

a constitution which they expected would have been reflective of the wishes and aspirations of the Grenadian people. It is unfortunate that these efforts were frustrated by the disastrous turn of events also discussed in that chapter.

The author applauds the new Guyana Constitution because the Guyana Government has been bold enough to subject the stereotype Westminster pattern of constitution to intense scrutiny and not to continue to accept all that a British Foreign and Commonwealth Office draftsman had prepared in colonial times, and embrace it as our own. At the present time, in so far as most of the constitutions in the area are concerned, the real wishes of the people have been of little moment. The constitutions granted to one former British colony has invariably been considered to be good enough for another. Very often the provisions of the earlier constitution are reproduced in an almost verbatim manner.

As the Wooding Commission which reported in Trinidad in January 1974 so rightly noted:

In reality the Westminster political system has a propensity to become transformed into dictatorship when transplanted in societies without political cultures which support its operative conventions.⁵⁹

It was with these considerations in mind that Trinidad & Tobago reshaped its constitution in 1976 in the manner described by the author in Chapter IV of this book.⁶⁰ The days for blindly applying "imported constitutions" should, by now, have passed and every former British territory should be prepared to take a leaf out of the books of Trinidad & Tobago and Guyana and establish machinery to examine its independence constitution with a view to shaping it to suit the country's present and future needs: avoiding the mistakes which Guyana has undoubtedly made. The views and wishes of the people must be fully taken into consideration since it is their welfare and their livelihood that the Constitution is intended to regulate.

Reverting once more to the 1980 Guyana Constitution, it is a pity that the in-built emergency powers and the obvious omissions from the document have marred an otherwise well-intentioned effort. It is to be hoped that such constraints as the judiciary has imposed upon itself—no doubt inspired by the sincerest of motives—will be modified in the light of reason and of the current of judicial opinion elsewhere. In the writer's view, the Constitution is not beyond redemption. It is in urgent need of revision so that the defects discussed in this chapter can be rectified.

We turn now to a consideration of the constitutional problems which have faced Dominica, St. Vincent and St. Lucia in the years of their independence.

^{59.} *Report of the Constitution Commission of Trinidad and Tobago*, para. 27, p. 6.
^{60.} See also Phillips, ch. XIII, pp. 191-97.

CHAPTER III

INDEPENDENCE AND MINI-STATE POLITICAL PRESSURES

The Cases of Dominica, St. Vincent and St. Lucia

In this chapter we shall consider developments of constitutional significance which have taken place in Dominica, St. Lucia and St. Vincent since the 1960s. In each of these territories, which became independent between 1978 and 1979, there was civil commotion of one kind or another shortly after independence. In Dominica the civil unrest was much more serious and sustained than in the other two territories; and, in addition, external elements played a much larger role than in either of the other two. In St. Lucia the political difficulties stemmed mainly from a leadership struggle within the governing party, whereas in St. Vincent the civil disorder took the form of a short-lived "mini-rebellion" which occurred in one of its dependencies. We shall now examine in turn the problems which each territory experienced.

DOMINICA

As far back as 1976 the Government of Dominica requested Britain to terminate the status of associated statehood which had existed between the two countries since 1967. The Premier, Patrick John, had first made public his intention to proceed to independence at a convention of his party, the Dominica Labour Party (D.L.P.), which was held in the village of Salisbury in August 1976. This statement became known thereafter as the "Declaration of Salisbury".

At that time the opposition Dominica Freedom Party (D.F.P.) was of the view that the provision of section 10(1) of the West Indies Act 1976¹ should be invoked, by virtue of which a referendum was required to determine whether the country should terminate its then current political status. If two-thirds of the people voting in the referendum decided in favour of terminating the association it would automatically have come to an end and the state would thereupon proceed to independence. This view was rejected by the D.L.P. government which asked Her Majesty's Government to terminate the association under section 10(2) of the Act, as Grenada had done in 1974 when it became independent, and as all the former associated states have since done. Under that sub-section, Her Majesty was empowered by Order-in-Council to terminate the association and to grant independence to

1. 1967 C.4 (U.K.).

that state at the request of the state government, signified by a resolution passed by its legislature.

Following the promulgation of the "Declaration of Salisbury", a Green Paper was published by the Dominica Government. Thereafter, both parties held a series of public meetings to explain the issues to the people and to prepare them for independence.

In May 1977, a Constitutional Conference was held in London at which fundamental differences between the Government and the Opposition became evident. The main points of contention between the two parties were:

- (a) whether Dominica should have a republican system of government with an elected Executive President. This was the proposal put forward by the D.F.P., while the Government wished to retain the Queen as the Head of State of Dominica, being represented locally by a Governor-General; and
- (b) whether there should be a unicameral or bicameral legislature and the basis on which persons should be appointed to that body.

On the question of the type of constitution (republican or monarchical), the D.F.P. had proposed that the country, upon attaining independence, should become a republic with an Executive President as Head of State. The President should be elected and should himself preside over the National Assembly. He should also have the power to delay for one month, or until the next sitting of the House of Assembly, any Bill which affected special interests which did not have the opportunity of making their views known. The House of Assembly should, by a 75 percent vote of its members, have the power to annul any decision of the President. With regard to elections to the proposed legislature, the D.F.P. wished to have a mixture of the two electoral systems, viz., "first-past-the-post" and proportional representation: the suggestion being that thirteen members should be elected to the 21-member House by the first system and the remaining eight members should be elected on the basis of proportional representation.²

At the Conference it was not possible to reconcile these differences. However, the Conference chairman decided that, having regard to the size of the Government majority in the House of Assembly, he would proceed on the Government's proposals which were slightly modified as follows:

- (a) The Queen would remain Head of State and be represented by a Governor-General.
- (b) Parliament would be a unicameral body comprising twenty-one elected and nine nominated members—and the electoral regime would be "first-past-the-post".

The chairman, however, left the door open on these two issues, suggesting that the Opposition should continue to canvass their point of view in Dominica in an effort to persuade the House of Assembly when the matters come on for debate.³

2. See Annex C of the *Report of the Dominica Constitutional Conference*. (London: H.M.S.O., May 1977), p. 22. Cmd. 6901.

3. *Ibid.* para 9 n 4 and ...

It was further decided that at the end of the Conference a paper would be prepared by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office setting out the areas of agreement reached on the terms of the Constitution. At the same time the Foreign and Commonwealth Office would prepare a draft constitution in collaboration with the Attorney General of Dominica for submission to Parliament.⁴ The British Government, however, wished to be satisfied that the move to independence commended itself to the majority of Dominicans. The Conference had anticipated that a further process of consultation between Her Majesty's Government and the Dominica Government might become necessary if the local political parties became deadlocked.⁵ As a result of these differences, the target date set by the Government (November 1977) for the attainment of independence was altered to early 1978.

Later in 1977, the British Government proposed, with the concurrence of the Dominica Government, that R.N. Posnett, an official experienced in constitutional affairs, should visit Dominica in May 1978 to discuss with the parties concerned the outstanding points of disagreement and to test the state of public opinion on the question of independence. The Posnett Report, which was published in July 1978,⁶ recommended that the matter be finalised on the basis that further agreement between the parties was unlikely.⁷

In the process of consultation the Government had accepted the proposal for a republican-type constitution. However, it still had not agreed to the position of the President as Head of State, which had been originally proposed by the D.F.P. The Government's proposals with respect to the office of President were as follows. Under the Constitution the President would be a ceremonial figure and would be advised on all matters of policy by a Cabinet of ministers. He would be elected by the House of Assembly and would hold office for a term of five years: Provided that where the Prime Minister and Leader of the Opposition had agreed on a nominee to the office of President they would submit his nomination in writing to the Speaker, who would declare that candidate to have been duly elected without putting the matter to a vote.⁸ With respect to the regime for holding elections of members to the House, the system of "first-past-the-post" would continue. In addition, there would be a unicameral legislature comprising the President and a House of Assembly.⁹

It was also agreed that the House of Assembly would consist of nine senators and such number of *representatives* as may be recommended by an Electoral Boundaries Commission to be established by the Constitution. Five of the senators would be appointed by the President on the advice of the Prime Minister while the other four would be appointed on the advice

4. *Ibid.*, para. 27, p. 8.

5. *Ibid.*, para. 29, pp. 8-9.

6. Miscellaneous No. 20 (1978), *Dominica Termination of Association* (London: H.M.S.O.), Cmd. 7279.

7. *Ibid.*, para. 48, p. 15.

8. See Schedule 1 to the Commonwealth of Dominica Constitution Order 1978 (S.I. No. 1027), hereinafter referred to simply as the Dominica Constitution, secs. 18 and 19.

9. *Ibid.* secs. 29, 30 and 57.

of the Leader of the Opposition. These decisions were duly incorporated into the Constitution, which came into force on 3rd November 1978 when the country became independent as the Commonwealth of Dominica.

Six months after the attainment of independence in Dominica, the Prime Minister, Patrick John, ran into serious trouble with his Cabinet and with Parliament. On 29th May 1979, when he tried to rush two very controversial Bills through Parliament, a peaceful demonstration estimated at between 15,000 and 20,000 persons gathered outside of Parliament to voice their opposition to these two measures. One of these Bills (to amend the Industrial Relations Act) had as its main object the prohibition of strikes, especially by civil servants and essential services workers while the other (to amend the Libel and Slander Act) was clearly designed to restrict the publication of criticism against the Government. It should be mentioned that the latter measure was being passed at a time when the Government seemed to have been engaged in serious negotiations with South Africa relative to the creation of an industrial free zone in Dominica.

The demonstration against these legislative measures was broken up by heavy-handed security men whose draconian behaviour resulted in the death of one person and in the wounding of several others. This incident turned out to be "the last straw that broke the camel's back"; as a consequence a general strike was immediately called by all the trade unions, which brought commercial and other activity in the capital city, Roseau, to a virtual stand-still. The Prime Minister's response to this state of affairs was simply that the D.F.P. was endeavouring to stage a coup against him, but that he would not yield in any way to pressure.

The next blow to the Government was the resignation of Oliver Seraphin, the Minister of Agriculture, who confirmed the rumor about John's South African connections and negotiations. This revelation in turn prevented John from obtaining any military or other support from his Caribbean neighbours in his effort to maintain himself in office. Indeed, when the news of his dealing with South Africa reached Trinidad & Tobago that Government summarily rejected an application for financial aid which had been previously made by the Government of Dominica.

The Dominica Prime Minister then endeavoured to appease local discontent by withdrawing the two Bills referred to above and dismissing the then Attorney General. At the same time he announced that he would appoint a Commission of Enquiry into the events of 29th May 1979, and would agree to U.N. supervision over the next general elections.

Meanwhile, a Committee of National Salvation (C.N.S.) which had been formed on the day of the shootings had been meeting daily to consider other means of forcing the Prime Minister to resign. This Committee comprised all the major factions opposed to John, including the Dominica Freedom Party, the Chamber of Commerce, the trade unions, the farmers, and the Civil Service Association. In the midst of this pressure the President of the country hurriedly left Dominica without taking the steps prescribed in the Constitution for appointing an Acting President. The relevant provision reads as follows:¹⁰

10. *Ibid.*, sec. 28.

(1) Whenever the holder of the office of President is unable to perform the functions of his office by reason of his absence from Dominica, by reason of illness or by reason that he is suspended from the exercise of those functions under section 25(3) of this Constitution, those functions shall be performed—

- (a) by such person as may with his consent have been designated in that behalf by the holder of the office of President, acting after consultation with the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition, by writing under his hand; or
- (b) if there is no person so designated or if the person so designated is unable to act, by such person as may have been elected in that behalf by the House in accordance with the like procedures as is prescribed by section 19 of this Constitution for the election of the President.

(2) A person shall not be qualified to act as President unless he is qualified to be elected as, and to hold the office of, President:

Provided that the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker may act as President, in which case he shall cease to perform the functions of his office during any period during which he is so acting.

(3) A person acting as President under this section shall cease to act when he is notified—

- (a) that another person has been designated or elected to act; or
- (b) that the holder of the office of President is about to resume the performance of the functions of his office.

Another event which further complicated the situation was that the Speaker of the House had tendered his resignation at about the same time that the President had left the country.

But despite the President's failure to designate an Acting President and notwithstanding the fact that Parliament could not meet to make such an appointment, the Prime Minister in desperation purported to designate *suo moto* a former governor to act as President in the hope that this appointee would do his bidding by dissolving the House of Assembly and setting a date for new elections. Unfortunately, the crowds set fire to the Acting President's car and stoned his house; and when he failed to obtain protection from the police (who were also on strike), he instantly resigned. As a result of these events, Dominica was without a Head of State for a period of twenty-three days. During that period, the angry Roseau crowds had taken to looting commercial places and had burnt to the ground the Registry of the Supreme Court. There was total chaos in the country. All work had ground to a halt, and there was a total breakdown of law and order. The situation was further exacerbated by the fact that the C.N.S. had vowed that this state of affairs would continue until Patrick John resigned from the office of Prime Minister.

In these circumstances the C.N.S., *de facto*, took over the reins of government and set out the following eleven specific points for immediate action:

- 1. that the elected members of Parliament other than the Ministers of Government and Ministers of State form a Parliamentary caucus, and

- that this Parliamentary caucus should elect a Prime Minister to head an Interim Government in consultation with the C.N.S.
2. that the present nine (9) Senators immediately resign and that nine (9) Senators be appointed on the advice of the C.N.S.
 3. that the President resigns and that a new President be appointed in consultation with the C.N.S.
 4. that the Interim Government set up machinery for the holding of free and fair elections on a list compiled on the basis of island-wide enumeration and that supervision be provided by a neutral body for both enumeration and election.
 5. that the Dominica Broadcasting Service be democratised immediately.
 6. that the Interim Government mount a public enquiry into the events of May 29, 1979.
 7. that in the interest of National Solidarity and Unity the C.N.S. recommends that the Hon. Oliver J. Seraphin be elected as Prime Minister in the Interim Government.
 8. that the Interim Government carry out a full and thorough enquiry into all contracts with South Africa and other such dubious financial dealing.
 9. that the Interim Government examines the question of compensation for striking workers and farmers.
 10. that the Interim Government set up a Constitution Commission to review the present Constitution and to make recommendations for amendments.
 11. that the Prime Minister, Ministers of Government and Ministers of State resign from Cabinet and from the House of Assembly!"¹¹

Since Seraphin had been named as Prime Minister, the C.N.S. had daily discussions with him for several days on the persons who were to be appointed as ministers and senators. At the end of these discussions the strike was temporarily called off and a degree of calm was restored. This procedure was akin to a people's forum (or a Senate hearing), since all the candidates concerned were screened and their suitability duly passed upon by a crowd of people who daily attended the Goodwill Parish Hall in Roseau to discharge this form of civic responsibility. To quote the expressive words of an eyewitness who has written on this peculiar situation: "It was in effect people's democracy in action."

After every effort to secure John's resignation had failed, the C.N.S. came to the conclusion that Parliament would have to be reconvened in order that a vote of no-confidence could be passed against the Government, after which an Acting President would have to be installed to make the appointment of the new "ministers". At this point, in endeavouring to illustrate the predicament of the C.N.S., the writer can do no better than give a summary of what Dr. Nicolas Liverpool had to say on this question:

11. In this account of what happened in Dominica the writer has drawn heavily from an article by Dr. N.J.O. Liverpool entitled, "A Study in Peaceful Extra-constitutional Change on the Caribbean Island of Dominica (An application of the Legal Doctrine of Necessity)", Faculty of Law, University of the West Indies, Cave Hill, Barbados, from which the facts mentioned above are taken.

There were six elected members and four senators in Dominica at that particular time who were opposed to the Government. These persons, together with Mr. Seraphin and another of his colleagues, would have been able to satisfy the constitutional requirement that before a matter can be validly determined by the House of Assembly at least twelve of its members must take part in the voting on that matter.

Such a meeting would have been quite competent to appoint the Acting President, but could not pass a no-confidence motion against the Government which was required to be supported by a majority of all the elected members of the House.¹² Mr. Seraphin therefore needed to ensure that the necessary majority of elected members attended the particular sitting of the House due to be held on 19th June, 1979, if the motion was to be successful.

The composition of Parliament on that fateful day in Dominica's history was as follows:

Government Bench : no Member present;
Opposition Bench :: 13 elected Members plus
4 Senators.

At that meeting, the Leader of the Opposition, having withdrawn her motion for a vote of no-confidence in the Government, requested of the Speaker that "all elected members should state whether they had withdrawn their support for the present Prime Minister and whether they supported a caucus of Government to appoint a government for the interim period before the holding of the next general elections in accordance with the provisions of the Dominica Constitution".¹³ All thirteen elected members then present expressed their intention to withdraw their support for the Prime Minister and to support an Interim Government. The meeting was then adjourned until Thursday, 21st June 1979, during which time the issue would be canvassed over the local radio station.

On 21st June the following Resolution was duly passed in the House of Assembly:

WHEREAS the Committee for National Salvation has proposed the formation of an Interim Government headed by the Honourable Oliver Seraphin;

AND WHEREAS at the request of the Committee for National Salvation a meeting of Parliamentary Representatives approved the recommendation of the Committee for National Salvation that the said Oliver Seraphin be chosen to head the Interim Government;

BE IT NOW RESOLVED THAT this House recommends the appointment of Honourable Oliver Seraphin as Prime Minister of the Interim Government pending the results of a General Election in accordance with the provisions of the Dominica Constitution.¹⁴

The Speaker then advised the House of the joint nomination of Jenner Armour as Acting President and that Armour had agreed in writing to serve

12. See Proviso to sec. 46(1) of the Constitution of Dominica.

13. Liverpool, p. 12.

14. *Ibid.*

in that office as required by the Constitution.¹⁵ The House then adjourned. Thereafter, the Acting President proceeded to appoint the Prime Minister and six other ministers, three of whom were senators. Six additional senators were also appointed to complete the composition of the House of Assembly.

Following the formation of the Interim Government, the strike was called off. The new Prime Minister declared that his immediate objectives would be to try to repair the shattered economy of the country while arranging the necessary electoral processes in preparation for general elections. He also promised a full investigation into the conduct of both John and his Attorney General.

But this was not the end of Seraphin's woes for in October 1979 he found it necessary to dismiss one of his key ministers, Atherton Martin, on alleged ideological grounds. Seraphin also found himself at loggerheads with the Committee for National Salvation whose functions he considered to have been 'spent'. In addition, the dismissal of Martin was severely criticised by three of the other ministers, who were themselves shortly afterwards dismissed by Seraphin, because they had questioned the length of time he was taking before calling general elections.

By December 1979 political pressure was being exerted against Seraphin by members of the Catholic Church, the trade unions, the business community and the civil service to force his resignation from the office of Prime Minister. While this drama was being acted out, the President, Frederick Degazon, tendered his resignation from abroad, to be followed very shortly thereafter by that of the Acting President, who wished to contest a seat in the forthcoming general elections. At this point, a candidate for the post of President was found acceptable to all parties so that he was duly elected by the Speaker's declaration.

Such was the travail that befell Dominica within seven months of the country becoming independent.

In the general elections which were held on July 21, 1980, the candidates of the Dominica Freedom Party (D.F.P.) were successful in 17 of the 21 polling districts. Two of the seats were won by the Dominica Democratic Labour Party (D.D.L.P.) while the remaining two seats were won by independent candidates. Significantly, both John and Seraphin failed to gain re-election to the House of Assembly. As a consequence of its electoral victory, the D.F.P. (described as "liberal, democratic and anti-communist") formed the new Government; and its leader, Eugenia Charles, a distinguished lawyer and business woman, became the new Prime Minister of Dominica. The 1980 elections thus brought a temporary respite to the disturbances. But as we shall soon see, Dominica's political problems were far from over.

Almost from its inauguration, the Government led by Miss Charles was plagued with internal civil commotion. In December 1980, barely six months after it had come to power, it became necessary for the authorities to disarm the Dominica Defence Force when it was discovered that weapons

¹⁵ Vide sec. 28 of the Dominica Constitution.

from the Force's armoury were being traded in exchange for marijuana from the 'Dreads' (the name by which the Rastafarian cult in Dominica was called). Later, the Government found it necessary to transfer all weapons in the Defence Force armoury to the Central Police Station where a strict inventory would be kept, it having become evident that most of the members of the Defence Force had been recruited by former Prime Minister Patrick John on the basis of their personal and political loyalty to him. On this account a number of officers had been given compulsory leave of absence by the new administration. There were, however, a number of members of the Force who were loyal to the Government, for there were demonstrations in the Defence Force demanding the resignation of the Army Commander (Major Newton), at the same time as John was praising him and stating publicly that the army was being disarmed in preparation for the conversion of the country into a "one-party state".

In February 1981, the Dreads kidnapped a prominent planter in retaliation for the killing of two of their colleagues by the police in the course of a "shoot-out" in the south-west of the country. After setting fire to the home of the kidnapped man, they released his wife with a note, evidently extracted from him, setting out the conditions of his release. These conditions included the release of two Dreads who were being held under sentence of death; an enquiry into the conduct of the anti-drug squad; and an end to "police brutality". Miss Charles immediately declared a state of emergency and in her speech promulgating the state of emergency she replied that she would not be prepared to accede to the Dreads' request until they had released the kidnapped planter unharmed and had surrendered their weapons. The planter was subsequently found murdered.

On March 7, 1981, the Prime Minister announced that she had received information of a plot to overthrow her Government during the carnival celebrations which were due to take place a week later, i.e. in mid-March. As a result the Commander, the Deputy Commander and three other officers of the Defence Force were arrested. It transpired that Captain Reid (one of the arrested officers) had originally been detained after the Martinique authorities had advised the Dominica Government that he and another Defence Force officer had been endeavouring to purchase drums of acid in Martinique, and after a letter he had written to Major Newton (his superior officer), containing details of the planned coup, had been intercepted by the police.

In the meantime, in the United States, the F.B.I. discovered that there was a definite involvement of certain Ku Klux Klan activists in the said coup. Two of them were subsequently sentenced to prison for violating the U.S. Neutrality Act and for conspiracy. Seven others pleaded guilty to violation of the Neutrality Act by mounting an armed expedition against a friendly nation: five being sentenced to three years imprisonment and two juveniles being sent to young offenders' institutions. A Texas businessman and an electrical contractor from Mississippi were also indicted for similar offences, as was J.W. Kirkpatrick, a Tennessee lawyer who, on June 21, 1981, committed suicide. The Texas businessman and the electrical contractor were subsequently acquitted by a federal court in New Orleans.

The evidence in the U.S. courts revealed that the ringleader of the planned coup (a Mr. Perdue) had originally contemplated a mercenary invasion of Grenada in April 1979 (i.e. one month after Maurice Bishop had taken control of that island), but had subsequently switched his attention to Dominica. It is reported that Perdue had received a total of US\$75,000 from unnamed co-conspirators and had actually commenced recruiting mercenaries for the job from among members of several right-wing organisations. There was also evidence that the U.S. conspirators had held a meeting with former Prime Minister John, Major Newton (the D.D.F. Commander) and Captain Reid in a Dread stronghold to finalise plans for the coup. In the course of this meeting Perdue had been accorded the rank of Captain in the Dominica Defence Force.

According to the report, the object of the coup was to have Patrick John restored as Prime Minister of Dominica for which Perdue would receive US\$150,000 from Dominica Government funds. In addition, he would be given Dominican citizenship and be appointed a Cabinet Minister. The amazing thing is that even after John and his cohorts had been arrested in Dominica, their American counterparts still continued planning the coup from their U.S. base and, but for the timely discovery by undercover agents of the U.S. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms who were able to arrest the mercenaries on March 27, 1981, on the eve of their departure for Dominica, there could well have occurred a take-over of the island by criminal adventurers from the United States.

Some Canadian citizens were also involved in the preparation of the proposed coup. A Miss Miriam McGuire, a Canadian citizen, who had apparently been sent to Dominica in advance on behalf of the Grand Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan of Canada, was arrested in Dominica, convicted and sentenced to three years imprisonment. Another Canadian citizen and a British national were deported from Dominica in May and September 1981 respectively after going to that island for the avowed purpose of freeing Miss McGuire.

In 1981 a state of emergency was again declared when on December 19 there was a concerted attack on the police headquarters and the prison, resulting in the murder of a police officer and injury to several others (including the Commissioner of Police) at the police station. Ironically, one of the attackers killed at the prison was identified as Cpl. Howell Piper. He had previously been acquitted (for lack of evidence) of taking part in the attempted coup earlier in the year. A second attacker who had escaped, ex-Defence Force member Ashton Benjamin, was later found shot dead.

The alleged objective of the December 1981 attack was to release Patrick John and his fellow defendants from prison prior to the hearing of their case, which was due to come on for trial the following month. The December 1981 State of Emergency which lasted until March 1982 provided for censorship of the press, a curfew, and the grant to the police of wide powers of arrest. Among those arrested were three French citizens who were said to be involved in the smuggling of arms into Dominica from the adjacent French island of Martinique, where the authorities actively co-

operated with the security forces of the Government of Dominica.

Meanwhile, there was further dissension and disintegration on the political front as well. Michael Douglas, elected to the House of Representatives in 1980, was one of the two D.D.L.P. members who left that party, the leader of which was Oliver Seraphin. As noted above, Seraphin had failed to retain his seat at the 1980 general elections, and as a result he had come under heavy fire from Douglas to surrender to him the leadership of the party. This member of the House then combined with his brother, 'Rosie' Douglas, to form a new party called the United Dominica Labour Party.

Since 1980 there has been no Leader of the Opposition in the Dominica House of Assembly because no member of that house commanded the support of the majority of those opposed to the Government. This was so even after the two independent members had formed themselves into a separate opposition group. That situation remains unchanged up to the date of this writing (31st March 1984). We shall now consider the constitutional significance of the events herein outlined.

The events related above appear to illustrate, in a somewhat painful manner, the problems which can arise in operating a Westminster-type constitution, promulgated by the easy means of securing the passage of an Order-in-Council by Her Majesty, rather than by employing the alternative, but politically more sound, procedure of obtaining the concurrence of the people of the country through a national referendum. The former method, it is submitted, produces a constitution which is supported by the political party with the majority of members in the legislature and gives only token recognition to the wishes of the minority party. The latter arrangement might, at least, ensure that the people are afforded the opportunity of participating in the process of formulating a constitution by which their lives and livelihood will be regulated.

The foregoing events also further emphasise the need for the recognition and observance of those vital conventions without which the basic structure of our constitutions cannot function effectively and smoothly. Patrick John's posturings in June of 1979 in an effort to secure the appointment of his nominee as Acting President in order to ensure the dissolution of the House of Assembly would clearly have been impossible in a country which recognises and observes the constitutional conventions which operate when a Prime Minister has lost both the moral and political authority to govern. However, as has been stated elsewhere, the conventions will take time to develop roots in some of our jurisdictions.

Finally, the events to which we have referred above—as well as those we will discuss below which occurred shortly after St. Lucia attained independence—present an object lesson in the extra-constitutional transfer of governmental authority. They show with much cogency the extent to which a people will ultimately go in order to redress what they perceive as gross wrongdoing on the part of the political directorate.

ST. VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES

As stated in our 1977 work, St. Vincent was, until 1959 administered as one of the four Windward Islands, the other territories of that group being Dominica, Grenada and St. Lucia. A single Governor, who then resided in Grenada, was responsible to the Colonial Office for the administration of this group of territories as one unit. The day-to-day running of the affairs of each of these colonies was, however, under the direct charge of a resident Administrator who was answerable to the Governor for the due discharge of his official functions. St. Vincent was also a constituent unit of the West Indies Federation which was inaugurated in 1958 and dissolved in 1962 in circumstances also fully described in the 1977 volume.¹⁶

When the attempt to form "The Little Eight" proved abortive in the mid-sixties, St. Vincent began negotiations with the metropolitan power (Britain) with a view to becoming an Associated State; but because of local differences, it only attained associated statehood in 1969, although five other British colonies in the Caribbean had assumed that status since 1967.¹⁷

In 1972 an event occurred in St. Vincent which made a mockery of the two-party system. In that year an election took place for a new 13-member House of Assembly. The results were: 6 seats to the People's Progressive Party (hereafter called P.P.P.) led by E. T. Joshua; 6 seats to the St. Vincent Labour Party (hereafter called S.V.L.P.) led by R. M. Cato; and 1 seat to an Independent candidate.

The Independent seat was secured by James Mitchell, a former minister of the S.V.L.P. But on this occasion he elected to align himself with the P.P.P. on one condition, viz., that in consideration of such an alignment he would become the Premier. This condition was accepted and the political leader of the P.P.P. was then appointed Deputy Premier in the new government. Two years later, i.e. in 1974, Joshua, and his wife, who was then a Parliamentary Secretary, disagreed with the Premier on certain matters of policy, and co-sponsored a successful motion of no-confidence in the Government. In the result, the Legislature was dissolved and general elections were held in December 1974. This time, the P.P.P. and the S.V.L.P. entered into a "unity agreement" for the purpose of contesting the elections — as a result of which the S.V.L.P. won 10 of the 13 seats and the P.P.P. 2. The leader of the S.V.L.P., Cato, accordingly became the new Premier.

One of the terms and conditions of the so-called "unity agreement" under which the S.V.L.P. and P.P.P. contested the 1974 general elections appears to have required that the leader of the latter would have been assigned responsibility for the administration of a department of Government: for Joshua was appointed by the Premier to be Minister of Trade in the new government. It also seems that the joint SVLP/PPP election strategy was directed to minimising the effect in the Legislature of James Mitchell who was then the only other member of that body and whose political

position was independent of both political parties. Mrs. Joshua, the wife of the leader of the P.P.P. and a member of that party, was originally also a member of the new government. This meant that Mitchell, the only member in opposition to the government, would logically be appointed to be the Leader of the Opposition. However, in what at the time appeared to be an odd move, Mrs. Joshua declared that she no longer supported the government and thus became the other member of the Legislature on the opposition benches.

While one can but speculate on the motives for such a strange move, the subsequent actions of the Government made it clear beyond conjecture what the objectives were. In 1975 the Government procured the passage of a Bill in the Legislature for an Act to amend the provisions of the Constitution of St. Vincent relating to the Leader of the Opposition. The amendment which inserted the following provisos to the relevant section marks, in the writer's view, the high-water mark of *ad hominem* legislation in that country:

Provided that if there are two or more such Elected Members who do not support the Government but none of them commands the support of the other or others, the Governor may, *acting in his own deliberate judgment*, appoint any one of them as Leader of the Opposition.

Provided further that in the exercise of his judgment the Governor *shall be guided* by the seniority based on length of service of the Elected Member and or by the number of votes polled by the Member at the General Election.¹⁸

(emphasis supplied)

In the event, therefore, Mrs. Joshua was appointed to be the Leader of the Opposition. Although she had no greater support in the Legislature than Mitchell (they were both opposed to the government and to each other) Mrs. Joshua appears to have gained the nod over him by virtue of the second proviso referred to above. It was well known that Mrs. Joshua had been a member of the Legislature for many years before Mitchell had entered electoral politics; and that she always won her seat at the general elections by a massive majority, equalled by few other local parliamentarians.

It will be convenient at this point to make a few observations with respect to the legislation which amended the Constitution of St. Vincent. The cases must indeed be rare in which legislation confers an extremely wide discretion on a person to act "in his own deliberate judgment" and at the same time prescribes legislative guidelines which on the then existing facts ensure that that discretion can only be exercised in a particular manner. What the provisos, shorn of all their legalisms, in fact meant was that where there are two elected members of the Legislature neither of whom is qualified to be appointed to be Leader of the Opposition then the Governor *shall* select as the Leader the one who has had a longer period of service as an elected member and/or the one who polled the greater number of votes at the general elections at which he was returned as a member of the Legislature. The amendment also created the patent contradictions of the

16. See Phillips, *Freedom in the Caribbean*, chap. VI, pp. 53-73.
17. *Ibid.*, chap. VIII; see p. 81, note 11.

18. See the St. Vincent Constitution (Amendment) Act, 1975 (No. 5 of 1975).

leader of the P.P.P (Joshua) supporting, and indeed being a minister of, the Government while his wife, the only other member of that party in the Legislature, was appointed as the Leader of the Opposition.

The author has on several occasions bemoaned the tendency which has been manifested in certain of the smaller territories of the Commonwealth Caribbean to regard the Constitution as being an instrument designed to assist the respective governments in the attainment of party political objectives. It is submitted that the St. Vincent events related above constitute yet another classic illustration of that tendency.

Certain events which occurred in St. Vincent in 1978 had the effect of further obscuring the position of the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislature. In the months immediately preceding the visit of the Premier to London, in mid-April 1978, to discuss the proposals for a new constitution with the British Commonwealth Office, serious disagreements arose between Premier Cato and E.T. Joshua, the Minister of Trade, with respect to the timing of independence. These disagreements led to Joshua's dismissal from the Government and he accordingly joined his wife and Mitchell on the opposition benches. At that stage it was not quite clear who *in fact* led the Opposition but Mrs. Joshua, quite properly, continued to be the Leader, *de jure*. In the normal case the Governor acting in his own deliberate judgment is required to appoint as Leader of the Opposition the member of the Legislature who appears to him to command the support of the largest number of members of that body who are in opposition to the Government. Mr. and Mrs. Joshua had clearly demonstrated that by mid-April 1978 they constituted the largest number of members in opposition to the Government; and no doubt Mrs. Joshua appeared to the Governor to command the support of her husband. This, it is submitted, rendered the two provisos to the section inoperative in the circumstances. In fact, the particular amendment then became a "dead letter".

In early 1978 Premier Cato announced that he intended to commence negotiations with the British Government with a view to attaining independence for St. Vincent under Section 10(2) of the West Indies Act. We have referred above to the disagreements which arose between Cato and Joshua with respect to the timing of independence for that country; and that these disagreements had led ultimately to the latter assuming a position in opposition to the Government. In support of his government's decision to lead the country into independence, the Premier put forward a case that his party (the S.V.L.P.) had won a majority of 68.52% of the votes cast at the 1974 general elections, thereby receiving a clear mandate from the electorate. On this issue Joshua (for the Opposition) countered that there had in fact been a reduction of 22% in the overall number of voters who were eligible to vote at the elections; and that this was the result of the instructions he had given to the members of his party in the various constituencies where his party did not field candidates—that they should not vote if they found they could not conscientiously support the "unity agreement" to which reference is made above.

Despite the arguments of the Opposition, which at first accepted the invitation to attend the Constitutional Conference and later refused to do

so, the Conference took place in London from September 18th to 21st, 1978, under the chairmanship of Ted Rowlands, a U.K. Minister of State. This Conference reached agreement on the draft constitution, in which were included proposals submitted to the Government by a group called the National Independence Committee as well as by other local groups. The draft was to be published in St. Vincent for further discussion before being finally presented to the House of Assembly for debate.

It was not until February 8, 1979, that the proposals for the draft constitution were brought to the House, where they were passed by 10 votes in favour to none against. The P.P.P. and Mitchell's New Democratic Party (N.D.P.) had refused to take part in the proceedings at either the committee stage during the reading of the Bill or the final voting.

There was further posturing by the P.P.P. and N.D.P. who then petitioned the British Secretary of State, requesting him to consider further representations in respect of the draft constitution. In a spirit of compromise the Commonwealth Office requested the Premier to accept some of the proposals made by the opposition political parties in order that a full consensus could be achieved. Accordingly, Premier Cato decided to accept three amendments put forward by them, so that on July 5, 1979, in the British House of Commons, Rowlands could say, "I think that the patient process to achieve the maximum possible consensus around the Constitution has been carried out".

Independence

St. Vincent and the Grenadines (as the State is now known) became independent on 27th October 1979. Subject to minor variations, the independence Constitution of that country is similar to those of Grenada, St. Lucia and Dominica which by that time had all attained independence. It will be sufficient to illustrate these minor variations by reference to the following examples. The constitutions of both Grenada and St. Lucia establish bicameral parliaments consisting in each case of a Senate and a House of Representatives (or Assembly).¹⁹

In the discussion above with respect to the Constitution of Dominica it has already been pointed out that while the Legislature of that country is unicameral, the Constitution has made provision for the appointment to the House of Assembly of a number of Senators.²⁰ A similar provision appears in the Constitution of St. Vincent.²¹ In addition, the constitutions of Dominica and St. Vincent both disqualify ministers of religion from sitting in the respective legislatures either as elected members or as appointed Senators.²² In general terms, the corresponding provisions of the Constitution of St. Lucia are to like effect.²³ On the other hand, a person

19. See Constitution of Grenada (sec. 23) and of St. Lucia (sec. 23) (S.I. 1978 No. 1901).

20. Constitution of Dominica, secs. 29 and 30.

21. Constitution of St. Vincent, secs. 23 and 24 (S.I. 1979 No. 916).

22. Constitution of Dominica, sec. 32(1)(b) and of St. Vincent, sec. 26(1)(b).

23. Constitution of St. Lucia, secs. 24(1)(c), 26(1)(b) and 32(1)(b).

who is a minister of religion is not disqualified under the Constitution of Grenada from being a member of the House of Representatives or of the Senate.²⁴

The Name of the Country

At the Constitutional Conference in London it had been agreed that the country should upon independence be officially styled and be known as "St. Vincent and the Grenadines". This has been reflected in the Constitution.²⁵ The Government, in taking this decision, must have decided that this would be the best means of showing the Grenadine Islands, which are 'dependencies' of St. Vincent, that they were at least being officially recognised as an integral part of the country. Whether this gesture will have the desired effect, time alone will tell; but barely six weeks after the country had become independent and two days after the general elections that followed, there occurred a mini-rebellion in one of these very dependencies—Union Island—in the following circumstances.

The Union Island Uprising of 7th December 1979

On the morning of 7th December 1979, information reached the Minister for National Security of St. Vincent and the Grenadines that there had been an uprising on Union Island, one of the St. Vincent Grenadines 40 miles south of the mainland. A group of armed men were said to have effectively taken over the island. Details appeared to have been as follows: The police station was attacked and dynamited and the airport blocked off.

According to the Minister for National Security, the Government of St. Vincent was not yet properly constituted, as these events took place only two days after the general elections. Although the electoral proceedings had not yet been completed, the results of the polls which were then at hand were sufficient to indicate that the S.V.L.P. had already been successful in the majority of polling divisions and would thus form the Government.

Ministers were hurriedly sworn in by the Governor-General and the following emergency action was immediately taken by the Minister of National Security:

- (1) a state of emergency was declared and a dusk to dawn curfew imposed;
- (2) military assistance was requested from, and given by, the Government of Barbados; and
- (3) the local police force was put on full alert.

In the face of these preparations the uprising was quelled with minimal loss of life or injury to persons.

²⁴ Constitution of Grenada, secs. 26 and 31.

²⁵ See Preamble to the Constitution of St. Vincent.

There were at the time of the rebellion many theories as to its origin. According to one such theory it was made to appear that some arms in the possession of the rebels came from Carriacou, a ward of Grenada. This may have led some people to speak of a "Grenadian connection". However, the subsequent extradition of the rebel leader from Grenada, where he had sought refuge, would seem to have scotched all such rumours. What seems clear is that the rebels were reacting to what they perceived to be gross neglect on the part of the central government. Apparently it was fairly widely known on Union Island that the group of men who later featured in the uprising were arming themselves. Whether there was inadequate intelligence on the part of the members of the police force stationed on Union Island or whether the urgency of the situation was not fully appreciated by the central police force, it is difficult to say. Suffice it to state that the central government was caught off-guard and it is anyone's guess what would have been the outcome if one group of, say, twenty well-armed men had attacked the police stations at Kingstown (the capital), Bequia, Canouan and Union Island simultaneously—and if help from outside was at the same time not forthcoming.

It is interesting to note that the mini-rebellion in Union Island was put down by the Government of St. Vincent and the Grenadines with the active support of policemen and army personnel sent for that purpose by the Government of Barbados. Quite understandably, there was little or no international comment about Barbados' action in this regard. It was quite clearly of a far different character from the violation in 1983 of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Grenada which occurred when the armed forces of the United States of America, Jamaica, Barbados and Member States of the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (O.E.C.S.) invaded Grenada. This matter has been fully discussed in Chapter I, above.

We must now look at the constitutional and other related developments in St. Lucia as they have taken shape before and after independence in 1979.

ST. LUCIA

St. Lucia was also one of the territories which, under the umbrella of the then Federal Government, was given a measure of internal self-government in 1959, having been a constituent member of the Federal establishment while it lasted from 1958 to 1962. Grenada, St. Vincent, Dominica Antigua and St. Kitts were in a similar position.

At the time of the introduction of the ministerial system in St. Lucia in 1956, the ministers were chosen from the St. Lucia Labour Party (S.L.P.), headed by George Charles, to form the Government. Charles became Chief Minister on January 1, 1960, at the time of the introduction of a new constitution for all the territories in the Windward and Leeward Islands. However, in 1961 certain differences arose between the older and younger members of the Labour Party. Several of the younger members left the party when they found that the differences could not be resolved. In any

case, problems continued to plague the party: so much so that the Government collapsed in 1964 (before it could run its full course). The collapse had occurred after two members of the House resigned, thus robbing the Government of its majority. At the ensuing general elections in that year John Compton became Chief Minister and continued in that position as the political leader of a new party called the United Workers' Party (U.W.P.), the members of which were drawn from the National Labour Movement (N.L.M.) and the People's Progressive Party (P.P.P.).

In 1967, with the advent of associated statehood, Compton became Premier of St. Lucia and the Legislative Council became the House of Assembly. Although provision was made in the Constitution for a Senate, this provision remained dormant, as the senators were in fact nominated members of the House of Assembly. As occurred after associated statehood in all the territories upon which the status was conferred, the Administrator at that time became the Governor: each country being then *de facto* independent in all its internal affairs but dependent upon Britain for the maintenance of its defence and the conduct of its external affairs.²⁶

There were, at one stage, strong feelings in the area that the Associated States should endeavour to seek independence as a group. When, however, Eric Gairy, the Premier of Grenada, moved in 1973 for separate independence, the other territories also decided to negotiate individually with Britain to seek independence on a unilateral basis.

At the 1974 general elections the U.W.P. was again returned to power and in 1975 the party decided to move to independence alone. The negotiations were however very protracted because of the fragmented nature of the opposition political parties, which Her Majesty's Government insisted must be involved in the independence talks. Consequently it was not until February 1979 that St. Lucia became an independent country within the Commonwealth, with John Compton as its first Prime Minister. He had then served as Head of Government of that country for more than 15 years and St. Lucia was regarded as being one of the most politically stable of the Eastern Caribbean States.

However, at the general elections held in July 1979, Compton's party was heavily defeated when a resuscitated St. Lucia Labour Party was voted into power: the S.L.P. winning 12 seats and the U.W.P. 5. Allan Louisy, the S.L.P. leader, thus became the Prime Minister of St. Lucia.

The political stability which, as we have stated, St. Lucia had enjoyed for the previous 15 years, was severely shattered by events which took place shortly after the July 1979 elections. George Odum, the Deputy Prime Minister, claimed that before assuming office as Prime Minister, Louisy had given to him a firm promise that he would hold that high office for only six months, after which he would wish to assume the office of Governor-General. Within months of the inauguration of the new administration a blazing row developed over this leadership issue which unfor-

26. See Phillips, *Freedom in the Caribbean*, for a full exposition of the history of Associated Statehood, chap. VIII, pp. 78-93.

tunately received considerable publicity not only in St. Lucia but throughout the Caribbean.

In an interview²⁷ given early in 1980 the Prime Minister sought to assure the people of St. Lucia that the matter had been finally resolved through the good offices of the Inter-Christian Council and the Civil Service Association. Notwithstanding that assurance, there followed in the ensuing months many overt acts which manifested the disagreement between the Prime Minister and his Deputy: one of these acts being the cancellation of Odum's designation as "Deputy Prime Minister" and the removal from his portfolio of the departments of Industry and Information. (It should however be observed that the post of Deputy Prime Minister is not an office established or recognised by the Constitution.)

By 1981 Odum and three other ministers who supported him came out in open revolt against Prime Minister Louisy; and when the Government presented the annual budget, they voted with the five members of the opposition party to defeat it. But even prior to that defeat, the Prime Minister had had the humiliating experience of witnessing Odum and his supporters walk out of Parliament as soon as the Acting Governor-General had entered the chamber to deliver the Speech from the Throne. In this way they protested the appointment of Boswell Williams as Acting Governor-General of the country.

As a result of the defeat of the Government on so vital an issue as the national budget Prime Minister Louisy, acting constitutionally and to some extent astutely, opted to resign from office rather than advise the Governor-General to dissolve Parliament. In so doing he at least ensured that the S.L.P. Government remained in power. Of course his resignation also meant that the offices of all ministers became vacant.²⁸ In any event, even if Louisy had advised in favour of a dissolution the Governor-General could constitutionally have refused to dissolve Parliament if, acting in his own deliberate judgment, he considered that the government could have been carried on without a dissolution and that it would not have been in the interests of the country to dissolve Parliament.²⁹

Following discussions within the party to select a candidate for appointment to the office of Prime Minister, Winston Cenac, the former Attorney-General (who by then had also resigned) and Peter Josie, the Minister of Agriculture, emerged as front runners. In the end, the mantle of leadership fell upon Cenac—more by default than by design; and despite massive protests from all sections of the community, the acting Governor-General exercised his discretion and called upon him to form the Government.³⁰

When Cenac took office in April 1981 the S.L.P. held nine seats, the

27. See the *West Indies Chronicle*, December 1980/January 1981 issue.

28. See Constitution of St. Lucia, sec. 60(9)(b).

29. *Ibid.*, sec. 55(4), proviso (a).

30. In making this appointment the Governor-General acted under sec. 60(2) of the Constitution: "Wherever the Governor-General has occasion to appoint a Prime Minister he shall appoint a member of the House who appears to him likely to command the support of the majority of the members of the House."

U.W.P. five, and the Odium faction of the S.L.P.—which subsequently became known as the Progressive Labour Party (P.L.P.)—held three seats. The first attack against the new administration was a call for a vote of no-confidence, which it barely survived. It is significant that the motion was moved by Compton and seconded by Michael Pilgrim, the Deputy Chairman of the P.L.P., in terms that the Government had brought the country to “a state of impending bankruptcy”. Although that motion failed, a further opportunity to bring down the Government came shortly thereafter when it sought to amend the relevant law³¹ to exempt the elected members of Parliament from the disqualification section thereof, after it was disclosed that a member of the governing party had been the notary in a government transaction. It was allegedly to legalise this irregularity and to introduce legislation having the effect of relieving ministers from having promptly to bring to account funds remaining from advances received in respect of overseas visits that Government had on January 11, 1982, introduced a Bill in Parliament to amend the existing legislation on this matter.

This move served to heighten the fears of the people of St. Lucia concerning the *bona fides* of the Government. As a consequence, public servants and members of the Chamber of Commerce, the Churches and the Small Businessmen's Association took to the streets in a spate of massive demonstrations to urge the resignation of the Government. The resulting political pressure was too much for the administration and accordingly the S.L.P. Government led by Cenac resigned in January 1982.

Once again, as occurred in the case of Dominica,³² necessity demanded that some means be found to run the country after Cenac was forced to resign as Prime Minister and until a general election could be held. It was in these circumstances that an extra-legal expedient had to be designed so that the government of the country could continue, for even if a dissolution had been requested and obtained, the then Prime Minister would have been expected to continue to head a caretaker government until the results of the election were made known; and neither Cenac nor the various organisations which had pressed for the resignation of the Cabinet wished to accede to such a holding arrangement.

The three parties—the St. Lucia Labour Party, the United Workers Party, the Progressive Labour Party—and the outgoing Prime Minister chose as the compromise candidate for the interim prime ministership Michael Pilgrim (the Deputy Leader of the P.L.P.) who was sworn in on January 17, 1982. Once more, too, the Governor-General endorsed the choice by recourse to his constitutional discretion to choose such a member of the House as he considered likely to command the support of the

31. Section 32(1) of the St. Lucia Constitution provides as follows:

“A person shall not be qualified to be elected as a member of the House if he . . .

(f) subject to such exceptions and limitations as may be prescribed by Parliament, has an interest in any Government Contract”.

The expression “government contract” is defined in sub-section (6) of sec. 32 of the Constitution. See also St. Lucia Ordinances No. 16/1960 and 13/1967.

32. See *supra*, pp. 76-80.

majority of other elected members. The Government was described as a government of “national unity” and this description was borne out by the fact that Louisy—the Prime Minister from 1979 to 1981—held the portfolio of Attorney-General. In addition, John Compton, the former Prime Minister of long standing, and George Odium, the former Deputy Prime Minister, were designated ‘Advisers’ to the Government—on Finance and Foreign Affairs respectively.³³

The Future of Constitutional Reform in Caribbean Mini-States

When the general elections were held on May 3, 1982, the United Workers Party under John Compton was re-elected by an overwhelming majority of the electors. At the date of writing, April 1984, a degree of comparative calm has once more returned to the country but it will be plagued for years to come with all the problems facing Third World states during their early years of independence. Not the least of these problems will of course be how to deal with constitutions which will inevitably need to be revised from time to time to keep pace with the will, expectations and aspirations of the populace in the years immediately ahead.

We now turn our attention in the next chapter to the bold (if not altogether successful) efforts at reform which the Government of Trinidad & Tobago has since independence in 1962 undertaken not only in respect of the country as a whole but also as regards its relations with Tobago, the junior partner in the unitary state.

33. The writer interviewed the Rt. Hon. Mr. Compton, Prime Minister of St. Lucia, on April 17, 1984, when the P.M. revealed that, although he was at the time appointed as an Adviser on Finance during the interim administration, he was never in fact consulted during Michael Pilgrim's tenure of office as Prime Minister.