
THE SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1986 – 91

SENATE

Wednesday, March 9, 1988.

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Public Buildings on Wednesday, March 9, 1988 at 11.15 a.m.

PRESENT

His Hon. Senator M. deL. Jordan, (Deputy President);
Senator the Honourable Sir James Tudor, K.C.M.G.,
(Minister of Foreign Affairs) (Leader of the Senate);
Senator the Honourable L. V. H. Lewis, (Minister of
State for the Civil Service);
Senator A. Morrison;
Senator N. W. Boxill;
Senator V. C. Fraser, B.S.S., J.P.;
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 Reverend 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;
Senator the Honourable Dr. C. D. Clarke, (Minister of
State for Finance).

Prayers were led by Dr. the Reverend L. A. Crawford.

MOTIONS RELATING TO THE BUSINESS OF THE SENATE AND MOVED BY A MINISTER

APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. Deputy President, His Honour the President is again not in the country and therefore not in his place for this sitting. In the light of that, I have great pleasure in moving that Senator Wickham act as Chairman of Committee of the Senate for the remainder of today's sitting.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: There being no objection, Senator Wickham will be acting as the Deputy President for the remainder of today's sitting.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. Deputy President, Senators will remember that when we agreed to this day's sitting we thought mainly that we would be dealing with Private Member's Business, but I did say to members that I did not know what business, if any, would have come from the Other Place to us in the interval.

I now draw the attention of the Senate formally to the fact that there was some business transacted in the Other Place yesterday which has come to us. It is two resolutions, one in respect of an acquisition in the parish of St. George at Drax Hall, the other in respect of approving the publication of a notification declaring the abandonment of a previously acquired parcel of land.

If Senators have no objection, I should like their indulgence in dealing with these two before we settle down to Private Members' Business.

The question that the Senate deal with those two Resolutions was put to the Senate and agreed to.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I am not quite sure, Mr. Deputy President, whether I need to move the suspension of any Standing Orders to deal with these.

Aside.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I am assured from the Table that I do not.

AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION NO. 36/1986 RE LAND AT DRAX HALL, ST. GEORGE

Order No. 1 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve of the amendment to Parliamentary Resolution No. 36 of 1986 which gave approval for the compulsory acquisition by the Crown of a parcel of land at Drax Hall.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. Deputy President, it appears that in March 1986 Parliament's approval was given for the compulsory acquisition from Drax Hall Plantation of a parcel of land situate at Drax Hall, St. George, and it was intended that this land should be used for the provision of recreational facilities in that densely populated area.

Before the publication of the necessary notice which would indicate the Crown's intention to have the land vested, the owners of the property requested an adjustment to the shape of the land so that the playing field would abut the tenantry lands to the east rather than leave a narrow strip of land to be retained by the owners. In the light of that, a revised survey plan was substituted showing a slight change in the description of the parcel of land to be acquired, and therefore a change in the description of the adjacent lands.

A Resolution amending the one which was first passed was prepared for submission, and this new Resolution was based on advice given by the Attorney-General that inasmuch as the adjustment to the boundaries and the shape of the land to be acquired had resulted in the creation of an entirely different parcel of land, it was better to have a new Resolution introduced.

Before submitting the Resolution to Parliament, it appears that the appropriate Ministry, the one responsible for Sport, Employment, Labour Relations and Community Development as it then was, was in receipt of a letter from the Housing and Lands Ministry in which they were

informed that all matters dealing with the acquisition of land and property which had not been approved by Parliament before May 1986 should be submitted for the Cabinet's ratification. The proposal to ratify the acquisition was in the usual way presented to the Cabinet in 1987 by the new Ministry of Tourism and Sport.
11.25 a.m.

At the meeting of the Cabinet on November 12, 1987, the Cabinet deferred a decision of the Ministry of Housing and Lands to negotiate for the acquisition of the property by private treaty. An attempt was made a little after that to finalise the acquisition in that way, and it should be noted that up to this point negotiations regarding the sale of the property concluded with both the Crown and the owners agreeing to a certain price.

● This Resolution now seeks parliamentary approval to vest 2.326 hectares of land at Drax Hall for the purposes outlined above.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put to the Senate and agreed to.

ABANDONMENT OF LAND AT ROCKLEY, CHRIST CHURCH

Order No. 2 was called – To move the passing of a resolution to approve of the publication in the Official Gazette of a notification under section 9(1) of the Land Acquisition Act, Cap. 228 declaring the abandonment of the acquisition of certain parcels of land at Rockley in the parish of Christ Church.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Sir, in November 1981, Government completed the compulsory acquisition proceedings in respect to six parcels of land, containing a total of 5 308 metres, situated at Rockley, Christ Church. At that time, these lands were acquired for the purpose of providing a beach facility and the accommodation of beach vendors.

An offer of compensation of \$10.76 per square metre was made to the owners, and it was made on the basis that planning permission had been refused for the erection of any structure on the lands, because in the light of that decision, the land was considered to be of little value to a purchaser.

The offer was, however, refused by all the owners, and counter claims ranging for higher prices, between \$15 and \$25 per square foot, were submitted. The contention of the owners, it appeared, was that the areas of land acquired

had been severed from larger areas by Highway 7, but, nonetheless, remained valuable beach lands.

Of course, none of the owners of the properties has received compensation, and in accordance with Section 9 of the appropriate Act which provides that at any time before compensation is awarded under this Act for the compulsory acquisition of any land, the Minister may, by the appropriate notification in the *Official Gazette*, declare that the acquisition of any such land be abandoned.

It has, therefore, been decided that inasmuch as no buildings can be erected on the site, and in view of the high cost that may be involved in paying compensation to the six owners, the acquisition of these six parcels of land should be abandoned.

This Resolution seeks the Senate's approval in addition to that of the Other Place to pursue this matter in this direction.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Mr. Deputy President, I hear words from the Leader of the Senate on matters of acquisition and matters to do with compensation. I know that the Draft Estimates have been laid on this Table. Of course, they are not now being debated, but, I hope that adequate provision is going to be made in the coming Draft Estimates for the payment of compensation to persons whose property has been acquired by the Government. There is a long and very sad record in this connection.

The fact is that people in Barbados do pay their property taxes. The Commissioner of Inland Revenue collects a great deal of money, and there really cannot any longer be any excuse why persons whose property has been acquired, has been put to use, been built on and occupied over a number of years by the Government, should not be properly and adequately compensated.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I think the observation of the Senator will, certainly, strike an echoing response to this side of the House. It is an old complaint about Governments for as long as I have been a member of either of these Houses. I make the point, however, that I really do not think that there is any wickedness on the part of Governments in this respect. The machinery grinds slowly, and it is something that we all ought always to be saying, whether we are in or out of Government.

The point which the Senator made about people paying their taxes is a valid one, but, it is the only valid one. I cannot really try to tax my memory now, but I think that if I did tax my memory, I could find two or three very bad

instances of this sort of thing being complained about at any time in the last ten or 15 years.

Asides.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: We are on the same ground, and your point is all the more welcome when we do not have to take a partisan approach on this matter. It is certainly very wrong on the part of Governments to acquire land, and I have very strong feelings on this, unless they know the money is going to be there.

There may on occasions be some real reasons, usually among the lawyers, although not entirely so, why a business deal in respect of paying for land cannot be concluded. But it is not entirely their fault. The bureaucracy does rather grind slowly in some other instances, or more slowly than the legal professions, if this is possible.

The point is well taken. I will see that the Senate's views on these matters are drawn to the attention of the appropriate quarters.

While I am on my feet, let me express my obligation to the Senate for assisting with the passage of these two Resolutions.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put to the Senate and agreed to.
11.35 a.m.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION RE STATEMENT ON FOREIGN POLICY OF BARBADOS

Order No. 2 was called – To move that further consideration of a Resolution inviting a statement on the foreign policy of Barbados be resumed.

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: Mr. Deputy President, the matters before the Senate under Private Member's Business includes a Resolution dealing with Barbados' foreign policy. That Resolution was initiated by me and the debate started some time ago, so long ago, in fact, that members may not even remember that it ever took place, or remember what they had said. But the Order Paper is very helpful in this regard, in that it sets out who spoke, and we know now that the debate must be resumed, and that I, as mover of the Resolution, have the right of reply in due course.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. Deputy President, I am obliged to Senator Wickham for so

accurately reminding us of the procedure which we must follow. However, since on the occasion on which I spoke certain questions were addressed to me in my capacity as Minister of Foreign Affairs, the answers to which had been prepared and which I have updated to suit the developments which have taken place since that time, I would like the leave of the Senate to deal with those and then make a general comment on other matters.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Permission is granted to the honourable member.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Sir, Senator Shorey in his presentation had commented that the document on which the debate was virtually based, Diplomacy and Development, copies of which, I believe, all Senators have, was partisan, that it did not contain a single speech of Ministers of the former Government, and that it did not, according to him, acknowledge the contribution of that Government to the country's foreign policy.

I fear that I cannot accept the notion that the review is partisan or that it did not acknowledge the past Government's contribution to foreign policy. In that presentation, what we were aiming to do was to trace a historical evolution in as seamless a way as possible, mentioning chronology and not party, and without contributing particular decisions to one side or another.

If the honourable member looks at the sections on Regional Integration, or Grenada or the People's Republic of China, I do not see how he can claim that anything we have said in those respect has been a partisan stance. The speeches we included were only those given in the six months prior to the document's publication simply because in vital areas of those speeches there was testimony to the continuity of our foreign policy and what I like to call the seamlessness of it.

I could, if I needed to, say something about the way in which at least I see the foreign policy of Barbados, and I would like to make one of my half a dozen comments here. Every Minister of Foreign Affairs has the awful responsibility of convincing the international community that the foreign policy of his country is a rational one, and every Minister of Foreign Affairs has a particular way of doing this. It is true that sometimes on the domestic level we stake out and hold certain positions because they make good reading in the newspapers or among party faithfuls, but, actually, there is a reality far beyond that. Let me give an example. It is a reality which shows up not only between parties, but even within parties.

I think that everybody knows that the late Prime Minister had a very strong view on the Grenada episode. It was, in my judgment, a well-reasoned view, and could be

defended quite logically. But it was not exactly my position. And it was not that I had a different idea or outlook on the Bishop regime, or, indeed, on any of the events which dealt with the passage of that regime from its inception into eternity, it was simply that in the specific instance of the events which led up to the intervention, I clearly said that I supported what was being done, but I did not believe what was being said.

I did not believe, for instance, that any Governor-General had sent out a message in the dead of night to anybody. I am convinced that he did not, but I thought that under no circumstances would I wish to see Coard and Austin survive a shameful murder like that. I am all against capital punishment, and probably if I had adjudicated that end of it, I would have a different view, but certainly I felt very strongly that what was done I could approve of, but what was said about what was done was a pack of lies. You can therefore have these nuances in an issue like that.

More importantly, let me give you another instance of how foreign policy of one party meshes into the foreign policy of another, and when it does, to show you how you achieve continuity.

A country's foreign policy has to be handled, in my judgment, in the most pragmatic way. I do not think that pragmatism is the only element which should enter into it, but you have to deal with the real world and not a world that you would like to create. I know very well that, for instance, if you look at the Falklands matter in terms of 1982 to 1984, and if you look at the development of that since we have come to power, if you are facile in these matters of superficial, you will discover what you might think would be a departure and a cleavage in the foreign policy attitudes of the two Governments. That however, is not so. You need to take into account the realities of a situation at a given period.

In 1982, when Argentina attacked the Falkland Islands, Argentina was a military dictatorship, and I do not see how any Government of Barbados could refuse to align itself in that particular issue on the side of the United Kingdom. No democracy, in my judgment, could choose to align itself with a military dictatorship in an issue like that at any rate, when clear principles and the precepts of international law would have dictated another policy, and, therefore, in my judgment the Barbados Labour Party was right in the line it took then.

Since 1984, Argentina has changed its constitutional and political status and become a democracy, so when I had to deal with that problem, I could not see it as a matter between a military dictatorship and a constitutional government. I have to see it now as a matter between two democracies, and therefore I have to devise foreign policy

concepts which take into account the pragmatic difference in the two situations, and all that I have been able to do in that respect was to appeal to both countries, both friends of Barbados, to cool it, as we say, to ask them to look at their problems in the calmest and most tranquil manner, however difficult they may seem, and see what accommodation they could reach on them. This is how a country tries to mend fences or build bridges in international relations.
11.45 a.m.

In a completely different situation, where two democracies have a problem, you cannot act as you would in a situation when one is a democracy and the other is not. Not that the Government of Barbados, as at present constituted, has been congratulated by the two contenders. I believe that our stance, which is even-handed and balanced, does not entirely please the United Kingdom and does not entirely please Argentina, because, on the one hand, Argentina believes that we are still a colony of Britain and therefore our even-handedness is part of the perception which they have of us. On the other hand, Britain believes, as I understand it, that residual associations to a Commonwealth connection, long historical association, all of these things, should count with us, and that therefore when we say we are even-handed, it appears that in their judgement, they would like us to be less even-handed and to follow the line which has been taken by some of the Commonwealth Caribbean countries in this region. But we cannot do this. And this is nothing at all to do with the fact that we are locked in a contest with Argentina now for the Presidency of the UN General Assembly, it has to do with the fact that you have to conduct your foreign policy on certain realities.

Small countries like ours cannot run around the world stirring up strife. Wherever it is possible, we have to ask countries to cool it, to be reasonable with each other. We do not pretend that they can always see what we want them to see, but it is better, in our judgement, to play that sort of role than to be taking sides where our own national interest does not require us to take sides.

As I said, the British Government may not be too pleased with us. I have had to point out to them at a certain level that the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Relations conducts the Queen's foreign relations with other sovereign states on behalf of the United Kingdom and I do it on behalf of this one, and that we do not need to be in agreement, except when each of us has, or both of us have, to tender advice to the Queen, because we should not give Her Majesty conflicting advice. But in all other matters, we can take separate points of view and still serve the interest of our countries, because we each have a duty to defend the sovereign interest of our respective country. So I can quite understand why the United Kingdom Government would wish more of us in this issue,

I could understand why the Argentine Government would wish more of us in this issue, but I think the proper role for Barbados is to be pragmatic and realistic.

We had a second question from Senator Shorey expressing concern at the trade imbalance with Venezuela. I think that if he can make reference to the book, if he has a copy with him, he would notice that if a breakdown were given of the statistics on page 118, we would find that the figure is largely made up of oil imports.

Many efforts were made in the recent past to explore markets for Barbadian products in Venezuela, but the exchange of the Bolivar against our dollar makes our products uncompetitive. We are therefore concentrating on the possibilities of joint ventures with Venezuelan business and on Venezuelan investment in Barbados as alternative ways of approaching that problem, and we will, naturally, keep working at possibilities of improved trade and to encourage Venezuela to address the imbalance in a serious way. There is, however, a redeeming feature, in the sense that our oil bill from Venezuela is converted, to a certain extent, into a concessionary loan scheme, under the famous San Jose Agreement, which is currently financing projects in Barbados in the energy and housing sectors.

Members of this Chamber will, of course, be aware of the official visit paid to Barbados in July last year by the President of Venezuela. During that visit agreements were signed on bilateral co-operation against drug trafficking and on the abolition of visas for nationals holding diplomatic or official passports. A bilateral consultative committee was formed to analyse matters of interest to both countries at the bilateral, regional and global levels. Future co-operation in trade, energy, aviation and culture were discussed. There is ongoing follow-up on all of these matters.

Senators Wickham had asked for a comment on Article 8 of the OAS Charter with regard to the membership of Guyana and Belize in the Organisation of American States. Barbados played, and here I give full credit to my immediate predecessor in office, the former Senator Nigel Barrow, a significant role at the 1985 OAS General Assembly in promoting an amendment to Article 8 of the OAS Charter, which makes provision for the eventual entry of Guyana and Belize into the Organisation of American States.

Barbados' continuing support for the territorial integrity of Guyana and Belize is articulated on page 10 of the document, "Diplomacy and Development".

We also, of course, maintain excellent relations with Venezuela. Apart from the concerns which I listed a few minutes ago, it is a democratic country and we are happy with the public commitment given by Venezuela, and this

has to be noted, to seek a peaceful solution to its territorial dispute with Guyana. We are very happy with the cordial and co-operative spirit of relations which seem to exist between the two countries.

I believe I am to receive a visit shortly, maybe next month, from the distinguished Foreign Minister of Guatemala. He already knows the commitment of Barbados in respect of Belize. As we have done in other cases, we have asked the two countries to approach their problems in a spirit of goodwill, to sit down and see how they, as sovereign states, could reach accommodation with each other, and that if they reached the point at which it seemed likely that they wished to have neutral territory to bring their agreement to a conclusion, then Barbados would be happy to provide the venue for that conference when both sides have reached accommodation with each other.

11.55 a.m.

I have also said, however, that under no circumstances will Barbados be a party to any attempt by them to lay claim to the sovereign territory of Belize.

With regard to the OAS Charter, which was the specific point addressed, we have ratified the 1985 protocol amendment to the Charter, which, when everybody has ratified it, or when two-thirds of us have ratified it, would make easy the entry of Guyana and Guatemala into the Organisation of American States. But only 14 ratifications have so far been registered with the Secretary-General of OAS, and we need 21.

I have always taken upon me, whenever I am in a Latin American forum, to impress upon our Latin American brethren the necessity of preserving, or at any rate establishing, the integrity of the inter-American system by subscribing to the amendment to the Charter and thereby making it possible for Guyana and Belize to be sovereign members of the OAS. I believe that this will happen, and I do not wish to appear to be chiding them, but I am speaking in this public forum in one of the Houses of the Barbadian Parliament, and I wish them to know that Barbados will do all it can to persuade them, and will never cease trying to adhere to that protocol so that Belize and Guyana may be admitted to full membership before 1990, if possible. This country's ambassadors in Washington, Caracas, New York and wherever have received my instructions to press that point so that Latin American countries with whom we are very friendly will know from us that Barbados does feel that there is something lacking in the solidarity of the inter-American system if they continue to drag their feet in this regard.

Sir, you had also asked, what plans does the Government contemplate with regard to improving its diplomatic relations with Suriname and Haiti? In respect to

Suriname, we are extremely encouraged by recent developments there, including the holding of elections in November 1987 and the restoration of democratic government under President Shankar, who was installed in January this year. Indeed, we had accepted an invitation to observe the November elections and we were officially represented by a Member of Parliament in the Other Place and the Chief Electoral Officer, Mr. Dennis Smith. Prime Minister Sandiford has also sent a message to the new President welcoming the return to democracy and looking forward to closer ties. We also let them know that there is an ongoing desire on the part of Barbados to develop substantive relations with the new Government, and, of course, we sent that message to President Shankar when we were represented at the inauguration ceremony of the new president by Ambassador Brazane Babb, who, though Permanent Secretary to the Prime Minister, still retains the creditation as the Ambassador to Suriname.

I am currently looking at ways in which relations, particularly economic and cultural relations, between Barbados and Suriname can be strengthened. We will be putting proposals to Cabinet in the near future in this respect, and in due course I will be able to tell the Senate how we have done this.

In respect of Haiti, the position is well-known. When this question was asked of me, however, in 1986, less than a year ago, I do not think the results which we have seen in the ensuing months could have been foreseen. This was at a time when I believe, the Constitution had been approved by the referendum and we were all of us looking forward to the fruition of democratic structures in that country. This has proved, unhappily, not yet to be the case.

We have set out our position and I want to make it clear here. I was a bit, quite frankly, pained a few weeks ago during the so-called public debate on Haiti because of the misconceptions which appeared, in my judgment, to exist in the policy of the Barbados Government. I say "misconceptions", because a lot of the citizens of our country do not always understand how foreign policy positions are arrived at and how the foreign policy, particularly of Barbados – I do not know about other countries – is generated.

Let me just make it clear. There is no sense in which a Government of Barbados could be so constituted that the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Prime Minister of the country were not *ad idem* on a foreign policy issue. I have had opportunity since I have been back into office on this occasion, and I find no record, even given the preceding ten years before our re-entry, of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs not being *ad idem* on a policy matter. Therefore, it is customary in this Government, when I was Foreign Minister after 1972 and since I have come

back in, for me and whoever is the Prime Minister, the recent one as well as this one, to have almost a daily consultation on foreign policy matters.

It is not clearly understood in this country that the real conduct of the foreign policy of the country is an executive function of the Crown, and in that case the Crown is represented by the Head of Government. The Minister of Foreign Affairs executes, conceives, but he does not on his own determine, and no Minister of Foreign Affairs in any country, I would think, should develop a foreign policy position if he is not certain that his Head of Government is not *ad idem* with him.

I can truthfully say for the two Prime Ministers I have served with that I have never had a difference with them on foreign policy positions and that both of them have been kind enough to rely on my judgment. This is extremely flattering, and all the more reason I try to put positions before them which can clearly be enunciated by them, because that is where the buck stops. If a Minister of Foreign Affairs were to mislead his Head of Government, or to lead his Head of Government into a foreign policy position which the Minister was not prepared to support and defend, he should give up office, because the consequences of misleading a Head of Government on a foreign policy issue would be far too calamitous even to contemplate.

I state unequivocally and fiercely that at no time did Mr. Sandiford and I not have complete and total agreement on all the foreign policy positions we enunciated. It was my duty, however, to make the day-to-day pronouncements and to monitor the situation in Haiti as it opened out. It was his duty – at the appropriate time, upon my advice – to make what pronouncements I thought the Head of Government should make.

12.05 p.m.

I do not tell the Senate this as any extenuation of anything, because I do not think there are any such circumstances, but since there may be a public perception that we were speaking with different voices, I wish to say it was not so. I would have been quite happy for him to have enunciated all the positions that we had reached, but he thought that some of the things that needed to be said should be said by the person who was the daily practitioner, so to speak, and that when definitive statements had to be made on behalf of the sovereign state of Barbados, it was better – and I agreed with him – that he should make them on that issue.

As we have said, we bear no ill will towards the people of Haiti, and certainly no ill will towards its Government, but we do not find it possible for us, at least at this stage, and until the Haitian people and whatever regime they have managed to show some convincing step in

the direction of democratic procedures, to change our position. We are not here pronouncing judgment on them, but we think that certainly those who say that they are interested in the well-being of the Haitian people – and I know that they are, and I want to pay compliment to Senator Miller for the unremitting interest she has paid in this matter – those who say that they have this uppermost in their minds cannot surely criticise us for saying that we stand on these particular principles and that you could have, with our support, if the effort had not been interrupted, been well on the way to a democratic society, anyway taking the first steps, and we will just watch your situation before we pronounce final judgment.

I think that a sovereign state is entitled not to follow the pack in certain matters, and we felt that not only our own judgment, but the judgments of the people of this country wanted us to pursue a certain line, and we have done so. But in this respect, realistically, we cannot entirely break off contact with Haiti, simply because if you are in the United Nations and another state is also a sovereign member of that body, on that level you must have some sort of bilateral contact. If you are in the Organisation of American States, or in some other regional body, and that state is also a member, there has to be contact at a certain level. It is in bilateral matters that you can take the judgment which we have taken, and that is the judgment we have taken. So there is no question but that we will maintain an interest in Haiti's development and would hold ourselves ready at the appropriate time, after we have looked at their situation, to help them on in the democratic process.

The Senate may wish to hear, if they have not already heard it, that when Prime Minister Barrow was in Miami, I think it was in November 1986, he in my presence spoke with General Namphy and he asked General Namphy how did the General think that Barbados could help Haiti in the peculiar situation in which they then found themselves. The General said that because of Barbados' history and long exposure to constitutional procedures, they would welcome any expertise we could place at their disposal in respect of management of elections and the statistical work connected with it, registration of voters and that kind of thing. Mr. Barrow said to him, "Well, if this is what you think we can help you with, please send your people and we will make every facility available to them."

At no time were we asked by General Namphy to honour Mr. Barrow's pledge, although I had made that known to Haitian officials where I had met them all through last year, and I had instructed our ambassadors to let them know this. But there was no overture.

I suppose that they, for reasons – I do not know, probably what the French call *amour propre*, self-respect –

wanted to get through with their own arrangements themselves. And it would appear that they had gone some considerable distance in being successful in that, because there was nothing wrong, as far as I know, with the elections in which the referendum was approved, and they appeared to be on their way until they was the outbreak of violence in a number of constituencies, or precincts, or whatever they were called, on November 29. Voting took place in the rest of the country without event, so my information goes, so it seemed to me that the country was well on the way to establishing democratic procedures.

What was required in that lamentable event was that the army, which then, and probably is now, was the sole source of raw power in the country, should have intervened on that day to restore order and to have allowed the voting to resume. In most other countries, if an election were going on and in only a tiny minority of electoral districts it appeared that people were prevented from being allowed to vote or whatever, I would think that there would be a solid attempt by the army, or whoever controlled the forces, to make sure that the will of the people was safeguarded and that the election could take place without any trouble. This was not done, and I wondered why the Haitian authorities did not take that option. There have never been any convincing reasons for that dereliction of an obvious duty on the part of those who held the power and authority to restore order.

We are leaving Haiti where it is for the moment. We are watching it very carefully and we are not interfering, but at the same time we are not hindering. Anything that Barbados could do on the multilateral side, I suppose, that would make their situation better, we would be prepared to do it. But certainly one-to-one, daily contact between the two countries cannot exist because of the reasons which I have given.

I have several things to say about the Presidency of the General Assembly, for which an election will take place this year. I think the most important thing that I would like public opinion in Barbados to catch on to is that we do not regard our search for this national distinction, as it would be to us, as in any way, except in the incidence of history, a Barbadian enterprise. What we are going after is vaster than can be encompassed within the narrow terms of nationalistic pride or anything like that.

We have a candidate who certainly is a distinguished citizen of our country, of tremendous international prestige. She is the candidate that any country would be proud to offer as that country's contribution to international peace, co-operation, security and otherwise. In other words, if Dame Nita, with that background and experience, was a distinguished citizen of the Argentine Republic and had the range of activities, distinctions and opportunities which she

has, any Government of Barbados would have been happy to support her in that quest. If, therefore, I ask the Government of the Argentine Republic to join a consensus and, therefore, let us proceed to the presidency without contention, I am not doing this because I am the Foreign Minister of Barbados, I am doing this because there has to be something said for the contribution which small states make in the international arena.

12.15 p.m.

Our judgement is that the small countries of the United Nations system have potential which large countries do not always give them credit for, that they are able, despite the overwhelming odds of poor resource bases, small populations, hardly any viable economies to speak of, with all of those disadvantages, to make a fundamental contribution to international peace and security. In order to further that potential, we offered our candidature, and we were immensely flattered at the initial reception of our candidature, which has grown, particularly since we have had the CARICOM consensus.

I must tell Senators that I would be misleading you if I did not tell you that I had a lot of misgivings in the course of the last year or so, when I saw that we were likely to have some difficulty in arriving at a CARICOM consensus. Then, it suddenly occurred to me that what is now, happily, no longer a difficulty, was in a very real sense, something of which the Caribbean should be proud, the fact that within 12 territories as small as ours are, 4 million people could produce three candidates, any one of whom could have fulfilled the high expectations usually associated with the presidency of the United Nations General Assembly. Therefore, I believe that there was a perception in the international arena that a small area like the Commonwealth Caribbean, which could at one and the same time offer three candidates, was a region, or a sub-region, to be reckoned with, and was a part of the world which had a distinct part to play in its contribution to world peace and international security.

I would like to publicly thank the Government of the Bahamas and the Government of Jamaica for taking their candidates out, not with any rancour, or with any sense of disappointment, because their candidates were, and are, persons of great distinction, but because they sensed that in Dame Nita, they, too, would be putting forward a candidate worthy of their distinction. On her behalf, I wish publicly to express the appreciation of the Government and the people of Barbados to the Governments of Jamaica and the Bahamas for this gesture. They have done this without bargaining with us, but since in these matters one knows instinctively that other people do not do things merely for the love of doing them, although, in this case, I think it was for the love more than anything else, we stand ready to

advance the foreign policy interests of Jamaica and the Government of the Bahamas in any way we can.

I believe that the Bahamas has intimated to the international community that they are interested in seeking a seat on the Security Council. In the light of that belief, I have instructed all of our ambassadors to join the canvass of the Bahamian candidate, whoever it is, so that the full weight of Barbados, and, hopefully, the rest of the Caribbean, will be put into that struggle, if it is a struggle, for the Government and people of the Bahamas. We must help one another in this respect.

Recently, we sent off the former Ambassador to Washington, Dr. Peter Laurie, who has just returned from New York, and I am pleased to tell you that the results of his soundings have been extremely positive. This campaign is now the No. 1 priority of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, if there is such a thing as a No. 1 priority. But it is No. 1 not, I must stress, for narrow national interest, but because of what it signifies to the Caribbean region for the future of the hemispheric relations among us, and for the role of the small, moderate states in the international community.

The presidency of the United National General Assembly has been held by the Latin American and Caribbean group nine times in the history of the United Nations, but never once by a Commonwealth Caribbean national, and never by a woman of our region.

Actually, two ladies have held the distinction of being Presidents of the General Assembly before, and both of them are alive. One of them is a very old lady now, a Mrs. Pandit who is the sister of the late Prime Minister of India, Pandit Nehru, and is the great-aunt of the present Prime Minister Mr. Rajiv Gandhi. The second one is the former Ambassador Angie Brooks of Liberia. It is certainly time for another lady now, and Dame Nita is an exceptional candidate and represents, we are happy to note, the entire Caribbean region.

Caribbean Governments, therefore, feel strongly that we have proved ourselves as mature and responsible democracies and that we consistently display a constructive and moderate approach to regional and world issues. I say for Barbados that we have invested a lot of energy and patient diplomacy in building bridges to overcome the historical, cultural, linguistic and other differences which separate us from our neighbours, and we throw out this invitation to our Latin friends, and we feel there can be no more fitting tribute to our efforts and those of our Caribbean partners than to have Dame Nita's candidature endorsed by all 33 member states of our regional grouping as our sole candidate of this region for this year's post.

12.25 p.m.

I must explain to the Senate how this thing goes. There are five regions in the world into which the United Nations Organisation is divided. There is Asia, Africa, Western Europe, Eastern Europe, and this one, the Western Hemisphere, although I suppose that Canada would be counted in Western Europe. Each region takes it by turn, and the drill is that you arrive at consensus within a region and the region says that Mr. X or Miss Y, Ambassador X or Y, or Foreign Minister X or Y, is our candidate through prior agreement. The sitting turn is being held by the East European region, and the Deputy Foreign Minister of East Germany is the current President. When it comes to our region, as it will from September, it is in respect of our turn that Barbados and the CARICOM states have offered Dame Nita's candidature as the whole Latin American candidate.

I have sent a message to the Foreign Minister of Argentina, and our relationships are extremely good. He is not going to beat me, I can tell you that, but I thought that there are certain perceptions of this matter which need to be kept in the forefront of the minds of policy makers in Latin America, people who have to make this kind of decision. One such perception is that the integrity of the whole inter-American system may well be at stake here, because this is the best chance for countries in Latin America to prove that they regard the English-speaking Caribbean as an integral part of the system.

About 18 months ago, I had the honour to represent this country at an OAS General Assembly in Guatemala. As a matter of fact, that experience was a catalyst in many respects, in that, in the first place, and so far as I am concerned perhaps the most important aspect of that experience, it clarified in my own mind this whole problem of the suspicions which are held by Latins of the English-speaking Caribbean. I do not want to go into the story now, but at one point at that conference it became clear that the Latins believed that they could not trust us with what they regarded as their particular concerns, and that they had to go off, figuratively speaking, of course, into a tent, consult by themselves and hold each other's hands because they could not trust us to understand the concerns of the region. Unfortunately, as ill luck would have it, it happened to be the same person who is still Foreign Minister of Argentina who brought this issue to a head, because in a presentation which he made, it came through to us that he was in fact saying on the Malvinas matter that there had to be total solidarity among the Latins, yet he was saying this in an Assembly which included about half a dozen English speaking states.

I felt that I needed to challenge that, but I discovered quite soon that the misconception was based on a bad perception of a historical reality. Sometimes when Latins speak, particularly when they speak among themselves, one

gets the impression that they still believe that people of this country, or Trinidad and Tobago, of Jamaica and, generally speaking, all of us in the English speaking Caribbean are still colonies of the United Kingdom. They understand if you explain it to them with their minds. If you explain the constitutional realities of this country or of any others in this region, intellectually they grasp it, but emotionally they do not, and I think the reason for that is that their experience of the break up of the Spanish Empire and the independence movement in Latin America has been totally different from ours. They had to fight for theirs, and, therefore, historically, they do see independence as a separation of nationalism, that having broken from Spain they have broken from Europe, except for the cultural affiliations which still exists, and that they understand by an independent country, a country which is necessarily a republic.

I patiently explained to them that the fact that some of the countries of the Caribbean are republics and some are monarchies is largely a result of the peculiar circumstances arising at a given time when independence was negotiated. In the case of Barbados, I told them that I certainly do not think that this is an issue of controversy with us, although people may have very strong feelings about the monarchy and some may have strong feelings against, that, in any case, the constitutional and political realities are that we are a sovereign state and that to more than all intents and purposes, and in no circumstances except in those cases where we specifically ask the Queen to perform certain constitutional functions on our behalf, the Government of Barbados governs by the will of the people of Barbados and that is our system, and therefore the foreign policy of the Government of Barbados has nothing at all to do with the foreign policy objects of the United Kingdom, except when they are looked at in their merit.

In the course of that discussion, I had to make the position of the English-speaking states of the Caribbean abundantly clear in a speech which I made, part of which, a very short part, I wish to read to the Senate so that they can know what our views are in this respect:

"Let no one doubt, Mr. Chairman, the sincerity and the interest of the Caribbean States in this matter of solidarity in this Organisation. It is, I know, still fashionable in some quarters, especially among those which mold public opinion in Latin America, to misunderstand the role of the Caribbean peoples in the Latin American system. It is claimed, for example, that our peoples are not truly sovereign, and that we can have no true appreciation of the anxieties which face our Hispanic and Latin brothers, and that we, for this reason, are unreliable partners.

"Of course, Mr. Chairman, we of the Caribbean do not discover this distortion of our position among those with

whom we frequently negotiate. Indeed, if we had had this experience, or if we had had this misconception taking root among the member states of this Organisation before the 1960s, none of it exists now, and certainly if it had been so, none of the English-speaking sovereign states would have been admitted as free and equal partners to the membership of this Organisation. We are here because we are sovereign states, and as such are not dependencies of the United Kingdom.

"Sir, had the histories of all our States been identical, then the misconceptions about our status could not arise, simply because we would all have inherited a shared experience. As it is, the Spanish and the Portuguese and the French empires came to an end before the British Empire, and Great Britain was able to profit from the experiences of Spain and Portugal and France. Independence which comes from negotiation and independence which is gained by the sword are the same in quality and no peoples are less sovereign than any other because of the difference about the way which independence has been achieved."

12.35 p.m.

I had had to make that clear. I said that to wind up this aspect of my presentation. I hope that I am wearying the Senate.

This campaign has taken a very interesting turn. It is my judgement, although I do not wish to breed complacency among any of us – we still have a lot of work to do – that we are not doing badly in our search for the presidency. I put it no higher than this.

The realities of this matter are these. First of all, if you look at the size of Barbados and you look at the size of Argentina, and it was size, importance, per capita, wealth, land space or whatever, obviously nobody would take a country like ours seriously. But that is not the case, and some of us here who are politicians may share this experience with those of us who are not.

All of us know how well we are doing in a campaign by the shifts, the changes in what your opponent says about you. When this campaign started, they ran about the corridors of the United Nations saying that we could not be taken seriously because three countries from the same region are running. We cleared that one up. Then, when Dame Nita's candidacy then took on what, in the judgement of some, was a more serious aspect, they devised a series of propaganda ploys to meet the new situation. One of them was that we are too small a country to be able to serve the presidency.

It is true that the state which has the honour of being elected to the presidency does have certain responsibilities,

but they are not beyond the competence of a Government of Barbados to provide. If, for instance, it is sending extra people up for the year that she is there to service the Barbados Mission and also to service the presidency, we will do this. I am sure that when we ask Parliament to make the necessary provision, because the honour would be great enough that no one in this country would consider extra resources required as being badly spent or badly apportioned, it will get the approval of members.

So they started to say that we could not service the presidency. When we knocked that one out and the recent upsurge came up between the United Kingdom and the Argentine Government in respect of the war ships which Britain proposes to send down in a few weeks time, they said that we were a client of the United Kingdom, that the battle was between Argentina and Britain and we were only fronting for Britain. I do not choose to regard that as an insult to my country, because even in the middle of a battle you have to keep a cool head, so I am not going to draw swords over that. I think that, objectively, all that Barbados has said at any time since it has been a sovereign state certifies that we are a sovereign state and that I do not need to answer it.

The last thing is that they have hit upon what, in a sense, is the most flattering reason that you could give for not wanting to support Barbados, if you were fighting against Barbados. It is that Barbados is renowned for the purity of its constitutional arrangements and that Barbados would gain nothing from the presidency, because we are already a recognised democracy, but that Argentina is a struggling one and needs to have its self-confidence boosted by the presidency. All of us here who have run for election know that when the opponent starts to say, "Do not give it to him, he does not need it," he is really saying that he is not going to get it. That is what he is saying.

But I do not want to stir complacency. I am immensely grateful for the national support which this candidature has got and is getting. There is no hint of any partisan flavour about it. Dame Nita is regarded as an international figure of great renown and we would obviously all be pleased when she succeeds. But at the same time, it is the business of all of us to make sure that she succeeds.

All I would ask, therefore, of the people of Barbados in this respect is that in the next few months we let nothing happen, to the extent that we can prevent it, in this country which would make it appear that we are less than what we are thought to be, or to damage the high regard in which our country is held. And that whenever we go abroad, at whatever level of travel or activity, we would consider it our patriotic duty on behalf of the whole region, and I want to stress this, not only on behalf of Barbados but on behalf

of the whole region, to make Dame Nita's candidacy an object of discussion and interest in whatever circles we move.

In recent weeks, whenever I have spoken with Latin American ambassadors, I have repeated that I believe that the test is more for them than it is for us, in that it may well be that this is the one opportunity they will probably ever have of showing that we are fully integrated into the Latin American system. Therefore, I have advised them that the best service they could render to the Latin American system would be to use their good offices with the Government of Argentina to persuade Argentina that it has most to gain from joining this consensus.

We are not fighting them because we are one country and they are another. We wish small countries of the developing world to be able to play some part on the world stage. We wish Barbados to play its part, but we do not insist that the Barbadian aspect of it is the most important. We wish to show solidarity within the region, and, I appeal from this Chamber to our Latin American friends that the easiest way for them to show that they take the Inter-American system seriously would be to persuade our colleagues of Argentina, for whom we have the highest regard, to join the consensus in respect of Dame Nita.

I do not know that I could say anything more than this, except to tell the Senate that in the bilateral relations which we have with Argentina, which are very good, Argentina has immensely flattered us and has underlined their own serious perception of the importance of this region to the inter-American system by accrediting a resident ambassador to our country.

12.45 p.m.

We were very happy to receive her, and it does seem to me odd that they should entrust such an important mission in the Eastern Caribbean to a lady and balk on us at entrusting the presidency of the United Nations General Assembly to a lady. There is something there.

I sent to tell the Foreign Minister that it is true of course, that, inadvertently, when I was addressing the General Assembly last November, he was not in his place for my speech, although I was in my place for his. But that was sheer inadvertency. He explained it to me in a way that I can understand. He said that he does not usually listen to speeches from a British delegate, which I thought was very funny, but then I realised, of course, he was not pulling my leg, since the British ambassador spoke after I did. I think he wanted to get out of the way before the British Ambassador spoke and the reference was not to me as a British delegate, and he wanted just to be clear.

I have sent to tell him that I leave it entirely to him to arrive at the clearest perception of the realities of this situation. My friend and predecessor over there will understand the diplomatic language. I have told the Foreign Minister that whenever he has the clearest perception of the realities of that situation, and, therefore, wishes Argentina to adhere to the consensus which is now raging all over the international arena, I would like him to have the honour and the prestige of announcing it himself.

Laughter

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: This is what I have sent to him and I cannot put it clearer than that. I could undertake to announce it, but that would be quite improper. I would like him to be able to say that his country is throwing its support behind Dame Nita.

We will continue to work, and work very hard. I thought I would let the Senate know how we are progressing and what we are doing. I do not think it a bad thing – I believe we may have to break in a minute – that this debate is taking place.

I want to congratulate all who have spoken on the absolute lack of rancour or bitterness. I think that the foreign policy of the country ought always to be conducted on this plane. I am immensely happy about it.

I am more than happy to be serving the people of Barbados at this particular juncture. There are some people who say I should go home.

Asides.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: No, no, it is not. Not even the signet sound which is a young swan.

Laughter.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I am immensely flattered to be the servant of the people of Barbados at this juncture of their history, and I invite my fellow countrymen to assist me in conducting the foreign policy of the country, by their criticisms when necessary, but certainly at all times by their support and understanding.

Thank you, Sir.

Applause.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Mr. Deputy President, I know that I have already spoken in this debate, but I rise to crave your indulgence.

Like the Leader of the Senate, I am glad that this debate on foreign policy has taken place. But it is unfortunate that we find ourselves today on March 9, 1988 in the midst of foreign policy debate and members of the Senate last spoke on April 15, 1987. Between April 15, 1987 and today, many matters which were alluded to by the Leader of the Senate have intervened, and Members who have already spoken would not have had an opportunity, obviously, to have addressed those matters.

I crave leave on my own behalf, and, perhaps, on behalf of other Senators who may wish to speak a second time in this debate.

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: Mr. Deputy President, as mover of the Resolution on the foreign policy of Government, I feel that Senator Miller's request is reasonable.

I, therefore, would like to move on this occasion the suspension of the relevant Standing Orders, which are 31(3) and 31(4).

My motion would need to be seconded.

SENATOR P. Y. FORDE: I second that.

The question that the relevant Standing Orders be now suspended was put to the Senate and agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I was wondering, Sir, I do not know, if the Senate wants to break now?

Asides.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: All right.

I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 2 o'clock.

Sir, we might consider that I may need to respond to something which arises out of the debate, I do not know, if necessary.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: This sitting is now suspended for one hour.
12.55 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The sitting is now resumed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS (CONT'D)

FOREIGN POLICY DEBATE (RESUMED)

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Mr. Deputy President, I am really very much obliged for the opportunity to say just a few words. As I said, many matters would have intervened, matters referred to by the Leader of the Senate, between April 15 last year and today.

I listened with interest to the Foreign Minister when he was at such great pains earlier today to point out that it is important for a Foreign Minister to be *ad idem* with his Prime Minister on matters of foreign policy, that, in fact, foreign policy is really, in a matter of speaking, the province of the Chief of the Executive more than it is that of the Foreign Minister, and that, in effect, in Barbados the Foreign Minister is more in the nature of a Foreign Secretary, as Foreign Secretary is understood in other jurisdictions.

I was particularly interested to hear the Leader of the Senate make this point about being *ad idem* with one's Prime Minister, because I must say that in the intervening time of almost a year now, Barbados has not exactly, in my opinion, and I believe in the opinion of many right-thinking Barbadians, distinguished itself in the matter of foreign affairs, and particularly on those matters on which you would expect the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister to be *ad idem*. I have the greatest respect for the present Foreign Minister, and I hope he remains Foreign Minister for longer than we have been led to believe that he may, but the Prime Minister's adventures out the waters of foreign relations have not been happy ones.

On the matter of the U.N. presidency, speaking for my colleague, Senator Tull, and I, who sit on this side, I do not think it can be in any question that our support would unreservedly be given to Dame Nita Barrow in her quest for the presidency of the United Nations. After all, it was our Administration that made her a Dame, that recognised at the highest possible level the contribution which she has made, and which she continues to make, to Barbados. Our support is without question.

It did concern me, and I am sure I have said in this Chamber before, Mr. Deputy President, that I was deeply embarrassed as a Barbadian at the way in which the Head of the African National Congress, Mr. Oliver Tambo, was treated by the Barbados Government.

Reference was made to the visit of President Lusinchi of Venezuela last year. He is an outgoing President; Carlos Andres Perez is *de facto* President of Venezuela even today. They both represent a party with which Barbados has had a good relationship, but I did not think at the time, and I

believe that other Barbadians shared my view, that President Lusinchi's visit should have taken precedence over Mr. Tambo's visit, or needed to have taken precedence. There was no reason why even at the time of a by-election we could not have accommodated both persons.

There is the feeling that a snub was offered to Mr. Oliver Tambo – and do not let us be in any doubt as to the esteem in which Mr. Tambo is held in international circles, especially at a time now when there are two films – "Mandela" and "Cry Freedom" – which do much to enhance the cause of the ANC. I do not think it can be argued that, in effect, we did offer an insult at the highest possible level to Mr. Oliver Tambo, and I really ask, what is the position with the African-Arab vote in respect of the U.N. presidency? I believe that Dame Nita was off canvassing, in very recent times, the African vote, but I know that some African countries did take umbrage at the way that we declined to receive Oliver Tambo in Barbados, and we still have not received him, even though the Foreign Minister later gave us the assurance that he will again be invited.

It was a source of embarrassment, and it was felt to be an embarrassment that was offered by the Prime Minister. There are times when some of us wonder whether the Foreign Minister is giving bad advice to the Prime Minister, or the Prime Minister is really receiving quite good advice, but declining to accept it. All of this is pertinent, too, when we hear the rumours, and I speak freely, that the Foreign Minister may, in fact, very soon be demitting the Foreign Ministry.

Again, in CARICOM matters, our recent forays made by the Prime Minister have been nothing short of disastrous. I wonder if the Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister were *ad idem* on a proposal which the Prime Minister put to a CARICOM Heads of Government meeting in St. Lucia, and which was promptly stamped on in the most insulting manner by the Prime Minister of Jamaica.

I do not think I need to go into any detail on our dealings with Haiti. Our response has been a weak one. Our whole stance at the Heywoods meeting is now history, but embarrassed history for us, and that was another time when Barbadians wondered whether the Prime Minister was taking the advice of his Foreign Minister, or taking his own advice, or the advice of somebody who had no knowledge or experience of foreign relations.

Secondly, the most recent in a string of foreign relations boo-boos happened just two days ago in Dominica. I, as a Barbadian, Mr. Deputy President, take great exception to the Prime Minister, the Foreign Minister or anybody, and particularly a Barbadian, suggesting that

Barbados is inferior to Dominica or any other country in the Caribbean in any form or fashion. I take great exception to Barbados being described as an LDC in any form or fashion. I do not think that we need to patronise the countries which are, in fact, the LDCs, the lesser developed countries, of the Caribbean. We do not need to patronise St. Vincent – and I name some of them deliberately – we do not need to patronise Montserrat, we do not need to patronise St. Lucia, and certainly not Dominica. I do not think that that should be the style of our foreign relationships within CARICOM, and I am being generous when I use the word "patronise". I am careful not to use the words like "humiliate" and "insult". We do not need to patronise the lesser developed countries of the Caribbean by beating our breast when we are specially-invited guests in one of those countries and by screaming at the top of our lungs that Barbados is an LDC and is inferior to Dominica in so many particulars. I take grave exception to it, and I begin to wonder what kind of foreign policy advice, certainly in respect of CARICOM, the Prime Minister is taking, or if, in fact, he is taking any at all.

I, along with other Barbadians, would very much want to hear the Foreign Minister on this, because I repeat, there are certain matters of high foreign policy principle on which the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister must be *ad idem*, especially in a small state like ours. I very much want to hope that the Foreign Minister would use the privilege of a second speech which now lies within his grasp to answer some of these questions, and I suspect that other Senators will ask other questions.

I am very concerned about our status now within CARICOM, particularly with the LDCs, and in respect of the OECS unity movement. We may not hear a lot of it debated, but I am up and down the islands a lot, and the matter of unity is perhaps the hottest issue in the OECS today. I would be interested to know where the Barbados Government sees Barbados in all of this.

Under a Barbados Labour Party Government, there could never have been any doubt. We could go back to the Sixties and remember the role that Barbados might have played in a Little Eight grouping. Right down through the years until this day, the stance that we have taken in the Barbados Labour Party in respect of our relationship with the OECS is without doubt and without question. It is so clearly stated. We always have been the champions of the beacon of the integration movement of CARICOM and all that goes with it, particularly in the case of Prime Minister St. John when he was Prime Minister.

The Democratic Labour Party mouths a great deal. I think, perhaps, they take too much on to themselves as a party, kudos that properly rightly belong to Mr. Barrow as a person in respect of the role that he played in CARIFTA

and, later, in CARICOM. The Democratic Labour Party has not been the party of the integration movement in the Caribbean in the fullest sense of the word, in the context in which I am addressing it today, and I am interested to know the situation today.

This is supposed to be a major debate on foreign policy, and the Foreign Minister, in my view, in his reply so far, has not addressed these matters. This is critical to us, because what is happening in the manufacturing, industrial and even tourism sectors in Barbados, when we consider that there has been a remarkable fall-off in tourists coming from CARICOM countries to Barbados, is of vital interest to us. So I think that this country needs to be told by a person of no less a status than the Foreign Minister exactly what is the Government's position in respect of the MDCs of this region – and in this context I insist that Barbados is a MDC – and with the LDCs and the OECS countries in particular.

I will not press the Government on Haiti. I believe that the Government is still in a state of great confusion about Haiti, I believe that the Government is still in a great state of ignorance about what happens on the ground in Haiti, so I am not going to press that. But it really is a matter of very great concern to me. I see that the upshot of the Heywoods Conference is that the Governments of the Caribbean are intent – and that is the import of their declaration, or whatever they called it, that they put out on Haiti – that each should be able to do his own thing, and so does each do. So it is not so much that I want to press for a statement on that, but I really would like to know what is the real truth about our relationship in CARICOM and about the status of the U.N. presidency as well.

It is all right to beat our breast and say that we are going to beat Argentina within this region. It is true it is this region's turn, but Dame Nita's presidency is not going to make a lot of distance if we do not secure the support of other blocs as well, so it is not only our Latin friends that we have to persuade. We have to be sure, as we say, that we are sure that within the Caribbean we have the Caribbean vote. We have to be sure that from the other big regions, we have the vote as well, and the African-Arab vote has always been important to us, and I wonder if we have not embarrassed it into, perhaps, abstention, if not non-support. I would be very interested to know because it is important, not only to Barbadians but to this region, that Dame Nita's nomination should meet with success.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy President.

SENATOR J. S. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy President, from my recollection of the debate on this that took place some ten or 11 months ago, it seemed to me that the thrust

was mainly political and strategic. It was a very, very interesting debate, and I, certainly, learned very much from it.

I am not going to try and evaluate our foreign policy over the years. I really do not feel qualified to do so. I do believe, however, that it has been based on high principles and that it has been pragmatic. Regardless of which party was in power, I think that theme runs throughout since our Independence.

But I see foreign policy as more than just strategic and political, even though that is very important. I think there is an economic dimension, and it is to that that I would like to offer a few remarks.

I would like to submit some thoughts on how our Foreign Service could possibly be made more effective, even though I admit at the same time that I know very little about how the Foreign Service is structured, and how they recruit and train. That aside, it may be useful if I made some remarks that may be helpful in seeing economic and national development as one of the key components of our foreign policy.

I wonder to what extent new recruits within the Foreign Service have a basic training in economics. I wonder whether a requirement in at least one foreign language, preferably Spanish or French, is mandatory. I am wondering how we consider the person's background, education and temperament so that that person would be at ease when he represents us in metropolitan centres. That may sound snobbish, but it is not intended to be.

I suggest that before anyone is posted to a Foreign Mission, he should have studied International Relations for at least one or two years, have a posting within the Foreign Service here, for possibly another two years, and after that possibly have a secondment in one of our Economic Ministries, whether it be the Ministry of Trade and Industry, Agriculture or Tourism. I say all this – and we will be debating the Appropriation Bill later on – because when we look at the need for investment, the need to develop tourism, agriculture and industry, the need to reduce unemployment, it seems to me that this economic dimension is very important and very critical as part of our foreign policy.

I am wondering whether when persons are posted abroad in the mission they have a very clear idea of the objectives and the programmes of the Industrial Development Corporation, Export Promotion Corporation and Board of Tourism, and what it is we are trying to do to develop our agricultural exports and offshore financial services. These are our ambassadors abroad, they will be meeting very key people and would be able to explain and

influence and, hopefully, persuade some of those people to assist us with our economic development. It may be helpful if some of these same persons who are posted abroad spent some time, if not in an economic Ministry, with the IDC or the Export Promotion Corporation.

I say all this, Mr. Deputy President, because, looking ahead, we cannot take economic development for granted. We have done pretty well so far, but the signs are not propitious, and, therefore, anything that can be done will be welcome. As this debate is centred on the Foreign Service, I am urging that if some of these things have not already been done, or have not been considered, that consideration be given to some of these thoughts, and other thoughts that are related, to see how our Foreign Service could become a very important arm of our economic development.

Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy President.
2.20 p.m.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator would be offended if I say that some of his remarks were, quite frankly, political, although no less legitimate for that reason. For instance, the comments made on the relationship between the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Head of Government, I find were fishing comments, and I appreciate them as such.

None of the scenarios which impliedly come from our questions can be applied to this situation. It is fashionable in some quarters to pretend that Mr. Sandiford has just come out of the woodwork and that he has no experience of anything at all. Yet, the same people, a little less than two years ago, were saying, "Why doesn't Mr. Barrow go home, because he is too old, and let that nice, clever, well-educated gentleman take over the Government."

(*Aside:* SENATOR B. A. MILLER: They weren't talking about Mr. Sandiford, they were talking about you.)

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Flattery will get you nowhere. Funnily enough, it goes to show how unfit I would be for the position, because I did not even know you were talking about me. But you used to say, "Why doesn't that old man go home and let that clever, well educated, Barbados Scholar, brilliant, young man take over the country and run it and he would get everybody around him to support him? The brilliant, young, educated man is still the same person, a bit older than when you said it, it is true, even younger than the one who is now trying to be Prime Minister, I mean on your side, but this is how our system works. We must pull each other's legs and make good-natured fun on these matters, but I do not think that I need really to stress that Mr. Sandiford is more than equal to the tasks which, by the will of God, descended on him,

as I think the country should have very great reason to know in the coming months.

The Senator did ask some specific questions, including one about Mr. Tambo. I think she is mistaken in ascribing to us some want of sensitivity in this matter. We thought that the best possible atmosphere in which this country could receive a visit from Mr. Tambo would be a time when we are not involved in partisan struggle, because it was the Prime Minister's intention – it still is – that whenever Mr. Tambo comes – and he is coming – we will wish people from your side to join with us in a public welcome of him, and you would scarcely have responded in a favourable way to our invitation when we would both have been locked in a by-election in St. John.

(*Aside: We did with Lusinchi.*)

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: If you cannot see the difference between the two visits, I do not think you will see the difference in anything.

(*Aside: There is no difference.*)

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Of course there is a difference. The difference is that in a visit by Mr. Lusinchi, the ceremonial aspect of receiving a Head of State that you had invited long before and who, therefore, would have made up his own arrangements and his own timetable for a certain time, you could not just say to him, we cannot have you because we are having a by-election, because that would be inviting his interest in our domestic affairs.

When Mr. Tambo comes here, we are going to ask you to join with us in a public welcome of him. I extend an invitation now informally, but a formal invitation will be sent to the Barbados Labour Party to do that. You are going to have the pleasure of greeting him with us in a non-partisan national situation, and if you cannot see that that is more desirable than bringing him here when we have a by-election, when you would not have been able to do what I know you would have wished to do, if you cannot see the difference between the two things, then I am powerless to explain it further.

(*Aside: SENATOR B. A. MILLER: But we met Lusinchi!*)

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: All right, you met Lusinchi, but if you cannot see the difference between the two, I am sorry for you. Mr. Tambo was not a state visitor in that sense.

You cannot have it both ways. If we had brought him here and had asked you to take part in the middle of a by-

election, you would have said that we were using it for purely partisan purposes and that we were exploiting your willingness and sensitivities. We have kept it out of that.

The point is that we have explained to him, and he has accepted our explanation in a very gracious way. He has been in contact with Dame Nita. His emissary saw me only, I think, three weeks ago, his second-in-command, as far as I know. We discussed this matter and he will come to Barbados, we are hoping, later in this year, and he is looking forward to doing so.

You cannot drive a wedge between us and public opinion on the issue of the Tambo visit. I certainly will not have that.

You want to know the effect of that on the African vote. Our support in Africa could not possibly be better, except among one or two countries which are now at the sort of "nicely" stage; and which will respond to us, in our judgment, positively in the next week or so.

Let me say clearly and unequivocally that the fact that Mr. Tambo did not come to the country when we would most have wished him to come – and he would have, except that certain matters intervened – will not prevent his coming, and has not in any way damaged our chances in respect of the presidency. Certainly African support is overwhelmingly favourable, and indeed there is no indication that there exists any misunderstanding on the part of African opinion in respect of Mr. Tambo's visit. He is coming, and when we ask you to come and stand up on a platform with us in welcome to him, if it is possible.....

Asides.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Of course you can talk. Why could you not talk? It may be Henry who will talk, but we will ask the rest of you to be present to support your leader, if he is still your leader then. We will invite him to stand up with us.

I have no doubt about this, there is no element of the Barbados Labour Party, as there is no element of the Democratic Labour Party, that will not accord the warmest public welcome to the arrival and sojourn among us of the President of the ANC. Our commitment to what he stands for is not only long-standing, but it is deep and irrevocable, so that we cannot really have a serious difference of opinion over the visit of Mr. Oliver Tambo. In any case, as I say, he is coming.

I have answered your strictures, if there are strictures, on the Prime Minister. We understand that is a little pleasant interlude in serious debate, so I do not think I need trouble myself about it.

In respect of the movement for political unity of the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States, the Government of Barbados has already said that it will offer its utmost support to any efforts of the peoples and Governments of these islands to forge closer political unity. We made this position clear at last year's CARICOM meetings of Heads of Government in St. Lucia. Any encouragement that we can give to it, we will, we will do nothing that will stand in its way, and we would expect that Barbados would have the closest possible association with any entity that emerges from that search for unity.

2.30 p.m.

I must, however, draw the attention of Senators to the comment recently published, I think it was in the last 48 hours or so, by Dr. William Demas, who, of course, is perhaps one of the three or four leading exponents of the integration movement in the Caribbean at the moment. He said it is something at which they must hasten with some deliberation towards, because there are a lot of positions which will have to be thought out, and settled, before that happens. But so far as Barbados is concerned, there is a tremendous amount of goodwill for them in this movement, and whatever we can do, we will do, and we certainly will put no stumbling blocks in their way. And we are not damning them with praise, we really do warmly support the integration movement.

(Aside: Senator B. A. MILLER: Are we joining the OECS?)

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I do not think I need trouble myself with that. The Senator, I think, has too much respect for serious politics to want me to trouble myself with that one. That is one moving away perhaps on the off-side, as they say.

Some very useful comments were made by Senator Goddard. Indeed, fully in theory and, to very large and important aspects, in practice, the significance of the questions he asked about the structure, training and orientation of Foreign Service Officers is very well taken. We try, because of our size and the relative paucity of our resources, to develop the best kind of Foreign Service that we have. But the difference between this country and a larger country, even like Argentina or Mexico, not even now speaking of the United States, Japan, the United Kingdom, France or the Soviet Union, is that the resources of those countries, both in terms of personnel and money, are more than adequate enough to provide them with a full range of specialist services in the conduct of their diplomacy. Barbados cannot afford specialists. We have them, one or two whose interests, orientation and study are in particular fields of diplomacy, but they could be numbered, perhaps, on the fingers of one hand. Everybody

else who comes into the Barbados Foreign Service is part of the Public Service of Barbados.

I do not mean to be offensive, even to the people who would not like to be interpreted that way, the people who serve me or to other members of the Public Service, but I think it is a bad thing for people to be in the Foreign Service all their lives, or for most of their careers. I think, as, indeed, is the case, that a majority of them, if not all of them, should be for some parts of their public service in the general service. And except in very exceptional circumstances, I do not like Foreign Service Officers remaining too long abroad, because I think that however good they are, there is a chance that they may miss some of the main developments taking place in their country, and it is good for them to alternate their service between the Foreign Service and the other larger executive Ministries of Government.

My PS will not mind me saying this, because this is just an example, he has served with distinction in the Foreign Service before, he is now the head of it, but he has had full service in the Ministry of Education – when I was Minister of Education, he was there – and is quite distinguished in Agriculture. He has been PS-Agriculture, PS-Education, and is now PS-Foreign Affairs. I would like that sort of rounded experience to be common in the whole service so that those who are in will have had, or will have at some time, some experience of helping to conduct the foreign policy of the country, bringing to bear on that the experiences gained in Ministries of Tourism, Trade, Agriculture, Education, Housing or whatever. I would also like those who are out and have served with distinction for some time to come back in and get back into the general service and get an orientation which they may not have had when they went out.

I do not know about foreign languages. I think that a foreign language is a very useful thing, I am not saying this in any patronising way at all, to be equipped with, but I do not think that your foreign policy projections or the conduct will suffer all that bad if all of your Foreign Service officers are not bilingual or trilingual. I think that – one has to keep a sense of balance here – where language skills are present, they should be used to the fullest, and where they are not present, those who have an inclination for them should at the appropriate times of their lives be encouraged to develop those skills. But you want something in the Foreign Service more than an ability to be a linguist. You want people who understand their country. It goes without saying that they must be dedicated to it to be able to explain its values and so on. They have to be people who also have enough common sense, clear judgements and perceptions to be able to deal with issues as they arise, especially issues that they may not have anticipated.

I think the Government of Barbados, at all levels since Independence, has been well-served by its Foreign Service. Remember that this is the smallest Ministry of Government. What is it? Not even, I think, 120 people at all levels serving. We are not a big administrative and executive Ministry like Health or Housing. We have to make a little go a long way.

2.40 p.m.

I think that I have said in *Diplomacy and Development* that for every dollar that this Government expends, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs expends about two cents. I suppose that if the aggregate expenditure goes up, the percentage spent by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs will probably be a 1 1/2 cents or 1.8 cents, or whatever it is. I think that the returns the people of Barbados get for that level of expenditure are really out of proportion to the expense itself, not only in terms of arithmetic but in terms of service. It is really fantastic that we have been able to do so much.

I take Senator Goddard's point, I am immensely grateful for it, but I have to point out that there are other aspects of the conduct of foreign policy, and other aspects of the requirements in terms of personnel and the skills, that we have to look at. The best thing to do is to get a blend of all of the important aspects of it.

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: Mr. Deputy President, in replying to this Resolution, which I had the honour of moving sometime ago, I need to make a number of comments, both on quality of the debate and to specific points which were raised in it.

Let me say at the start that the debate fulfilled all the intentions which the mover had in putting it on the Order Paper, in that it provided an occasion for a wide-ranging and comprehensive discussion on foreign policy matters, something which, to my certain knowledge, has never been done. It did not have any intention of polarising opinion on one or other side of the Legislature, but to suggest that the interest of foreign policy was the interest of everybody, and I think that has been achieved. What is more, I suspect that, with the help of the Press, with intelligent coverage of the debate, public interest will be aroused – perhaps mildly, because we are not in the habit of thinking very seriously about these things, but still aroused – and perhaps some of the things will provide points of debate and departure.

To turn to the specific points, in his earlier speech the Foreign Minister indicated that his Ministry was interested in hearing comments of citizens on their return from foreign travel. That is more than it should be. But I suggest that we have to be careful that that kind of invitation, so generously extended, is not interpreted as to snoop and tell, because we

cannot be unaware of the tendencies of our people in this direction.

It seems to me of equal importance that Ministers of Government and officials should make a point of reporting to the people when they return from official visits overseas. By reporting, I do not mean Press conferences which are called, or hastily uttered statements at airports. I mean a report which tells the people something of what the traveller has seen and some of the insights which he has been able to secure.

Ministers and politicians travel much more than ordinary people. They see things abroad, and it is only right that they should say what they have seen and let the people on whose name and on whose behalf they have travelled share in some of those insights, certainly on an educational level. If the Minister has seen a play or a game of football, he has to have seen something that he can speak of to the people he represents.

It may be that our public information media are not efficiently alive to the rich resource of material which they have in Ministers. Other countries take their foreign affairs very seriously, and their Ministries publish regular, packed newsletters. We try to do this. Certainly those countries in Europe which have need of support at the international level never fail to send out circulars and newspapers to all sorts of people.

For some reason or other, I get a copy every week of Moscow news whether it is *Triker* or *Glasnos*. It is all there, photographs and everything. Somebody thinks that it is important that a member of the Senate who is also a journalist should have this information. Some of the things are very revealing. A lot of it is probably propaganda, but some of it is important.

It seems to me that we ought to be doing something like this. Because, Mr. President, I am firmly of the belief that Barbados has a character and a personality of integrity. It is unique. It is like no other place in the world, and we sell ourselves short if we do not say that and explain how we came to be so.

Senator Tull in his speech made a derogatory reference to Parliament. He made a comment on the fact that we were celebrating 350 years of Parliament, and he said, cavalierly, "What parliament?". I will tell him what Parliament. It is the same Parliament that he is sitting in. It is the Parliament of which this present one is a very honourable descendent, and it is this Parliament which traces its roots back to the beginnings and traditions which we cannot deny, ought not to deny, and which must be the source of whatever we shall become.

Applause.

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: Senator Tull's speech has been very deservedly described as a *tour de force*. It was an excellent speech. It was very useful and wide-ranging, and he brought all the experience of his incumbency in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and, in fact, other Ministries, and his passion for Barbados to bear.

He described the area of foreign affairs as that contained by five concentric circles, and he went on to list them. There was, first of all, he said, CARICOM, then there was the wider Caribbean region, there was the hemisphere, and then the world. But that only made four. He could not remember the fifth that he had in mind, and he went on with his speech.

It occurred to me that the fifth which he could not recall, and which in the ordinary course of things he might have reasonably started with, was the circle which embraced Barbados, the smallest of all. I thought it significant, and perhaps, symbolic of our general regard for ourselves, that it was that one, the one closest to our concern, which should have escaped his memory, even if only temporary.

Mr. Deputy President, the question which Senator Goddard raised about the economic component of foreign policy brings my mind to the cultural component.
2.50 p.m.

When I first arrived in this Senate, in my first speech I started to mention something about culture and a member of the Senate, equally as young as I was in the Senate, muttered an aside to the effect that I had a bee in my bonnet. My reply to him outside of the Senate after was that I was overwhelmingly glad that I had a bonnet to have a bee in. I make no apology, therefore, for talking about the importance of our culture.

Culture, which informs everything that we do and say, is not performance. It is not singing calypsoes, it is not limbo, it is not Cou Cou Village, it is not any single one of those things. It is what we are, and we do not escape it by talking about it and reducing it to the ridicule of call-in programmes and that nonsense that we hear from time to time. It is what we are, and we have, therefore, to use it as an instrument of ourselves. Each one of us is an ambassador, but we must do it in a way which makes no apology, but no bombast, about what we are.

That cultural heritage which we acquire, which we cannot undo – we cannot unmake history – is like our face. It may not be handsome, but it is what we have. We do not ask anyone to like it or to praise it, but because it is ours,

we hold it dear, simply because without it we would simply not be what we are.

I think we do ourselves less than service when we neglect to make use of our heritage, with all its faults and imperfections, to learn from it and to acknowledge its lessons. We cannot erase the past, and we cannot pretend that it never happened. We cannot take pride in all of it, but we should be less than honest if we claim that our history began in 1966, or in 1937, or in 1834, when, in fact, we are the product of everything that has taken place in and with this landscape.

In winding up this debate, I would like to urge, in addition to the annual exposure of foreign policy to this kind of analysis and discussion, the formation of a Joint Parliamentary Committee, a Standing Committee, on Foreign Affairs, to be charged with the examination of foreign policy matters and the consequent submission of reports to Parliament. I will probably hear that this is difficult to arrange, but nothing is difficult if there is a will, and I want to leave that thought, as the evangelists say, with you.

I said that we inherited the experience of a previous Parliament. We have also inherited the experience of the world, which is a unique experience. I believe we have a great deal to say to people about how it is possible to live in a place like Barbados.

I must tell you a personal story. I did not mean to say this, but it is very clear to me now that it is relevant here. A few weeks ago I happened to be in the company of a number of people who were Pakistani, German, a French person, a Trinidadian and a Jamaican. The talk turned to food, and one of the ladies said how often she had been disappointed in going into a big name restaurant and finding large unpronounceable dishes and finding that they did not taste good. I was moved to say that I have eaten in a number of quite expensive and high – sounding restaurants, but I have never eaten better than I have eaten at home, and all these people agreed with me. It then occurred to me that here were we all of very different races speaking about food in exactly the same terms.

It would be impossible for that gathering to be meeting in South Africa, or perhaps even in the United States in some centres. What I am suggesting is that we met without any fanfare, without any difficulty, without anybody wondering why we should have been meeting. We met socially, and it was a very enjoyable evening.

When we talk about the polarisation of races, we often forget how easy it is in Barbados to walk down Broad Street and be unsurprised by the ease with which people of different races walk around. They do not avoid others on

the sidewalks, they share every single thing that is going, and it seems to me that we ought to do more about that than to spend our time arguing, taking up what old Barbadians sometimes call other people's fire-rages.

This was the purpose of my present intervention, and it is the burden of the motion which I have had the honour of presenting to this Honourable Senate.

Thank you.

Cheers.

The question that the Resolution inviting a statement on the foreign policy of Government do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

**RESOLUTION THAT GOVERNMENT EFFECT
RECOMMENDATION THAT SENATE
DEAL WITH MONEY RESOLU-
TIONS**

Order No. 3 – To move the passing of a Resolution requesting Government to take steps to give effect to the recommendation of the Constitution Review Commission that the Senate should be authorised to deal with Money Resolutions.

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. MCK. JONES: Mr. Deputy President, I believe I should begin by asking your permission to read the terms of the Resolution. It reads as follows:

"WHEREAS the Legislative Council, predecessor of the Senate, and for some years the Senate itself dealt with Supplementary "Money" Resolutions as they passed the House of Assembly:

"AND WHEREAS by an interpretation of Section 54(4)(b) of the Constitution such Resolutions no longer come before the Senate:

"AND WHEREAS the sums voted by such Resolutions have, for several years, been considered only cumulatively by the Senate in a final Appropriation Bill after the end of the financial year in which those sums were expended:

"AND WHEREAS the Constitution Review Commission in its Report in 1979 recommended that Section 54(4)(b) of the Constitution should be amended so as to give the Senate the authority to deal with "Money" Resolutions and that the Senate should be given the same powers and functions in relation to such Resolutions as it has, by virtue of Section 55 of the Constitution, in relation to Money Bills;

"BE IT RESOLVED THAT this Senate request Government to take all necessary steps to give effect to the recommendations of the Constitution Review Commission."

3.00 p.m.

Mr. Deputy President, as the terms of the Resolution suggest, the predecessor of the Senate, the Legislative Council, used to have authority to deal with money Resolutions in the same Chamber. Then, when the Legislative Council became the Senate, for some years they still had the authority and privilege of dealing with money Resolutions. That is the first thing I think we need to bear in mind.

It was only after an interpretation of this clause in the Constitution, 54(4)(b), was given that the Senate was prohibited from dealing with money Resolutions. That is what has caused me to bring this Resolution to the Senate, because it seems to me to be preposterous to ask intelligent people to come in here and listen and give support to an Appropriation Bill, when millions and millions of dollars have been spent already, and only then we are asked to say that we agree with how it was spent. There has to be something wrong there.

To make my meaning even clearer, we must remember that the Constitution was framed in 1966. Eleven years after that a Constitution Commission was appointed to review the Constitution, and the members of that commission said that in studying the Constitution, they saw many weaknesses and deficiencies which, by their action, they were hoping to remove. One of the things they referred to was this same very 54(4)(b).

I would like to read, Mr. Deputy President, what the Constitution says in 54(3)(b) and 54(4)(b), and Section 54(3)(b) says this beginning with (3):

"(3) Except on the recommendation of the Cabinet signified by a Minister, the House of Assembly shall not –

(b) proceed upon any motion (including any amendment to a motion) the effect of which in the opinion of the person presiding, is that provision shall be made for any of the purposes aforesaid."

When we read Section (4)(b), it says:

"(4) The Senate shall not –

(b) proceed upon any motion (including any amendment to a motion) the effect of

which, in the opinion of the person presiding, is that provision shall be made for any of the purposes aforesaid."

You will see that those words are precisely and identically the same, and yet, by an interpretation which really escapes all logic, (3)(b), when applied to the House, permits them to deal with money Resolutions, and 4(b), when applied to the Senate, inhibits them from dealing with the same money Resolutions. I have never been able to understand why that should be so.

I spoke about this about three years ago and it is in Hansard, too, so I do not wish to repeat everything I have said then, but I just want to bring a few points to your notice. We have to remember that there are some people who are saying that we should not have a Senate at all, that it should be a unicameral legislature and not a bicameral one. There are some members in this very Senate now who, when they were in the Lower House, used to say that they should abolish the Senate.

Asides.

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: I did not say "you". I said "some members". They are in the Senate today, but I know this is a fact, that when they were in the House, they said the Senate should be abolished. But they are members of the Senate today.

(Aside: Call names)

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: I am not calling any names, but I know who I mean. I can go to Hansard and tell them who said it. They are in the Senate today.

Asides.

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: I am not calling names. Mr. Leader of the Senate, I am not calling names. You can read the same Hansard that I read and you can find out who said so.

Asides.

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: Even that I am not saying.

There are some people who feel that we should not have a bicameral legislature. I do not agree with that. I feel it is a good thing to have the Upper House, not because I am a member of it, but because when the members of the House have to deal with questions like this, you have to remember they have a lot of pressures on them that many people in this Chamber will not have on them, because we

are not elected members, but the Members of the House are elected members.

I know there are some people who are saying now that the Senate should be elected. I do not know if that would ever happen. Whether that be so or not, I think that it is a good thing that we have certain people in this Upper Chamber who do not have to be pressured by what people are thinking outside, and we can give an objective and dispassionate look at the things that come before us and say what we feel is in the best interest of the country. So I feel that it is only right that the Senate should have some say on financial matters.

One of the reasons people are saying that we should not have any Senate at all – and I can quite understand them – is that there are 48 members in this country who are saddled with the awesome responsibility for initiating legislation in this country, and out of those 48 members there are 21 of them that cannot say one word when millions and millions, let us say, \$173 million, will be spent, that when the Appropriation Bill comes up here, the money is spent already, and then we have to give assent to it. So people are saying, if that kind of money can be spent and 21 members cannot say one word about it – because we cannot speak on Supplementary Resolutions now, we can only talk about Bills – what is the purpose of having them up there? You cannot altogether blame people for thinking that kind of way.

We can add to that this. I remember, I do not believe it came from any Member of Parliament, reading in the Press not so long ago that the reason why we did not have any Senate Meetings between December 16, 1987 and March 2, 1988 was that there were dealing with money Resolutions and the Senate cannot say anything about them, so what is the point of having the Senate?

The Resolution that I have submitted is not being submitted to set any precedent, because, as you heard already from the terms of the Resolutions the Legislative Council used to deal with money Resolutions and the Senate used to deal with money Resolutions.

We know very well that we are not accountable to the public, so we cannot have the last word as far as money is concerned. And you know very well that the most that can happen here is that the Senate can delay a money Bill for about a month, and then if we do not settle it in a month, it can still go to the Governor-General and be passed. We cannot stop it, and I feel that as men and women in this Upper Chamber, we should have a chance to discuss these things and not just have them brought up to us at the last minute and tell us we have to assent, when the money has already been spent. I cannot see any sense in that one.

We are not setting a precedent. We are only asking that we revert to the system that they used to have long time ago, which, I believe, is much more appropriate and much more pragmatic than that which now obtains.

The members of the commission also defined what a money Resolution was, and I would like to read that for the benefit of the members here in this Chamber today:

"A "Money" Resolution is understood to be any motion, other than a Bill, the effect of which is that provision shall be made for any of the following purposes:—

- (a) the imposition or increase of any tax;
- (b) the imposition of any charge on the Consolidated Fund or any other public fund or altering any such charge otherwise than by reducing it;
- (c) the compounding or remitting of any debt due to Barbados."

3.10 p.m.

They did not stop there. The Commission:

"saw no good reason for maintaining a distinction in the legislative requirements in respect of the two measures, and recommends that section 54(4)(b) should be amended so as to give the Senate the authority to deal with "money" Resolutions, and that the Senate should be given the same powers and functions in relation to such a Resolution as it currently has, by virtue of section 55, in relation to a "money Bill".

Mr. Deputy President, the commission had two lawyers and a Professor of Law on it. Mr. Ezra Alleyne and Mr. Jack Dear were the two lawyers, and Professor Carnegie of the University of the West Indies was consultant. The Commission also had on it members like Dame Elsie Payne, Sir Carlisle Burton — they did not have these honours yet — as a matter of fact, I believe sitting on the Constitution Commission helped them to get some of these honours —, there was Mr. Mencea Cox, who later became Sir Mencea, he was the chairman, and Mr. Alexander Hoyos, who became Sir Alexander Hoyos. All of these members decided and said that the Senate should be given authority to deal with money Resolutions, and that is all this Resolution is seeking, and I believe that if the Senate address their minds to it, members will see that there is substance in this Resolution.

Thank you.

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: Mr. Deputy President, I beg to second the motion and reserve my right to speak.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy President, I should like to put the debate in the context of the occasion which gave rise to the loss of the right to debate supplementaries in the Senate. The last occasion, Mr. Deputy President, that supplementaries came to this Honourable Chamber was on December 17, 1969, and I have some regret that His Honour the President is not here today, because he was very much involved in the circumstances which gave rise to the withdrawal of the right of the Senate to debate such supplementaries. It is also a matter of regret that Senator Smith as he then was, who sat here with us, is not here on this occasion, because he was also one of the actors on that occasion.

There were 19 supplementaries on the Order Paper for that day, Mr. Deputy President, covering a wide range of issues. There was the establishment of a forensic laboratory, the provision of assistance to the Mental Hospital, funding for legal aid, the Visual Aids Department of the Ministry of Education, money to staff the Community College, housing allowance for Government officers, agriculture, old age pensions, Defence, hotel training. It was in respect of the debate on the provision of housing allowance to Government officers, the 15th item on the Order Paper, a matter introduced by the Leader of the Senate, Senator Philip Greaves, that the hurricane was unleashed.

Senator Walcott, in response to the Resolution, said:

"I am amazed to hear a Minister in Barbados, two years after independence, stand in a Chamber like this and ask us to agree to one of the most antediluvian Resolutions we have ever had."

He went on to say, Sir:

"I am not here to underwrite nonsense or to be muzzled or to be against anybody".

Senator Walcott went on for another three or four pages of the Hansard Report. He conceded in the course of his debate, Sir, that the Resolution passed the Other Place, the Senate had no control over finance, it could only talk, but he thought he had a right to say what he thought. Senator Walcott, Mr. Deputy President, was supported by Senator Asquith Phillips, the Deputy President of the Senate, and he was also supported by Mr. Maurice King, who now holds a very senior position in the Other Place.

As a result of the intervention of these gentlemen, consideration of the Resolution was deferred. On resumption in the New Year, on January 29, 1970, the

Leader of Government Business in the Senate, Senator Greaves, made a statement. He said then, quoting from Hansard:

"The debate on this Resolution was widely reported in the Press and on the radio, and as a result of this some constitutionalists began to investigate the competence of the Senate to vary in any way a money Resolution passed by the House of Assembly. As a result, the Honourable Attorney-General was asked for a legal opinion as to whether the Senate had the power to vary in any such way a Resolution. The Attorney-General gave a legal opinion on the matter to the effect that the sole right of granting supplies resides in the House of Assembly and that the Senate has no right to vary a money Resolution, in fact, a money Resolution does not even have to be assented by the Governor-General."

The only one, Mr. Deputy President, who spoke strongly against that opinion at that time was Senator R. G. Mapp. He spoke out at some length on the matter, but one of the things that was said in the course of the debate, and I say this to put the matter in a perspective, was that the Attorney-General stated that the opinion had been sent to the Leader of the Opposition for his consideration so that there could be unanimity on the position of the Government and the Opposition on the issue.

Senator Mapp, Senator Phillips and Senator King spoke. I do not know if in the interval the last two had been seeing the error of their ways, or, to use the words of President Reagan, had been taken out to the shed and had the birch applied to them, but on that occasion in January 1970, they fully supported what the Leader of the Senate said.

Sir, this matter reached culmination when the Senate met on February 19, 1970, by a Message from His Excellency the Governor-General to the Senate which advised – Message No. 2/1970:

"His Excellency the Governor-General has the honour to inform the Honourable the Senate that he has been advised that the practice of inviting the Senate to concur in Resolutions to grant sums of money from the Consolidated Fund and to place those sums at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates and of seeking the Governor-General's assent thereto is not in accordance with section 109 and is contrary to Section 54 of the Constitution. This advice has been supported by the provisions of the Financial Administration and Audit Act, 1964.

"His Excellency the Governor-General has the honour further to inform the Honourable Senate that,

in view of the advice tendered, the practice referred to above will be discontinued immediately."

And that was the end of that, so to speak.
3.20 p.m.

Mr. Deputy President, I previously have taken a position, which I may have intimated on occasions when the chance occurred, that I did not agree with the position then, but it is one one had to accept. I have asked the Honourable Philip Greaves if he could locate the opinion that was given in 1970, but in light of the Message, which I only was able to unearth this morning, through the kind assistance of the facilities of the Barbados Public Library, I see that there is reference now to Section 109 of the Constitution. And I must say, Mr. Deputy President, that when I read Section 109 of the Constitution, which says that the Minister responsible for Finance may lay supplementaries before the House of Assembly – and there is another section which goes on to say that any sum paid out of the Consolidated Fund should be under the hand of the Minister responsible for Finance – I was somewhat stumped.

Mr. Deputy President, there is a conflict, and that is why I think the Constitution Review Commission took the point between the provisions really not, I think, of Section 54, but of Section 57 of the Constitution and 109. Section 57 of the Constitution, Mr. Deputy President, defines a money Bill in some fairly wide terms. It defines a money Bill as a Bill which, in the opinion of the Speaker, contains provisions dealing with all or any of a number of matters, including the raising and guarantee of any loan or the repayment thereof.

We have dealt in this Senate from time to time, Mr. Deputy President, with Resolutions which did that, and therefore they come within the definition of money Bill, but which we are empowered to do under Section 57 of the definition of a money Bill. But when you look at 54, it is said that we do not have a right to deal with these things.

As Senator Jones has stated, we are asked to concur in a Final Appropriation Act some long time after the matters have been raised and the money spent. I invite the honourable Members of the Senate to consider the logic of asking this Chamber to go through a process of really what it amounts to, a rubber stamping after money has been spent.

In 1981, Sir, the Estimates approved a round figure of \$481 million. In the year following, another \$72 million was spent by supplementaries, about 15 per cent, and 12 per cent to 15 per cent is the average of the supplementaries in every year thereafter.

An examination of Hansard will indicate, Mr. Deputy President, that Ministers introduce the Final Appropriation Act with the most perfunctory language. The money has been spent. So all you say is the money has been spent. There is no explanation as to why it has been spent or what it was needed for, as happened when the supplementaries came up. When the supplementaries were dealt with in December 1969, to pick one, Mr. Deputy President, "Order 23 - Provision of Money for the Ministry of Education in Relation to Hotel Training", an explanation was given and it evoked comment and debate from Senator Ashby, Senator Smith, Senator Phillips and Senator Morgan, because they had an interest in that matter; Senator Morgan was a hotelier, and he was able to respond. Ministers made statements in this Chamber on matters of substance and therefore had a response from the community which was represented at this level.

The debate which has taken place in this Honourable Chamber over the past two weeks had contributions by Senator Wickham, there were contributions last week by Senator Ward. And contributions on other occasions by other Senators have more than reinforced my belief, Mr. Deputy President, that the Government and the country lose the opportunity to benefit from the collective wisdom of the Senate in terms of advice and contributions to matters infecting the general wheel of this country.

It is interesting, Mr. Deputy President, to look at the practice that has evolved in other places. I have been endeavouring to get the records from my colleagues in Jamaica and Trinidad, and they were promised to be sent to me before this; unhappily, they have not arrived. I understand that in Trinidad they go by way of Supplementary Bill No. 2 or No. 3, as the case may be, so, perhaps, the same constraints do not apply. But certainly one of the authorities on the rules and customs of the House of Parliament of Canada made the point that the Crown demands money, the Commons grants it and the Lords or the Senate assents to the grant. You do not vary or delay it, but you assent. The same principle is applied, Mr. Deputy President, to the position in the House of Lords in the United Kingdom. Again there is only a limiting power of delay, and I think that that is all that one would want to have in that purpose.

The interjection is for what purpose? I have to invite the Senate to consider the illogic of saying that the Senate has authority to sit down here within the next two weeks when we come back and deal with the Appropriation Bill, which is expenditure of money for the whole country, but say that we have no right, when the money runs out and they have to go and top it up, to debate that.

There was a debate in the Other Place a few weeks ago on a supplementary, and it dealt with a whole host of

things - the Judiciary, the Prime Minister's Office, the Ministry of the Public Service - and it was passed fairly routinely. No one in the Other Place, Mr. Deputy President, at the time that Resolution was debated, made reference to the fact that in respect of the vote for the Judiciary, the Supreme Court No. 1 has been condemned by the Ministry of Transport and Works and that those who use that building might well be in danger, because it has not been maintained for years and the whole thing has been moving out of sync. That is one example of something about which someone in this Chamber with the knowledge could make that observation.

We dealt here in December, 1986 with the Final Appropriation Act for the year 1985-86, when \$81 240 866 was approved. Do you recall, Mr. Deputy President, any background information given as to the several items of expenditure? Six hundred and forty-four thousand dollars were spent in the Ministry of Agriculture, \$9 million under the Head for the Ministry of Education, \$2.5 million under the Ministry of Health for drug services, at the time the debate would have taken place, \$8 million for the Transport Board and \$1.5 million of Tourism and the Environment. No background. We just said that the money had been spent and therefore we had to give retroactive approval to it.

Mr. Deputy President, so long as I am a member of this Chamber, when these supplementaries come up, the Final Appropriation Act, I am not even going to come. It is a waste of time if we are not permitted to debate them at the time the advances are made. At the end of the day, you might concur in them.
3.30 p.m.

In fact, 15 out of 19 were concurred in without debate on that occasion, because an explanation was given to the Senate as to the reasons the money was required and a statement was made as to what Government's thoughts on the matter were.

The Senate, Mr. Deputy President, is an integral part of Parliament and all Senators are, first and foremost, Senators, before they are members of the Government, because you have to be appointed to the Senate first before you can become a Minister. If not, you have no basis to be elected to the Other Place.

In other chambers, people take their rights and privileges in the Senate, or the body of which they are a member, with some degree of seriousness, and not just a matter of "because my side said it, I must go along for it." Members of the governing party in 1969 Senator Walcott, Senator King, and Senator Phillips challenged what was being put forward at the time. They challenged it too successfully, because the end result was that Government

got scared and said, if those fellows are giving us trouble do not let us carry it up there and have us take that sort of flack from people who are not elected. In the process, they have done themselves and the country a disservice. I think it behoves the Senate at this time to redress the matter and pass the Resolution standing in the name of Senator Jones so that the benefit of the views of Senators can be brought to bear on these matters as and when they arise.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. Deputy President, I have no doubt whatsoever that, in the two speeches which have just been made, some very important items have been raised. However, I do not know that these issues, important as they are, have been studied in any great depth by all the members of the Senate, certainly not by me, and I, therefore, should like to move that further consideration be postponed so that all Senators may have a chance to explore these very important issues.

I have not made up my own mind, because, frankly, I have not studied them. I have enough to interest me to make me do some research. I suspect, however, that the issue may not be as simple as they have been presented to us here. For instance, if this Chamber were to become co-equal with the other Chamber, I would think that, sooner or later, the basis of its composition would have to be examined, because something is inherent in co-equality which would have to

be addressed. But I do not have any judgment on this. I would not even like to prejudice my own opinions on it.

I beg that further consideration be postponed so that we can all have a chance to look at this matter and express our views on it more fully, and be more helpful to each other in the course of the debate.

The question that further consideration on this Resolution be deferred was put to the Senate and agreed to.

THE ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: The Appropriation Bill, as I reminded Senators last week, is going to be done next week in the Other Place, and it will come to us the week after that. If it is agreeable to Senators, I would like for us to start our part of it on Monday, March 21, 1988 at 10 o'clock. It is possible that we shall be on it for two whole days, but we will see.

I beg to move that the Senate do now adjourn until Monday, March 21, at 10.00 a.m.

The question that the Senate do now adjourn until Monday, March 21 at 10.00 a.m. was put to the Senate and agreed to.

3.40 p.m.

CONTENTS

MOTIONS RELATING TO BUSINESS

Senator the Hon. SIR JAMES TUDOR. 661

Appointment of Senator J. C. W. Wickham as
Chairman of Committee.

Leave to deal with Resolutions from Other Place
re Land Acquisition at Drax Hall, St. George
and Abandonment of land at Rockley, Christ
Church.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION NO. 36 1986 RE
LAND AT DRAX HALL, ST. GEORGE. . . .662

Senator Tudor, 662.

ABANDONMENT OF LAND AT ROCKLEY,
CHRIST CHURCH. 662

Senator Tudor, 662; Senator Miller, 663.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION RE STATEMENT ON
FOREIGN POLICY OF BARBADOS. 663

Senator Wickham, 663, 678; Senator Tudor,
663, 675; Senator Miller, 673; Senator Goddard,
674.

RESOLUTION THAT GOVERNMENT EFFECT
RECOMMENDATION THAT SENATE
DEAL WITH MONEY RESOLUTIONS. . . .680

Senator Jones, 680; Senator Blackman, 682;
Senator Tudor, 685.

f.c.p.

SUSPENSION. 672

ADJOURNMENT 685

Senator Tudor, 685.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

BLACKMAN, C. A.
GODDARD, J. S.
JONES, Can. I. McK.
JORDAN, M. deL.
MILLER, B. A.
TUDOR, Hon. Sir James.
WICKHAM, J. C. W.