
THE SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

THE SENATE

Wednesday, 22nd October, 1980.

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Public Buildings, on Wednesday the 22nd October, 1980, at 2.45 p.m.

PRESENT

His Honour Senator the Honourable Sir ARNOTT CATO, M.B., Ch.B., LL.D., (President); His Honour Senator the Rev. G. ANDREW HATCH, M.A., (Deputy President); Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW, B.A., LL.B., (Minister of Information) (Leader of the Senate); Senator O'BRIEN TROTMAN, (Parliamentary Secretary, Prime Minister's Office); Senator Sir MENCEA COX; Senator H. F. G. ROCHEFORD, B.A.; Senator R. L. FIELD; Senator AARON TRUSS; Senator K. E. HINDS; Senator Miss O. A. LYNCH, B.A., Dip. Ed.; Senator Mrs. E. M. LYNCH, B.A.; Senator J. D. S. MACKENZIE; Senator Miss M. I. St.C. BLACKMAN; Senator J. C. W. WICKHAM and Senator R. E. BRATHWAITE.

Prayers were read by Rev. Dr. L. A. CRAWFORD.

ABSENT

Senators J. CONNELL, D. HUNTE, C. DEANE, K. HEWITT, H. LINTON, and the Hon. D. G. BLACKMAN.

EXCUSE FOR ABSENCE

Senators C. DEANE; K. HEWITT; H. LINTON and Hon. D. G. BLACKMAN.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, just before I gave notice of the Items before me, it

has just struck me that Senator Blackman's name was omitted from the list of persons for whom there have been excuses and he is out of the country on Government Business. If you would permit, Sir, I think his name should be added to the list.

Mr. President, I beg to give notice of the following:—

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Mount Tabor, St. John, for the construction of a Primary School.

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Husbands and Oxnards, St. James, for the provision of recreational facilities.

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Bank Hall, St. Michael, for housing development.

A Bill to reform the law respecting trespass to property.

A Bill to reform the law respecting civil liability for animals.

A Bill to provide for the improvement of Administrative justice in Barbados and for related matters.

A Bill respecting enquiries to advise and to investigate.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Let it be recorded in the Minutes that these Bills have been read a first time.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

Mr. PRESIDENT: Call Order No. 4.

DEFENCE ACT, 1979

Order No. 4 was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Defence Act, 1979—25.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barrow.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, prior to announcing the First Order, reflected Sir, in what has now become common practice in this Honourable Chamber that the Order Paper cannot possibly be made up, without a mistake. I believe Sir, that it was only the last Sitting, that I pointed out, that a number of the items which were according to the Order Paper down for a First Reading had already been read a First Time and indeed, the only item which was set down for First Reading which had legitimately so been set down, was this Bill which is now before us, the Bill to amend the Defence Force Act. It seems as though, when one draws attention to these matters, the ears which receive the comment are indeed, deaf ears.

I mentioned that too Sir, because of the state of disorder of the Honourable Senate Chamber, up to the time which we were supposed to meet this evening. By disorder, of course, I am not suggesting that it looks as though people had had a fight, but simply that up to 2.30 p.m. nobody had seemed to worry about preparing the Honourable Chamber for the Meeting. I believe that if this sort of slackness continues to pass unobserved, only the good Lord knows what next we might expect. I believe, that the Administration of Parliament will have to do a great deal to pull its socks up and to ensure at least, that this Honourable Chamber is treated with the dignity which it deserves. We can only speak for ourselves. We do not know what happens in the Other Place.

In relation to the Item before us, Sir, it is not only a short Bill, but indeed, it is a simple Bill which does not have a great deal of substance to it and therefore, I thought that we could take it and get it out of the way. In the framing of the original Bill, there is provision for persons transferring into the Defence Service from the Public Service including Sir, the teaching service, to preserve their rights of Pensions Legislation affecting them. At the time, Sir, I believe that somebody had the notion that such transfers would only be temporary because in Section 226, Sub-section One, the word temporarily has slipped in before the word "transferred". I think Sir, that the implications of that would be obvious to anyone simply that those who transferred temporarily would be in a position far more favourably, than those who decided to transfer and make a career service to the Defence Force. That Sir, cannot possibly be the intention and the real point and this Legislation before us, is to ensure that persons who wish to transfer from the Public Service including the teaching service

into the Defence Force and make a new career there will be able to continue their Pension rights.

The rest of the Bill, Sir, is a matter of clearing up an omission; that is, in Section 164, sub-section Five, there was no definition of adopted child and this omission it is taking the opportunity here Sir, to remedy by providing such an omission.

Finally, Sir, we ourselves passed the Status of Children Act to eradicate references to illegitimate children and this Bill is now being cleaned, by taking the opportunity here to eradicate such references in the Defence Act.

Those Sir, are the three Provisions of this Bill and I believe Sir, that it would not be difficult to invite support for them:

1. that there should be a Provision for the transfer, not only temporarily, but also permanently of members of the Public Service without jeopardising their Pension rights;
2. that there should be a definition of adopted child in this Legislation; and
3. that references to illegitimate child should be eradicated from the Defence Act.

Those are the three points in this Legislation and I therefore move that this Bill be read a Second time.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just before I propose the question, I will advert to some of the remarks made by the Hon. Leader of the Senate in his opening speech and just say that I have spoken very firmly to those concerned and I sincerely hope, that they will all pull their socks up and not leave room for these sort of statements to have to be made again.

It is proposed that this Bill be now read a second time..... Senator Rocheford.

SENATOR H. F. G. ROCHEFORD: Mr. President, my comment is to do with some of the things which have been said by Senator Barrow himself, to do with the Order Paper and I do not think, that I should stop making remarks about these things because I want to see them gone out of the way myself. For instance, it says this Bill first appeared in the Official Gazette on the 29th September, 1980. I receive the Official Gazette all the time and I have not seen the Official Gazette for 29th September, 1980, the last I received is dated August. This makes a mockery of it, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am not quite sure of the validity of that point. If the Gazette has been published,

it has been published. That is another matter whether the Hon. Member has received it. Anyway, the main point is that the Hon. Member gets his Papers in proper form.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put to the Honourable Senate and agreed to.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. Barrow, the Senate resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill Senator the Rev. A. Hatch in the Chair.

SENATOR K. E. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Bill be taken as read.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, just before we report I would like to ensure that the commencement clause, which is clause 4, does exist on the copy of the Bill which is for the signature of the President. It appears in the Arrangement of Sections, but as to whether the commencement clause says that this Bill shall come into force on what date or by proclamation or how, no such clause appears on the printed copy which I have.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the printed copy which stands in the President's folder page 2 does not appear either, so it seems that some major lacunae in the printing of this Bill, to which the Clerks will pay their attention to make sure that the full and unabridged version be signed by the President.

The question that the Senate do resume and the Bill be reported was put to the Senate and agreed to, and Mr. President resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, in reporting that the Bill has passed the Committee without amendment, I believe members would like the assurance in my reporting that the Bill has passed without amendment that in the copy which is for your signature clause 4 which reads: "The principal Act shall have effect and shall be deemed always to have had effect as amended by this Act," does in fact exist. I do hope, Sir, that something will be done about this sort of nonsense.

I would like to report that the Bill has passed the Committee without amendment, and move that it be read a third time forthwith.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Again before I put the question, it is obvious that there has been some carelessness in the

circulating of this Bill. The Bill that was sent to members originally as far as I know, and certainly as far as mine was concerned, had all the clauses, but it seems that the Bill that have been sent out with the Order Papers, portions are missing, either page 3 or page 2. Anyway, the Bill that has been passed by the Committee is the whole Bill with all the clauses up to clause 4.

The question that the Bill be read a third time forthwith was put to the Senate and agreed to.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I move that this Bill do now pass.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

THE MENTAL HEALTH ACT 1980

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, the two major Items before us this afternoon both relate to matters of health. Both indeed have quite significant implications for the care of persons in our community, and this one which deals with the care of persons of unsound mind seeks indeed to consolidate the law, to modernise the law and particularly to ensure that the approach to the treatment of those who are not of sound mind be removed from that general atmosphere in which such persons were treated as though they had committed some heinous crime.

While at one level in our community we have long ago accepted, Sir, that someone who has a mental illness is exactly what that would imply, somebody who is ill, old practices and old beliefs die hard, and the general attitude of the community is always indeed reflected in laws. Sometimes happily the community moves ahead of the laws and the laws then have to catch up, but I believe, Sir, it is true to say that there is still in this country, as indeed reflected in the present laws, some stigma attached to being mentally ill, which stigma is not attached in the same way to having some form of physical illness. I believe, Sir, there are those who would argue that there are certain kinds of physical illness brought about perhaps by ones own wrong doing or undoing which perhaps should carry greater stigma if stigma were to be attached at all to illness.

Basically, Sir, what this Bill seeks to provide is reflected in this sort of synopsis. Where previously a man who at a hospital or an approved home had carnal connections with someone who was receiving treatment at that hospital or home, that was an offence.

The Bill recognises that offenders in such circumstances are not necessarily male and recognises that that sort of conduct is not to be encouraged, and the provision would be that any person having such connection would be guilty of an offence. The law relating to mental health is by this Bill revised and consolidated. You will find the categorising of patients into voluntary patients, medically recommended patients, hospital order patients. You will find, Sir, that where a person is believed to be suffering from mental disorder that the police have certain obligations under the law; you will find a provision for a Mental Health Review Board; where persons claim that they are unreasonably detained, there is to be machinery for dealing with such complaints. You will find administrative sections like sections 14 and 16, one of which outlines the duties and responsibilities of the Mental Health Director, and the other of which places the staff of the mental hospital under the general direction of the Chief Medical Officer. There are in this Bill provisions for the Court to exercise certain powers regarding the management of property and affairs of persons whom the Court on medical evidence considers incapable of managing their property and affairs.

The Bill is a comprehensive Bill and really, Sir, again there is nothing I can find in here which can cause contention really, and it is difficult in a Bill of this sort therefore to seek to meet objections when objections seem as though they can hardly arise. We do have to have legislation of this sort, and we have to ensure that there is a sufficient legal framework within which persons who are not of sound mind may be looked after and properly provided for. This is not, Sir, an item that stands by itself, because I think it has to be seen as part of the general approach to the care of the mentally unwell in that there has been a lot of activity going on in this area, not the kind of activity that would indeed catch headlines, but the kind of activity that certainly would make for a better life for those who are unfortunately in the institution at Black Rock. The Government has prepared a dormitory for mentally retarded children. They have upgraded the Grassfield Ward which is a main ward and which is a long-staying ward. The OB Ward has been upgraded and proper lavatory and bathroom facilities have been provided, completed the dining hall area, recreational area, nursing station of the Observation Ward which is a female ward. Work has been done on another female ward, E Ward in the dining hall area; work done on the nursing administration office, work on the maximum security unit to the tune of some \$200,000 for its complete renovation. There has been constant upgrading of the old school building for recreational centres and for teaching and also for use as a church for in-patients. Buildings have been converted into change rooms for maintenance staff, emergency lights have been installed in key areas in the event of power cuts, beds have replaced cots to the tune of 150 of such items, one ward has even had

a solar heating system installed. The child guidance clinic and centre was started, an alcoholic and drug information centre was started, and the services offered by the rehabilitation unit in the field of ceramics and plant nursery have been extended, and these things also with general maintenance amount to a significant on-going expenditure because you cannot just leave the buildings looking drab and claim to be providing a service and put in some staff and call it George. The ordinary maintenance alone was over \$100,000 a year for each of the last three years.

There has been significant increases in staff whether by provision of a psycho-therapist or psychologist or the twenty additional nurses and nursing assistants, 20 as temporary posts and some two Sisters and eight nurses and two nursing assistants, two occupational therapy assistants on the permanent establishment, a Hospital Director of course which they never had before, and an accountant. There has been significant provision of staff including as you will see, Sir, a cook now added to make it 13 cooks for the institution; so that both the medical staff has been kept up, the para-medical staff has been kept up and increased, and also we have had security guards and all the other support services which are necessary for a hospital.

This of course, Sir, is not the end of the line because there has to be on-going re-evaluation of the facilities for the care of the mentally ill, and at the same time a review and examination of new approaches to mental health and a general review and examination of our own provisions for looking after those who are not mentally well.

What this Bill seeks to do, Sir, is to provide the framework within which the care which is so seriously needed can be provided. It is a Bill largely about the administrative arrangements and the location of certain powers.

Mr. President, I move that this Bill be now read a second time.

SENATOR H. ROCHEFORD: Mr. President, I am happy to know that there has been consolidation of the administration of the Mental Hospital. I have been in recent times having to pay some visits to that Institution because of the fact that certain volunteers of our Organisation have been assigned there and I did get the impression that in recent times there has not been as much attention paid to the Sheltered Workshop as used to be paid in the past.

I was there visiting the Nursery which was developed by our Two Peace Corps Volunteers and it struck me that there was need for some attention to the grounds up there. There is a large area of grounds and I

wanted to hear too that the Mental Hospital does no longer carry on a Pig Farm which was a great source of revenue, I believe, as in past times so I am very glad to hear that there is effort being made to look after some of the buildings and grounds of the Mental Hospital because there is a lot of land there and it should not stay and waste at the moment and I am very happy to know that something is being done about it.

SENATOR K. HINDS: Mr. President, just to associate myself with the remarks made by Senator Rocheford. On a previous discussion on the Mental Hospital I raised the question about that Sheltered Workshop. I, too, am not satisfied that in this day and age the Workshop looks the way it should look.

It is a very useful thing. I am sure a lot of members of the public do not know what can be done in this Workshop. Printing, there is a Tailor Shop, Woodwork and in addition to that a section which deals with Agriculture and I believe there is a lot of room for improvement.

Some time ago in a private conversation with the Minister, she told me that they did not do any advertising because they would get more work than they could handle but my feeling is that if the facilities at the Sheltered Workshop were to be up-dated, then the Workshop itself would serve a much more useful purpose than it is serving at the moment.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put to the Senate and agreed to.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. Barrow, the Senate resolved itself into Committee to study the Bill, Senator the Rev. A. Hatch, in the Chair.

On the motion of Senator K. Hinds, the Bill was taken as read and in parts.

Part I was called.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: I beg to move that Part I stand part.

SENATOR R. L. FIELD: Mr. President, on page 4 Part I "relative" means "husband, wife, son, daughter, parent, brother or sister of the whole blood" and it goes on right down and everything relates to whole blood and I am wondering what would be the position with the half blood. In other words, recently we have been coming to this Chamber with legislation protecting or trying to do whatever, particularly the Succession Act, doing things which we thought would assist people of the half blood whether it be illegitimacy or whatever it may be termed, but here as I see this, there is no provision made here for

those people of the half blood. Can the Minister probably enlighten me on that?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Minister suffers from certain disabilities since the pages between 2 and 27 do not appear in his Bill at all.

SENATOR H. ROCHEFORD: While we are now waiting one slight, perhaps, facetious comment. It seems that we can now call it Mental Hospital again.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Senator Barrow.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I believe Sir that the answer to Senator Field's point is to be found in the fact that this Legislation is Legislation which has been revised and brought down really, by way of amendment of similar Legislation which was introduced into Parliament, I think it was in 1975. I am trying to find my reference here Sir, but, the fact is that in July, 1971, that is, under the previous Administration, a decision was taken that the Law should be revised and consolidated. It took from then, until 1975 for this Legislation to come down and when it came down, the amended Bill was passed by the Honourable House of Assembly on 27th April, 1976, but there are a number of unsatisfactory Clauses which caused the Honourable Senate to defer the Legislation, for further consideration to be given to these Clauses because these offending Clauses gave the Police too much power, by authorising them to take into custody, any person who was suspected to be suffering from a mental disorder.

The Bill went back for redrafting therefore, and the focus in the redrafting would be on the points raised by the Honourable Senate and on comments of the Chief Justice, the Association of Medical Practitioners, the Hospital Director, the Mental Hospital itself, and so on. My interpretation Sir, of what is before us is that, in all of that, while they were settling the points which were the disputed points, the Status of Children Legislation did not come into their minds and therefore, we have a Legislation here, which I think there is going to have to be some further cleaning up with, if it is going to reflect the present position as reflected in the Status of Children Act. But that, I am sorry, if I said that in my Second Reading Speech, the fact that it had been sent back by the Honourable Senate in 1976 because of dissatisfaction with certain of its Provisions. I believe that this would have made it reasonably clear how this sort of contradiction comes to be in the Bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Senator Field.

SENATOR R. L. FIELD: Mr. Chairman, I think that the explanation by the Hon. Minister is quite satisfactory. However, I would hope that some Provision

be made, as soon as possible, to correct the anomaly set out here in this Bill because further down under (2):-

'The word "parent" shall be construed within the context of the Succession Act.'

But, it does not bring the other Bill into focus, so I hope that something would be done, as soon as possible, to have this corrected.

I thank you, Mr. Minister for explaining the position.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Senator Barrow.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, Senator Field's comments will certainly be passed on to the Hon. Minister responsible, but I just want to make a further point which I did not make and depending Sir, on what role a relative can play, I believe that the Ministry, might in fact — I believe that it might in fact have come to their attention and they might have been hesitant to tackle the problem before without having worked out the sociological implications of tackling that problem because I think that we know very well Sir, that in these family arrangements, we have a certain mix in Barbados, in some instances, extended family, in some instances, nuclear family, whatever you ask I think that we have it.

Parts I to V inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. Barrow, the Senate was resumed and the passing of the Bill was reported to the Senate and Mr. President resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. Barrow, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Order No. 2 was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to provide for the establishment of a Drug Service for Barbados.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barrow.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, this is a matter to which a great deal of publicity has been given. If Sir, I go back to the 1976 Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party, on page 11, there is a specific undertaking to establish a National Health Service for all Barbadians and there is the statement within that context:

"The Party will therefore provide for the price of drugs prescribed by doctors to patients within the Health Service to be reduced, or standardised."

There is also an undertaking in this fundamental part of the Manifesto:

"The entire Programme will be worked out in consultation with the Medical profession."

What we have before us, Sir, is a relatively simple piece of legislation, one that does not need to be passed by any special majority as did the revolutionary tenancies legislation, but one which is of fundamental importance to us all in that it touches on the lives of every single member of the community. People may devise ways of staying out of the National Insurance Scheme by managing neither to be self-employed nor to be employed by another party, or by being sufficiently unfortunate indeed as not to be able to find a job at any time in their lives. People may find ways of staying out of school completely, and indeed a number of persons like Senator Lynch expressed very serious concern with truancy in the educational system, but I know nothing, Sir, that man may elect to do that can free him from the incidence of the activities of medical services. He is bound to be affected in some way by what goes on in relation to the provision for medical care, and fundamental of course to medical care is the availability of drugs, and fundamental to cheap or free medical care is the availability of cheap or free drugs.

While, therefore, the legislation before us, legislation which in one way or other has been treated in the Press whether in the report of the very extensive speech made by the Minister of Health introducing this matter in the Other Place, a speech, Sir, which is as voluminous as what you see in my right hand, and which was a speech of very high quality giving the analysis that only one who has been as familiar with the whole exercise and who has pioneered it could do, only such a person could impose such authority and quality in the course of that speech, but throughout I can find something here like well over 130 Press clippings referring in one way or other to the drug service, the drug scheme, the National Health Service, the expansion and provision of more polyclinics, all of the varying aspects of the programme for the medical care of the community, and a great deal of the comment and a great deal of the reporting has had to do with this aspect of the provision of medical care for the community.

Mr. President, I said before this is not the legislation that requires a special majority, but for all that it is legislation which has far reaching effect. The Bill provides for the establishment of a drug service in Barbados and for the administration of that service by the setting up of a drug service office with a Director and other necessary staff. The Director is charged under this Bill with ensuring that an adequate stock of drugs is available at all times and at a reasonable price. He is permitted by this Bill to contract with persons local and

overseas for the provision of drugs for the drug service. There is provision within this Bill for the preparation of a drug formulary and for the operation of a Drug Formulary Committee. I believe, Sir, that every Senator has seen a copy of the drug formulary which has been the product of a great deal of hard work. It has been produced by a Committee on which a number of people have given their time, the President of the Barbados Pharmaceutical Society — and in her speech in the Other Place the Minister made the point that that Society gave every cooperation and is giving and has been giving every co-operation to the Ministry in this exercise — the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners whose nominee is Dr. Jane Yeo who is a general practitioner, Dr. Henry Fraser — and some of us will remember Dr. Fraser as a very bright youngster at school, a Barbados Scholar who has gone on really to distinguish himself, he is a pharmacologist, the only one in Barbados, and is here as a member of the University of the West Indies staff. I am told he is a clinical pharmacologist. There is Dr. Graham who is chairperson of the Queen Elizabeth Drug Committee, Dr. George Mahy, the chairman of the Formulary Committee, who is a psychiatrist, he is attendant psychiatrist at the Psychiatric Hospital, Dr. Rao, public health doctor in charge of the polyclinic at Warrens, and the Director in the drug service is Mr. John Turnbull.

The names, Sir, are mentioned because one needs to understand that in the Manifesto where we pledged ourselves to achieve close consultation with the medical practitioners it was not an idle statement because we recognised that programmes of this nature, far reaching as they are and holding out as great hope as they do, are not achievable unless the cooperation of those who are most deeply involved in their operation is secured right from the start.

I believe that the Ministry is on record as being in praise of the doctors and pharmacists and those others who are closely involved in the operation of the National Health Service for the amount of time and energy and the cooperation which the Ministry has been receiving from these people. The Bill, Sir, permits a pharmacist to select and dispense an interchangeable pharmaceutical product of lesser cost than the one prescribed unless the person prescribing specifically directs otherwise, and the reason for that is that there is an abundance of information to indicate that the brand name sometimes is all that accounts for the difference in price, and this has been the experience of countries who have such services or who monitor this sort of thing. For example, the United States has been quite reactionary in relation to providing medical care for its population. However, this does not mean that the Food and Drug Administration which is the Federal Agency does not monitor closely what is happening in the field of drugs, and it is the publication indeed of that agency that has

made the point quite recently that as people move towards dealing in generic names, they have indeed been able to achieve great economies. If I can find the exact reference I shall make it available. What the document says is that “with rare exception products of the same formulation and approved for use are therapeutically equivalent regardless of the brand or commercial name under which they may be marketed”. That is a point made in a paper “Increased Use of Generic Drugs in U.S. Health Care” which is put out by the FDA.

The point therefore, Sir, is that if a pharmacist has to substitute, again a provision which countries which have this kind of legislation always exhibit, the legislation of Saskatchewan as indeed the legislation of Ontario will reveal this, that if you are to take full advantage of reducing costs and also getting treatment which is prescribed, then the pharmacist has to be allowed to substitute only where the cost is less. This, Sir, is a little different from what obtains at present, which is that a pharmacist never really changes what is prescribed unless he telephones the doctor and gets clearance on the point first. In this particular case what we are saying is that the formulary is available and the information is there as to what is the equivalent drug, and therefore action is easier taken in the interest of the patient's pocket.

The framework, Sir, of the legislation is to provide for the fact that a community owes a responsibility to its citizens to ensure that those who have need of certain services are provided with those services. This is a country, Sir, in which the incidence of diabetes is alarmingly high and all of the evidence that I have ever been made aware of says that diabetes is a very expensive illness. From what little I know of it, Sir, it is clear that persons who once they have it seem to continue to have it for the rest of their lives, and that if they are careless then that life may be both miserable and short, and drugs are particularly important to diabetes and to persons who suffer from hypertension, and the information is again that in these cases that requires a great deal of expense. Again there are children under six years old and there are citizens over sixty-five, one pre-school, the other outside the work market, and these in particular represent categories where the strain of having to purchase drugs within the present context is peculiarly severely felt.

We trust, Sir, that by the time the entire National Health Service has been brought into being and all of the programmes of the drug service have been phased in, then it will not be nearly as burdensome to Barbadians, those perhaps in the minority, who have to make regular use of medical service and of drugs through illness.

It would not be as burdensome for them now as it is today. I believe, Sir, that a number of people do not wish to take this kind of legislation with the kind of seriousness that it deserves because to some extent we have always managed to enjoy in this country a certain level of subsidised medicine.

The Queen Elizabeth Hospital has never functioned purely as a Hospital Casualty and this has caused problems but at the same time it has taken a lot of pressure off a lot of people and if you want to improve the Hospital care, the Casualty after all being an emergency area, then it means that provision must be made throughout the country to take off that load and to provide that people are looked after in a competent manner. Hence, we have had to develop the District Hospitals.

The Polyclinics too are well on the road to providing for each Barbadian to go to his or her Doctor and not be burdened with the cost of that. It seems, Sir, that may be in this community we need to be reminded a little bit of one of the harsher facts of life where Government does not deliver as its priority Medical Care to its citizens. I am referring to the fact of life of which Americans are exposed everyday and from which a lot of them are only shielded by Insurance. The fact that people should have spent a lifetime working and who have accumulated reasonable savings can sometimes see it completely wiped out by a single incident.

I believe, Sir, that we should not fool ourselves about this because even in this country Medical Care is expensive. When we look at the Indices within the Cost of Living Index, when we look at the Statistics as the cost of living moves from period to period, one of the things that we notice moving quite significantly is always the cost of Medical Care and this is not a reflection purely, Sir, of the activities of those who join the profession in a day much later than yours, Mr. President, and who set fees which perhaps are so many times more than yours might have been, Sir, or might be. It is also a reflection of the cost of drugs.

I think we have to recognise that the fact that a man or woman who is ill can go into a public ward in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and be looked after completely free of charge is an extremely important fact which belongs only to the realm of socialist medicine. I believe that we must recognise, Sir, that if the continued care for the whole of the population has to be taken to its locality of collection, then we can only go where the programme of this Party is taking it which is into a full National Health Service.

This Drug Plan which we are legislating today is fundamentally part of the National Health Service. It represents perhaps the most far reaching legislation which

would have come down in the first term of this Government. It touches everything. It is not an attempt to interfere with anybody's livelihood. It is an attempt to provide for a happier life for the entire community.

It cannot start by making provision for everybody immediately. It is the intention to move there. We are not taking the chance, Sir, of importing drugs and being left with a lot of drugs on our hands when those drugs have passed the time which the Manufacturers would guarantee their usefulness. You will notice that we are talking about six months periods and we are talking about a new Formulary every six months. It has been years of study and years of hard work that have been gone into producing this Legislation before us.

I believe, Sir, the fact that it is a matter of four years is what will tend to mislead people but it has only been possible to get this before Parliament in 1980 because work on the National Health Service begun immediately this Government was elected.

The point about drugs and their cost, the point, Sir, about bulk purchasing and bringing down the cost of the drugs the point about the removal of duty further affecting the cost of the drug, all of that, Sir, should be taken with the cost which must be realised, when once we deal with drugs by their generic names.

In April, this year Valium was sold at \$81.79 per thousand. Diazepam, which is the generic name, Appo-Diazepam, is now going at \$5.00 per thousand. That may be one of the more extreme examples and not being the Minister who has to work on all of these and therefore not having the opportunity to look at all of these things as closely as she would, I cannot speak as easily on the various drugs whose costs would be favourably affected by ordering in bulk as indeed she would be able to.

But, just let us look at it Sir, that the example of the Beckles Road Geriatric Hospital already suggests, their own experience suggests something of the probable effect, even if we are not looking at reducing at a level which I just mentioned, when I mentioned a tranquiliser. The Beckles Road Hospital, for all the drug items bought in the month of April this year paid \$9,262.00. This is a supply for a month and with a partial operation of the Scheme because remember, Sir, pilots have been running, we have been running trials all year. With the partial operation of the Scheme, the cost of the same drugs for the same hospital, in September, 1980 was reduced from \$9,262.00 to \$7,398.00, or something approaching \$1,900.00 which may not sound like a lot of money, but when you multiply through, then you see exactly how much money it is, Sir. I do not believe Sir, that I should take up the time of

this Honourable Chamber going through more and more examples of this kind of thing.

I believe indeed, that the most I could do is to sound the learned, if I refer to things like the cost of Altomet in April, 1980, \$293.96 per thousand, compared with Carnet within the same generic pool and manufactured here, in Barbados, at \$79.00 per thousand. There are many, many examples Sir, but they just lead to the same point, that once one purchases generic, rather than brand, there are substantial cost savings to be realised and if that were all, then, that in itself would justify the Service. As I said, Sir, the Service has to be seen as a fundamental part of the National Health Scheme and only then, Sir, are we likely to understand how far reaching the Legislation before us is.

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

Mr. PRESIDENT: It is proposed that this Bill be now read a second time.....Senator Hatch.

SENATOR THE REV. A. HATCH: Mr. President, it is with a certain diffidence that one enters into the sphere of drugs in this Honourable Chamber, where you are the one qualified, more than any of the rest of us to be knowledgeable on this subject and indeed, my particular concern does not relate to drugs themselves, but to the dangers of bribery and corruption in the administration of the National Drug Service.

It is known that amongst the transnational corporations, the chemical industry ranks high as one of those which have made millions. For example, the Lilly Foundation in the mid-west of the United States of America was, up to two years ago, able to distribute US\$52,000.00 per annum which was not on the Lilly Foundation's assets and the distribution of \$52,000.00 from the Lilly Foundation did not affect the capital of which the Lilly Foundation was established and the Lilly Foundation was launched with funds aggregated from the manufacture of chemicals and drugs. So, I think that it is fair to say that if societies and particularly Third World societies are concerned and need to be extraordinarily vigilant at the operations, or is it Senator Wickham's, "at the operations of transnational corporations", I think that those involved in the chemical industry, with particular reference to this Bill, need particular attention.

For example, it is reported that aluminium interests have spent, in the past, millions of dollars to get rid of fluorides which is a by-product of the manufacture of aluminium, but they have persuaded water authorities to buy fluoride and this has proved advantageous to the manufacturers of aluminium. One understands that the manufacturers of sweets, soft drinks and cakes have also joined the lobby to persuade water authorities to fluoridate the water supply since someone has pointed

out that if you eat sweet things, cakes, soft drinks, candies, but the water is fluoridated, then the incidence of tooth decay would be lessened. I draw this illustration, not to deal primarily with fluoridation at this stage, but to the enormous power of transnational corporations and particularly of the manufacturers of chemicals and how the public can be bamboozled and how we are increasingly being barraged with chemicals, whereas it is known, for example, that chemical fertilizers in no way over a long run, was as constructive and positive as the rebuilding of natural earth by humus and by composting. So, we are in so much of the development of drugs and chemicals, in our day and age, being affected in ways of which we are not totally informed and one does not have to adduce the rush which led, within a short space to Thalidomide babies and I believe, Sir, that you, as a medical person would know of many other illustrations of the effects of sufficiently tried drugs, on the society.

Just recently, in Trinidad, over the purchase of aircraft, we had the revelation of the enormous amount of money which is said to have been expended in order to obtain contracts for the purchase of aircraft. It seems to me, that the authorities responsible for the National Drug Service will move the purchase and acquisition of drugs into an entirely new ball park, as the Americans say. The purchase of drugs, on the scale which is likely to develop in this National Drug Plan would be for high stakes and therefore, the dangers of bribery and corruption will be enormously increased.

I see that this Bill indeed envisages this possibility, and in section 10(2) on page 8 institutes a fine of \$5,000 or imprisonment for two years or both for any person who offers gratuity, bribe or other inducement to procure a contract, and if we turn to section 4(3) on page 4, the drug service and those responsible for it with the approval of the Minister may enter into arrangements or contracts with persons in Barbados or persons abroad. This means that they will have enormous power, by spending large sums of money and be opened to the possibility of pressures from people who have a product to push.

On page 6 in section 9(c), the Minister may make regulations respecting the entering into negotiations for these contracts with manufacturers, importers, wholesalers and agents, and in 9(e) the Minister may make regulations respecting the approval of drugs, the designation of drugs to be purchased, and in (f) may establish committees as necessary for the effective administration of the drug service, which is the point of what I wish to say. I think one of the committees the Minister might well consider establishing is the committee, a sort of integrity committee, to monitor the operation of this drug plan, because I do believe that we are no longer going to be in the realm of drugs salesmen speaking to this drug store at the corner or that drug store on Broad Street, or even to one or other of the Government

Departments, we will be now dealing with a purchasing authority that is going to spend a considerable amount of money, and I think that the dangers and the temptations will rise in proportion to the quantum of money expended even though one is assumed to have to make what I believe is a realistic observation, and therefore I draw the Government's attention to the fact that the integrity with which this programme is administered may well be crucial to the success of the National Drug Service.

SENATOR D. S. MACKENZIE: Mr. President, I do not think that anyone or any reasonable person could really and truly object to the objects that this Bill is trying to set out. If anyone cares for his fellowman at all I think he would have to agree with the principles that are set out in this Bill, but the points that Senator Hatch has made are valid points and here again one cannot because of the frailties of human nature and because of the things that can happen that ought not to happen in the administration of a piece of legislation or a service to be provided decide that that service should not be provided because of those frailties of the human beings that will be involved.

Mr. PRESIDENT: He did not say that.

SENATOR THE REV. A. HATCH: I just wanted to say that this was not implied far less said.

SENATOR D. S. MACKENZIE: Okay, Sir, my misunderstanding and I apologise, but nevertheless in listening to some of the things that Senator Hatch said reminded me of another organisation of which I have spoken in here already called the Barbados Marketing Corporation, and all I would like to say is that the two, the National Drug Service and the Barbados Marketing Corporation run parallel to some extent in what they originally intended to do and the manner in which they will operate, their *modus operandi*, and I would like to say that I hope at this point in time that the National Drug Service does not become to the medical profession or to drug representatives or to the people of Barbados what the BMC has become to agriculturalists, large and small, to fishermen and to the taxpayers of this country.

In this Bill there are certain strengths, but equally like a democracy its strengths can be its weaknesses, and to give an example of what I am getting at, if we were to deal with the BMC; the Barbados Marketing Corporation took unto itself an exclusive right to import certain items. I think chicken parts happen to be one of those items, and I think there are several of them of which they have a monopoly, a right to import as the sole importer, but when they wish to import these things they go to the purchasing house that they are accustomed to dealing with overseas and they obtain a price and they place their

order and they obtain the goods, but at no point have they ever been able to say that the price that they get from the house that they deal with overseas was the best price that you could have got that commodity for, because they do not invite tenders on the local market from local representatives asking them what their sources of supply could supply the same product for.

I think that with medicines it must be very important too that when the time comes they will request tenders for the supply of drugs that they always in every instance ask for a tender from those people who have supply of source, because unless they do that they cannot be assured that they will be carrying out the function that this Bill wants to do, and that is to be able to supply drugs for or at the least possible cost to the public of Barbados.

I noticed when the Leader introduced the Bill that he said that this was not an attempt to interfere with anyone's livelihood, so I presume from that that the people who will be running this National Drug Service will therefore always be asking for tenders from the various sources as represented in the country, and so I would just like to say that we have seen some errors in administration in another organisation that for food parallels this in the field of drugs and it has had a disastrous history, it has cost this country millions and millions of dollars, and I sincerely hope that although no one can fault the scheme and its objective and the piece of legislation, that the points made earlier by Senator Hatch will be in fact carefully monitored to see that in all instances we have integrity of service and integrity of dealing with the purchases of the drugs that would be required and needed. It is not my understanding from the Bill that the National Drug Service will be the only importer or the only stockist of drugs. I believe that it is true to say that pharmacists and commission agents and people like that will still continue to carry drugs that may lie outside of the formulary that has been set up by the committee that has gone into that work.

So there will still be a broader base of spectrum of drugs available if required for the use of medical practitioners and for specific illnesses, and only I presume if the need for a quantity of a particular drug becomes evident will it then be embodied into the National Drug Service. So, Sir, this makes the second organisation that runs parallel, one is the Barbados Marketing Corporation and this is the National Drug Service, and the temptations in both are horrendous as Senator Hatch has said, and I would like to think that it is monitored very carefully because the experience of the BMC to put it mildly has been far from a happy experience for the people of this country. It has helped neither the agriculturalists, the small man that it was supposed to help, nor has it helped the fisherman, the man who was to have a stable price for his

fish so that when he caught a lot he would get a reasonable price and when he caught a little then he was able to sell on the market for a better price; but it could not stabilise it; they never did, and they went into trying to keep the organisation afloat by importing food which is distributed by other people in the country reasonably satisfactorily, but they felt that they could do so profitably and have failed to do so on any form of economic line whatsoever. I sincerely hope that we do not get this kind of thing happening with the National Drug Service.

I think in principle it is an excellent idea. No one who has any care for his fellowman can go against the objectives of this piece of legislation.

SENATOR A. TRUSS: Mr. President, allow me to preface my remarks, Sir, by also quoting from the Barbados Labour Party's manifesto of 1976. The BLP has always been the leader in planning for the health needs of Barbados and Barbadians. As far back as 1940 it is recorded in the Barbados Labour Party's manifesto, and I am sure that Senator Sir Mencea Cox can bear me out on this, a commitment to establish clinics to deal with ante-natal cases, child welfare, tuberculosis, cancer and social diseases. At that time in the Forties it was projected by the Barbados Labour Party. In the 1956 manifesto we pledged that we would build a new hospital which is now known as the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and that was to be but one aspect of a scheme for a national health service. The party built the hospital but lost power before it could implement the rest of its programme.

In 1961 the party's manifesto again promised four new district hospitals with outpatient clinics and that was part of the BLP's last Government's Development plan for Barbados before losing power in 1961, and in 1976 the B.L.P. said it would establish a free national health service for all Barbadians, and the relevant part with reference to the Drug Act was quoted by the Minister introducing the Bill.

With reference to some of the comments that have been made by both Senator Hatch and Senator MacKenzie, I think it is important that we do not lose sight of the fact that the Bill also makes provision for a Tenders Committee which has been appointed by the Minister, and the Tenders Committee is quite separate and distinct from the functions of the Government Tenders Committee and also from the Government's Central Purchasing Department. These two areas of Government traditionally have handled all the purchasing that the Government has done and looks after the tenders of the respective Ministries. The Minister of Health very wisely, I think, has extracted from the Central Purchasing Department and from the Government Tenders Committee the function of purchasing drugs and

tendering for drugs as a separate Committee which will operate under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Health, because they believe that on so fundamental an issue as health and health care you could not depend on the people at Central Purchasing to look after the health of Barbadians.

A claim has been made, and I suppose it is always possible when people deal with a lot of money that there is bribery and corruption. That is a chance you have to take. In any system there is always that possibility but I believe if we are dealing with people whom we can trust, people who have a vested interest in the country, that will be reflected and we are hopeful not to see the bribery and corruption which some people may expect to see because sitting on the Tenders Committee is the Director of the Drug Service who is the Chairperson of the Drug Tenders Committee, the Chief Supply Officer from the Central Purchasing Department; we have also an Attorney from the Attorney General's Chambers who would be the legal person that will be able to vet all contracts with any pharmaceutical firms that are signed by the Drug Tenders Committee. Dr. Jane Yeo who is the nominee for the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners is also on the Committee, Mr. Noel Paris who is Chief Pharmacist at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Mr. George Yearwood who is an Assistant Director of the Barbados Drug Service, and there is also a Mr. Clarke who is a representative for the Barbados Pharmaceutical Society. These are the people who serve on the Tenders Committee. I believe if the information is not given in the Bill and it is not as I understand, the information is now available.

I myself have shown a particular interest in things of this nature and admit that I at times go out of my way to seek out information from different Ministers and people involved in Government before I come to the Senate, so that I can satisfy myself as to whether or not the Government will have my support on any particular piece of legislation. In such an instance I must admit I have some information which perhaps was not available to some Senators on the other side and I am going to make that information available now.

Senator MacKenzie made the point also about the supply of drugs. As far back as June or July of 1980 the Ministry put out tenders all over the world with reference to a whole list of drugs to feel out from major pharmaceutical firms what the price is worth and also took into consideration not only the price but the quality of the drug which was offered, and as the Minister pointed out, the pilot scheme which has been tested by the Ministry over the last six to eight months has already been implemented because the Drug Committee has met and several of the drugs are presently on the market as were described by the Minister, cheaper drugs that is, the same

generic type of drug with just a different name or perhaps no brand name at all. It is important to point out, Mr. President, that the brand name of a drug could multiply the cost of such a drug by 100 per cent, 500 per cent, 1,000 per cent even, as has been pointed out by the Minister because when you advertise a job in the national press, on television, radio, in fancy bottles, fancy clips, cotton wool, fancy labels, all these things have a cost and this cost in turn is passed on to the consumer.

The second most profitable industry in the world today is the pharmaceutical industry. The first most profitable one is the advertising agency. They are the people who make more money, as a generalisation than pharmaceutical companies are making unfortunately all over the world.

I believe what the Ministry is trying to do is to get away from the use of the other names and to give the same drug which has the same quality and would serve the same purpose for a sick person at 5% of the price of the overall drug and in the instance, again, which the Minister has mentioned, he has given two or three descriptions there which reduce the drug to a standard that the poor person in the street can afford.

Another interesting thing, I believe, Sir, that the Ministry is working with, and this has been pointed out by the Minister in introducing the Bill, is the 15% duty on drugs which has been lifted, but in addition to that, by bulk purchasing which has already been mentioned by Senator McKenzie, you must understand the concept of bulk purchasing.

Business people, generally, have always prided themselves to be better business oriented than the Government and, perhaps, up until 1976 this has been true, but after 1976 we had a new breed of Government officials who in their own rights are business people and are capable of making business decisions and who are capable of running the things they must do as well as any businessman can.

Bulk purchasing, Sir, simply means that the Ministry commits itself for a particular quantity of that commodity for a period of 12 months so that if the Ministry of Health is buying a particular drug for 1981, January to December, or however the financial year may run, they commit themselves for 10 million pills but they can take delivery every month, every six weeks, quarterly or every half so the drug does not sit on the shelf, does not turn into powder, does not lose the quality for which it was first purchased.

By estimating, this is the way the Drug Formulary Committee comes in, how much a particular drug is used in Barbados over any particular period, is the basis by which the Tenders Committee purchases and accepts

delivery and the whole idea of the Tenders Committee purchasing on a 6 months' basis as has been pointed out by the Minister, the Formulary which changes is that there are new drugs coming into the market from time to time, prices change. As competition, of course, increases, a particular Drug Company might drop the price of a particular drug in order to promote it and in these areas by having every six months, the Tenders Committee can pass on these savings to the consumers in Barbados.

I understand that the figures that the Ministry of Health are working on in terms of savings by bulk purchasing is in the region of 20% so we consider a 15% which the Minister of Finance is taking off drugs and the 20% which the Ministry of Health can save by bulk purchasing, we are already talking about 35% at cost which is clearly 60% on the retail shelves, but that is not enough, Sir. Generally speaking, in Barbados most Pharmaceutical Firms, most people who deal with drugs have a mark-up of 50%.

The Minister and her committee has been working with the private sector in establishing a mark-up basis because it is believed that although these Companies might have lots of expenses; they might have to have refrigeration units to keep the drugs cool. They might have very high overheads. They must service the people that come to them. Fifty percent, perhaps, is still too high in the light of the fact that if people need drugs, it still must be given to them at a cheaper price.

One thing is quite clear as far as Doctors are concerned, and this is not meant as any particular reflection on you, but it is a proven fact that Doctors bear no relationship to cost. If someone is sick, they prescribe something for them and sometimes, although it is true that there are Doctors who would give the patients, if they cannot afford, it is not always possible to know what the financial position of the patient is and although they might appear to be prosperous, they might not be and it is also true that most Barbadians after visiting a Doctor and they get their little prescription, some of them do not even know what the prescription says, Mr. President, and again I mean no particular reflection on the medical practitioners but there is an old joke...

Mr. PRESIDENT: That may be a good thing.

SENATOR A. TRUSS: That is true, Sir. There was an old joke that the prescription said that there was a little message from the Doctor to the Pharmacist saying "I got my \$10.00 now, you get yours." But I am not saying that, Sir. That was only meant as an aside, Sir. It was just meant as a joke. The seriousness now, Sir, is that the Doctor does not take into consideration at all times the fact that there are some people who cannot afford to get the drugs which he or she may be pre-

scribing for them. Consequently, they may leave the Doctor's Office and never get the drug.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I think you should say, "some Doctors".

SENATOR A. TRUSS: I did, Sir. I am sure I preface my remarks by saying "some", and they are not from this place. Some of them surely from the Other Place. So, Sir, these are the things which have struck the Ministry of Health most forcibly because when the people of Barbados go from the Doctor to the Drug Store, invariably they find that the cost of the medication far exceeds the cost of the visit to the Doctor, not unless you are from Delaware, or live in St. Michael South Central on the eve of an election.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Leave out those things, will you?

SENATOR A. TRUSS: Sir, so the Bill before us, The National Drug Service, relates to bringing into sharper focus the problems which have been experienced by Barbadians for too long and it is the first step in an overall plan which the Barbados Labour Party has been talking about since 1956 and which, for the first time, we are in a position to partially implement.

The problem with doing it whole hog and being able to do it step by step, as has been stated by the Minister responsible, is that in England, we have learned something very much from the English system. Where the English system tried to implement a Drug Service and a free National Health Service at the same time, giving all things to all people at the same time, it immediately put them into a tremendous disadvantage financially for which, I am sure, they have not yet recovered, and not even the present Prime Minister is in a position to change that.

The Minister of Health has taken that into consideration. She and her Committee and Advisors have looked at systems all over the world and have not copied a system and used it in Barbados. They have learnt what they can from the systems and the shortcomings from the systems and the shortcomings of the systems all over the world and have applied out of those systems what they think would be beneficial for Barbados and that is important so although we may be going relatively slow, there is a method, Sir, to the Government's madness. It is better to make one safe step forward than to make one forward and two back.

So, with reference to the overall costing again, of the drugs, it is important to notice, Mr. President, again, I must emphasize that immediately there is a saving and the saving became effective from the 1st September when the actual Bill was first introduced in

the Other Place. The 15% that was taken off the tariff, the 20% as a result of bulk purchasing and then, of course, although the mark-up has not yet been settled with the private sector, that is the consideration to be taken. At least 10% will be shaved off of that. I am sure.

Now, the Government is working along with the private sector as far as tenders are concerned, and all drugs coming into Barbados, and this has something to do with the point that Senator McKenzie was making, all drugs whether they are for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, or whether it has to do with Government's business on the Drug Plan or the private sector, all tenders will be coordinated coming from Barbados in order to ensure that you get the sort of discount that is available to you when you buy in bulk for everybody, rather than have company, A, B, C, D, E, in the private sector tendering separately, or buying their own separately and then, the Barbados Government buying their own separately, by coming together, by coordinating the purchase power of the private sector, as well, the public sector greater savings can be made and certainly, that is a good thing.

Again, you see an opportunity that the Government has taken to teach the private sector something, as well as, to learn something from the private sector and I believe, that that feeling of co-operation, both from the private sector, from the doctors, from the people who work on Committees, on the different Committees establishing this policy Sir, I do not believe that it could fail and I could not help but get up and speak in favour of it.

On the Formulary Committee, it is important to note that, the names have been called by the Hon. Minister introducing the Bill, but the Committee covers, or represents a wide spectrum of the medical profession, psychiatry is covered, paediatrics, public health, general practice, pharmacology, the pharmacists themselves are represented, so everyone who is involved in the use of drugs, the sale of drugs, or anything to do with drugs is taken into the confidence of the Government and again we see Sir, as we mentioned in the Manifesto of 1976, in the area which involved all of the people of Barbados, the Government, in their policy of open Government have certainly gone a long way in breaking down the walls which had been built up by the Democratic Labour Party, prior to 1976 between the Government and the private sector.

Sir, I think that that covers briefly points with relation to the Drug Service and again, I must say that I

rise in support of this particular piece of Legislation because as has been pointed out, by the Hon. Minister introducing the Bill, it is perhaps the first piece of Legislation, which has been introduced by any Government, that will touch the lives of every single Barbadian. From the time that you are born, you are born into the system and when you die, the system is there assisting you until that very end.

Sir, in conclusion, let me say that 16% of the National Budget goes towards Health. That is a percentage of which I think that all Barbadians should be proud. In Jamaica and countries like Jamaica, well, Jamaica specifically, less than 5% of their National Budget goes towards health and yet, in a country like Barbados with no natural resources, we can find 16% of our National Budget to put into health and this is indicative of the kind of high priority which the Government has shown, in the area of health and that in itself is certainly something again, like I said, of which the Government should be patted on the back and told: "a job well done" and the Hon. Minister particularly who has done an extremely good job and has worked extremely hard in the last four years, in putting together this package.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Field.

SENATOR R. L. FIELD: Mr. President, I too rise to support this Bill because anyone really looking at this Bill would certainly say that the objects of this Bill are for the benefit of the people of Barbados. But, I have some concern and I share the views expressed by Senator Hatch. I will put it probably a little different. It opens the door for a few people to get rich quick, rather than a lot of people taking a longer time and spreading the joy wider, over the eye of getting rich.

I say this, Sir because in the drug business, a number of people in this Island have been, I would not say getting very rich, have been making some high profits on drugs coming into this Island. But, these people could not be afforded that same opportunity any more, but a limited few will certainly have the opportunity to get rich and I say this, Sir because particularly when Senator MacKenzie referred to the Barbados Marketing Corporation, I too share the view that the Marketing Corporation, I am not saying in the last couple of years, but certainly, it was an institution, whereby a number of people certainly got rich overnight.

There is another concern which I have. When the International Bodies who produce these drugs, they are the same people now who are sending brand names here to this Island, when they realise that the doors are closed to their drugs, the particular brand names coming here and maybe, one or two large suppliers of drugs making all of the money coming to this Island, we will find that maybe, in the first years, we will get the benefit of low

prices, but thereafter, you are going to get a substantial increase in price when these people consider that they have a monopoly upon entry into this Island and because of the area of monitoring of drugs. We cannot control the people at the other end, when they put a price, that is the price and what we are going to hear in future is that the increase in oil prices caused it, we are going to hear that inflation caused it and this is what we are going to hear. It would not be inflation, it would be as a result of having a monopoly and they will be calling for the prices which they brought last year, the prices which they are selling at now because they would be barred, prices would be barred, but you would get that institution, or two or three institutions getting together and demanding the price from this country. That is the area that I fear.

Another one would be that those people with the brand names because we are still going to get brand name products, I hope that they are not stopping all of the brand name products because some people believe in special drugs and if they can afford to pay for them, let them pay for them. But, when these brand names which are coming into this Island realise that they are not selling the volume to the people, the price will rise, in order to keep their profitability and the price will rise. So, these are the areas where we have got to look for these things in the long run, in order to keep our prices within the reach of the poor man. I agree that the poor man will be able to get these drugs in the first instance now, at that price, but, in the long run, Mr. President, I am giving you that now, here, in the long run, maybe in two years, that you will see the price of drugs back where they were today and it will be to no benefit to the people of this Island.

I know that the Drug Plan is a good one because it is necessary at this time to reduce the price of drugs and I must compliment the Hon. Minister for the fine work which she has put into this project and I hope that some proper system of monitoring the situation, as far as, possibility of making money in the wrong way, as far as, that is concerned and the Tenders Committee, I heard referred to by Senator Truss. You have got to be very careful and try and change the Tenders Committee, as often as possible, that is all I wish to say, Mr. President.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barrow.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, in a little while, I thought that the only point I might have had to reply to was Senator Truss' observation that we were a country, which had no natural resources because the greatest natural resource of a country is its people and the amount of money which we spend on health is a reflection of the fact that this country has, for a very long time, recognised that the greatest natural resource are the people of this country.

That is why, Sir, I do not understand Senator Field's point. There are prophets of doom and gloom and who rise in the guise of supporting a measure when in fact what they are saying is everything they can to undercut the measure. It is like Senator Field and the Tenantries Bill, the only Senator in here to be afraid of the fact that, as he put it, the new land owners will now have to pay the tax, the people who live in the plantation tenantries, like if anybody who owned land can escape the incidence of taxation, like if people before they buy property and bring themselves within the ambit of the tax paying community do not understand first of all, stop and deliberate and then understand what the benefits are that comes to them as a result of ownership of property.

SENATOR R. L. FIELD: Can I get in a point, Sir?

Mr. PRESIDENT: I think we had better not go over what has been done already.

SENATOR R. L. FIELD: I was hoping that he would not discuss the Tenantries Bill now, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I will ask the Senator to keep a little closer to the Bill that is before us.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Yes, Sir, and to be relevant I must admit that the whole tenor of the Senator's speech triggered off something in my mind and at the time when he said it I sat and did nothing, but we seem to be developing a little bit of a pattern. How can anybody in his right senses come in here and criticise this measure on the ground that it will open the door for a few people or a lot of people to get rich? What are we talking about, how are we going to debase the currency? Do we intend to debase the political currency of this country even further than it is right now? As far as I am concerned that contribution is one of sniping at the legislation, and I think if you want to oppose it you come out and oppose it. That is the fundamental point.

SENATOR R. L. FIELD: Mr. President, I rise because the Senator is telling me I opposed the Bill. I complemented the Minister for bringing such a Bill, I said I rise to support the Bill but I must make my observations, and I am entitled to make my observations on the Bill. If I feel these things are necessary to be brought before the public, not only to the Senate, not only to you, Sir, but to the whole general public so that they will be aware of what is happening. I thank you very much, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You are not allowed to make another second reading speech. Let us try and keep ourselves under control.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: I still need, Sir, to deal with the point because it is an important point to me. I like to read the headlines that say "I Support the Bill. It Will Open the Door for People to get Rich Quick." (Shout from the Gallery).

Mr. PRESIDENT: Mr. Clerk, do I understand that a comment was made by that visitor just now? Are you paying attention?

Mr. CLERK: Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. PRESIDENT: This is the second occasion on which that particular stranger in the Gallery has taken upon himself to make a comment during the course of debate here. I will instruct the Sergeant to let that person know that if he comes back into this Chamber and makes any further interruptions I will use whatever legal measures are available against him. Let the Clerk and the Sergeant make sure that that person understands what I have said.

Mr. CLERK: Yes, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barrow, you may continue.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Yes, Sir. My point and my real reaction to Senator Field's comment is that it is all right to make statements like "it will open the door for people to get rich quick" especially in the context of the speech in which he gave absolutely no example of the means by which the door is being opened for people to get rich quickly, but it says something about the Senator's focus, because the people who come up with this legislation have a focal point which is that if real impact is to be made on the medical care of the community and its spiralling cost, then everything must be done to bring the price of drugs down. That is the ground that we stand on and that is the position that we move forward from. We are not perfect, not one of us is, and we are not expecting that just because we have made provision within the Bill to deal with bribery, and generally the lack of integrity, that that will be by itself enough, we know very well that this sort of thing has to be properly policed, otherwise all you need is one bad appointment and you do not know what will happen. We know this, but this is true of every activity under the sun.

If we are going to operate the Caves Commission, unless we are vigilant that will open the door for people to get rich quickly. If we are going to operate a tourism concern, that will open the door for people to get rich quickly unless we are vigilant. Why therefore make the point in relation to the drug plan that it opens the door for people to get rich quickly if you are giving it genuine support? I do not accept that kind of back-handed

complement, Sir, I believe that when Senators make that kind of point that they are under a duty to support it by advancing argument and say what they mean, that they are under a duty to warn by producing evidence against the kinds of things that might happen, not just to throw out a damaging slanderous statement.

The talk about monopoly situation will arise, I do not understand really where that takes us, I believe that if we operate in this from the basis that certain things have to be done if a national health scheme is going to have real impact in the lives of the people of this country and if the cost of drugs will come down, then there are certain inevitable steps that have to be taken. If we want to warn that in organising anything in this community we have to be very careful because like any other community it will have people in it that are dishonest, let us say this, but there is nothing peculiar to the drug scheme, nothing peculiar to what is brought in by this Bill that justifies a comment that it will open the door for people to get rich quickly. That, Sir, it all I want to reply to.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put to the Senate and agreed to.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. Barrow, the Senate resolved itself into Committee on the Bill, Senator the Rev. Hatch in the Chair.

SENATOR K. E. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Bill be taken as read.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 were called and passed.

Clauses 4 and 5 were called and passed.

Clause 6 was called.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 6 stand part.

SENATOR R. L. FIELD: Mr. Chairman, under Clause 6(2) "no liability attaches to a pharmacist or a person prescribing a drug by reason only of the fact that the pharmacist has dispensed an interchangeable pharmaceutical product."

Now this brings to my mind a pharmacist prescribing a product which he supposes can be interchanged. There are cases where drugs are interchangeable serving a similar function and I know of probably two, one of which agrees with the patient and the other does not. I can call to mind librium and valium which are two particular drugs with the same function. They are supposed to satisfy the same problem, and I know of cases,

and I have been told by people in the profession, where one has a different reaction from the other. Now if a pharmacist fills an interchangeable drug and the patient dies or gets worse or whatever the case might be, then no liability is attached to the pharmacist by reason of interchanging. I would like a little clarification and I believe the Minister can probably enlighten me on this.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, section 6 subsection (1) says "unless the person prescribing a drug otherwise specifically directs, a pharmacist dispensing a drug or drug product may select and dispense an interchangeable pharmaceutical product of lesser cost than the one described." Then it goes on about no liability attaches to a pharmacist. Unless the person prescribing a drug otherwise specifically directs. In other words, all of the people operating in this and again it is being done with the cooperation of the doctors, the pharmacists and all of them. If in this particular case a drug is not interchangeable, it is the responsibility of the person prescribing to say so. Where that person does not specifically say so, then what happens in Saskatchewan what happens in Ontario where these systems operate, the same provision in our law would obtain to say that the pharmacist using his drug formulary may say we have available a drug which is the same drug called by another name, designed to do the same thing, costing half the price and you may have this if you want. Do you mean to tell me that when a man does that, Sir, we are now to impose a penalty on him for that? That is precisely what the legislation is about.

The question that Clause 6 stand part was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Clauses 7 to 11 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. Barrow, the Senate resumed and the Bill was reported as having passed the Committee without amendment, Mr. President in the Chair.

On separate motions of Senator the Hon. N. A. Barrow, the Bill was read a third time forthwith and passed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS BUSINESS

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER NO. 75(5)

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, if it is appropriate at this stage, before Senator MacKenzie rises I should like to move the suspension of Standing Order No. 75(5). The provision in the Standing Orders in that where we are dealing with a Private

Member's Bill, it automatically must go to a Select Committee, and in this particular instance, I have myself heard no objections to what the Bill seeks to do, and since it is a matter of the Chamber having business to enter into and the passage of this Bill is delaying the entering into of that business, then I believe that we could usefully use the ordinary Committee process in the Senate to deal with this matter, and there what I am proposing would suspend the Standing Order relating to sending it to Select Committee, and therefore speed up the process by having us deal with it in this Committee this afternoon.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I had thought that Senator MacKenzie himself may have drawn that point to the Senate's attention, but if the Minister draws it to the attention of the Senate and the Senate is satisfied that there is no objection to suspending that Standing Order, I will put the question. Is it agreeable to the Senate that Standing Order No. 75(5) should be suspended for the purposes of this Bill, that is to say, the Bill on which Senator MacKenzie's name appears? Is there any objection?

It is agreed that Standing Order No. 75(5) be suspended for today's sitting.

THE BARBADOS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY ACT, 1980

Order No. 2 under Private Members' Business was called — to move the second reading of a Bill to repeal and replace the Barbados Chamber of Commerce (Incorporation) Act, 1868.

SENATOR D. S. MACKENZIE: Mr. President, it was my intention in speaking on this Bill to ask Hon. Senators if they would have suspended Standing Order 75(5) and I would like to express my thanks and appreciation to the Leader of the Senate for having done so and to Hon. Senators for having agreed to the suspension.

Basically, Mr. President, the Barbados Chamber of Commerce whose Registered Office is now situated at Norman House, Broad Street, commenced operations in 1825, some 155 years ago but it was not incorporated until 1868 when on the 11th August, 1868 it was incorporated under an Act of Parliament entitled the Barbados Chamber of Commerce (Incorporation) Act, 1868.

Now, Mr. President, with the passage of time and particularly with the passage of such a long period of

time since its incorporation, that would be about 112 years now, Sir, and with the consequent social, political, and economic changes which have occurred since it was incorporated in 1868, the Chamber has found it necessary to up-date the conditions of its Act or its incorporation and seeks specifically to do two things by the introduction of this new Bill which is before us today.

Firstly, Sir, the Chamber seeks to remove the restriction placed upon it by the 1868 Act with regard to the value of real estate it may acquire and secondly the Chamber seeks to update and expand its objects and functions so that it can perform a greater and more useful role in the economic development of our country.

The Chamber also has been advised that in order to effect the desired objectives, it is necessary that an Act of Parliament of Barbados to repeal and replace the Barbados Chamber of Commerce Act, 1868 be enacted and hence, Mr. President, the reason for this new Bill before us today.

Now, if I may deal firstly with the restriction placed on it by the 1868 Act with regard to the value of real estate that the Chamber may acquire at anytime. The present Act restricts the value of £10,000. Now in 1868 that sum was then considered to be a lot of money and £10,000 could buy at that time a very good property but, unfortunately, that sum is totally inadequate to purchase any suitable facilities for it today.

The Chamber had an opportunity to purchase and to acquire a property. I believe it still has that opportunity at this point in time and if the Bill is passed and it goes through the Other Place in time then happily we will enter into the Contract for the purchase but until the Bill has been passed, we cannot do so because we are under the restriction of the £10,000 of the old Act.

With regard to the second aspect of the change and I believe this is much more important than the first one and that is namely to expand the objects and the functions of the Chamber. If we look at page 1 of the Act it says:

"AND WHEREAS it is thought expedient to widen the objectives and functions of that Association in the interest *inter alia* of promoting and encouraging in Barbados of manufacturing operations suitable to the country and capable of making contributions to the economic development of the country:"

That is basically in a nutshell why the Chamber wants to change the Act, or the second reason why it wants to change the Act.

I would like just to make a couple of comments about economic development because there is a significant difference between economic growth and economic development of a country. Economic growth merely means to increase with the existing means of production the economic output of a country. To put it another way, it means to produce more of the same and to continue doing what you have been doing in the past but only doing it more efficiently and with much greater result.

Economic development, however, Mr. President, involves structural changes in the economy so that the whole system of production and the variety of output is deepened and broadened to include not only a wider variety of goods produced but more importantly to include a much wider base of entrepreneurial participation by the people of the country.

Economic development has the advantage not only of increasing the economic output of a country but it also increases the number of people who will receive benefits by way of return on their investment as well as by way of increasing the opportunity and variety of goods that will become available and will flow from this broader base of economic activity.

Now both the past Government in all fairness and this present Government are fully aware of the social and other changes of economic development. Both of them realise that economic development is very important for the country as a whole if the citizens of the country are to upgrade their standards of living and both of the Governments through various fiscal incentives and policies in the past and through the Industrial Development Corporation have been laying down guidelines, as it were, for the private sector to follow.

Now, it is in keeping with this, what I would consider to be a clear mandate and need for mobilization of capital and managerial skills to promote further development, that the Chamber really and truly has decided to seek the repeal and its replacement of the Chamber of Commerce Act because although that Section (d) of the Objects in the old Act states "the doing of all such other things as may be conducive to the extension of trade, commerce or industry or to the attainment of the above object", although this Section (d) implies a pre-occupation with industry, it does not spell it out very clearly and it is felt that the need to emphasise this interest should be stated much more forcibly in the new Act.

If we look at page 2 of the Act, at the bottom we will even note that there has been a change of name in order to highlight this interest because in Section 3(1) at the bottom of it it says that it should be known as

"the Barbados Chamber of Commerce and Industry" and that is an attempt to highlight the needs that they see.

Section 4 of the Bill, Mr. President, Functions of the Chamber, is the one that contains specific changes from the old Act.

In the old Act, there were only four functions, a, b, c, and d, whereas, in the new Act, there are very, very, many more functions. If we look at (a), on page three sub-section (a):

"to promote measures calculated to benefit and protect the trading interests"

That is the same as the original one. (b) is the same, (c) is:

"to promote and encourage the development in Barbados of manufacturing operations suitable to the community and capable of making contributions to the economic development".

This, as I said, was alluded to in the old (b), but it clearly states it much better at this point in time. Again, that section (d) was alluded to by the old section (d) but clearly identifies it again. Section (e) is:

"to promote and encourage adherence by manufacturers in Barbados to proper standards and grades of quality in all manufactured products."

Again, this is done, so that the Chamber could play a role for the protection of consumers, as well as, to support the Barbados National Standards Institute because we feel that it is important for the community that this be done. Objective or function, (f):

"to promote and encourage the use by consumers, by advertising trade fairs or howsoever, of products manufactured in Barbados"

Again, it is designed to support local manufacture of local products, something which the community has been able to do for a long time. Again, we recognised it and this is why it is important in the new Bill.

The other one:

"to assist in securing markets for both raw materials and finished products".

Well, the Chamber of Commerce, in the past, predominantly had traders, importers who were accustomed to trading and this is put in, so that they can use the expertise of the existing members of the Chamber of Com-

merce who are traders to promote export, on behalf of some manufacturers who may need assistance with it. So, we are utilising the assets which we have to the benefit of the whole community. Section (i):

“to collect and disseminate statistical or other information relating to trade and industry, imports and exports, manufacturing processes”

and so on. This is put in, as a provision which envisages the possible amalgamation, in the future, of some of the private sector organisations into one big one, as has happened on the basis of the Caribbean, where you now have the incorporated Chambers of Commerce's name was changed in 1970 to the C.A.I.C., the Caribbean Association of Industry and Commerce now because they recognised the need that the two go hand in hand and this Bill is merely to forcefully state, to bring forth and to reflect that need and so on.

Right down, the whole of that, Sir, if you look at (n):

“to amalgamate with companies, institutions, associations or societies as it thinks fit”.

Again, it leaves the going clear for possible amalgamation of private sector organisations. (o):

“to form associations with other Chambers of Commerce and other bodies for the advancement of trade and manufacture and the protection of traders and manufacturers.”

Again, this is so that we can play a role in the Chamber in the Association of Industry and Commerce. So that is basically in this Section Four, Mr. President, where most of the changes have occurred.

I would just like to ask Hon. Senators to look at page two and make one correction which is very important, it says: “CAP 2”, Section Three, sub-section (2):

“Subject to this Act, section 21 of the Interpretation Act, applies to the Chamber”.

It should be “CAP.1” because CAP. 2 is the Revision of Laws. CAP. 1 is the Interpretation, so I would like to amend that on the bottom of page two. Can I do that at this stage, Sir? Very, well. It occurs incorrectly at the top of page eight as well.

Mr. President, I really cannot think of any further explanations of this Bill, except to say that the repeal of the old Act and the replacement by this Act stems from the genuine desire, on the part of the members of the Barbados Chamber of Commerce to do their part in promoting the economic development of Barbados. That

is really the *raison d'être* of coming to go through this process because we want to broaden the base, so that we can benefit the community.

Mr. President, if this Bill should pass its Second Reading stage, as I have said before, I would like to ask Hon. Senators if we could go through, I know that we have suspended the Standing Order 75(5), but if we could go through, so that it could be read a third time, in other words, deal with it in Committee, I would appreciate this very much.

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

SENATOR MISS M. St.C. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. PRESIDENT: It is proposed that this Bill be now read a second time..... Senator Miss Blackman.

SENATOR MISS M. St.C. BLACKMAN: Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to be able to support this Bill. I am aware of the efforts which the Chamber has been making to help in the question of employment and there is nobody, in Barbados, better placed to recognise the shortcomings in our local industrial sector.

The Chamber of Commerce is acutely aware, that we are not making our best use of our tourist industry, by not being able to supply the tourists the items which they would willingly purchase in this country. If you go into town, so much of the merchandise which is available for tourists is imported into the island and so little is manufactured here. The Chamber is very conscious of this and I know, that they have been making a serious attempt to look at the possibility of correcting this, among other matters and for that reason, Mr. President, I am more than pleased, that this matter is now before us and I do hope that it will have a quick passage through this House.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Wickham.

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: Mr. President, the Bill before us certainly seems constructive and admirably suited to meet the demands of time. Certainly, something which was valid 112 years ago, must certainly have outlived its usefulness.

There is one point however, about which I seek a word from the Introducer of the Bill. There have been unhappy noises from the Barbados Manufacturers' Association about what is regarded as poaching on their reserves, by the Chamber of Commerce, by including industry and manufacture among their functions and terms of reference. As a matter of pure interest, I should like to know whether that little dispute has been settled, although I certainly agree, that the functions outlined

take account of the changing times. It would be unfortunate, if we had two bodies arguing over a bone of contention.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Rocheford.

SENATOR H. F. G. ROCHEFORD: Mr. President, there are just two comments which I would like to ask of the Introducer. He did mention the Association of the Caribbean Association of Industry and Commerce. I just wondered why they chose to have the name commerce and industry and not industry and commerce, since all of the other Chambers seem to have gone industry and commerce.

The other point I want to direct to yourself, Mr. President. Under the Standing Order 75 (1), it says: that every:

"Private Bill shall contain a clause saving the rights of Her Majesty the Queen, her heirs and successors, all bodies politic".

I cannot seem to find it.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am not sure if the Hon. Member was present at the time, so possibly he may have missed my remarks on that particular point.

I did inform the Honourable Senate, that I had noticed the absence of the saving clause of the Bill, but that I was advised, that under the Interpretation Act, it was covered. Once it is not put into the Act, it is deemed to be saving the rights of Her Majesty. If you read the Interpretation Act, Section Three, I think it is, you will see. I am speaking from memory. The Section may be wrong. Anyway, the point is covered. Actually, it is Section 10, Eight covers the other parties.

SENATOR D. S. MACKENZIE: Mr. President, if I may deal with the last first, Senator Rocheford had asked why did we give it the new name of the Barbados Chamber of Commerce and Industry and not the Barbados Chamber of Industry and Commerce. To tell you the truth, I do not think that it was anything that was necessarily intentionally done, but it is natural that the organisation was called the Barbados Chamber of Commerce and when they wanted to highlight the industry part of it it was added on at that time. In the Caribbean the Caribbean Association of Industry and Commerce in 1969 when we wanted to get the regional body together where the interests of both manufacturers and chambers would come together for the good of the whole community, in bringing in the new organisations the manufacturing associations of the various islands felt that it was politic in getting them to come in that you would state for two

reasons, first, since you were trying to get them in you would use their name first, and secondly, since it represented a very important developmental aspect of the whole region that more importance should be paid to the aspect of industry rather than to the aspect of commerce, and I know that there were big arguments as to whether it should be the Caribbean Association of Commerce and Industry or Industry and Commerce. In the end they won out and at a big long meeting it was decided it would be the Caribbean Association of Industry and Commerce.

With us there are other islands that have associations and they have changed their names from, like the Dominica Chamber of Commerce to the Dominica Chamber of Commerce and Industry, and there are several islands that have gone the other way, rather than put industry first they kept their names and added on industry at the end, and I think that is really the reason why that occurred.

With regard to Senator Wickham's point about the unhappy noises from the Barbados Manufacturers Association concerning the poaching of interests, I think personally that that was more of a personality problem than a fundamental problem to deal with what we are talking about here, and I know for a fact that discussions very recently have been taking place, and I know that the Chamber will welcome the amalgamation of these organisations into one umbrella organisation, and it is felt by the members of the Chamber that this is what we would like to see happen, if it is possible to have that happen. That is why section (n) was put into the new Bill where you could amalgamate the companies institutions, associations or societies as it thinks fit, so that it would have in the new Act the ability to get together the private sector organisations. Work is actively going on now to bring together the private sector organisations, and I believe that the personality clashes are not as great now as they are in the past and possibly it will happen, but if it did not happen there is no harm to the community in having two organisations interested in the industrial development of the country rather than one. Neither one would claim nor could claim a monopoly of any right for the industrial development of the country. The more people who go in for it, the better it is for everybody, but we are hoping that we will have an amalgamation of the private sector organisations.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put to the Senate and agreed to.

SENATOR J. D. S. MACKENZIE: Mr. President, I beg to move that the Senate do now resolve itself into a Committee on this Bill.

SENATOR MISS M. St.C. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to, and Mr. President left the Chair and the Senate went into Committee on the Bill, Senator the Rev. A. Hatch, in the Chair.

SENATOR K. E. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Bill be taken as read.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Clauses 1 to 11 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 12 was called and passed.

The Preamble was called and passed.

On motion of Senator D. S. MacKenzie seconded by Senator Miss M. Blackman, the Senate resumed and

the Bill was reported as having passed the Committee without amendment, and Mr. President resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Senator D. S. MacKenzie seconded by Senator Miss M. Blackman, the Bill was read a third time forthwith and passed.

Mr. PRESIDENT: After I have signed the Bill, the Clerk will take the usual steps to send it to the Other Place.

THE ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I beg to move that this Senate do now adjourn until this day week, Wednesday, 29th October, 1980, at 11.30 a.m.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to and Mr. PRESIDENT adjourned the Senate accordingly. 6.00 p.m.