

---

# THE

## House of Assembly Debates

### (OFFICIAL REPORT)

---

FIRST SESSION 1994 – 99

---

#### HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

*Tuesday, May 14, 1996*

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at **11.15 a.m.** on Tuesday, May 14, 1996.

#### PRESENT

His Honour I. A. ROETT, B.A., Dip. Ed., (Speaker)  
His Honour R. D. MARSHALL, (Deputy Speaker)  
Rt. Hon. L. E. **SANDIFORD**, B.A., M.A., (Econ.),

J.P.

Mr. H. **deB. FORDE**, Q.C., M.A., **LL.B.**

Rt. Hon. **O. S. ARTHUR**, **M.Sc.** (Econ.), (**Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs and Minister for the Civil Service**)

Hon. D. **A. C. SIMMONS**, Q.C., **LL.M.** (Attorney General and Minister of Home Affairs)

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON, **LL.B.** (Hons.) (Leader of the Opposition)

Hon. Sir **HAROLD St. JOHN**, Q.C., **LL.B.**

Mr. L. R. **TULL**, Q.C., M.A.

Dr. R. L. **CHELTENHAM**, Q.C., M.A., **M.Sc.** (Econ.)

Mr. J. **O. TUDOR**, J.P.

Hon. G. W. **PAYNE**, (Minister of Public Works, Transport and Housing)

Hon. R. C. **EASTMOND**, J.P., B.A. (Hons.), Dip. Ed., **LL.B.** (Hons.), **LEC** (Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development)

Dr. R. C. **HAYNES**, M.B., **Ch.B.**, F.R.C.P. (Edin.)

Mr. D. **CARTER**

Hon. R. N. **GREENIDGE**, B.A., **LL.B.**, (Minister of Labour, Community Development and Sports)

Mr. G. A. **CLARKE**, **B.Sc.**, Dip. Ed., (Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Public Works, Transport and Housing)

Mr. J. M. **EDGHILL**

Mr. F. J. **STUART**, B.A., **LL.M.**

Mr. H. F. **LASHLEY**

Hon. R. St. C. **TOPPIN**, **LL.B.**, (Minister of State, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tourism and International Transport)

Mr. D. St. E. **KELLMAN**

Hon. Miss H. E. **THOMPSON**, **LL.B.** (Minister of Health and the Environment)

*Prayers were taken by Rev. Father Ivan Harewood.*

Mr. **SPEAKER**: The House is now in session.

#### MINUTES

Mr. **SPEAKER**: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, May 7, 1996.

Hon. D. A. C. **SIMMONS**: Mr. Speaker, the Minutes of Tuesday, May 7, 1996 have been circulated. I move that these Minutes be taken as read.

Rt. Hon. **O. S. ARTHUR**: I beg to second that, Sir.

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

#### PAPERS

Hon. Miss H. E. **THOMPSON**: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:

1. The Sanitation Service Authority (Fees) (Amendment) Regulations, 1996.

#### STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

Rt. Hon. **O. S. ARTHUR**: Mr. Speaker, with the leave of the House I should like to move that this matter of "Statements by Ministers" be deferred until 12.00 noon when I will have the exact text of the statement to read to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there **are** no objections leave is granted.

#### SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, **42(5)**, 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I beg to second that, Sir.

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

#### GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

#### ORDER NO. 8 - THE ENVIRONMENTAL LEVY BILL, 1996

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move the second reading of a Bill to introduce an environmental levy into Barbados. At the outset I need to say that this Bill has to be read in conjunction with the Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) Order, No. 3, 1996 which represents and **embodies** the second part of Government's fiscal policies to deal with the management of solid waste in this country.

In that respect, Sir, I just want to let the House know at the outset of the debate that it is not only Government's intention to introduce an environmental levy to raise funds as the Bill indicates to meet the cost of collecting and to defray the cost of disposal of refuse, Mr. Speaker, but it is also Government's intention at the same time to provide a new regime of fiscal concessions for enterprises that **are** involved in recycling. We are using a two-pronged approach to research for the solutions to environmental management matters in this country.

On the one hand we are introducing a levy to help defray the cost of establishing and operating efficiently landfills in this country, and **we are** also introducing a new regime that would allow recycling industries 10-year **tax** holidays from the payment of income **tax**, and also allow them duty free access to equipment, vehicles and other materials used as part of their operation. I must stress that, Sir, because the two go hand in hand. They go hand in hand because it is Government's fundamental position that Barbados must never again find itself in a situation where the management of the environment and the management of solid **waste** reach the levels of disastrous **proportions** that existed in the early 1990s.

Mr. Speaker, let me therefore deal with the Environment Levy Bill and set it in context. I would like first of all, Sir, to set it in its international context and to remind the House that at the United National Conference on Environment and Development held in Rio in 1992 that the Honourable Member for St. Michael South attended and was therefore party to its decision...

*Aside.*

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I **am** not attacking you. I am acknowledging your presence.

I want to draw attention to Principle 16 of the Rio Declaration which recommended that:

"National authorities should endeavour to promote the internalisation of the environmental costs and the use of economic instruments taking into account the approach that the polluter should, in principle, bear the cost of pollution with due regard to the public interest and without distorting international trade and investment."

Sir, Principle 16 of the Rio Declaration, subscribed to by all countries, established an international understanding and philosophy that polluters should really bear the cost of the management of the environment.

*Aside.*

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, all I **am** saying is that the Member for St. Michael South's **presence was** quite distinguished because he added to the ambience of the occasions in matters that will not entertain us today.

I want to establish, Sir, that **this** matter has international dimensions and that it is something that has arisen out of the Rio Summit. It is Principle 16 of the Declaration which establishes the philosophy that member countries should seek to internalise environmental costs and use economic instruments taking into account the approach that the polluter should, in principle, bear the cost of pollution with due regard to the public interest and without distorting international trade and investment.

In furtherance to that, Mr. Speaker, a number of countries, particularly in the European Union, have already introduced environmental levies or instruments of the **kind** to give effect to the principle that those goods and entities which create solid waste management problems should be responsible to the extent feasible for defraying the cost of **finding** solutions to those solid waste management problems. And in the course of the **discussion** today the Minister of Health and Environment will be discussing **the** way in which Barbados will be **seeking** solutions for solid waste management problems. I am dealing in **my**

introduction, Sir, with the fiscal aspect of it. It has now become standard therefore that countries impose taxes particularly **on** commodities that are non-biodegradable on imports but particularly on goods that take up most of the space in **landfills** as a way of defraying the cost of solid waste management.

11.25 am.

Mr. Speaker, I also subscribe to the view that whenever we add a permanent stream of expenditure to the account of the **Treasury** we should look as well to a permanent stream of revenue if we **are** going to keep Government finances in relative balance. I want to address that point, Sir, because when we reflect on the environmental disorder **that** Mount Stinkeroo represented, it is safe to say that Mount Stinkeroo **reached** the proportions **that** it did because of the lack of resources committed by the Government to the resolution of the problem it represented. A sufficient body of resources simply was not committed to those responsible for the management of the **landfill** to allow that **landfill** to be managed in an environmentally and ecologically pleasing manner.

Rt. Hon. L. E. **SANDIFORD**: Sir, in respect of the physical contours of Barbados, Sir, I have searched all of the cartographic sources and cannot find any reference to any Mount Stinkeroo and I believe we should be accurate, as far as possible, in this Chamber. If the Prime Minister will point out the sources for this physical excrescence of Barbados, Sir, I would be happy.

Rt. Hon. O. S. **ARTHUR**: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I fully take the point of the Member for St. Michael South to say that Mount Stinkeroo used to exist in Barbados but it has been replaced by Mount Pleasant. He wanted me to say that, Sir, so as to draw his colleague, the Member for St. Michael West into the issue, but there used to be a Mount Stinkeroo located at Mangrove. Mr. Speaker, he is too experienced as a parliamentarian to have made that **kind** of point were it not without it being his intention to want me to reflect upon what was and what now is and I thank him, Sir, for the intervention. There was a Mount Stinkeroo but it no longer exists and I thank him for the correction.

The point I am making, Sir, is that the argument was advanced **that** there were not sufficient resources given the **stringencies** of the fiscal position at the time to attend to the affairs of the **landfill** at Mangrove and that contributed partly to the **landfill** presenting the problem that it presented.

I also feel, Sir, that in a wider sense because that **landfill** was so badly managed because of lack of resources there has been a public perception in Barbados generated

as a result that a **landfill** will of necessity be an environmental blemish and an environmental block. It is our position on this side, Sir, that all over the world landfills exist as places where solid waste management functions can be carried out in an environmentally pleasing and safe manner and that once the requisite resources are devoted to the task that a new **landfill** can be established in Barbados without giving rise to the **kind** of hazards and problems that attended the **landfill** at Mangrove known to us then as Mount Stinkeroo under a previous dispensation.

We on this side, Mr. Speaker, were very critical of the extent to which that experience was allowed to degenerate because of the failure of the Government to provide adequate resources. We feel therefore that we have an obligation to ensure for the future that we can find the resources to be able to defray, in part, the costs of establishing and running a new **landfill** so that the public can be assured that **landfills** can be established in this country without being a hazard to the public health and without being an environmental block as the public has come, unfortunately, to believe. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, Sir, this environmental levy is intended to accomplish an important public purpose.

The establishment of an operation of new landfills in Barbados will be an expensive endeavour running into the millions of dollars. They will not only involve the establishment of the **landfills**, we may have to have a variety of various types to deal with bulk waste, hazardous waste and the like. There will have to be a composting facility that can convert some of the existing garbage into fertiliser and the like. We can, Mr. Speaker, impact a solid waste management industry in Barbados where there is a creative approach to the management of solid waste but all of the solutions will be expensive.

The construction and the management of a sanitary **landfill** is going to be an extensive endeavour. The construction and management of a composting facility is going to be an expensive endeavour. The management of bulky waste facilities will be an expensive endeavour and as a result, Sir, we can anticipate that there will be an increase in public expenditure arising out of the desirability of having environmentally and economically sound approaches to solid waste management in this country. This environmental levy is structured and designed to conform to the principle that the polluters should meet the cost of cleaning up the environment. I will go into the details of it, Mr. Speaker, in due course.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a lot of controversy has arisen over the fact that this matter has not been introduced before but I want to advance for the House's consideration two sets of factors, the **first** being that these funds are being sought to assist in partly deferring the cost of

constructing and operating a landfill. In this year's Estimates the House will recognise that an amount has been set, I think it is about \$8 million, and it is anticipated that the full construction and the operation of the **landfill** will cost far more than that. The measures that are to be introduced today by this levy are intended to raise \$7 million in the course of a financial year. Sir, **the** Government did not think that it would have been prudent to have been collecting funds for the construction and operation of a **landfill** well in advance of the **landfill** actually starting construction and operating, and therefore we are seeking to reconcile the imposition of the levy to coincide with the construction and the operation of the new solid waste management solution.

11.35 a.m.

The second matter has to do with the vagaries of consultation leading to a Budget. Last year, Sir, when I sought to have an environmental levy approved in principle I asked for advice as to how to structure the cost of it and, Mr. Speaker, Sir, what was presented to me and what I announced in the House would have led to the environmental levy collecting far, far more than the amount necessary for the construction and defraying the cost of the landfill. Sir, the Member for St. Michael East seems to make statements that are harsh and pejorative about me, but I **am** not an adamant man, Sir. So that if my Budgetary intention was to impose a **landfill** that as the Rio Declaration said, Sir, caused the polluter to bear the cost of pollution, I do so with due regard to the public interest and without distorting international trade and investment. It is not Government's intention, Mr. Speaker, in introducing an environmental levy therefore to distort investments nor trade arising from this country. Therefore, the charges that were indicated in the Budget would have gone far and beyond what would have been necessary for the purpose...

*Aside.*

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Yes, but I said what was provided as information would have raised more than \$2 million and many times over. That is the point. Bad forecasting! I am not adamant about that, Mr. Speaker, because what you do as the Member for St. Michael South knows is that you get advice rendered to you and thereafter the consultation takes place because the number of persons who are involved in the process are very limited. So that the process of consultation takes place after it. So that I **am** freely conceding, Sir, that what was set out in the House last year would have gone way and above what were the intentions of Government. I have no difficulty whatsoever in saying this, Mr. Speaker, that it is not my intention in introducing an environmental levy to distort trade nor to restrict investment taking place here, and therefore if what was said last year, Sir, like **\$1.00** per pound or per kilogram for plastic sheets or other impositions would have

borne adversely and beyond the intentions of Government on the productive sector. We are pragmatic people. That was not Government's intention, Sir, and therefore it is not going to be reflected in the law. Government's intention is in fact, Mr. Speaker, to raise sufficient funds to be able to defray part of the cost. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, would like to draw Members' attention to the purposes that the levy is supposed to serve. The levy is supposed to help to defray the cost of the disposal of refuse, to defray the cost of operating and maintaining refuse disposal sites and also to assist in financing the preservation and the enhancement of the environment. I should therefore in that respect, Sir, make the point that we are also seeing the need for this environmental levy in the context of the restoration of a **5-day** week at the National Conservation Commission. The National Conservation is an institution whose work bears upon the preservation and the enhancement of the environment and the decision to put the workers of the NCC, which **all** sides of Parliament agreed to, Sir, on a **5-day** week basis rather than a 3-day week basis has added a permanent additional cost to Government's expenditure.

I shall also want to make the point, Sir, that the existing legislation governing the operation of the National Conservation Commission is relatively narrow insofar as it does not allow the Corporation to be involved in the general beautification of Barbados. For example, the Corporation cannot enter lands and do **debushing**, cleaning up and charge the people. We suffer in this country from **problems** arising out of the hazards of having the environment badly managed. Last year there was a dengue outbreak, Sir, and we believe that the National Conservation Commission now that it is fully operating on a 5-day week should not just be involved in specific beautification but should see its task of involving the preservation and the enhancement of **the** environment of Barbados and that some of these sums therefore are intended to help us offset the increase in public expenditure that arises from the fact the workers of the NCC are now to work on a 5-day week basis rather than work on a 3-day week basis.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Sir, **the House** will want to be informed of the details of the law. Last year I had announced in my Budget certain charges which if introduced would have been draconian and included in them, Sir, were things like a **\$1.00** per kilogram for plastic sacks, **\$1.00** for plastic sheets and so on **that** would have been passed on in the form of higher domestic cost and would have affected domestic trade and investment. I have consulted, Sir, on this matter and I have therefore determined to substitute what **was** provided by way of announcement in the Budget with the following: That there will be an ad valorem levy of 1 per cent of the value of imported goods in containers of plastic, glass, metal or paper products as well as empty containers, in addition,

Mr. Speaker, so that those goods that put greatest environmental hazard will bear a levy equivalent to 1 per cent of their imported value. In addition, Sir, all other imports will be charged 0.75 per cent levy. Let me put that in a very simple way that the goods that put the biggest burden on our solid waste management systems will be charged 1 cent of the dollar as a levy. On all other imports, Sir, there will be an **ad valorem** levy, of less than 1 cent, 0.75 per cent. **As** you know, Sir, there are a number of things like tyres, old refrigerators, washing machines and so on for which specific bulk waste facilities have to be created and managed, Sir, and there will be a levy prescribed on them. In the case of a motor vehicle, it is \$150 per vehicle; tyres other than motor cycle and bicycle tyres \$10.00 per tyre, motor cycle tyres \$1.00 per tyre, bicycle **tyres** \$1.00 **per** tyre, stoves and ranges \$15.00 per stove, refrigerators \$15.00 per refrigerator, freezers, washing machines and dishwashing machines \$15.00 each, TV sets \$10.00 each, mattresses \$10.00 and electric **accumulators** \$10.00 per battery.

As I said, Sir, these are the items that I have been **advised** generally for which special provision has to be made in the provision of appropriate facilities and therefore an environmental levy of this nature, Sir, will be attached. 11.45 a.m.

As I said, Sir, this environmental levy is estimated to raise approximately \$7 million per year and it compares with the amount provided in the Estimates to start constructing a **landfill** of \$8 million, although we know that the cost is going to be higher. It is only going to partly offset the cost of establishing landfills, composting facilities and other waste **disposal** facilities in the country, and on this point I must say that the Government is placing as much emphasis on the cost to polluters as we are in providing incentives to recycling industries. I am therefore pleased to ask the House to examine the Order exempting recycling industries from the payment of income **tax** as forming an integral **part** of this legislation, a separate but related **part** of the legislation.

I should also use the opportunity, Sir, to say that since these policy initiatives have been announced we have had a large number of statements of interest by enterprises interested in converting garbage to useful resources in Barbados. I should wish the House to have that wise and handsome approach to the issue of solid waste management. There are important industries that stand to be created in Barbados having to do with the management of solid waste and the conversion of what is now regarded as garbage into useful goods that can be used for beneficial purposes. Therefore, we have an obligation to provide a fiscal regime to enable those industries to flourish, and I am pleased to say that the recycling industries will now **benefit** for the first time from the existence of a fiscal regime that treats them in the same way as manufacturing industries operating under fiscal incentives.

There are, however, Sir, some offers of interest and statements of interest that are still very futuristic. Among them is incineration. The advice rendered to us is that incineration is still a very expensive option which cannot yet be justified from the point of view of economic and financial cost and benefit, and therefore while we have been bombarded with a large number of statements of interest to establish incineration plants in Barbados, we have not to date given any encouragement to any enterprise to believe that incineration is a solution that the Government would now support as being relevant for Barbados' purposes. We have, however, seen a number of industries emerge which are not only converting garbage into useful goods, but also exporting some of the articles that result from the recycling effort. It just goes to show, Mr. Speaker, that where there is a will to set a new course a motivated private sector will find a way to respond.

I had earlier said that this matter has been castigated as being brought to the House late. We have had to go through a lot of consultation on this matter. We have gone through a lot of consultation with the owners of public service vehicles and the Government will also keep its word in relation to those vehicles very soon. We will. We have gone through a process of consultation in relation to this matter with a view to getting a levy that we can all agree that will not bear too adversely on domestic cost of exports in this country. What I am, therefore, recommending to the House, Mr. Speaker, is a levy structured in such a way as to accomplish the purpose of enabling us to get the true polluters to pay for the cost of pollution without distorting private investment and trade.

I also want to say for the record, Mr. Speaker, that I have listened very carefully for the castigations of the Other Side about bringing matters to the House relatively late after the introduction of a budget. This House has not in recent years had a large amount of new legislation, apart from the stabilisation tax and so on, arising out of budgets, but we had to structure an environmental levy through consultation with the people whom it would affect. The Government had to go through this process and it has been extensive. This is new legislation, this is not an amendment to existing legislation. We have had to develop new special development loan legislation. I just want to set it in context, because I seem to remember that in 1989 the then Minister of Finance had indicated in his budget:

"I exempted the hotel sector from customs duties and consumption taxes on inputs needed for refurbishing or improving their plant.

I now propose to grant these concessions under the Hotel Aids Act which will be amended to treat refurbishing, or major improvements in the same way that an extension of capacity is treated."

That was a budgetary proposal, Sir, in **1989**. I am not aware, I do not want to mislead the House, but I am still checking to see if the Hotel Aids Act has been amended to treat refurbishing or major improvements in the same way that an extension of capacity is treated arising out of a budgetary proposal presented to this House as far back as **1989**. Perhaps it might have been, and I do not want to speak from memory, but I know it has been a sore issue with the hoteliers. It just goes to show that sometimes with the best will in the world the intentions expressed in budgetary statements might depend upon other Ministries. I know the Ministry of Tourism has been trying for the longest time to have this matter addressed without the hotel sector agreeing to what should be included and a lot of consultation that has ensued about what you can and cannot include in the list, and that process of consultation takes extensive time after a Minister of Finance...

*Aside.*

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I just want to say that in **1989** there was this commitment as a budgetary proposal to change the Hotel Aids Act and that after five years nothing has happened.

Against that background, Sir, I should like to commend this measure to the House and ask that this Bill be read a second time, but in doing so I should like to bring to Your Honour's attention that it is now **12.00** noon and that I had asked the Leader of the House to have the item Statements by Ministers reopened at **12.00**.

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

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to second that, Sir. **11.55 a.m.**

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that further consideration of this Environmental Levy Bill be postponed.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I beg to second that.

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

**STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS**

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. **Speaker**, it is announced from Buckingham Palace that Her Majesty the Queen, on the recommendation of Her Majesty's Ministers in Barbados, has been graciously pleased to approve the appointment of Sir **Clifford Straughn** Husbands, Knight of St. **Andrew**, as the Governor-General of Barbados in succession to the late Dame Ruth Nita Barrow. The appointment will take effect from June 1, **1996**.

I am also pleased to be able to announce that in keeping with tradition Her Majesty the Queen has also agreed to confer on Sir **Clifford** the honour and the dignity of Knight Grand Cross of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George.

**GOVERNMENT BUSINESS**

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that consideration of Item **8** on the Order Paper be resumed.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I beg to second that.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the Bill before us today provides this country with an **opportunity**...

*Asides.*

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, as far as I am aware my contributions are to this House of Assembly and for the record of this House and not for the record of propaganda or for cheap political gains in the Press. I speak to this Honourable House and I am not aware that there are any Press persons around. So my contribution will be based on the Bill before this House and I certainly would not want to be sidetracked on such an important **Bill** even though I appreciate that the recently made announcement may in fact have a tremendous impact on the society.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill before the House today is intended to defray the cost of the disposal of refuse generated by the use of imported goods and it is secondly to defray the cost of operating and maintaining refuse disposal sites and thirdly it is for the preservation and the enhancement of the environment and for related matters.

For some time, it has been my belief that this country has been subjected to a public outcry by the residents of **Bennetts** and Arch Hall in St. Thomas and those cries of affected citizens were ably supported by their then parliamentary representative, the Honourable Member for St. Thomas, and in seeking to represent his constituents he gave the country certain promises that the Barbados Labour Party then in Opposition if they so happened to form a Government would be in a position to provide an alternative **landfill** in the snap of a finger or in a very short space of time.

That prompted us to believe that the disposal of solid waste management was simply the provision of an area of land for the dumping of solid waste and that it could be done overnight and that an administration which for the first time in the **1990s** sought to introduce into Barbados a scientific approach to land filling... It was a sad event that the debate went down the path of seeking to score cheap

political points in representation of people while condemning **an** administration that for the first time was seeking to introduce a scientific **landfill**.

The Minister of Finance, the Right Honourable Prime Minister, indicated today that he understood the constraints of the country at the time when while we were in the middle of a stabilisation programme we found ourselves unable to provide the resources to satisfy the proper and efficient management of that scientific **landfill** which had been developed by the Democratic Labour Party. That was most unfortunate and I regret that it ever happened, that we were subjected to a **landfill** that to some extent was not managed in a manner that would have ensured that the entire operation was a success, even though we are **admitting** that it was in fact a new scientific approach to **landfills** in Barbados.

Like anything else in this country, we start somewhere and we seek to correct the wrongs of a new development if it has gone wrong. The point is that this Democratic Labour Party when in office sought to make sure that solid waste disposal was progressing down a new path and we certainly **deserve** the credit for having introduced that programme.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for this country to understand that solid waste and landfilling is a minute segment of a solid waste disposal programme for this country and we must not be confused into believing that to site a **landfill** or make **an** area of land available to the disposal of waste is a programme of solid waste disposal in this country. Mr. Speaker, there are several components of a solid waste programme and I think for the benefit of members and certainly for the benefit of the records of this House, when history is recorded the historians will record that this House of Assembly had the benefit and understanding of what is the entire structure of an integrated solid waste management problem.

Certainly, Sir, I am going to place on record my understanding of that programme.  
12.05 p.m.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the final Report of the Environmental Impact Assessment which was commissioned by the Government of Barbados. I will make it available to members who would want to see it, but I am sure that other members will have access to it. On page 22 it deals with the collection of garbage. The report says: -

"The Programme proposes improvements to the present method of waste collection from householders. The education of the public is a key part of this programme, to entrain the public to

separate their waste into the appropriate waste streams. It is **proposed** that waste be separated at source to the **degree** feasible, that is, in the household, and at commercial or industrial sources. The waste would be segregated into:

- municipal solid waste (largely food, packaging, miscellaneous);
- **bulky** waste (e.g., car wrecks and old stoves);
- yard waste (grass trimmings, branches, et cetera);
- special waste (sewerage sludge, abattoir blood, kitchen grease);
- recyclables.

These wastes would be diverted to a national sanitary **landfill**, a bulky waste disposal site, a composting site, and various recycling routes, respectively.

As pointed out elsewhere in this Report, the diversion of solid waste in this manner could result in a reduction of some 68% in the amount of waste to be disposed in a sanitary **landfill**.

The Programme will entail improvements for solid waste collection such as having community disposal sites and the rerouting of the collecting system."

Immediately, Sir, you are starting to get a picture that the disposal of solid waste in this country is not purely a decision to site a **landfill** in a specific area. I will go on, Sir. Other considerations that are noted and recorded on the **same** page 22 are:

#### "TRANSPORTATION AND WASTE TRANSFER

A Waste Transfer Station will be necessary..."

It is important, Sir, for me to read this into the record because I am going to be commenting on it in a broad sense later on in my address but I think it is important for me to read this into the record.

"A Waste Transfer Station will be a necessary feature of the Programme if the proposed sanitary **landfill** facility is located at Greenland or any location distant from the waste centroid."

Now, I noted with great interest that the Right Honourable Prime Minister avoided debate on the question of Greenland. I think it is important that we place at the disposal of this House **all** of the considerations available to this country as to the correct approach to the disposal of solid waste and by extension to the protection of the environment on behalf of the people of this country.

A Waste Transfer Station will be a necessary feature of the Programme if the proposed sanitary **landfill** facility is located at Greenland or any location distant from the waste centroid, the waste centroid being that **area** which is available to all parishes in Barbados and certainly, where the present **landfill** is located at Mangrove that, for example, is considered to be the centroid position of the country. I just want to be clear that we understand that the preferred position would be to have a **landfill** that is in the centroid of the country. It goes on:

"The purpose of the transfer station (which, if in the event a decision is taken to take it out of the centroid location) is to accept solid waste from the collection vehicles, bale the waste in compact form, and transfer the baled waste to a large vehicle which will convey it to the sanitary landfill. This will considerably decrease the number of vehicle trips to and from the sanitary landfill, (i.e. to 7 vehicle trips per **day**, as opposed to more than **80** if there were no transfer stations and the collection vehicles conveying it directly to the landfill). The transfer station will receive municipal solid waste from the southern parishes, while solid waste from the northern parishes of St. Lucy, St. **Andrew**, St. Peter and St. Joseph will be taken directly to the **landfill** site. The transfer station will only accept municipal waste. Bulky wastes and special waste, (for example, abattoir blood, **kitchen** grease and yard waste) will not be accepted at the transfer station but will be redirected to the bulky waste disposal site and composting facility, respectively.

Monitoring of the waste will be done at the transfer station for materials that should not go to the sanitary landfill. All of the unloading, baling and loading operations will be carried out inside the building which will have atmospheric controls to limit **offsite odours** and noise. The vehicle is weighed before and after off-loading so that the weight of the waste accepted by the transfer station can be monitored."

Mr. Speaker, the whole process goes on and on. I am not trying to weary you, neither am I playing for time for the journalists to return, but I think it is necessary to place all of this in the record of the House.

Now, Sir, section 26:

#### "COMPOSTING AND SPECIAL LIQUIDS

**Composting** is the name given to the **controlled**, solid phase, aerobic biodegradation of organic matter. The rich organic soil mix generated in this process is called compost. Compost can be used to add to **agricultural** and garden soil to improve its nutrient content and overall structure.

The term "special liquids" includes abattoir blood, **kitchen** grease and sewage sludge. Under the proposed Programme, these liquids, which are presently land disposed in trenches, will be disposed of at the composting facility."

Hon. Sir HAROLD St. JOHN: On a point of order, Sir. I hate to interrupt the Honourable Member in his stride but I must admit that the Honourable Member is not complying with the rules of the House. I do not believe that the **rules** of this House allow any Honourable Member to quote by reading extensively from every document in that way. Of course, the Honourable Member can refer to the document but not read it extensively like what the Honourable Member is doing.

Secondly, Sir, I draw to your attention and **ask** whether the Honourable Member is making that document a document of the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member did say that he would make it a document of the House. Could you proceed, please?

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am making the point, and I want to set the debate in the context that solid waste is not just simply a process that a decision is made to site a landfill. I am clearly seeking to identify that there is an entire process that has to be gone through so that I can clearly expose the folly of making statements in a constituency that I am going to see that a **landfill** is shut down overnight and it will be open by June **30** of this year and two years since the public is not able to have access to the **landfill** that was promised. I want to make the point that it is not a process that this country can take in a simple vacuum where we can treat it as a political debate. It is a very serious debate and it must be clearly **understood**. The records of this House must be understood fully because I am not satisfied that the Honourable Members on that side want to make all the **information** available to the country so that they can be the judge.  
12.15 p.m.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: On a point of order, Sir. Mr. Speaker, in Vying to suggest that Members on this side do not want to make the information available to the country, the Honourable Member is misleading the House insofar as all of the reports that were available and certainly the one from which the Honourable Member is reading were given to every media house in Barbados and left us to them to copy from it what they will. So the information has been made available to the media and to the public through the media. Every single media house in Barbados has one.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I **am** very grateful to the Honourable Minister for indicating that the information is available but to the best of my knowledge it has not been made available to this House and I **am** today, taking this opportunity to make it available to this House so that I can speak and understand clearly that this House understands that there is a clear understanding about the framework of a solid waste disposal programme.

So, Mr. Speaker, if I can continue, and I will continue to indicate that I was speaking under section 2(6) of this document and I **am** indicating, Sir, that the proposed **location** of the composting facility...

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member you are quoting now to support your point?

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Yes, I **am**. And I am outlining all of the different processes that have to be gone through.

*Asides.*

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, let us hear the Honourable Member.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: The proposed location of the composting facility is at Dayrells Plantation, St. Michael. Weekly collection of yard waste from residential homes will be accepted at this site. Private haulage will bring similar yard waste from resorts and hotels, **blood**, grease, sewerage slush and grease trap pumping. The liquid waste to be stored in separate holding tanks on the site prior to incorporation in the compost. The waste will be placed in **windrows** on top of an impervious pad. This pad will be sloped so that liquid leaching out of the piles will run off into a pond and be used to wet rows of compost. Sir, it is a whole process.

Waste minimization is another consideration where the objective of a solid waste management programme clearly would introduce waste minimization which is an integral part especially in a country as small as Barbados where we do not have large available land spaces that we can just simply go and dump garbage which would not be of any kind of a hindrance to the residents of this country. So we have to consider all different types of programmes before we are able to just simply make a decision about a **landfill** which is a process that has to be gone through.

Waste minimization: As part of the programme it is proposed that a national source reduced policy be implemented to improve the following elements which **are** outlined in the feasibility study...

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member, please. If the Chair might offer you some guidance. I do not think, according to the rules, the rules clearly state that you may

read extracts from books or papers other than newspapers in support of your argument and based on what is said here it means therefore that you must put forward an argument, a point. I do not think you could simply give a title and say, waste minimization or whatever it is and then just continue to read the document. I think you have to make a point according to the rules about waste minimization.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I made the point.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not saying you cannot read it or you cannot quote.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: I made the point up front, Sir, that there is a perception in this country that solid waste disposal is simply a matter of a politician making a decision that a **landfill** cannot be sited in his constituency. By such and such a time he is going to shut it down. I am going to open up a new **landfill**, condemn an administration that was introducing a scientific approach to landfilling and to solid waste disposal in this country. I am setting out clearly, Sir, that there is a lot of business that has to be discussed before we can enter into a decision about siting a **landfill** or debating a solid waste disposal programme. This is tedious, Mr. Speaker, and if that is not making a point, I am trying to make the point that these **are** all areas that have to be considered. We are discussing today a levy that is introduced and I **am** going to develop my speech, Mr. Speaker. If Honourable Members are as tired as they have been suggesting that they are, I suggest that they all walk out of the House because today is going to be a long, long day. It can be boring or whatever because something that is as important as the environment in this country they would find boring because it has to deal with the environment on behalf of the mass of the people of this country so that is a boring topic.

*Asides.*

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, let us hear the Honourable Member. Proceed please.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: So, Mr. Speaker, waste minimization is an integral part of a solid waste disposal programme. A national procurement policy encouraging recyclable material which the Honourable Minister of Finance referred to today is very interesting in that regard.

Distribution of procurement guidelines and a list of qualified products, distribution of list of vendors applying environmental friendly products, showcasing and publishing source reduction success stories consisting in the employment of drop-off depots. Advertising, duty free concessions to recyclers, **landfill** bans and fines, tax holidays, and then we come to the point of an environmental levy which the Honourable Member

indicated he would want to impose, not in a manner that he had suggested in the 1996 budget but in a manner that would not distort investment or trade in this country.

Sir, all of this has to take place before a decision can be made about the siting of a **landfill** in this country. Sir, the Honourable Minister of Finance, the Honourable Prime Minister, indicated that this country was very heavily taxed, overtaxed, that the tax was a burden on the backs of the people of this country. Well he did correct it today because he to some extent made me to revise my presentation because I wanted to point out that if he had in fact gone ahead and introduced all of the taxes relative to this environmental levy as he had planned to do then we would have had an enormous burden of taxation on the backs of the people in this country.

What we have seen, Sir, is the Prime Minister and Honourable Minister of Finance today revising his position and indicating that the new levy which is now to raise funds to the tune of \$7 million in this financial year as the result of an ad valorem levy of 0.75% on all goods except those referred to in paragraphs 1 and 3 and an ad valorem levy of 1% on all goods imported in containers made of plastic, glass or metal, goods imported in containers made of paper boards or empty containers made of plastic, glass, metal and paper boards. And the whole list of description of goods like motor vehicles, tyres and so on are listed. Sir, these taxes are new taxes. This is an entirely new Bill. It is a new tax by an administration that condemned the Democratic Labour Party for the introduction of levies. There was a stabilisation levy, they criticised it. There was an unemployment levy, they criticised it. There was a health levy, they criticised it.

12.25 p.m.

Every single levy that was introduced by the Democratic Labour Party Administration was condemned by the Barbados Labour Party and it is short of shocking that they would find it possible in 1996 to introduce into this House of Assembly a Bill to collect a levy from the taxpayers of this country. But in addition to that, this is not a direct **tax**. This is a tax that is going to hit the small, big size man, everybody in the same way. Every single Barbadian will have to pay the same rate of taxation on this levy whether you are poor, whether you are unemployed, or whether you are a housewife. Every single person in Barbados will have to pay. In addition, what frightens me, Mr. Speaker, is that when the **Stamp Duty** was introduced to this country by the Barbados Labour Party Administration it started very small and over the years we saw that tax increase to the extent that it reached some 15 per cent on the C.I.F. cost of goods into this country.

Yet again, we are seeing now the introduction of an Environmental Levy that has the potential to increase over the years because, as I outlined and as it is clearly understood by the Minister of Finance, the amount of money that is being derived from this levy will still not be sufficient to satisfy the mitigating circumstances of putting a **landfill** in place as well as absorbing the cost of the additional workers at the NCC and so forth. What we have, Sir, is a Government that came into office totally confused, without a solid waste programme who find themselves now making stop gap measures here, there and everywhere to satisfy a means to an end and this is not comprehensive planning. They have done this, Sir, in spite of the efforts by the former administration to systematically put in place a solid waste programme that would be responsible, well researched, well-understood and had to be dealt with in relation to the available resources of this country at the time.

Sir, we could talk, we can plan and we can do all kinds of programmes. But unless there is the money available you cannot do it.

#### *Aside.*

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: But, Mr. Speaker, on the one hand the Government is saying that there are too many levies. They condemn them. On the other hand, they are saying that taxation is too high and that it is a burden on the backs of the people in this country. On the other hand, they are saying that yes, they can put this **landfill** in place in 30 days or as soon as they win the Government they can put a new **landfill** in place. Sir, on top of all of that, they then come back to this House of Assembly in traditional BLP style and discard everything that they have said before and now introduce a levy which will have the impact of more taxes on the backs of the poor people and, in fact, on everybody in this country – more tax, more tax on top of the people in this country.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is another frightening development coming out of this entire Bill that I already placed on the record of this House and I am going to repeat it again. The Minister of Finance in his Budgetary Proposals of 1995 indicated that there will be a tipping fee of some \$40.00 per tonne and I indicated last year during the Budget presentation that that will spell doomsday for a number of private **truckers** who are presently operating and tying garbage to the **landfill** on behalf of companies and individuals at a price of some \$80.00 per **truck** load regardless of the weight of the garbage. But once this tax is introduced it will mean, Sir, that a truck that has the capacity to carry 10 tonnes of load will have to charge their client \$480.00 to dump that garbage wherever a decision is made to create the **landfill** and the Government said they will be placing it at Greenland. It means, Sir,

for an 18-tonne truck it would cost **\$720.00** which will mean that the businessman or the consumer or a person building a house or whoever will have to pay **\$720.00** if they engage the services of an 18-tonne truck at the **proposed** rate of **\$40.00** per tipping fee.

Sir, businessmen in this country do not absorb cost. They pass cost on to the consumer and every single business house that has to employ truckers to remove garbage in these numbers from their places will pass on that cost to the consumer in some form. So in addition to the taxes that are going to be heaped on the backs of the taxpayers of this country and everybody, they will have to pay a proportion of this tipping fee which is going to be passed on to them.

Now, Sir, I am going to show you the danger of this situation. There are over a hundred small truckers in this country who will most probably, and I must make this point before I say what I was about to say. The Sanitation Service Authority trucks will be exempted from the payment of this tipping fee and that you know, Mr. Speaker, is short of being a laugh. Because this efficient Administration would you believe it, Sir, is unable to provide trucks today to collect garbage around in any of the St. Michael constituencies in a meaningful way. All over Bridgetown and St. Michael garbage is to be collected because they have no **trucks**. But the Sanitation Service Authority trucks will be exempted **from** paying the tipping **fee** at the garbage dumps. They will be exempted. So it means that persons will have to go to the Sanitation Service Authority whose trucks will probably be broken down and they will be unable to get their garbage transported because that is the only way they will be able to save cost if they go to the Sanitation Service Authority.

Now, Sir, you know and I know that with unemployment, despite the promises of this administration that they would create 30 000 jobs, there is no movement in the direction of creating any jobs and there are small truckers who are self-employed in an **area** where the small man has gone and bought himself a truck and is looking for a way to make a dollar. Now he will find himself having to pay these enormous tipping fees and as a result of the competition he will get **from** a Sanitation Service Authority that will probably be ill-equipped will have to compete and will probably not be able to get **anymore** business. It is a serious problem. Sir, what will they do to survive and they are going to try to survive? You may find that many of them may take advantage of the fact just like how many defaulters in this country collect the **NIS** money and do not pay it in and collect PAYE deductions and do not pay it in. Do you understand, Mr. Speaker, that the likelihood exists that they may in fact be tempted to collect the tipping fee and then, rather than dump the garbage in the appropriate dump or in the appropriate **landfill** and you

may find that they end up dumping the garbage all over Barbados and creating an environmental hazard throughout the length and breadth of Barbados merely by the introduction of the tipping fee that will have an impact on the consumers of this country? It will have an impact on the pockets, eventually, of the **residents** in this country.  
12.35 p.m.

Sir, I should bring the House's attention to what has happened in Trinidad and Tobago, because the same consultants that are advising the Barbados Government advised the Trinidad Government with regard to the placement of a **landfill** which is over 60 **kilometers** outside the Trinidad main living environment. In Trinidad, as a result of this same kind of process, the truck men are dropping the garbage anywhere, in any hole or gully, and they are now burning garbage to get rid of flies and mosquitoes and things like that.

This is not an issue we can take lightly. My debate today is not one of a political nature, but I intend to speak clearly. If we are **talking** about the environment, then let us have a good debate about it. I am not seeking to be offensive to the Government, because I have already dismissed the political position they held, but I think they are showing a willingness to retract from an unfortunate position and I think we have to help them along the way, because if we were in fact the Administration, as we were in fact doing, we would have continued in the professional manner that we were going in developing a solid waste programme for this country.

Sir, I am going to have to question whether this levy is not on contravention of the Prices and Incomes Protocol, because for some time it seems to me that the emphasis of the Prices and Incomes Protocol is a process that focusses only on people's wages, that the wages of the workers in this country must be held down, that there must be wage restraint. Even during our time there was a salary cut and all of that was done in an attempt to save the Barbados dollar. So I am going to question whether or not this is an infringement of the Prices and Incomes Protocol, because the tendency is to focus on wages, and the small man who can barely **survive** in this environment today will now have on his back additional costs by way of taxation. This was not promised to him by the Barbados Labour Party, he was promised an ease. He was told that they could get the job done – and I am not going to deal with the whole process at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and those other areas, that is a separate debate that would take another whole day – because they were aware of the financial constraints of the country, yet all of these promises were made. Yet they reintroduced a Prices and Incomes Protocol and I am questioning whether or not this is an infringement of that Protocol.

Sir, the Bill indicates, at Clause 8, that the environmental levy collected shall be paid into the Consolidated Fund. I understand the language in that very clearly, Sir, and the Right Honourable Prime Minister alluded to it in his address where he indicated that he did not want to progress with charging of the fees because he did not want to be charged for having placed the money into the Consolidated Fund and they had in fact not put the **landfill** in place as yet. My concern is that once these funds go into the Consolidated Fund, this Parliament will have a clear understanding that any money derived from an environmental levy, which we consider to be unfortunate at this time given the circumstances, those proceeds will only be used in areas that will improve the general environment of Barbados and I would have no **difficulty** if they are used for the development of a **landfill**, disposal site or anything that would improve the environment of this country. I **certainly would have** no **difficulty** with that, but I would hate to **think** that like other **situations** where money is **collected and** placed in the Consolidated Fund, that we find that these **areas are** discarded and we again have other **priorities** that crop up from time to time that would push the environment into the background.

Now, Sir, I **really** set the debate so that we have to understand that when we raise money for a **landfill** there are **all** kinds of problems throughout this entire Barbados that need addressing and that we would have to allocate **funds**. **Whether** we use **funds** from this specific levy or not, I **believe** money should be **earmarked** for the general **improvement** of the environment in several of the categories I would want to list.

There are chicken farms and pig farms all over Barbados. There **are** chicken farms in every single constituency that are creating problems for residents. My concern is that there **are** technical details available that can improve the environment and I would like the Government to embark on an educational programme where all of the farmers or persons interested in setting up these farms are sensitised to the pollution of the environment and that some money be allocated to deal with the problem of the stench from chicken farms and pig **farms** across Barbados. It need not happen, because as we look at scientific approaches to solid waste management I think we have to take this into consideration.

*Aside.*

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: It is true. I think his is probably one of the best they have in Barbados.

*Asides.*

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: I have promised to go and see it. I have not seen it...

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us continue, please.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: ... but I know it is a major problem.

Sir, I spoke about the non-collection of garbage. That is a major problem, as far as I am concerned. I am not a technocrat, I **am** not a doctor, I am not a health inspector...

*Aside.*

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Sir, I will not go into this question as to who these persons' fathers are, because my father did not keep a rum shop. If my father kept a rum shop, you know what I would be.

*Asides.*

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please! Honourable Members, let us hear the Honourable Member and would you please cut out the **Asides**? Continue, please.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: I have already dealt with the non-collection of garbage. Can you imagine that a Government that made such a hue and cry about Mount Stinkeroo, which turned to Mount Pleasant, which has now turned back to a Mount Something, because it is still smelling like Mount **Stinkeroo**, it still has a stench...

*Aside.*

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Do not tell me that. I went and experienced it myself and it does have a scent. Even if the scent has improved, it still has a bad scent coming from it. Garbage will always have a bad scent. There are some situations when you even complete a **landfill** and there are exposures because of cracks or whatever, you can still **run** the **risk** of bad scents emanating from it.  
12.45 p.m.

So don't say that it does not have a bad smell. It does smell badly and anywhere you go, you **are** going to have problems with the **landfill**, especially in a small society like ours.

Sir, I am of the view that some immediate attention will have to be paid to the problems at the Sanitation Service Authority because something has gone radically wrong up there. The whole place, at the Sanitation Service Authority, is breaking down. There is no management. Everything seems to be going topsy turvy. There **are** no parts, no vehicles. They were trying hard and all of a sudden something has gone wrong at the Sanitation Service Authority. They started good and all of a sudden now something has gone wrong.

I **am** not commenting on any personalities or anything like that. It is a fact that at the Sanitation Service Authority they have a major problem with equipment. If we **are** going into a new process where we **are** developing a **landfill**

within the short term in Greenland or wherever we are going to put it, it is a major problem that is going to call for major financing. Now that Government knew that. That Barbados Labour Party Government understood that we were going to have problems in this regard. They knew that we have limited resources yet they belly-ached and convinced the whole of Barbados that we were uncaring, that we were unable to manage the landfill. Yet, today this caring and efficient Government has the temerity to be in here after failing to collect garbage **all** across Barbados for the last few weeks. Barely collecting garbage. This caring Government, I wonder what they would say. Sir, not only Mount **Stinkeroo** smelling, Government Hill, Macaroni Village, Pepperoni Village, **all** over Barbados, smelling.

Mr. SPEAKER: These are all your constituencies?

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: ... Because of the failure of this Government to collect garbage in this country. The whole of Barbados is smelling, wherever you go, there is a bad smell. It is all over Barbados that is stink because of their failure to collect garbage, especially in Bridgetown. I used to write calypso and I am not too sure that I might not come out of retirement.

Sir, I want to deal with another serious problem that we are facing in this country and it has to do with the disposal of offal. For some time I have been trying to find out exactly what is happening with the fish offal... I understood that the Minister has indicated to this House that they were dumping it at sea, and the Honourable Member for **St.** Lucy quite rightly pointed out that that was in contravention of the international laws of the sea and it should not be happening. Yet we were told that they were dumping offal at sea.

I understand that they are still from time to time dumping offal at Mangrove. Whether they are now paying **stricter** attention to it, I have not been able to see it myself. I am not going to report inaccurately. It is my understanding that they are still dumping offal at sea and they are still dumping some of the animal offal from the abattoir at Mangrove Dump even though we were told that that had to stop immediately because that was creating a bigger problem at Mangrove. I think that when we spoke in terms of bad management that one of the problems we had was that they were dumping offal at that dump and I felt that was wrong and that it should be processed.

What has happened, and I **am** aware of it, and I am glad that it has happened, and it is my understanding that there is a rendering plant that has been solicited in Barbados. When we were in the Government we were certainly part of **the** negotiations to make sure that a proper rendering plant was brought into Barbados. We have gone out of office but I understand that those plans were still progressed and very shortly we will see a rendering plant open in Barbados.

I can only speak of what I know because I spoke to the people myself. Nobody told me about it. I am fully aware of it. The rendering plant will probably eliminate that problem and it will have a value for the society because the residue will be able to be used for fertiliser which is an improvement.

Sir, you can see the trend that there is a development in Barbados where we are starting to pay **strict** attention to the integrated solid waste management of garbage in this country and not simply by doing it by the snap of a finger and saying I **am** going to put a **landfill** here and just simply calling that a day, that is the end of the problem. It is a process that you have to go through.

Sir, there is a major problem we are having in Barbados and that has to do with the burning of garbage in villages. If the Sanitation Service Authority is failing to collect garbage you will notice that there has been an escalation of the burning of garbage in villages and communities across Barbados. I **am** sure Sir, that in your own constituency you have noticed that where because of the failure of the Sanitation Service Authority to collect the garbage and because of the stench and so **forth** and in order to eradicate the stench from their own communities they have resorted again as they used to do many years ago to burn garbage in their own districts. It is annoying.

*Aside.*

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: ...They are sitting down at the Sanitation Service Authority from 5 o'clock a morning to 3 o'clock waiting on a truck and there is no truck for them to go out on. So you cannot blame them if there are no trucks for them to drive. But they are at work and they have done a good job. Many of them have gone beyond their call to **satisfy** the needs of the people.

It is a major problem that has emerged in this country, Mr. Speaker, and I **am** sure that we will have to pay some attention to it. If we are going to raise funds from an Environmental Levy, some of those funds must be earmarked for the proper training, public relations programme, educational programme to make sure that these kinds of practices are eradicated.

Mr. Speaker, there is a major problem again with the gullies in this country. With the rains of 1995, you would have noticed that there were many swampy areas around Barbados where we had mosquitoes, flies and other insects and there was an outbreak of dengue fever last year despite the Minister trying to **downplay** it. There was a new large outbreak of dengue fever last year, despite the Honourable Minister believing that the mosquitoes were only in my head or buzzing around my head. There was a major outbreak, in the Minister's own constituency, of flies and so forth.

*Aside.*

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I understand that they want to take a break and I will resume after the break.

#### SUSPENSION

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to move that this House be suspended until 2 o'clock today.

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

*The question was put and resolved in the affirmative and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the House accordingly.*  
12.55 p.m.

#### RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed. The Honourable Member for St. Michael East.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, prior to the suspension I was dealing with some of the environmental problems that are currently affecting Barbados and urging that the entire process should be looked at, not necessarily in the context of a **landfill**, but in terms of the entire problems with waste disposal and bad environmental practices that have the effect of disturbing the environment. I was at that point dealing with the problem of burning of garbage in villages.

I wanted to make the point just before the suspension that there were some real examples particularly in the St. Michael areas that are seriously affecting the residents of St. Michael and in particular I refer to the **Ellis Quarry**, for example, if I can use that as an example. It may be important for me to mention it very early because I am quite clear in my mind that the particular representative for that area will not mention it, so I will seek to do that job for him.

The **Ellis Quarry** lies in the constituency of St. Michael West Central. That particular quarry, as an example, continues to affect the children at the St. Stephen's School. You know that with the advent of asthma – I myself as an asthmatic – one of the reasons why I get so involved in the environment is because I am very badly affected not only by the vegetation of the country but also by the atmosphere. The slightest thing triggers asthma and you know that asthma can be very fatal and sudden. Certainly this is why I consider this debate as one that we have to take seriously because bad environmental habits can lead to sudden death. The children at St. Stephen's School and some families have had to abandon houses in the immediate area just like the residents of Arch Hall and

**Bennetts** who have been affected. We have had these **kinds** of problems surfacing in other areas, and certainly the **Ellis Quarry** is one.

There are other quarries in Murray's Land, Rogers and so forth where a similar thing is taking place. As a broad policy, rather than us repeating a situation where an Opposition is seeking to say to the people of Barbados that an administration is failing to do A, B and C maybe because of the financial constraints that are available to the administration at the time, do not let us get caught up in that kind of a debate. Let us deal with the development of it and try to keep it within a developmental base according to the resources we have available to us. So we will continue to take a responsible position in this particular debate.

Now, Sir, I did not get the chance before the suspension to deal with the whole question of dead animals. This is a major problem in Barbados. It is offensive. I have spent a long time being associated with tourism directly with the marketing of Barbados as a tourist destination. One of the major stumbling blocks to our image is the fact that in Barbados we are leaving dead animals to lie on the roads until they swell. Why it continues to happen, I really do not know. It is a major problem. We just seem to drive past them. People walk past them. They smell terrible. They look temble. They are offensive to the society yet we are quite prepared to sit down day after day and pass these animals in the road without doing anything about it.

*Aside.*

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: It was a problem under both administrations. It was a problem under the Democratic Labour Party Administration. I am saying that the efforts at eradicating it must continue because I raised a lot of cane about it. I wrote to the Sanitation Service Authority about it and I have repeatedly made calls that they should do something about the dead animals that are left lying on the roads from time to time.

Now, Sir, let me turn my attention to Greenland. Greenland, Mr. Speaker, as you can determine from my presentation so far, clearly by the actions we have seen and witnessed by this present Administration, they are presently doing a hatchet job at Greenland. The advent of Greenland is nothing more than a hatchet job. I have made the point and I have made it over and over again that the **landfill** area is just one segment of the entire solid waste plan and that we cannot debate Greenland in that context. We have to look at solid waste disposal in a holistic manner. I think that is what we would have to term Greenland because of the approach of this Administration where the Greenland site that is proposed to be introduced is just merely a stop gap measure as the Government cannot decide just what the national plan is for the management of waste.

Now, Sir, I am aware that there needs to be significant legislation that will have to accompany any solid waste management plan. The specifics of that legislation will have to be gone into and it would be silly for any administration to assume that overnight they can just simply make decisions because all kinds of processes have to be gone through before that final decision can be made.

I want to again point out, Mr. Speaker, the folly in seeking to score cheap political gains by condemning an administration about one particular area of Barbados where there was some degree of mismanagement, even though the approach was a new scientific one, yet the same administration that condemned the former administration is now allowing total decay in the environment of Barbados where we can see the total collapse of the Sanitation Service Authority with regard to the collection of garbage around the country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make another point to emphasize why I think it is undesirable for any administration to just simply believe that they can just take a decision that they are going to Greenland. Greenland is in the Scotland District of Barbados. The Democratic Labour Party, when it was in office, commissioned a Water Loss Study which was financed by the Inter-American Development Bank. By strange coincidence the Water Loss Study may, in fact, and I have very good reason to believe, identify Greenland in the Scotland District as an area for the trapping of surface water. Now, Sir, you are aware that the water resource base of Barbados is almost 100 per cent allocated. It means that with future development at the present growth rate at about 4 per cent that the allocation base of Barbados will be completely wiped out by the year 2000. In another three or four years' time we will not be able to allocate any new water to any new developments whether it is for housing, agricultural development, golf courses, sporting development or tourism development, and that is a real point.

Now, if the Government does not understand that you have, to complete a Water Loss Study before you enter into a determination that you are going to place a **landfill** in Greenland, then something has to be fundamentally wrong. I am submitting that the Government should wait and exhaust all avenues, have a clear understanding of the total picture of solid waste disposal before a rash or a hatchet job is done at Greenland which we may regret in years to come.

Sir, it may also mean that the Scotland District has to be looked at in the context that the country may, in fact, have to **prioritise** the placement of a desalination plant in the event that we are unable to find new water resource bases in Barbados because the aquifers that presently supply water to this country are all identified. Every single one of them is identified and if I had the map I would

point every one of them to you to show that they have already been identified. We are either going to start trapping surface water or we are going to have to introduce programmes to sensitise housewives and householders in this country about the trapping of water on their homes where we would be able to accumulate additional water supply on a daily basis in this country.

Sir, to make a decision that we are going to Greenland by such and such a date is a lie and it should never have been canvassed to the people of Barbados because it was not achievable. They could not do it. It was a false intention because it was an intention that could not have been achieved but yet it was done to appease people in a political context. It is a sad reflection, and the people of St. Thomas should punish the Barbados Labour Party and make sure that they never ever again have a representative that sits in this House of Assembly.

2.10 p.m.

Now, Sir, I want to make the point and there are some submissions. There are a lot of things that the Government has to consider. There have been suggestions that in seeking to handle the problem that a decision could be taken by an administration which would allow the separation of garbage to be such that we can take some solid waste like rubble and that kind of substance. There are proposals that have been submitted to successive governments. I am not sure if the present administration has seen it but there were proposals that suggested that because of the nature of the land shape of Barbados that we could in many agricultural fields around Barbados that we could remove the present top soil, fill in those areas where there are sinks and little gullies in fields, where we should then be able to take some of that garbage that is presently dumped in Mangrove and set it aside in ...

*Aside.*

Mr. J. O. **TUDOR**: Yes, the **Colin** Hudson proposal. It does make sense. It is a proposal that is before the country and should be analysed because with mechanisation of the sugar cane industry and so forth, it is very difficult to cut canes when there are these slopes and the rain falls. If the land is flat or is evened out you can picture in your mind, Mr. Speaker, that it certainly would be a lot easier if we were able to take these fields and make them more conducive to the producing of agricultural crops, a level field more or less. It would probably take years to do it but it is a process that would assist because we should be mindful that the capacity of any **landfill** in Barbados would come into question so we have as a matter of policy now to concentrate on what we would consider to be desirable for Barbados over the next 40 to 50 years. That is an option that the Government must consider rather than just rushing into a situation, rush down to Greenland in a hatchet job just to satisfy a means to an end.

Sir, there are some considerations and I am going to go on and I am going to explain the **difficulty** with the decision to go to Greenland. I am going to deal with this Greenland because I would hate, Sir, to **think** that this House of Assembly did not give the public of Barbados the benefit of all of the variables that would have an impact on the decision to site a **landfill** in this country and it would be a sad day if we were to allow it to go ahead. Mishaps may take place or you may have a flood as we had in the early twentieth century where the entire Scotland District was disrupted and washed down almost into the sea where a lot of debris went into Long Pond around the coast and down the West Coast. Can you imagine if you pack that area with all **kinds** of garbage and have an unusual event where you have about 30 or 40 inches of rain and all the garbage washes into the sea in Long Pond.

Now, at Greenland itself, Mr. Speaker, underlying the area where they propose to have the **landfill** is a spring and the engineers are trying to divert that spring. The area itself is a high-risk area and underlying the ground is a stream that goes from 2 feet to 17 **feet deep**. Now if you have to dig down and you are going to excavate you are going to be reaching water that would have to be redirected. I am talking about **Dottin** Spring. Sir, they have tried many times where the road itself, just below Farley Hill, has broken up as a result of the spring. These are real situations, Mr. Speaker, and I am just trying to paint in the mind of this Parliament that when we take these decisions we are going to have to live with them and if disaster strikes somebody is going to have to pay the cost. We are debating a few dollars today – \$5 million or \$7 million – to assist with a landfill. We may in fact be creating a huge monster of a problem by going ahead in a hatchet manner to end up in Greenland when in fact we are just inviting disaster in this entire country.

Can you imagine, Sir, a rainy day or a rainy period. You have dug out in Greenland. You have set up a **landfill** in Greenland which in itself is a risk because I am not a technical person, I am not an engineer, but I can tell you that they have informed me that there are areas in Greenland where there are natural walls that if in fact excavation takes place that the areas around those walls may in fact collapse and you may see a total collapse of the same **landfill** that we are trying to set up. These are some of the mitigating circumstances that you are confronted with at Greenland. So if you have some trucks now, and let us assume that the **landfill** is at Greenland and it is a rainy day. Do you know that steep hill, Sir? Can you imagine the mud on the road and trucks trying to get up those hills? We are talking about 18-tonne trucks and 40-tonne trucks. Can you imagine the sliding that will go on? Those roads were never constructed for the use of that kind of equipment. Can you imagine the entire tourism belt where we have gone and enjoyed the view from Farley Hill

without any smells, just to enjoy the magnificent view in the area? Can you imagine the distortion that is going to take place in that area just to satisfy a means to an end?

Now, because of the fact that you cannot excavate the entire area as you would like, it is going to mean that the capacity of cells at Greenland will be significantly reduced. It would mean that if you cannot dig down as deep as you would want to dig down it means that you would be reducing the volume. I would tell you that the studies that they had with regard to the capacity of the volume are conflicting with information that was received by other professional people in the industry who have indicated that the amount of garbage that is supposed to be accumulated on a daily basis is almost twice as much as what the Stanley Report suggested. This would mean that the life span of the **landfill** would be significantly reduced. In fact, Sir, the way it is estimated originally to have a life span of about 20 years, in the first instance because of the amount of garbage that is being generated it would be significantly reduced to about 14 years and with the other mitigating circumstances the likelihood of further reduction may bring it down to 8, 9 or 10 years of useful life.

Mr. Speaker, the problem that we have is that you go and you spend all this money at this time introducing levies into the country that are a burden, only then to **find** out that you have created an environmental monster and placed it on the backs of the people of the country. Now many have argued and I think that one of the options that this Parliament should be aware of is the least cost option because if on the one hand we are asking the taxpayers of this country to pay additional taxes in the form of a levy why is it that we are not **seeking** to reduce the burden on the taxpayers of this country by opting for the least cost option with the siting of a **landfill** in this country? All of the studies reveal, Mr. Speaker, that the **siting** of a **landfill** at Mangrove is the cheapest option available to this country and in addition to that the **marl** that will be derived from the digging out at the Mangrove site can be sold. The environmental impact assessment does not provide for the return in revenue that would be derived as a result of selling the product that is dug out from Mangrove. And these are considerations that we have to take into account. On the one hand you are asking the taxpayers to pay more money. On the other hand you are not going for the least cost option which would be acceptable to the country, which is in the centroid location of Barbados but you **are** going to heap on the backs of the taxpayers more taxes and at the same time you are not going to give them the benefit of the least cost option which is more desirable and more in line with the technical advice available to this country. 2.20 p.m.

Now we cannot do that, Sir. Because political weight is a strange thing, because as long as you have political clout and you are in office and you are saying this is

the decision I am making that it has to be that. I am saying, Sir, that that is wrong. That is very, very wrong and this Parliament must not allow a situation to occur in this country where political weight, because you have the power within your own administration to use political weight, that you use it and disregard the professional advice that is available to this country. It is fundamentally wrong and all of the options, every single option, must be thrown out and must be available to this country. It must not simply be discarded as far as that is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, this new Administration should be condemned. Can you imagine, Sir, that they set up a Task Force and invited prominent persons in this society to sit on a Task Force? When they met for the **first** time, the Minister attended the meeting and the first thing the Minister did was to indicate to the Members that they must not debate or consider the placement of a new **landfill** in Barbados. Can you imagine that? They set up a Task Force and invited professional people, a whole list of people that they invited to sit on that Task Force, and the Minister could attend the first meeting and instruct them that they must not discuss a **landfill** and went on to suggest that they must not listen to certain people like Dr. **Colin** Hudson...

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a point of order please. Take your seat please. The Honourable Member, take your seat please.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for St. Michael East is misleading the House. First of all, he was not a member of the Task Force and, insofar as he is commenting here, he is commenting only on what was reported to him. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the remit of the Task Force as given by the terms of reference approved by Cabinet were for the consideration of Solid Waste Policy generally with particular reference to recycling and specifically omitted the review of Greenland. I did not suggest whom they should or should not listen to. I merely indicated to the Task Force what agreement **as** determined was and they could look at future sites for landfills and make recommendations for **all** landfills in the future, but that Greenland was not part of the remit of that Task Force. So that in framing it in that way, the Honourable Member is trying to suggest that I did something wrong. That is not true.

Mr. SPEAKER: Proceed, please.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what I said that the Minister had appointed a Task Force that included prominent persons in this society and I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, that I had indicated to call those names. I will not call the names now, but I have already

indicated properly so in accordance with Rule 28 (10) that I intended to refer to those persons. Now I take it, Sir, as an insult to the integrity of people in this country when you invite them to examine a programme on integrated solid waste and then you ask them to exclude the consideration of a placement for a landfill. It is offensive. It is an affront to their integrity and they should have all resigned. I would have walked out of the room from the time the Minister spoke those words. I would have walked out of the room to demonstrate my disgust of the comments of the Minister and then when she went on to suggest that they must not listen to Dr. **Colin** Hudson, a gentleman who has made significant ...

Mr. SPEAKER: On what do you rise please?

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: On a point of order, Sir. I have never suggested to the Task Force, as the Honourable Member is trying to say, that they should not listen to Dr. Hudson. As a matter of fact, Dr. Hudson was a member of the Task Force and was present in the room on the first and only occasion that I have ever addressed them. So it is not true for him to say that I told them not to listen to Dr. Hudson.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: And he felt very badly. Mr. Speaker, you would know that I have a copy of the Task Force Report which identified the identical comments that I am making. I have a copy of the Task Force Report. I get everything that I want in Barbados. I learned from the Honourable Member for St. Thomas. Not me - I do not speak in this House unless you have whatever you want to have to back it up. Do not play with me when I have information and I do not play games as far **as** this is concerned. It is an affront to the integrity of those persons, **Sir...Dr. Hugh Sealy...**

*Aside.*

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: I indicated to, Mr. Speaker, that I intended to call their names - Dr. Leonard Nurse, Miss **Sandra Prescod**, Fisheries Officer, Fisheries Department, Mr. Tom Cross, Bowie Cross Advertising, Dr. **Colin** Hudson, Engineer and Environmentalist, Mr. Christopher Griffith, Manager of Sanitation Service Authority, Mr. Bentley Norville, the Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, these are people who are held in high regard and the Minister reduced them to literally nothing on a Task Force seeking to report in the interest of the people in this country. But there was a reason because they were themselves objecting to the placement of a **landfill** at Greenland because they all know and they have expressed those comments on several occasions to the inquiry that they had where they had the international consultants with the members of the public at the Bethel Auditorium.

They have listed their objection to the placement of a **landfill** agreement and I believe that the Minister was aware, but it was necessary to set up the Task Force to give the impression to the public that yes, the Government has given wide consideration not knowing that the Minister had instructed them but leave out Greenland. That is not for debate. That is a *fait accompli* and I do not know if I need to explain *fait accompli*. That is French language that people understand.

Mr. SPEAKER: I believe the Honourable Member is not referring to the Chair.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: There have been objections to the placement of the **landfill** at Greenland for many, many reasons apart from the scientific reasons, apart from the mitigating circumstances that **are** such that it will cost an enormous amount of money to really do a job of a proper **landfill** in that area because when you consider the road infrastructure and all the other mitigating circumstances that would have to be put in place, the money that we are attempting to raise today is chicken feed in relation to what would have to be spent if we want to do the job properly. But no, in the immediate area we are going to destroy Farley Hill, the Morgan Lewis Mill, the last remaining sugar mill. It is a good tourist area. They are restoring the mill. They intend to have it as an area where tourists can come and visit, but it is going to be badly affected with the stench from the dump. I mean all of the environmentalists have indicated that.

Mr. Speaker, this is my understanding. They indicate to me, Sir, and this is in a report from the Scotland District Association that the Morgan Lewis Mill is within 500 yards...

Mr. SPEAKER: From what do you quote?

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: From the Scotland District Association.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you making this a document of the House?

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Yes, I can make this a document of the House. They indicate that the Barbados National Trust has embarked on the restoration of Morgan Lewis Mill and they expect that this will receive international acclaim because of the patronage of the venture. It will be the outstanding heritage attraction of the island. A British company of mill restorers is to start work on June 12th of this year. The site is to be developed as an **outstanding** heritage attraction and the mill will be restored to full working capacity but that entire programme will be through the **eddoes** if we allow this hatchet job to take place, the organic sugar project in the Scotland District. This is a project, Sir, proposed by Hickey and Hill Incorporated in California and the BADMC of Barbados...

Mr. SPEAKER: What has this quote that you **are** reading now to do with the point that you **made** earlier?

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: I am just making the point, Sir, and I am going to lead up to the reasons why they **are**...

Mr. SPEAKER: Oh, you have not made the point yet?

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Yes, I have made the point that there are people who are objecting. I **am** trying to show you some of the reasons why people are objecting and I will outline all of them if you want me to one by one. This is just another reason. There is another project - the organic sugar project in the Scotland District which is going to be set up in association with the Government. It is a good project and it has a lot of potential for another attraction as a tourism destination as Barbados is. So why would we not want them to develop this project? But it will be in jeopardy if we allow the area to be **destroyed**.  
2.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, we have gone through all kinds of approaches to get through to the Government, but we seem to be unable to convince the Government that they need not fear that certainly the Opposition would want to pressure them into making a bad decision. I am not going to prolong the House, as I had intended to, by reading every single critique into the record of this House, I will make this information available to the House by way of making it a document of the House, but I want to make the point that even though I **am** not reading all of this critique into the record of the House it must not go forward that there **are** persons out there who are not objecting to the manner and the approach of this Government with regard to the siting of a **landfill** at Greenland. I want to make it absolutely clear, and if I can be assured that this will be properly considered, because I am aware that they have this information available to them, but I want to be clear that the public of Barbados has this information available to it as well, so I will make this a public document and I will be referring to it in public after today.

*Aside.*

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: It does not matter. I will make it a document of the House, Mr. Speaker, so that I will be able to refer to it in the other avenues I have available to me, so that the impression does not go forward that there **are** no objectors, because the Minister is on record as saying that the IADB gave it its blessing. That is not true. She has said a lot of "mistruths", but I do not know what they are called in here.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member, please. You are not imputing...

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: But she has misled the House and Barbados on many occasions. I do not want to belabour the point, but the impression has gone out that the IADB has given the siting of a **landfill** at Greenland its blessing. That is not true. I say categorically it is not true. They are willing to assist the country but they have not given this Administration or the Minister any blessing about Greenland, because they themselves want to be satisfied that the country is not going to find itself with mitigating circumstances in Greenland that they cannot control or command. It is not **true**. In fact, they have even deferred consideration of the loan assistance to this Government till September when the Board meets, but there will have to be a review some time around June or July before that.

Let me say this. Do not doubt that I am aware of every single thing that happens. Do not believe you are getting away with anything, because I am clear in my mind about everything that happens with regard to the landfill, and I **am** going to be on it like a watchdog, because it is a wrong decision which started on the wrong premise, the Government went down a bad road and they must be told that they are not a law unto themselves when it comes to the siting of a **landfill** in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly would like to indicate that there are alternatives that are available to this country, apart from all I have said, and I am aware that the Government is aware of other alternatives, such as incineration. I heard the Honourable Minister of Finance indicating that he is also aware of proposals that have been submitted and I urge the Government to take a serious look at garbage disposal and integrated solid waste management in this country. They must not continue a charade that they are the saviours of garbage in Barbados, when they now have the worst record ever of garbage collection in this country. Never before in the history of Barbados, Sir, has garbage been left like it has been left in these recent days. It is a reflection of the very poor quality management which emanates from the Ministry of Health down to the Sanitation **Service** Authority. Something has to be fundamentally wrong for the persons who have all the answers to be so inefficient and ineffective with regard to the handling of the environment at this present time.

I **am** concerned, and as we seek to take money out of the pockets of the taxpayers of this country we must be assured that that money is going to be properly spent and that there will be decisions made in the interest of the public and not in the interest of a political appetite.

Sir, I will return if I have to, under any other forum until the proper decision is made in this country to ensure that an administration does not step out of line and make a politically biased decision to the detriment of the people in this country. So I will rest my case at this point. I hope

that the Honourable Members will take some or all of my contribution in a genuine context and not necessarily in a biased political context.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt whatsoever that the Honourable Member for St. Michael East has made a very valuable contribution to the debate on the **dump** and is obviously very informed on that particular matter and the House has had the benefit of what he has said. There can be no question about that.

At a more simplistic level, it is evident to me, Sir, that it is utter madness to put a dump at Greenland in the middle of a national park, to opt for easily the most costly option, the one that is going to cost greatest inconvenience to the largest number of people in Barbados to get to the dump, to put it at a site where access is going to be most difficult because of the road structure, where there is instability in terms of the geological structure, to have to incur increased costs to have other collection points in the island, and the whole thing seems to me to amount to a lot of economic madness. That is as I see it. I am of the view that any time you try to put a large dump anywhere in this island you are going to have all kinds of problems, traffic and environmental problems, and possibly pollution problems among them. And I have expressed the view that there are so many other forms of activity in Barbados that it is probably better to look at smaller dumps over time in many different places in Barbados while you work out a long-term **strategy** at different sites. That is my view. I think that is the best solution in the long run so that Mangrove will not have to be taking rubbish from all over Barbados. It would be taking from St. Thomas in its **turn** and in due course those that dump in St. Thomas would have a dump in their area over a period of time, in the south you would have one and in the centre or somewhere else you would have another dump, I think that would give much better psychological satisfaction to all the people of Barbados knowing that it is their turn to receive and their turn to give.

2.40 p.m.

It doesn't all have to be done at the same time. I think that from the studies that I have seen certainly of all the options studied that Greenland was certainly the worst option; but I don't want to get into that in too much detail today. There is plenty of opportunity. I want to deal with some matters relating to the Budget and relating to the Budget of 1995 and the Instrument we have before us which purports to be legislation to put in place what was the purpose and intent of the Budget.

The first thing that strikes you, Sir, is that the changes are so substantial, not only in dollar terms but also in other terms that one wonders whether they should not be a GIS programme to indicate that there has been a substantial

change in Government's position in relation to raising money to finance the particular project that it has in mind because there is very little relationship between this and this.

Apart from the fact that it comes more than a year late, which is highly unusual, nonetheless I think one would be remiss in not pointing out to this House the major errors in the Budget of 1995, errors of calculation in relation to the budgetary measures under the heading Solid Waste Management. I do not know what is happening here in relation to the tipping fee.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order. The Honourable Member who is trying to speak was not in his place for the majority of the Minister of Finance's Second Reading Speech. The Minister was careful to say that he readily concludes that what he proposed in the Budget last year is radically different from what this Bill currently represents for the reason that the information which informed last year's budget when the calculation was done would have yielded so much more money than Government would have needed that he had to abandon those calculations after representation and consultation. To that extent, this is now something that is requiring only one cent in the dollar as compared to what we proposed last year. It is to yield \$7 million.

I have gone on Sir, because the Honourable Member was not here and I am giving the gist of what the Minister was saying.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I was here when the Right Honourable Prime Minister sought to present this thing to the House in a very mild form. What I have to tell the House is that it was not an error of \$5 million. It was not an error of \$10 million. It was not an error of \$15 million. It was not an error of \$20 million. It was a massive error in terms of the calculations based on the Budget. Over and above that there were several companies in Barbados that would have gone out of business. There are even more companies whose products would have been made so uncompetitive that the CARICOM products would have taken over the markets overnight. That is a fact.

I grant you that the Right Honourable Prime Minister tried to soften the blow because he knew what was coming. I understood the tactic; but the point I am trying to make is that there were such gross errors, such gross miscalculations, that I think it would be advisable if there should be a public relations exercise made through GIS because the public would have had the full benefit of a televised debate on the Budget and they would not have the same benefit at this point in time.

*Aside.*

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I wouldn't have time to go back to this so I have to make my time today.

The Honourable Minister of Finance who is not in his place, for many years has castigated successive Ministers of Finance when this kind of thing happens. We understand, those who have been Ministers of Finance, how this can easily happen because a Minister of Finance is entirely dependent on the information presented to him by various departments involved in making these estimations. He does not make them himself. All previous Ministers of Finance have been held responsible and solely responsible in this Honourable House by the Right Honourable Member for St. Peter when this sort of thing happens. I think that today it is only fair and right that he should not only be held responsible but that this Honourable House should know the extent to which he should be held responsible. That is fair not only in terms of the fact that it is his ministerial responsibility but also more fair in terms of the posture that he has taken in the past in the full knowledge that when these kinds of errors occur that the Minister is not solely responsible for it. I think that he should get today a taste of what he has delivered in the past to so many Ministers of Finance in this country.

I have heard the figure of about \$30 million instead of \$2 million being bandied about in the private sector a few days after the last Budget which would have been the impact of these taxes. Over and above that, Sir, if you look at the Schedule and the items in the Budget which were listed, 1 or 2 things fall there. I am not sure what has happened about the tipping fee. The tipping fee of \$40, is that being retained or not?

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. Sanitation Service Tipping Fees Regulations I think they are called. They are regulations being made to deal with them.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you very much. The point is quite clear to me that if you maintain this tipping fee at \$40 people are going to be dumping garbage everywhere else but in the dump. Already it is \$80 a load to get garbage taken to a dump in Barbados. With a small truck you may get away with \$60 a load. So add \$40 to that. You are asking for big problems. I would think that that \$40 fee is probably excessive and don't say you can call the Sanitation Service Authority.

*Aside.*

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of elucidation, Sir. I tried to explain to the Honourable Member. This is very much like the argument about the "or" and "is." 2.50 p.m.

What the Honourable Member has in his hand represents the proposals for the budgetary speech from last year representing certain proposals. It was found after those proposals had been delivered that the impact would have been too severe. The Bill now today before us is radically different from those proposals both in nature and content. To that extent he has to deal with the document before us which, as he said, has softened the impact. The Regulations provide for the tipping fee. Those **are** separate and distinct. They have been laid. The Minister laid them today, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have not seen the documents laid. But even \$25 a tonne is going to be excessive because I cannot see many people paying a truck \$80 to take a load of garbage away, let us say a 5-tonne truck and then paying \$25 a tonne as a tipping fee to get that garbage into the dump. The people just do not have that kind of money. Maybe a few businesses may be able to do that but I **am** talking about ordinary householders and people who from time to time hire a truck to take away garbage. What is going to happen is that people **are** going to dump the garbage elsewhere than in the dump and that is going to have a net effect.

Hon. Sir HAROLD St. JOHN: On a point of order, Sir. I think the Honourable Member is misleading the House because there is nothing in the Bill before the House that deals with the tipping fee. As has been pointed out by the Attorney General, the tipping fee has regulations which he can debate which he can bring in a substantive motion because they are subject to a negative resolution. Incidentally, the Honourable Member is misleading the House and the public by suggesting that people who dump ordinary garbage at the dump will have to pay a tipping fee. A tipping fee relates to commercial garbage which at the present moment is the subject of a special fee for removal.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: If I may continue, Sir. I have in my hand a document which is a document of this House. I also have in my hand a document which is a Bill before this House, and I **am** dealing with both because it suits me to deal with both for the purposes of my debate. When you have the opportunity to speak, you can deal with what you want to deal with.

Mr. SPEAKER: Proceed please.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I **am** saying, Sir, that that charge is excessive and whether it comes from commercial houses or wherever it comes from a lot of garbage is going to find its way elsewhere. That is the **first** point I want to make.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member. You **are** not now referring to the previous document of 1995? You **are** finished with that.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I **am** finished with that.

I notice, Sir, what is missing is the 10¢ per bottle for plastic bottles as previously indicated would have been in this Bill. I notice that is missing and that would have done a devastating blow to major industries in this country. I **am** very glad to see that it is omitted from this Bill, so I **am** speaking positively about this Bill.

I **am** also very pleased to see, Sir, that \$1 per kilogramme for plastic sacks and bags and the \$1 per kilogramme for plastic sheets and the 10¢ for glass bottles have also been removed. You are not going to be able to cover up the extent of the error that was made. A major error was made and an attempt is being made to correct it. Let us call a spade a spade and I **am** entitled to make as much mileage as I wish to make by comparing the two.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. I resent the use of the word "cover-up" because the Prime Minister was very open about this matter this morning. He admitted that what he presented last year would have had a yield that would have been too burdensome and he has revised that. He was very candid about it so there is no question about a cover-up. If you were here from the beginning when the House started you would have heard, but you have a habit of not coming to the House on time.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I heard exactly what took place and I **am** not going to change my tune. My tune is very straightforward that this Bill is more satisfactory to this Honourable House. I **am** not going to vote against it because it represents a major correction of errors made in the past in a budgetary matter.

Now, on the issue of the levy, Sir, I **am** surprised that at this time when we have virtually reached some kind of a broad consensus of the need to reduce the number of taxes in Barbados, at a time when efforts have been made to remove almost all the levies that once again a levy is being slapped on the people of Barbados because in the long run it is the people that will be paying this levy. It is going to start off as 1 per cent and 0.75 per cent but that is on the C.I.F. value. By the time that reaches the consumer you are going to have a pyramid effect. The cost of a particular item would be significantly increased because of the levy that was put on at the time of entry into the Port.

I **am** surprised at a time when we **are** talking about a Value Added **Tax**, a single **tax** replacing all the indirect taxes that we have that now all of a sudden just before a budget is due, we are having another tax introduced into Barbados. Is this really necessary? Is it desirable in terms of the overall macroeconomic situation of Barbados? I have my doubts whether this is necessary to put on this kind of broad-based **tax** to deal with a narrower problem.

Sir, it seems to me that there is a conflict in **terms** of taxation policy because we have heard it so carefully articulated that the aim is simplification, the aim is a reduction in the number of taxes and now here one week later, or two weeks later we are seeing a new tax being implemented. Now, if last year's Budget was unacceptable after careful consideration I believe that the levy could have been omitted all together as well. You could have removed the levy as well. It would have done no harm in principle to the fact that you presented one thing in the Budget and something substantially different as has come before the House. As a matter of fact, the environmental levy was supposed to raise \$2 million. The levy we hear today now is supposed to raise \$7 million and the Honourable Member for Christ Church South would have us believe that this represents a reduction in the proposed levy. It is quite clear, Sir.

In the Budgetary Proposals, Tuesday, April 25, 1995 page 34, Environmental Levy under Summary of Proposals \$2.1 million. Today we are hearing environmental levy in excess of \$7 million and we are told this is a reduction. It is not a reduction in the yield from levies. It is a reduction in the other impositions that would have been placed, like the amount charged per bottle, the amount charged per kilogram of plastic bags and that kind of thing. Some of those have been eliminated altogether, some have been reduced but in terms of the tax, in terms of the yield from the levy as proposed, this is substantially higher than what was proposed. The levy of course has a much wider application than the specific taxes because they would affect only the manufacturers and the users of those particular items whereas a levy has a fairly broad-based effect of affecting the whole population in terms of the cost of what they have to buy.

3.00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to detain this House significantly longer. I do not propose to deal with the many health and environmental issues which one can legitimately raise under this debate. I think it has been very extensively dealt with by the Honourable Member for St. Michael East. I really do believe that he did a pretty good job in this House today in highlighting the problems of garbage and so on as it is affecting communities in Barbados. There is only one additional point I want to make. From my observations it is the poor sectors of the community, where the poor people live, where there is greatest difficulty in getting garbage removed. It is an awful sight sometimes when you go through places in Bank Hall, when you go through St. Michael South Central, **Carrington's Village**, **Delamere Land**, **Bannister Land**, **Brittons Hill**, the many key areas where large numbers of people live, especially in the urban areas. There can be no doubt in my mind that it must constitute a health hazard and there is no doubt it is a major problem and something has to be done to improve the services to these people.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, on many occasions since I have been a Member of this House over the past 18 years, apart from a short vacation, I have had to send trucks into my constituency and pay to get garbage removed. It still has to be done **from** time to time. I think you are unaware of what is going on because there is no question whatsoever that there is a significant deterioration in the level of service being offered. Either there is more garbage or the services have been reduced. But certainly there is far more garbage that you **see** for much longer periods and it is terrible, Sir, when you pass by some of these spots and you **see** the garbage and the flies and the smell and a lot of small houses around them. It is quite wrong and something needs to be done about it. So I sincerely hope that the Minister has listened very carefully to what the Member for St. Michael East said in relation to the whole question of garbage.

On the question of smells I have one suggestion, Sir, and it is a very serious suggestion. There is a tree called an African perfume tree. It has a **paco** rabanne type smell during the night.

*Aside.*

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It has a much nicer smell and remains much longer. I wonder whether or not some of those trees should not be planted strategically around the dumps.

*Aside.*

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The African perfume tree. There are a few here in Barbados and I believe they can be grown and during the night for quite a distance around you can get a really nice smell and I think that will go a long way in helping the immediate environment with these smells. I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D. St. E. **KELLMAN**: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this Bill, Sir. This Bill has some serious implications for the poor people of this country, especially those who live in rural Barbados. I have been looking at the Schedule and my observation that the \$150.00 for a motor car would not affect the rich people in this country because they were aware that this Bill was coming and that is why you will **see** on the roads today so many Mercedes etc. Sir, I have checked and from a good authority the evidence is that the minimum life of a Mercedes is 15 years so it tells me that if you have a new Mercedes today **that** the impact on the rich with this tax would not affect them at all but it is the poor man who buys the **Lada** who might have to buy 5 or 6 **Ladas** within a 15-year period that would have to find himself forking out this levy.

Sir, the **same** poor man would have to buy tyres. It is **true** that the rich might have to buy them but if the rich have to buy **tyres** they can afford to buy tyres because the **\$50.00** tax means nothing to the rich but it means a lot to the poor people in this country.

Refrigerators, Sir. Poor people cannot go and buy an expensive refrigerator that would last them 12 years. In that 12-year period sometimes you **find** that they have to buy 5 refrigerators so I am saying that this is another imposition that is going to impact heavily on poor people so when you total these charges you will see that they will come to **\$267.00** and you could be sure that the poor people in this country would have to bear the total effect of these charges.

*Aside.*

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: If you have a problem with brand name sneakers, I have no problem with you taxing brand name sneakers because nobody has to wear brand name sneakers but people have to buy refrigerators. If you have a problem with brand name sneakers **tax** them one thousand percent. It means nothing to me because I could easily tell my people in St. Lucy, the poor people, that they need not wear brand name sneakers but how can I tell my people that they should not sleep on a mattress. Is that what you are telling me? Is that what the Honourable Member for St. James South is saying to me? Are you trying to tell me that my poor people in St. Lucy should not be sleeping on **mattresses** and they should not have television sets? You cannot be serious about this. I agree with you, if you want to tax brand name sneakers I would tell you to tax them by one thousand percent.  
3.10 p.m.

When you want to deal with me, be careful. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am also wowed and I somehow believe that the Honourable Member for St. Michael South **Central** had a peep at my notes. I honestly believe that because, Sir, I sat here and when this levy was being talked about I asked myself: How is it that a couple of days we were told that we will soon be **getting** a VAT? Listen to this carefully and the VAT is supposed to get rid of a lot of nuisance taxes and yet still we **are** introducing another one today, Sir. This is a serious thing. I am not blaming anybody. I am not trying to pull down anybody. But I am saying that, if we are correcting the system, correct it one time. If it means that VAT is going to deal with everything, leave it until VAT and I am told that VAT will soon be introduced. So if you are going to introduce VAT shortly, there is no need to bring this Environmental Levy and I am serious about this.

Mr. Speaker, I am on record in the Minutes at the Sanitation Service Authority since 1986 of calling for an

incinerator for this country and every time I talk about an incinerator for this country people tell me that it will cost too much money. But do you realize something, Mr. Speaker? An incinerator will mean something to the people on Military Road, Pie Corner and Josey Hill. But do you know something? We can find millions of dollars to spend on sewerage plants. Do you know why, Sir? It has nothing to do with the people in Military Road or in Pie Corner or in Josey Hill.

*Aside.*

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: No, you would say that. But I will teach you something. You need a lot of teaching and, when I am speaking, you should not get involved. Remember the last time you had anything to say to me was at Arch Hall and I had the Honourable Member for St. Thomas to pay me witness to this and we **are** still waiting on your promise.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. That is very correct, Sir. The last time the 3 of us met, Sir, was in the church hall at Arch Hall and the people of Arch Hall nearly murdered languidly. They abused him and ran him out of the place, Sir, but he has a lot of courage. He stood up there and took all of the insults and abuse that night. He is a very courageous man, Sir.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: That is true and my good friend, the magistrate, was there too. But, Mr. Speaker, do you know what happened, Sir? You know that I can go to Arch Hall today and walk all through Arch Hall. But there **are** some people in here that cannot go because June has passed and another June is about to pass. So I do not worry about that, Sir.

I understand that they want trees imported now to plant all across Barbados. Do you know why? We have a serious garbage problem, Sir, and not only do we have a serious garbage problem, but we have a serious rat problem. I **am** saying that if this Levy has to be introduced that the BAS should be the first people to get their \$100 000 out of this Levy. Do you know why, Sir? We need to eradicate the rats from Barbados and wherever you can see rats you can see garbage. This is foolishness, Sir, that money was spent at the Sanitation Service Authority – I was there, Sir.

*Aside.*

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: No, I was there. I am going to deal with that. That is why I **am** always calling in this House of Assembly for the accrual system of accounting. If we had the accrual system of accounting, the nonsense that I am hearing about money was not spent

at the Sanitation Service Authority, nobody would be able to get up and say that. But do you know why, Sir? Sometimes people speak and they forget what they say. They brag about the amount of money that they had to pay on our behalf not realizing that if you had to look at the total amount of money incurred under the Democratic Labour Party in trying to service Mangrove and compare it with the amount of money incurred by the Barbados Labour Party, that light will be shown. And that is, Sir, more money was incurred with the Democratic Labour Party than under the Barbados Labour Party and that they found bills is no lie. They found bills owed to people because a lot of money was spent on Mangrove and the Sanitation Service Authority and it must be said in here that if certain people at the Sanitation Service Authority would stop fighting among themselves and manage up there probably we would have not had that problem. There are a lot of people in here who know that as a fact. There are a lot of people who are trying to achieve positions even though there are people in positions up there already and there is no management structure at the Sanitation Service Authority not even today. People believe that because you put people in a position in a management structure...

*Aside.*

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: The records at the Sanitation Service Authority will show that I have been fighting for 8 years ...

*Aside.*

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Unsuccessfully - yes, because I have no problem with that. People do not understand that there is a particular structure of boards and some day I will get a chance to change that. There is a serious need to overhaul certain boards in this country. There is too much power in the hands of certain people and I am not denying that. This foolishness about saying oh, you are a board member and they know full well being a board member does not always mean that you can do a lot of things. So this nonsense must be stopped, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to know and it is a serious question if when the VAT is introduced is this one of the indirect taxes that will be removed? I want to know because if that is so there is a possibility that I might support this Bill. But if you tell me that it is going to continue with the VAT, I cannot support it, Sir, because then you will have a situation in this country where you would have two taxes going the same time when in truth and in fact you are fighting to have a one-tax system and that is indirect taxes that I am speaking about, Sir.

Every Member over there would agree that once we had a problem in this country where people were tipping all over Barbados. They were tipping in Jack In The Box Gully, Stoney Gully and any gully and I remember there was a massive programme to clean up. That is why I like the Honourable Member for St. Thomas. I like his honesty. He is telling me that they are still doing it and that is why I know that this Bill will encourage them not only to still do it but do it more so than ever. If you are prepared to introduce a Bill, Sir, that is going to encourage people to do things like that, that is up to you. But my suggestion is that, if you need this revenue and you are soon going to introduce the VAT, all you have to do is to look at a way where you can add on a cost to this. Because what you are doing is sending this right on the backs of the poor people of this country who are fighting to be employed.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious thing and sometimes we seem not to be listening to those people out there. The people out there are suffering and they are crying and the more they are suffering and crying, I am getting the impression that more pressure is being piled on. I have to live in this country, Sir, and I am saying that we have to be very careful how we are treating those poor people out there. Because it is just like telling me, Sir, that we in here are saying that a mattress is a luxury.

*Aside.*

Mr. SPEAKER: No Honourable Members said that. You would not want such a comment to be attributed to...

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: No, I never said that. I never said that any Honourable Member said that. I would never do a thing like that, Sir. But I am saying to charge a poor man, Sir, \$10.00 for a mattress, he cannot afford to pay that cost and the thing about it, Sir, especially in this time when that poor person out there is fighting hard to work to make sure that they can pass on a piece of change to the boys around the block, to make sure that they do not do wrong things, Sir, I know that we would not like this Honourable House to put **anymore** pressure on the shoulder of the Honourable Member for St. Thomas because his hands are full and everybody **knows** that I am borrowing a loan too. Yes, the Honourable Member for St. Thomas is a good man. We cannot afford to put pressure on his shoulder. We cannot enforce anything that is going to cause young men to be on the streets doing the wrong things, we must build a good society and we must make sure that any impositions will unite a family and not divide a family. This \$10 for the mattress is the same \$10 that the mum or dad might have to give the child on the block who cannot **find** a job.

3.20 p.m.

This is a serious imposition and I will ask the Honourable Member for Christ Church South to join with me in asking the Government to rethink this and also to ask the Government to consider whether this is an additional **tax** to the VAT or if this will be part of the VAT, because if it is not we are going to have some serious problems.

Some people believe that just because they live places where garbage is collected daily there is not a garbage problem, but you would know, Sir, because your constituents in Military Road **are** always complaining to you that they would like their garbage collected.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to inform the Honourable Member that the dump in Military Road and Pasture Road is no longer a dump. I personally filled it in.

Mr. D. St. E. **KELLMAN**: Oh, you personally filled it in?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is no longer a dump, it is a playing field now.

Mr. D. St. E. **KELLMAN**: The Honourable Member for St. James South should really congratulate you, Sir, because you **are** doing a very good job, one that the Sanitation Service Authority cannot do. You should be congratulated, and I want to personally congratulate you for doing a good job. I wish I could say that for a lot more that have the power to do things.

Mr. Speaker, there is also a charge at the Port. This charge is going to start at one thing and by the time the charges are added on it is going to end up somewhere else. You know, Sir, that these charges are not going to be kept by the people who have purchased the goods with the **c.i.f.** charges, they are going to land right on the backs of the poor people in this country, the consumers. As I said before, the people who have money would not worry, because they would look at \$267 and say it is no money, but \$267 sometimes is a week's pay, for some it could be two and for others it could be three. When we look at something, and some people would want to tell you that \$267 is not a lot of money, I **am** telling you \$267 is a lot of money for poor people and it is in demand.

The Honourable Member for St. George South would tell you that there **are** some youngsters who would wait on you to get a piece of change, and we have to make sure we do not create situations where people **are** forced to wait on us to get a piece of change. We have to make sure that we get away from these regressive tax systems and move towards the progressive **tax** systems. I am saying this

environmental levy is a regressive **tax** system right here in operation, because it is not the freighter who is going to pay this **tax**, it is the poor man who has a tree to be removed that is going to feel the full impact of this **tax**. This tipping levy will be passed on to the consumer.

Talking about that, I would like to see M W doing some work like that for the poor people in this country, especially the pensioners. I honestly believe that when the pensioners have trees in their backyards, there should be some department at M W they can call and get someone to come and remove those trees. I **am** finding too many cases where old people, who have worked long – and this is not a criticism of my friend, the Minister, but I **am** telling him that he has to set up a department in his Ministry to look after these old people if he wants me to believe that he is caring, and I believe he will set up one, because I do not believe that old people should be made to call around to find out how you get a tree removed or trimmed or anything like that, and then to hear that they have to pay a tipping fee along with the freight fee. They would have contributed already, and we have to stop asking our people to contribute when they **are** young and also when they are old.

It is not only the trees, when I get to the National Assistance Board I will deal with that too, but we are not now dealing with the National Assistance Board, we are dealing with the old people and I **am** not going to tell you all of their problems today, I will get an opportunity to talk about the others.

There are two groups we have to look after, the young ones and the old ones, and we **are** having a serious problem **today** where we are not looking after those two groups. The old ones have to fork out of their pension for tipping fees and the young ones are deprived of money they can use as capital to generate more revenue to open their own business by having their parents taking that same money and paying tipping fees and levies. If we are serious about small businesses, we have to be serious about finding a way where we are going to give additional revenue to people to open small businesses and not take that revenue away from those people.

I expect the Minister, when she gets up, to agree with some of the things I have said and not three months from now, because the garbage problem in this country belongs to all of us. The same way the sewage problem can be dealt with, the garbage problem should be dealt with. As you know, Sir, and I will continue to make this point, whenever it has anything to do with poor people we have a problem in this country and garbage not only affects the rich, it affects the poor, and that is why we cannot get an incinerator in this country. If it was something that was only affecting the rich in this county, I can assure you a

lot of pressure would have been placed on **MPs**. The same way certain **MPs** living along the west coast, the south coast and the City were under pressure for a sewerage plant, we would have had a lot of pressure if they had a lot of rich people living in rural Barbados, and in St. Andrew, and I know the people of St. **Andrew** would like to have an incinerator.

3.30 p.m.

The people of St. Lucy would like to have one **too**, because we feel that this is the only sensible way to tackle the garbage problem in this country. It is a waste of time when every minute you have problems, where somebody is saying they don't want this and they don't want that. You have a solution and do not deal with it.

I am saying, Sir, that we know the solution, why can't we deal with it? Are we going to wait on the IADB, the World Bank or the **IMF** to tell us that we need an incinerator? These are ideas that are being placed here on record by our own people with our own thinking and I **find** on too many occasions we have a situation in this country where we had good ideas and the only time we could implement these ideas are when we are told to do them by some institution overseas.

I would say and I would not deal with the particular point now but in the Budget, there is enough evidence that whenever we have accepted the evidence and the information and the dictates from people overseas on our economy instead of having good foreign reserves they slide down and the **1985** situation should have taught us a lesson. It seems to me that don't care what happens to us we are not learning. I am sorry **about** that, Sir. We brag about our educational system and we are committing the same errors over and over. We have good foreign reserves and yet still we allow people to tell us we need this and that. Mr. Speaker, when we have money we need not borrow. This is a serious thing. There is always a catch clause in these things. As in **1985** people want to **saddle** us with their problems and they pass it on us and they help other countries and as I said I will deal with it in the Budget.

That is why I am saying that we as a country must take a decision. If we feel that incinerators are the right thing, we should put incinerators in place. Nobody should tell us that because their country do not have incinerators and they have **landfills**, that we in Barbados should not have incinerators, that they have to put incinerators in their country then for us to come and say we will follow pattern. We must start leading by example and we have the capacity to lead by example. We are having this situation every time, countries telling us we cannot do this and we

cannot that and whenever you check it is because they do not have it in place and they believe that we should not get it because they don't have it.

We have it in education where there **are** some countries whose vision, and this is just an example going back to the incinerator point, because they don't have free secondary education that it should not be here in Barbados. Some countries now feel that incinerators is a new fashion thing, the latest technology, blah, blah, blah. We kowtow to them and agree that we should not get incinerators in Barbados. Do you know what you **are** actually doing? When you deprive the people of having incinerators you are creating problems. The same way you have a problem in St. **Thomas** you will have that same problem in St. Lucy, in St. Peter, in St. Andrew, in Christ Church, St. **Philip**, St. George, wherever you go.

I am saying that if you have a problem and you know the solution you should go straight ahead and make sure you solve the problem.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has 2 minutes to conclude.

Mr. D. St. E. **KELLMAN**: ... Because what you **are** doing is making the citizens of this country very unhappy and we cannot be talking about economic growth at the same time when you are making the citizens of the country unhappy. We are not in a crisis situation **anymore**. If we were in a crisis situation where sometimes in a **crisis** people understand the pressure. Everything is well, so why are you putting so much pressure on the citizens of this country? I am saying that you should rethink what you said about incinerators and we must go full speed ahead and try and get an incinerator. If that is what is going to make the people of Barbados happy, we must please them because in the long run when it is done everybody will acknowledge that we should have done it **26** years ago.

Sir, a good example of that is that the sugar industry wanted restructuring years ago and nobody did anything about it and now it has been done everybody is saying that it should have been done since **1967** when Mr. Barrow talked in the "Cane Blade Speech". Thank you very much, Sir.

Hon. Miss H. E. **THOMPSON**: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise in this debate to support the measures before this Chamber and to say that we were at Rio and in fact, Principle 16 of the Rio Declaration is that the polluter must pay, and this economic Instrument intends to give effect to Principle **16** of the Rio Declaration.

I also wish to say that despite the comments made in this House today this measure comes at a time when this Administration can be justly proud of the work that it

has done to develop Barbados' solid waste and waste management generally since September of 1994.

We come to this House today against a background where the problems at Mangrove have been resolved where an area that was **defined** as Mount Stinkeroo has been renamed Mount Pleasant. In September 1994 when we took over and up until January of 1995 there have been constant **fires** at that site. From June of 1994, the odour emanating from Mangrove daily made it impossible for the people of Arch Hall and **Bennetts** and as far down as the Sandy Lane Residential Development and as far down as the Sunset Crest Development and as far down the coast as the Sandy Lane property itself were complaining on a daily basis about the odours emanating from Mangrove. Today, Mr. Speaker, this Government has been able to hold sports activities, bicycle racing and cricket games within the **landfill** itself with no adverse impact on anybody. That there **are** occasional complaints once in a while about some odour problems invariably when investigated they in fact come from illicit dumping around the **landfill** but not from any problem originating at the **landfill** itself.

Not only have we been able to do that, Mr. Speaker, we have been able to give the broad definition and to shape the **future** of Barbados' solid waste programme. For the first time Barbados has a programme and is in the process of developing a nation-wide solid waste management programme. No programme existed before now. We have had "dumps" and we have had problems with landfills. It had reached the stage under that Administration, Mr. Speaker, Sir, where we were on international television as an example of how landfills should not be managed.

Sir, I **am** happy to report that since we took office and did the clean-up operation at Mangrove...

**Aside.**

Mr. D. St. E. **KELLMAN**: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The impression is being given by the Honourable Member for St. James South that there were no dumps in their time but she was forgetting that there were dumps at Black Bess, **at** Kingsland and **Melrose**...

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: The Honourable Member is always distorting. I **am** saying that there was no solid waste management policy generally in the broad way that we are now defining it before. We have had since this Administration came to office international conferences for the training of technocrats held outside of Barbados and the work that was done to refurbish the Mangrove **landfill** was cited by the people who hosted the conference as a way in which a **landfill** can be brought around, can be properly managed once the resources and the management skills exist to do it. That was a matter of tremendous pride to me to hear that the remedial work which has been done on Mangrove has been internationally recognised as creating a new standard in the Caribbean.

3.40 p.m

We have been able, Mr. Speaker, since September **94** to frame out and start the South Coast Sewerage Project and even now today as we speak negotiations are going on for the consultants who will design and supervise the construction of the bulky waste site, the composting site, the transfer station and the other facilities which will comprise the national landfill. Those negotiations are going on today.

Mr. Speaker, we are also now in the very fortunate position that on the ground as well **are** the technocrats and the consultants who will be involved in the West Coast Sewerage Project and who are working on the designs for that project. We are, under that project, looking at a new and revolutionary concept in Barbados. That is the concept of using grey water for the irrigation of golf courses and for general irrigation. All of this is going on.

I want, Mr. Speaker, to just **frame** some of the elements of Government's solid waste policy. First of all everyone is aware that we have taken a decision to site the **landfill** at Greenland and I will deal with that in greater detail later on because much has been said about it today. It is envisaged that we will have one or more bulky waste sites specifically for fridges, cars and other large metallic objects. It will be necessary to have a site for construction rubble and so on. Also part of the Government's new solid waste facilities will be a composting facility which will deal with yard waste and other green waste of that sort, sewage blood, sludge, blood and grease. Those materials will be converted to compost to use as fertiliser in the agricultural and other sectors of the country.

We are going to be, and are in the process of developing a plant that will deal with **hazardous** waste, toxic substances, chemicals used in manufacture, dry-cleaning or certain types of waste which are disposed at hospitals and health care institutions. Given the location of the **landfill** outside of the waste centroid it will be necessary to have a transfer station. At the transfer station waste will be baled in a specific shape and will be transported from the transfer station to the **landfill** site. The landfill will be bulked in cells and will be specifically designed to receive bales of garbage.

Also, Mr. Speaker, as part of the general solid waste plant, both the Sanitation Service Authority and the National Conservation Commission and the ways in which they operate and currently discharge their functions will be **restructured**. Not only will the scope of their operations be broadened, but the problems being currently experienced by the **SSA** will be corrected over time.

Much has been said today about the Sanitation Service Authority. In **1994** we inherited a fleet of about 60 vehicles. I think there were 57 vehicles. Only **12** were then on the road every day under the Democratic Labour Party.

The fact is that over 50 per cent of the fleet, which constitutes about 57 vehicles, was 20 or 25 years' old. It has been difficult to keep vehicles of that age on the road.

In the newspapers people have seen from time to time that we have been ordering and receiving new vehicles to replace those in the fleet that are so old that it makes no point repairing them, but until we can get a fleet of vehicles up to the number of vehicles that is required to service the whole country and of the quality needed to serve the whole country, there will continue to be breakdowns and some problems because you are dealing in the most part with vehicles that are over 20 years old, or which have been on the road for a long time.

The Government has spent a tremendous amount of money in ordering new vehicles, service parts and equipment and trying to keep the fleet that we have on the road. Clearly, given the age of the vehicles, that process has not always met with success but when the new fleet is here that condition will improve. Over the last 16 months or so there are other initiatives that the Government has already started in relation to the development of our solid waste programme. You have seen on the television and heard on the radio new Ads encouraging people not to litter. There is a new set of them aimed at educating and teaching the public how to dispose of waste.

Our recycling programme is in its embryonic stages. We have been encouraging people at the individual level to recycle more. Some supermarkets have set up recycling bins for plastics, newspapers, bottles, metals and there are other recycling sites and activities going on throughout the island. Increasing numbers of people are also getting into the export of scrap metal, newspapers and certain types of waste. All of this has been causing our waste stream to be reduced.

At some supermarkets now and gas stations as a result of the initiative by the Government one sees posted, signs inviting people not to take a plastic bag, for instance, if they are going to be taking the items they purchase out to their car, in an effort to reduce the amount of plastic being used. Shortly I will be holding a meeting with the owners, managers and directors of supermarkets so that we can look at ways of creating "green shelves" and ensuring that these businesses bring into Barbados environmentally friendly products.

It is also my hope to see very soon an increased use of reusable supermarket bags established. So that instead of going to the supermarket and taking lots of plastic bags that people will take a specifically produced supermarket bag for the purpose of shopping at the supermarket and will receive some small, rebate from supermarket owners for not using the plastic. Increasingly, as well, supermarkets have been encouraging consumers not to use

so many plastic bags and have been encouraging them to use boxes **and/or** paper bags because paper bags tend to **biodegrade** better than plastics. **All** of this is currently going on.

Those are the major features of the programme, Mr. Speaker, but there are other things that we have been in the process of doing, for instance, the promotion of greater private sector involvement in waste management. Throughout the world, waste management is a billion dollar industry and the private sector in Barbados has to get into areas of waste management where they **can** help the Government deal with the country's waste problems and where they can make revenue and create jobs. The opportunities are there. Already since this administration has come to office as a result of incentives being offered by the **Minister** of Finance and Economic Affairs, companies have come **forward** and said they are interested in setting up rendering plants in Barbados to turn offal into processed food, fertilizer and other materials.

3.50 p.m.

Now that is an important initiative because such a plant would take a large amount of biodegradable matter which is a valuable resource out the waste stream and it is the type of biodegradable matter that causes tremendous odour and other problems, such as scavenging at the landfill. So the development of a rendering plant in Barbados is another important initiative which has been taken by this administration.

The Ministry of Health has already given approval to one private sector organisation and I believe the work on their rendering plant has started. We have seen the development of waste industries and I have given some example of these. The recycling of the **paper**. There is a lot of that going on. People are collecting and exporting pep bottles. People are exporting scrap metal. All of these are the kinds of initiatives that have been taking place since September of 1994.

I wish to turn now to say that the Government has also, in an attempt to have wide public consultation on waste policy in Barbados, established a task force on waste. This task force is not to be confused, as the Honourable Member for St. Michael East did earlier, with the steering committee on Greenland. This task force has no remit from the Cabinet to review Greenland. The remit of the task force, as given by Cabinet, and I would let Parliament note, was to look at the issues, problems, approaches and solutions of solid and liquid waste management in Barbados including to review the recommendations made by Stanley Associates in relation to waste management generally.

The purpose of the task force was to examine legislation needed to regulate waste disposal and waste management. They were to look at the issue of public

relations and effecting **attitudinal** change through public education and awareness. They were to look at the matter of waste reduction and recycling. The issue of generation of energy and recycling of materials into worthwhile resources was to engage their attention. They were to look at the waste, Mr. Speaker, in relation to health and the environment and to look at policies and developing mechanisms for garbage separation. That was the broad remit of the task force and therefore when I met the task force to give it its remit I did tell them, when they asked about Greenland, that Greenland was not part of the remit and I have indicated to them what was the remit the Cabinet had given to the Task Force. So there was no attempt as the Honourable Member for St. Michael East was suggesting to offend intellectuals or people who have expertise. The Task Force had a particular mandate that it was asked to carry out and I had to say to its members that Greenland, since a decision was already made, and since we had a separate steering committee about which I am going to speak in a moment, **looking** at Greenland, Greenland was not part of their remit.

Apart from the persons named by the Honourable Member for St. Michael East, also sitting on this Committee were a large number of civil servants. There was a member of the Bar Association, the Chamber of Commerce was represented, the Hotel industry was represented. I think the BHTA sent a member. The National Trust was represented. So it had wide representation from both the private and public sectors and other individuals with wide expertise and with an interest in this matter. The **Bellairs** Institute was another organisation that was represented. Because we tried in bringing this task force together and in **asking** them to give recommendations, to get them to look at the global issues involved in the management of waste in Barbados. I am happy to report to this Chamber, Sir, that that report came to my desk a week ago and it will be made available to the media after it goes to Cabinet.

There has been, Mr. Speaker, absolute transparency in relation to the way in which Greenland has been reviewed. Not only will we make the report of the task force available to the media, but the Stanley Report which is the report of the consultants on Greenland and their recommendations for waste management in Barbados, a copy of that report was delivered to every media house in Barbados so that they could review the recommendations and discuss the recommendations.

In addition to all of that, Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind this Chamber that two town meetings were held to discuss Greenland, one in St. **Andrew** and one at the Bethel Methodist Church. We established an Environmental Impact Assessment into Greenland and a Social Impact Assessment. We established a steering committee which comprised **all** of the organisations and individuals who said

that they objected to Greenland as the site for the **landfill** – the Scotland District Association, Mr. Richard Goddard, Mr. Edward Cumberbatch. We had sitting on that the National Trust, the Chamber of Commerce, a wide range of private sector organisations, public sector organisations and every interest group in Barbados, every NGO that was perceived as having an interest in the matter was put on a steering committee. They were allowed full access to all of the information available from and by the consultants. They were given the Environmental Impact Assessment (**EIA**) they were given the Social Impact Assessment (**SIA**) and I also want to remind this Chamber that the executive summary of the EIA for Greenland was printed in its entirety in both newspapers and people were asked to give comment within a specific date. All of that was done to ensure that there was transparency in relation to Greenland. All of the people who objected were constituted into a committee and given the opportunity to review all of the material and to comment and to meet with the consultants themselves.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that that steering committee which was comprised of objectors to Greenland saw the report from the consultants, including the EIA and the SIA before they came to me as Minister. That was the level of transparency that we had. They met with those consultants and had discussions with them, were free to ask them questions on any issue before I have even seen the consultants or knew whom they were. That was what the Government allowed to happen. So there is nothing about concealment or treating people with discourtesy or hiding. None of that has gone on. This has been a completely open process. Several sets of experts have all identified Greenland as a suitable site for a landfill. There are, it is conceded, some engineering challenges but there were engineering challenges when we built the Deep Water Harbour on reclaimed land and people said that it would sink. There were engineering challenges when the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was built on a bog and people said it would sink. We have in Barbados to have confidence in the level of expertise that we have and we have experts who can meet the challenge of engineering Greenland to acceptable standards and maintained to acceptable standards. I have continued to say that once the landfill is constructed a committee of residents from the affected area will be constituted to review the operations from time to time and report to Government whenever there is a problem at the landfill.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, that we can do more than that. We have made a decision, we have been absolutely transparent, we have delayed moving from Mangrove at the time that we said we would in order to ensure the widest possible consultation, in order to guarantee transparency, to check and re-check our figures or facts and the technical information so as to ensure that the problems which took place at Mangrove would not be repeated at Greenland. In those circumstances, Mr.

Speaker, I am now informing this Chamber that we will be moving out of Mangrove and going to Greenland over the next few months and the date will be announced.  
4.00 p.m.

The tenders for the construction of the Greenland **Landfill** are already out and have been approved by the Cabinet. A couple of weeks ago in speaking to the Press, I made the point that work on Greenland had started and I was very careful to say what the nature of that work had been, that we had done all of the **geo-technical** and other surveys and tests. We have developed an engineering design which would ensure that even in the event of an unseasonable and heavy rain that the **landfill** would not be flooded. We have taken the advice and information of long liners from the district around Greenland and used all of the anecdotal history and commentary and the local knowledge of the area to help the technocrats, local and foreign, in the design of the construction of the landfill. I never said before that construction had started. When I spoke in terms of the work on Greenland having started, I was clear to cast my remarks in the context of work preliminary and preparatory to construction. In fact, one of the journalists who was there when I made the remark and, I always wonder how they distort, asked when construction would start and whether it was true that the tender had gone out and had been approved by the Cabinet. I was very careful to say that I would not say at that time when actual construction would start and an announcement would be made later on. But yet, within 2 days, I could read in the paper that I had said that work at Greenland in terms of construction had started. But that is the nature of the people with whom we deal.

Mr. Speaker, there is one last point that I would want to make and it is in response to something that the Honourable Member for St. Michael East raised. That is the matter of Greenland being one of the sites identified in, I think it was, either the 1990 or 1991 Water Resources Study. It is true that Greenland was identified as a site for damming water. Of all the sites approved and short-listed for damming water, Greenland was the penultimate choice. It was the one before the last. It ranked this low because the shape of Greenland apparently was not conducive to damming of water. The government therefore made a decision that given all the technical reasons that made Greenland well-suited for a landfill. The **landfill** would in fact be sited there, but that the damming would go on at other sites which had been identified as more appropriate and better suited to damming than Greenland is.

Much has been said today about the fact that the tipping fee will cause illegal dumping. The Government recognizes this possibility and the tipping fee cannot be imposed in a vacuum, Sir. What you will see coming

before this Chamber very shortly is a new regime of legislation and a new way of operation for the **landfill** that will militate against illegal dumping and I will give specifics. On my desk at the moment is legislation which will deal with the illegal dumping of offal and other **materials**. That legislation also deals with damage to coral reef. It is legislation that is intended to help protect the environment. That legislation is coming to Parliament.

As the Minister of Health and the Environment I also intend to make proposals to the Cabinet that will ensure that at the new **landfill** we operate what is called a cradle to grave manifest system where an individual is charged with the responsibility of carrying waste **from** its point of origin to the **landfill**. So that when it leaves the point of origin we have a record of it and if it does not reach the **landfill** then **CEO's** are going to be **fined** and people are going to be penalized not only in terms of monetary penalties but at risk of imprisonment if illegal dumping goes on.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has two minutes to conclude.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: These are the **kinds** of policies that exist throughout the world and this new form of environmental management, this new regime of economic and general environmental incentives, this environmental package which we have been seeking to enunciate and develop in the form of solid waste and sewerage management will bring Barbados in line with what exists in the rest of the world in more developed countries. It is not a step backwards. It is not a penalty to poor people. It is, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the next stage of development, the stage that will guarantee that Barbados will continue to enjoy a good health care system by not having garbage problems and that we as a people will enjoy our environment and the tourists enjoy an environment that is protected through a proper solid waste programme and through a proper system of sewerage management and disposal.

That, Mr. Speaker, Sir, is what this Levy helps to accomplish and I congratulate the Minister of Finance and I am happy to be one of the change agents who is helping to set Barbados on this new path to development. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central.

His Honour R. D. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a short intervention and to support this piece of legislation before this Honourable Chamber. This Environmental Levy, Sir, and other green taxes to be introduced are certainly a step in the right direction.

Such a move, Sir, gives Barbadians the stimulus to move away from being a typical Western consumer society to become a conserver society.

For too long, Sir, this society has been hiding from the truth. Sir, we drive our cars and we keep running our air condition units. We run our refrigerators and freezers with neither a care. Sir, we have pumped tonnes of chloroform **carbons** into the atmosphere and these substances can do two things. One, they can **deplete** the ozone layer and, secondly, they can increase the amount of greenhouse gases in the air. We have to pay a price, Sir, for being a capitalist society. Take for instance, Sir, the tyres that we use on our cars. When these tyres have passed their safety limit, we discard them. When we use soft drinks and so, we discard the containers. The same can be said, Sir, of newspapers, cardboard boxes, packaging materials, plastic bags and plastic forks. Sir, all of this material must be disposed of and of course it ends up at the **landfill**.

4.10 p.m.

Talking about the landfill, Sir, and the disposal of garbage, as a boy playing on that pasture in the Pasture Road, **Bank Hill** area, the constituency which you represent, Sir, and some time last year I remember you **took** the initiative and made sure that all the old refrigerators, dead dogs and everything that was dumped there were removed from there, and eventually it was stopped. You were able then, Sir, to make it into a playing field, which the young people of the area are using, and you have gone so far as to put in a play park for the little children in the area. I must compliment you on that.

In a small densely populated country such as ours, if we want to be producing so much refuse we should be paying for its disposal. If we say we are going to charge a moderate fee, say \$15 or \$20 per tonne, for tipping, this is more than reasonable.

Talking about paper, Sir, many businesses and individuals, as well as Government Departments, waste reams and reams of paper every day, and this must be dealt with. The question I would like to ask is if this paper cannot be recycled. We can also look at typewriter ribbons, copying residue, old car batteries, old paints, solvents, **degreasers** and **all** other hazardous substances which should be disposed of in a proper manner and should be included under this levy.

I want to make an intervention on wastage. I believe that every Government Department should have a waste audit and every two years or so an audit done. If Government sets the example, undoubtedly the private sector will follow. Not only will it cut down on the wastage but it will save money as well.

We should also encourage people to reduce the amount of materials they use. They should be reusing containers and where possible recycling and composting. We must clearly define the terms of recycling, "green" business and sorting. I would say that Government should be looking actively and pursuing recycling and composting. What I believe is necessary in this country is implementing harsher penalties on people who litter and dump illegally.

Mr. Speaker, a healthy environment still remains a prerequisite for a healthy population and we should be encouraging and educating people, starting with our children. We should start in the schools and keep educating children about the environment.

I also want to make two points. One, the Minister of Health in her presentation talked a bit on sanitation and about the position of the trucks at the Sanitation Service Authority when the Barbados Labour Party came to power. I want to say that since this Government came to power, I saw a reduction in the amount of garbage on our streets and I want to compliment her for that. I am not saying that everything is rosy where that is concerned, because I know that there are some areas in my constituency where some of the **trucks** do not go into the smaller areas to remove the garbage. I have found that the people still have to be bringing their garbage up the gap to the top and leaving it. If the truck does not come around for a day or so, because in most areas we get a two-day collection, you find that the garbage is then strewn all around by the dogs and the wind.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I believe the direction this good Government is going in implementing an environmental levy is the right step in the direction of "green" taxes.

I thank you.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will not be very long in this debate, but I should congratulate the Honourable Member for St. Michael East for a very good presentation, in which he demonstrated as usual a great knowledge of the Democratic Labour Party's position relative to the alternative sites for waste disposal and other aspects of our environmental policy. I want to congratulate him for that contribution and I want perhaps to add my voice to some of the comments which have been made in the course of this debate.

I have no sympathy for the Right Honourable Member for St. Peter bringing this legislation a year after the Budget, and the legislation which is being brought has less to do with what the Honourable Member said during the Budget than it has to do with what are afterthoughts about a suitable way of raising revenue. This is only called an environmental levy, but this has nothing to do with

any environment. The Government is running a surplus. If it wanted to divert resources to the environment, we would not be engaging in this time wasting exercise from 20 past 11 o'clock this morning right now to 20 past 4 o'clock this afternoon. All it would require is for the Minister of Finance sitting at his desk to determine in the annual Estimates that he is going to make an adequate and fulsome provision for the relevant Ministry which is going to undertake the task of the environment. The Minister of Finance now recognises there is no need, but to save face he is bringing this legislation before the House to give the impression that he is introducing some imposition on the public so that they will be more conscious of waste management issues in Barbados.

The second point is that it is horrendous to think – and there is no other Minister of Finance in the world who on the threshold of introducing a Value Added Tax and abolishing all other indirect taxes would, days before his announcements relative to the Value Added Tax, introduce a brand new indirect tax in Barbados. What we have had this week, Mr. Speaker, is a long story from the Right Honourable Member for St. Peter to the public about all the indirect taxes which need to be removed in Barbados and why they need to be removed to be replaced by a VAT, and days before he is going to announce the introduction of a VAT he is introducing another indirect tax. Now I hope that the Honourable Member for St. Peter will allow the House to know whether this tax is going to be abolished next week or whether he is already reversing himself on yet another issue, and while on the one hand saying he is abolishing indirect taxes and replacing them with a VAT, he is in fact now making further imposition on the people of Barbados. But that does not surprise me, Mr. Speaker, Sir, because I heard one of the underlings – and I don't mean that as an offensive term. "underling" meaning a junior – in the Ministry of Finance on the radio this morning.

4.20 p.m.

The Barbados Labour Party has a solid record of reducing certain areas of taxation. The Honourable Member's economic policy is based on a low tax, low interest rate, low energy price policy and I heard the Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry of Finance on the *Voice of Barbados Radio* this morning saying that it would be very difficult to make any adjustments relative to the price of petroleum products because the Government is locked into a MOBIL agreement. I don't want to divert to that subject, but I remember he is probably not speaking for the Right Honourable Member for St. Peter. In fact, I would dare say he could not be speaking for the Right Honourable Member for St. Peter because the Right Honourable Member gave me an undertaking and the rest of Barbados that at the earliest possible time, and we are now into 19 or so months, that he would make

arrangements to terminate the MOBIL contract and provide...

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member, please I would wish that you would relate what you are saying to the Bill.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I agree with you, Sir. That's why I will relate it. What the Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry of Finance said this morning is that the Government is locked into an arrangement because of the consumption taxes on petroleum products and we are dealing with the indirect tax here. What I am saying is that the Government is reversing itself on the fundamentals, low energy price, low tax, low interest rates. Again this morning and I am buttressing the point I am making by saying that the junior Minister of Finance was heard to be saying that there will be no reduction in relation to the price of petroleum products because it would be very difficult to reduce the level of taxation on those products in Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, these reversals do not surprise me. We had a reversal on the low tax and in fact the Honourable Member for St. Peter can only say to the people of Barbados that his tax concessions to the manufacturing sector relieved them of \$5 million but he then had to turn around and say that the Democratic Labour Party's tax reform in 1993 relieved **taxpayers** of paying \$40 million **indirect** taxes. So Mr. Speaker, Sir, his boast on reduced taxation is an idle boast and the Barbados Labour Party boast is entirely idle.

They do not propose to introduce any low tax, low energy prices or low interest rates policies. This is an indication that that fundamental economic policy has been jettisoned, abandoned and thrown through the window by the Right Honourable Member for St. Peter. I was only waiting to hear about energy prices and I heard it this morning on the radio. It has been **confirmed** to the people of Barbados that between now and the year 2000 the Barbados Labour Party believes that it has no leverage, no elbow room to reduce the taxes on petroleum products and therefore there will be no possibility of increased margins to the dealers or reduced prices to consumers.

The entire fundamentals have gone and I hope that the Right Honourable Member for St. Peter can get it on course and provide the level of relief that is necessary. I am saying that this is an exercise that is unnecessary because if the Minister of Finance wanted to put his money where his mouth is on this issue all he needed to do, he was running a surplus, was to make a sufficient allocation to the relevant Ministry in Government, increase his budgetary allocation to undertake all of this without increasing the burden of taxation on the people of Barbados.

It is also unnecessary because by his own statement he plans to abolish indirect taxes next week, so why are we introducing a levy this week only to abolish it next week and replace it by a VAT? This will be a one-week tax in Barbados or it means that what has been said to the people of Barbados is not correct. Somebody has been misleading them because the impression has gone abroad that the VAT is replacing all indirect taxes except import duties. It is replacing consumption tax and stamp duty. Those are the two principal indirect taxes which Barbadians face and if they were too many it would not make sense to have a VAT just to take away 2 if we introduce 1. If not, the net effect of what we are doing today is that the VAT will result in 2 taxes replacing 2 taxes. The VAT and the Environment Levy will be replacing the stamp duty and the consumption tax, if I am to understand the logic correctly.

So we have 2 new taxes, one today and one next Tuesday or whenever. I assume the House will meet in a week.

*Aside.*

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: He didn't **ask** for my help. He doesn't need my help. I afforded him \$40 million in **tax** reductions which he is now admitting to the people of Barbados. The Right Honourable Member does not need my help or help from anybody over here. We helped him **all** we could.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, Sir. The Member is misleading the House. There was a Minister of Finance in the form of the member for St. Michael South who introduced the income **tax** reform and I **know** how careful the Member for St. Michael South is about seeking vindication and about how careful he is when the Member for St. John claims credit for things that are not his. The credit for the income tax reform fell to the substantive Minister, the Member for St. Michael South, and again he wants to mislead this Honourable House.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, that intervention does not bother me. The Honourable Member wants to prove he is his own man. He wanted an economic debate with us and we have been waiting for it since the Estimates and every week the Budget gets pushed further and further away and yet he has the temerity...

Mr. SPEAKER: Please let us get back to the Bill before the House.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, this is a measure to give effect to decisions which were put to this House in the last Budget. It is coming on the heels of another Budget. We have been anxious in this House to have a full debate on all the economic fundamentals and the Government has not yet afforded us the opportunity.

*Certain remarks made by the Member for St. John were expunged from the record by Mr. SPEAKER.*  
4.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member, please! The Honourable Member is aware of the Standing Orders.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: This legislation is as a result of dilatoriness on the part of the Minister of Finance. It is as a result of poor fiscal planning because we on this side of this House have committed ourselves to an approach which will see the Budget following closely on the heels of the Estimates and we tried some years ago to see that process brought to fruition. The Honourable Member for St. Peter was one of the chief proponents of the view that the Estimates and the Budget debate should be collapsed into one debate and that those matters should be dealt with.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member, please. I do not know if you are hearing the Chair but I am asking you please address the Bill that is before the House. May I remind you of the rule of anticipation which states clearly that you cannot bring before this House matters that are set to be discussed. Please, could you stick to the Bill?

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I am not speaking about anything that is to come before the House. I am speaking now about the principle that in fiscal planning in Barbados the Honourable Member for St. Peter, and this is a fiscal matter, had committed himself, along with other Members of this Chamber in the past to a policy. He went as far, I think, as to write to the Clerk of Parliament, that was indicated to the House to seek ...

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I wrote to the Clerk of Parliament to indicate that if it was the intention of the then administration to collapse the two processes into one that it would require fundamental changes in the Standing Orders of this House as they pertain to the debate on financial matters, that I was not aware that the Standing Orders Committee had met to deal with any such matter and therefore I was not aware how the then administration was hoping to proceed as it had announced to collapse two measures into one.

I am glad the Member **has** raised that point because I was waiting for him to say so to say that I have never been party to the intent to collapse them into one because I recognized you would have to change the Standing Orders of this House first.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member has said exactly what I was going to say, that he would be committed, **as far as** I know, to

the fundamental changes that would be necessary to have this full financial debate. Over a year since the last Budget – I am not dealing with the next Budget because I do not know if it will ever come, and I **am** not anticipating the House. I **am** guided by you, Sir. You are not anticipating a budget nor am I anticipating a budget. We may not even have a budget so I thank you for that advice, Sir. You, like the rest of Barbados cannot anticipate whether there will even be a budget in Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Bill now, the Bill that is before the House.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: We had the full 12 months passed ...

Mr. SPEAKER: What about the Bill?

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: That is what I am at now.

...and this legislation now comes to the House. It does not reflect substantially what was in that last Budget and it reflects a range of new things.

There is a point which the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central made which needs, in my view, to be heeded by the Government. When you introduce measures in a Budget, as the Honourable Member for St. Peter did in his last Budget, people in the private sector, people who are involved in business start to plan for those measures. But the people who consult with Government are not those people. This is part of the problem.

There is a clique of business people in Barbados – the Honourable Member for St. Peter knows them, I know them, the Honourable Member for Christ Church South knows them and the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central knows them – who are in discussions in planning that legislation. They are fighting their cause on the issue, but the average man who has started to plan his life would have been given no indication by the Minister of Finance that he had second thoughts in relation to some of these issues, and that what may be coming to the House may be substantially different to what he had proposed.

I think, Sir, in that regard, if I were a Minister of Finance who did that, you could accuse me of negligence to the people. I would have been negligent in not returning to the people after the Budget and saying, "**Look**. I have had second thoughts about these measures. I am going to revise them significantly so do not plan your business arrangements along these lines. I was a bit confused and mixed up when I introduced those measures. I was playing to the Gallery and publicity. I was engaging in pure politics and obfuscation. I have now seen reality and now that I have seen reality I **am** adjusting my policy because there are very few measures in the last Budget".

Mr. Speaker, this is an unbelievable scenario. There are very few measures in the last Budget which have been introduced in this House in the form in which they were announced in the Budget. The Honourable Member for St. Peter, and that is why you are quite right, there is no point anticipating a Budget because even when the Budget is given it does not mean anything because the legislation which will follow has nothing to do with what the Minister of Finance says in the Budget debate.

#### *Aside.*

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: But you were never like that. Even though the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central showed you another way you still went ahead and pursued it, much to your detriment, **so** you are now praising people in hindsight.

This is a 5-minute speech. I promised only a 5-minute speech.

So, Mr. Speaker, what do we have in Barbados? This is the scenario of confusion that we have and only the Honourable Member for St. Peter can hold our hands and take us out of it. We have an indirect **tax** being introduced this week, indirect taxes being abolished next week or whenever, and a new indirect **tax** being introduced next week. The net effect will be that two indirect **taxes** will go next week. One will be introduced next week and one will be introduced this week. Those are the facts before the House.

You have a scenario in which the Honourable Member for St. Peter, the key factor which he brought to economic planning was his forecasting ability. All of his forecasts on simple fiscal matters have been totally out of wack. Today, the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central showed how the effect of what he would have introduced in the last Budget is totally out of line with reality and we had other legislation which has had to be amended because it is totally out of line with what the Minister of Finance intended.

Then you have flip-flops or clear reversals to the **so**-called policy of low interest rates, low taxation and low energy costs. One limb of it is represented by this, the Bill, an increase in taxation through the introduction of an environmental levy by this legislation which is before us. As I said, I will not refer to what I heard on the radio this morning, nor will I refer to the question of interest rates until later.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, you have this legislation coming more than a year after the last Budget presentation. Mr. Speaker, if you wish Honourable Members to listen intently and make notes whenever a Budget is held again in this

country, I believe that the person who is going to deliver that Budget, and I know it will not be me, will have a duty to clarify all of that before he could expect us to believe that what is said in the Budget is going to be reflected in the legislation which is brought before this Chamber, if not, there is no way in which people in the private sector and individuals can actively plan in the context of Government's fiscal policy. This is a clear example of those kinds of policies gone awry, improperly planned, badly executed and of a Government being negligent in not telling the public that it has changed its position along the way.

With those few words, Sir, we cannot support this increase in taxation. It is on the pretext of an environmental levy, but this is just another tax collecting exercise.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we left office by reducing the burden of taxation in Barbados at the end of the day, removal of levies, reduction in income tax, etc. and we have to stand on the side of that policy and we therefore will not be able to support this particular Bill.  
4.40 p.m.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Member for St. John has already called for some place for him to put what he calls the dead weight of the Democratic Labour Party. I just want him to know, Sir, that the dead weight of the Democratic **Labour** Party is not going to attract either a tipping fee nor an environmental levy in its disposal. I will start with his contribution although I wish to start with that of the Member for St. Lucy. I felt the Member for St. Lucy should have referred Members to page 448 of the Public Sector Staff list where the Board of the Sanitation Service Authority is shown and the Members for that Board under the Democratic Labour Party were a Mr. J. Daniel and a Mr. D. C. Franklyn, a Mr. G. Holder, a **Mrs. S. Alleyne**, others and a Mr. D. Kellman. I believe that I have a responsibility to tell the House that Mr. D. **Kellman** and the Member for St. Lucy are one and the same person, Sir, and that he was a member of the Sanitation Service Authority that magnificently presided over the mismanagement of Mangrove.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am not going to get into the debate as to whether he personally is responsible for the Mangrove landfill. I know he is responsible for the problem with the sugar industry because he was the financial controller for that sector. But I will not have what is now being proposed by Government in the nature of tipping fee misrepresented by a person who sits in this House and who was a Member of the Board of Directors of the Sanitation Service Authority.

Mr. Speaker, from 1971 the Sanitation Service Authority was by regulation of that year authorised to charge fees for the removal and the collection of rubbish.

They were allowed to charge for mould \$15.00 per load. For the rubbish of any trade or business or from construction sites, a fee of \$1.00 per cubic yard. For the removal of all household or domestic rubbish a fee of \$1.00 per cubic yard. What we are proposing to do is to replace, and we want to make it clear, Sir, we are abolishing these existing regulations that have been in existence from 1971 and replacing them by a tipping fee. When a person who is sitting in this House and who has been a member of the Board of Directors of the Sanitation Service Authority can get on the Floor of Parliament and criticise the Sanitation Authority for the charging of fees for the dumping of things on site, when he presided as a member of the Board on the collection of fees on domestic rubbish, household rubbish, mould from excavation sites and the kind, we are in dangerous waters.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: On a point of order, Sir, I challenge the Minister of Finance.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point of order, please.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Yes, Sir. The Minister of Finance is misleading this House because he cannot produce any document in this House to show that one cent was collected for domestic garbage and was placed anywhere in the Consolidated Fund or anywhere in any revenue collection account in Barbados.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to refer this House again to the Sanitation Service Authority Fees Regulations, 1971 because the essential point in this, Sir, is that the tipping fee is now to replace these regulations of 1971 which are now being abolished. Between 1971 and 1996 the Sanitation Authority was in a position to collect these fees as approved by this Parliament.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation, Sir. I am a little concerned, Sir. The charges which you are reading out now relate to collection and transport. Is that the same thing as a tipping charge? For my information, Sir, and information of the House, I am asking whether or not a tipping charge is the same thing. In other words, if I own a business and I paid a truck to take my garbage to the dump am I going to be charged a tipping charge at that point? I understand that to be a tipping charge. I understand those charges are collection and transport charges so it seems to me to be a bit of a problem. I do not understand it.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: What I am saying is that these regulations are now being removed so that even if in the past the Sanitation Authority could charge for the collection of rubbish as it could have and did, that is now being removed and what would obtain in the future is

that if you take commercial rubbish to the **landfill** you will pay a tipping fee. But it is unworthy of a person who was a member of the Board of the Authority and knew that these regulations existed to **try** to create the impression that the charging of a fee for the collection and removal of rubbish in this country is something that is new. I want to stress that point.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Member for St. John spoke at length and his role obviously is to try to confuse the issue. I do not blame him because he is holding on tenuously to office and his leadership in his party. If he has a party that is divided on its own purposes, his party strongly called upon the Government to introduce the VAT. They said we were too slow in introducing the VAT and I heard himself and a person from the Other Place lambaste the Government for being too tardy in introduction of the VAT.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prolong the debate. The Honourable Member for St. Peter is misleading the House. I have never accused the Government of being tardy in introducing it. I have accused the Government of being tardy in not telling the public when it is going to introduce a VAT. That is the concern that the Minister himself does not appear to know. The private sector does not know, you do not know, Sir, I do not know, nobody knows.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, at one stage the Government had representation from the spokesman for the NDP that we should take 2 years while the Senator from the Other Place was saying that we **are** too slow. I am saying that we must be doing something right if both the NDP and the DLP **are** criticising it. One is saying we are going to fast and the next because we **are** doing it too slow.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, as the Member for St. John knows, there **are** a large number of niggling indirect taxes in Barbados. Consumption tax is one, Sir. Stamp duty on goods is another. You have entertainment tax, you have the hotel and restaurant sales tax, you have ticket taxes, you have taxes on travel, you have taxes on mining and quarrying, you have bank taxes on assets, a whole range of indirect taxes including import duties. You also, Sir, have a training levy that predates the VAT and as far as I am aware, Sir, and I would have to consult within the Ministry of Finance will also be there after the VAT and that the training levy was retained in place by the Democratic Labour Party even when they wanted to hold a VAT. I challenge the Member for St. John to deny this now, Sir. The Value Added Tax was never intended to replace all indirect taxes and I challenge the Member for St. John on the Floor of this House and to deny that it was ever intended to replace all indirect taxes, Sir.

4.50 p.m.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I am not getting up to deny anything. I am saying that the Honourable Member for St. Peter is who said so. I saw him on my television screen Saturday or Sunday and the people who I was with said: "Praise the Lord. He is removing taxation." But then he went on to say that he was going to apply it on a wider range of goods and I said: "Oh! Lord, he gives it in one hand and he is taking it back in the other." And I sat with them in silence and nodded my head.

Mr. SPEAKER: This was not a video though? Was this a video?

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: No, this was television - live and in living colour.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, I understand only so well the antics of the Member for St. John but nobody has ever said, Sir, that the import duty is an indirect tax and it is intended to replace the import duty, and nobody ever said that it was to replace all. It is not intended to replace all but it certainly will replace the consumption tax, the stamp duty on goods, hotel and restaurant sales tax, the entertainment tax and taxes of that character.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that point is clear and that was the concept of the VAT from its very inception, that import duties would remain...

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of elucidation if the Honourable Member would give way. I am elucidating, Sir. My only concern is whether the VAT is going to replace the Environment Levy. So if he is going to remove that when he introduces the VAT, well he will reflect on that issue and that is the question that I want answered, Sir.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Member wants now to run from that position about the VAT replacing all. Sir, from the outset, it was understood that the VAT alone could not yield all of the revenue that is intended to yield by the existing range of taxes and that excises on certain commodities will remain in place. The draft legislation, Sir, that has been circulated is legislation that says that excises will remain in place on petroleum products, tobacco, liquor and motor cars. The issue is: Do we impose excises up to the level that they will give the same amount of revenue from those items on which they **are** imposed in addition to the VAT or do you impose excises in such a way that the excises and the VAT will let those commodities stay at the same prices? The answer is, Sir, if you allow the excises and the VAT yield the same level of revenue from those commodities, particularly petroleum products, the price of the product would rise. When Mr. Barker made that point then, Sir, he was trying to draw reference to the fact that the

Government has had to **make** a determination as to whether we are going to let petroleum products rise because of the VAT or not and that we are taking the decision that the price of petroleum products will not be allowed to rise because of the introduction of the VAT. I thank him, Sir, for putting it out. The Member for St. John tried to discredit him but that is the reality of the fact that the...

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: On a point of order, Sir. I heard the news report this morning. That is not what the Parliamentary Secretary was discussing. He was discussing the Mobil Agreement and the fact that it does not end until the year 2000 and that the reason why petroleum prices are at that level is because there are certain built in taxes which the Government does not propose to reduce. That is all he said and I repeated today what he said. I have nothing to do with those other embellishments because the Junior Minister does not understand what he is saying either...

Mr. SPEAKER: Okay, please. **You** have made your point.

*Aside.*

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. As we discuss this matter of levies, I think that it is important that this House should know that that is the favourite form of taxation of the Honourable Member for St. Peter and that he was the person who introduced the idea to the late Tom Adams in 1981.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is **no** point of order, Sir. Let us proceed please. That is no point of order.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. John seems to believe that he has in this matter a responsibility to try to confuse the public as to what the VAT is about. Mr. Speaker, I understand the policy of the situation. But the truth is that the VAT was never intended to replace all indirect taxes and it will not and I come to the point that was crucial to this debate that at the Rio Summit it was proposed in Principle 16 that member countries national authorities should endeavour to promote the internalization of environmental and the use of economic instruments taking into account the polluter. I make the point to say this, Sir, that there are countries like Great Britain and countries in the European Union that have both a VAT as well as an environmental levy and that this environmental levy relates to the fact that we are at the tip of the iceberg where finding solutions to environmental problems is concerned, that what we are facing this year is but the first part of a series of fairly expensive amounts that will have to be incurred in finding environmental solutions. They are talking in terms of constructing and establishing and operating a **landfill** in a manner that does not give rise to a Stinkeroo and, Mr. Speaker, they are

speaking in terms of establishing a **composting** facility and establishing a facility that will deal with solid bulk items and that the total costs of solid waste management solutions in Barbados are going to add to Government's expenditure an amount that goes far beyond what has been provided in this year's Estimates. We therefore have, Sir, to add to Government's revenue a stream of revenue to meet those costs that will be coming in the future and that is what this is about. It is a tax, Sir, that has now found favour all over the world and, Mr. Speaker, what is interesting in this debate, Sir, is that the Opposition parties have condemned the environmental levy but they are not prepared to face the fact that we are introducing as part of a two-pronged approach to dealing with solid waste management problems and that we are not only having an environmental levy, but we are also introducing a regime of concessions for companies that are involved in recycling.

*Aside.*

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member, you are not only interrupting the House. You are interrupting me too.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I can only speak in a salutary manner with all Members on this side and all Members of my Party because there is no dead weight in this Party whatsoever. But the Member for St. John cannot get up and say the same thing about his Party, Sir. He is the dead weight.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Members, please. The Honourable Member for St. John and the Honourable Member for St. Peter, please could we address the Bill and let us move on?  
5.00 p.m.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was making the point that the word must go forward from this Parliament that the environmental levy is but one of a **two-pronged** approach by Government to find solid waste management solutions in this country, that even as we are introducing an environmental levy we are also giving a new fiscal regime to **recyclers** for the first time in Barbados that gives them 10-year tax holidays, which include refurbishment, as well as duty free relief on all equipment and materials used to establish industries. So that if the House is going to have a balanced perspective on the issue, they have to balance on the one hand the tax that is going to be collected relative to the revenue that is going to be given up to those companies that are going to be converting garbage into useful goods. That is the point.

Mr. Speaker, if we were only introducing an environmental levy but not putting something positive in place by way of concessions to encourage industries to start recycling in this country, perhaps the Opposition would

have a case, but they are obnoxiously blind in not wanting to face the reality of what is before this country, an enlightened approach that brings Barbados in line with other countries that are using both the carrot and the stick in order to address environmental matters.

*Aside.*

Rt. Hon. **O. S. ARTHUR**: Mr. Speaker, I really would be glad if what a Mr. Boyce said about the Honourable Member for St. John and myself and our behaviour on the LIAT plane were true, that we were not speaking to each other. We spoke at length, although **Hayden** Boyce did not say so.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for St. Michael East gave a very long but tiny speech that was intended to raise questions as to why it would have been that he could find himself down in Shorey Village to commiserate with the victims of a non-existent **landfill**, but has never yet been able to find himself up in Arch Hall and **Bennetts** to commiserate with all of the victims for six years of his party's diabolical approach to solid waste management. He was seen on the front page hugging up people quarrelling about the effects of a non-existent **landfill** up at Greenland.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. It is well known across the length and breadth of Barbados that I am by far the most caring Member of Parliament they have today.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that the point of order?

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: In addition to that, Sir, on more than one occasion I have gone house to house and expressed my concern for the residents of Arch Hall and Bennetts. I have gone myself, personally, and observed the kind of conditions they were suffering. I am an asthmatic, I understand the difficulties they were going through and it is not fair for the record of this House to reflect that I have never once gone and shown compassion. That is not true. I have gone on more than one occasion. I **really** regret that the residents of Arch Hall and **Bennetts** had to suffer the way they did, but they are suffering just like how t' entire Barbadian community will now suffer, because of the inability of this Administration to remove garbage off the streets.

Mr. SPEAKER: You have made your point.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: So not only the residents of Arch Hall and Bennetts, ...

Mr. SPEAKER: You have made your point.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: ... all of Barbados is **now** suffering.

Mr. SPEAKER: Take your **seat**, please. You have made your point.

Rt. Hon. **O. S. ARTHUR**: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture said that he was seen in Shorey Village, accompanied by a sheep, commiserating with the residents of Shorey Village on the impact on them of a **non-existent landfill**.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I happened to have been accompanied by the former Right Honourable Prime Minister of Barbados, but the present Prime Minister is on record of calling people all **kinds** of names, and now today he is referring to an honourable gentleman as a sheep.

*Asides.*

Mr. SPEAKER: Please.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, you are going to have to deal with him.

*Asides.*

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Members, order! Order! Order, please!

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Last week, Sir, he lambasted a journalist in this House and up to now there has been no proper apology on the record of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order. The Honourable Member for St. Michael East, you have made your point. You were accompanied by the former Prime Minister. Take your seat, please. Could we proceed, please?

Rt. Hon. **O. S. ARTHUR**: Mr. Speaker, I stand on what was reported to me by the Honourable Member for St. James North and corroborated by the Honourable Member for St. Michael East. I am making that point to come to the gravamen of the issue.

Mr. Speaker, it does not fall properly from the mouth of the Honourable Member for St. Michael **East**, nor from the mouth of any member of the Democratic Labour Party, having presided over the environmental disorder and the blot and the hazard that constituted Mount Stinkeroo, now to come to castigate anybody for any policies pertaining to environmental management in this country. Mount Stinkeroo will stand for ever and ever.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

*Aside.*

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: One minute, please.

*Aside.*

Mr. SPEAKER: A point of order, please. The Right Honourable Member for St. Peter, please.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: On a point of order. At no time did I castigate the administration for any policy position on the environment. What I castigated the Government for was the failure of this administration, that promised so much, to collect garbage from around the length and breadth of Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: Okay. Your point has been made.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Precisely. They have presided over the failure...

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point has been made, please.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, the image of the Democratic Labour Party in the minds of the people of Barbados is an image that has at its core a mountain of stinking garbage in the centre of St. Thomas, people in Arch Hall suffering at the hands of a callous, callow and indifferent Government and an unwillingness and inability on the part of the Democratic Labour Party to deal with the matter.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am going to have to ask that you **strike** the comments made by the Honourable Member out of the record. We have made it clear on several occasions that we regret it. The Honourable Member understands that this country was going through a **stabilisation** programme...

*Asides.*

Mr. SPEAKER: Please.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: ... and the resources were not...

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member, please. That is no point of order.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: But he must not do that. You cannot speak about uncouth and all that kind of thing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just take your seat, please.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, am I to believe that the **same** Government that could not find money to deal with Mount Stinkeroo could find millions of

dollars to spend on high priced consultants and other persons to do the planning of a VAT for this country and to staff a VAT Implementation Unit? It says something about the priorities of the Democratic Labour Party. That is their priority, Sir. They did not care about the welfare of the people of Barbados. We inherited the administration of this country's affairs in September, and by October I had called the Minister of Health and said to her: "Tell me how much resources you want to get the job at Mount Stinkeroo done, because it is a blot on Barbados and a threat to the health of the people of this country." And now those Members on the Other Side, who presided over the greatest and most monumental environmental disorder and disaster in the Caribbean and the western hemisphere, now can dare to come to the House to talk about their position on environmental policy! Mount Stinkeroo is the symbol of DLP environmental policies. And it shall be so for as long as there is a Barbados. Mount Stinkeroo is what the DLP and the environment is about. Throughout the length and breadth of Barbados nobody believes the DLP when the matter of environment comes up because they will always remember that the DLP left office with a nasty, stinking, smoking mountain of garbage in this country to identify them *en masse* to Barbados. He was a member of the Board.

5.10 p.m.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: On a point of order. Was the Honourable Member referring to the **landfill** at Greenland or the one at Mangrove?

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Member for St. Lucy was a member of the Board of Directors of the Sanitation **Service** Authority that put Mount Stinkeroo in place and managed it as the worst environmental disaster in the history of the Caribbean. I do not want to hear pablum on the question of environmental management, because we have on this side nothing to learn from them where environmental management is concerned. We do not want to replicate the sad and unfortunate history that the Democratic Labour Party was party to and what they did to Mangrove and to the people in the surrounding areas in St. Thomas. It was an ugly, sordid example of an uncaring and insensitive government which used the notion of fiscal stricture to justify a threat to the health of the people of this country.

I want to say that when in due course this Parliament is asked to vote a supplementary of some substantial amount to allow fair payment to the people of Arch Hall and **Bennetts** for the deterioration in their health caused by the Mount Stinkeroo disaster, I hope that it will enjoy full support on all sides and I am not going to be hearing that I am bringing too many supplementaries to Parliament. I just want to say that a supplementary is going to have to come here because the chapter on Mount Stinkeroo

cannot properly be closed until the people of Barbados recognise that the damage to those people's health is something for which they have properly to be compensated.

Mr. Speaker, this environmental levy has been brought to the House because the costs of finding solutions to Barbados' environmental problems **are** going to be large and are going to amount in the future, If we were to go to an incinerator it would run into tens of millions of dollars. We **are** bringing an environmental levy because this country must never again find itself in a situation where we tell the people that we put their health at risk because we do not have the will nor the imagination to raise the resources to manage **our** landfills properly.

It is in that context that I am proud and honoured to bring this legislation to Parliament and I do now respectfully move that this Bill be read a second time.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Members, before we go into Committee the present Chairman of Committees is absent so we will have to appoint a temporary Chairman. Do we have a proposal?

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we appoint the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central for the duration until he returns.

Hon. Sir HAROLD St. JOHN: I beg to second that.

*The question was put that a temporary Chairman of Committees be appointed and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*On the motion of Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR seconded by Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. D. CARTER in the Chair.*

*Clauses 1 to 9 were called and passed.*

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Schedule be the Schedule to the Bill.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to second that.  
5.20 p.m.

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

*On the motion of Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, seconded by Hon. G. W. PAYNE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to His Honour the SPEAKER, the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly*

*On the separate motions of Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, seconded by Hon. G. W. PAYNE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.*

#### ORDER NO. 6 – BILL TO **AMEND** THE **BETTING** AND GAMING DUTIES ACT, CAP. 60

##### *Asides.*

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I know that it is usual at this hour to have a little levity at tea time, but if the Honourable Member for St. John would just give me a chance to do the Bill, he will get away and revert to his accustomed place downstairs near the **bar**.

Sir, the Betting and Gaming Duties (Amendment) Bill is another piece of legislation that is a consequence of the budgetary process of last year. Honourable Members will recall, if they have the Budget speech from the past year, that the Minister of Finance had proposed a fee structure for the operating of gaming rooms in hotels and he had increased the annual licence fee payable by pool betting agencies from **\$150** a year to **\$300**, and for racing service businesses from \$60 000 to **\$75 000**. After the budgetary process was completed, there were certain representations made to the Minister of Finance about the proposals. Those representations were listened to and what is before the House is a synthesis of all of the discussions that have taken place between April last year and February this year when this Bill was drafted.

There are really no matters of any great moment by way of policy in the Bill itself. There is a provision of a registration. In clause 3 "Every person who prints tickets bearing the medallion for use of a racing service business shall submit the tickets to the Accountant General before distribution to the racing service business." The reason for that is that these betting slips carry a duty. It was found that one racing service which has closed down was not, in fact, stamping the tickets so that the Accountant General was at a loss to know how many tickets had been sold and to what extent he was short of revenue, so they are stamping all the tickets now when they **are** printed. The racing service can have them and the Accountant

General has a copy of how many tickets so that they can reconcile the statements better. That is what we intend to tighten in clause 3.

In addition to that, approved national organisations have to register now if they want to carry on a lottery and they have to apply to the Comptroller for registration giving the usual details of name and address of the organisation and such other particulars as may be prescribed, pay a fee and once they are approved to pay the fee, the Comptroller will register them.

That is really the essence of this Bill. It sets out in the Schedule the fees payable by the various organisations and services or businesses which run bingo, pool betting, racing service, gaming machines, amusement machines, amusement arcade licences, and so on. It is pretty straightforward.

I also wish to mention this. Together with this Bill we have published regulations amending the existing regulations. The key feature of the amended regulation, 1996, is that no person under the age of 18 years will be admitted to any betting facility to place a bet or purchase a ticket in respect of any lottery or collect money payable in connection with a lottery. In other words, no person under 18 can go into any depot that is selling Olympio or Lotto and buy a ticket or go to cash a ticket. That is the cut-off point.

There are obviously **many** sociological factors involved in gambling apart from any economic spin-off that a country may get. Without going into the matter now, Sir, I would just like to say that some of us are concerned at the proliferation of gambling and the attraction of certain types of gambling to the average people who cannot afford to gamble. Later on in the year, Sir, I suppose we will have a debate when some of us can express our views fully on this matter but, for the time being, under 18s are banned from playing Lotto or Olympio.

With those few remarks, Sir, I beg to move that this Bill, which speaks for itself, be read a second time. There is nothing complicated or esoteric about this Bill.

Mr. L. R. **TULL**: I beg to second that.

Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief on this Bill. We all accept that gambling is now a major economic activity in Barbados and that it impacts in a very dramatic way on the lives of many people in this country. I am glad to hear the Government has been taking some look at some aspect of gambling, and I would want to venture a few comments in

relation to the operation of the horse racing betting pools in Barbados.

I believe, Sir, it is proper for me to declare an interest since I advised an applicant for such a licence. There is a situation in the country where we are more and more accepting that everybody should be able to participate in the economic life of this country and to invest in whatever area one wants, one must be troubled about the mere monopolistic position of those who run betting shops for horse racing in Barbados. There are, in fact, two of them. Recent experiences of mine have led me to see how they have locked off in a very serious way the business of betting the racing pools for themselves. I have had to look at the Betting and Gaming Duties Act and the regulations thereto over the last three or four months, and there are some serious deficiencies in them, that whereas the Act may be suitable for an earlier time the Act is certainly not suitable for the situation that obtains in Barbados today. I am asking the Government to take a look at the Act and see where it can open up the Act to shut off these monopolies and allow others to participate as freely as they want in that kind of economic activity.

5.30 p.m.

Now, Sir, in the old days there used to be a franchise for the jockey club in England that was given to one company in Barbados. We have a situation now, Sir, that where any new applicant for licence for a racing pool, according to those persons, not according to me, I read the law differently, according to those persons can only get a licence if they apply to the people whom they would compete against to have a share of the monopoly franchise that they have out of the United Kingdom. In other words, Mr. Speaker, Sir, you have to apply to someone that you want to compete against in the same business for that person to give you a right to be part of the operation of a betting pool system in this country. Sir, I do not agree with that interpretation. Those were the days before the development of technology in the way in which you can get audiovisual transmission of racing out of practically any country in the world into Barbados so it is a new ball game altogether. But there are still persons who feel that they have a right to dictate in Barbados to Barbadians what economic activity that they should participate in.

They say a word to the wise is enough but the people of whom I speak are not wise so it is going to require more than those words. I am using this opportunity, Sir, only to fire a few warning shots across the brow of certain persons because I myself as a legislator and as a practising attorney-at-law in this country have been submitted to abuse in recent times by persons who have no goodwill in my view for the masses of people across this country and whose only matter of concern is how much money they can make.

I believe the Government has, if it aims to be a Government of the good society, to investigate what is happening in gambling in this country. Let it all hang out. Ventilate it, Sir. Let us all look at it. Let the people of Barbados understand who owns what, who runs what, who pays what to whom, the whole works because I am saddened when I look at the forces at play in the last few weeks in this country and see how they have strangled off honest endeavour by a number of people in this community.

I want also, Mr. Speaker, to let it be known that we must, in looking at this Betting and Gaming Act look at the position of the people who comprise the committee. I am not **talking** about the persons now. I am talking about the positions, the offices. I cannot understand for instance, Sir, if you appeal from the decision of the Chairman of the Gaming and Betting Committee that the Chairman of the Gaming and Betting Committee is a member of the appeal or review committee. I cannot understand that, Sir. I also cannot understand how we can continue to have a situation in this country where persons who are principal advisers to Ministers of Government, along with that role as principal advisers, are also regulators of gambling. That is the best way to put it. Something is wrong with it and I am urging on the Government to give a very urgent look at the situation as it affects, not only the persons who are in the business of running gambling establishments but ultimately the public would want to feel that there is some sort of equity in this whole system.

I **am** not going to use this opportunity to go into the question of returns but I really do feel that the Government should treat it as an utmost priority and do not allow a few individuals who feel that they have got more clout in this society than anyone in this Chamber would want to think they have. We want to prevent them **from** feeling that they can run this country in the way they want it to run and that they can ridicule whom they want to ridicule and say who is to get what and who is not get what in this country and who is to go around telling people whom they know and who will protect their interest. All that, Sir, needs to hang out. I cannot be **any**more vehement than I have been so far to urge the Government, in the interest of the Government and the people of this country, to conduct an urgent investigation in the operations of the whole system of gambling in Barbados. I am grateful to you, Sir.

Hon. Sir HAROLD St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I represent a constituency which starts at Rendezvous and it goes right up to Silver Sands and in that area, Sir, there is an area called the St. Lawrence Gap area and the Worthing View area, Sir, and there is a large number of establishments there who operate various forms of activities which come under the regulation of the Betting and Gaming Act. I want to share with the House some

experiences that I have, particularly by way of telephone calls, sometimes in the wee hours of the morning, in which various areas of dissatisfaction with the gambling machines and the **payout** ratio in particular.

Everybody is not fully aware of the great degree of dissatisfaction with the fact that the machines which are in existence in Barbados do not state what is called a **payout** ratio. I have never played a machine but people who make it a habit, in particular ladies who make this a habit, regard it as being a matter of gross injustice to people who play these machines that they are unaware of the **payout** ratio which each establishment gives. They argue very strongly, Sir, that it is in the interest of protection of the consumer that there should be some minimum standards of **payout** which is indicated very clearly just as if you bet on a horse you know the odds, they say if you bet in a machine in any country in the world that they should tell you that this machine pays out a percentage of the take.

Now, I am told, Sir, that in many countries there are regulations to this effect and I have had a look at the Gambling Commission's Report and I believe that some observations were made in that report with respect to this area but I have been persistently requested that on the next occasion that this matter comes before Parliament that this legitimate complaint, according to the players of machines be put, Sir. Now in respect, Sir, of the area of fees, I am also being besieged by two competing interests in this area. On the one hand, you have those people who have a bank of machines in their hotel and, on the other hand, you have another group who have a bank of machines in an arcade and, particularly in the St. Lawrence area, there is a great deal of dissatisfaction on the part of some people who have to pay large arcade fees for carrying on activity along the road. There are others who advertise their activity along the same road but the activity is taking place in a part of the hotel which is exposed to the road and one pays the fees and the other does not pay the fees.

Sir, I have received so many letters and telephone calls from these constituents of mine as to what they regard as unfair discrimination. They say that if hotels are allowed to carry on the activity with no payment of a fee for the licence to carry on the activity and only the individual, then they should not be allowed to advertise in the road where they have a sign apparently, Sir, along St. Lawrence Road itself, on the main road that you have a situation where you have an arcade near to the Pepperpot which has to pay arcade fees and then you have a sign outside of the hotel saying that you have games room in the hotel in which there is an arcade where one pays and one does not pay. This is causing a tremendous amount of dissatisfaction and I **am** the representative for the area and I must say, Sir, that they make persistent complaints and it is almost unanimous now in that area.

5.40 p.m.

Now there is a new phenomenon that has arisen of a thing called a sports bar. I am hoping, Sir, that the regulations will again be expanded to deal with some of the activities going on. I have never been into one but I noticed, Sir, that you have regulations dealing with under 18 here. I think that a very early look should be taken at the activities that go on in there. I do not know about a sports bar. I know of some of the old traditional ones particularly those **started** with satellites that used to bring American football, boxing and things like that. But I am told that there are a large number of machines now which perform other activities and I know that at one stage in **Oistins** Town there used to be a games room in which certain games were played and the police had to monitor it from the school children going in there and eventually the types of games that were put in there were educational games **as** opposed to other activity. This is how we see an area that is changing, Sir, and I feel that we should update our regulatory regime of this. It is time that we have a good look at it and get the best expert advice and we deal with it.

Obviously, the point that the Honourable Member for St. George South made about monopoly is a very important point, because sometimes in these areas it is the people who use their mouth in such a way **as** to cause disrespect to the politicians. I want them all to understand that, if my constituents tell me that they are dissatisfied with some of the situations that they **see** in relation to pay-outs and in relation to alleged monopoly in respect to the ownership of hotel licence and I regard it as legitimate, I am coming to the House of Assembly and I am mentioning it. This is where the laws **are** to be made and this is where the laws **are** to be amended and there is a dissatisfaction out there with respect to the discrimination for the fee for arcades and the fee for licences in respect of hotel operations. Because they **are** allowed to compete in advertising in a manner which is regarded as not fair. I will not speak on a national organization, Sir, of the lottery and it is well known, Sir. I have given opinions on the formation of one of those lotteries, Sir, and I will not speak on that.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I listened to the speech of the Honourable Member for St. George South and I believe that he put some of the points which I felt were worth putting in relation to this debate. I want to reiterate at the outset but from a different perspective the **point** which the Honourable Member for St. George South made about the Betting and Gaming Committee. I read an article in the *Advocate Newspaper* which sought to ask of the former Minister of Finance, meaning me, how the Olympio Lottery was permitted to set up in Barbados. I want to make it clear that in relation to permissions granted for gambling it has nothing to do with any politician. The law is very clear. A committee has been set up of public officers by law. They do not have to listen to me. They do not have to listen to anybody. They are entitled to exercise

the discretion by law and they approved the lottery. They were not required to inform me and they did not inform me at that time that there was any such lottery being operated in Barbados. I think that is an **important** point because I suspect that a lot of Barbadians believe that there was some shift in policy in relation to gambling. For you to shift the policy in relation to gambling in Barbados, you would have to amend the existing law. I made that point when all of the fulminations were being made about casino gambling in Barbados. There is no law which will permit that **kind** of activity. In fact, the law outlaws that **kind** of activity. The Vagrancy Act is the Act which outlaws it and, therefore, for you to introduce casino gambling you would have to repeal the Vagrancy Act. I do not think that many people realize that. I think the Honourable Member for St. Thomas may realize it. It is in fact the Vagrancy Act which outlaws casino gambling and then there is the old Betting and Gaming Committee Act which you will find in the statute books but it was never proclaimed which would have permitted some forms of table top gambling in Barbados, or it was proclaimed and reversed by the Honourable Member for Christ Church South according to the anecdotal evidence which is available to us. That was a very worthy decision of his which I support 100 per cent though he would doubt that I support it. I support it 100 per cent. But the point is that in relation to permissions for gambling operations under the present law there can be no political input unless the licence it turned down. It is only at that point that the Minister can appeal and the way the committee functions very few people appeal to the Minister. I certainly never saw an appeal from a decision of the Betting and Gaming Committee in the **entire** time in which I was a Minister of Finance.

The Honourable Member for St. George South has an office next to mine and he knows the kind of activity that goes on in there particularly on a Friday evening. People are taking up their money. They are not paying child support. You are seeing the child's mother hanging around and sitting on the stairs around the Central Bank Building trying to divert the fathers of the children to pay and get a little money out of them even where they have Court Orders in place for maintenance. I have seen this on several occasions when I have come downstairs and found women down there complaining about this kind of thing. The level of gambling in Barbados, particularly the lottery, is something that worries me considerably. It probably would **worry** me less but it would not obliterate my worry if the proceeds of that gambling was going towards some kind of charitable or philanthropic cause in more substantial amounts than it is presently. I hope the Government will do something about that because I think that is very important.  
5.50 p.m.

The second point relates to the increase in the number of gaming machines, which was done in the last Budget. There were supplications from all quarters to increase

the number of gaming machines on the pretext that the existing licences people had, that sometimes the licences were not matched by active machines, and therefore you may have licences for 300 machines but only 150 may have been active. I do not know what the figures were, but a decision was taken by the Minister of Finance in the last Budget to increase the number of gaming machines and it was not a decision with which I agreed, nor was it a decision with which the Democratic Labour Party agreed. It should have been predicated on the advice of the same Commission. You had \$200 000 paid to a Commission, of course it only investigated casino gambling, but you could have spent that \$200 000 paying somebody to draft new legislation in two or three weeks – because I am certain if you are paying them \$200 000 they would stop whatever else they were doing – to completely regulate the gambling industry in Barbados.

There is the problem with pay out, but I believe that the law does presently provide for a ratio. That is my recollection, but it is not being enforced. There are no inspectors and there is nobody who goes out and regularly checks the pay outs on the machine to see what they pay. One night I locked myself out of my office and went to the arcade in Spry Street and while I was calling I saw this machine with \$50 000 on it and I asked the girl who was dispensing the money if it ever paid out the \$50 000. Of course, she would not answer me, she just smiled, but then I asked somebody else and they said in the entire time they were in there – and he said it was about seven years he had been going in there – that machine never paid out \$50 000.

*Aside.*

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: You are probably right, \$50 000 from him, so that \$50 000 means pulling in. I believe there is a way to regulate it. The people who operate the machines also say they do not really make any handsome profit, because I have spoken to the operators of them and they also say they do not make a substantial profit, which means for them to make that profit the system needs to be regulated more. There are some people who have to pay arcade fees, as the Honourable Member for Christ Church South said, for operations which are not open for long enough hours. For example, we had the problem in the Port where the operator of an arcade, during the low season, may not see any tourists at all but he still has to pay the annual arcade fee. That is another matter that needs attention, because when he applied to the Ministry of Finance he said there is no power for the Minister to waive or adjust or **prorate** the arcade fee for the high season and a lesser fee for the other part, so the whole regime needs to be reassessed.

I am not saying it should be reassessed to put power in the hands of Ministers, I say it needs to be reassessed to add some detachment. The best people to put on that

Commission **are** religious ministers, because they know more about gambling, they know more about Bingo and other kinds of gambling for raising money and they could direct it to useful purposes, because the Betting and Gaming Committee when it grants you a licence sometimes requires you to make a contribution to a charitable entity, so let us say you have a Coney Island coming here, they tell you they will give you a licence but you have to give \$5 000 to the Child Care Board, \$5 000 to somewhere else, *et cetera*.

My suggestion would be detach it from public officers, from the political directorate and individuals such as ministers of religion maybe the best persons to regulate – maybe one of the players might be a **good** person – and you may find it is the same person.

*Aside.*

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I agree. I accept that and I think the suggestions that have been made **are** worthy. This is a small amendment, but I hope it will be followed by substantial revision to the law relative to betting and gaming.

Thank you, Sir.

Mr. D. St. E. **KELLMAN**: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to be **too** long on this issue. What has happened in Barbados is that we have introduced computer gambling,, into this country and we have not put in place **the** necessary checks to safeguard the players and the agents who are selling these tickets.

I honestly believe that whenever you have on-line gambling in Barbados there should be some checks to make sure that everything is going right. It is a serious thing to have a machine in your place and that machine is controlled by someone else, so I am calling on the relevant Government Department to make sure that the checks are put in place to ensure that nothing goes wrong with those machines.

That is all I will say at this time.

Hon. R. N. **GREENIDGE**: Mr. Speaker, when I was looking fairly closely at the Betting and Gaming Act, I realised that the Comptroller of Customs and his officers have a tremendous amount of responsibility under that particular Act, power really.

Customs obviously is concerned with ensuring that licences are obtained to import these slot machines. In other words, if you are bringing in a video game or a slot machine you have to get the approval, and I think it is a lot of responsibility not only in that respect, Mr. Speaker,

because they are also concerned with ensuring that the premises on which the machines are kept are licensed. You cannot put a bandit or video game at a location which is not licensed. If I am not mistaken, I think the places you can put them are gazetted. Whenever you move a machine from one place to the other you have to let them know, because that is their responsibility, and every year you should tell them where the machine is and they should come around to check, to confirm things like serial numbers. It is a lot of responsibility on them.

There are a lot of video games and, to me, people keep calling for new machines and new games very often. In a matter of months a machine can become obsolete and you find a lot of people then go into a different type of machine. When you **are** dumping a machine that is obsolete, for instance, an officer must accompany you to the dump to check that that serial number is now dumped and no longer working. It is a lot of responsibility. I feel **the** time is coming when we are going to have to look and **try** to come up with some other **structure**, some other regulatory agency to operate and to superintend gambling as a whole.

Customs obviously is also concerned with ensuring that the yearly fees are paid, so even if you have a machine that operates for one day you still have to pay your yearly fee. So the example given of someone in the Courts happens, because as I said just a single day and you will have to pay.  
6.00 p.m.

I am also aware of the point made by the Honourable Member for Christ Church South that there is a lot of discussion about the difference in the arcade fees where 2 machines or more you pay very high fees but you pay per machine at the hotels. I know that is causing some concern **as** well. I don't **think** we have reached the stage yet but I attended a conference on lotteries at Sam Lord's Castle a few weeks ago only to be told that in the United States certain games **are** actually tied into a central agency where Uncle Sam ensures that when you buy a ticket automatically you punch in and Uncle Sam gets his revenue. I don't **think** we have reached that stage, but it just goes to show the extent to which people are going nowadays.

If the only thing that certain custom officers had to do was to look after this portion of gambling, I would not have any objection to it. I believe that when they have their substantive work to do that we may very well have to look at getting some other system in place. A point made by the Honourable Member for Christ Church South, I know that there **are** a lot of complaints out there by customers and I believe that the same person who spoke to him actually spoke to me. A machine, for instance may malfunction to the disadvantage of a customer and whenever it happens

the customer feels the pinch. Obviously if it malfunctions to the advantage of the owner there is no problem, but patrons could very well complain that machines are not paying out. They are also saying that the owners are not listening to them when they complain about the machines not paying, that even if they complain to the Committee that the response to the complaint is not forthcoming as quickly as they would like.

Customs have no technicians to go around and check the machines. I believe that if we **are** going into this business that we have to train personnel to check the machines and find out whether they are tamper-proof or not. Someone who is playing a machine wants to know that and be confident as he plays.

In the United States I was informed at the same conference that they have technicians paid by Government who go around and examine the machines so as to ascertain whether they are performing properly or not. We have to realise, Sir, that people who can least afford to gamble in Barbados **are** the people who gamble and we have to protect them from themselves and we also have to protect them from the machines.

I agree with the Member for St. Michael South that we should be able to reconcile the amount of jackpot paid out with the total revenue intake of the machine. I believe that that is one way that we will have to make people feel much more confident when they play games. There should be some acceptable percentage **payout**.

The other point I would want to make is that in Barbados we cannot say that the lotteries have not made some contribution. They have ploughed back some of their profits into the community, whether through sports or whether it be donations to certain charitable organisations, but I do get the impression and I would ask other things like racing pools... To me there is not enough being ploughed into the community from those sources and our social services and sports could very well do with some contribution from them so that we would not have the impression that it is all take and nothing really coming back.

**Thank** you very much.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am quoting these papers as it were. This is not my substantive ministry but I can tell Honourable Members that the Prime Minister recently raised with us the possibility of moving this subject to another Ministry because I think all of us on this side and clearly those on that side are satisfied that we have to deal as a people with the question of gambling and it is a fact of modern life, contemporary societies, and it has to be regulated. I agree with the Honourable Minister of Labour that I cannot see how it can be properly regulated **as** an appendage of the Department of Customs.

From 1974 we had gambling machines in Barbados. It came in illegally. In 1974 they were protected by certain law enforcement personnel. Then the Barbados Labour Party in the period 1976-81 legalised them, but we saw the potentiality for corruption and the passing of money. Politicians were denied any involvement in the legislation or in the Committee and the Gambling Committee is a committee of civil servants headed by the Comptroller of Customs. What the Honourable Leader of the Opposition said is right. That was a deliberate policy to keep politicians out of the allurements of gambling.

It has never moved on. When Tom **Adams** was Prime Minister and Minister of Finance he had a better knowledge of gambling both theoretical and practical than anybody else in Barbados. He was a practitioner, an expert gambler, and he used to take an interest. It was for him a fetish. He loved it. Since then I don't think we have had any Ministers of Finance who had the same keen interest. He used to look after everything that was happening in that and presumably he would meet with the Comptroller of Customs from time to time and make suggestions to him by way of policy. But nothing has changed.

I do not believe that there is a secretariat which deals with the question of gambling that would feed up to the Minister policy suggestions for changing this and that. Everything is centralised at the Comptroller of Customs and perhaps we need to expand, create little secretariats. Certainly the country must be prepared to pay for an inspectorate, 5 or 6 people who will police these things, who will be trained, who know what to look for and to enforce to give the public confidence. All of that has to be done.

I expect, because as I said the Prime Minister raised it with some of us recently and I am at liberty to say that, that some time later on this year this whole matter will be looked at, but I want to deal generally with the point raised by the Honourable Member for **St. George** South. I have heard of the Happy Valley matter. I have not received any official correspondence setting out a systematic and detailed way what is the nature of the problem.

As I understand it, the Happy Valley organisation is being denied the right to carry American racing on their programmes. Now, let's stop and examine what is the problem. The other people who have the franchise or exclusive rights to the English racing get it because of a contractual situation between them and the Jockey Club in England. But why is it difficult to sell the programme to Happy Valley? I understand that the argument is that Happy Valley did not do what they should have done. Nobody has explained to me what it involves but in Government circles I am hearing that Happy Valley did not do what they should have done. I say, tell them what they must do and let them do it because there can be no argument on the part of the people who have the exclusive

licence to deny Happy Valley legitimately. I will tell you why. That group of persons who have that **franchise** have always had it and they were pleased to make arrangements for Caribbean Racing Service to carry English racing for donkey years.

6.10 p.m.

Another company established above there called "Triple Crown Racing," **Rodney** Jones, he carried English Racing. Now, if the people who have the franchise could give Jones and Cann on whatever terms, why cannot they give **Harewood** and his crowd? Surely, it seems to me to be some constitutional point about discrimination. It seems to me. I do not know all the details but I am only speaking from what information I have and I want **certain** people up there to carry me. I am speaking from limited information but I really cannot understand the argument and the thing should be tested.

#### *Asides.*

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: They were always giving other people. How all of a sudden this fellow cannot get? Okay, they have an exclusive arrangement. You cannot tell them who to sell to but come and say why. Explain why you were selling to Cann and to Jones. It is not a matter that is in my Ministry. I want to make it clear.

Sir, I hope the assurances I have given Honourable Members that the Government is very concerned about the way that gambling is being carried on in Barbados without adequate policing, inspection, enforcement of the law and, indeed, to my mind, in some cases with a certain degree of illogicality. Now, let me tell you.

A gentleman, a very respectable Barbadian, complained to me some weeks ago. The Honourable Member for Christ Church South knows this gentleman. He has a little hotel property. He wanted to bring in two machines from overseas and the Gambling Committee told him that he cannot bring in machines. He must buy machines locally from people who have machines in Barbados.

#### *Aside.*

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: If certain people we know, we cannot call the names in here, who are the big popes, who have the big machines, as a small man and you want two, you have to go and buy from them. Now, I think that is **completely** wrong. I could understand when the policy was set up in the late 1970s you were watching the **outflow** of foreign reserves and, therefore, it was routed through the Gambling Committee. You had to get an import licence so they could **see** how much money was going out to bring in machines. The reserves are

\$560 million. Somebody wants to bring in two machines and you are going to tell a man that he must be forced to buy a secondhand machine that is manufactured in the year "dot" that somebody locally will want to sell him for \$10 000 when he can get a new machine, a 1996 model, for \$3 000. What madness? All that foolishness needs to be changed.

**Aside.**

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I do not have responsibility for the business but I do not like cats. I do not like dogs but I love a horse. I love a racehorse. I know a little bit about them.

Sir, this is a matter we need to ventilate more at another date but I **am** grateful to Honourable Members who spoke.

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

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: I beg to second that.

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

*On the motion of Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, seconded by Hon. G. W. PAYNE, the House resolved itself into Committee, Mr. D. CARTER in the Chair.*

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

*Clauses 1 - 8 inclusive were called and passed.*

*On the motion of Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, seconded by Hon. G. W. PAYNE, the CHAIRMAN reported to His Honour the SPEAKER, the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*

*On the separate motions of Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, seconded by Hon. G. W. PAYNE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.*

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for the day. I beg to move that this Honourable House do now adjourn until Friday, May 17, 1996 at 11.00 o'clock in the morning.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the motion before the House and to say that it is customary that the House be given at least a week's notice when the presentation of the Financial Statement and the

Budgetary Proposals are to be announced. Obviously, if the House meets on Friday, Sir, what I have to say would be cutting it short. I just want to serve notice, speaking on the Adjournment, that it is my intention to present the annual Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals to the House on Tuesday, May 21, 1996 at 5.00 o'clock in the afternoon. A relevant motion for the adjournment of the House on Friday to accommodate that will be done, and that a relevant motion for the adjournment of the House on Friday to accommodate that will be done but I **am** just giving the House notice at least a week in advance of that announcement.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the adjournment I would like to ...  
6.20 p.m.

**Asides.**

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the adjournment I think I would want to bring to the House's attention that a matter that was debated in this House on the last sitting, a matter concerning comments that were made during the ...

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member. You are out of order. Please take your seat.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I **am** speaking on the adjournment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member would you take your seat, please? Honourable Members over the past few weeks I should say I have noticed Members speaking on the adjournment seeming to believe that they can speak on anything on the adjournment. There are rules of this House and I **am** asking you, Honourable Members, to observe these rules. Standing Order 17 clearly states that if a Member so desires to raise a matter on the adjournment he must move the substantive motion. The Honourable Member for St. Michael East you are out of order. You have not presented such a motion to this House it cannot now be entertained.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I **am** rising to second the motion. I hope that notice was properly given by the Prime Minister just now, getting up and speaking on the Adjournment.

**Asides.**

*The question that the Honourable House do now adjourn until Friday, May 17, 1996 at 11.00 a.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.*  
6.25 p.m.

## CONTENTS

## MINUTES

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS ..... 3040

**Confirmation** of Minutes of Tuesday, May 7, 1996.

## PAPERS

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON ..... 3040

The Sanitation Service Authority (Fees) (Amendment) Regulations, **1996**.

## STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

Rt. Hon. **O. S. ARTHUR** ..... 3040

## SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS ..... 3041

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

## GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 8 – THE ENVIRONMENTAL LEVY BILL, 1996 ..... 3041

Rt. Hon. **O. S. Arthur**, 3041; Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 3042.

## STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

Rt. Hon **O. S. ARTHUR** ..... 3045

Statement to the effect that Her Majesty the Queen has appointed Hon. Sir **Clifford S. Husbands**, Q.C., as Governor-General of Barbados with effect from 1st June, 1996.

## GOVERNMENT BUSINESS (resumed)

ORDER NO. 8 (resumed) ..... 3045

Mr. J. **O. Tudor**, 3045,3048,3053,3056,3077; Hon. Sir Harold St. John, 3047, 3060; Hon. Miss H. E. Thompson, 3047,3056,3065; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 3058, 3059, 3074; Hon. D. A. C. Simmons, 3059, **3060**; Mr. D. St. E. **Kellman**, 3061; His Honour R. D. Marshall, 3069; Mr. D. J. H. Thompson, 3070; Rt. Hon. **O. S. Arthur**, 3072,3074.

ORDER NO. 6 – **BETTING** AND GAMING DUTIES BILL, 1996 ..... 3079

Hon. D. A. C. Simmons, 3079,3084; Mr. L. R. Tull, 3080; Hon. Sir Harold St. John, 3081; Mr. D. J. H. Thompson, 3082; Mr. D. St. E. Kellman, 3083; Hon. R. N. **Greenidge**, 3083.

SUSPENSION ..... 3053

ADJOURNMENT ..... 3086

Hon. D. A. C. Simmons, 3086; Rt. Hon. **O. S. Arthur**, 3086; Mr. J. **O. Tudor**, 3086.

## SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, Rt. Hon. **O. S.** (St. Peter)  
 GREENIDGE, Hon. R. N. (**St. Philip** North)  
**HAYNES**, Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central)  
 KELLMAN, Mr. D. St. E. (St. Lucy)  
 MARSHALL, **His** Honour R. D. (St. Michael West Central)  
 MILLER, Hon. Miss B. A. (City of Bridgetown)  
 St. JOHN, Hon. Sir Harold (Christ Church South)  
**SANDIFORD**, Rt. Hon. L. E. (St. Michael South)  
 SIMMONS, Hon. D. A. C. (St. **Thomas**)  
 THOMPSON, Mr. D. J. H. (St. John)  
 THOMPSON, Hon. Miss H. E. (St. James South)  
 TUDOR, Mr. J. **O.** TUDOR, (St. Michael East)  
 TULL, Mr. L. R. (St. **George** South)