
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1981 – 86

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, May 24, 1983

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour C. L. Bolden, LL.B., (Deputy Speaker)
Hon. L. S. Craig, (Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Leader of the House)
Hon. H. B. St. John, Q.C., LL.B., (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Trade, Tourism and Industry)
Mr. L. E. Sandiford, M.A. (Econ.)
Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, (Minister of Education)
Hon. L. B. Brathwaite, (Minister of Housing and Lands)
Mr. J. G. Odle, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees)
Hon. V. L. Johnson, M.A., (Minister of Transport and Works)
Hon. DeL. O. Bradshaw, (Minister of Labour, Social Security and Sport)
Mr. L. L. Sisnett
Dr. R. C. Haynes, M.B., Ch.B., F.R.C.P. (Edin.)
Mr. R. E. Brathwaite
Hon. Dr. D. G. Blackman, B.A., M.A., PhD., (Minister of Health and Community Services)
Mr. W. O. Franklin, A.I.A.S., J.P.
Mr. A. Truss.

Prayers were read by Archdeacon F. A. Cayless.

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, May 17, 1983.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes of Tuesday, May 17, 1983 be taken as read.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to second that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If there are no objections or observations, let the Minutes stand confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to lay the Reports of the Registrar of Trade Unions for the years 1980–81 and 1981–1982.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I beg to lay the following:

The Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Barbados Community College for the year 1981–1982, also the Erdiston Teachers Training College Board of Management Order 1983.

The Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic Board of Management Order 1983.

The Public Secondary Schools Boards of Management Order 1983.

The Education (Amendment) Regulations 1983.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay:

The Annual Report, Auditors' Certificate and Financial Statements of the Central Bank of Barbados for the year ended 1982.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to give notice of the following:

Resolution to approve the Erdiston Teachers Training College Board of Management Order 1983.

Resolution to approve the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic Board of Management Order 1983.

Resolution to approve the Public Secondary Schools Boards of Management Order 1983.

Resolution to approve the Education (Amendment) Regulations 1983.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: A Resolution in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Michael South regarding the Caribbean Community.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:

WHEREAS the state of relations within the Caribbean Community is causing concern within Barbados;

AND WHEREAS it is desirable that there should be a progressive enhancement of the levels of co-operation and integration within the Caribbean Community;

Be it resolved that this House call upon the Government of Barbados to take all appropriate steps, both separately and in co-operation with its CARICOM partners, to:

1. Restore faith and confidence in CARICOM as a vital movement for the economic, social, and cultural development of the region.

2. Strengthen the mechanisms for the integration within the movement.

3. Secure further democratic control over the institutions of CARICOM by the people of the region.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Sir, if it will be permissible, with Your Honour's guidance and the pleasure of the House, I would like to give the Member, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the assurance of doing that Resolution which he has just read out on Friday, for the simple reason that it really does not say very much.

I can understand how the spokesman on Finance on the other side condemns the Government for going along with its colleagues in CARICOM and having their monies tied-up in the Clearing Facility now that because of that we were forced to go up to the IMF. He has castigated and condemned Government for that. On the other hand, this Resolution is now asking us to join with them and get some form of mechanism.

I really would like to hear a real debate on this, because it is so contradictory. The spokesman for Finance is saying that we should never be in this position. Now we are hearing the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, a man whose abiding faith is in that of our CARICOM partners, saying that we should get in it.

I really am going to discuss with my colleagues during the course of the day whether to come back and hear what both gentlemen, the spokesman for Finance on that side and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, will have to say, because it is a contradiction. I am going to ask my colleagues if they can find it possible to come back on Friday to hear what they have to say. It is a contradiction on both sides. It shows you how confused they are in their thoughts.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, in view of the statement made by the honourable Leader of the House.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, we are not now discussing the Resolution. The Leader of the House was asking for leave to deal with this Resolution on Friday. I will give a ruling on that, and when it comes, anyone will have the right to make his speech. The honourable Member for St. James North is Leader of the House. It is left to him to direct the business of the House and when the House sits. If the honourable Member is of the opinion that the House should come back on Friday to deal with any business, it is then left to him to determine that and the hour, and the House will meet under those circumstances.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, just on a point of order for a matter of clarification.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On a point of order.
12.25 p.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: There are two matters raised, Sir, the question of seeking your permission.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: As I said, the Leader of the House does not have to seek my permission for the House to sit.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: May I finish, Sir? There are two matters — the question of the House sitting on Friday, and remarks made during that speech. I consider it quite improper for the honourable Member to get up and make all sorts of distorted remarks and then for us not to have the opportunity to respond to it, because those remarks can only stem from a total ignorance of what we have been discussing in relation to the CARICOM Multilateral Clearing Facility. It is just total ignorance on the part of the honourable Member.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, you are to determine what is improper in here and what is proper. That is gross ignorance if you are saying that I am doing something that is improper. It is a reflection on the Chair. That is all I have to say.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Questions by the honourable Member for St. Michael South. Question No. 1 re payment of individual Income Tax.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question:

To ask the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance:

1. How many persons were subject to the payment of individual Income Tax for the income years 1980, 1981 and 1982?
2. What was the distribution of such persons among each of the tax bands operable for the years referred to?
3. What was the yield of Income Tax for each of those tax bands?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question by the same honourable Member re classification of public service files and documents in security matters.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question:

To ask the Prime Minister and Minister of Defence and Security:

Will the Minister state what are the levels of security classifications and their meanings in respect of the files and documents in the Public Service?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question by the same honourable Member re breaches of the Official Secrets Act.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question:

To ask the Prime Minister and Minister of Defence and Security:

In view of recent statements in the House of Assembly concerning possible breaches of the Official Secrets Act, will the Minister state:

1. How many reports of possible security breaches in the Public Service have been

received by the Government in the years 1980, 1981 and 1982? How many of these were investigated, and how many actual breaches of security were revealed from such investigations?

2. Did any changes in security procedures result from reports referred to?
3. Is the convention being followed whereby the Prime Minister consults with the Leader of the Opposition concerning an investigation of reports of security breaches in the Public Service?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to move that Government Business be the instant Order of the day.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Government Business is now the instant order of the day.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Order No. 6, Sir.

PROPERTY TRANSFER TAX (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1983

Order No. 6 was called – To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Property Transfer Tax Act.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, the object of this Bill is to provide a legislative framework to capture an area of income which the Commissioner of Inland Revenue believes has been under-reported in Barbados for a long period of time. It is that area of income which is derived from the sale of real estate which is physically situated in Barbados, but because of the law relating to land in Barbados, the owners of which are not necessarily situated in Barbados.

It is exceedingly difficult without having the law, which prohibits the ownership of land in Barbados other than by a person who is living in Barbados or by a company which is incorporated in Barbados and all its shareholders, either persons or companies, incorporated in Barbados, for the Government to monitor this situation other than by attempting to devise machinery whereby information flows to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue, and from thereon the Inland Revenue is alerted to the transactions. This, Sir, is the object of this bit of legislation.

We also, of course, have to ensure that there are sanctions in the event of non-compliance, and as a matter

of principle, one of the sanctions that this legislation would provide is that, in the event of non-notification, the transferor will have to provide certain information within 14 days to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue.

We also provide under Section 13 that the Registrar shall not register, record, file or stamp any instrument or document relating to the transfer of any property unless the Property Transfer Tax has been paid, or security for the payment of such tax has been given. The Property Transfer Tax Act was introduced some considerable period of time, and only a few amendments have taken place with respect to it. I think that there is a case for a review of its workings, which should be undertaken not with a view to the abolition of the Property Transfer Tax — because it must be remembered in Barbados that Property Transfer Tax is our attempt at introducing a charge on capital gains which arise in Barbados very often as a result of actions which have taken place without any expenditure of money on the part of the land owners, but very often as a result of expenditure which the rest of the taxpayers have had to incur in the interest of the public good. Therefore it is necessary for some machinery to be in existence to capture any gains which have arisen, so there can be no question of the abolition of Property Transfer Tax in Barbados.

12.35 p.m.

The tightening-up of the administration of the Act, and the provision of machinery to ensure that evasion is not large scale, is the area that I am particularly thinking of. From the Bahamas down, many countries in the Caribbean have had to deal with the situation which arises where people who own land, or have rights in land in Barbados under the shelter of the Cayman Island Companies, or other companies anywhere else, and the totality of share ownership in those companies are also held by another company and the transfers to ownership take place not by physical transfer of the land or by a deed of the physical land, but by the rights in the company. That is a difficult situation.

Of course, the honourable Member who is an acknowledged expert in this area — not that he is a lawyer and he is able to give good advice as how to legitimately avoid the tax — he is a beneficiary of these companies and therefore, having been advised that this is a legitimate way to preserve the corpus of his considerable estate, has proceeded thus.

And I am not blaming him on that at all, Sir. I am only indicating that we feel that the time has come when those who earn a living in Barbados by disposing of their interest should, like everybody else, pay their just tax in respect of their profession or calling with regards to advice in this area.

I beg to move, Sir, that the Bill be read a second time.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

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

On motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clauses 1 – 3 inclusive were called and passed.

On motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee without amendment and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

CINEMATOGRAPH FILM CENSORSHIP (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1983

Order No. 7 was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Cinematograph Film Censorship Act.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Sir, this is a relatively short amendment to the Cinematograph Film Censorship Act, Cap. 299.

Apparently, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Film Censorship Board is not the kind of board that people are particularly interested in serving on. As a matter of fact, the censors have been serving for something like 20 years, Sir. Government is appointing a new Censorship Board for a matter of three years and we sincerely hope that there may be more interest in this area.

The amendment is also, of course, primarily to increase the fee from \$480 to \$10 000 for cinemas who show that their film is not in keeping with the provisions of the Act.

I would like to make a relatively minor comment in relation to a number of things which I, myself, see on the screens in cinemas and on television.

Those persons who are responsible for censoring a number of these films must really look back and recognise the fact — it is true — that Barbados has changed, let us accept that, but the amount of four-letter words that you hear, and the crime that you see on the television

and cinema screens, Sir, is something which, far from being old-fashioned, I believe I could push up my nose at.

I have no doubt that many of the sophisticated crimes which are committed today come straight off the screens in the cinemas. Many years ago, when you heard of a man being arrested for stealing, you would hear that he had climbed over somebody else's fence and probably carried away a sheep, a cow or chickens. But today it is picking of pockets, breaking in banks, and sticking up people at gun point.
12.45 p.m.

I recall that the late Sir Grantley Adams once said that there is no doubt that tourism is an industry which all Barbadians should be interested in and should give of their best to make sure that they can have visitors to a country. He also said that, as a matter of progress, time would surely show that it was also an industry which one should really keep a very close watch on because it brings all sorts of things with it.

I must confess, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I am not one of the people who are particularly satisfied with what I see on the television and the cinema in relation to crime and killing and things of that nature. Although we have been changing our pattern of life somewhat in Barbados, I do not think that we are that far gone. I have no doubt that the church is trying to play a very responsible role, as they have done in the past, in this, and I would sincerely hope that they will continue with their spiritual guidance to save Barbados from that path which I must push my nose up at.

The amendment primarily is to increase the fine from \$480 to \$10 000.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Mr. Deputy Speaker, on this amendment to the Film Censorship Act, I want to take this opportunity to find out the answer to something that has been bothering me.

Lots of times you see films that have been passed for adults only, and there seems to me to be no effective means, if any at all, of policing the entry to these cinemas to see whether or not the people meet these ages. And it is a known fact that thousands upon thousands of very young children have been going in to see these "Adults Only" rated shows that are being shown, and which are very popular nowadays.

I know it is the operators' responsibility to see that rules are carried out fairly strictly, but I think that the

Censorship Board should give a serious thought to this most recent activity of the young in Barbados — and I really mean young people — in considering it their duty to see how best they can introduce the necessary mechanism to make sure that "Adults Only" films are restricted to adults only and not further contaminate the young people of Barbados.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I can appreciate what the honourable Member for St. Philip North has brought to our attention, but standards have fallen so rapidly in the country that even if you have a video in your own home, you have to police it. Although I can appreciate what he has said, I myself find it hard to police that, but I have no doubt that the Minister will take note of your comment.

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

On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE LEASE OF LAND TO AHI (CARIBBEAN) LIMITED

Order No. 3 was called — To move the passing of a Resolution to approve of the lease to AHI (Caribbean) Limited of a parcel of land at Lodge Hill, St. Michael.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution is simple and straightforward. This land is part of a larger area of 11.505 hectares which the Government proposes to lease to the company involved. The Government's new policy with respect to leasing is that the rents must be a fair return for the value of the property, that the lease should not exceed 15 years and that negotiations should take place every three years. We consider this to be a fair arrangement in the light of the changing property values.

In relation to a number of old leases which were around in the past, I recall when my predecessor in office, the honourable Leader of the House and representative for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig), had to come to Cabinet to ensure that a number of these leases that only bore peppercorn rents be brought up to what were regarded then as a proper rate of return on the value.

The Government is seeking to have all these matters regularised and put in a true and proper form. This lease is quite straightforward, and, as I said before, the value for the land which will be leased to the company is regarded by the Chief Valuation Officer as the current value of this property.

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

Mr. L. L. SISNETT (St. Michael North East): Mr. Deputy Speaker, in seconding that motion, I would just like the Minister to give a little consideration to the number of problems which the residents of that area have been experiencing over a number of years since that company erected its business there in Lodge Hill.

For one, I would like to know if there is any consideration given to the fact that the main road which the company uses is a cul-de-sac and borders entirely on the Friendship Development, where there are at least over 80 houses. I remember distinctly about two years ago at the entrance of the Lodge Hill area leading to AHI there was a fatal accident around 7 o'clock in the morning, and as a result of the ensuing turmoil, it was impossible for any of the residents of the Lodge Hill area to exit on Lodge Hill. Certainly, I realise there is a need for more land in that area, but at the same time, we would like to know that the people's interests are being taken care of.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW entered the Chamber and took his seat.

12.55 p.m.

There are quite a lot of heavy vehicles in that area and there are lots of private cars using that one street, and I would surmise that if there is going to any acceleration in the use of that main street by this company, the Government certainly should be considering at least another road whereby the residents could have a choice of exiting into Lodge Hill to make their way into the mainstream of the traffic in that area.

So I would just like to bring this to the Government's attention that that main road into Lodge Hill is one street and it is a cul-de-sac. If we are to learn from our past mistakes, the morning of that accident none of the residents there were able to reach their places

of business for about four, five hours — until the body in the road could be removed.

If the honourable Minister perhaps could give us a little more information as to if there are any plans for making an alternate route in that area, I believe the residents there would be much happier.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is more by way of information. Did I hear the Minister say that this is a portion of 11,504 hectares intended to be leased to AHI? I would like that clarified for my information.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this site used to be known, or, rather, I believe still is known, as the site of the National Crematorium, which is now deceased. The whole site, including the area where the houses were put, was originally acquired for the National Crematorium. I thought you would have been aware of that. And the lots in there are part of this larger area or 11,504 hectares. I do not know if that answers what you are trying to get. Even where the polyclinic is built is part of that area as well.

In answer to the honourable Member for St. Michael North East (Mr. L. L. Sisnett), I would just like to inform him that the Government plans to build a major highway within the area that he is complaining about at the moment. I do not know how much it is known, but that major highway will be linked with University Drive as well as with the new highway which is being built to link up Chapel Gap and Wildey. So there are going to be major changes within that area.

There is another thing which we have to bear in mind. Progress brings with it a fair amount of disruption. It brings with it noise pollution, a lot of heavy equipment and a lot of motor cars, and, as soon as a country starts to develop, these are problems which you are not going to avoid.

It is a question of having industries or having none at all. And if you are to have industries, they have to be sited somewhere and you have to look for places that are comparatively accessible to the airport or the seaport. I do believe that that is the reason why, in the first place, permission was given for a number of companies to be built within that area.

But this Government is very environment conscious, and therefore will take into account any situation which tends to affect the health and living conditions of the inhabitants of any area. So I give my colleague from St. Michael North East the assurance that if there is any assistance which I can give in order to improve the egress and ingress for the people in that area, we will

make sure that provision is made to make life much more comfortable for them.

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

GUARANTEE DATED 14TH APRIL 1983 REGARDING THE FUTURE TAXING OF THE ROYAL BANK OF CANADA (B'DOS) LTD. AS A LICENSEE UNDER THE OFFSHORE BANKING ACT

Order No. 4 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the Guarantee dated 14th April 1983 regarding the future taxing of the Royal Bank of Canada (B'dos) Ltd. as a Licensee under the Offshore Banking Act.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): Mr. Deputy Speaker successive Governments in Barbados, in their efforts to promote development in the country, have from time to time granted statutory concessions to certain sectors of the economy in order to attract and develop investment in those areas.

Perhaps the forerunner of all such legislation was the Pioneer Industries Act of 1958, which granted relief from Income Tax, the then existing Trade Tax and interim traders' fees and other charges, and from Customs Duties to industries which were not then being carried on in the island. Our whole industrial development has arisen from these tax concessions. Those concessions were subsequently refined and enlarged in 1974 and it is in accordance with the provisions of the Industrial Incentives Act of 1974 that the industrial sector continues to receive concessions.

The hotel sector, of course, has been given concessions, I think since 1955, under various Hotel Aids Acts. The Hotel Aids Act of 1967 granted Income Tax relief and other tax concessions to the industry. The agricultural sector has benefitted from tax concessions of slightly different classes. And the most recent concessions have been those given to international business companies, which were exempted from Income Tax in 1965, and offshore banks which had a special regime established for them in 1979.

Under the Offshore Banking Act, it is provided that a guarantee relating to taxation can be given to banks in certain circumstances. Effectively, the guarantee relates to the concessions in Sections 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 111, 112 and 113 of the Act.

The Royal Bank of Canada (B'dos) Ltd. was either the first or one of the first three of the offshore banks to set up in Barbados, and it has been a very successful

offshore bank indeed. It now writes more business than all the on-shore banks in Barbados.

It has, in a way, made the prediction of the right honourable Leader of the Opposition (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow) come true, a prediction which he made a few years ago to the effect that within five years, Trinidad would be borrowing money from Barbados, for the Royal Bank of Canada (B'dos) Offshore Branch has participated in a loan to the Government of Trinidad.

It has made loans to the Government of Barbados itself, and, at the moment, it is in the process of preparing for a great deal of new business that may arise as a result of court decisions in other jurisdictions.
1.05 p.m.

The Government has therefore acceded to the bank's request for a guarantee under, and by virtue of, the Act for a period of 20 years. Subject to this guarantee, the bank will pay tax at the rate of 2½ per cent on the first \$10 million of its profits and 1 per cent thereafter, and it will be exempted under the conditions of the Act for the guaranteed period.

The guarantee, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is really by way of making sure that what is in the Act remains what is in the Act, for this bank may be viewed as a pioneer in the field of off-shore banking.

I, myself, do not believe that it will ever be necessary in Barbados for a foreign investor to make a special request that both political parties in Parliament support his investment. This was done in St. Lucia, as honourable Members will recall, in connection with the establishment of the Oil Transshipment Facility. However, if the foreign organisation in this case, the Royal Bank, wants what it sees as the protection of the guarantee, I have absolutely no reason to refuse it that protection – although I will be prepared to assure it that the two political parties in Barbados are responsible parties and are unlikely, no matter what turns the electoral fortunes may take, and what changes occur on Government and Opposition benches, to repudiate the obligations entered into by each other when in Government.

It has never been done, so far as I know, despite the fulminations of political parties when in Opposition against the policies of the other party. I know of no case where faith has been broken with a foreign investor who entered into a direct agreement with the Government of Barbados. The survival of the Mobil Agreement bears testimony to this, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Indeed, the Leader of the Opposition will surely remember that Banks Beer maintained its incentives even after the events of December, 1961.

I therefore expect that although the guarantee may contain an element of redundancy, insofar as neither political party is likely to invite economic destruction by taking such steps as would destroy the offshore banking regime, which is now in its infancy, but will not always be an infant, I am prepared to offer it and to invite Parliament to pass it, and I therefore move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Sir, I beg to second that.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, recently I made a rather long intervention in Parliament on the need to examine all the various aspects of the legislation not only to give security or a sense of security, or should I say a greater sense of security, to all those involved in the Offshore business, but also to ensure that an adequate administrative structure is established in Barbados — not only to deal with the domestic aspects of the management of the offshore sector, but in particular to deal with the whole question of promotion of the offshore sector in Barbados.

We expressed our reservation in 1979, and on subsequent occasions, in relation to off-shore activity. I do not propose to go through that again today. However, the fact that Royal Bank of Canada has asked for this guarantee probably stems from the kind of difficulties which I outlined not so long ago in this Parliament.

One of the problems has been the repeated amendments to the substantive off-shore Banking Act. Another problem has been the failure of ensuring adequate harmonisation with the existing Companies Act, and the proposed Companies Act, particularly in the area, as I understand it, where it is crucial for the expedition for this sort of activity. The facility should exist where an individual himself can be the sole shareholder in forming a company. As I understand it, the existing Companies Act does not provide for that, but the new Companies Act does provide for it, and that particular step would be very significant in relation to further development of the off-shore sector.

I pointed out that there was a need, indeed a very urgent need, to establish some concrete institutional framework here in Barbados where adequate expertise can be developed by those responsible for the management of the sector and for liaising with the various institutions — accountants, legal personnel and so on who will be responsible for the management and promotion of the off-shore centre. I also referred to the techniques of promotion which would be highly dependent on the establishment for such an administrative infrastructure.

I believe, Sir, that if all these things were done, and if there was not an element of confusion that has arisen from time to time in the very banks in respect of the

status of individual investments and in relation to the existing law, resulting in repeated amendments to the Off-shore Banking Act, then we might have not found ourselves in a situation where the Royal Bank would be asking for this guarantee.

I do not think that that request arises out of any political uncertainty as to what a future Government might do in this particular area as far as honouring commitments of a previous Administration. I think that it probably arises out of the difficulties which have arisen as a consequence of the numerous amendments that have had to be made to the Off-shore Banking Act. And I think that honourable Members would appreciate, and I have drawn concrete examples to this House before, that it creates problems not only for the banks, but also for the accountants, and for the legal profession locally and overseas. As a matter of fact, Sir, I recall that the last amendment to the Off-Shore Banking Act was to ensure, or at least to give the Royal Bank of Canada the assurance, that they had not done something illegal in terms of lending to the Government of Barbados. 1.15 p.m.

I will once again urge on the Government the necessity to look very carefully at the Offshore Banking Act, to look very carefully at the International Business Companies Act as amended, to look very carefully at the Shipping Act, and to look very carefully at the Act which established the facility for captive insurance business in Barbados. There are many areas in those four bits of legislation that need to be looked at and need to be harmonised in relation to the existing Companies Act. I do not propose to go any further, but I am sure you are going to get this kind of problem again and again unless that is done.

I also took the opportunity to point out that it is my understanding that Antigua, a country which entered into this field after Barbados, was able, perhaps because of its lack of domestic tax regime, to put together the various bits of the legislation far more efficiently than Barbados has been able to do so far. This is my understanding from people who work in both jurisdictions as lawyers and as accountants, also from people who work in the banks in Antigua and work in the banks in Barbados, and this is a genuine problem that needs to be looked at.

I do not think it is really in the ultimate interest of this country that the Minister of Finance should find himself in a position where he should have to be responding to a request from a bank for a formal guarantee to reinforce what are, in fact, the substantive provisions of an Act passed by this Parliament. I believe that with some effort and with some attention to the kind of details which I have outlined in a previous speech,

and which I say I will not necessarily repeat today, because I think I have made that speech only about four to six weeks ago and it forms part of the Official Record of Parliament — if those problems are acted on and the suggestions taken, I do not think that many other institutions will be asking the Minister of Finance to come to Parliament for this kind of guarantee in order to give them greater security.

There was one little area of confusion. I am not sure whether the Honourable Minister of Finance indicated that there was some variation in the rate of taxation consequential on the guarantee.

Aside

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Fair enough, but that was the impression that came across. Once I am satisfied on that score, I think I have made the salient points in relation to this guarantee. I do not think it should have been necessary, and I think the problems arose out of the kind of situation which I have repeatedly dealt with in this House. I do not propose to pursue any further at the moment.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John): Mr. Deputy Speaker, quite apart from the 25 consecutive years which I have represented the parish of St. John, my experience in Parliament spreads over a period of 32 years, come December. During part of that time we were not an independent country, we were one of the more advanced colonial territories. I maintain that we were never a Crown colony.

The Parliament of Great Britain never had any authority to legislate for us. As a matter of fact, when they wanted to enshrine in the laws of this island the Agreements which had been made under the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement in 1947, the Parliament of Barbados enacted the Sugar Industry (Price Stabilisation) (Rehabilitation and Labour Welfare) Act of that year. In other words, whereas the United Kingdom could by reference say that this law applies to, let us say, Mauritius, Trinidad — it was not Trinidad and Tobago in those days — Seychelles, even Jamaica after the rape of the Jamaica Constitution — a voluntary rape I should say, because you will remember in your constitutional law that the Jamaican Parliament itself asked for an inferior constitution — they could not say it applied to Barbados.

We came very close to that in 1939 when it was seriously suggested by one of my predecessors, who subsequently became the first Premier of Barbados, that Barbados should revert to the Crown colony system of Government. But we never did, and those who are serious students of the events of those times would know that the first Premier of Barbados was so exasperated by the

actions of the plantocracy in this Chamber, that he felt that the only way to put them in their place was to ask the Colonial Government to put us back in the same situation to which Jamaica had reverted.

The point I am trying to make is that during those 32 years I have never seen a bit of legislation like this. I think the honourable Member for St. Thomas himself (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams) would admit that this is an insult to the Parliament of Barbados. First, it is absurd; because no Parliament can bind another Parliament. It is unnecessary. It is absurd.

But you have to look at the history of Parliaments of Barbados where the Parliaments in Barbados have always accepted the obligations of previous Administrations. That was until 1976, of course, when we did not exactly repudiate agreements made with the Treasurer of the United States of America, but this Government said they did not want the North Star, although the American Government had sold it for \$52 000 — and not for the \$21 million paid the Trident, which is riding at moorings in the Careenage.

What I am saying is this: I am surprised that a Canadian bank could ask for this kind of guarantee. We can understand some of the United States institutions asking for this kind of guarantee, because they do not understand the constitutions of places outside the United States. In fact, judging from the actions of some American businessmen, it is very difficult to accept they understand the Constitution of the United States of America. Once you cross the Potomac, or you leave New Haven, or you sail out past Staten Island, they are completely at sea so far as the constitutional practices, rights and usages of Parliaments in countries like ours are concerned.

What does this Resolution do? We are seeking here to endorse an agreement ostensibly made by the Minister of Finance on the 13th April — I think the date is the 13th April, Sir, but some time back in April — and we are now in May 1983. I said “ostensibly,” because it starts off in the first line by saying that this given this 14th day of April one thousand nine hundred and eighty three by the Government of Barbados acting herein by the Minister of Finance to the Royal Bank of Canada (Barbados) Limited a company incorporated and registered under the provisions of the Companies Act Cap. 308 of the Laws of Barbados, *et cetera, et cetera*.

Unless the House is being misled, the guarantee itself says that the guarantee has been made by the Minister of Finance. In my humble opinion, if they are treating Parliament with the courtesy and respect which is due to Parliament, the guarantee could not be made. This is not an Order, for which the law already provides that, unless there is a Negative Resolution, the Minister may

make an Order. It is Parliament which is guaranteeing it, therefore it should take effect, if we agreed to June, July or some date beyond that period, but not 14 April; because, let us sit down now and do not vote on it and see what will happen!

1.25 p.m.

There is no provision in the law for the Minister of Finance to make a guarantee and have it subsequently ratified. This is a serious matter. It is a serious matter from the constitutional point of view, and it is an erosion of the privileges of this country as a sovereign independent country; and in behest of people who really do not understand what the facts of life are in independent countries — supposedly independent countries — like Barbados.

The Minister is asking us to ratify something he has already done, but that is a small issue compared with the statement issued, which we have to deal with today.

The guarantee is nonsensical to begin with, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because the guarantee is asking us to bind a Parliament 20 years from now, whatever Parliament it is. Once it is the Parliament of Barbados, the Government and people of Barbados are bound to something by virtue of which conditions may change next year or year after next.

If they can only function in this kind of guarantee, then, as far as I am concerned, they can get out of Barbados. The Minister says that so many offshore banks will come here, another one like the Royal Bank of Canada Off-shore Bank, one more or less, would not make much difference.

Why is it that other offshore companies have registered here without this guarantee? If you give a guarantee to one, you are going to have to give it to all, because the next one coming in will say we want to have a guarantee because we are putting our money in this thing and we want to make sure that you do not change your mind.

What is the constitutional position of the Minister, the honourable Member for St. Thomas, who mentioned something about Banks Breweries and pioneer status, or whatever it is. We were in office for 15 years and we never took away anybody's status, no matter how they supported the Labour Party, and I would not expect the Government of today to take away pioneer status granted under the undertaking enshrined in the Statute Books of Barbados because they do not like the political allegiance of the people who come in.

They have done worse. Companies have come in here and said they do not want any agreement with any trade union — although it is unconstitutional, and we have

every provocation to take away the privileges which are granted to them.

It is stated that we must recognize the Constitution of Barbados and the right of the workers to organize. And what did we do? We did not take it away. We got the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union to bring in a petition on his standing. Now, that is weighed by its strength or otherwise. It means that you bring somebody to redemption and to the throne of grace. But that is a matter for them and not for me. The point is that we did not take away people's privileges under which they set up industries in Barbados.

Now along comes the Royal Bank of Canada and says that they want a guarantee that only if the Law changes for the better, will there be a change. You cannot have it both ways. If you are trying to guarantee that nothing adverse happens to the company or the offshore bank — let us call it the Offshore Bank — during the next 20 years, you have accepted the conditions as they are today. You cannot say that if things be better they want a piece of that, because they have come in here under certain condition and under certain stipulations under the Statute Law of Barbados, with which they must have been satisfied.

They want a guarantee. A Government may be out of office in six months, or two years, and then another Government will be out of office another year after that, and then another Government — like they had in Canada three or four years when the Liberal Party did not have a straight majority and the Government changed then. But they want this Parliament to bind all future Governments in a country like Barbados, no matter what the personal inclinations of the people who comprise the Government may be, or if they get a rush of blood sometimes, or otherwise. The point is that no matter what Government has been in, we always recognise that if people come here to do business under certain provisions those provisions should not be changed to their detriment.

They say in this agreement, which the Minister apparently has signed, in Clause 4:—

"If at any time during the term of this Guarantee the Act or similar legislation is amended to provide tax rates or exemptions which in the company's opinion are more favourable to the company, the company shall have the right to substitute those tax rates or exemptions for those which are the subject of this Guarantee and the Guarantee shall then continue to apply for the remainder of the 20 year term".

Just let us examine that clause. As I said, they have come in here under certain exemptions and relief from taxation. Suppose ten years from now the CARICOM

Ministers made a positive decision; the CARICOM Ministers decided that, as from April 1, 1983, any offshore banks coming into this area — because there is a movement called the Organization of Fiscal Incentives, to which we subscribe, and I am dealing with this now as a fiscal incentive — because of looking towards a harmonization of these fiscal incentives, will have improved conditions from that day, and then they add that no company which is registered before April 1, 1993 shall be entitled to these privileges, it would mean then that the Government of Barbados has to have a write up on that, because we have told the Royal Bank of Canada that whenever things get better, they can have it better. If they get worse, they have nothing to do with that.

The adverse side of the picture is this. Let us say that in the harmonizing of this fiscal incentive decision, the Heads of Government come to a conclusion that these provisions are too generous and they say that on and after a certain date we will harmonize so that we will only have, say, 50 per cent — I am just giving you a broad generic term — of the incentives which exist, at that stage the Government of Barbados will say “We agree, but we would just like to tell those companies to whom we are committed that they could not be affected, because that would be tantamount to trying to institute redrafting legislation.”

It is probable for the Government of Barbados to say that, so what is the Royal Bank of Canada worried about? They are now coming as a supernational institution that they are now telling the Parliament of Barbados that we have to bind future Governments of Barbados for the next 20 years?

I am saying that the guarantee is inept and it is absurd and unnecessary, because if they cannot accept the good faith of the Government, or the good sense of the political parties in Barbados, then they are treating us with some kind of contempt that not even the United States Government has tried to put on us.
1.35 p.m.

I will tell you now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what the United States Government did. I know we have gone back, since Reaganism, to gunboat diplomacy in Nicaragua and El Salvador, but at a certain state in the Sixties, the United States Government realised that governments may change and may take a different view to the United States investment in this region particularly. And what did the Government of the United States do? They did not say that every company coming into your area must have a guarantee from Parliaments, because the Government of the United States realised that was absurd. What they did was to ask the Governments to agree to an investment insurance which the Government of the United States paid for, and continues to pay for; and

what the Government of the United States said is that if there is any riot, revolution, civil commotion or a change of policy which would affect the investment made by the United States investor, then they would pay you for any losses.

This is what the Royal Bank of Canada must try and get the Canadian Government to do, because I am not aware that the Canadian Government has an investment insurance in the same way as the United States. It is not very often that the Government of the United States acts sensibly in these matters, but the Government of the United States decided that they wanted to help their businessmen, long before any Caribbean Basin Initiative, and they passed their Investment Guarantee Act and asked governments like the Government of Barbados to agree — they could have passed the Act and left it like that, but they asked us to agree — that they could pay out their business if anything adverse happened to their investment. I hope you follow me. I think you know about it, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

All the Royal Bank of Canada has to do is to ask the Canadian Government to set up similar investment insurance. That is all there is to it. But I cannot agree to this because this means that I do not have any independence now as a Member of Parliament, that Parliament itself is not an independent Parliament. I think it is absurd, and I really think that the honourable Member for St. Thomas brought it in here to let us tell the Royal Bank of Canada what we think about it, and to withdraw it.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I must support the points made by the Leader of the Opposition, the right honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow), because I myself was a bit puzzled about the whole legality of what we are purporting to do. I was discussing this matter here with the next Attorney General of Barbados, the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central (Mr. M. A. King), and the Shadow Minister of Finance, and we are in fact puzzled about the procedures.

I think the Prime Minister recognises the point now, because this matter and the guarantee are supposed to be done pursuant to Section 108 of the Offshore Banking Act, 1979–26. Now when I take up a copy of the Offshore Banking Act, 1979–26, at Clause 108 (1) I read:

“When in the opinion of the Minister it is in the public interest to do so, the Minister may by agreement give such assurance or guarantees regarding the future taxing of a licensee as it may require before commencing to do offshore banking from within Barbados”.

The operative words there are “before commencing to do offshore banking from within Barbados”.

The first question I have to ask therefore is, when did this Royal Bank of Canada (Barbados) Limited commence to do offshore banking business in Barbados? I am positive that I have heard official statements to the effect that they have been operating from 1982, or maybe even 1981 – I do not know – for that matter. I am certain that they have been operating before April, 1983, when this guarantee was given to them by the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance. So the question I am really asking is this: we are purporting to do this Resolution to give a guarantee to the Royal Bank of Canada in respect of its offshore banking activities, but the Act under which we are supposed to be giving that guarantee by means of Affirmative Resolution indicates that such a guarantee can only be given to a company before it commences to do offshore banking business?

We are into a major problem here, and I believe the Government will therefore have to explain the legal basis on which it is proceeding in this matter. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am no legal luminary, as you are. The Government has all of its legal officers and so on. The matter is not dissimilar from what is happening in respect of the Post Office, but that is another matter which I hope I will get some opportunity to deal with in this Honourable Chamber. I will not deal with that now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I thought we were dealing with a Resolution with respect to the Royal Bank of Canada. There is nothing in this Resolution which draws my attention to the Post Office.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am not going to dwell on this matter any longer. It is something which I believe from both sides of the House we will realise that we are on very unsure and unfirm ground here; and I hope that the Government will take into account the points that were made from over here.

I suspect, though, that there is a wider problem, and I will give the Prime Minister some advice from the Floor of this House. You have a large number of persons in your Cabinet.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member should address the Chair at all times.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am making the point that the Prime Minister has a large number of persons in his Cabinet, but it is clear to the people of Barbados now that there is a mismatch between the talents of the people whom he has in his Cabinet and the portfolios to which they are assigned, and the sooner he addresses his mind to that problem, the better it will be. If not, Government is going to find itself in more and more problems, which will be very difficult not only for the Government, but for the succeeding Government to get itself out of.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have over the course of the last 25 years had a lot to do with the law and with people who have been coming to Barbados in an attempt either to set up pioneer industries under the Pioneer Industries Act, fiscal incentive industries under the Fiscal Incentives Act, applicants under the International Business Companies Act, before it was amended by this Government to make it workable in 1979, and also, since 1976, I believe I have dealt with a large number of industrialists both here and abroad. If there is one characteristic which all of these people have, it is that they wish the moon if possible to set up an industry, set up a bank, set up an international business company or anything. They are likely to ask for the moon.
1.45 p.m.

This is not a problem peculiar to Barbados, because during the course of our last negotiations for the LOME Convention, when the Governments of Europe were trying to voice within the Convention guarantee provisions in relation to foreign investment, the Prime Minister of Fiji looked at them and said: "You do not ask Australia for this, you do not ask New Zealand for it, you do not ask the United States for it, are you asking the underdeveloped world for it because they are black? So it is very clear to me that pressure or demands will be made in respect of offshore banking.

In our Ministry, we have always taken the point that, as we understand it, once you are a country like Barbados which inherited the British Common Law, and that common law was enshrined in a written Constitution, the provisions of our law were the same as the United Kingdom Law. And if there is one principle in Constitutional Law that you learn as a First Year student in Law School, it is that one Parliament cannot bind its successors. That is a fundamental principal of law.

Now, notwithstanding that, these people still want you to pass a Resolution. What is the big thing? If you point out the idiocy of their action, if you pointed it out to them and you tell them that the Constitution of Barbados does not allow this to have any force, they still want it. But if the idiots want it, give it to them. I do not see any difficulty with it.

Laughter.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I mean, you tell the people this all the time. They say that Parliament has passed it. It is true that Parliament has passed it, but it only binds this Parliament.

There would have to be a constitutional amendment to take away that fundamental rule. And, no doubt about

it at all, there cannot be a constitutional amendment to interfere with that rule, because the Government is not going to do it. So, I do not see what the big thing is.

I want to say, Sir, that we have had quite considerable success in relation to this off-shore regime. And I wish to take up some of the points which the honourable Member for St. Michael Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) has made.

The Government long ago recognised that you have to have a relationship between the separate exemptions from the normal rules, in relation to companies, taxation, Banking Acts, Shipping Acts and, most of all, that you have to have a core bit of legislation in relation to the incorporating of companies, which has to be modernised and updated.

I want to enlighten him on a few points. He is not the originator of that. That exercise has been going along for a long period of time. If you see the manifestoes of the Labour Party, you will see it.

I have repeatedly held the view, and have put it in writing to all of those who advocate this, that we should not have an exempt Bill for special companies in Barbados. I always say, "No." My own belief is that I am not coming to the Barbados public and say, "I have a special class of culprit called an exempt company", because I have to ask the questions in relation to what I mean.

What I say is, if you pass a series of legislation where in the Act itself the deviation from the normal rules of law are set out then, anybody who has any kind of understanding would understand that the general rules do apply, except where they are changed by the separate pieces of legislation.

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: But the insurance company is basically the same thing.

So I have resisted this exempt company provision. I am telling you that. And I say the reason why we would have to do that, and the reason why the Antiguan situation is different from ours, is simply that in the other countries, the Bahamas and the Cayman Islands and Bermuda, they do not have Income Tax. But this country has Income Tax.

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I said so. You are only repeating what I said.)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Well, the problem with Antigua is that it does not have Income Tax, but it does

not have enough taxes to pay the debts to the other governments that it owes. You had better look at its having Income Tax, if the Government is to pay for its education and the other things.

(Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: That is right.)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: We have never fooled the public in Barbados that we can abolish Income Tax. The only person who would say that is the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes). I believe that is going to be the next plank in his platform, because they say he is now saying that he will be abolishing taxes for public utilities. He will soon abolish Income Tax. But we know he does not mean it.

So the basic position is that telling me about Antigua does not advance the points that we are making. The fundamental point is that in Barbados, we have to engraft upon our existing laws, a regime which carries a number of exemptions; and the best way to do it, in my opinion, as a lawyer, is to make it clear that only in certain restricted areas are these exemptions to apply.

That is the answer to it, and you must have enough courage to tell them that you are not going to do it the other way around. And that is the position. I do not believe that Barbados has lost one company by not doing it the other way around.

Sir, if the honourable Member wants to take the view of the Central Bank, because that is the view of the Central Bank that the honourable Member is advocating, let him take the view of the Central Bank. But as far as this Government is concerned, we are taking the view that the general laws are the governing laws. I am not giving way! No way! I know exactly what I am talking about.

I am not going to be hustled or pushed into any view point which I know is wrong. The Central Bank does not have enough knowledge of the general law in Barbados to be competent in this area. I say that. They do not have the guidance there, nor the advisers.

Because the general view is clear. If you are starting from a situation in which you have total exemption from Income Tax and these things, you can approach it differently from where you are starting, from a situation where your general law predicates Income Tax, and then what you are doing is to create a series of exceptions. That is my view. We have it with international business companies, too.

There are some people who are scared to tell the people that is the law — if you do not want to come, go somewhere else. Because you do not come here because of the law. They have made a judgment already that the

factors which they take into account are that Barbados is either preferable or non-preferable. That is a fact. And the sooner we have sufficient self-confidence in ourselves to say to them, "This is the position, you are taking this or you are leaving it," — the better.

The point about selling of the services is one that is valid, because we do have to have a series of specialists in finance and accountancy and in marketing.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can the honourable Member complete his address within the next ten minutes?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: No, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The time is now 2.00 p.m. This sitting now stands suspended until 2.45 p.m. today.
2.00 p.m.

On the resumption:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. Since there are no Questions, we now come to Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no business under Private Members' Business.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Government Business is now resumed. When the suspension was taken, the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central was speaking.

RESOLUTION RE GUARANTEE TO ROYAL BANK — Cont'd

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Yes, Sir, I think I had better set out clearly for the benefit of all, the Government's position in respect to the offshore sector; that we recognise that offshore business is a very highly competitive business. We recognise that the Bahamas, Bermuda, Cayman in the Caribbean, Lichtenstein, the Isle of Man, the Channel Islands and other countries in Europe, together with a number of countries in the Pacific, are out there with a much longer tradition in this area than we have in it. Notwithstanding

that, we feel that there is still an area for us to operate in.

We have repeatedly said that we regard offshore banking, offshore insurance and the Shipping Bill as complementary to our main thrust. Our main thrust has been in the area of international business companies, and the international business companies, contrary to what a number of people have said, have been vigorously promoted by the Industrial Development Corporation overseas for at least 10 years. The problems have been largely solved by the amendments which took place in 1979, and also by certain developments that have taken place lately, which we feel is going to make Barbados even more attractive, namely the use of the satellite as a means of communicating between continents.

We just had a strategy study done, and one of the terms of reference of the strategy study for future industrial development promotion, which we specifically put in, was to ask them to evaluate Barbados as a centre for services in this new area of telecommunications and information business. Already, as I said before, we have attracted a number of companies in this area. Everybody knows that a subsidiary of the American Airlines is actively recruiting staff now. There are one or two others.

Of course, again because this is a new area, we have one or two problems to solve. For instance, what do you do with a person who is coming here and wishes to bring in his computers? Obviously, you will have to look at your regime, and thank God our regime is flexible to allow the man to bring in his computers for that specific business duty free. All of these are new areas.

So that when the honourable Member criticises the Government for amendments, what we have tried to do is to have a series of amendments which vest a certain discretionary power in the Minister of Finance subject to parliamentary review. As a result, if this thing develops, and as requests come forward, we then will be able to know and understand exactly what kind of total inducements you need to give to win this type of business activity.

It is impossible for any set of legal draftsmen, or any set of people in the Ministry of Finance or Trade, to envisage every particular application you will get. If you take this new area of being a centre for the transmission and processing of information by virtue of computers and modern technology, there are few countries in the world which have this industry — quite simply, because the technology has just been developed. So you cannot sit down and say that you have a precedent in the Cayman Islands, Bermuda, and those other areas.

In this area, I am bold enough to say that I agree with the conclusions of the consultants, that Barbados'

competitors in this area are not the Cayman Islands, the Bahamas, nor Bermuda. They do not have the people that we have with the qualifications and skills in this area. But you have to compete with countries like Ireland, Ceylon, India and, indeed, as some people say, now even with London. And it is true.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, little countries in the developing world are now finding themselves having to compete with the biggest developed countries in the world, countries like Belgium. Belgium has lost such a large number of their employment opportunities, because of the run-down of certain old industries, that they are now into new industrial development, and in the technological winning industry game, and they are willing to give far more concessions than we are willing to give.

The free enterprise zones in the United Kingdom give better concessions than we are willing to give. Anybody who has investigated the crash of a company like the DeLorean Motor Company will know how much money, in cash, the British Government put into that. So what is a little guarantee that does not have any legal effect? That is my opinion of it. What legal effect does it have? I insist, as a lawyer, that it does not have a legal effect, because I believe that this Parliament cannot bind a future Parliament. What we have to recognise is that we are out there competing with developing countries, because of the rapid rise of unemployment, because of the structural changes that are taking place in employment in developed countries.

I feel that the administration of offshore promotion of this area should be invested. In my opinion, I feel that the IDC is competent to deal with it. I am not in favour of creating new institutions in Barbados. I feel Barbados has enough institutions already. Once you create new institutions, you run into the problem of getting people to manage them.

We should have a body in Barbados at the highest level which, from a policy point of view, co-ordinates the various areas of this offshore sector. I am all in favour of that. We formed a committee for co-ordinating industrial development. It is a broad-based body which has worked exceptionally well. And we need it now for this type of thing, because, Sir, not only are the operational Ministries and institutions involved — the Ministry of Finance, the Central Bank, the Ministry of Trade — but the Ministry of Education is a very important component of this. We have to think of what kind of education we are going to give people so that they are able to service this kind of need in the future.

When I see Scotland now advertising as an electronic centre, and they can demonstrate that they have seven to eight universities within 20 miles of a particular area of Scotland which are pouring out

thousands of graduates every year in the electronic information field, and when I see that Ireland can take a whole page in the *Times* of England and say that this year, 1983, they are having so many graduates in the various areas, I know that we have to be able to say something about this.

Obviously, the needs that we have in relation to the number of jobs will not be as great as Scotland or Ireland. But we need to have ours, too. So this needs a broad-base attack here, and this is one of the reasons why I am very happy to see that the Central Bank building is being built, because I know that we are going to need a floor — a whole floor alone will be needed for this.

The honourable Member on the other side attacks the building because he does not feel there should be a building. But I am going to tell him that one of the reasons why I support the building is because I feel that the companies registry, the intellectual property registry, the committee which is going to co-ordinate this — the one that is going to deal with the shipping and so forth — should take up a whole floor because we need a monitoring body. We need a think tank. You need all of these things.

Now obviously the time has come after, let me see, it is now nearly 10 years since we had the first International Business Companies Act, for us to do an evaluation of what benefits we have derived from having the International Business Companies Act, the Offshore Banking Act and these other things, so that we can plan now.

2.55 p.m.

We know that there are jobs out there. If our present plans go through, we are likely to have at least 400 jobs alone in information processing by the next year. We know that with the satellite communications they have here, Cable and Wireless has a very great role to play in this area. As a matter of fact, the Prime Minister addressed a dinner on it recently in London, and constantly, from a Ministry of Trade point of view, we have been dealing with this area. I believe in Jamaica there is a conference going along now trying to enlighten the Caribbean as to this new opportunity. So we have all of these things before us.

There is a great danger that people from abroad will ask for the world — I will finish where I started off — and I want to say this. The Government has been doing its best to resist an unreasonable request, but it must be remembered that even common law countries are now purporting to give periods of time which, before, one would regard as being unreasonably long.

Remember, Sir, the first Fiscal Incentives Act, I believe the Pioneer Industries Act had the maximum

period of time as eight years. Then in 1974, it was 10 years, and remembering that the Lesser Developed Countries give up to 15. I know for a fact that the Philippines and other countries give 20, but obviously we are not in this competition game.

One final point. I would like to disabuse the mind of the Leader of the Opposition. This Act has nothing to do with the Harmonisation of Fiscal Incentives Act. When we first started to have the regime to think of Barbados as an offshore centre, there were people in Trinidad who objected and said that they did not see how Barbados could be part of CARICOM and have a fiscal regime relating to this area which was not in harmony with the Fiscal Incentives Act.

Of course, we were able to point out that the whole object of all the legislation was to treat CARICOM as though it was part of Barbados, and since the activities were prohibited in relation to Barbados activities, then there could not be any question of this being in conflict with anything. After we put forward that viewpoint, they began to recognise that all we are saying is that we are trying to create Barbados as a base for these activities to take place so that we can earn foreign exchange outside of the CARICOM area.

Of course, as far as the banking is concerned, and you are lending money to Barbados or lending money to Trinidad, it was always envisaged that once it was that kind of loan for which they had to go to London, the Euro-dollar loans, you would naturally create an advantage in giving access to countries within the Caribbean to come to Barbados, because after all, if they have to send their lawyers down here, it would be much cheaper for them. That is the base, but it is not in conflict.

I do not care what the Antiguanians have done; I wish them the best of luck. Antigua is not Barbados. As far as I am concerned, I would like all of my CARICOM countries to have a better standard of living than Barbados, because I know that Barbados' standard of living would increase greatly, because we would sell them more goods. I really mean that, I feel that Barbados can compete with the Caribbean, so I have no pangs of jealousy at all. However well they do, I will be very glad. The better they do, the better for us, because I know that we would sell more. That has been our role in this area. I have absolutely no reason to doubt that we will continue to do very well as long as our CARICOM brothers are prosperous.

I thought I would give the House the benefit of a little bit of experience that I believe I have built up in dealing with these kinds of people over the course of the last 25 years.

Thank you, Sir.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is very little I can add to the debate. This is one of the few debates which I think I have ever attended in the House in which it seems to me that every Member's speech was supportable, even if not at all times supportive of the Government. Really, every point that has been made by everybody has some substance to it.

The honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. JOHN) has made the decisive speech and the decisive points, but everybody else has contributed something valuable to the understanding of the offshore banking community of the nature of constitutional government in Barbados, as well as the practicalities of the economic life in a small country.

I took the view at an early stage that since the bank had gone ahead and started business without obtaining the guarantee, it had perhaps taken itself out of whatever benefit Section 108 could confer on it. I dare say the bank might argue that it had assurances, but that it wanted more. My attitude is if they want it, let them go ahead and have it.

The Prime Minister of Fiji made an excellent point in conversation with the Deputy Prime Minister — it is perhaps only countries like ours that get asked these things; although I believe the Government of Great Britain has been asked on occasions to enter into contracts with investors relating to future Government economic policies. There are one or two occasions where this has been demanded.

If it takes the Royal Bank no further legally in the direction of the protection they want, that is not for us to worry too much about. If it makes the Royal Bank happy on the other hand, if it can show its shareholders and its Board of Management that they are dealing with a Government which preaches what it practises, I am quite happy to leave them with that impression, and I would therefore urge on honourable Members the passing of this guarantee.

The only thing I would add to what other honourable Members have said is that the fact that this guarantee has reached the Floor of the House perhaps says more about the nature of lawyers in Barbados, both in the Crown Law Office and in private offices, than it says about anything else. That the lawyers cross "Ts" even where the "Ts" are not there, and they dot "Is" for blind people. If the lawyers, both in our department and in James Street, can really advise their clients that this guarantee should go to Parliament, then, Sir, all I can do is to tell Parliament that if it feels that its time has been wasted, I apologise, but that the Cabinet properly should

act on legal advice. We should not substitute our own views — and I may say that mine correspond with those of the Deputy Prime Minister — for those whose duty it is to advise us. We must not keep watch dogs and then presume to go and do the barking ourselves, and I urge the House to pass this Resolution.

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

TAX ON REMITTANCES ACT, 1983

Order No. 5 was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to provide for the imposition of a tax on certain remittances from Barbados and for related purposes.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the Hon. Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) is on record as saying that Budgetary measures come before the House all through the year. He implied on an earlier occasion that that meant that they never came before the House in a Budget. He has also suggested that there has been a great deal of taxation this year already before the Budget. Well, this is a piece of financial legislation and it has come before the House in May 1983, but I will draw to the honourable Member's attention that it was contained in the Budget of 1982. I therefore do not want to detain the House for a long time dealing with something that has been fully debated already.

The only thing which I think relates to the point is that since 1976 we have battled in Barbados to mobilize the insurance industry. We have been fighting and we have been successful in reducing foreign participation in local insurance risks, and some of these taxes relate to the position of local agents for foreign companies. Indeed, perhaps we may say that all of the tax touch on it.

The 20 per cent tax on all general insurance premiums remitted from Barbados insurers not registered under the Insurance Act is intended to catch the people who are straightforward agents for overseas insurance. The tax of 15 per cent on long-term insurance, the premiums that held premiums, that is the same thing, but it covers the items that are not covered in the first one, giving a differential tax over those.

I will try to cover the situation where people are agents for a foreign company and derive their income from commissions. We have been discovering that some of the commissions were as high as 40 per cent, that some of the foreign companies use the Barbados agents merely as fronts to accommodate the multi-national companies, which also have their own captive insurance agents but do not want to register in Barbados and bring themselves under our Supervisor of Insurance.

I sometimes think that they use the agencies in Barbados only as a post office. They use foreign brokers and the local agents; really, all they do is to deliver policies issued and issue third party certificates in insurance matters. Sometimes the agent gets a very small commission and so on.

Our object is to make the local agent get a big commission. If some local agents can get up to a 40 per cent commission, there is no justification for foreign companies paying the local agent as small as a 5 per cent commission. We are therefore aiming taxation at those foreign companies which use a local agent who is grossly underpaid.

In other words, they are really carrying premiums out of the island. If the agent does not get the money, then the Treasury has to get it. The 15 per cent has to be the effective minimum hold back of premiums paid to foreign insurers who operate through an agency.

I do not want to say very much about the insurance business today, because, as the Deputy Prime Minister and I were discussing earlier, we are meeting some difficulties with insurance companies — none incorporated in Barbados, but not necessarily foreign either — in other words, CARICOM companies which are failing to meet their liabilities.

There is the temptation of insurance companies to get money out of Barbados to a country with a higher interest rate — and there are many of those, no matter what they say about ours, which have had higher rates abroad over the last two years. We are also having some difficulties with CARICOM, but I do not wish to dwell on that.

Some companies are trying to maintain only the legal minimum investments in Barbados. While we look at the level of those minimum legal investments, we are putting a special remittance tax on surplus funds which go overseas.

Now this is a financial measure in so far as it appears to be dealing with taxation, but I hope that honourable Members realize that these measures go as much to deterrence as to collections. Our real object is to improve the atmosphere of the local insurance business and, where foreign companies operate in Barbados, to ensure that they keep as much as possible of the collected premiums in Barbados. I am using "foreign" in that sense to include CARICOM companies as well as extra-CARICOM companies.

It is open to any company to avoid the measures which I am going to ask the House to pass. They can take corrective action to maintain levels of local investment.

In conclusion, Sir, I would merely warn all those CARICOM companies which are taking premiums from

Barbadian motor drivers, not paying insurance claims, not meeting home judgments, writing insulting letters to the Supervisor of Insurance and sending copies to the Prime Minister, quarrelling because they have not been given work permits for their cousins and uncles in Trinidad and so on, that steps are going to be taken to deal with them decisively.

I am just going to give a general warning. I am going to ask the Supervisor of Insurance to give me a review of all of the companies which are failing to meet their financial responsibilities in Barbados.

Our Supervisor of Insurance is a very able man. He does not know this, but sitting in my office one day, I glowed with pride when a gentleman concerned with exempt insurance and captive insurance was coming down here to discuss the regime which he would have to put in place, and asked for the legislation to make captive insurance companies subject to our Supervisor and subject to his office and his powers because of the confidence they had in our Insurance Regulations and in the personnel who run it.

I have no intention of letting any element of CARICOM anarchy allow me to close my eyes to wrong doings by a CARICOM insurance company and allow the reputation of the Supervisor of Insurance to be compromised by racketeers from other Caribbean islands seeking to rip-off the drivers of this country, and then taking it upon themselves to deal abusively with our quite outstanding Insurance Department in Barbados.

The achievements of the Government of Barbados in the field of insurance over the last seven years has not been trumpeted and sung from the rooftops, but equally, Sir, and this may be just as important, they have not been decried by the Opposition either.

I think that all Barbadians recognise that we have done a great deal towards shaking off our dependence on foreign insurance exploitation. Exploitation can come from outside CARICOM and it can also come from within CARICOM. I give this warning, Sir, since I have this opportunity of dealing with the Bill.
3.15 p.m.

The Bill, of course, is a new Bill. We are not putting this into the Income Tax Act, because it is not necessarily a taxation measure, as I had explained earlier. So we are having a specific Act, a Tax on Remittances Act, to deal with this and nothing else, so that insurance companies with overseas connections will know exactly their position.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

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

On motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 15 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Sir, this brings us to the end of Government Business for today.

In moving the Adjournment of the House, I am informed that a Member of Parliament, the Leader of the Opposition and Right Honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow) has reached another landmark in his political and parliamentary life. I am told he has now been the representative for the constituency of St. John for some 25 years. No doubt, Sir, that is a feat which many of us in here may hope to accomplish, and I would be failing in my duty as Leader of the House if I did not salute him for the many years in which he has represented that constituency.

No doubt the right honourable Leader of the Opposition is well aware of the fact, speaking for myself and I believe for my colleagues on this side, that when the history of this country is written, he will surely have a firm place in it in golden letters.

For me to recite his many outstanding achievements as a parliamentarian and a leader of this country for some years, would be a bit difficult at this time, so as he celebrates his silver anniversary as a representative for the parish of St. John, I can only sincerely say that we wish him well in serving for the other three years as the Member for that constituency.

We on this side wish him good health and strength, and sincerely hope that those who have been in the

struggle with him, and the constituents of St. John, would be justly proud of his outstanding work.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, with those few remarks, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, May 31, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): Mr. Deputy Speaker, in seconding that motion and adverting to a matter raised by the honourable Member in his speech, I think that in the case of the Leader of the Opposition, the right honourable Member for St. John, we really ought to revive the custom of giving a parliamentary dinner for long service.

When I first came into this House, 21 years used to be the measure, and I have attended more than one parliamentary dinner given for Members who had passed that landmark. Indeed, although I cannot remember whose anniversary it was, I do remember when I was the most junior Member of the House, on one occasion it did fall to me to make a speech at that dinner.
3.25 p.m.

The right honourable Member for St. John has been in the House 30 years and a few days in total; 25 years continuously in St. John and five years and a few days for St. George. I think that a period of 30 years is so long in Parliament that it really should be recognised by a suitable parliamentary function.

When the right honourable Member had been in the House for 25 years, 20 years in St. John and five in St. George, I did approach a Member of the other side with a suggestion that he mention the possibility of a dinner for the right honourable Member. I also spoke to the Clerk of Parliament. Whether it was mentioned or not, I do not know, but I know that it did not come off.

I think that in taking this opportunity of saying publicly that Parliament should honour the right honourable Member for St. John, it will not escape his attention. And I certainly will be happy to attend and take my proper place, as I believe he is the most senior in the House, on the occasion of any function that we might choose to have.

There is one other matter that I would mention — it does not come so well from me, I suppose, mentioning it, Sir, but if nobody else would say it, I will have to say it — Barbados should aim at some pictorial record of its Premiers and Prime Ministers. As things are, there is no picture in the House — and I am going to go back years — of Sir John Sealy, the first effective Government Leader Barbados had; there is no picture in the House of E. K. Walcott, for so many years, effectively the Leader; and, much more important than those two, who

were the longest serving of the old Government leaders in Colonial time, there is no picture of Dr. Cummins; and, so far as I know, no immediate prospects of a picture or a sculpture for the right honourable Member for St. John.

I think that he should be asked — at the Government's expense — to have one of these three dimensional photographs taken, if he is unwilling, while still an active politician, to sit for a bust. I really would not recommend any active politician sitting for a bust or a sculpture, but for the sake of record, the commemorative works of art should be secured at an earlier stage.

We have a good number of portraits around the House of Assembly; very few of them are portraits of persons who are recent additions to the parliamentary system in our island. Yet, with all the parliamentary history that Barbados has, the only man who has even been both Speaker of the House and President of the Upper House is still alive. It never happened before 1971 that anybody held both offices. The youngest man ever to sit in Parliament is still alive. Sir John Gay Alleyne was twenty-one when he was elected to the House, but Martin Tudor was a few days younger, also twenty-one when he was elected.

There is a lot of history going on today in Barbados, and we are doing very little to preserve it. Indeed, we are sinking ourselves in a welter of political controversy between two political parties which, by an outsider, can hardly be distinguished one from the other, except that one has a better set of chaps, and we are carrying on all the battle and the struggle that we did not carry on when we were seeking to become independent.

There seems to be more bitterness now in politics than when we had the struggle to evolve from colony to independent country. I really do think that it is time we recognise the essential unity of public life in Barbados and recognise how fortunate our country is to have preserved the concept of continuous traditions, and to have preserved the traditions of decency and give and take in politics.

I hope that my words will not fall on deaf ears at any level, and I hope that the Leader of the House will undertake the responsibilities which I think lie particularly within his grasp, of, for example, the parliamentary dinner, or steps to commemorate for future generations, the present generation of politicians.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Just briefly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, speaking on the adjournment and specifically in relation to the matter raised by my colleagues and friends, the honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig), and the right honour-

able Member for St. Thomas (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams), I merely wish, on behalf of the Opposition, to express appreciation for the fact that those two honourable Members have taken note of the 25 years continuous service which the right honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow) has rendered in this Honourable Chamber, I am certain they were speaking on behalf of all honourable Members of this honourable Chamber.

I also wish to take note of the many kind words that they have said on his behalf. There is no doubt that he has made an indelible contribution to the social, political, economic and cultural life of this country, in respect of the constituents whom he represents in St. John, in respect of the people of Barbados as a whole, and, indeed, Sir, in respect of the Caribbean and in the wider councils in which he may have participated at the world level.

I think the right honourable Prime Minister has made a very valuable point about some form of acknowledgement of the service which Members may make, by means of a suitable memento; and, of course, I think that is a matter which should be discussed through the usual channels to see that there could be some agreement on the form of recognition which should take place. I think he will find that on both sides of the House there may be some agreement on that. The problem may be to get the right honourable Member himself to agree on the form of the memento. And I do hope that, through the regular channels, this matter could be taken up and discussed, and some common approach to the problem adopted.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I too, would like to join with honourable Members in this Chamber in offering sincere congratulations and appreciation to the right honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow) in having served his constituency and this country for some 32 years.

I believe the people of Barbados are unaware of the agony, the ruination of health, family life and all other things which go with political representation. In my view, there is a false opinion about the benefits derived by those persons who enter political life, simply because they have a commitment to their people, to their brothers and sisters who have not yet seen the light and the need for adequate political representation.
3.35 p.m.

I join with the honourable Prime Minister in saying that it is high time there should be a pictorial representation of those persons who have given service to this country. The walls of this Chamber are drab. There is no basic reason why they should remain in a dark green

colour, empty of any statues, but bearing the stained glass windows which those before us have seen fit to affix. The Minister responsible for Parliamentary Affairs (Hon. L. S. Craig), and the Minister of Finance, (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams) can be held responsible, because one has got to take the initiative and the other one has to provide the necessary finances.

This relates, too, to making this Chamber even more comfortable for those who have given much of their lives to come here week after week to make sure that this country continues in the path that it has followed all these years. I believe it is a shame on politicians that persons who work in private industry can have comfortable chambers, exquisite offices, work for decent salaries — yet still politicians are asked to come here week after week to sit and remain in this place.

I, too, would like to join and say that it is time that parliamentarians can come together to celebrate an occasion such as this. We may have our differences politically, we may have our differences in opinion, but there is no need for us to stand separated and divided when it comes to honouring the work of a man who has been in the political fight for some 32 years. Thirty-two years is a long time, and I wish to offer the honourable Member all sincere congratulations, and I hope that he enjoys a long life in the future.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John): Mr. Deputy Speaker, unfortunately I was out of the Chamber during the earlier part of this discussion, but I was in time to hear Your Honour offer me congratulations and also to wish me long life in or out of this Chamber. I am very indebted to the sentiments which have been expressed.

There is a saying that "the race is not for the swift, or the battle for the strong, but for him" — I say for him, although I have always read the quotation as "for he" — "that endureth to the end". If for no other reason than for him is more euphonious, whether it is syntactically correct or not, I would say that the battle is for him that endureth to the end.

In my own particular case, I would like to state that the battle is for me who has endured from the beginning. There is no guarantee that I will endure to the end. My title to fame is that I have sat in this Chamber on both sides of the House, which I think is a remarkable feat in itself. I have endured on both sides. I have endured from both sides.

I have sat in this Chamber with such eminent parliamentarians as the like of the late Sir Grantiey Herbert Adams, Mr. Kenmore Nathaniel Husbands, as Speaker; Sir Theodore Brancker as Speaker; and Dr. Hugh Cummins as Speaker. But, particularly, I would

like to say that the person from whom I learned most from about Parliament was the late Arthur Edwin St. Clair Lewis, better known as "T. G." Lewis. I do not think that we parliamentarians really appreciate the debt that we owe to T. G. Lewis for his insistence on upholding the right and dignity of Parliament, and particularly the rights and dignities of individual Members.

I do not want to make a long speech. All I can say is that I am frequently embarrassed on occasions like this, because my only title to fame is that I have endured from the beginning. I do not like praise, even when it is sincere, and I am sure that the sentiments which have been expressed in here today are sincere sentiments, because sometimes our better instincts prevail even when we are like Sampson's agonies. So I would just like to thank honourable Members.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I, too, would like to express a wish that the honourable Members on both sides, at least some of them, the majority of them, will still be here when I continue to be a Member of Parliament, and when I decide that I have had enough, which is a long time from now. Let me put it this way. I hope that on the 45th anniversary, some of the Members here will be

able to join me if not in dinner, in having a congenial drink.

Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Cheers.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Perhaps the honourable Member would indicate if the Clerk can now go ahead and arrange the commemorative dinner.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will take that on what the Congress of the United States calls "unadvisable", and I will bear it in mind, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hope we will get a positive answer as soon as possible.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I will have a word with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and we will see what can be done as soon as possible.

The question that the House do now stand adjourned until May 31, 1983 at 12 o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. Deputy Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.
3.45 p.m.

CONTENTS MINUTES

Confirmation of Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday,
May 17, 1983. 3596

PAPERS LAID

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW 3596

The Reports of the Registrar of Trade Unions
for the years 1980-81 and 1981-82.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER 3596

The Annual Report and Statement of
Accounts of the Barbados Community College
for the year 1981-82.

The Erdiston Teachers Training College Board
of Management Order 1983.

The Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic
Board of Management Order 1983.

The Public Secondary Schools Boards of
Management Order, 1983.

The Education (Amendment) Regulations,
1983.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG 3596

(On behalf of the Minister of Finance) The Annual
Report, Auditor's Certificate and Financial State-
ments of the Central Bank of Barbados for the
year ended 1982.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG 3596, 3597

Resolution to approve the Erdiston Teachers
Training College Board of Management Order,
1983.

Resolution to approve the Samuel Jackman
Prescod Polytechnic Board of Management
Order, 1983.

Resolution to approve the Public Secondary
Schools Boards of Management Order, 1983.

Resolution to approve the Education (Amend-
ment) Regulations, 1983.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (ST. MICHAEL SOUTH)
NOTICE Re relations in CARICOM 3597

Hon. L. S. Craig, 3597; Dr. R. C. Haynes,
3597.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

QUESTION BY Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (ST.
MICHAEL SOUTH) OF PRIME MINISTER AND
MINISTER OF FINANCE (RT. HON. J. M. G. M.
ADAMS) Re payment of individual income tax for
income years 1980, 1981 and 1982 3598

QUESTION BY Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (ST.
MICHAEL SOUTH) OF PRIME MINISTER AND
MINISTER OF DEFENCE AND SECURITY (RT.
HON. J. M. G. M. ADAMS) Re classification of
public service files and documents in security
matters 3598

QUESTION BY Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (ST.
MICHAEL SOUTH) OF PRIME MINISTER AND
MINISTER OF DEFENCE AND SECURITY (RT.
HON. J. M. G. M. ADAMS) Re breaches of the
Official Secrets Act 3598

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

PROPERTY TRANSFER TAX (AMENDMENT) ACT,
1983 3598

Mr. St. John, 3598.

CINEMATOGRAPH FILM CENSORSHIP (AMEND-
MENT) ACT, 1983 3599

Mr. Craig, 3599, 3600; Mr. Franklin, 3600.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE LEASE OF LAND TO
AHI (CARIBBEAN) LIMITED 3600

Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 3600, 3601; Mr.
Sisnett, 3601; Mr. Franklin, 3601.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE GUARANTEE
DATED APRIL 14, 1983 RE FUTURE TAXING
OF ROYAL BANK OF CANADA (B'DOS) LTD.
UNDER OFFSHORE BANKING ACT 3602

Mr. Adams, 3602, 3611; Dr. Haynes, 3603; Mr.
Barrow, 3604; Mr. Sandiford, 3606; Mr. St. John,
3607, 3608, 3609.

TAX ON REMITTANCES ACT, 1983 3612

Mr. Adams, 3612.

SUSPENSION. 3609

ADJOURNMENT 3613

(Congratulations to Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow on twenty five years of representing the constituency of St. John)

Mr. Craig, 3613; Mr. Adams, 3614; Mr. Sandiford, 3614; Mr. Deputy Speaker, 3615; Mr. Barrow, 3615.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ADAMS, Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. (St. Thomas)

BARROW, Rt. Hon. E. W. (St. John)

BOLDEN, His Honour C. L. (St. Joseph)

BRATHWAITE, Hon. L. B. (St. Andrew)

CRAIG, Hon. L. S. (St. James North)

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

HAYNES, R. C. (St. Michael South Central)

ST. JOHN, Hon. H. B. (Christ Church East Central)

SANDIFORD, L. E. (St. Michael South)

SISNETT, L. L. (St. Michael North East)