be a beacon to the rest of the world, developed as well as underdeveloped. But it is my opinion that we will only fulfil that potential if the people who lead these countries take a very different approach to their relation-

ships with the mass of citizens of these countries. I think that what we need in Barbados, and I will come around very soon to showing you how this relates to foreign policy, is a new relationship between the governed and the governors in these countries.

3.15 p.m.

We should be aiming at some type of creative partnership — and I know that these are ideals that people have touted and touted about not very seriously for decades, but yet there is a basic germ of truth in them — a creative partnership between ruler and ruled, between the governments and the masses of people. I believe that our people must begin to feel a sense of personal responsibility for the fortunes of Barbados, and our people are only going to be able to develop that type of consciousness if the people who govern have sufficient faith in the masses of people to confront them with the realities of the environment in which we exist, the international environment and the domestic environment. We must be able to tell our people that Barbados is a poor, post-colonial island state existing in a hostile international environment, that we exist in a precarious economic environment. We have to get away from a lot of this foolish propaganda about BLP and DLP and trying to score cheap political points. That does absolutely nothing for the masses of people of Barbados. We have to let the people of Barbados know the realities of our existence that we exist in an international environment which was not created by us, or for us, for that matter, but was created by powerful industrial countries to serve their purposes, and by that mere fact, that it is a hostile environment for us in which our existence is a precarious one.

We all must have a sense of personal responsibility. We all must know that the fortunes of this country depend on each and every one of us. It is simply not good enough to adopt the attitude of leave it up to the Government, Mr. Barrow will take care of it, he is the big McGuffie, he is the know all. To leave it to him, the DLP or Sir James is simply not good enough.

Mr. President, I think that when we talk about development, we are really talking about development of our people, and we who govern have to begin to let our people know these realities, and this is where foreign policy comes in. When I say "foreign policy", I am talking about educating our people in terms of foreign policy. I am talking about educating them about the international political and economic environment in which we exist. I think that foreign policy must become the concern, and the day-to-day concern, of each and every citizen of this country, and I am happy to support Senator Wickham on that.

We have about four radio stations, Sir, we have a television station. What role do they perform in this

country? We are a small, poor, developing country with a crying need to educate our population, and we have radio stations that are little bit more than jukeboxes, and when you turn them on, all you hear is some announcer with a pseudo-American accent playing American music. As far as I am concerned, our radio stations and our television station, to a large extent, play a role that is basically irrelevant to the real needs of the people of this country. I made the point that we need to start educating our people about the international, political and economic environment that we exist in, and I make the further point that we have to use our radio stations and our mass media more productively. As far as I am concerned, they are a liability. The way they are being used, they play a more negative role than a positive role.

Our people must begin to understand their history, our own domestic history and the history of our development in the international fora. Indeed, I make bold to say we must begin to understand, and I do not think that this is above and beyond the capacity of the average citizen if we go about it in the right way, and get a proper insight into the history and development of the international monetary and trading systems. Our people must be cognisant of the fact that when we were colonised 350 years ago, Barbados was never intended to be a human society in the way we understand that term today. We were a little island factory somewhere out in the Atlantic. We were there to produce raw materials and to be an appendage to the infant capitalism of Britain and Europe. We were never intended even to be a human society in any acceptable sense of that word. Our people must know this, because this is our history.

The whole natural economic process of a human society was distorted in Barbados, and distorted deliberately. We were never intended to produce for our own needs. We were to produce to fuel British capitalist endeavour. It was never intended that there would be any capital accumulation in Barbados to provide for the development of Barbadian people. That was not our purpose. This is our history, and our people must know this history. They must know and understand it if they are to develop the intellectual, the spiritual, the cultural, to use that all embracing term, to understand where we need to go now, to understand the problems we have to deal with in terms of our development, how we are going to overcome the problems and how we are going to progress.

They need to understand that the European countries, particularly Britain, came to the fore internationally in the 19th century. The 19th century can be described as the British Century, when Britannia ruled the waves, when the total international trade and monetary system was dominated and created by England to serve England's purposes. Towards the end of the 19th century, the other European countries got into the act. For example, in 1884, we had the Berlin Conference where the major

European countries went about deciding how they would cut up the continent of Africa.

We need to understand the role that was played by the fast developing industrial power of the United States and the other European industrial countries in the early part of the 20th century, and the predominant role that was assumed by the United States in the post-World War II era. We need to understand that the total system of international monetary arrangements, the system of international trade, was a system developed by the United States and the European industrial giants to serve their purposes. The international monetary system is a trading system that was put in place at the end of World War II, and embraced by the United Nations and the institutions created under the Breton Woods Agreement of 1944, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, and the general agreement on trade and tariffs was not designed to cater to the interest of countries like Barbados or other Third World Countries.
3.25 p.m.

Mr. President, I hope that the Minister of Foreign Affairs would take the suggestion seriously that we need to begin exposing our people to an education in foreign affairs, and my interpretation of an education in foreign affairs is basically an education and understanding of the international environment in which we live, the development of that international environment and, particularly, an understanding of how it functions and in whose interest it functions. When we begin to educate our people about this, these will be the types of things we will be telling them, and they will be getting a proper understanding of how the whole system functions.

What I have said so far, Mr. President, would tend to suggest that we exist in an international environment that caters little to our needs, but we must also draw reference to the Third World movements. The Third World movements began, I would say, in the 1950s with the whole movement in the Colonial World towards decolonisation. The historic Conference of 1955 in Indonesia started the ball rolling in terms of institutions, and this was followed by the creation of the Non-Aligned Movement in 1961.

I have heard a number of strictures applied to the Non-Aligned Movement, but I think that those strictures arise because of a lack of understanding of the Non-Aligned Movement. To begin with, the Non-Aligned Movement was originally the brainchild of President Tito of Yugoslavia, and Tito was anxious to create a third force in international politics that would act as a countervailing force to the Soviet Bloc and Western Bloc. But over an above that, Tito's main concern was not the United States. Tito's major concern in 1961 was, in fact, the Soviet Bloc. In fact, at that stage Tito was receiving financial aid and support from the Government of the

United States, and if Tito had to see either the United States or the Soviet Bloc as Yugoslavia's enemy, the enemy would have been the Soviet Union. He may have even counted the Western Bloc as his allies. So the Non-Aligned Movement was Tito's brainchild, and so even the very formation of the movement would suggest that it would be inaccurate to write off the Non-Aligned Movement as simply an appendage of the USSR Bloc.

This is not to say that the Non-Aligned Movement has not had a checkered history throughout the movement. The movement is made up of, I believe, by this time, well over 100 nation states. These states run the gambit of Marxist-Leninist tendencies to out and out capitalist states which could be said to be satellites — or if not satellites, certainly supporters — of the United States. And there has always been a tug of war in the Non-Aligned Movement between the more radical states which have wanted to see the movement as taking a tough anti-imperialist stance, states like Algeria and Cuba, for example — and those have been in the minority, mind you — and the more moderate majority which have tempered the anti-imperialist rhetoric and opted for a consensus approach on issues like South Africa, economic development, aid, technology transfer and a North-South dialogue. But I think it is unfortunate that Senator Shorey chose the 1982 Havana Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Resolutions passed at that conference as the basis on which to judge the value and the workings of the Non-Aligned Movement. Because anyone who has studied the movement knows that the Havana Conference is perhaps not the most shining example of Non-Aligned Movement's achievements. In fact, to a large extent the Havana Conference, which was under the Chairmanship of Cuba, and we know of Cuba's relationship with the United States, was manipulated by Cuba and Castro to serve Cuba's propagandistic ends. So I think it is unfortunate that of all the achievements and all the conferences held by the Non-Aligned Movement, that one was singled out.

To be fair to the Non-Aligned Movement, you have to look at it over its total history. The Non-Aligned Movement has had, at least, if you are judging it from my standpoint, as I said, of a black Third World person who has been through a history of colonisation, some very impressive achievements. For example, the initiative towards getting the General Assembly of the United Nations to create the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, a specialized agency which will be devoted to the problems of Trade in the Third World, was the initiative of the Non-Aligned Movement, and again particularly the initiative of Tito. The development within the United Nations framework of the so-called Group of 77, the Third World lobbying group for trade and economic transformation in the International Economic Order, could again be attributed to the impetus created by the

Non-Aligned Movement. In fact, the way that the two bodies, Non-Aligned Movement and the Group of 77, have operated over the span of their history, is that the Non-Aligned Movement has tended to set the political agenda and political objectives, and the Group of 77 has complemented that role by setting the economic and trade agenda and objectives.

The two organisations have complemented each other and have managed to achieve a lot. They have managed, for example, to transform the very perimeters of the relationship between the North and South, the former colonies and industrial countries, within which dialogue takes place. We now speak about the possibilities of a new International Economic Order, even though, with the accession to power of the Reagan Administration in the United States, that whole debate has tended to be derailed. But the political agenda for the Third World is now being seen within the perimeters of a new International Economic Order, and when we are talking about a new International Economic Order, we are talking about transfers of technology to the Third World, tariff preferences in industrial countries to Third World manufacturers, greater aid and financial support for Third World countries, debt renegotiations, a greater Third World say in the institutions that control international trade, such as the World Bank, and the IMF. Even putting these things on the international agenda is an achievement, and a lot of the credit for that achievement must go to the Non-Aligned Movement.

3.35 p.m.

This, Mr. President, is another aspect of the educational process that I was speaking about, and which is crucial to the development of the people of Barbados. Our people must know what the North-South debate is all about. The average man in the street must know what the new International Economic Order is all about. He must know about the Non-Aligned Movement, OPEC, UNCTAD and the Group of 77. Our radio stations and television station have no right functioning as jukeboxes, as vehicles for crass American commercialism and materialism. We have to be serious about ourselves as a people.

Another aspect of our people's education is the role of the United States. Everybody finds it difficult to openly criticise the United States. I do not want to jump on any bandwagon in terms of criticising the United States, but we must realise that the United States is the dominant imperial force in the world, and has been certainly since the end of the Second World War. They dominate International trade and the whole international monetary system. I am not saying that we want our people to be anti-American or hostile against the Americans, but they must have a proper and correct understanding of the role that the Americans play in the

world economy today, and have played throughout the 20th Century.

It is easy to say that Third World Countries which criticise the United States are biased against the United States and are pro-Soviet Union, but the fundamental fact that we must realise is that the vast majority of Third World States are post colonial countries. We were colonies of the Europeans for the most part, or we came out of client relationships with the United States, and the Soviet Union, perhaps by a quirk of fate, has not played that type of role in World politics. These are the facts of history. The Soviet Union's history has been a different history from the western industrial countries, so the international monetary and trading system, with which we are involved and which we find to be created to our disadvantage, is a system largely created and directed by the United States and the western industrial countries, and when we criticise that system, by extension we are criticising the United States. It does not mean that we do not recognise the defence of the Soviet Union — by no means — but because of our historical relationship with the United States and the western industrial countries, that is the international environment within which we are located and which we find has been created to our detriment.

Our people have to come to some proper understanding of the role of the United States. I found it grotesque, to speak quite frankly, to see the type of adulation that President Reagan got when he came to Barbados. When I went to the United States, all the black Americans were telling me that this man was the worst thing that ever happened to black America, that he was destroying social programmes that black Americans had worked so hard to struggle to put into place, that there was a resurgence of racism in the United States, he has taken a backward stance on the whole question of South African blacks, and yet we were treating this man as if Jesus Christ himself had come down to earth, as if we had no conception of what our true interest were and of where this man stood in relation to our true interest and our welfare. That type of mentality frightens me, because I think it is a product of ignorance, and it means that our populace has not been given the necessary material.

Similarly in respect of the decision on the part of our cricketers to go to South Africa, I am convinced that a number of them would not have made that decision if they had been properly informed and educated about the whole South African issue. There we were failing, and we continue to fail our people, because we do not seem to acknowledge that we are still a struggling Third World country whose resources should be geared towards development. We seem to think that we are some powerful industrial country and that we can have four radio stations devoted to performing the role of a jukebox. The United States can afford that, because they have thousands of

radio stations and they have proper public educational television. They can afford to have not four, but 400 radio stations performing the role of juke boxes, but we cannot. We are not in that position.

I am making this plea for us to begin a real programme of serious public education. Our people must know their history, they must understand the environment within which we live, and it is crucial to even begin to make plans as to how you move forward, what you need to do, what are the problems that you have to overcome. You can only do that if you first have a proper understanding of where we have come from, and I just want to give you one more example. Perhaps I am drawing this into the debate, but I cannot refuse drawing reference to it.

3.45 p.m.

Another glaring example that came out recently of how we do not seem to understand where we have come from, and what our true interests are, is found at the Central Bank. We recently spent close to \$100 million in a Central Bank. A Central Bank is supposed to be one of the most important of our national institutions. It should be a symbol of the progress of the masses of our people.

The last act that the former Governor of the Central Bank chose to do at that Central Bank was to put up a plaque on the front of the building with a quotation. Who does he choose to quote from? There is nothing wrong with putting up a plaque with a quotation on the building, but who does he choose to quote from? Does he choose Jose Marti, the Cuban poet and patriot, or Frantz Fanon, the Martiniquan, or Aime Cesaire? Does he choose George Lamming? Does he choose Eddie Brathwaite, Martin Carter from Jamaica, or Edmund Wilbert Blyden, the West Indian and African scholar of the 19th century? Whom does he choose? He chooses John Ruskin, a 19th century art critic and author!

And when you research John Ruskin, you discover that John Ruskin was a racist, a disciple of Thomas Carlyle, the 19th century racist propagandist *par excellence*! He was also an arch-imperialist who urged the British Government to go into the world and acquire colonies and colonise people who looked like us. He stepped into West Indian affairs in 1865 after the Morant Bay Rebellion, when he rushed to the defence of the English Governor of Jamaica, John Edward Eyre, the man who was responsible for the wholesale massacre of hundreds of Black Jamaicans. In other words, John Ruskin was a man who stood for everything that was inimical to the interest of the masses of black Barbadians, and yet, when we choose an author whose words we are going to emblazon on one of our most important national institutions, we choose John Ruskin!

Even the former Governor of the Central Bank seemed not to know his history! He seemed not to be aware of where he came from. He seemed not to be aware of what our true interest and welfare are as a people. I could not resist mentioning it, because it struck me when I read about it in the newspaper, and it fitted nicely into the thrust of what I have to say here, that we must begin educating our people about their history, their true interest and their true welfare, and I urge upon the Minister of Foreign Affairs to begin that process seriously in his own sphere of Foreign Affairs.

I want to praise the new Administration for the trend that I have perceived as emerging in the conduct of our foreign affairs, and I have made a short checklist of some of the more prominent developments in foreign affairs since the Democratic Labour Party came to office. I think we began on the note of the Prime Minister's criticism of President Reagan. There have been strictures applied to that, but I think that more good than harm has come out of Mr. Barrow's stance for the people of Barbados in terms of our psychological emancipation and how we see ourselves in terms of one's feelings of self-respect.

In fact, I cannot see any demonstrable harm. I hear these nebulous allegations about American industrialists taking offence. I see no evidence of it. In fact, it would appear that the American people have taken the cue from Mr. Barrow, and Mr. Barrow is seen to have opened their eyes.

The point is that, especially in the early part of the 1980s, we in Barbados were taking much too much of a subservient position, or *vis-a-vis* the Reagan Administration. It was demonstrated in Grenada. I am against the Grenada invasion, and I am against it because I am lucky enough to have an historical view of the United States' relationship with this region. I know, for example, that the United States has invaded the Caribbean and South American region some 32 times in the course of the 20th century, and up to the invasion of Grenada the only area in this hemisphere that was secure and sacrosanct from American incursion was the British, English-speaking Caribbean. Grenada has now demolished that, and Grenada has now set the precedence, so I take opposition to it, and I think that Mr. Barrow did a good for the people of Barbados by making a bid once again for our self-respect and for our independence *vis-a-vis* the United States. He gave us a sense of dignity.

He then followed it up with a speech to the CARICOM Heads of Government in Georgetown, a speech entitled the "Path of Duty". I have read it about three or four times, and it is easily one of the more statesmanlike and enlightening speeches made by any Caribbean Head of Government. As a young citizen of

Barbados. it gave me a sense of pride and a feeling of dignity that my leader was speaking like this and representing me in this type of manner.

He then went on to the Miami Conference, Mr. President, and again his speech was right on target. I want to quote a bit of it, because I think that this speech really brings out the foresight of the man. At page 166 he said:

"If one examines many of the arguments used over the past few years, both by American and Caribbean persons, to persuade the American people of the desirability of assisting with the economic development of the Caribbean, one finds that essentially negative themes have tended to predominate."

And he summarizes these themes:

"If the U.S. does not help the Caribbean

- (1) the Communists, who are conveniently hiding behind every palm tree, will take over and surround the U.S. with a ring of hostile islands."

3.55 p.m.

- "(2) if the Communists do not succeed, then the drug traffickers will take over and use the islands as bases to flood the U.S. with dope.
- (3) in either case, the entire population of the islands will flee to the U.S., legally or illegally, and take away jobs from American workers."

He went on to say:

"The first think that strikes one, or ought to strike one about this line of reasoning is that it paints a terrifying, degrading and totally false picture of the Caribbean. For it suggests that what American has lurking offshore is nothing but a sea of troubles, with waves of disasters threatening your domestic tranquility. And unless one throws a whole lot of money and possibly guns at the situation, it might blow up in the face of the U.S."

"It is dehumanising and false to view the Caribbean as potential American problems. We are people with an identity and a culture and a history — the Parliament of Barbados will be 350 years old in 1989. We do not need lessons in democracy from anyone. However severe the economic difficulties facing the Caribbean, we are viable, functioning societies with the intellectual and institutional resources to understand and grapple with our problems. Collectively we have the resource potential necessary for our continued development and, of course, we have a heritage of exquisite natural

beauty entrusted to us. The Caribbean is, after all, a civilisation."

Mr. President, when I hear words like those emanating from the mouth of the leader of my country, I must feel proud. It is not a matter of genuflecting. In fact, genuflecting is so contrary to my nature.....

Asides.

SENATOR D. A. COMMISSIONG: Mr. President, the honourable member has succeeded in distracting me.

As a young Barbadian, Sir, one must feel proud. This is how I want my leader to speak!

Then Sir, we were treated to a statement by the Honourable Leader of this Chamber at the United Nations General Assembly on the whole question of South Africa, and I understand it was one of the most highly praised and erudite — I am indebted to Senator Boxill — speeches at the General Assembly. And it was followed by Senator Sir James Tudor's offer of financial support to the anti-apartheid struggle in South Africa.

We see the trend emerging. We see the positive nature of the policy that is taking shape, and, to my mind, Sir, we are moving in the right direction. The Prime Minister has set the tone. The Honourable Minister of Foreign Affairs has followed virtually hand-in-hand with the Prime Minister, and we see a positive trend emerging that gives us reason for hope and fills any Barbadian like me with a sense of pride. My only urging now, Sir, is that the Minister of Foreign Affairs takes the initiative in involving the mass of Barbadian people in the whole process of our foreign affairs. Let us begin to disseminate that information, let us begin to use the instruments of education that we have available.

We have enormous potential for education in this country. The means of communication in this country are so powerful that it is my contention that we are capable of doing virtually anything if what is called for is education and communication. Let us begin to use that enormous potential and give our people the knowledge, and thereby the capacity, to begin to seriously address themselves to the real task of development for the people of Barbados.

I thank you, Sir.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Mr. President, there are some things said by the most recent speaker, Senator Commissiong, and I think we heard him at his best this afternoon in the Senate, with which I am much in agreement, and it does not come easy to say that at this stage.

But I begin, Sir, by saying that truly I had hoped at the beginning of this debate for perhaps a more definitive, if not a more provocative, statement of this country's foreign affairs by the Minister responsible for Foreign Affairs, who, after all, among his many experiences, is a highly experienced diplomat. I was disappointed in that.

Even from the Senator who introduced the debate, I had hoped that we would have been into a far more vigorous discussion of this country's foreign policy. That is perhaps only just beginning to emerge. I am being critical of early speeches as I have a right to be, as it is my privilege to be. What we had really was the kind of disposition which might have excited debate and it has not, but perhaps with what Senator Comissiong has said, we begin to see the glimmer of a debate coming, and I am hoping that when Senator Wickham and Senator Tudor speak towards the end of this debate, we may hear more of what certainly I have been looking forward to, they having had the benefit of all of our discussion.

One of the first things that I want to say, Mr. President, one of the first matters on which I am in total agreement with Senator Comissiong and other Senators who have spoken already today, has to do with the non-partisanship, if that is possible, — but for want of a better phrase, of the non-partisanship — that certain areas of our foreign policy must embrace. The Barbados Labour Party and the Democratic Labour Party have quite different stances, generally speaking, on foreign policy, starting at the very basic philosophy and extending, perhaps, to some of the less weighty areas of foreign policy. But, generally speaking, and as far as this country's history can be interpreted up to the present day, there is very little area for disagreement, at least, so I had thought.

4.05 p.m.

But I must agree with the criticism levelled by Senator Shorey of this publication, "Diplomacy and Development". It alleges to be a review of the foreign policy of Barbados and it turns out that it is a review of the foreign policy of Barbados as seen by the Democratic Labour Party! And it is not unlike a nearly two hour programme to which we were subjected on the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation's television last night. I also agree with Senator Comissiong about the role the media can, and should, and must play in the dissemination of foreign policy in the educating of Barbadians of foreign policy, but if this is the way in which the media role is going to be interpreted, then I am afraid there is going to be a lot of disagreement between Senator Comissiong and myself. It was bordering on the disgraceful!

(*Aside: It was obscene!*)

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Yes, it was obscene! Almost two hours of what was described as "a cavalcade of the years 1955 — 1986" really was a hymn of praise to Mr. Barrow the Prime Minister! At one stage coming towards the end, it almost seemed like a retrospective, and I pray that it will not be prophetic, because I have said before outside of this Chamber and inside of it, and I say it again today, I want him here in 1991! Even if he is dribbling and holding a hookstick, I want him here! And I did not like the retrospective tone of that two hours to which we were subjected.

We still only have the one channel. And now that the Prime Minister is the Minister of Information and has the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation television within his portfolio, there is even greater cause for disappointment, because I would expect a man of his broad experience to bring a greater balance to it. Barbadians were greatly affronted at the way in which history was distorted in that two hours last night. Some people feel that it was an attempt to distract us from the fact that some of the measures in the Budget are already beginning to bite. It was very skilful public relations on the part of the Democratic Labour Party! It did not say that, and that was all! It did not have to say that! And the gloss over the years 1976 — 1986, I mean, it was incredible! And the same is true of this document. It is in that sense that I mean that we cannot be partisan in the area of foreign policy when we look at it from the perspective of the true and total history of Barbados. I had to get that off my chest!

I go on, Mr. President.

Mr. PRESIDENT: But was the thing last night dealing with foreign policy, too?

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Oh yes, Sir, oh yes! It started out as. It started out as a show which was staged in London and attended by the Prime Minister and certain handpicked Barbadians who were flown up there by Caribbean Airways last November.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I only wanted to know.....

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Remember it was complained of in the newspaper. A letter was written by somebody called A. Lashley in the newspaper. It was a quarter page!

Mr. PRESIDENT: I only want to know if something on the television of Barbados.....

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Oh yes, Sir! Yes, Sir! It was brought from London here. It was first staged in London.

Mr. PRESIDENT: What I am asking is if something shown on television in Barbados is really foreign policy?

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Oh yes, Sir, very much, Sir! You see it was first staged in London and then it was brought to be staged at the George Street Auditorium here, and we were all treated to it last night.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You still have not got me yet. If it is shown in Barbados, how are you going to describe it?

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: It started in London, Sir. It is like a stage show. It is going around the world, you see. It has had its premiere in London and the second Barbados showing was last night.

I am moving on, Sir. As I have said before, I am in agreement with all those Senators who have said that it is important that foreign policy should be part of the day-to-day affair of the man in the street in Barbados. I am in favour of all who have said that it should be part of the public education process, that it is necessary, especially, in my submission, in the school system.

I know that following the syllabus set by the Caribbean Examinations Council, Caribbean history is taught in the schools today in a way that it was not taught in your time, Sir, nor in mine. But I want to refer to Caribbean current affairs as distinguished from our past history. Some of what I have heard from Senator Comissiong and Senator Prescod would lead me to believe that there is a generation of us which still tends to wallow in our past history. When we do that, it does not help us. We have to use it as a springboard to the future. I am talking about the Caribbean today.

The print media more especially than the rest of the media, but the media generally, does not do us good service in respect of the current affairs of the Caribbean. I am not talking only about the English-speaking Caribbean, I am talking about the wider Caribbean as part of this hemisphere, as part of the Americas. We have North America, Central America, South America and the Caribbean, and I speak in that context. We live in a region where our parliamentary democracies are exceedingly fragile. Harold Wilson once said that a day in politics is a long time, and that is true. It was true then, as it always has been, and as it still is. Within 24 hours it is quite possible for the entire political and parliamentary temperature of this little region in which we live to change. A hurricane could do it.

(*Aside:* SENATOR L. R. TULL: A police raid could do it.)

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: True, a police raid could do it.

Aside.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: It could be achieved by much less than that.

When Senator Wickham introduced the debate, he made reference to something which had been once said by the late Eric Williams about the Caribbean being the new world cockpit. That is true. We never really were a backwater. The history of conflict in the Caribbean is almost continuous. I do not know that it is ever likely that the Caribbean could be a zone of peace. If you go back to the pre-history of the Caribbean, you see wars between Caribs and Arawaks, the European wars which were fought out in the Theatre of the Caribbean, slave uprisings during that period of time as well, and we come right into the 20th century conflicts within the Caribbean. There are battles still being fought out here, and some being fought out elsewhere with a monumental ripple effect which shakes us in the Caribbean from time to time.

Perhaps we do not take sufficient notice of what is happening in Suriname and of what the metropolitan French are doing in Suriname. Perhaps we do not take enough notice of what is happening in the two departments of France with the separatist movement, and again the big ripple coming from metropolitan France there. We do not make this our business in the English-speaking Caribbean. We do not pay enough attention to what is happening in the Spanish-speaking Caribbean, and we did not until we discovered that there were lots of Cubans in Jamaica and, later on, that there were more Cubans in Grenada. But in this hemisphere parliamentary democracy is very fragile. We see in Argentina, to touch on the South American continent, a struggle to restore their democracy, and next door in Grenada a terrible struggle even now going on to restore their democracy.

In the anglophone Caribbean, of which we are a part, we have seen, certainly within the last few days, just how fragile it is. It is unprecedented, I think. We see Parliament being recalled and dissolved within the hour, so to speak, and it is quite possible, given the recent history of St. Lucia, that their democracy could be in jeopardy. I hope that is not, but that is entirely possible.

4.15 p.m.

We have seen significant movements out of the Cabinet in Grenada. It is all right for Senator Comissiong to say that he disapproved of what happened in Grenada. He was not living in Grenada at the time. By accident of birth, he could have been. It is all right for all of us who were not living under the yolk of Gairy at the time to make pious statements.

Asides.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: The fact that you have family there is neither here nor there. The fact is that you are here, and, like myself, part of a movement that deplored the rule under Eric Gairy, and I would hate to see it return. It is a fact that Gairy is poised again to take the Government in Grenada. At 65 and going blind, it is believed that he could win possibly 12 – 15 seats in Grenada if there was an election tomorrow. But we do not know what would happen tomorrow, and I would watch very carefully what the Foreign Minister and the Cabinet of this country would do should it turn out that there was an entire breakdown yet again of parliamentary democracy, as we know and love it, in Grenada, because it can happen. They are on the brink of that.

In Antigua, where there is virtually no Opposition, we have one Cabinet Minister taking to task the Prime Minister and other Cabinet Ministers on matters to do with integrity. That has the potential, let me put it this way, of escalating itself into proportions which, too, could in time, and perhaps sooner than later, threaten parliamentary democracy in Antigua.

In St. Kitts, only last week we heard that the Leader of the Opposition was arrested in a disreputable manner with his shirt-tail hanging out and drunk. I know of what I speak, because I speak of whatever I have seen with my two eyes in the last ten days travelling through the Caribbean.

In Guyana, there are demonstrations day after day. We hear that thousands are in the streets protesting the rule of the President.

Asides

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: I quite agree. My distinguished colleague, Senator Tull, is reminding me of what I saw last year – long lines of people as I have seen them in Cuba, in Russia and in the GDR. It is like a badge by which you identify the Eastern Bloc countries, the long lines waiting to buy basic food commodities in the street.

Even next door in Trinidad, again the Press does not serve us as it should do. We give a lot of lip service to the fact that we are Caribbean people, but truly we are not, because we do not care. You can find the *New York Sunday Times* in this building if you ask for it now, Mr. President. You can find the *London Sunday Times*, but you could not find the *Jamaican Gleaner*, the *Sunday Guardian*, or the *Express*. Something is wrong with that, and I continually complain about it, and I will go on complaining about it. But in Trinidad, even with the recently elected Government there, do we really fully understand that on a virtually daily basis there are demonstrations of 2 000 to 3 000 people in the streets in

Trinidad? This I have seen with these two eyes. This I have experienced myself. I have not even mentioned Jamaica, where the Leader of the Opposition is now calling for civil unrest as a policy.

So do not let us fool ourselves in this immediate Caribbean where we live. The Parliamentary democracies are very fragile, Sir, and I was greatly disappointed, and here is the burden of my criticism, when the Foreign Minister spoke at the beginning of this debate. What the debate called for, according to the opener, was a statement of this country's foreign policy. We have not really heard anything about what is this Government's foreign policy in respect of the immediate region in which we live.

Senator Prescod, rather simply, stated for the benefit of us all, as though we did not know, that our foreign policy of necessity must be an extension of our domestic policy. I have a lot of difficulty with that, Mr. President, because the domestic policy of this country.....

Aside.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Order! If that gentleman does not behave himself, we will have to ask him to leave the Chamber.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: I was saying, Sir, that if it is generally understood maxim that the foreign policy of a country, of necessity, must be an extension of its domestic policy, then I am again in some difficulty, because the domestic policy of this country is not at this time at all clearly defined as far as this side is concerned, looking at it through the eyes of a politician, it would appear to be somewhat right of centre – contrary to what we hear, that is the appearance – a general domestic policy that does not now seem to be geared to development. We have just had a Budget in which nothing has been given to agriculture, and nothing given by the Government to tourism. What is coming to tourism is coming from the private sector, in its own self-interest and out of the abundance of the tax relief given it last July, but from the Government, as a matter of policy we are not seeing that development in the largest sense of the word. It is an important aspect of policy.

The Prime Minister recently said that there are done with building big buildings and undertaking major projects, deliberately slowing down the construction industry, which is traditionally, the high employer in our economy, and there are other signs and wonders. It is very clear that the Government's immediate policy really is to ignore development and muster as much money as it can out of people's pockets into the Treasury in anticipation of 1991. I mean, in the crudest possible terms, that is what appears to be the case. So that does not give any pointers to honourable Senators, Mr. President, as far

as this country's foreign policy is concerned. We are still waiting for those pointers.

Asides

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: The Leader of the Senate, the Marshal should be called.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Ask that gentleman to leave the gallery, please! Leave before I call the police! We cannot have these people coming in here and going through the back door!

4.25 p.m.

The police should be in here that this nonsense cannot take place in the Chamber. What nonsense do you all have that the police are not in here that these stupid people can walk in the Chamber like this? What do they think it is?

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: True, Sir, I agree entirely.

When the Leader of Government Business, who is the Minister of Foreign Affairs, spoke earlier, he intimated that he would be interested in his final reply to respond to queries, and there is a particular question that I have to ask in the light of what I have just said. I want to know what possible role does the Government envisage that Barbados can play in welding a certain Caribbean solidarity. What role does the Government envisage that Barbados can play in a consultative connection within the Caribbean? I am a very firm believer — and I am moving on to another point — in what is known as TCDC, technical co-operation between developing countries. It is a concept which is not quite so popular nowadays, but I am a passionate believer in it, always have been and I suspect I always shall be, and in the context of this debate, I am particularly interested in the Government's attitude to TCDC, especially South-South TCDC in this hemisphere, the Americas, which would include the Caribbean.

We see TCDC on a very provincial scale in the immediate English-speaking Caribbean. We lend public health inspectors to the Cayman Islands and to the Turks and Caicos, and we train all sorts of technicians, we share certain institutions, although not as much now as we used to do, now that every country in the Caribbean has its own, or virtually every one has its own nursing school, its own police training centre and its own teachers training college. We do not train so many of our Caribbean people as we used to do, but there is still a lot of room for TCDC, and anyone at this table who has held ministerial office would know that.

But there are certain institutions within this hemisphere which, I believe, could be more useful vehicles for

TCDC than they now are. I refer to organisations such as the Pan American Health Organisation, which is a hemispheric organisation, such as the OAS, to which, I think, reference has already been made in this debate, the Inter-American Development Bank and so many more. The trouble is that, traditionally, Sir, that even in these hemispheric bodies, shall I put it, as opposed to international bodies, the Caribbean so often tends to be out-flanked, if not out voted, by the South Americans and the Central Americans. We see it particularly in the bodies to which I have referred, even though we are now a growing voting bloc in the Caribbean as more and more countries are becoming independent. At one stage, they were becoming independent at about the rate of one a year. Even though that is so and even though the South Americans and the Central Americans, when voting in regional organisations, or even in the international organisations such as the World Health Assembly and UNESCO and others, recognise better than we do sometimes our growing strength as a voting bloc, time and again they and others are able to divide and manipulate the Caribbean.

Many times have we gone to regional and international meetings and seen the Africans standing together as a bloc, but somehow Brazil or Argentina or Peru can get in the coop and make mischief. Very rarely, if ever — I suppose if I cast my mind far enough back, I can remember an occasion in the ten years that I was in Government — could we see the Caribbean standing together as one. The Africans, as I have said, somehow, because they used to have the problem, too — Francophone Africa, as opposed to Anglophone Africa, as opposed to southern Africa, as opposed to the western African regions — have learnt to overcome them.

What role can Barbados play in the welding of the Caribbean as a bloc in the face of these traditional problems that we have had? The division often cheats us of a lot of what we are properly entitled to in these organisations, starting at the level of employment within the organisations even, not to mention the benefits which membership of the organisations should necessarily obviously confer upon us, and it often works to our disadvantage. This is a role that Barbados can play, has great potential to play, Mr. President, if only from the point of view that at this stage in our development in this region, somebody in the Caribbean has to do it, if not we are going to lose what little voice and influence we do have in these hemispheric institutions and in the regional institutions. I think that Barbados has many of the attributes which are required. We do have many of the skills and experience which are required for a country which would assume that role, and I would like to know what is the Government's attitude to this point of view.

I want, Mr. President, to close my remarks on the same topic on which I began, public education. I feel

very strongly about it, and like I said, I do agree that foreign policy cannot, in the best sense of the meaning of foreign policy, continue to be foreign to Barbadians. It is not only the media, and we must not forget that, like in so many developing countries, we are no different in respect of the Government owning a significant chunk of the media, and it is at the disposal of the Government — we could have been treated to a discussion, a documentary last night instead of that two hours of distortion — it is not only the media, including the print media, but the school system as well. I believe that Current Affairs is today still treated as it was in my time. It does appear on the timetable at most of the secondary schools for the more senior forms, the fifths and the sixths, where there are sixths, and sometimes the fourths might get a look in, mostly they do not, but it is not something that is regularly on the agenda. Sometimes it has to do with the ability of the teachers or heads to persuade people to come to talk, or to give a slide presentation, or in some other fashion instruct young people in what is *au courant*, but I think that in the modern Caribbean, we need more than that. I think it needs a proper structure placed on the curriculum of the secondary schools, and I think that it needs not only a place at the level of secondary schools, but it needs a structured place on the curriculum at the level of the primary schools as well. 4.35 p.m.

When I was Minister of Education, I visited every primary school in Barbados and I was pleased to discover — it was mostly on a Monday morning — that in most of the classes there was a class called “News”. That is the word that I used to see written on the blackboard, and it was an opportunity for the children to say if they had done anything interesting over the weekend, and for the teacher to discuss what was on the front page of the newspapers over the weekend, or what might have been a hot news item on the television or the wireless over the weekend or that Monday morning. Very instructive it was! But, again, it was a very “sometimish” thing, and really very much depended on the whims and fancies of a particular class, or a particular teacher, or whether or not they were preparing for exams and if they thought they had time for it or not and as you got higher up in the primary school system, it tended to disappear altogether, because they were totally occupied with preparation for the Common Entrance.

It does not matter to me what you call it. I think honourable Senators understand clearly what I am trying, perhaps, not too well, to articulate, that the public education process in respect of what is the current affairs of this country, not the past history only, leaves a lot to be desired. Past history must be taught, too, and has its place, but what is happening today in the Caribbean will more clearly be understood by two or three generations

hence in the history books than we have any understanding of it today, and something is wrong with that.

We have no idea, really of our own Treaties that we devised and signed in the Caribbean over the past 25 years. We do not even know what the signatories to these treaties are. We do not know what the content of a particular treaty is. We do not know the rationale behind the treaty to do with something as important as CARICOM, and at the time when it was done, something as important as the Federation. We know that somebody went to Chaguaramas and signed something, but our public education system has never sought to make this a priority, and I think that as we move into the 21st century, it has got to be.

Something is wrong when we could know what a bank robber did in some backwater, provincial town in North America that nobody has heard of and we do not know that next door in St. Lucia, in St. Vincent, Grenada or St. Kitts, wherever, something of historic moment has occurred. Something is very wrong with that, and I am hoping that the call by some Senators for a joint committee on Foreign Affairs in this Parliament might come to be a reality, if only for the reason that it might give some of us a chance to be a little more in touch with what is happening in our own region, furthermore what is happening outside it. I would give my support to the formation of any such committee.

Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR G. L. EASTMOND: Mr. President, I will not take much of your time, but I figure that I should say a few words. Before I say my piece, I would like to congratulate the Honourable Minister for giving us a review of the foreign policy of Barbados and enlightening us on what Barbados' policy is all about. We certainly appreciate this.

When I look at the word and think about diplomacy, I think about all these foreign Ministers and persons, especially at the United Nations — I am not referring to the women there particularly — and I have witnessed how often the men get together and are so diplomatic in their ways and in doing things. They talk in glowing terms and make you feel that everything is all right, and by the time the meetings are finished and the years go by, there is something else, because the things that should be forthcoming are really not forthcoming as they should be. So the word “diplomacy” often means to me that sometimes you have to go to cocktails and you cannot come out openly and say what you have to say, forcefully and fearlessly. You have to sort of put the cover on it, put some icing on it.

When I look at our foreign policy, I am looking at it as a mother, a grandmother and looking at it in the

and exhibitions, and also in the form of us going up occasionally and their having special functions to promote this type of activity.

I am specifically thinking about one of the whipping horses, and that is agriculture. We have tremendous potential in some of the crops we are growing, for instance, the tandue melon, and sweet potatoes. Quite a lot of these crops is shipped every weekend from here including breadfruit. These are going to these various countries.

Today, a big food promotion luncheon took place in Barbados — some people may not have realised it — at the Hilton Hotel. Sir James was to have been a guest speaker, but he could not be there because of being here. I see these as steps in the right direction to increase the employment situation in the country, because we could then encourage more people to make orders through the embassies for our handicrafts and food items. It has happened in small amounts, but we need the kind of impact that a permanent exhibition could have. We cannot have that if we just have these things going in dribblings.

The Eastern countries and so on have permanent exhibitions set up. As you want, you can see their handicrafts. Perhaps that is the reason why when we go into our own stores here in Barbados and we pick up a souvenir, it is made in one of the Eastern countries, because of the marketing techniques that they have used to sell that particular item. I sincerely hope that this will be coming about for us as soon as possible.

I am talking about very few people in staff. But there are people who are effective as individuals, and you do not need a thousand people to do a job when a person is effective and efficient. In addition, you have other support services, there are many voluntary organisations with links to the U.N., and there are many Barbadian organisations in New York, in England and in other parts of the world which will assist with anything that is going to be done to develop Barbados. So the missions need not think that they will stand alone in an exercise like that, for surely they will have the assistance of all of the regional and international organisations which have offices in these particular countries.

Somebody said something about technocrats coming here to help to develop Barbados. We have a number of Barbadians who are very highly qualified, who are living in the United States, England and all over the world, you could almost say, and our missions could be used as places to influence Barbadians by letting them know what is going on back home. Some of them do not always get this information. When I go abroad and I see Barbadians, and they ask me what is happening back home and if I think there is any opportunity for their

expertise, if I do not know myself, I try and find out so that I can pass on the information to them. Each of us can be a diplomat in our own way, and an ambassador and representative of this country.

I have always made it a point when I am leaving this country to take some rum, falernum, molasses and handicrafts so that people can see what we have to offer. In the same way, a lot of highly-skilled Barbadians especially in the area of agriculture, can be told the facts and encouraged to come back to their country to help us out, rather than us getting people from extra-regional sources. We must realise that when we get technocrats from extra-regional sources, we have to look for a house to put them in, a school to send their children to, we have to give them a gardener and a car, and we have to spend a whole lot of money. It is all right to say you are getting a technocrat, but look at the amount of money that you are spending out of your purse. If you get the Barbadian to come back home, the Barbadian tends to look for his own house. Even if you gave him a house, for the time being, he is going to look for a house at some point, and if things are going well, he is going to settle in this country.

Some people have come back, and they have been fantastic technocrats. I think that this is one of the areas we have to look at. We have to have faith in our own people. We have some people with some of the best PhD's in the world. I know of a Barbadian who used to work with a particular agency, one of the UN agencies, and he is now in one of the Carolinas as a top professor. We can look for these people through our embassies. That is another job.

I would like to see cultural and agricultural attaches in our missions, people whom we can approach with specific problems, specific ideas or information. Our Ministries in Barbados can get this information even to see. I remember when we had the Prices Commission. If somebody is inflating a price, the missions can be used to monitor it, and I would like to see greater use made of the missions in that particular area.

Mr. President, CARICOM. For a long time, an organisation, which I have the pleasure to be President of, has been approaching Governments in the region — indeed, we were able to get a Woman's Desk at CARICOM set up — because we thought there were many problems which affected women in a very serious way in the region. Also, we are very interested in a lot of the work that the region has done in the past, and I think that I have said this in this Chamber already — there is no point constantly having conference after conference and we do not sit down and unearth this work and see what various places in the region can do. I know that an attempt is being made, I am involved in it too, with the Regional Food Plan — it is now called the Regional Food and Nutrition Plan — but the thing is that you

are still getting in the same extra regional technocrats when we could utilise many of our trained technocrats to analyse this research, to understand what we have available in the region. That time must come, we cannot keep saying that we must get everything from abroad, and therefore we have to cut down on that kind of thing.
5.15 p.m.

As far as regional unity is concerned, ...

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Fraser, I only want to remind you of the Resolution. It is a Resolution inviting a statement on the foreign policy of the Government. I just warn you the emphasis is on the foreign policy of the Government, not the regional co-operation.

SENATOR C. V. FRASER: But in order, Mr. President, to touch, if I may

Mr. PRESIDENT: Deal with the Resolution.

SENATOR C. V. FRASER: I am dealing with the Resolution, Sir but I am touching on the foreign and linking it with the regional. I do not want to be difficult to you in any way, I am sorry if you think that way, but I am linking the regional with the foreign, because if you are going to continue to bring in the technocrats from abroad, that is what I am saying, when we have these technocrats in the region, I think that is a very significant point which we must observe, because a lot of our money is going abroad.

I will go back to the foreign policy specifically

Mr. PRESIDENT: I do not want you to go anywhere. I am only pointing out to you

SENATOR C. V. FRASER: Thank you very much, Mr. President. That is what I intend to do. There was no intention to dwell on any extraneous matter.

Mr. President, it is necessary at an international level to have, whether you call them cocktail parties or not, gatherings of people from different parts of the world. Sometimes this is very important to help you to know how to vote. You can sometimes feel out people at a cocktail party about how are you going to vote tomorrow on this particular issue. Sometimes you hear what plans are being made. This is an old system that has been used. If you do not want to call it cocktails, perhaps you could call it punch at the U.N. system and things like this.

I think we would like to see some more Caribbean people in these international agencies. I think that is something that we have to work hard at, and we must be a more cohesive group of people. Somebody mentioned the cohesion of some of the Africans. You

find at some of these international conferences that we as regional people, or we as Barbadians or what have you, differ so much in some basic ideologies. For instance, on the Palestinian question you may get differences coming from some of the islands, and then they may go and align themselves with some of the big world powers because they feel strongly about one thing or the other. It appears to other people that we are sort of divisive when we do not try and get together and settle our differences as small island states, and I think the world dialogue at Nairobi had a lot to do with addressing itself to the whole question of small island states, and indeed we in Barbados and in the Caribbean region are very much involved in this.

Another thing that is very necessary is the shopping around for grants at the international level. I recall that for the Nairobi conference, our present ambassador did shop around the world in many different countries for grants to take the 16 000 people to Nairobi that went there, and indeed it was one of the great learning experiences. I am not talking about the actual U.N. conference, but I am talking about the forum where people were able to learn from each other. That is vitally important.

It is vitally important to enter into the area of public education on international issues, and I support anyone who makes this plea, because I do not know if you would call this going to the region, but a lot of our people do not even understand the CARICOM cheques, they do not understand what the Caribbean technical assistance programme is about, a lot of our people do not understand when you talk about Lome Convention. What is that to people on the street? How does it help Barbados? How does it influence our lifestyle? A lot of people do not understand what some of these acronyms mean, even the agencies — PAHO, UNESCO — and what they do, and therefore I am in very strong support of a sustained programme — I do not want a programme that will start and stop in the middle — informing our citizens of what our foreign policy is, our goals and the agencies that are involved, the type of relationship which we have with other countries, whether they are countries in the Latin American or Caribbean region, which are next door to us, or at the international level, why we have relations with these people and how these people react to us.

As somebody mentioned, we get a lot of things from Japan coming in here, but our fishing is at stake. What are we going to do about that at international level? What are we going to do about the pollution of our coasts? Some of the smaller countries in the world, they are not big powers, they made moves and their citizens made representation so that none of the ships carrying nuclear weapons can come to their shores. Surely if we want to look at the matter of international pollution of

small island states, in which we would be included, we can solicit the support of many of our people who are highly trained, who are not living in Barbados, the support of friendly countries, and we must make a greater effort to lobby with these international bodies in our own interest. We have to exercise that type of diplomacy if we, as Barbadians, the Caribbean and small island states, really want to benefit from these particular institutions to which we belong. Mr. President, there is no point servicing or paying these various institutions or what have you accept we can see that the benefits accrue to our citizens in terms of employment, saving of our hard-earned money and foreign currency, building up our agricultural policy and also our environment, because if our environment becomes totally polluted, we are going to be in very serious trouble.

5.25 p.m.

I was glad to hear that the United States is assisting us in dealing with drug trafficking. Indeed, we now have a very serious cancer on our hands, and it means that at the international level much lobbying has to be done, because although we are concerned with the wider world, the wider Caribbean and Latin America and those places in order to have our diplomacy stay intact in certain ways — we are friends of all, remember the statement, but satellites of none — we have to be concerned that our children's brains are kept steady and kept away from the drugs. Otherwise, what will happen to us in the future? Ten years down the road, will we be able to produce a Prime Minister, will we be able to produce Senators or will we be able to produce people whose brains are addle? So I am glad to hear of that assistance, and I hope our Ministries will work vigilantly.

Again, Mr. President, I should like to congratulate those who have worked hard in getting this document before us and outlining our foreign policy in this booklet. I think it spells out quite clearly the ten point foreign policy aired, and we are beginning, as I can see, to pursue a number of areas here in our foreign policy. The journey of 1 000 miles begins but with one step.

Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Mr. President, I should like to commend Senator Wickham for initiating this debate. Too often we tend to neglect important areas in public life to deal with issues of bread and butter. I use to have the same difficulty at one point in the Other Place when I sought to get debates going on culture, because nobody was concerned about those things.

I am also grateful to the Leader of the Senate for preparing this document and having it not only as a basis for this debate, but as official reference. I hope that it will be a continuing policy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to collate important decisions of what

is happening in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs so that not only the general public, but decision makers would be in a position to use this as a basis for reference.

I must join my colleague here in saying that I am a little bit disappointed about the structure of the book. As Senator Miller and I used to say, we like to think that sometimes we would get a footnote in the history of Barbados. I am modest by nature, but I would have liked to see myself get a footnote in this, having served as Minister of Foreign Affairs for four years in very recent times.

That aside, I have no problems with what has been compiled here. I went through it very quickly. It is a fair representation of factual developments and decisions taken in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs over the period of time of which there was a Foreign Ministry. I also found the appendices at the back are useful and I will, no doubt, use them from time to time in the future.

I think the debate has been an interesting one from many points of view. For instance, I liked Senator Comissiong's contribution. It would be churlish of me if when he makes unattractive contributions I get up and tell him so, and then when he makes one that is attractive, I do not say that he made an attractive contribution. Obviously he did some research, understood what he read and presented it properly. That does not mean that I agree with everything he said. I have to take issue with one or two of his perspectives and one or two of his conclusions.

I am forced, Mr. President, as a very recent Minister of Foreign Affairs and a member of a Government that has just gone out of office, to answer some of the criticisms and charges, because they are obviously not directed towards the present Government. The present Government was not in place when there was an intervention in Grenada. The present Government was not in place when there was a decision to join the Non-Aligned Movement. The present Government was not in place when, as Senator Comissiong said in the early 1980s there seemed to be a subservience to Washington. There was another Government in, and I really cannot allow some of those statements to escape without some kind of levelling.

Dealing first of all, with the Non-Aligned Movement, Barbados joined the Non-Aligned Movement as a full member in 1983. For many years before that, 13 years, the Government had been playing at it, they were observers. Nineteen hundred and seventy, I believe, was the first time Barbados became an observer, and they started to attend meetings. They went to one meeting and missed another, then they went to two and they missed one, and what was clear was that there was no evident commitment to an association with the Non-Aligned Movement.

The decision in 1983 to become a member was taken for a number of reasons, they being stated already both by Senator Shorey and by Senator Comissiong. Barbados is a post-colonial developing country, with all the problems and strains attendant thereon, and we felt it was necessary, if we were to make useful impact on what was happening in the international affairs in relation to the developing countries, that we should be members of groups that could exercise that influence.

My last recollection was that there were 158 members in the United Nations and 103 members of the Non-Aligned Movement so that the Non-Aligned Movement comprises a broad spectrum of states from all corners of the globe. What is significant about it, Sir, is that it comprises states of very different ideological orientations, from countries that are, obviously, Marxist-Leninist, countries like Cuba and Libya, to countries on the other side, like Singapore and Saudi Arabia, that are staunchly pro-Western and staunchly pro-capitalist. So you have the widest possible spectrum.

But they have something in common. What they have in common is a history of exploitation and a history of abuse by so-called First World Countries which, as we know, and I think Senator Comissiong is quite right, pursue policies not out of any generosity to Third World Countries, but out of pure *ultraism*, their own self-interest. Whatever they do, they do for themselves, and if the Third World gets a piece of the action, a piece of the spoils, or a spin off, then so be it. The Non-Aligned Movement provides a forum for countries of like experiences to get together and try to develop strategies and policies that they can pursue as one to make an impact on the so-called First World Countries, and they have been remarkably successful.

I understand Senator Shorey's misgivings about the politicalisation of the Non-Aligned Movement and the distinct movement towards the left in the three years 1979-1982 when Cuba had the chairmanship of the Movement. We have to remember something. Marshal Tito, the then President of Yugoslavia, was one of the five founding members of this Non-Aligned Movement. I think the others were President Nehru of India, President Nasser of Egypt, President Nyerere of Ghana and President Nkrumah. It started as an African-Asian unity group, because these were countries fresh out of colonialism and they wanted to solidify their independence and to guard their sovereignty, and they felt that this could best be achieved by working together and not getting involved in bloc politics, either USSR or the Americans. This is not to say that they would have been neutral to important and burning international issues, but that they would bring their own perspective to bear on those issues, and they set some very eminent goals, concern about peace and disarmament, about the removal of racism and apartheid, about common development of the

developing countries and transfer of resources. These are noble goals and I do not think we should knock them. The fact that they are countries that have a different ideological situation is no reason for us to say that we are not going to mix with them. If that were the case, why join the United Nations? At United Nations all the countries of the world, left, right and centre, are involved, and you deal with them.
5.35 p.m.

Right now Secretary of State of the United States, George Schultz, is in Moscow and he is discussing matters of importance not only to the USSR and the US, but matters that affect all mankind, and that Secretary Schultz should be welcomed in the Soviet capital in a civilised way, with people greeting him, waving and so on, is nothing to reproach the people of the USSR for. I say this only to slip in that the comment made by Senator Comissiong about President Reagan's visit here and the enthusiasm excited really should not be a reproach. To tell the truth, the Senator took me by surprise, because my recollection is that there was no great enthusiasm when Reagan was here. I remember that there was correct behaviour. I do not remember the enthusiasm. I think, perhaps, Senator Comissiong was talking about when the Supremes were here. Anyway, I do not think that this is a reproach for anybody.

Heads of State and senior members of Government must be treated a certain way when they visit another country, and it has nothing to do with whether you believe in their philosophy or not. Civilised societies demand that you behave that way. I would hate to think that if Prime Minister Barrow visited Washington, because there is an almost violent hostility by Prime Minister Barrow against the President of the United States, which he talks about all the time, he would be treated any less than the Head of Government. If he was, the members of the Opposition would be as loud in criticising the United States Administration as would indeed the members of the Government. So I do not think we should use these things as indicators.

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Senator Comissiong says I missed his point. I am glad that is not the point he was making. I apologise.

I do not want to spend too much time talking this afternoon, so I would not go on with the non-alignment, except to say, Mr. President, that the Barbados Labour Party Government decided to join the Non-Aligned Movement for what I thought were very good reasons. We still feel that the decision was a good decision, and that Barbados should continue to play its role in the Non-Aligned Movement.

But something troubled me this afternoon. I could not find out exactly what is the Government's position on many of these issues, because Senator Prescod says one thing and Senator Comissiong says another. I was not present and I apologise for not being here at the beginning; it was not meant as a discourtesy to the mover of the Resolution, or to Senator Tudor, or to you, Sir, or any member of the Senate. I had pressing things in other places — but I understand that Senator Tudor made a contribution along certain lines which conflicts in many material particulars with what was said by Senator Prescod and Senator Comissiong. So what is the Government's position? That is why we are confused on this side. We want to hear something coherent. Foreign policy is too important to have us worrying about exactly what our position is.

Mr. President, I cannot blame Senator Comissiong or Senator Prescod, I could perhaps blame Senator Tudor, because Senator Tudor is a senior member of the Government who, I believe, has sufficient influence in the Government to make sure that these mixed signals do not keep coming out. In this regard, I am talking now about what the Prime Minister says and then what the Minister of Foreign Affairs says.

I do not want to interfere with the tenor of this debate. I think it is going well. It has not generated any heat, and I do not propose to do that, but I am a little puzzled as someone who, even if I say it, am somewhat conversant with the importance of foreign policy for our country, to hear the Prime Minister from time to time make what I consider very gauche and crass comments about the President of the United States. Get me straight. I do not mean criticism of the United States policy, because before I finish I will criticise some of the United States' policies, too, but there is a qualitative difference between attacking the policy of a Government and attacking the person who is the head of that Government, there are two completely different things, and if the Prime Minister of Barbados does not believe in the CBI, that, for instance, as some intellectuals argue, the CBI is merely a United States counter to the rise in non-alignment in the Caribbean area, or, as the Americans themselves say, that the CBI is a sop to the Caribbean to prevent them from getting a little skittish, getting a little restless and start talking too much left wing talk, he can say so. If they do that in their own security interest and we feel the need to criticise this initiative of theirs, we say so, and I will criticise it, too. But I really think it is very unfortunate — I would not use a word like "undiplomatic", because that means many things to many people — it is in bad taste, for the Prime Minister to constantly make personal attacks on the President of the United States. Attack his policy. Do like Senator Comissiong, say that there is a rise in racism in the United States since President Reagan has become President; say, like Senator Comissiong, that his prescription of private sector pallia-

tives for everything like we have seen in Barbados nowadays is wrong.

It is strange, you know, Mr. President, to hear them at one moment attack President Reagan and then the next moment you see them pursuing his economic policies lock, stock and barrel. That is the confusion. I cannot even say confusion of thought, it is now confusion of action!

5.45 p.m.

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Oh, my perception! Well, I do now know! I am not too bright, anyhow!

But, Mr. President, those of us who have a little experience in these things know that the President of the United States and his State Department, indeed his Congress, do not give two hoots of what the Prime Minister of Barbados says about the President of the United States and, therefore, it will not affect Barbados-US relations.

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: He is saying do not worry. When you hear A, wait for B. You hear on the one hand and listen for on the other hand. Do not jump.

It does not make the slightest difference to President Reagan, his Secretary of State or his State Department whether Mr. Barrow attacks the President every time he opens his mouth. It would not interfere with Barbados-US relations, because Barbados-US relations are founded on something more fundamental than the reckless remarks of an individual here and there. Where it makes a difference, Mr. President — and those who felt like dismissing it can dismiss it — is in mid-America, with the ordinary man and woman in the United States, in Kansas, Missouri or in Toledo, Ohio, who turns on his radio and hears that there is a Prime Minister down in Barbados who is saying some very uncharitable things about a President of the United States. It makes a difference to them whether they support the President or not. If I hear the President of the United States saying uncharitable things about Prime Minister Barrow, I would be offended, and I would think he is out of place. So the average person in the United States hears these things, they are uninformed about a lot of things, like the public of Barbados not too informed about foreign policy — that is not a phenomenon that exists only in Barbados, it is a phenomenon in developed countries — and the people in middle America get offended by it. They do not like these outsiders to be attacking their leader, whether they are Republicans or Democrats.

The Leader of the House would know that, a few short years ago, when the United States decided that the United Nations is a place to get out of because all these Third World countries were doing was attacking the United States, voting against it and pulling it down — they paid the most of the money in this institution and all they got was a lot of abuse — Mr. President, you would recall that it was the preponderant body of opinion across the United States. People who had not even given the United Nations a thought before were saying, 'Yes. We pay our tax dollar and keep this thing going and all they do is abusing us all the time.' So it is going to affect us in investment, and it is going to affect us in tourism.

Do not fool ourselves about it. There are many places you can go now very cheap. You can go to Europe cheaper than you come to Barbados. You can go to Mexico and these places for a fraction of what it costs to come to Barbados. And when people in mid-America are planning their vacation and somebody mentions Barbados, they say it is exotic to them and they think about it. Then they hear how people down there like they do not like them, because we are attacking the President, and they have so many places they can go to that they head for another place. That is one of the matters that we have to consider as a small country.

In addition to that, Sir, we have the matter of investment. There is terrific and fierce competition in the United States, as in Western Europe, for investment dollars in Third World countries. Indeed, there is fierce competition for investment dollars in First World countries. States in the United States are now competing with Barbados to get investment in their states. It is now, come to the Sun Belt, come to the Midwest, come to southern California, put your money, so we are competing even with the First World itself. These people are sensitive — these are the corporate boardrooms now, the people who are going to invest big sums of money and set up a factory — and when they hear that Barbados is getting too critical of them, they say they do not have to come here, they can go to the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Antigua, Jamaica, Mexico, Costa Rica, Singapore, Hong Kong — anywhere these days — but not to a country where I am unreasonably abused. And I want to draw the distinction again between an honest criticism of a policy, which I think most people can put up with, and abuse of an individual.

I know for a fact, Mr. President, that two companies — there may be more, I do not know — that decided not to set up factories in Barbados even though they had reached an advanced stage of negotiation and near agreement with the Industrial Development Corporation a year ago. They decided not to set up in Barbados, and they said it openly, that they did not like the new climate, and "new climate" meant nothing more than

what the Prime Minister was saying from time to time. These are hard times, a lot of unemployment and jobs are critical. You cannot walk around talking big unless you know how to back it up. We know that even in villages in Barbados, if you talk big in the district, you better be able to back it up, even if it is with a heavy pair of fists. So these are things we have to consider.

I do not want to spend any more time on that, but I still have my contacts, and I know it is bad business to hear the Prime Minister make these strong anti-Reagan statements and then have the Barbadian diplomats edging through the side door in the State Department saying, 'I am sorry, we did not mean that.' That has been happening. That has been happening here in Barbados where people in the Government are saying, 'Look do not mind the Prime Minister's word, we really are well disposed to you people.' It is degrading.

Senator Comissiong talks about self-respect, which I share. We are a small country, but we are proud. We do not go and beg anybody for anything. Nobody is going to push us round. We must have our self-respect. I entirely agree with that. But you cannot base self-respect on that kind of strange behaviour. I am finished with that.

Let me deal with a third point that was raised which I believe deserves an answer, the issue of Grenada. You know, Mr. President, that when Barbados had some part to play in the whole Grenada exercise, there was a song in unison from one side to the other of Barbados saying, 'Good!' I cannot think of any political issue in my living memory on which was such unanimity of view as the so-called Grenada exercise. There was a debate in the House of Assembly and the members of the then Opposition got up one after the other and spoke in consort with the Government. All across the country there was a feeling that this was an action that needed to be taken. It was popular. I remember the night when the carnage took place. The carnage did not take place by any troops going in, the carnage took place before troops went in. A hundred and something people were killed on that fateful day when Hudson Austin and the gang took charge. A hundred-odd people fell over the embankment at Fort Rupert when they started to open the tanks on them, men, women and children, and on the other side of the embankment they took up legs and feet, hands and ears and eyes. That is the carnage that took place.

5.55 p.m.

I heard the now Prime Minister saying on radio at that time that some sanction would have to be taken against Austin and his gang. You can quarrel for the rest of the night over what he had in mind, but he felt that some sanction should be taken, that that was a situation that was untenable in this region and to allow it to subsist in one part of the Eastern Caribbean while the

others did nothing about it was to invite disaster for ourselves. They say in this country that when your neighbour's house is on fire, wet yours. It is a very foolish man who sees that kind of confrontation next door and sits back watching TV and playing like nothing is going on. So that was the view at the time. Well, time has passed, Sir, and the left wing, pseudo-intellectuals all over the world have written a lot of mumbo-jumbo about it and a lot of foolishness about what International Law says, that you should leave the peoples' country alone.

I was surprised to hear Senator Prescod talk about the then Prime Minister sending somebody to the airport to tell the then Foreign Minister of Grenada that things were on the ball at home and he would advise him to stay in Barbados if he wanted to, because his life may not last too long if he went home. I know Unison Whiteman very well. He was a friend of mine. The day before he came to Barbados, he was at the United Nations and I was there. He spoke his usual Marxist-Leninist rhetoric, and when he finished, he came over straight from the podium and gave me the Castro bear-hug and whispered in my ear and said, "I want the cameras to pick up that. I left the podium and came straight to you." I told him what I had heard was happening and he told me he had to go home. When he went home, he died three days later. He was one who was shot down at Fort Rupert. Sir, if in that sense the late Prime Minister told Unison Whiteman that things were on the ball and if he wanted to stay here he could stay here until he saw how things were, what is the criticism? I do not quite understand.

I do not want to spend too much time on Grenada, Sir, because there are other areas. In fact, there are so many areas that time would not permit me to talk about them, but let me just say one or two other things about Grenada. Grenada was not a mere aberration. Grenada was something that was fundamentally adverse to all the values that we cherish in this region. Senator Comissiong is right that the Americans go in every place in this hemisphere. They treat this hemisphere as if it were their backyard. They not only go into the Dominican Republic, they go into all Latin American countries when they feel like it. But they have not been coming into the eastern English speaking Caribbean principally because the English speaking Caribbean were British Colonies and the Americans are not likely to come in with troops in British Colonies. Secondly, since independence there has been relative stability in the English speaking Caribbean, and the Americans have no quarrel with stability, so they did not come in here. Senator Comissiong said they set a precedent.

It is true, Mr. President, and we regret that it was necessary to have that precedent, but I must keep asking what was the alternative? Should we have stayed here in Barbados and hear the cries of anguish next door and say that it has nothing to do with us? If that is your

position, I would say I understand your position now, I beg to disagree with it, let us move on. But I do not like this blowing hot and cold. The Government has to make up its mind what it believes in. It cannot say one thing one time and something on another occasion and expect people to take them seriously. Mr. President, I have a quotation here. I could make this a document of the House, Sir.

Asides.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: No, it is not Ruskin. It is not one of those fellows. It is not Thomas Carlisle or Ruskin or any of those nigger haters. It is from nobody other than Comrade Maurice Bishop, a progressive by Senator Comissiong's standards. There is a historic speech he made called the "Line of March" speech on September 13, 1982. It would make good reading. I believe that the Minister of Foreign Affairs probably has a copy of it, and he really should get some copies and give to everybody, including and especially Senator Comissiong and Senator Prescod, for their further education. Here is a quotation from that speech by Comrade Maurice Bishop:

"I want to think of another area. Just consider comrades how laws are made in this country. Laws are made in this country when Cabinet agrees and when I sign a document on behalf of the Cabinet, and then that is what everybody in the country, like it or do not like it, have to follow. Consider how people get detained in this country. We do not go and call for votes. You get detained when I sign an Order after discussing it with the National Security Committee of the Party or with a higher Party body. Once I sign it, like it or do not like it, it is up the hill for them."

That is what we were contended with. I only give you one quotation, Sir.

Asides

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Do you want some more? I am going to give you this when I finish.

This is something that went to the root of our common values in the English speaking Caribbean and it shocked, traumatised and indeed frightened a number of people in Government in the English-speaking Caribbean. Everybody is writing books these days. I hear about cook-books, and book on the BLP, and all of that. I am putting together mine, too. They need not put my speeches in there, because the important parts of my speech will go into mine. And a lot of things happened around the time the events in Grenada that I have very intimate knowledge of. If I was an American, I would get a ghost writer and I would have put out a book two or

three weeks after the incursion in Grenada and I would have made \$4 million or \$5 million off the book.

I was at the OECS meeting held in Barbados that decided what action should be taken in Grenada. I was the only non-Head of an OECS country who was there. One of them had a Deputy Prime Minister present, but these were the Heads of the OECS and I was present, and I know what they decided. I was in the meeting they held with the High Commissioners from Commonwealth Countries on the Saturday morning to inform them what was going to happen. I was at the now historic or notorious meeting that was held between the two deceased people, the meeting with Prime Minister Adams and High Commissioner Pitt. I was the third person present, I am the sole survivor of what happened, so I know what happened at that meeting. And not only was I the only other person there, since I was not the important one, I was the least important of the three, I was taking the minutes. I took the notes of the meeting which I still have. I am not going into detail. The two gentlemen are deceased. I, Mr. President, was at the meeting the Saturday in Port-of-Spain where the Heads of the CARICOM countries met. It was a closed meeting of the Heads, but I was in the meeting because Prime Minister Adams stayed in Barbados and asked me to go as his envoy, and since I was no Head of State, I said nothing, but wrote down what everybody said. I did not say a word, Sir, because in a forum of Heads I do not believe I have an audience, so I kept quiet and I wrote down, as clearly and as rapidly as I could, what each one said, that I could report faithfully to the Prime Minister when I came back. I still have those notes, Sir.
6.05 p.m.

(*Aside:* SENATOR N.-W. BOXILL: I can see them?)

SENATOR L. R. TULL: You cannot see them. How are you going to see them? You will read them in my book. Everybody is writing them. I will share the information with the Leader of the House, not as Leader of the House but as Foreign Minister, because I, too, believe that there should be some bi-partisan approach to foreign policy. I am not saying that there will never be disagreement, and on the odd occasion violent disagreement, but I believe that foreign policy can be bi-partisan, and that has been followed to a very large extent, and Prime Minister Barrow was told at the time as Leader of the Opposition what was happening in Grenada. I do not know if they know that. He was told what was happening, because it is a tradition in matters of that import and serious security matters that the Prime Minister informs the Leader of the Opposition. That is a tradition in this country, so he knew. I am going to get off this Grenada thing because there is so much misinformation that has gone on about it, I could not deal with it in the course of a short speech like this.

I want to put something else in perspective. My friend says that the Government in the 1980s were subservient to the United States. Do not forget when

Prime Minister Barrow rants and raves against the Regional Security System and talks about militarisation of the Caribbean and he will have no part in it, and these American neo-imperialists want to do this, that and the other, that there was a military base in Barbados. The United States had a military base in Barbados in all of the 15 years that the Democratic Labour Party was the Government and they had no quarrel with the Americans and whatever sophisticated equipment and what stuff they had there in the north of Barbados. It was all right with them. The Barbados Labour Party felt that the base should go and we said they had to leave, but now we hear about this subservience.

Senator Comissiong, as a young, good lawyer, always accuses me of getting up making wild allegations without a substratum of fact or evidence. He falls into the same hold that he always seeks to put me in, because he said there was subservience in the 1980s and he has not come up with anything to tell me what he means.

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Like what? What happened in the 1980s? Give me a couple of examples of what happened to make the good Senator make that kind of allegation. I suspect that he cannot.

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Well, give me one on Grenada. I want to hear it, because I want to answer it. These things must not be distorted.

That is all I have to say, Mr. President, in relation to two or three of the scurrilous comments that were made in relation to foreign policy of the previous Administration.

Senator Miller, in my view, was batting on a very good wicket when she zeroed in on the Caribbean. I hold the view that our foreign policy should be like five concentric circles — CARICOM, then the region, the region is this hemisphere, Caribbean, North and South America. you can then have the Commonwealth, which is a wider one and the rest of the world, and we have to accord priority of attention to them as I stated them.

We have to build up the CARICOM region, and Barbados' foreign policy must, in my view, be directed first and foremost to a solidifying of the Regional Integration Movement and the collaboration in key areas by CARICOM countries. If you have a strong CARICOM, then you can move outwards. Then you work to strengthen your relationships in the hemisphere, Latin America, or work in the Organisation of America, States.

Latin America has been a big area of default. It is due a lot to our education system, which taught us

an expert in one small area and the Minister can constantly turn to this cadre of advisers to advise him on every little thing. We in Barbados have to do everything, because we have two or three advisers. You cannot beg off in a meeting and say, 'I am not up-to-date. I do not understand', so we have to be selective in what we pursue.

We are not to say that we are not interested in what happens in Kampuchea. To say that we are not interested in Kampuchea is a sign of weakness, because no man is an island. We are a little island but it does not mean that we are an island internationally in that sense. We have to be concerned of all the butchery in Kampuchea and all the vagabondism by people like Pol Pot and all of these people who killed people by the tens of thousands. Every man's death diminishes me, so we have to be involved in that. We cannot by-pass these things, but we have to set ourselves our top priorities, those things that are of critical interest to Barbados.

Trade and economic matters would have to be at the life blood of our foreign policy. We have been talking from 1976 - 1987 about setting up the mechanisms for our foreign missions to get more involved in promoting Barbados' trade. This is both the DLP Administration and the BLP Administration. There is a lot of talk, but when the time came to translate that talk into effective action, it has not happened. I am hoping, Sir, that Minister Tudor will be able to succeed where all of us before him have failed, because there is no point talking about maintaining the quality of life in this country and making sure that we do not slip back and we meet the problems of endemic unemployment and so on if we continue to use our missions overseas mainly as political outposts. I say 'mainly' because they have to do political work, too.

Do you know, Mr. President - I do not know about "have", Sir, I move off the scene for a while - we had a United Nation Mission, a Barbados Consulate, next floor the Export Promotion Corporation, next to that the Barbados Tourist Board, and next to that the Industrial Development Corporation, five separate and independent empires, republics. It was so bad that you could not ask the driver at the UN Mission to drive someone from the Consulate if the driver over there was sick.

We had a situation in the Foreign Ministry - two offices next to each other on the same floor on the same building, and they used to mail letters from one to the other! The Consulate in Toronto would mail a letter to the Tourist Board even though the Consulate General was sitting down approximately 15 feet away from the other one. That is a fact.

We had a situation where there was a telex machine in one office in New York that could not be used by any of the others, and they had a second telex machine as if one country was Germany and one was Syria. That was the kind of thing that has been happening.

I blame all of us, Sir, including me. I am not ducking out of that, but we have to address these problems. I see Senator Lewis looking on. He is the O and M man and the man who has to cut out a lot of fat. I would suggest that the Government put Senator Lewis on a plane and send him to these missions and see how you can save hundreds and hundreds of dollars because of all of the duplication and multiplication that exist in the Foreign Service. That is the situation that we see, and we have to do something about it.

I heard Senator Jordan talk about buying buildings for missions. We thought about buying a building about four years ago in New York. You say we are paying too much rent? We used to pay about half a million dollars a year in rent for the offices in New York. We said that was untenable, we might as well buy a property, and we looked around. The properties cost US\$12 million. You could get one in the slums for less than that. If you want a mission in the slums you can get one for far less than that, but if you want a mission anyway near the United Nations in an environment that would not do any violence to the reputation and image of Barbados, you have to pay for it. I am not making out any case for the Government. Senator Tudor will, no doubt, in the fullness of time have to deal with these things, but I am just giving you the benefit of my experience.

I want, Mr. President, to deal quickly with this joint committee we are hearing about, this bi-partisan committee, or whatever expression you use, on foreign affairs. I agree with it. I think that foreign affairs should be discussed in an atmosphere of calm, lack of passion and excessive partisanship. Notice I said "excessive." There must be some partisanship, I agree with that.

The Constitution of Barbados gives the Prime Minister the total right to appoint all people in the Public Service, including the maids. He can appoint everybody. I do not know that I would necessarily quarrel with that. I am not one who belongs to the school that I hear so often on the other side that talk about ministerial interference. My education has not yet worked out for me what is meant by ministerial interference. If you are dealing with your own Ministry, that is beside the point, but what I would like to see, however, if we are going to be serious, is to import some of the better practices of other countries into Barbados.

6.25 p.m.

We have a Westminster system, so-called. It is very different in a way, because we have over the years put our own national personality on our so-called Westminster system, and it works well, but I think that we can import other things that seem to work well and perhaps can enhance our own system.

In respect of this bipartisan committee of Parliament to deal with foreign affairs, I would like to suggest

that people who are nominated for posts of ambassadors and Heads of Mission should go before a bipartisan committee and be interviewed like they do in the United States. A lot of people would not get pass, and a lot of people who would not get pass do not deserve to get pass. I would like to see that. Let us ask them some questions, not necessarily a grilling, and then let the bipartisan committee, having interviewed, send on the recommendations to the Prime Minister, who can agree or disagree.

One of the greatest problems that has plagued the Foreign Service is the number of unfortunate appointments that have been made over the years, not by the BLP and not the DLP, by both sides, some insults to the people of this country. I never understand Prime Ministers, Sir, they are a very strange bunch of people, and I do not know how much of that power they want to keep, but if they were interested in having a good system, they could implement that system where these people are interviewed.

It would also assist in putting off the pressure from the political supporters for jobs, because politics is about patronage, do not fool yourselves. A fellow whose house is threatened to be burnt down for you during the election campaign figures that he is entitled, and I agree with him, to some consideration when the campaign is over. So I have no quarrel at all about patronage, but patronage must be based on mature consideration like the right people for the right job, not giving a man a job because he has run around and made a lot of noise for you during an election campaign. This would insulate the Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, whom he consults about appointments, from too much pressure from the political supporters.

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I am not going to deal with the wild man that they have appointed.

Asides.

Senator L. R. TULL: I want, Mr. President, to deal with another matter that affects us as a small island state at this stage of the development, and which should be at the top of our priorities. Let us take the Law of the Sea. Over a decade of negotiations led to the agreement of the Law of the Sea Convention, and I believe that it was signed by over 100 countries, in Montego Bay in 1982. It has subsequently been ratified by a number of countries, but not enough. I do not believe it has been ratified by Barbados, and the reason why it was not ratified by Barbados, certainly when the BLP Administration was there, is that we wanted to look at the maritime legislation and rationalise it before we rushed into ratifying this international convention.

One of the distressing things about it is that, after all the work has been done to reach fruition of a Law of the Sea Convention, countries like the United States, West Germany, Britain and the USSR have refused to sign this convention for reasons of selfishness. The main piece of the convention was that the wealth of the oceans and the seabed outside the exclusive economic zone would be the property of all mankind, so that the Americans, the Soviet Union or the Germans and Japanese, because of their superior wealth and technology, could not go and mine the ocean floor and take everything for themselves, because the ocean floor has far more resources than the earth, and if these people have the resources, they can go and clean out the ocean floor and the rest of us would get none of it. So you have your territorial exclusive economic zone, 200 miles from your shore — and where islands were together, the medium point — a change from the traditional international law division, and at the heart of the convention, the resources of the ocean floor are the common heritage of all mankind. The Americans do not want to hear about that. They and the Russians are quarrelling over Antarctica, because it is now abundantly clear that Antarctica, covered in ice all the time, has abundant riches.

Barbados is interested in the ratification of that convention, and it must do a number of things. Now that I hear about everybody is getting study leave, the land is flowing with milk and honey again, and I am happy for them, I think that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs should identify maybe two persons, either they train Foreign Service officers or a lawyer in the Public Service, or a combination of the two, who should be given the appropriate training, perhaps at the Institute in the Hague, to study the full implications of the law in relation to the seabed and would be assigned to work on that on a constant basis, because the benefits that could accrue to Barbados, an island state, could be tremendous. We cannot sit back and hope that people will do it for us, because, as I said already, there is no altruism, there is no big burse of generosity in the breasts of the developed countries for the developing countries of the world. No such thing exists, and I believe that that is an area where we have to train people and put them there to do a continuous job.

Jamaica did it; one of the experts in the world in that area is a Jamaican whose brother used to be an Attorney General. We need to do the same thing. We need to get some work hurriedly. We were waiting on CARICOM to do it jointly, but we cannot wait on them forever. Quite often Barbados is set to lead in CARICOM, so when they are dragging, we go ahead.
6.35 p.m.

We need to get a study done. We had enlisted the aid of the Canadians to do a study on the delimitation of boundaries. We need to get that done like yesterday.

We need to develop a proper harmonized set of maritime laws that would ensure that we get the benefits that exist within our 200 mile exclusive economic zone, and to stop all these people who are coming in and are doing as they like, the Japanese and the Koreans, because they have high-powered boats, and are carrying away what is ours. We have to do something about them. These are where resources have to be thrown. The Government will hear no quarrel from me if they go and borrow money for that purpose. None at all, Sir!

I want also, Mr. President, to deal with the peculiar problems of small island states. One of the things that we have to remember is that, despite smallness of size, you need a basic infrastructure and a certain level of administrative spending to keep the country going. You may have a country that is 5 000 square miles that gets by on one airport, but it may have 10 000 living on it who contribute to the international wheel. But if you are 166 square miles, you still need an airport. We have to have the basic infrastructure that far more developed countries and far bigger countries have. We must have a port, an airport, a proper telecommunications system, health, education and industrial infrastructure. We need all of these things, but we only have a work force of about 118 000 — there are about 30 000 not working — and that work force of a hundred and something thousand people have to pay for an airport that millions of people in a bigger country pay for. There are costs which are inescapable. Whether you are big or small, you must have a judiciary, a Police Force, a Civil Service and so on, and these things must be paid for.

So small island states have as their main problem smallness. Professor Schumaker says small is beautiful. I do not know about beauty when we are talking about hard practical problems. Beauty is one thing, but we have to have these things, and, therefore, it is incumbent on Barbados, as a small island state, to throw their lot in with other small island states across the globe and form an effective lobby in international institutions that would consider the smallness of an island state as a shortcoming, much as they would for the LDCs of the world, the sub-Saharan countries and others. We must impress on them that the very fact that we are a small island state means that we have special problems that must be addressed by the international community.

We have heard for years, Mr. President, that, because of its GDP, Barbados should be graduated out of soft loans from the World Bank and other institutions. These people do not take into consideration that with a small population, per capita GDP is different from per capita GDP in a place like Brazil with 100 million people. We have to form an association, a grouping of small island states, that would bring our peculiar problems constantly before international organisations and Governments.

We have to realise that economies of scale militate against us, and therefore we have to combine resources in a number of areas. I am not talking about common embassies and things like that. It is a little bit foolish to suggest that we could have a common embassy of Caribbean states. If you mean a common building, yes, but not common staff, somebody working for Trinidad and Dominica and Barbados at the same time. I do not accept that one, that would not work. But we have to combine our resources because we are so limited. We have to put effort in that area and we have to look around and see how we can get maximum benefit for the two per cent of the Government Budget that we spend on foreign affairs.

I was going to talk about the Regional Security System, but I would leave that, because I cannot understand what is the Government's position. I have asked already. Perhaps the Minister may explain to me. The Memorandum of Understanding that was signed in 1982 between the Governments of Barbados, St. Kitts, Nevis, Antigua and Barbuda, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Dominica was an effort to have a joint approach to many of the problems that were facing us that cost a lot of money, things like fisheries, contraband, immigration violation, oil spills and fishermen lost at sea. We said we would co-operate on them, and that we would come to each other's assistance in a small way when there were certain problems, with total discretion and good balance before we made these decisions.

The treaty was intended to put in a legal framework the Memorandum of Understanding. The Memorandum of Understanding is not a treaty. They wanted a treaty so that they could register the treaty with the Register of Treaties at the United Nations and so that they would not have all the problems when joint action is taken on certain things.

My recollection, Sir, it is getting a little bit dim now on these things, was that the reason for the treaty was because a number of donor states, certainly Venezuela and France stand out in my mind, preferred to deal with a central secretariat rather than having to deal with each constituent member of the Memorandum of Understanding, because if you have the Memorandum of Understanding, you cannot deal with a central body, you have to deal with each one independently. And you know why I have a natural hostility to that kind of arrangement, Sir, because the great powers in the First World and the industrialized countries have for too long sought to balkanise, split up in pieces, divide against each other, much of the world today. In Africa they made a lot of arbitrary cuts of boundaries, cut tribes in half, put half in one country and half are in the other, and you got untold problems on the continent of Africa because of their policy of balkanisation. And they did not do it

casually, there was a plan. There was a plan to sow constant confusion.

The Memorandum of Understanding is pregnant with difficulties, because the Americans could fly to Kingstown and tell the Prime Minister there one thing, fly to Roseau and tell the Prime Minister there another, and then play off one against the other. I believe that this was one of the main reasons why we wanted a treaty.

The Government is saying so many things that they changed their mind on, I do not know why they do not change their mind and do the opposite on this one, because they are doing everything that the treaty envisaged. They said that they would not get involved in any military exercises with the United States, but they are involved in military exercises with the United States. Do not mind the big words being spouted from Bay Street from time to time. They are involved in military exercises with the United States. Right now they are involved, this moment! So I do not know why they can change their position on things of, in some cases, less moment and they cannot on something as important as this, because I go back to the point I made, that it is critical that we make a solid region.

6.45 p.m.

The integration movement in the Caribbean must be strengthened before we can move upwards, and there must be a proper understanding between the leaders. The essence of diplomacy is communication. If you do not communicate, and you do not communicate properly, you are in trouble. It reminds me of Paul Newman in *Cool Hand Luke* — there is a problem of failure to communicate. When Prime Ministers Compton, Mitchell, and Adams met down in the Grenadines and sat down for a *fête-à-tête* and discussed a few things, they solved a lot of problems in the region. When the Prime Minister gets on a plane and flies down to Tobago and sits down and talks with Prime Minister Robinson, a lot of problems are solved. This question of communication is critical, and I will give you an example of what I mean, Sir.

In 1978, a Memorandum of Understanding was signed between the Governments of Trinidad and Tobago and Barbados, Prime Minister Williams was still there. We sent down a shuttle to negotiate. It was then Prime Minister Adams, the then Foreign Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister who went down and had a number of meetings with Prime Minister Williams and came up with a Memorandum of Understanding that sought to put Trinidad and Tobago and Barbados in the lead of collaboration in CARICOM, hopefully with others coming along. It was a historic document.

When I heard the DLP talk prior to the last election about the Barbados Labour Party had put a strain on

CARICOM and relations with Trinidad and Tobago, I had to say they either did not know what they were talking about or they were brimming over with malice. I say that, Sir, because the Memorandum of Understanding in 1978 had things in it that had never happened in the Caribbean. For instance, Trinidad and Tobago agreed — I was then Minister of Education. I took part one-to-one with one of those Ministers on that — for a Barbadian to be a member of a statutory board in Trinidad and Tobago. Can you imagine that the Government of Trinidad and Tobago agreed for a Barbadian nominated by the Government to sit on a statutory board in Trinidad and Tobago? This was the National Institute of Higher Education Research Science and Technology. I had introduced a White Paper for this new thrust in technology which was going to be revolutionising education and training in Trinidad and Tobago and to move Trinidad and Tobago into a new technological age, and the relationships between the two countries were so sound, and the vision of Prime Ministers Williams and Adams so great, that they knew that this could revolutionise relations in CARICOM and move us forward.

Trinidad and Tobago also agreed that Barbados would nominate someone to sit on their task force on the development of Mount Hope, Mount Hope being the facility for dental, medical, nursing, and veterinarian education. Could you see the broadmindedness of the Government of Barbados — this is a rhetorical question, Sir, in letting a Trinidadian come here and sit on one of our statutory boards? I do not know. Maybe they will, but I have serious doubts about it. I, Mr. President, nominated Professor Waldron to go and sit on the task force on the development of Mount Hope, a billion and a half dollar complex to deliver those educational services that I just referred to.

Asides.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I do not want any thanks. I do not like that business. The only thing you learn, Mr. President, is that you do not get any thanks in politics, and I am not interested in that.

Professor Waldron was the nominee of the then Minister of Education, which I was, and he used to go to meetings in Trinidad and report back to me and tell me what was going on. So Barbados had an input in a major financial undertaking in Trinidad and Tobago. That was the kind of relationship we had, and I will tie in this question of communication now into that.

Up to the time that Prime Minister Williams died, the relationship was extremely cordial, very close. But then you got different people, people who showed themselves and their abilities to be in the shadow of the great Eric Williams, did not know how to assume the mantle for themselves, who felt cowed by greater experience and,

perhaps, even greater intellect, and who began to behave like little children, showing petty jealousy and this kind of thing. That is what caused the problems.

Do not let anybody fool you, Mr. President, that because somebody makes a statement there is a rift caused. I remember that when Prime Minister Barrow said that Prime Minister Williams could not even leave the country Trinidad and Tobago for failure that he could not get back in, Prime Minister Williams retort was, 'When I need to discharge my intellectual batteries, I do not have to go out to Miami and teach a bunch of under-graduates. I will go in my library and write a book.' That is how it has become. That is how Caribbean people get on. You do not run and hide and fret and pick up your marbles and go home when this happens. Sparrow is at the Frank Collymore Hall tonight and it is going to be packed with people, and he is going to be making sport in all of his calypsoes about Bajans. It is only a custom. That is the way we live. So when you hear all this talk by the DLP about we had relations strained with Trinidad and Tobago because of injudicious statements and all of that, it is that we were dealing with petty people. If Eric Williams was there, the situation would have been very different. We cannot blame ourselves because they did not have confidence in themselves to run a country and to deal with people man to man in this kind of relationship. These things need to be settled with a historical accuracy and not all of the foolishness you hear.

Mr. President, Sir, I want to wind up, otherwise I am going to transverse the globe, but I will deal with recruitment in the Foreign Service before I touch other parts of the globe. I have already made some reference to what I feel could be a device to get around this weakness in appointments in the Foreign Service at a high level by Governments. But I want to go further. I am a little bit disturbed at the total polarisation of the top of the Foreign Service. I do not believe that you should have anybody at the top of the Foreign Service who does not understand the political exigencies of the Government. I do not want any Foreign Service Officer or career civil servant to head any mission of Barbados overseas if he does not understand and is insensitive to the political objectives of the Government in power.

When I was Minister, I was told by one or two people that I should leave things alone and let senior Foreign Service people do what they do. I said they must be stark raving mad. The Heads of Missions must be sensitive to what the Government is trying to achieve, and they must understand your political priorities, more so since they are away from home and you cannot deal with them day after day. So I am not making out any case for any career people to be at the top if they do not meet that important criterion. Happily, I think there are a number of them who, without sacrificing any of their

integrity, competence or intellectual perspectives, can do that.

6.55 p.m.

I think it is a most unfortunate development that you are making all your Heads of Mission political people so-called, non-career people. One of the reasons why I think it is unfortunate is because it throws a damper on the Foreign Service people who are excelling, and who need to get to the top of their career. What is the point in being in a career when you cannot reach the top? If you have these good and competent people who cannot reach the top, then they get out, and I think that some of the officers in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, not all, are people who I think would be a tremendous loss to Barbados if they were forced to move out when they saw that all opportunities for promotion had disappeared.

I believe also, Sir, that you have to give greater thought to — to use a vernacular — horses for courses in assignment of people overseas. I have already made the point that you are not dealing with domestic matters. When somebody at MTW does something foolish, like block up somebody's driveway with a load of marl and they cannot get their car out, you express your annoyance, but it is all at home. And when I go to pay my driver's licence and I have to stand up for ten minutes while all the officers on the other side talk about what they did on the weekend and which nightclub they went to and so on and I am totally ignored, you say, well these are my people, and you put up with that. When you are dealing with people of other countries, that kind of thing is not going to work. One incident can destroy a lot of what you spend years to build up, and, therefore, you have to be very careful about whom you have in your service and where you put them.

I do not believe that sufficient and mature thought is given to that kind of operation. It is still let me look after so and so, and it is not a good way to work.

I will tell you something, Mr. President, and I want the Leader of the House to hear me on this. When I was Minister of Foreign Affairs, I never on a single occasion recommended the appointment or transfer of a Foreign Service officer without asking the Permanent Secretary to advise me on it. Not one single time have I ever done that. I am not talking about Heads of Mission, do not misunderstand me, but on every other posting, on every other recommendation for promotion I relied on the Permanent Secretary to advise me confidentially before I made recommendations to the Prime Minister.

It grieves me, Sir, and I am not blaming the Minister, because I do not know if what I hear is true, to think that there is a departure from that, because, as I said, it is too critical. It is not the Lazaretto nor the

Welfare Board, all of which is at home. When you are dealing with foreign postings, I think that professionalism and professional considerations are paramount.

One or two appointments that have been made recently are so scandalous that they frighten me. They really do, Sir. I am not going to name names now. I am in a very benign or benevolent mood this evening, so I am not going to name any names.

(Aside: Do not spoil it.)

SENATOR L. R. TULL: It is not a question of spoiling it, because I will call the names at a public meeting on Sunday night in Carlisle car park. It is not a question of spoiling it, it is that I am doing one thing here and another job there. I am carpenter in here and mason there.

I will do something else.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Does it have anything to do with this Resolution?

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Yes, Sir. I am dealing with appointments in the Foreign Service. I believe I may have mentioned them to the Minister already, but, from an abundance of caution, I will mention them again to him privately. I believe that the Minister — he can say otherwise behind my back if he likes — feel that I have no axe to grind. I tell him exactly how I feel and I am finished with that. But some of the appointments have been most unfortunate, and they cannot do anything to promote Barbados' interest overseas. I say more on that.

We have been making a lot of talk about economic and trade matters, and I do not want to spend too much time on this area; I just want to make another recommendation. My colleague, Senator Miller, made reference to the activity of European powers in the Caribbean from the 17th century. There were marauding bands of Europeans about the Caribbean from time immemorial — time immemorial means the 17th century — who cut up, divided, exploited and generally pushed about people in this region. The Europeans, generally, in more recent times, maintain interest in particular islands rather than the region as a whole. Many of the developments in the last decade brought a greater European focus on the Caribbean — Grenada did it, the new links with Latin America did it, the importance of Cuba in the region did it and the Central American conflict did it — and I am recommending that we do some kind of shift in our foreign policy, because it is too North American/United Kingdom oriented.

There is an abundance of goodwill and interest by a number of European countries in the Caribbean, and I believe that we could get arrangements with them, based

on mutual respect, that will inure to the benefit of Barbados. I know that we have a number of accreditations to European capitals for our ambassador in Brussels and our High Commissioner in London, but I believe that it is increasingly more important for us to have a more direct, a more continuing contact with some European capitals and countries for the benefit of Barbados.

Mr. PRESIDENT left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT took the Chair.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Mr. Deputy President, you will know that in Guadeloupe there is a very vigorous leftist and Marxist minority that demonstrate a lot, attacking, blowing up supermarkets and what not and generally keeping things hot in Guadeloupe. The French are now beginning to perceive the problems of Guadeloupe, and, to a lesser extent, Martinique, as not the problems really of French outposts in the Caribbean, but as Caribbean-wide problems, and therefore they are making more direct contact with the Caribbean.

We know, for instance, Sir, that Spain, because of our new links with Latin America, has developed a keener interest in the Caribbean. Do not mind that they come telling us at the Organisation of American States and the United Nations that they want to celebrate in 1992 the 500th anniversary of Columbus discovering the Caribbean. I do not know what is the position of the Government now, but I know when that nonsense started I was the Minister, and I said those Spaniards and the Latin Americans must be crazy. When Christopher Columbus came here, he found people here. You mean the Arawaks and the Caribs are not people? What 500th anniversary you are telling me about? They say to you that this is very important to them, do not rock the boat. But it would be intellectual dishonesty to go along with that so as not to rock the Hispano-American axis. It cannot work so. I do not know what is the position now. Maybe this is one of the notes that the Minister can jot down and give us some kind of answer to before the day is over.

7.05 p.m.

Asides.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: No more on that.

We fool ourselves with so many symbols. We keep talking. I do not like to disturb these things, but we talk about a 350th anniversary in 1989 of our Parliament. What Parliament are you talking about? A Parliament that the people of Barbados could not even look at?

When I was a boy growing up and you step foot in Belleville after 6 o'clock, you used to be arrested for loitering. I remember walking home from school — I was going school at Harrison's College — through Barbarees Hill and on through Strathclyde, just at twilight when

you thought that was the most beautiful time of the day, and have dogs set on me, and this 350th anniversary of Parliament is an insult to a lot of people in Barbados, including me. I want that recorded in Hansard.

The 350th anniversary of Parliament? What Parliament? You mean a Parliament that two or three dozen landowners appointed, the local planter, the merchant, and the people could not vote? They could not come near to Parliament and you are telling me about celebrating that? What is this numbers game we are playing, as if there is something magical and exciting in 350 so we should beat our breasts and say how proud we are? The path to something, Sir. The path of duty.

Asides.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: It was not "The Path of Duty" that my friend, Senator Comissiong, read from. It is the speech made in Miami, the CCIA meeting, the Miami Conference Meeting, in which the Prime Minister was telling people in Miami about the 350th anniversary of a Parliament. The Prime Minister should be ashamed to be walking about telling people so! What Parliament are we talking about?

(Aside: This Parliament.)

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Anyhow, Sir, I am off that.

Finally, Sir, I have to deal with two or three areas in the world that any foreign policy debate would be incomplete unless you adverted to them. I am talking about Central America, Southern Africa and the Middle East, the Gulf. Four years ago, the *Foreign Affairs Journal*, a reputable journal published in the United States, identified five hot spots, troublesome spots, in the world, and they listed, in addition to the Gulf, the Middle East, Southern Africa, Central America, the Caribbean. It was the first time the Caribbean got that kind of mention as one of the most exclusive areas in the world.

The Caribbean is important strategically to the United States. The principal reason is that the great powers have obviously carved out their areas of suzerainty, overlordship, and this is the sphere of influence of the United States. The Soviet Union has theirs. That is why Afghanistan remains the way it is and the United States makes nothing more than token noises about Afghanistan, because that is in the Russian sphere of influence and that does not cause any sleepless nights in Washington.

The Caribbean is important strategically to the United States because 85 per cent of the oil supply of the United States passes through the Caribbean, and the United States has to be concerned about that. That is why the United States has to be so keen and interested in

what is happening in the Gulf, and so is the Soviet Union. The politics of oil is keen politics with the super powers, so the Caribbean is important to the United States. And it is not only so because it provides the sea lane for the vast amounts of its oil imports, it is also important from the point of view of credibility, because if the United States appears to the Soviet Union that it cannot even keep order in its backyard, what say could it have in the rest of the world? You cannot even keep people quiet in a little area by you and you are going to come out here in this part of the world and tell us what is going on?

I do not want anybody to misunderstand me. It is not my view that we are anybody's backyard. That is not what I am saying. I am saying that it is the Americans' perception of us that we are their backyard, that they have to keep order. They are the policeman with the big stick walking through here keeping everybody in line. That is where we fit in this hot spot.

The Russians were very active around here. Endless numbers of Russian nuclear submarines used to, and probably still do, sail around the Caribbean Sea. A number of acolytes, the messengers of international Marxism, moved through this region with alarming frequency in recent years making some very unwholesome contacts during that period. So the presence of the two super powers in the region, jostling for whatever it is they are jostling for, made the Caribbean a hot spot.

Quickly, Sir, Southern Africa. I want to go on record as saying that the Barbados Labour Party has always and continues to throw its support behind the people of Southern Africa, both South Africa and Namibia, who are living under oppression of the South African white regime. Easy and facile statements about what one side, the DLP, is doing and the discernment of a change is a lot of poppycock. If there is one thing that there has been a confluence of views on between the political parties, it is on Southern Africa.

The present Government has the total support of the BLP in any action it has taken to support those people who are living in the jack boot in South Africa. So do not let us pull it aside, and if you want to pull it aside, do not tell me that anything fantastic has happened when the Prime Minister recently said that he is going to give some money to the freedom fighters in Southern Africa. The Barbados Labour Party as a Government not only gave money to the ANC, but it brought students from Namibia and South Africa to Barbados and trained them in nursing, firefighting, and technical skills, and paid all their expenses. We have done that, so do not let us make this thing partisan. If you say you spent \$100 000 and you

spent another \$100 000 or \$200 000, you are going to get the support of this side, because we have to do more than just talk about Southern Africa. It is a problem that touches us very intimately, not only because of our ethnic relationship, but because it is a country that has seen the worst of slavery, colonialism and exploitation, and we must feel a natural empathy for people who are undergoing that kind of pressure in these days.

7.15 p.m.

In respect of the Middle East, Sir, I heard very briefly some statement about Israel. I did not hear the details. The Barbados Labour Party continues to support the implementation of Resolution 242 of the United Nations.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT left the Chair and Mr. PRESIDENT resumed the Chair.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: We believe that the Palestinians should be given a place to lay their heads, they should have a place that they can call home, and we believe that all of this must be done at the UN in the context of a conference to arrange a proper delineation of boundaries in the Middle East. If there are no clear boundaries and if the Palestinians.....

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I heard you, Mr. President, and I will come home. I think I have been a little bit unkind. But, Mr. President, I should speak, because I did not get any pick in this book. If they had put in some of the things I had said in here, all I would have to say is, 'Refer to page so and so'. But they did not put me in, so I have to say the things I have been saying for years.

Anyhow, Mr. President, I will not be unkind. I am tired myself, it is twenty minutes after seven, I am enjoying this debate, and I would really in future hope that things will come up where we can speak on other aspects of foreign policy. I think that the debate has touched on a lot of key areas that require the attention of Government, Parliament and the people of Barbados, and I think that if the approach of the present Minister to bipartisanship and divulging of information continues, we could see far happier times in relation to the conceptualisation and implementation of foreign policy in this country.

Thank you.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Mr. President, before I swing into action on this Resolution, let me take this opportunity of saying that this is the finest speech that Senator Tull has made since I was here with him. I have always said, Mr. President, that if one cannot say something bad about one's foes, one should not say something good politically, but at this time I break that maxim to congratulate him on a very fine, statesmanlike speech. It is

true he went off some of the time and I will have to bring him back in my speech, but apart from that, I told Senator Goddard and Senator Tudor that the honourable member was going very good. Let me say something to you — when you are going good, do not overdo it by going too long, because you may repeat yourself. But you were really good.

I want to say a few words on this Resolution, and if I happen to mention anything in correction to what Senator Shorey said, I do not want Senator Shorey to take it as an attack on him or anything, but just a clarification. I would like to say that everybody who spoke so far, including the introducer of the Resolution gave a good account of himself.

Before I go further, I would like honourable members to turn to page 41 of "Diplomacy and Development" and see if I am right or wrong in a correction at the top of the page. It says:

"Relations with Nigeria were highlighted in 1974 when the then Head of State of Nigeria, General Yabuku Gowon....."

I think it is "Yakubu" Gowon and not "Yabuku".

Mr. President, Senator Shorey made reference to certain things that he claimed took place that he was a bit disturbed about, and one of these things he mentioned was the criticisms in this book being mostly against the United States. He talked about the Non-Aligned Movement and spoke about the veto being used so many times and we did not mention anything about Russia. What I would like Senator Shorey and honourable members of this Chamber to understand is this, and I am saying this for the benefit of the Senate and for the benefit of the people who have not done as much reading as I have done, the United States is the greatest democracy in the world. We cannot deny that. They have the best of everything. We on this side, and especially I, are not unmindful of the fact that during the lean years and during the good years, it is the United States that kept the majority of us alive.

That does not mean that we have to kowtow to them in everything. As I said, they have the best of everything, but that does not give the United States the right to dictate to small nations like ourselves as they have always been doing. Do not forget that all the dictatorships in the western hemisphere, without exception, were created by the United States Government. They supported Castro, they supported Samosa, everyone you call they supported, so if people turn sour after that, do not blame us — it was of their making.

What I wanted to say about United States democracy was that it is the only country in the world where a slave was able to sue his master, and win the

case, too. There is no other country in the world where this has happened or could ever happen. It is true that he lost the case in the appeal. Dred Scott is who I am talking about, and — I am sure that Senator Shorey is a historian and he would remember this — Dred Scott sued his master for ill-treatment and won. Despite how critical we might be of the United States, we are not unmindful of that fact.

7.25 p.m.

If a showdown came between the West and the Eastern bloc, naturally we would have to align ourselves with the United States. That is clear, elementary understanding. As I said before, and I continue to say, nobody in their right senses is going to leave their aunt's doorstep to go and sit down at their cousin's own. That means that we are not unmindful of what the United States has done. Do not mind the rantings and ravings you might hear from certain people.

Let me remind the Senators that years ago when the union was over at the corner of Nelson Street and you went in the union, there was a big hammer and sickle picture of the communist party. Do you really believe in all sincerity that the members of the Barbados Labour Party and the members of the union were really communists? But at the time it was nice to bring up these small ideologies to fool who they could. It was popular at the time, so do not let us misconstrue the real object of these things. There is nobody on this side of the Government and I can almost say, he might find one or two people who will rant and rave about this communist idea and thing but they are not any real communist. They are joke people! Communist what? They do not know anything about communism. I believe that if a showdown came they would go and align themselves with the Americans against the Russians or against the Eastern block. So let us not let our exuberance overrun our reason.

Senator Tull was touching on the invasion of Grenada. He gave his views, I will give mine. I wrote an article a long time ago after the invasion in which I did not support it. They were arguing that they had this trouble because it was all set up. The people in Grenada, in my view, only wanted — they say it was a rescue mission — to be rescued from the people of the United States and the people of Barbados. It is true that the situation got out of hand, but we must also ask, how did the situation arise in the first place? Was it not a situation deliberately created to cause the one that took place?

Personally I do not feel that Austin, Coard or Strachan should have been tried. My view is they should call the people, let the people know in advance that on Good Friday, Austin, Coard and Strachan will be let go — that is all. The people would settle that matter. That matter would get resolved.

Asides.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: That is my view. You would not have all this problem of wasting time about this person appealing and all that kind of thing. Let them go. Let the people handle the situation.

Aside.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: But he would make it up some way. There are a lot of fools about here who would go and commit some crime.

What I would like to say to Senator Tull is if he were trying to make out a case for the invasion of Grenada, why is it that you had reporters in Vietnam, Lagos, Cambodia, Germany, France, all over the world, and in Lebanon right now, and you are not worried about the protection of those people, but when you were going into Grenada, you did not allow one reporter to go in because, as they said, it was too dangerous? What was too dangerous? Reporters travel all across the world, risk their lives in all sorts of situations. You would not let them go into Grenada, but you let them go into other places. There are other reasons greater than the ones that you know, not that I know. So much for the Grenada situation. That I would say is under the bridge.

I did not hear Senator Miller's speech completely, but I am very worried now about what will happen to Grenada, because it looks to me as though Bishop lost his life in vain. You were talking all the time about the ballot box, but, let us be realistic, you know and I know, the ballot box can be worked in a way to suit certain people, and it worked that way in Grenada. It was working so with Gairy so there was no alternative. Those people would have never won an election. Here it is now you are going to put these people back under the yolk of Eric Gairy. I am more sure I heard Senator Miller say something about he is getting blind. Thak God for that.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Boxill do not allow us to debate Sir Eric Gairy. This is not the Assembly to debate that. We are dealing with our foreign policy. Personalities like Gairy are not in the debate. Is that relevant to what we are debating?

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Yes, Mr. President, it is relevant.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Explain to me.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: It is relevant, because I was referring to what Senator Miller said.

Mr. PRESIDENT: She is not speaking. You are speaking.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Mr. President, Sir, I am only referring to points that were made by Senator Miller and Senator Tull. I am not bringing in Gairy, but we cannot get away from mentioning about Sir Eric Gairy in this context, because we were dealing with Grenada. Grenada is a part of the foreign policy that we are dealing with.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You say he is coming back.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: I do not know if he is in here.

All right, Mr. President, I abide by what you say.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Let us keep on the foreign policy of Barbados.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: ALL right, Sir.

Dealing with the foreign policy of Barbados, I heard Senator Tull talking about career diplomats as against non career diplomats. I am sure it was pointed out to Senator Tull here a few weeks ago that a lot of these people who we have outside as career diplomats, I should say, wanted to come back, because if they are out there, there is no promotion. I do not think some of them will reach as high as assistant to the Permanent Secretary, so they have to come back to get promotion.

Take the last person who came in from Washington. He is an able diplomat, but at the same time there were people here who were moving ahead of him, so he had to come back to be promoted. There is no point staying out there, working all the time for the Government and doing a good job, but going nowhere. Like anybody else, you want to get promotion, you want to reach the top. These people have to take orders — in the Foreign Service the Permanent Secretary is the next person to the Minister of Foreign Affairs — and, therefore, a fellow is not going to be satisfied that people can come up the line and become a Permanent Secretary and he is still out there taking orders from the Permanent Secretary, although he has been doing a good job for years. So these people must come home. Senator Tull, you know that what I am saying is true.

Laughter.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: What I would say to the Government now is that we must be very careful with some of these overseas appointments, because — I said it before and I will say it again — I was not at all happy with some of the appointments that were made under the last regime, and Senator Tull agrees with me. But, as we all know, this is the prerogative of the Prime Minister and not the Minister of Foreign Affairs, as a lot of people seem to think.

I should like my party to take a careful look when we are sending ambassadors out to represent this country. It is not necessary that you have to pick someone who has a degree, because sometimes they do not make good ambassadors, nor we do not have to take someone who has to put the plural verb all the time in its right perspective. They have not gone to learn English.

Laughter.

(*Aside:* That is a good one!)

Applause.

Laughter.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: We have to put in the Foreign Service someone who has empathy with the people who are overseas. We have roughly about 65 000, I believe, in England, and maybe more than that in the United States. Therefore, you have to send somebody who can empathise, who can sympathize, who can really get down with these people and hear their problems.

I, Mr. President, may not be the greatest diplomat in the world, but I am certainly one of the best ambassadors this country ever had over in Canada.

Laughter.

Applause.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Senator Tull can prove this. He can vouch for this.

Laughter.

(*Aside:* SENATOR L. R. TULL: He looked after me.)

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: It was not my job.

When I was in Canada, Mr. President, I did not care who you were, as long as you were a Barbadian, you could be blue, white, pink, short, tall or fat, I made sure that you were accorded the respect that a Barbadian should get in Canada, because I know that some of these immigration officers could be a bit unmannerly and out-of-hand. I used to make sure that any Barbadian national who I had to go and represent got full representation. Of course, I had my liaison with immigration officers, too. A bottle of rum makes a lot of difference, and I would always know how to handle the situation. I have never lost a case when I was up there. I say that to say that it is not necessary that a fellow who goes out there to represent us must have a Ph.D. — that is not "Post Holes Dig" at this stage — a B.Sc., M.A. or anything. You want people who can relate to the people they have to look

after. This is very important in sending people out to these missions.

7.35 p.m.

I am not going to be too long, Sir. There is something I have here that I wanted to draw to the Minister's attention, and I do not want anybody to think that because I am saying what I am saying, I have any axe to grind with anybody. But as I said before, the United States is a great power, there is nobody who could deny that, and the United States is a great power down in this hemisphere, fortunately for us. I do not know of anybody who sent back anything from Russia for anybody about here.

Laughter.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Not one pair of shoes has come back from Russia for anybody about here. So we cannot fool ourselves with this thing.

But I have something to say to the Minister, and I want him to take up the point most seriously. When people from Barbados go to the American Embassy to get a visa, they submit their passport. They may be going on a legitimate vacation. For some reason or other, the officer there does not think that the person should be given a visa, and writes in your passport. My view is the only thing that should be written in a passport is when you are getting a visa of the country to enter. Nobody has any right to write anything in the back of anybody's passport. If you are not given a visa to go to the States, they should hand you back your passport and that is the end of it.

I have had this problem. This is a fact. I know what I am talking about. Many times when I went to defend people in Canada, it was because the Immigration people looked into the back of a passport and asked if the person tried to get a visa to go to the United States. The person would say 'yes, but I was refused.' This is something that I object to most strenuously, and I would like you to take up this with the American Embassy. I do not think they have the authority or the right to be writing in people's passports. If they do not give you a visa, they should hand you back your passport, because you cannot go in anyhow. A visa is for you to enter into the country, and if you do not have a visa, you cannot go in. They have no right writing in your passport. You should get back your passport, and that is the end of it.

Asides.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: I beg your pardon. I always have good points man.

Laughter.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Mr. President, I do not want to hold up the debate. I just want to get across

those few points, and I would like the Minister to take up this issue most strongly with the Americans.

Senator Shorey and Senator Tull said that they feel that because the Prime Minister had to say certain things about the President, it is going to hurt us. I do not see this, Sir. Let me tell Senator Tull this. If he looked at TV a few nights ago, he would have seen that when President Reagan went to Canada, there was a fellow dressed like a cowboy saying that he wants President Reagan to understand that he is giving the cowboys a bad name. So do you mean that they are not going to deal with Cabinet because he said so? Come on, we have got to be bigger than this, and we have to be careful when we make statements in this Chamber. The reporters are waiting for anything to write that is sensational, and tomorrow you will see big headlines that Senator Shorey said that as a result of this particular statement, the economy of Barbados has fallen. We have to be more than careful in our exuberance when we are making statements not to make these kinds of rash statements, because there is no foundation to that.

I will even go further. If the honourable Senator Tull looked at I think it was the newspapers yesterday or the day before — there is not much to look at in them anyhow — he would have seen that tourism has gone up. You were saying that somebody in the car driving and heard that this happened is not going to come. That is not true. It is true, I agree, that they can go to Europe much cheaper than they can come to Barbados. But all this is a part of the plot to destabilise us to keep us poor. Do not let us forget, as you said already, that when they do things they are not doing anything for us out of a great big heart. They are doing things not for us, but for themselves, and as a result we get some of the spill-off.

We must be more than careful, especially supposedly responsible people like Senator Tull and Senator Shorey, when making statements like this for the Press to be running out and highlighting these things. These are the things that can really hurt the economy of the country, because you have to understand that people focus just on the flash of the headline news and do not worry to read what else you went on to say. They just take that for granted from people who work on these sort of things.

With those few remarks, Mr. President, I know that we all will support this Resolution, because, as the introducer of the Resolution said, there is nothing controversial about it. But we have got to get in our little points, and I must say again I must thank Senator Tull for a most erudite speech.

ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I have taken the feelings of Senators, and it appears that four or five of us, including me, wish to make further contributions to this debate, and it is agreed among us that we should meet on another day. I believe that this also meets with the approval of the mover of the Resolution.

In the light of all of this, I beg to move that this Senate be adjourned *sine die*.

The question that the Senate do now adjourn sine die was put to the Senate and agreed to, and Mr. PRESIDENT adjourned the sitting accordingly.
7.45 p.m.

CONTENTS

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

Senator the Hon. Sir James Tudor 364

The Barbados Economic Report, 1986.

The Annual Report of the Barbados Industrial Development Corporation for the year 1985/86.

Suspension of Standing Orders 365

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION INVITING STATEMENT ON FOREIGN POLICY OF GOVERNMENT 364

Senator Wickham, 364; Senator Tudor, 368;
Senator Shorey, 374; Senator Jordan, 378;
Senator Prescod, 379; Senator Comissiong, 382;
Senator Miller, 387; Senator Eastmond, 392;

Senator Fraser, 394; Senator Tull, 397; Senator Boxill, 411.

SUSPENSION 374

ADJOURNMENT 415

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

BOXILL, N. W.
COMISSIONG, D. A.
EASTMOND, G. L.
FRASER, V. C.
JORDAN, His Hon. M. deL.
MILLER, B. A.
PRESCOD, T. A.
SHOREY, Dr. L. L.
TUDOR, Hon. Sir James
TULL, L. R.
WALCOTT, His Hon. F. L.
WICKHAM, J. C. W.