

THE SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1981 - 86

THE SENATE

Wednesday, December 19, 1984.

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Public Buildings on Wednesday, December 19, 1984, at 11.15 a.m.

PRESENT

His Honour Senator the Honourable Sir Arnott Cato, K.C.M.G., (President)

His Honour Senator J. C. W. Wickham, M.B.E., (Deputy President)

Senator the Hon. N. A. Barrow, (Minister of Information and Culture) (Leader of the Senate)

Senator the Hon. O'Brien Trotman, (Minister of Health)

Senator the Hon. C. A. Griffith, (Minister of State, Prime Minister's Office)

Senator St.C. E. Howell, (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance and Planning)

Senator J. E. D. Williams, (Parliamentary Secretary of the Prime Minister)

Senator H. R. Linton

Senator Mrs. E. M. Lynch, G.C.M.

Senator Miss J. Clarke

Senator Mrs. M. O. Reece

Senator E. E. Greaves

Senator W. W. Hall

Senator A. W. A. McClean

Senator Mrs. G. G. Reader, M.B.E.

Senator C. D. Seale

Senator the Rev. Canon I. McK. Jones

Senator L. A. Ward, G.C.M.

Senator C. Jemmott, B.S.S., J.P.

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

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I have the honour to lay the following:

The Report and Financial Statements of the National Housing Corporation for the year 1982-83; and

The White Paper on Housing.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I propose the following order of Public Business for the day.

The Resolutions standing in my name are going to be managed by me, and they are to be taken in the following order, Orders Nos. 3, 4, 7 and 8.

Bills standing in my name will be managed by Senator Trotman, with the exception of Order No. 5.

The order in which we will take the other items will, at this moment, be Orders Nos. 5, 6 and then the others seriatim, with the exception of Order No. 1. That was returned to the Attorney General's Chambers as a result of points raised by the President of the Law Society, and has not yet been returned to us and so will not be available for this sitting.

VESTING IN THE BARBADOS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PARCELS OF LAND AT BRIGHTON, ST. MICHAEL

Order No. 3 was called - To move the passing of the Resolution to approve of the vesting in the Barbados Industrial Development Corporation parcels of land at Brighton, St. Michael.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, this relates to lands adjoining the Spring Garden Road, and to the fact that lands in that area had been allocated for various uses.

The Resolution itself seeks approval for the vesting in the Industrial Development Corporation of two parcels of land for industrial purposes. These form part of a larger area of 5.429 hectares or 13.41 acres which was acquired by Government in connection with the construction of the Spring Garden Road. One of the parcels of land at Brighton, Spring Garden, is 2.4 hectares or six acres and the other is 1.2 hectares or three acres. I will pass the plans around so that Senators may have a good look at what we are talking about.

The IDC has been for a long time looking for suitable lands for the setting up of a furniture factory, and when a Government-appointed committee was examining land use in the area, they submitted their requests for land to be allocated for the purpose. Government approved the request and a parcel of land was allocated to the IDC. That parcel was six acres or 2.4 hectares for the construction of the factory.

11.25 a.m.

The smaller area of 1.2 hectares was subsequently allocated to the corporation. It was earmarked for housing, but was allocated ultimately for further expansion of the furniture complex. It was also considered ideally located to provide a buffer zone between the residential development at Brighton Terrace and the factory site. Moreover, this land had a steep gradient falling from 40 feet to five feet above sea level. It was mainly of rock formation and marl, which when cut out to be used as fill for the furniture project resulted in a reduction, overall, of land development cost.

The complex, which is now in an advanced stage of development, will be used by small scale joiners. It will provide a drying kiln, workshop, lumber yard, showroom, warehouse and other facilities for the export-oriented development of the furniture industry. All of this will be available from a perusal of the plans which I have passed around. One set of plans dealt with the 1.2 hectares and also had on it the layout of the furniture complex. The other one deals mainly with showing where the land lies in proximity to the road on a general relationship to whatever else there is in the area.

The Government has received assurances from the IDC that safeguards will be used to reduce hazards such as noise and pollution which could accompany an industry of this nature. I think many of us have heard the noise coming from buzz saws and such equipment.

The Resolution is before us because no Government land may be sold or leased or otherwise vested in any other body save with the approval of Parliament. That is Section 5(1) of the Crown Lands (Vesting and Disposal) Act, Cap. 225, and even though the IDC is a statutory corporation, it means that the transfer of title is not possible without the approval of Parliament.

The purpose clearly is a worthy one, and it is clear that the nature of the purpose is permanent, and therefore that it would be appropriate to vest the lands in the IDC.

I beg to move that the Senate concur in this Resolution.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. President, I rise to support the Resolution in the first instance, but at the same time to take the opportunity to express the concerns of a number of young people in that area, who at present can find nowhere else for recreational places but in an area not too far from where we are talking about today as far as the Resolution is concerned.

I recognise from the plans which the Leader of the Senate sent around that the area they are using now is not involved with what we are talking about. Nevertheless, I am hoping that, although we recognise that the land in that area is prime land and it has been earmarked for industrial development, we would pay due regard to the consideration of people who live in the area. I am in essence lobbying for the retention of a bit of land in that area for a playground, and I am hoping that I would not see the day when the entire area would be used for industrial development.

I see some smiling on this side, and I dare say, that it is an area in which I have a great interest. I trust and hope I will have the honour to be the representative for that area. I am lobbying with that great commitment.

I also want to take the opportunity to thank the National Sports Council for clearing the area. If you had passed that area a few weeks ago you would have found that it was full of a lot of bush. I have been very instrumental in pursuing the National Sports Council to clean up the area.

I have no difficulty in supporting the Resolution.

SENATOR St.C. E. HOWELL: Mr. President, I agree with the Leader of the Senate that this is a worthy cause. I think that because of the effort which has been made by the IDC in promoting industry and trying to maintain the export drive in this country at a time when things are clearly difficult throughout the world, the Corporation must be congratulated, and encouraged to carry on the very good work. That corporation, in conjunction with the Export Promotion Board, has really served this country well within these difficult two years or so. They have managed to increase the output and exports of the country at a time when trade in the CARICOM region has been falling. Exports to the extra-regional areas, particularly the United States, have been most noticeable.

The Government must also come in for some praise here for putting its money where its mouth lies. This joint venture to have this furniture complex means that the joiners and other small artisans can be all housed under one roof and be adequately provided for with the sort of facilities that they could not possibly have enjoyed if they were scattered throughout the country.

I beg to support the Resolution.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I note the comments made by the two members, and in the spirit of goodwill, I am sure that this time of the year the interest which one has expressed in a particular area is not all that would explain his concern for the goings on in the area. But the point which Senator Williams has made has been taken serious note of, because we do have a policy as a Government where in planning development we take into consideration not only housing needs and employment interests, but also recreational interests.

11.35 a.m.

We are extremely strong as a Government on provision of facilities for the young. I have said in here before that, if we examine the record, we will find that community centres which are used mainly by young people were built either in the 1950s or post-1976. There is a telling lesson in that statistic. If we examine the statistics which Senator Simmons has made available here on more than one occasion, again we will find that playing facilities, like hard courts, which you see all over the country, are almost entirely provided since 1976. You will find that, I think, there were two built out at St. Patrick's prior to 1976 and post-1961. The dedication of many acres of land to playing fields, again you will find that that is either a pre-1961 or a post-1976 phenomenon.

The interest which Senator Williams has expressed is really an interest held very deeply by the party and the Government. Consequently, it is a matter of pleasure for me when a member raises a point like that, because it is something which, in the event that it might have been overlooked at any level, once it is brought to our attention, we certainly would have no hesitation in seeking to have meaning given to it. We must protect the facilities for young people, and that means that we must also in our approach to the youth think of protecting opportunities for recreational facilities.

The question that the Senate concur in the Resolution was put to the Senate and agreed to.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT PASSAGE ROAD, ST. MICHAEL FOR THE PURPOSE OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

Order No. 4 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of

land at Passage Road, St. Michael for the purpose of housing development.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, the Kensington Lodge Housing Development, to which this relates, lies in between King Street and Passage Road, and in between White Park and Baxter's Road. The plans which I have passed around would have meaning if the master plan were seen, and once that context were borne in mind.

The area we are talking about is 265.69 square meters of land, with a dwelling house located in a north-eastern position adjacent to the Kensington Lodge Housing Development, which used to be called "St. Cecilia", in the old days of the St. Cecilia Barracks. The purpose of the acquisition is to facilitate the said development. Already two blocks of the Kensington Lodge Housing Development have been completed. They were officially declared open on August 22, 1984. They have been allocated to deserving tenants, and are being occupied. It is expected that, within the next few months, the remaining three blocks will be completed. These are in the process of being allocated.

The acquisition of the property under reference will permit the National Housing Corporation to remove the vacant building from the land and give space to extend the north-eastern boundary of the Kensington Lodge Housing Development, thereby allowing for a more practical and orderly layout of the site.

I beg to move, Sir, that the Senate do now concur in this Resolution.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

LEASE OF LAND AT GRANTLEY ADAMS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, CHRIST CHURCH TO JENNIFER ATKINSON LTD.

Order No. 7 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the lease of land at Grantley Adams International Airport, Christ Church to Jennifer Atkinson Ltd.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I first heard of this matter five or six years ago, I believe, and, therefore, it is of some satisfaction to see that it has finally reached Parliament for approval.

The plans would indicate that we are talking about a piece of land at the corner of the airport road, as it goes into the car park, and would therefore be off to the north-east of that corner.

Representations were made to Government – I hope I can find the date, but it is some considerable

period of time — my recollection is that it is about 1978 — by the operator of the service station, Jennifer Atkinson, to the effect that the new airport operations — it has to be 1980 coming to think of it, not 1978 — had some considerable effect on the state of her business. She operates the airport service station. The terminal building was shifted to the east and this had an effect on her business. This was in July, 1980.

Government accepted that she, who was a lessee of Government, in the present position had in fact been adversely affected, and that there was a fair case for allocation in another area. The officials went back and forth. In the end, it has been sorted out, with the result that we now have an area of land clearly identified, and before us a Resolution that the lease should be for a period of fifteen years, with an option of renewal; that the rent payable should be subject to a review every three years, that the rent for the first three years should be at the rate of \$7 745.64 per annum and, that all costs associated with the construction of the station, including the construction of the new road and landscaping of the premises, are to be borne by Jennifer Atkinson Ltd.

The company currently operates from the Grantley Adams International Park, but is anxious to relocate in closer proximity to Terminal 1 due to the tremendous loss in revenue that has been experienced as a result of the construction of Terminal 1 and the consequential fall-off in traffic business at Terminal 2, as I said before. The land on which the service station will be allowed to relocate is situated east of the east roundabout designated 'b' on the drawing revised by the Ministry of Transport and Works. Actually, it does not matter whether it is a, b or c, because the plans indicate which land we are talking about.

11.45 a.m.

Much care has been taken to ensure that vehicles doing business with the service station, but not with the airport, would not have to pass through the airport compound. That was one of the considerations which the technicians had and which was one of the reasons this took so long. They were looking at a number of factors and that was one of them.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate do now concur in this Resolution.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

**COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT SIX MEN'S,
ST. PETER, FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE
SPEIGHTSTOWN BY-PASS ROAD (PHASE 3)
AND FOR HOUSING RE-LOCATION**

Order No. 8 was called — To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Six Men's, St. Peter, for the construction of the

Speightstown By-Pass Road (Phase 3) and for Housing re-location.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, there was a time, a few weeks ago, when this Resolution may have been contentious, but we have been overtaken by events.

The central point of this Resolution is that it was always recognized that certain additional lands had to be purchased in connection with the third phase of the Speightstown By-Pass Road. These are lands in the Six Men's/Retreat area.

There was, at first, the view held by the technical officers that only one portion of land was needed, and this was a decision which had been taken in accordance with the state of advice at that time. It is the property of Robert Goring, some 11 298 sq. ft. or 1 049.6 sq. metres, which lay directly aback of the six houses which had to be resited, and which was considered ideal for acquisition to facilitate the removal of the houses.

We were advised that that was all the land from among these seven parcels that would need to be acquired. However, on further investigation, it was established that that advice should give way to better advice, and, as a result, this Resolution is before us, involving seven whole properties among 11 parcels of land.

The land which belongs to Mr. Goring has already been acquired. Because of the proximity of this to the seven properties being acquired, it will only be necessary to shift the houses back from the path of the road and thus abrogate the need for Government to acquire lands elsewhere in order to relocate the tenants away from the existing community. This is in accordance with the Government's policy that, when relocating people, we try as far as possible not to disrupt the community. There has been some disruption, but we try to keep it to the minimum, because we would not wish to take people from living in that area and put them even across the other end of Speightstown. If relocation can be done within that section of Speightstown, then there is little disruption in terms of their daily activities.

The other factor in terms of Government resiting programme is that we always seek to improve the quality of housing whenever we resite.

Details of the 11 properties which are being acquired are as follows:

525 sq. metres from the Golden Mile Resorts Ltd.	
172 " " "	Wilmont Busby
169 " " "	Beryl Babb

What I am seeking to find out, therefore, is whether there is going to be this relocation of the road, and if so, what is going to happen to those houses on the seaside. It is known that they have suffered severe damage from the sea, and something ought to be done to protect them, whether they are going to be resited or otherwise, and we ought to get a very clear position from the Government on that.

If the road is not going to be resited, what is going to be done with the very dangerous corner at Six Men's where the Manning, Wilkinson and Challenor building practically juts out into the road? That is extremely dangerous, for motorists and pedestrians. If the Government is going to embark on the extension of the Speightstown By-Pass and do this kind of work in the Six Men's area, some attention ought to be paid to that corner with a view to making sure that the corner does not pose the kind of danger that it poses at present, but have the road running right through. It was not very clear from the Minister's address what is going to happen.

I very well recall that the last time we came in here to acquire an area of land in the Retreat/Six Men's area, Senator Williams introduced it and was not clear as to what he was doing, he admitted, in terms of the area. I asked certain questions because I have some familiarity with the area, and I did not get the kind of answers which would satisfy me that the people who are bringing the Resolutions down to introduce them are clear about what they are introducing and what is being planned, and I believe that we ought to get some very clear indications from the Minister about what is happening.

I hope that we would see some general improvement in the area as a result of the extension of this highway, and that proper arrangements will be made. I know that the Government gets advice from the technical officers of the Ministry of Transport and Works, but there is a water-course which comes through Six Men's and empties into Six Men's Bay. I think that they ought to take very careful advice on that and make sure that proper provision is made to ensure that the water empties into the Bay properly and does not get an opportunity to spread over and destroy the properties which may adjoin. If you pass there and look, I know Senator Barrow will know what I am talking about, a boat almost fell into the sea as a result of the last flood. He frequented down there quite a bit, so he would know. In all seriousness, I hope that would be looked at very carefully.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, at the time when I introduced the Resolution, I was under the impression that I had in fact passed the plans, and I was only aware when Senator Greaves raised the question that I had not, and therefore I am sorry I had

345 square metres from Noel and Rita Johnson

164	"	"	Edna Broome	"
180	"	"	Lester Graham	"
189	"	"	Allan Skeete	"
375	"	"	Eugene Babb	"
610	"	"	Dr. Homer Rogers	"
1090	"	"	Manning, Wilkinson &	"
	"	"	Challenor Ltd.	"
227	"	"	Six Men's Plantation	"

In order to ensure a rational and comprehensive development of the parcels of land being acquired, Government intends to acquire the whole properties of the seven owners along with such portions of the other four owners' properties as required for the proposed road works, the other four being Golden Mile Resorts, Dr. Rogers, Manning, Wilkinson & Challenor and Six Men's Plantation.

To establish the total areas required for the said road works and to do a lay-out of the subdivision of the remaining lands, including the parcel of 1014 square metres previously acquired, it would facilitate the houses being shifted, or resited, whatever is necessary, and the respective lots being offered back, if possible, to the tenants for their purpose.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in this Resolution.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. President, Senator Barrow in his introduction indicated that the acquisition of these properties has to do with facilitating the extension of the construction of the Speightstown By-Pass Road, (Phase 3), and for housing relocation. I do not have it quite clear as to how far the By-Pass Road is going to extend, whether we will see the extension of the road right up to Six Men's and a shifting of the existing road or whether the By-Pass Road will terminate in the Retreat area. At present the Speightstown By-Pass Road terminates at a neck in the corner by Wilmont Busby's property and Mr. Hind's house, on the westward side coming from Bridgetown. I am trying to find out whether the road will continue through when these properties are acquired or whether there will be a shifting of the existing Speightstown road.

11.55 a.m.

I am asking this because one has heard the Government making some promise, or giving some indication, that those houses in Six Men's on the seaside which have suffered a severe battering from the sea would be resited and I did not get the impression from Senator Barrow's introduction that this is going to be done. There is no point passing a map to me now. This ought to be explained.

not at the time. I must say that had I passed the plans out, the questions which he raised would still, I think, have been raised, because from the plans which I have passed around, it is not at all clear what is to be done with the corner. It is my understanding, according to that plan, that the road virtually terminates in the corner. It does not show what use the area to be purchased will be put to in relation to the straightening out of the corner. It is the intention of Government to eliminate the dangerous corner, but that is not clear from the plan.

The point raised by Senator Greaves about drainage is well taken. In all these major road works a lot of attention is paid to the design of drainage, because if you disrupt a watercourse without dealing seriously with the drainage problem, you could only be asking for trouble.

The other point raised by Senator Greaves concerned what is to happen with those people who live in Six Men's Village on the seaside. The Government has already scheduled Six Men's Tenantry, under the Tenant-tries Freehold Purchase Act for development. Do not mind the other party voted against it, I would still concede them an interest in what could happen under that Act. This would facilitate the development of a properly laid out Six Men's Village, and therefore take care of the problem of people continuing to be renters of land all their lives, because we would give them the right to purchase the land, and also take care of the problem of the houses exposed to be ravaged by the sea, because we would allow for the re-development of Six Men's Village as a result of the scheduling of the tenantry.

That is well in hand, and I am very pleased to say that even though his colleagues would not give us any support, at least one member of the party understands the benefit of having the Tenantry Freehold Purchase legislation.

The question that the Senate concur in the Resolution was put to the Senate and agreed to.

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) ACT, 1984

Order No. 5 was called – to move the second Reading of a Bill to amend the Stamp Duty Act, Cap. 91.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, this Bill simply seeks to make an amendment to the Stamp Duty Act, Cap. 91, as a result of the presentation of what is now commonly called the mini-budget in October by the Prime Minister, where the stamp duty was changed from 5 per cent to 10 per cent. 12.05 p.m.

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

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: I think the raising of the stamp duty on imported goods from 5 per cent to 10 per cent can now be classified as a significant departure from the CARICOM arrangement in terms of free trade within the region and a Common External Tariff. Perhaps it is time that the region should recognize the extent to which we have departed from the letter and perhaps, indeed, the spirit of CARICOM, and face up to it in terms of what it means as far as the integration movement is concerned. Indeed, it may be found that the strategy of a Common External Tariff and free trade might not be the best basis for promoting economic integration in CARICOM, especially if this is going to co-exist with considerable restrictions with trade such as licensing and other forms of restriction.

It may be in the interest of the region as a whole to return to a system where each country has some greater degree of flexibility in the fixing of external tariffs than that envisaged by the CARICOM arrangement. A return to such a regime would perhaps obviate the need for such subterfuges as stamp duty, labelling or import duties. It should also make it possible, let us say, for a territory to have tariff systems which, while at the same time fulfilling the requirements for the integration system, are much more in tune with the requirements of the individual country.

At the moment, the present departure which we get from the Common External Tariff is essentially an upward direction where we impose such things as stamp duties which we have provision for here. But there might be instances where we might want to reduce duties on a particular commodity, and I presume that one can be sufficiently imaginative to come up with negative stamp duty or some such thing, but it would be better if he can face up to it and relate directly to the level of tariff applying to various goods.

There is one area in which I believe, if we should accept that this type of development, that Barbados could possibly benefit from lower import duties, and I think that is the area of duties on alcoholic beverages. Barbados is a tourist destination, and I think it would enhance our image quite a lot if alcoholic beverages were not seen to be overly expensive not only to Barbadians but also to visitors. If visitors could get the liquor that they are accustomed drinking back home at reasonable prices, this might, in their minds, make them feel that this is a nice place to be.

Laughter.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Beyond that, from our way of looking at it from the point of view of the revenue significance of it, I am not so sure that the high duties that we have on imported liquor enhances the revenue of the Government, because there are a lot of people in Barbados now who drink these expensive liquors, but they do not buy them in Barbados. I am not saying that they are engaged in any illegalities, but a lot of people travel and make use of their opportunity to travel to bring in the amount that they can bring in duty free. If liquor were available in Barbados at the type of prices that they can get them abroad, they would not want to avail themselves of the inconvenience of travelling with liquor. They would buy it here and the Government would presumably be no worse off in terms of the revenue from imported liquor. That is just one particular example, but I think that the main benefit of it would be in terms of having a situation where it is possible for the hotels and shops to sell their beverages at prices which do not seem to be rip-off prices in the eyes of visitors.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just a minute, Senator Greaves. This may not be necessary — in this particular instance it is pretty obvious — but I did sometime ago promise to draw to honourable Members' attention to the fact whenever we were dealing with a money Bill. This is a money Bill.

Senator Greaves.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. President, when Senator Griffith introduced this Bill, one would have gotten the impression from what he said that this was really nothing; that it was just merely changing 5 per cent to 10 per cent, so it was of little or no consequence. However, I believe that one has to look beyond the very simple and matter of fact way in which Senator Griffith attempted to lull the Senate into accepting that this particular change was of little consequence, and really examine the full impact of this particular change.

I do not propose to be long. However, I want to make the point and impress upon honourable Members that this mere changing of a figure from 5 per cent will have, in my view, an impact on the price of goods which will be made available to the community, and the impact will not be an insignificant impact.

I think that one has heard me on this on more than one occasion on the effect of the stamp duties. One can very well recall when, a few years ago, the stamp duty was ten cents. But it moved from that and went to two and a half per cent, then it was moved to 5 per cent, and now it has taken a double leap, as it were, from 5 per cent to 10 per cent. This is not going to have an insignificant impact on the cost of living. As I understand it, the stamp duty will be added on on top of everything else — cost, insurance, freight and consumption duty. If one were

to look at that, one would see that the end result must be that the goods reaching the consumer must reach them at a higher price.

The second point relates to the one which Senator McClean raised. That is the whole impression which would be created about Barbados' commitment to the integration movement in the Caribbean, and the effect which this kind of departure will have on the future of CARICOM. It is true that Barbados is not the only offender in this particular regard, but what one will have to begin to look at is the kind of impact which these measures will have on trade in the region. I can well recall that soon after this stamp duty was raised, there was an adverse reaction from businessmen in Trinidad and Tobago on the kind of impact which it will have on their trade with Barbados.

12.15 p.m.

I think that these are things which have to be examined. One has to question whether the money which will be raised by this method will be worth it in terms of the harmful effects which it could have on the whole integration movement, and whether, indeed, we need the integration movement as it exists at present. So these are very serious considerations which one would have to look at.

I wonder whether Senator Griffith could give some projection as to the amount of money which the Government hopes to raise by this particular measure. I do not see this to be just a mere changing of figures, but I see it as having a very serious adverse impact on prices in this country in the future.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, I think I should deal first with the last question raised by Senator Greaves concerning the quantum of money projected to be raised under this stamp duty. The Prime Minister in the Other Place, presented a Mini-Budget, and the statement was also laid here in this Chamber about the anticipated amount of revenue that was to be raised by this. If the people in the Senate would do their homework, they would not come asking these questions. I would like to refer the questioner to the statement that was laid in this Chamber, the statement that was made by the Prime Minister on October 24, I think.

I want to deal with the effects this stamp duty will have on the integration movement. We get in here and play with a lot of words and talk about how the unilateral action of Barbados will harm the CARICOM movement. It cannot be gainsaid that the Barbados Labour Party Government has always been for a federation, so one cannot presuppose that from all of our public statements, all of our actions, the present Barbados Labour Party Government would be interested in doing

anything to harm a movement which they espoused long before any of us in here aspired to be involved in public life. And that position has not changed.

The truth is that within the entire CARICOM movement, and indeed outside of the CARICOM, countries usually take positions which are in their own best interest, in spite of their relationships with whatever trading arrangements they may have. It has happened in the Andean Pact. It has happened in the European Economic Community. We have heard of fights between Britain and France. We have Britain threatening all kinds of destruction in the community because of the fact that they have over-subscribed to the EEC budget. All these noises have been made, and still the EEC has remained intact.

We have heard about cries of protectionism. The United States has been accused of trying to protect its own manufacturers and its own market. There have been arguments of trying to get the Japanese to stop exporting to countries because of their overwhelming control of markets outside of Japan because of their quality products and prices. Closer to home, CARICOM countries individually have taken action to protect their own economies. We have had a running battle in this region with certain countries where actions have been taken inimical to the interest of the manufacturing community in Barbados.

We have made overtures. In fact, the Prime Minister of Barbados at almost every Heads of Government Conference, almost every opportunity he gets, makes the point that we have to get together and resolve the difficulties. I have had the privilege of sitting in CARICOM meetings, where we have fought hour after hour, day after day, to try to get some of the issues resolved, and we usually hear that action must be taken to protect one's own interests. We may quarrel with how Trinidad introduces the ECO forms, which have had a harmful effect on CARICOM countries, we may quarrel with other countries that have taken steps to protect their own borders, but that is the way they perceive they must deal with the problem, and as far as they are concerned, we must live with it.

The Common External Tariff that was mentioned in the mini-Budget came out of an agreement at the last Heads of Government meeting in Nassau. Barbados, in introducing the tariff in here, was only carrying out its obligations under the decisions made at that meeting in Nassau, and what we have been criticized for is that we have been the first to meet our obligation. It is as simple as that. We are not taking any steps that are inimical to the interest of CARICOM.

Some countries may use the imposition of the stamp duties or some other means, but let me say now

that people who understand fiscal actions of Government must appreciate that the decisions as far as fiscal authorities are concerned are not always designed to raise revenue. Fiscal measures are taken to dampen the enthusiasm for consumption. That is an established fact.

We have had licensing impositions made on Barbados' goods. I heard Senator Greaves talk about the complaint of the Trinidad and Tobago manufacturing sector. They have complained against Barbados, but what has happened to the other small CARICOM countries that cannot get produce into Trinidad and Tobago? Six per cent of the imported goods into Trinidad were from the CARICOM area, and this representation was made when the ECO forms were introduced, and it had no impact, because the Trinidad Government decided it was in their interest to introduce the ECO forms, as they said, to stop the haemorrhage of foreign exchange. It has affected us all, and I think we ought to do our homework if we really want to speak with any kind of intelligence on economic matters affecting CARICOM.

I made an introduction which I thought was to the point, but I heard from Senator Greaves all kinds of reasons for my introduction, that I was attempting to lull the Senate into some false sense of security. The speech that was made by Senator Greaves is the same speech that was made before. It is a speech made about how we are going to create inflation. When we introduced the 5 per cent stamp duty, we heard that inflation was going to be spiralling in the country. The information shows that inflation remained at 4 - 5 per cent or 4.3 per cent after the 5 per cent stamp duty introduced in the April Budget this year. Now, again, we are hearing about promises of inflationary spirals because of the additional 5 per cent. Senator Greaves has been proven wrong before, and I dare say he will be proven wrong many times hereafter, so I do not accept his views on these matters.

12.25 p.m.

These matters are not done wantonly. The Government makes a projection of revenue and sometimes the revenue projections do not hold out, and analyses are done on these things. In the case of the 5 per cent stamp duty, it was found that it was not bringing in the amount of revenue that was projected. The reason for that was that there were imports from countries against which the Barbados dollar is strong, because the Barbados dollar, which is tied to the US dollar, currently is very strong, so imports from countries against which the Barbados dollar is very strong were on the increase. If one looks at the latest statistics, you will see that there were increased imports from Britain and the European countries, so it meant that the revenue fell in those areas.

Government did not revise the stamp duty in October in isolation. What the Government did in October

was to come with a set of proposals designed to put the country back to work, and it could only put the country back to work if it had the wherewithal to do so. So I do not accept some of the drivel I hear about inflationary spirals from people who are totally uninformed, or would not care to get informed about economic matters affecting this country.

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

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, I beg to move that the Bill be not committed.

The question that the Bill be not committed was put to the Senate and agreed to.

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

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, I beg to move that the Bill do now pass.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I had intimated that the order would probably be seriatim in terms of what is on the Order Paper, but indeed the order which we propose at this stage for the items to be managed by Senator Trotman is Order No. 9, followed by Order No. 6, followed by Order No. 2.

THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE BOARD (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1984

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, Section 16 of the National Health Service Board Act, which was passed earlier this year, provides for the making of regulations under the Act. However, during discussions with the representatives of the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners on the regulations which are being drafted, we agreed that provision should be made for medical practitioners to appeal from the Board to the Minister in instances where they have not been given what they consider a fair opportunity to be given panels under the National Health Service.

Section 16 of the Act does not, like most other sections, have a general section to it saying that the Minister shall make regulations for the general carrying out of the Act, and therefore we could not do it under the Act as passed earlier this year. The Bill before us therefore seeks to amend Section 16 in such a way as to give the Minister power to make regulations for the general carrying out of the Act, as well as to give provision for the making of regulations under which the doctors can appeal to the Minister against decisions of

the Board. We have, I think, the full support from the doctors on this particular occasion.

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

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

On motion of Senator the Hon. O'B. TROTMAN, Mr. President left the Chair and the Senate resolved itself into Committee on the Bill, Senator J. C. WICKHAM in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. Chairman, I was under the impression that the amendment which was passed in the Other Place was circulated, but the Clerk is advising me otherwise. I am not too sure what the position is.

The Bill was printed and submitted to the Other Chamber and it was amended in that Chamber last week. We adjourned for a week and therefore I would have thought that the corrected Bill, as is the custom, would have been the Bill before the Chamber sitting now, and therefore in that case I do not see how I can amend the Bill before the Chamber. The Clerk is trying his best to help me do something mischievous.

12.35 p.m.

I now understand that the officers of Parliament asked to have the Bill reprinted, and it was reprinted incorrectly, so I have to move the correct amendment now.

Clause 2 should be read — I am not too sure what they managed to print and what they did not manage to print, Sir. —

"2. Section 16 of the *National Health Service Board Act, 1984* is amended

- (a) by deleting the marginal note thereto and substituting the following:
"Regulations and Review";

That was necessary from the original Bill which went to the Other Place, because it was argued that, before the Minister could make regulations to review, he had to be given the powers to review.

- "(b) by deleting the full stop appearing at the end of subsection (1) thereof and substituting a semi-colon;

- (c) by adding after paragraph (j) of subsection (1) thereof the following:

"(k) respecting the review by the Minister of certain decisions of the Board;

(l) generally to give effect to the provisions of this Act.”;

(c) by adding after subsection (2) thereof the following new subsection:”

Aside.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: The substance has not changed. It is only the drafting that has been changed.

“(3) The Minister may review a decision of the Board and for the purposes of any such review he may appoint suitably qualified persons to assist him in the determination of the matter in respect of which a review is sought.”

(SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: I got it in the House Papers.)

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: The House Papers are correct and the Senate Papers are wrong. What I have read out is correct.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Before I put this, let me just draw attention and clarify this. The amendment passed in the House makes the Bill before us now at section 2 read:

“Section 16 of the *National Health Service Board Act, 1984* is amended.

(a) by deleting the marginal note thereto and substituting the following:
“Regulations and Review”;

(b) by deleting the full stop appearing at the end of subsection (1) thereof and substituting a semi-colon;

(c) by adding after paragraph (j) of subsection (1) thereof the following:

“(k) respecting the review by the Minister of certain decisions of the Board;

(l) generally to give effect to the provisions of this Act.”

Therefore, the changes there involve the introduction of a new first paragraph, which is given as (a), and the changing of the former (a) and (b) into (b) and (c).

(*Aside:* I have a document like that.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not.

Going on now to (c):

(c) by adding after subsection (2) thereof the following new subsection:

“(3) The Minister may review a decision of the Board and for the purposes of any such review he may appoint suitably qualified persons to assist him in the determination of the matter in respect of which a review is sought.”

The question that Clause 2, as amended, do now stand part was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Clause 3 was called and passed.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. O'B. TROTMAN, the Senate was resumed and the Bill was reported as having passed in Committee with amendments and Mr. PRESIDENT resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE DEFENCE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1984

Order No. 6 was called – To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Defence (Amendment) Act, 1984.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: This Bill seeks to approve a Bill which was passed earlier this year. The Defence (Amendment) Act, which was passed earlier this year, sought to outlaw the wearing of camouflage uniforms by persons who are unauthorized to do so. However, there was no effective date for the wearing and use of camouflage material on the amended Bill at that time.

The Bill before the Senate now seeks to give an effective date to that amendment. The effective date will be 1 April, 1985, after which date it will be illegal to wear and sell camouflage material in Barbados. My understanding is that persons who might have stocks of camouflage will be somehow compensated for having it in stock at the particular time.

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

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. O'B. TROTMAN, Mr. PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate went into Committee on the Bill, Senator J. C. W. WICKHAM in the Chair.

Clauses 1 – 3 inclusive were called and passed.
12.45 p.m.

On motion of Senator the Hon. O'B. TROTMAN, Mr. PRESIDENT resumed the Chair and the Bill was reported as having passed without amendment and Mr. PRESIDENT reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Senator the Hon. O'B. TROTMAN the Bill was read a third time and passed.

CARIBBEAN AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND
DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE (AMENDMENT)
ACT, 1984

Order No. 2 was called – To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Caribbean Agricultural Research and Development Institution Act.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, the Caribbean Agricultural Research and Development Institute, CARDI, at present has three seats on the Board represented by the University of the West Indies, and the Schedule also provides for Belize to be represented on the same seat as Antigua, Montserrat, St. Christopher/Nevis/Anguilla. That was so because in those days Belize was not independent. However, at a recent meeting Ministers responsible for Agriculture decided that Belize should have its own independent seat and, therefore, one of the three seats held by the University of the West Indies has been allocated to Belize, and the other seat has been allocated to the Caribbean Food Corporation. That, in effect, is the purpose of the amending Bill.

The format of CARDI remains intact and the Bill merely seeks to recognize the coming on stream of the Food Corporation and the independence of Belize.

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

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity this Bill offers to make a comment or two about CARDI.

I have been charged from time to time, having raised the question of CARDI at the time of the annual Estimates of Expenditure, of having a bee in my bonnet about CARDI. The most I can say in answer to that charge is that I am grateful that I have a bonnet to have a bee in. Some people do not have bonnets.

Barbados has, ever since independence and even before, come to be regarded as a haven for international organisations. We host them well, we are very prompt in our payments of our dues, and I have no doubt that there is a queue of perhaps minor organisations who would like to come and set up house in Barbados. We

have been extremely hospitable. We have not always been treated as if we were good hosts and I question very much whether this particular organisation, CARDI, has treated Barbados – I speak not of any other country – as well as it might.

For one thing, I certainly, since I have been in the Senate, have not seen an annual report of the CARDI operations. We make substantial contributions to their budget. I have never seen an audit. These are substantial questions. Year after year we are being asked to pay our way, to make our contribution to the regional effort, and we do so. We ought to know what is going on.

I make no mention here of the technical expertise which comes out of CARDI, because I know very little. Very little is made public about what they do. All Caribbean Ministries of Agriculture, so far as I know, have, to a greater or lesser degree, a Research Department. The CARDI operation in research, therefore would seem to me to cover those aspects of research which could be regarded as of regional significance. Barbados is a part of this region, and I would really love to be able to see what work is being done by CARDI.

If the Minister who has introduced this Bill is able to point my nose in the direction of literature or information regarding the operation, the successes or failures of CARDI, I should be happy to listen to him and do my own research. I am unable to find out anything about CARDI except for hearsay.

That, Mr. President, represents the bee in my bonnet.

SENATOR L. A. WARD: Mr. President, like Senator Wickham, I have never seen much of the literature or reports from CARDI, but I must say that CARDI has done an excellent job in this country in the research work that they did on the disease that yams had in Barbados, that is, the internal spotting of yams in Barbados. I do not know how many of us have visited the Research Centre that they have at Groves in St. Philip, but I have done so, and I was very impressed with the work that they have done there. They have done an excellent job by eliminating the brown spotting of yams in Barbados. We have now practically a virus-free strain of yam that has been developed and has been promulgated and spread across the country, and I think that, largely, we are over the problem that we had.

At one time we were shipping quite a lot of yams to Britain, but then with this virus that the yams had, the market vanished, and people were not buying yams anymore. But since we have had this work done by CARDI and eliminated the virus, the market is picking back up, and we are again marketing quite a bit of yams.

I agree with Senator Wickham that you do not get very much information, but as long as we get results I am happy.

12.55 p.m.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: There is a view that these organisations should give an expose of what they are doing if they are using Government funding, for example, through the agency of collective Governments in the region, and I support that view. But what is happening in the Caribbean now is that there is an emphasis on the whole question of information sharing. We have seen it happen in the area of science and technology with the assistance of UNESCO, and I dare say that with CARDI the same thing is the result. The important thing is that whereas before you had a costly set of activities where individual countries were involved in their own research programmes, which in effect were duplicated, right now you have a co-ordination of activities and I believe this is the benefit that must be derived.

We have been doing particularly well in agricultural development in Barbados and we can see a greater emphasis in the move towards the establishment of agro-business. This is particularly beneficial to the country, indeed the CARICOM region at large, and this is something that we must all feel very proud about. Even in the area of sugar, we find that while there is a lot of carping about the sugar industry, the confidence that is placed in the industry in Barbados is not reflective of the kind of attacks made on it. By that, I mean that the sugar bonds that were put on the market for \$10 million were subscribed, and there was still a lot of interest in the sugar bonds. That was a demonstration of confidence not only in the sugar industry, but also in the policies of the Government.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, in the spirit of goodwill I think Senator Griffith just spoke and refused to answer about CARDI, but on this side we are not satisfied with CARDI either, and I think Senator Wickham deserves a direct answer. We only know of work in yarns for an institution that has been set up ten years, and I believe that in an age when information is so freely communicated, if CARDI had something else to tell us they had done, they would have told us, and I get Senator Wickham's message very clearly.

I believe that in the spirit of Christmas, perhaps we do not want to be too hard on CARDI, but then in terms of reality we must ask the question whether CARDI is doing anything more than providing an additional teaching resource to the university, because they certainly do not have a research output of which I know that can be regarded as satisfactory. I know that for some time they had some serious management problems. I also know that it is one of the Caribbean agencies which would conform more to the pattern that people like the Governor of the

Central Bank usually like to talk about, because Dr. Blackman is a great one for saying there should not be political interference. What he means by that I do not know, and CARDI is an example where, perhaps, if there had been some more direct political assistance, involvement, participation or even interference, the output might have been a little more understandable to members of the Senate. I hope that CARDI will forgive me for saying that from what I know of them, I too am not satisfied.

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

On motion of Senator the Hon. O'B. TROTMAN, Mr. PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate resolved itself into Committee on the Bill, Senator J. C. WICKHAM in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On motion of Senator the Hon. O'B. TROTMAN, Mr. PRESIDENT resumed the Chair and the Bill was reported as having passed the Senate without amendment.

On separate motions of Senator the Hon. O'B. TROTMAN, the Bill was read a third time forthwith and passed.

THE ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I rise to move the adjournment, and in so doing I am sure that all members of the Senate would wish me to extend to you and to the Clerks and the staff of Parliament the seasons greetings.

Sir, we have just gone through a period which has been marked more by goodwill than by acrimony, and today's meeting has been particularly so marked.

I now beg to move that the Senate stand adjourned *sine die*.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Before I put the question on the adjournment, I would like to thank the Senator for his remarks and to thank all members and the staff of the Senate for their co-operation and assistance during the past year. I hope that they will have pleasant holidays and will come back in the New Year refreshed for whatever lies ahead.

The question that the Senate do now adjourn sine die was put to the Senate and agreed to.
1.05 p.m.

CONTENTS

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW 600

Report and Financial Statements of the
National Housing Corporation for the year
1982-83.

The White Paper on Housing.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

VESTING IN THE BARBADOS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION OF LAND AT BRIGHTON, ST. MICHAEL 600

Senator Barrow, 600, 602; Senator Howell,
601; Senator Williams, 601.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT PASSAGE ROAD, ST. MICHAEL FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT 602

Senator Barrow, 602.

LEASE OF LAND AT GRANTLEY ADAMS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, CHRIST CHURCH TO JENNIFER ATKINSON LTD ... 602

Senator Barrow, 602.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT SIX MEN'S, ST. PETER FOR ROADWORKS AND HOUSING 603

Senator Barrow, 603, 604; Senator
Greaves, 604.

STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) ACT 1984. . 605

Senator Griffith, 605, 606; Senator McClean,
605; Senator Greaves, 606.

NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE BOARD (AMEND- MENT) ACT 1984 608

Senator Trotman, 608.

DEFENCE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1984 609

Senator Trotman, 609.

CARIBBEAN AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE (AMEND- MENT) ACT 1984 610

Senator Trotman, 610; Senator Wickham, 610;
Senator Ward, 610; Senator Griffith, 611;
Senator Barrow, 611.

ADJOURNMENT 611

Senator Barrow, 611; Mr. President, 611.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

BARROW, Hon. N. A.
CATO, His Honour Sir ARNOTT
GREAVES, E. E.
GRIFFITH, Hon. C. A.
HOWELL, St. C. E.
McCLEAN, A. W. A.
TROTMAN, Hon. O'B.
WICKHAM, J. C. W.
WILLIAMS, J. E. D.