

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1961 - 66

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT) SECOND SESSION OF 1961-66 HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 29th June, 1965.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock (Noon) today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. E. L. CARMICHAEL, (Deputy Speaker); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. J. C.

TUDOR, M.A., (Minister of Education); Hon. G. G.

FEBGUSSON, (Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries); Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (Chairman of Committees); Mr. J. B. YEAR WOOD and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (Minister of Health, Housing, Local Government and Community Development).

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I regret to inform hon.mem-bers that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready for confirmation.

Mr. BOXILL entered the House and took his seat, PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to lay the following-

The Special Development Area (Cave Hill) Order, 1965.

The Development Duty (Capital Gains) (Cave Hill) Order, 1965.

The Betterment Charge (Cave Hill) Order, 1965.

The Quarterly Digest of Statistics No. 32 - December. 1964.

The Selected Monthly Indicators January - February, 1965.

The \"Economic Survey 1965.\"

Mr MOTTLEY entered the House and took his seat. GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$9,200 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates

1965-66, Part 1 Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1965-66, No. 7, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

I also beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Housing Act, 1955.

Hon. j. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance I beg to give notice of the following-

A Bill to amend the Police Act, 1961.

A Bill to provide for the establishment of an Urban Development Corporation with responsibility for managing the development of areas designated as areas for urban development and for purposes connected therewith.

On my behalf, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Cinematograph Film Censorship Act, 1940.

REPLY LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 46/1964, asked by the hon. senior member for St. James, is now ready.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to consider the Money Resolution of which notice has Just been given by the Hon. Minister of Health.

Mr. SEALEY entered the House and took his seat.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the following Bills were read a first time:-

A Bill to amend the Police Act, 1961.

A Bill to provide for the establishment of an Urban Development Corporation with responsibility for managing the development of areas designated as areas for urban development and for purposes connected therewith.

A Bill to amend the Cinematograph Film Censorship Act, 1940.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Housing Act, 1955, be now read a first time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders 5,14,16,18, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

12.25 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1965-66 No. 6

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, as hon. members will see, this Resolution comprises a request for a token vote of \$1.00, the purpose of which is set out in the Addendum. Hon. members will see that the Government proposes to enter into an agreement with an agency known as Computing Devices of Canada Limited for the installation of what is called a Visual Omnidirectional Range System at Seawell Airport in order to provide accurate navigational facilities. It appears that this system is required because of the need in the Eastern Caribbean for a network of these transmitters, which, when used, permit aircraft to fly from airport to airport with greater facility.

It is proposed to rent this equipment from the Company at \$1,108 (Canadian) per month with a monthly maintenance charge of \$1,261 (Canadian) and the agreement will be for a period of five years in the first instance. The Company itself will be responsible for the maintenance of the equipment, while the cost of the site preparation will fall to the Government. Token provision is therefore required in order that the Government may enter into the agreement with Computing Devices of Canada.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, while I do not think any of us on this side of the Table would have any objection at all to any technical devices which would ensure the safety of aircraft between this country and other countries, this is a rather technical thing, and one need not be ashamed to admit that he does not fully appreciate the circumstances and it was hoped that the Hon. and Learned Premier who has experience in aircraft navigation would have been here to present this Resolution, though I am not saying that the Minister presently in charge is not au fait with the situation. The Addendum states that it is proposed to enter into an agreement for this installation of a Visual Omnidirectional Range System at Seawell Airport in order to provide accurate navigational facilities. The requirement of this system is based on the need for an Eastern Caribbean network of V.O.R. transmitters which will permit aircraft to fly from airport to airport on known tracks.

It is obvious that we have no national air carrier, because Trinidad is a foreign country so to speak, as

we know it, and the British West Indies Airways, which is a sort of misnomer, is a Trinidad-owned Airways, while this speaks about an Eastern Caribbean network. I speak quite ignorantly of what I am asking, and I am therefore asking this question of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture who might have greater acquaintance with this than the Hon. Minister of Education. I have read what the Premier said about the British West Indian Airways, and I should like to know if we are entering into this, whether it is not something in which the Eastern Caribbean should be included. We are

entering into this agreement with Computing Devices of Canada Limited to instal the equipment, and we have to make preparations for the site, and when we have passed this token vote of \$1.00 we will then give a carte blanche to go ahead.

Mr. Chairman, none of us in the Opposition would in any way be against having anything done that would ensure the safety of aircraft coming to and going from this island, but while this information might be sufficient for a person who is knowledgeable on navigation, this would hardly be enough for the average layman who would have a nodding acquaintance of these matters. We have confidence in those persons who have entered into this and know something about it, but it would be fair to let us know more about it because it mentions an Eastern Caribbean network which would be from Jamaica, including the French and other West Indian Islands and right back to Barbados. I would like the Hon. Minister in charge or one of the other Ministers to give members on this side of the House a little more enlightenment on the subject. We should like to know if the other islands in the Caribbean area are going to make some contribution to this or whether this is going to be done in all the other islands. I am sure that my colleagues and the other members of the Opposition would like to know something more about this Caribbean network, since this is not for Barbados alone. I think we should have a little more information if it is possible or you could delay it for the Hon. and Learned Premier who has a lot of experience in this field, and who would be able to allay any fears we would have in entering into any agreement in which the other colonies should participate and actually assist in the expenditure thereof.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I will try to answer the hon. member to the best of my ability. I believe the hon. member knows that there is an International Organisation known as the International Civil Aviation Organisation. This, of course, as the name says, is a world-wide body. Some time in April of this year, this International Civil Aviation Organisation held under its auspices a conference in the Capital of the Dominican Republic. 12.35 p.m.

It was the third Caribbean Regional or Navigation meeting which was held in the capital of the Dominican Republic. The purpose of that meeting was to consider means for improvements at the airports in the Caribbean and to make recommendations to enable airports in the region to reach international standards. One of the recommendations was that the Visual Omnidirectional Range System should be installed at the Seawell Airport. This bit of equipment is really a radio transmitter and when it is used in conjunction with the receiving equipment of aircraft, it helps with greater accuracy to indicate to the air crew the best bearing from one air mark to the ground station which is ahead or to which it is due, and the pilot uses this for his information as an accurate position finder. This is what I consider to be the standard of air navigation in the international field.

The token requirement for this radio transmitter is due to the fact that Barbados because of its geographical position is an important air terminus. It is a major terminus for air routes, and in the last

two years there is a terrific amount of air traffic which requires more and more navigational facilities.

It follows, therefore, that the purpose for installing this equipment is not only for the purpose of guiding aircraft leaving Barbados or coming to it, but that all aircraft within the region would be able to enjoy the benefit of this system.

There are similar systems in others parts of the region. One is in the Dominican Republic, another in Puerto Rico; so that the installation here would be Just one more in the entire region. The more of these Visual Omnidirectional Range transmitters that you instal within the region, the greater the degree of safety for air travel within the region.

This has nothing to do with the Eastern Caribbean Governments as such - not that they are not interested - but I have explained, Barbados is more interested in it because we have a higher density of aircraft and we are the terminus and the others are not.

The hon. members asked whether the reference to Eastern Caribbean in the Addendum has anything to do with airlines or governments. No; it has nothing to do with airlines or governments as such; it is to set up a network through the Eastern Caribbean. The one here is to be an important chain in that network. If the hon. member would care to see this pamphlet which I have here, I will pass it to him. This is the bit of information which we have of this V.O.R. transmitters. You will see from it the sort of equipment which we propose to instal. I would like to say again that it has nothing to do with the Eastern Caribbean Governments or with the airlines as such; it is a radio device which is going to be installed with the consent of the Barbados Government to provide a greater degree of accuracy for airplane flights.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the information asked by the hon. senior member for the City, this bit of equipment would enable aircraft to tell exactly their position from the aircraft to the airport to which they are going or going from the airport which they have left. previously, let us say that they were on Line 80; they would know that they are on that line, but they would not be able to tell at what point they were on the line. With this equipment, if an airplane is coming into the Seawell Airport on Line 80 degrees, it would know that from Puerto Rico Airport they could have the C.B. Line and simultaneously they would have an interception and it would be able to tell the position which it is in from the Seawell Airport. It would know exactly what point of the line it is on.

There is a method which you could have used for that before but it is too slow for airplanes moving at such a speed as they do now. With the installation of this trans-mitter, you will be able to tell exactly what is your position on the line, and similarly at the airports they will know where you are and they will be able to call you and tell you exactly what is your bearing and your distance.

Mr. HUSBANDS; Mr. Chairman, there is one thing on which 1 would like to question the Horn Minister. There is one point which appears to me to be a bit cloudy, and it is whether or net this particular device to be used at the Seawell Airport would be enjoyed by Barbados alone or if It would be serving other areas in the Caribbean as well. If that is so, we having been asked to instal this device and it would be serving other territories as well, would such territories be contributing to this? I am hot clear on that. The Hon. Minister mentioned that this device is installed at Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic and some other place, but if Barbados because of its geographical position has agreed to the

installation of this transmitter, is it to be of benefit to other areas in the Caribbean? If it is, are they going to contribute to this rental? 12.45 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman. I personally would like to say how grateful I am for the explanation which the Hon. Acting Leader of the House has given and which goes very much further than the Addendum has gone. The hon. member has certainly shed a certain amount of light on the matter, but what the hon. Junior member for St. Peter has said has not been actually clarified. As the Hon. Acting Leader of the House has said, this is nothing to do with the Eastern Caribbean and then he read from the Addendum that the requirement for the system is based on the need for an Eastern Caribbean network of V.O.R. Transmitters which will permit aircraft to fly from airport to airport. The hon. member pointed out to us that Cuba and Puerto Rico come into the area of the West Indies and we do not think of them as of the Eastern Caribbean, so to speak. There was no need to mention Trinidad, but I presume that the Airport at Trinidad will have this equipment. When the hon. member mentioned the monthly rental cost from the

Company and the monthly maintenance charge, you cannot deny the fact that the United States, Canada and Barbados would be in line with this; but I do not suppose that the airport at Antigua and such other airports would be carrying such heavy traffic.

I quite appreciate the point which the hon. member has made, that is to say, you want to ensure safety and so on. However, when the hon. member read from his private file, he referred to the basis of the requirement for this system and we wanted to know if any attempts were being made to bring in the Eastern Caribbean. When you come to the monthly rental from the Company at a cost of \$1,108 (Canadian) with a monthly maintenance charge of \$1,261 (Canadian), that seems to be a negligible amount when you consider the safety of persons who travel and the requirements which are needed for their safety. I feel that the hon. member should make us understand the entire matter. We are voting a token amount giving the Government permission to go ahead with this matter. We want to know whether Antigua will come into this Agreement and make their own contribution or whether they will be included along with Barbados in this matter.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I will answer the hon. member in this way. Obviously, it would be desirable for other airports in the region to instal this equipment, but there are two things which will militate against that immediately. The first thing is that this equipment is fairly expensive to be installed and, secondly, there are not all airports which have the intensity of traffic which our airport has. It is therefore thought that insofar as this side of the Caribbean is concerned, this equipment is being in-stalled where it is most needed at the moment, and that is without prejudice to any other territory in which it may be installed. Therefore, the Barbados Government is not entering into any agreement with other territories in this matter. This is something which Seawell International Air-port must have in order to provide a greater margin of safety for the aircraft which travel to and from Barbados. This does not preclude the installation of this equipment in any territory; that is a matter for the Governments in the Caribbean. We have a density of traffic, and because of the nature of the traffic which is going through this airport, it is necessary to have this equipment installed.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

This Addendum could have done without mentioning that the requirement for this system is based on

the need for an Eastern Caribbean network of V.O.R. Transmitters which will permit aircraft to fly from airport to airport. This is what is worrying me. Will the hon. member express the fact that the International Conference agreed that this should be so? To say that in Antigua there is no need for this equipment - well not that there is no need for it, but Antigua has not yet entered into any agreement to have it installed,

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

On a point of order. There is no obligation on the part of the Barbados Government to consult with other Governments in this matter, but it is possible that another Government in the region may see the need for the installation of this equipment in so far as its airport is concerned. We feel that our situation here justifies this.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

The hon. member will appreciate the point which I have made with regard to the requirement for this system being based on the need for an Eastern Caribbean network of V.O.R. Transmitters. The air traffic which goes on at Seawell is not based on the majority of traffic through the Eastern Caribbean as such. Traffic coming from Canada and the United States of America stops at Antigua and then comes on to Barbados. The traffic between St. Lucia and these other islands is rather negligible, and therefore we do not appreciate this particular part of the Addendum to this Resolution. You have told us exactly what it costs per month to rent this equipment and what the monthly maintenance charge is, and you state that this equipment will be very expensive to install. We do not begrudge the expense of installing this equipment, because persons will be able to appreciate the system which we have in travelling, and they will realise that there must be greater safety in travelling between these islands and the United States and Canada. 12.25 p.m.

I would suggest strongly that in writing these Addenda, one must be very careful, because this leads us to believe that this requirement is based on the need for an Eastern Caribbean network, when it is really not so. If I am to take what the hon. member says as correct, it is based on what he read from the private file following the International Conference for such safety, and not on the need for an Eastern Caribbean network, because the traffic from the Caribbean Islands is negligible, while that from other countries is quite appreciable. However, Sir, the hon. member has given us the warning that this is very expensive to install, but I would like to suggest that in writing Addenda in future, you should be more careful and not believe that we are going to allow things to pass like that. I thank the hon. member for the explanation which he has given, because it does seem now that this has nothing at all to do with the Eastern Caribbean. You have this system in Puerto Rico and in other big countries, but I do not know if Trinidad has it. Since this is necessary for an airport which carries such a volume of traffic as Barbados does, we will support it.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I do not want us to get too confused over this. First of all, if other territories in the Eastern Caribbean with an airport could afford this equipment, the more of it the better; but the fact that all cannot afford it is no reason why some should not. Those that have need of it and who wish to bring the airport facilities up to certain recognised international standards will, of course, install it. It is desirable and I am speaking not now for Barbados, that all airports if they can afford should install this

equipment, because the wider the spread of this equipment, the greater the area of safety provided, and obviously there is a greater need in the Eastern Caribbean than anywhere else in the area.

The second point I want to make is this. I did say that the equipment would be expensive to install, but I did not say that within the context of this Government's expenditure on it, because I drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that the installation of the equipment will not fall to us, but to the Company. It says in paragraph 3 of the Addendum that the installation of the equipment will be at the expense of the Company, while the cost of site preparation, which has not yet been determined, will fall to the Government. The reason why we are asking for a token vote is that until the agreement is carefully studied, we could not bring down definite figures as to our part and what is required for us to contribute to it.

Mr. GODDARD:

Mr. Chairman, the equipment will be rented from the Company at \$1,108 (Canadian) per month with a monthly maintenance operational charge and who will operate this unit. Will this be done with our existing staff, or will we also have to provide additional staff when the time comes? We will have to have a man versed in electronics to look after its operation. Can the Minister tell us from his files whether there are personnel at the Airport who will be qualified to operate this or whether we will be faced with another Bill? I think he should let us know in advance.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, my information is that the people who are responsible for the equipment will install it and they themselves will train the very few people needed to maintain it after. We have enough skill and know-how here in this island, and with very little specialised training, it will be possible for us to provide the personnel to maintain this equipment.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

The point which the hon. member has made is not about the installation. The Resolution tells us that the cost of installation will fall to the company, and the cost of maintenance is also outlined, but I think the hon. junior member for Christ Church focussed his attention on the operation, what staff is needed and what is the possible expense.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

When I was passing the information, I think the hon. member waved it back because he wanted to show me that he trusted me sufficiently that he did not want to trouble me for it, but I think, perhaps, I could draw

the attention of the Committee to one or two things. This is the kind of equipment which, when once put down, can remain undisturbed for quite a considerable time. The transmitter is encased in a steel and reinforced shed; it cannot be disturbed by the natural elements; it is automatic and you do not need a lot of people. The cost of maintenance therefore, from the point of view of continual running is really negligible.

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

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported

the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

1.05 p.m.

On separate motions by Hon. J .C . TUDOR, seconded in each case by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

TENANTRIES (CONTROL AND DEVELOPMENT) BILL, 1965

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The next Order of the day is to resume debate on the Bill to provide for the control and development of tenancies.

At the last meeting, when the House adjourned, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was speaking.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I was saying, this Bill is such an important Bill that the Hon. Premier would like the people of this country to believe that he should rush in through the House at such a speed as he desires it, and yet before we even started to discuss it, amendments were introduced. That explains for itself that the Bill was not properly drafted or was not completed. Hon. members were also asked to deal with it without seeing it. That was another thing which the Hon. Premier wanted.

Sir, when one reads this Bill and starts to think on it, in one way you can clearly see that the Government was only aiming at trying to stop the "\"Quit Notices\"" and the increasing of rents; but there is a lot more to this Bill and a lot more which should be drafted into it, in order to help the people whom you want to help or the people who ought to be helped, because when you come to this Bill, what can cause a tenant to clear out is very wide. From what is writ-ten in this Bill you can cause more embarrassment to the tenant than to anybody else.

I know that there are tenants who owe dues of more than three months. Some owe for two years and at present the landlords do not let that worry them; they only ask the tenants to pay it when ever they can. But now, because of this Bill, landlords would have to do no more than to draw to the notice of the tenants the contents of this Bill and say to them "\"It is not I, but it is the Government who is asking you to pay your dues promptly.\"" This Bill says that you must pay. If you are in arrears for three months, or what-ever it ia, you would have to pay off your arrears if you want to stay on the land. The Protection is not so great or so important as you may think. It is more in the favour of the landlord than the tenant, in my opinion. If the people do not know that, they would have to be told.

Sir, I would like to see the tenants protected. By all means they should be protected. It is high time that they should be protected, and the landlord should not be allowed to move off a tenant after that tenant had been living on that land for the last thirty years. Some of their houses put up with lathe and plaster walls, I am sure if you visit some of these people\'s homes, you would not think that they are living on rented land. As a matter of fact, the people feel that they were living there so long that they should become the owners of the land.

The Government is only thinking of the quit notices. It is not fit bad thing to think About for them, but you are think-ing of one thing and not the other. You are protecting them in one thing and not the other. You are closing the door at the front to prevent the bailiff from coming in, but you are leaving the back door wide open. So wide open that he can come in and take away everything.

This Bill is not airtight. I would like to know who drafted this Bill because it is not properly drafted. Last Tuesday, the Hon. Premier said that his Cabinet was comprised of three lawyers. I would like to know if the three lawyers to whom the Hon. Premier referred has seen this Bill and allowed it to come here in this form, I will have to call them just pieces; in other words, when you do not fill my eyes as a lawyer, you are Just a piece. I am sure if this Bill was dealt with on the occasion when the Hon. Premier wanted to deal with it, I would not have been able to say one word. When a layman has to read this Bill, with the type of lawyers who have drafted it, then surely you must give the layman more time, I can now see the reason for the Hon. Premier trying to get this Bill through the House on that occasion. Then the Government was saying that this Bill was in the hand of the Opposition from the Monday night previous while I did not get mine until the Tuesday afternoon when I went home, In other words, you have a responsible member of the Government - the leader of the Government, the Hon. Premier - trying to make the people believe that the Opposition was against this Bill and does not want to give it the necessary attention. However, as soon as I have finished speaking, I think the people would clearly see who it is that does not want to give them the necessary protection. 1.15 p.m.

As soon as I am finished with it, I think that these people will clearly see who it is that does not want to give them the necessary protection. This cannot protect them; you are closing the front door and all the back door has been left opened. Clause 5 of this Bill says this:-

5. No order of ejectment shall be made on the application of the owner or lessee or of any agent of the owner or lessee of a tenantry or of any part thereof within a prescribed area against any tenant in such a tenantry unless it is proved to the satisfaction of a court of summary Jurisdiction under the provisions of any law affecting the relationship of landlord and tenant that -

(ft) Any part of the rent payable in respect of the ten-ancy is in arrears, in the case of a monthly tenancy for a period of three months or more, or where the tenancy is a weekly tenancy for a period of thirteen weeks or more, or

(b) the tenant has without the consent in writing of the owner or lessee parted with the possession of, as signed, or sublet the lot held by him, or

(c)

(d) the tenant has created fit nuisance to the Annoyance and detriment of other tenants or of the owner or lessee of the tenantry and has neglected or refused to abate the same after notice given by the owner or lessee or his agent, or•••••

(e)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would not go any further. I will pause here for a moment, If I am a tenant and I rent a bit of land And I wanted to put a little house on it for some re-lative, as soon as I do that, I will be sub letting It is

the same piece of land which I am paying for, but through trying to help my son or my daughter or myself I can be served with a notice.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member said that if he were renting a house spot and built a house on it for his son, he would be sub-letting; but as long as he is not charging anything for the house he would not be sub-letting.

Mr. SMITH:

I want to Agree with the Hon. Minister. If that is so, then why do you put it in here? I could draw rent

for the house and say that I am not drawing anything. I am departing from my son or daughter now; suppose my friend wants a little spot; all I will have to say to him is this: \"You know what is happening, you will pay me something.\" That is why I am saying that this Bill has not yet been properly drafted. If subletting is only for the purpose of drawing money, I do not know. Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will know more about this than I will know about it. This concerns a Minister and we would have to take the time from him.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. Subletting is not creating any tenancy; you cannot do that now. If you are a tenant you cannot sublet without the consent of the landlord. That is how it is at present. It is not that the hon. member misunderstand the meaning of subletting.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will ask you to remind the Ministers that they can reply. They should not be getting up on point of order and bringing out whatever they feel like bringing out. I am going by what has been written here, not by what any Minister says. I am going by what is written in front of me. Sub-paragraph (c) of this Clause says this;

\"(c)the tenant has created a nuisance to the annoyance and detriment of other tenants or of the owner or lessee of the tenantry and has neglected or refused to abate the same after notice given by the owner or lessee or his agent, or.\"

This is very far and wide; it is very elastic, I think that a definition of the word \"nuisance\" should be inserted here; otherwise you may as well tear up the Bill. You are doing the tenant more harm than good by allowing this word \"nuisance\" to remain here. If you define that word, the landlord could get rid of the tenant. Relative to that word, the landlord would only have to take up his dictionary and deal with the tenant. For instance, if you have a radio and you turn it up a little too high, that is a nuisance; that is disturbing your rest.

Hon. C. E. TALMA; On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to assist the hon.

member, (Mr. SMITH:

I do not want any assistance.) It is a question of a public nuisance or a private nuisance and in this case it is a private nuisance. If one tenant is a nuisance to another tenant, that nuisance can be dealt with. If it is a public nuisance as the hon. member purports to be, or a private nuisance, the court will note the nature of the nuisance, which can be attended to at the appropriate time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The point of explanation has been made. It is clear that some hon. members will give one interpretation to a matter and other hon. members will give another interpretation to it. I am advising hon. members, and particularly the Ministers, that if an hon. member gives one interpretation which, for the purpose of this Bill, is not the right interpretation to the Minister, the Hon. Minister can make a note and reply, because it will appear that whatever interpretation an hon. member gives, it is being interpreted by him in good faith. 1.25 p.m.

I think it would be better if the Ministers would note the particular things that should be explained. Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. SMITH:

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you have heard the Hon. Minister refer to me as a public nuisance.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I said "pur-ports to be". If he goes on like that, he will be, but I did say "purports to be".

Mr. SMITH:

When the hon. member said that

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I will say to the Hon. Minister that that is not in order, and it might be better to withdraw that remark.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

If Your Honour so rules, I bow to your ruling,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am not going to have any debate being entangled with any form of personality. Let the hon. member proceed and be cautious also.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member said he is bowing to your ruling, but I am asking that the words be withdrawn, though I would prefer him to withhold and let me go for him now as we!} as the others, especially the Minister of Education, because he laughed the hardest,

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I withdraw.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I am suggesting to the Hon. Minister that the term \"purports to be a nuisance\" should be withdrawn. If the specific words have not been used, per-haps the Minister will make it clear.

Hon, G E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I withdraw the

words which you ruled are objectionable,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the members on the other side think they can stop me speaking, they have another thought coming,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I will ask the hon. member to proceed on the Bill.

Mr. SMITH:

Now, Sir, I am still dealing with the word \"nuisance\", which as you have said, depends upon the interpretation, but we still have to go by the book. I was mak-ing the point that if one has a radio and plays it too loudly to prevent another tenant from hearing his, that is a nuisance. I have a doe at my home to protect it, and if it barks loudly in the night and prevents other tenants from having a night's rest, that is a nuisance; but, after all, it is my dog and I pay for it. Sometimes you tret children passing along, and teasing the dog, and that is a nuisance, and the landlord can call on the tenant to go for that. Now if you have an obnoxious smell, that is a nuisance. A person clean-ing out the pigpen can be a nuisance. Sir, I can go on for the remainder of the day defining the word \"nuisance\". You must start somewhere in this Bill; otherwise the landlord can get rid of every tenant in a short space of time with this word \"nuisance\" if he wants to. And it did not say \"nuisance\" to the tenant alone, but to the landlord also. One may say that he would not be able to get rid of all the tenants because someone would have to remain and he would only be a nuisance to himself, but the landlord is there and you might annoy him, and soon all will have to go and leave the landlord.

I am wondering, Sir, if they read or if they expect all noodles to be over here and say \"yes\" to a paragraph like this, or whether that is the reason why the Hon. Prem-ier wanted us to pass it without seeing it.

If you include in a Bill like this what can be responsible for ejection, then the landlord would not have any trouble. They will have an easier passage with this Bill as it stands now than before; so when the tenants might have gone to bed and breathed a sigh of relief and said that Mr. Brown cannot get rid of them, I think that Mr. Brown can get rid of them much better now, unless something is done to this Bill. You will remember, Sir, that in my opening remarks, I said that I was wholly in favour of protecting these people, but this Bill as it stands is not protecting them, and I would like to hear you in a Jaw court on the landlords' side with this word \"nuisance\". The other side would not have a case at all, be-cause when you start to define the word, you are bound to be right. So long as that word remains, this

is no Bill at all. This is like a centipede when you take out the stingers, You take them out and it can walk all over you. This in a harm-less Bill for the landlords, but can be very destructive for the tenants. This 100-year social legislation which this Bill represents is nothing at all. 1.35 p.m.

I am only too sorry that the Hon. Premier is not here. I would like him to contradict me. This Bill is doing nothing to help the tenants and I am not sorry that it has been brought down here like this because it will make these same tenants in St. Michael who are out on a limb to understand when candidates of the same Government come to them to get a vote, to look at them and do not vote for them. I hope that they will remember it, and when members of this Government have to come to town from all over the country to contest a constituency under this new system, when they think that they are being praised publicly for this measure and that they will get a vote, it would be to the reverse.

Sir, you have people living in these tenancies who have to go out to work at night, and when they go outside to start up their motor car, some of these motor cars can start up so noisily that they can, as it were, create a nuisance. But the man must start up his car in order to get to work. As I have said, this can cause a nuisance.

Sir, I am not a lawyer, and if you care to I shall be pleased if you will correct me if I stray. Clause 6 of this Bill reads as follows:-

“(1) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in any other Act a Court asked to make an order of ejectment may -

- (a) adjourn the application from time to time;
- (b)
- (c) stay or suspend execution of the order, or postpone the date of possession for such time as it thinks fit;
- (d)
- (e) from time to time grant further stays and suspensions of execution and further postponements of the date of possession and on such conditions, if any, as the court thinks fit;
- (f)
- (g) if such conditions are complied with and the order has been made, discharge or rescind the order.”
- (h)

I take it that a magistrate has this authority already to postpone or adjourn any case. I feel so because sometimes you get a postponement or adjournment of a case. I feel that a magistrate should know his onions. Why put this clause in this Bill? Have you done it in order to fill up the Bill or have you done it to make the tenants feel that you are doing everything for them? I do not know if you are telling the magistrates this to make the people believe that you are smart. That is all I would put it to. Magistrates

already have the power of the law to postpone or to adjourn. Now, you are putting that in Section 6 of this Bill. I cannot see the reason for it.

This Bill is not finished yet if you want to help the people. In Clause 7 you are talking of control of increases of rent.

Clause 7 (1) reads as follows:-

"From and after the eighth day of June, 1965 the rent exigible by an owner or lessee in respect of any lot in a tenantry within a prescribed area shall be the rent at which it was let at that date, and no increase shall be made in the rent payable in respect of that lot except in the manner and in accordance with regulations made under section 8 of this Act."

"(2) An owner or lessee who desires to increase the rent of any lot or lots in a tenantry within a prescribed area shall make application to the Magistrate exercising jurisdiction under subsection (2) of paragraph (c) of section 4 of the Magistrates' Jurisdiction and Procedure Act, 1956 in the magisterial district in which the tenantry or any part thereof in respect of which the application is made is situated"

In this particular section, something is wrong: something has been left out. This Bill is not finished yet; it says in paragraph 8 (1) "The Cabinet may make regulations for fixing the permitted increases in the rent of any lot or lots in a tenantry in a prescribed area and generally for the purposes of this Act" Something is also left out of this paragraph. This is the Bill that the Hon. Premier wanted me to pass before seeing it; therefore I have to be very particular about it and let the people find out who really sleep out at night.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I just want to remind the hon. member to go very carefully and do not say anything in respect of what was said outside of the walls of this Chamber.

Mr. SMITH:

Sir, the way in which I am putting it now, you will have a job finding out if it were said in or outside of this Chamber. However, the Hon. Premier talks so quickly that he does not know what he is saying himself.

Here it is, you have to apply to a magistrate if you want your rents increased. Let us say that a magistrate is there for that purpose. I am not saying anything derogatory of a magistrate, but I say that magistrates of today go to school and from school they go abroad to practise their law and some of them come back here directly and go on the Bench. The same thing applied to some of the Ministers or to any Premier of a Government. They go to school, and then they go abroad to a University to learn law and then come back here. Now tell me what they know about the value of a cane hole today. As a matter of fact, they do not know a cane hole from a hoe stick. This Bill is asking these people to do these things. This Bill is asking the Cabinet to fix regulations so that you can go to a particular area and fix the price of house spots. What does the Cabinet know about this? 1.45 p.m.

What does the Cabinet know, really and truly, with the exception of one or two? I am not pulling down the Cabinet because I may be in the Cabinet or you may be in the Cabinet; but if you do not know, then

you do not know. With this Social Legislation you are putting the tools of a mason in a carpenter's hands. How on earth do you expect a good job to be done? It is just a question of putting a square peg in a round hole. In the absence of a Rent Restriction Board or a tribunal, where are we going in this Bill? Where are we going with this Bill when there is no one for the landowner or the tenant to appeal to? You are putting that in the hands of the politicians. Sometimes the politicians are so much out to do the right thing that they do the wrong thing; they do not intend to do what is bad, but they so much intend to do what is good that they do what is bad. That is the case with this Bill. I am not defending any landlord, neither am I blowing any tune; I am here to defend the tenants. The landlords can defend themselves and with this Bill they have no fear whatever.

You are referring everything to a magistrate or to the Cabinet, and there is no right of appeal or anything at all. I am submitting that even when one is being accused of murder and that person does not have the money to employ a barrister, the Crown gives him a barrister. Even when you are in the prison cell having been charged with murder, and you do not have anybody to defend you, rather than allow you to go to the gallows whether you be right or wrong, the Crown does the right thing, that is to say, the Crown will give you a chance of defending yourself. In this Bill where is the tribunal, the right of appeal or the Rent Restriction Board? If you want to justify yourself, by all means you should set up a Rent Restriction Board with people who know about valuation. For instance, in a particular area, a person might want 10 cents per spot and another spot which is not far off from the first one, may be valued at fifty cents. But a person who does not know will say that a spot not very far from here is valued at 50 cents and therefore all the spots are worth fifty cents, and you may have the thing in reverse. That would not be fair. We cannot just think of bringing forward a Bill which is merely for the purpose of protecting the tenants. I call this Bill a hot and sweaty Bill, and therefore you should give it some time to cool. The landlords cannot interfere with the tenants any more. You should bring in a Bill and "freeze" all transactions.

I know that when the Carrington's Village land was being sold out, a lot of things were going on there. All

sorts of prices were being charged, and the Government of that day brought down a Bill to "freeze" all transactions until they got through with the Bill to set up land values so that they could go in and value the land. They did not rush in hot and sweaty with a Bill and try to pull around hon. members; they brought in a Bill to "freeze" the value of land. I will not mention what happened; a lot of things were happening behind the doors and if anybody were to look up the debates he would see what happened. Why could not this Government bring in a Bill for the purpose of freezing all transactions and then go through the Bill and put it right? It would be fair for them to dot the "I" and cross the "T". After they had done that, they would still not be building up popularity in St. Michael with the people. Now they have made it worse. They have made the people in St. Michael, and in other parts of the island feel that they are not in favour with the Government. You are saying that this Bill is for the protection of the people when in truth and in fact the protection is faraway. I think that the Government should bring forward a proper Bill.

They prepared a Manifesto before they came into this House, and in that Manifesto they were preaching to the people of this country that they would see about this tenantry business. They promised that they would buy plantation tenancies for the benefit of the people. I think I am correct in saying that. Even before the people made up their minds to elect this Government, before this Government got into

power, they had it in their minds that they would do some-thing about this matter, for the benefit of the tenants in the various areas. 1.55 p.m.

As I said last week, if they had carried out the promises made to the people of having an election in three years' time, they would have gone back to the people and the situa-tion with the tenantries would be the same; so this goes to show that they were only writing because they could, but in truth and in fact they did not have the people so much at heart, as this is one of the things that would have been done early. No sooner had they come into power, they had something called a \"crash programme\". Quite a few dollars were spent there which could have been spent in acquiring one or two tenantries and allowing the tenants to pay back the money to the Government. If they had done that and had settled the people,, it would have driven some fear into the landlords who wanted to exploit the people, and they would not have pushed their necks so far seeing that the Government meant business. They dragged their heels all the time on it, and forgot it, spent the money wherever they liked, the people were being kicked about, and at the last moment the Government is still exposing them to more kicks owing to the drafting of this Bill. If there is a small tenantry, the Government should buy it and allow the people to stay on it and pay rent to the Government, because you cannot build a three or four room bungalow on a small spot, and the small tenant would remain in his small corner. I am sure that this Government has spent so much money in the wrong direction that they could have found money to buy one or two of the tenantries.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I am hearing the hon. mem-ber as well as other members talking about time. The Standing Orders have been suspended, and if the hon. mem-who is speaking desires to bring the debate to a close, there is a procedure to be adopted. Let the hon. member proceed as he cares.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think I would be in order to move the suspension for three-quarters of an hour and come back, because I think there are others like myself whose throats are dry at this time, and I think I can go on for another hour; so rather than keep hon. mem-bers watching me, I will make the motion.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for three-quarters of an hour.

Mr. BOXILL:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspen-ded the sitting accordingly. 2.05 p.m.

On resumption.

STATEMENT re, BUDGETARY PROPOSALS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, before we proceed the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance wishes to lay a statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Hon. and Learned Pre-mier is desirous of laying a statement. If there is no objection, leave will be granted the hon. member. (A P A USE)

There being no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Premier.

Hon. L.W. BARROW:

It is proposed at 4 p.m. on the 1st July, 1965, that the Hon. Minister of Finance will lay a White Paper on the assistance to Private Secondary Schools. and immediately thereafter I propose to lay the Financial Statement and Budgetary proposals for 1965.

It was stated previously, that during the second week of June that the Financial Statement and Budgetary Propo-sals for 1965 would have been laid, but it is important that this particular exercise with which we are dealing be completed. I refer to the, Bill to provide for the control and development of tenantries. This Bill must be dealt with before any other Bill is initiated.

I therefore will lay the Financial Statement and Bud-getary Proposals on Thursday, 1st July, 1965.

TENANTRIES (CONTROL AND DEVELOPMENT) BILL, 1965

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

When the Sitting was suspended, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was speaking.

Mr. SMITH:

On the suspension, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was making the point relative to the fact that the Cabinet may make regulations for fixing the permitted increases in the rent of any lot or lots in a tenantry in a prescribed area and generally for other purposes of this Act.

Now, Sir, I am wondering how the Cabinet can expect really and truly to do justice to the landlords or to the tenants by making regulations fixing the prices of house spots in the absence of a Rent Restriction committee or a tribunal. I do not think I am speaking for any Government or any particular Cabinet. You have certain personnel now comprising your Cabinet, and the next session you may have another set of Ministers. I can see no Government fixing the prices of land when they are not knowledgable about the matter. You have to know about land and land values to be able to fix the prices and everything coming from that.

Reading through this Bill, I have not seen anything as regards the right of appeal and, as I understand it, whatever the Regulations call for, they would be that.

However, Sir, you have to think in terms of both parties. You have to think of the landlord because, after all, it is the landlord's land. You also have to think of the tenants because it is the tenant's money. This Bill seems to make us to understand that the Government is leaning very heavily on the side of the tenants, although to me they are not leaning at all on that side. The landlord would only have to depend on the decision of the Cabinet. Whatever the Cabinet does would be that. However, I am saying that when one does not know land values, one does not know its value. I am sure that there are people today who own land and who do not know its value.

According to this Bill, you are going to make regulations as such, and there is the possibility that they may be

too little or too high; but when you have a panel of men who know their job, they would be better able to fix the prices.

As I was saying, you should have a Rent Restriction Board. I do not know what is the Government's intention, but I know that whenever you have too many politicians dealing with anything, you cannot get too far with it. Even the people who have to do with it are embarrassed at some time or another. In anything like this, you have to keep politicians far from it because a politician may find himself embarrassed too much. In fact, he has too many people to please, and it is his intention not to displease anybody at all. Any time you have too many people to please and you cannot please all, something goes wrong. I think that the Cabinet should not fix the value of the land.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Can the hon. member who is speaking on this Bill explain for the benefit of other hon. members exactly in which part of this Bill is the Cabinet given the authority to fix the price of land?

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Premier can ask whatever he likes, but I am going by what I see here in this Bill, It says here that the Cabinet may make regulations for fixing the permitted increases in the rent.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Probably it would be better if you dealt with the hon. member, but I have not come in here to tell anybody how to put a particular case. Under Subsection 2 of Clause 8, it is stated that all regulations made under this Act shall be laid before both Houses of the Legislature. In this particular case you will make regulations. This is worded exactly as the Rent Control Ordinance in Trinidad, and in this matter the hon. member is being deliberately misleading the House. He should have a modicum of intelligence to know that in a Bill of this kind, this is machinery which the Cabinet would find necessary to install. As a matter of fact, we would not have that time to waste to fix prices. We do not even have the time to listen to this harangue of nonsense by the hon. member. He can take it down to Coffee Gully and places like that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

According to Clause 8, sub-section 1, the Cabinet may make regulations for fixing the permitted increases in the rent of any lot in a tenantry in a prescribed area and generally for out purposes of this

Act.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you can plainly see what the Hon. Premier is out for and, really and truly, I am not in the spirit for that this afternoon; but if he pushes me into it, I can get into it.

This makes me to understand that the Hon. Premier himself had not read this Bill, and if he has read it he does not want to understand. What does this section say? It says:-

"The Cabinet may make regulations for fixing the permitted increases in the rent of any lot or lots in a tenantry in a prescribed area and generally for out the purposes of this Act."

What can this mean? It means that the Cabinet may make regulations for fixing the permitted increases. The permitted increases of what? The permitted increases of madness, foolishness, or ignorance? What would it be? I interpret it to mean "the permitted increases of rent".

Let us return to Clause 7 (1) "From and after the eighth day of June, 1965". Now, Sir, the note to the Clause is worded "Control of increases of rent." That Clause reads as follows: -

"From and after the eighth day of June, 1965 the rent exigible by an owner or lessee in respect of any lot in a tenantry within a prescribed area shall be the rent at which it was let at that date, and no increase shall be made in the rent payable in respect of that lot except in the manner and in accordance with regulations made under section 8 of this Act." 3.00 p.m.

(2) An owner or lessee who desires to increase the rent of any lot or lots in a tenantry within a prescribed area shall make application to the Magistrate exercising jurisdiction under subsection (2) of paragraph (c) of section 4 of the Magistrates' Jurisdiction and Procedure Act, 1956, in the Magisterial district in which the tenantry or any part thereof in respect of which the application is made is situated."

Nothing more can be done. Section 8 tells you that the Cabinet may make Regulations for fixing the permitted increases in the rent of any lot or lots in a tenantry in a prescribed area and generally for out purposes of this Act. Now, the hon. member is asking where in the Bill, the Cabinet has to fix anything, and that tells me and the people of this country as well that he has not read the Bill

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The hon. member would be pleased to know that not only have I read the Bill, but I drafted the Bill.

Mr. SMITH:

What is the hon. member speaking on?

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I was helping the hon. member. There is a difference between making regulations and the outright fixing of rent.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I have read this Section not long ago, and it says that the Cabinet may make regulations for fixing the

permitted increases in the rent; it does not say that the Cabinet will fix or increase the rent. The point is that the Cabinet may make regulations for fixing the permitted increase in the rent.

Mr. SMITH:

What is meant by permitting? Somebody says that you control the increases, and what are the increases? As I understand it, the increases would be money. This Bill is for the purpose of preventing landlords from putting all sorts of prices on their land. What are we dealing with? I was thinking that the increases would be money, that is to say, if a lot is rented at 12 cents per month today the increase would be as much as 30 cents. What would you be regulating? Would you be regulating the land and not the increases? I am saying that this Bill has not been properly drafted. We read in this Section 8 (1) that 'the Cabinet may make regulations for fixing the permitted increases in the rent of any lot or lots in a tenantry in a prescribed area and generally for out purposes of this Act'. That is not right; I know that it is not right.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order. The word 'carrying' has to be inserted between the words 'for' and 'out'. If Mr. St. John has briefed the hon. member, he had better brief him properly.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, do we have a Mr. St. John in here? The hon. member seems to have Mr. St. John on his tongue.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Hon. Premier has pointed out that there has been an error in the printing, and that point has been settled now.

Mr. SMITH:

The hon. member had this Bill before and why did he not amend it?

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

We circulated the amendments in the normal course of events, and it is known that when we get to the Second or Third Reading of Bill verbal amendments can be made, although the Bill has had two readings already. Must a Government Minister not only draft resolutions, but do the printing as well?

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, every time the hon. member gets up he makes the case worse. He is making the case worse each time he gets up, and I think it would be better if he were to sit down because, as I said, every time he gets up he makes the case worse. He makes the case weaker for my not going on with him in passing this Bill. If this Bill is for the purpose of helping people the time has come when we must not encourage people to hold

on to a little spot of land and pay so much a quarter. What we must do is to encourage people to own their spots. That is what the Government has in mind, and what they have told the people in their Manifesto. The Government said that they would purchase tenancies and allow the people to buy the spots on which they were living. Now they are saying that if the people do not pay so much arrears of rent they will have to leave the spots on which they are living. What I am suggesting is that they should

have told the people that if they owe arrears of three months' land rent, the landlord can eject them from the land; or, in other words, the landlord can get rid of them. They did not do that; what they did was to tell the people that they would buy the tenancies and, as far as I know, they have not yet purchased one tenancy. They have now introduced this 'nay nay' Bill when they have told the tenants that they would purchase these tenancies. This Bill says that if the landlord cares to be hard on the people in the next few weeks, they will be put off the land. I am not a solicitor or a lawyer; but, of course, there are some lawyers of whom I would say I do not know how they became lawyers. 3.10 p.m.

There are some lawyers and solicitors who are always breaking the law.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

This Bill does not deal with lawyers or solicitors, and I will ask the hon. member to stick to the Bill before him.

Mr. SMITH:

I am saying, Sir, that lawyers and solicitors draft Bills, and this has come from the hand of some solicitor or lawyer, and not from me, because I am a lay-man. We have a Premier in this House who is a lawyer.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I have told the hon. member to desist from making comments about lawyers or solicitors.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, lawyers or solicitors are not immune from having their names called in this Honourable Chamber.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I was explaining to the hon. member that he made reference to lawyers and solicitors, and I have told him not to repeat it, because it prolongs unnecessary debate. The question of lawyers and solicitors has nothing directly to do with this Bill. In passing you may make reference to lawyers and solicitors, but you cannot delve into the question about the ability of lawyers and solicitors.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I sat here last Tuesday and heard the Hon. Premier lambast the last Judge. He set the example and I am following on.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member has made a statement about my lambasting the last Judge. I made a statement specifically with respect to a pronouncement delivered on the bench which I did not consider a Judicial pronouncement, which tended in my mind to incite people to march to Government Headquarters, and I made a particular pronouncement and quoted a case from 2 All-England Law Reports of 1945, Yuill vs. Yuill which stated that a Judge should not descend into the arena, because his eyes may become clouded by the dust and smoke of the battle. I said that Judges ought to confine themselves to judicial and not political pronouncements, and I repeat it here today. I was not lambasting anybody; those were the words of the Lord Chief justice of England.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not see any Lord Chief Justice in this Bill, and he was allowed to call the Chief Justice's name.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Let me make the hon. member understand that at this point no direct reference to a lawyer, solicitor or Chief Justice will be entertained. We are going to deal with the Bill before us, and not go into any detail about the ability or otherwise of lawyers or solicitors. That is my final ruling. Let the hon. member continue.

Mr. SMITH:

I was making the point. Sir, that the time has come that, rather than trying to keep these people tied to a house spot and paying \$8 per quarter, the Government should brine down legislation calling on these landlords to sell these people the spots. By that I would know that the Government has the people in these tenancies at heart. I am sure, Sir, that that is not going to happen too easily, because I have heard that there is a certain member now who gave £3,000 for a property and is now asking £9,000 for it, and he was lucky enough to get an offer of £9,000 for it, but refused the offer. When they get up inside or outside of this Chamber and talk about these landlords fleecing the tenants, they are bigger land sharks than anybody else. Every man wants to get as much in his pocket as he can, regardless of how he gets it,

I am saying, Sir, that the time has come that a Land Restriction or Rent Restriction Ordinance be made calling on land owners to sell the land to those tenants who have occupied the spots for the last 40 years. There are some who have built groundsels and steps and have erected permanent structures, and under this Bill they can be called upon to leave if they create a nuisance. This is no protection now for them; their protection would be to buy the lots, and the Government should pay for those lots where the tenants are unable to buy them, and allow the tenants to repay the Government by way of rent. If they wanted to protect the tenants, they would have brought in a Bill to freeze all land transactions up to a certain time. When land elsewhere was being sold out and the Government thought the prices asked were too exorbitant, they brought in a Bill to freeze the sale of land and then brought in a Bill to appoint valuers. They did not come with a hot and sweaty Bill asking members of that day to pass it within an hour's time without seeing it. You should draft legislation now in such a way that if the owners want to sell the land, they would be able to sell to the tenants or to whomever they want to sell. I can afford to tell the people that nothing is being done for them because they are still out in the wilderness as far as this is concerned, unless it was included in the Bill that from 8th June no landlord can serve a notice. So long as they leave in this paragraph setting out how the land owners can get rid of the tenants, it is doing nothing for the tenants. 3.20 p.m.

You are not doing anything. This Bill does not worth the paper on which it is written, as far as proper protection is concerned. Proper protection would mean that any owner who wants to dispose of his land would have to sell it to the tenants; and if the tenants are not in a position to pay for their spots at the same time, that Government would step in and pay for it for them and the tenants will pay along the same lines as anybody who is paying rent. This is all. If that is so, it would be the best piece of legislation; but not this. The Hon. Premier was bragging and saying that this was the best piece of social legislation to be put on the Statute Book for the last hundred years. Looking at it, you can run a horse through it. I will have to say that to the advisers who drafted it. I want to know how the advisers are going to run through it for the landlords.

This is a waste of time and it is doing nothing. This Bill is only to catch votes. It is going to catch votes now, but I will catch them- not in Cabinet. This is only a vote-catching thing; and if it were not that single-member constituencies were coming about, members of the Government would have forgotten the tenants down here. Now that it is coming to late in the night and every man must break for himself, you are saying, \"Let us try and build up popularity among the tenants.\" But you are not building up any popularity among them as long as Lloyd Smith is alive.

There is no popularity whatsoever for you to gain by this Bill. Freeze this Bill and bring in a proper Bill. Bring in a Bill which says that any landlord who wants to dispose of his tenantry must give his tenants the first refusal and that would be the end of it. I will be prepared to say \"Aye\". If you do not do that you are doing nothing, you are still leaving them on a limb. I do not care what the people may say, any sympathetic person hearing me this afternoon must agree with me. The time has come when people living on rented land for more than 10 to 12 years should own it.

They do not have wide areas on which to live: they only live on house spots of about 2,000 square feet.

I can tell you that many of these tenants would buy tomorrow. As a matter of fact, some of them have the money in the Bank and they can go to the Bank tomorrow and draw the money to pay for the spot, but they cannot because the landlord is not going to sell the tenantry. He does not want to sell it; therefore, let it remain there.

Sir, it is Government's duty to protect the people. The Government is just like a father and mother to their children. Everything that you can do for your children, you are going to do it; therefore, everything which a Government can do, it is going to do. But I ask you not to do things in such a way as to cause people to say that you are smart or that you are fooling them; do it in some concrete way. Now is the time to do it; do not fool around any more. The tenants will be able to go to sleep happily if the Hon. premier does what I told him, but tonight they are not so very happy if this Bill is passed this way. They may have to tone down their motor cars; so they may not be able to get to work. They would have to send away their dogs because the dogs barking would cause a nuisance. When you do anything on your own which is liable to cause any obnoxious smell, that can cause a nuisance, and they will have to pay up their arrears of rent. They will have to do lots of things.

If the Government is really willing to help it would not have stated that in the Bill. As regards what I have told them to do, they can say that it is foolish advice; they can say it is advice coming from a foolish person; but if you do not want to do that, you do not want to protect them.

Well, Sir, if this Bill had really got through at the pre-vius Tuesday when the Hon. Premier wished to deal with it - and they failed, which caused them to walk out - I do not know if they were so afraid of the Bill that they had to run out and leave it because all was not well - imagine what would have happened! Imagine now, Sir, that the advisers or drafters draft a Bill today and before members receive it, amendments have to be made to it. That shows that it was a hasty, hot and sweaty Bill, and I daresay if you were to keep it longer, there would be more amendments. After the Bill was brought in here, they had to bring in amendments to it. A promise is a debt, and they owed the people that debt because they promised the people that they would buy out all the tenancies and pass the spots of land on which they

were living to them. The time has come when it should be done. We are nearer to election time than anything else. Their practice now is to walk out. They have to get up and have these measures passed in order to keep the confidence of the people, but I think it is still too late. The people of this country have had enough, have seen enough and have learnt enough; so they are not going to listen to them. I know of a case where a chauffeur of a motor van collided with a man and the chauffeur was so afraid that he got out of the van and ran straight home. He would not be seen with the van nor the man anymore. He was a burnt child. All these things, would soon be started, but the people are not protected by this Bill as it is. 3.30 p.m.

I have raised certain points in this Bill which I feel the draftsmen could get around. I feel that all is not well with it. As to the word \"nuisance\", if anyone knows the meaning of it, that word should be taken out. There are a lot of things which would cause the poor tenants to leave, and in the absence of a tribunal or a Rent Restriction Board, I can-not see that this Bill will work so well, i cannot see that you can fix the price of land rents or make any valuation of land without such a tribunal. Something like that should be done rather than leave the Bill like this. The Government has all the time and the opportunity to get around these things. They should bring down a Bill for the purpose of \"freezing\" all land; they can go through this Bill again and put it in order. As I have already said, I think the word \"nuisance\" should be defined, and they should bring down a Bill to the effect that if a landowner wants to sell a tenantry he must give the tenants priority of purchase and the Government would be there as a standby; in case that the tenants are unable to buy the land, then the Government will buy it. That is the

sort of Bill which will suit the tenants better. I beg to move that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. BOX1LL and Mr. WEEKES rose to speak.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I should like to remind the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that the second reading of a Bill has to be passed before a motion can be made for sending that Bill to a Select Committee. My eye caught the hon. junior member for St. Philip first.

Mr. BOXILL:

I do not want to question Your Honour's ruling, but I should just like to remind Your Honour that I seconded the motion for the suspension of the sitting,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. junior member for St. Thomas is right this time. (After a Pause), If the hon. member would just give me a moment... (4 pause) I do not see in the Standing Orders of this House that seconding the motion for the suspension of the sitting gives the hon. member the right to speak- The hon. member has a right to speak after seconding the motion for adjournment.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I take it

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I am taking it that the hon. member has risen to speak, on the point which has been raised by the

junior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

No, Sir, I want to speak on the Bill.

Mr. WEEKES:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is my duty as one who is from among the masses to give this Bill my whole-hearted and unstinting support. I do so with a full sense of responsibility as a member of this hon. House. This Bill strikes at the root of evil and wrong-doing and it has been introduced for the purpose of protecting the tenants of this island. We, on this side of the Table, would be traitors to the electors of this Island if we did not introduce new legislation so as to protect the poor unfortunate tenants. I consider this Bill as a very far-reaching one; it not only protects the tenants of this generation, but it also protects the tenants of the future generation. Sir, this matter is a simple one. Before this Government took over the reins of office, tenants were given notices to quit and deliver up possession of houseplots, and if they could not acquire suitable places in which to place their houses, they would be ejected; not only that, but their houses would be placed at the side of the road. Their belongings would also be exposed to public view.

Sir, imagine a poor woman who has a number of children receiving a notice to quit and deliver up possession of a spot of land. She has no where to, place her house and she is ejected. It means, Sir, that she has to apply to the Government for assistance and she will also have to apply to the Institution for help. If she were to take her children to her family and friends and they are not in a position to help her with the children, then she has to take them to the Institution. 3.40 p.m.

When it comes to the help and maintenance which the Government can give at the Institutions, those things are a burden to the taxpayers, and the unscrupulous and wicked landlords sell the land, put the money on the bank and do not care what becomes of the poor tenants. I consider myself to be a small landlord, because I have ten tenants on my land; but, Sir, I feel that the interests of the tenants should be protected, and therefore I give this Bill my support. You will agree with me, Sir, when I state that to offer a house plot to tenants at \$1.25 a square foot is quite unreasonable, dishonest and unjustifiable. None of the former Governments, including the Barbados Labour Party, took any interest in the tenants, and it has taken a very strong fearless Socialist Government with honesty of purpose to introduce such legislation.

Sir, some time ago an old man from the constituency which I represent came to me with tears in his eyes and explained that he had been given notice to quit and deliver up the spot of land on which his house was placed. I sugges-

ted to him that he go back to the landlord and beseech him to re-consider the matter. He did so, but the landlord was unsympathetic and the old house was taken down and placed beside the trench. This abominable sin and injustice by the landlord was meted out to this poor, unfortunate and penniless old man. Could the members of this Government allow such things to happen? The answer must be in the negative.

I noticed, Sir, a very lengthy article in the Advocate newspaper which had as its headline 'Land Measure Is Just Stupid'.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I want to caution the hon. member not to read from the newspaper.

Mr. WEEKES:

I have notes, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. WEEKES:

I saw and read an article in the news-paper and the headline was \"Land Measure Is Just Stupid\". This was last Sunday's Advocate. I feel, Sir, that the writer failed to represent the tenants, but has done a11 that lies in his power to represent the landlord. Regardless of his vocation, I am prepared to say that I consider him stupid, instead of the stupidity which he mentioned with regard to this Act. I can only implore the masses of this island to beware of wolves in sheep's clothing and do their utmost to support this Government which has always done and will continue to do its utmost on behalf of the masses.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I give this Resolution my full sup-port.

Mr. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what surprises me most is that when this Bill was first introduced a couple of Tuesdays ago, one would have thought that the Conservative element of the Legislature would have been up in arms; but like all intelligent people, the Conservative element in here saw fit to laud this piece of legislation and has already stated emphatically that they are going to support it. Those of us who were here last Tuesday and saw the display of the so-called Socialist element on the opposite side of this Chamber, I am sure, were shocked and appalled at the statements that were made and the filibustering that went on from then until ten minutes ago.

When the Leader of the Opposition got up to speak on this Bill, he started to do what is mostly expected of rite Opposition, and I will say here, as I have always said, that it is the duty of the Opposition always to make things in-teresting for the Government by pointing out what in their opinion they consider weaknesses in Bills, Resolutions or what have you; but it is also noted, remarkably so, Sir, that although the Leader of the Opposition said that this Bill could work two ways, he still gave this Bill his whole-hearted support along with the other members of his Party. 3.50 p.m.

The hon. leader of the Opposition pointed out that the Bill can cut two ways and that those tenants wanted to buy the house spots on which they were living; but because the landlords had already found out that the tenants could not pay the price for the land, they had served them with evic-tion notices.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Sir, I hate to rise on a point of order, but I have to do so. The hon. junior member for St. Thomas, while not misquoting me, has omitted to put exact-ly the point which I made. I do not know if it is his inten-tion to do so, but having gone on from the point which I made, he started to state the reason why they were offered this land. Sir, you will recall the suggestion which I made whereby appraisers could be appointed. I did say that; I went on to say that the Government would be able to control the price. The hon. member did state that I said that it would cut both ways, but I went on to make that as a sug-gestion which should be incorporated into the Bill

Mr. BOXILL:

Have I misquoted the hon. Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I did not say that hon. member mis-quoted me. I said that he omitted to mention that suggestion.

Mr. BOXILL:

I am not going to be too ticklish about that. After the hon. Leader of the opposition spoke quite lengthily, he made it very clear that he was going to support this Bill. Then we had the hon. junior member for St. George who pointed out things in his regular philosophical way and he started by saying that Clauses 3, 4, and 5 of this Bill were not agreed to by the Party to which he belongs, but he did not mention that it was this Government which had to change a section of the Town and Country Planning Act which stated that a person may appeal against a decision given by the Town and Country Planning Officer, but that person was not permitted to attend the appeal. This Government has changed that legislation so that the person who filled the plea can attend/These are things which the hon. member has not remembered or probably he does not know.

When one listened to the hon. junior member of St. George last week, one noticed that he was very careful not to say, as she is so often fond of saying, that he would change this piece of legislation if he were a Minister again.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I regret very much that I have to answer that ugly remark by the hon. member. He has misquoted me. The hon. member referred to the Town and Country Planning Act, 1959, and to part of this Bill which states that for the purpose of this Act the provisions of section 4 of the Town and Country Planning Interim Control Act, 1959 shall apply to all applications for permission to sell any lot or lots in a tenantry.

Mr. BOXILL:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not hear what the hon. member said, I never said that the particular legislation was changed. I said that the present Government changed part of the legislation so that the person could attend the appeal. The hon. junior member for St. George was probably not listening to me. It is so foolish -

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Do not invite unnecessarily any misconduct in this Chamber.

Mr. BOXILL:

I will tell you this; I will behave myself.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

You are not to tell the Chair what to do.

Mr. BOXILL:

If I am wrong, I am sorry.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member continue.

Mr. BOXILL:

I was saying before I was so rudely interrupted.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Let me tell the hon. junior member for St. Thomas this. While the hon. member was speaking, the hon. junior member for St. George spoke on a point of order. I want the hon. member to understand that never at any time during the last five minutes was there any unnecessary interruption, and I am going to ask the hon. member to withdraw that remark now.

Mr. BOXILL:

What must I withdraw?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That you were so rudely in-terrupted.

Mr. BOXILL:

I did not say that you were rudely inter-rupted.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

You were not rudely interrupted at any time that you were speaking. Let the hon. member continue.

Mr BOXILL:

As I was saying, Sir, any person listening to the hon. junior member for St. George would have noticed that he was particular in not saying that he brought forward

this piece of legislation. He simply ranted and filibustered; but what was most shocking was when his colleague got up to speak. 4.00 p.m.

These were the words which were used by the hon. member's colleague. "Only a large scale idiot or a full-size monkey would vote against this Bill." I am saying Sir, that at that time there Were two large scale idiots and one full-size monkey that I had seen.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. May I ask the hon. member where he saw those animals? It would be interesting to know whether some of the animals are in this horseshoe.

Mr. BOXILL:

I saw these animals out side the Chamber just after the session was over. I remember some years ago that a gentleman had a talking parrot and this parrot repeated a speech which the gentleman made. At the end it said "Ladies and gentlemen, the words you have just heard are not really the opinion of me." Last Tuesday the hon. junior member for St. Joseph made an aside after something which I had said. He said this "Simple Simon met a pieman." He should have said "Simple Simon met a pie," but you cannot eat that pie because it has no sub-stance. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph spoke today for

over one hundred minutes and said during the course of his remarks that those who drafted this Bill did not know what they were doing. However, up to this moment for all the time during which the hon. member spoke, he has not suggested one amendment to the Bill.

You will remember, Sir, that last week when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was talking about some of these tenantries, he referred to a tenantry known as Holder's Tenantry. It might surprise you to hear that this tenantry has approximately 300 houses on it and what is appalling is that it has absolutely no roads or water or standposts in the area. There is no light.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order. The hon. member is quite right, but I also referred to the fact that we called in this man and asked him to do something about these roads and we threatened him.

Mr. BOXILL:

What is most shocking is that the least that any tenant has to pay is \$3.00 per month, if these people were living on Government land, you would have seen very many petitions. I have been told that the tenants cannot owe one month's rent; as soon as they owe a month's rent, they are levied on immediately and they have to get the money. No complaints were made. Would any intelligent person come in here with this Bill which is now before us, and say that this Bill is one for the purpose of supporting landlords? I am saying this now. If the hon. member feels that this is a Bill which is for the purpose of supporting landlords, he can vote against it so that I will be able to have something more to talk about than cane fires. If the hon. member votes for this Bill, he will still be in a neck-tie because he will be voting with a Government which is , passing legislation the effect of which is to support landlords. You can either vote for this Bill or vote against it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

You mean the hon. member, not "you".

Mr. BOXILL:

Well, Sir, I want the hon. member to vote against this Bill. The hon. member was saying towards the end of his speech that in his opinion this is a political gimmick and that we must have told the magistrates to support us. I can assure you that if your Government used to interfere with the judiciary, this Government does not do that. (Mr. HUSBANDS The Deputy Speaker has no Government.) I am not talking to you.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member is supposedly addressing Your Honour and he made use of the words " Your Government". He heard me say in an aside that the Deputy Speaker has no

Government. I know that you did not hear what the hon. member said, but I consider it to be rude and unparliamentary for an hon. member to be addressing the Chair and to be using the words "Your Government". Your Honour can say who is right and who is wrong.

Mr. BOXILL:

I am saying, Sir, that if the Government of which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was a party,

used to interfere with the members of the Judiciary, the Government of the Democratic Labour Party has no intention of so doing. 4.10 p.m.

The hon. member went on to say that the Government should buy all the tenancies; but when the Premier first outlined the reason for introducing this bit of legislation, he took pains to point out that to acquire all the necessary tenancies would cost this Government something in the vicinity of \$13 million. It is true, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the hon. Junior member for St. Joseph was a member of the Party that ran the affairs of this country for seventeen years, but it is also true that he had absolutely no say in it, because if he did he would know that for a Government to acquire money, it has to go about it in many ways, and one of the ways is taxation. On more than one occasion the Premier who is Minister of Finance has pointed out that taxes here are fairly high; yet here is a member who supports a so-called Socialist Party asking the Government to tax people more than what they can afford to the tune of \$13 million. The point, Sir, is that if the Government made the mistake of buying one tenancy of, say, five acres for \$100,000, you can understand that when they go to acquire the second tenancy, they would be asked to pay \$200,000, and there would be no stopping; and I am sure that the same members would come into this Chamber and look towards the Gallery and say how this Government is killing the poor taxpayers, that formerly a fellow could pick a "berry", but since this Government has come into power he cannot pick a "berry" any longer. If the members who ran the Government to which he belonged had given him a chance to see how a Government is really run, he would know that money is not dipped out of the sea or is not found on a ledge, but comes from people like you and me and 240,000 odd people in this island.

The hon. member said so many things, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that one was at a loss to understand which side he was on. He said that politicians were interfering too much. I always challenge people who make that statement. Why should politicians not interfere with everything? They have been given a mandate by the people to look after their affairs. When he said that politicians interfere too much, he was referring to the last Government, because you know, Sir, that such places as the Housing Authority and the Transport Board were the resting place for a lot of the Barbados Labour Party yard fowls. All they had to do was to go to certain Ministers and tell the Ministers that they voted for them, that the person doing the job did not like them, and in went one and out the other. I know for a fact that during the last election gasoline was used out of the taxpayers' money in the taxpayers' van with people canvassing against this party.

Now what I am at a loss to understand is what the hon. junior member for St. George has said, because he talked all night last Tuesday and did not make one point. Despite all the criticism which they had against this piece of legislation, they have not up to this day brought an amendment to this Bill though they said it is badly drafted, it is drafted in favour of the landlords and against the tenants and everything is wrong with it. You will have noticed, Sir, that in every political speech which the hon. junior member for St. George has made on this floor in recent times, he is always talking about what he will rescind and what his Government will rescind, but I cannot understand how he can have the temerity to come into this House or even go on a political platform after the hon. senior member for St. Peter sat here last year and heard the statement out of his mouth relative to the economy of the island and the numerous cane fires which were then taking place. I do not know if some people have no shame. Apparently one would think so after hearing some members of this Chamber.

I am going to sit, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and give this Bill my blessing and I am going to listen

distinctly to hear who will vote against this Bill because the hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that only a large-scale idiot or full-sized monkey would criticise this Bill, and that he went on to say that this Bill is solely and strictly to protect the landlords.

Mr. YEARWOOD and Mr. HUSBANDS rose.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

My eyes caught the hon. junior member for St. John first.

Mr. YEARWOOD:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to commend the Government for a Bill of this kind. Thinking about legislation which has been passed in this Honourable Chamber, and with reference to this legislation which the Premier referred to as the best in the last 100 years, I would myself say that I feel that since emancipation there is not a Bill that will pass this Chamber as important as this Bill in my hand. After sitting and listening to the section of the Labour party on the other side - the hon. junior member for St. George and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph - it leaves me to wonder, if we had Conservatives in 1837 or 1838 with the same mind as those members, whether the abolition of slavery would ever have come about in this island. 4.20 p.m.

After hearing the Hon. Premier outline this Bill, I thought it would have passed through this House in an hour's time. I heard the hon. junior member for St. George say that there is nothing new in this Bill. I would like to let the hon. member know that in 1961 in the constituency of St. John which was represented by a Minister of his Government, appeals were being made to stop a lady's house from being thrown off the spot. That lady had eight children and her aunt was working at the plantation, as well as her sis-ter. That lady rented a little spot in between them, and after she left and went to another plantation to work, her house was thrown off the spot. It was a house which, although it needed repairs, she could have lived in it; but after it was being removed and was so bad to put up again I gave her permission to put it in my yard and they burnt it out as firewood.

I would like the hon. junior member for St. George to state after this Bill is passed if any of the landlords would be able to do that. In 1963, a gentleman working at the same plantation died leaving his wife and some small children. The wife was unable to work and in six months' time she was given a notice to quit.

The hon. junior member for St. George said that there is nothing new in this Bill, I really would like him to explain what he means by saying that there is nothing new in this Bill. It is true, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that members sitting in the Opposition would oppose, but I never thought that a member who says that he is a Socialist would not support a Bill like this and would state openly that he is opposed to this Bill.

I am shocked, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to think that I heard the hon. junior member for St. George saying that as long as there is a sugar industry and wherever there is sugar, there is bound to be slavery, and therefore the people must have a certain amount of aid. To what has he generated the people of this island? These are the things which we have to watch. How far down are we going to send all the people? Do you mean to say that because there are sugar workers, you must provide aid? Never in the history of Barbados have sugar workers felt as happy as they feel tonight because they realise that whatever they

do with their little home they do not have to move it. They can start to build groundsels around their homes; they can start and put in electricity which they could not do before because of the fear that when they do that they could be called upon to move their house. I am sure that the speeches of the hon. junior member for St. George and the hon. Junior member for St. Joseph would never be forgotten by the tenants - especially those living in the rural areas, and I am sure that both hon. members are going to pay for what they said.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am happy. Why I am happy is because this was a burden on politicians - the ones who take the interest in the underprivileged. Whenever a tenant was ordered off a tenantry, he usually sought the politician to bring his complaints. People are turned off tenancies just because of their political ideas. Some of them cannot talk politics for those in authority to hear. If the landlord is in favour of this political Party and the tenant talks in favour of another political Party, too often that tenant is turned off the land. Why should this be so?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I support this Bill one hundred percent, and I must again say that I commend this Government for bringing down this Bill at the time at which they have brought it.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not attempt-ing to electioneer on this Bill, I will give a cold and dispassionate criticism or confirmation in part on this piece of legislation. Hon. members and indeed the general Public of Barbados will know and will remember that the question of finding house spots for people in this country has been a difficult problem. It has been my experience that more than one Government of this country found itself in the position of having to resite tenants after a sale of tenantry land. The Government preceding this one has had that experience more than once.

Sir, I remember on one occasion in this Chamber during the regime of the former Government that the Government was placed in an embarrassing position relative to the short notice given to tenants that the land on which they were tenants was for sale. 4.30 p.m.

This present Government has found itself in that same embarrassing position. We have listened to the Hon. Pre-mier as he gave a recital, while perusing his files, of the embarrassment in which this Government has found itself with regard to more than one tenantry which he has mentioned. Looking back at the introduction of this Bill, one feels that he should commend the Government for bringing ('own this piece of legislation, but there is always an ultimate end and an immediate end. Sometime ago I read one of the weekly newspapers and I was informed that this Bill had for its immediate aim and object the prevention of the development of some land at Oistins. That is what it was worth to the public of Barbados. As a citizen of Barbados, I read what this newspaper had to say vis-a-vis the introduction of this Bill. I am not at all saying that I agree with what was written in that newspaper, but there is something in the amendments which have been brought down which makes me feel a bit worried over whether the introduction of this piece of legislation was a normal tidying-in with broad, general Government policy, or whether it was something to do with a particular happening. In other words, I was wondering whether it was just a piece of expediency - I agree in differentiating between these things - and not even tidy-ing-in with the broad objective of Government policy. if the latter is the case, I commend the Government on bringing down this piece of legislation. On the other hand, I do not

take the extreme view and say that this is the most wonderful piece of legislation which has ever been thought of by any Government. However, Sir, I listened to that recital which was given by the Hon. Premier in his attempt to convince this House that owing to the rather recurrent embarrassment to his Government and to the preceding Government, it was quite necessary to bring down a Bill of this sort at this time, and I wondered whether or not, as some others would have thought, it is just a piece of expedient legislation which has been brought down at this time for a particular reason.

The public of Barbados must be satisfied about that. I did not say or rather I would not say, because I talk from what I know, that this is a vote-catching measure. I am not going to begin to criticise people's motives. I am dealing with the Bill in my own way.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member is a former Speaker of this

House and he knows that one of the privileges which is claimed, on behalf of the House at the opening of the Legislature, from the Crown is the right of access to the Sovereign or Her representative, freedom of speech, and the main privilege which is claimed is that the best construction must be placed on the debates of this Chamber. I went to considerable lengths in outlining the whole history of this eviction of tenants, and now we have the hon. member saying that he has read in the newspaper that this Bill was brought down for the purpose of preventing some merchant from developing his land at Oistins. That is the hon. member who was sitting in the Chair at one time. The hon. member said that he will or does not challenge people's motives. He will challenge the motives in this Bill whether they be vote-catching or not. I do not see the way we could get thrown out if we introduce legislation to stop people from being thrown off land. I may have to accuse the hon. member of intellectual dishonesty if he goes on like that.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member has said nothing; as a matter of fact, he had nothing to say. I said that I am not going to challenge the motives behind this Bill. (Hon. E. W. BARROW That is exactly what you are doing.) If a man says that, is that against the Government? Who but the Hon. Premier would try to challenge what I intend to say?

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order. The hon. member knows what he is doing - attacking the thing in a very underhand kind of way.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have not accused this Government of any improper motive vis-a-vis this Bill. I think that I have the privilege to read any newspaper in Barbados.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order. The only good thing that the Labour party did was to remove him from the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I am not hearing both hon. members. There have been exchanges by both hon. members as regards that particular point. Nothing more will entertain on that point. Let the hon. junior member for St. Peter

Speak on this Bill.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you seem to be angry with me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I am preserving the order of this House.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if there is any-body who has been offended in this House up to now, that person is your humble servant, but I will maintain my balance. I again repeat that I attached no improper motives relative to the introduction of this Bill. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want that to go down in the records. Not only this Govern-ment but.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the hon. member entitled to come in this House and quote from a newspaper, using that newspaper as an authority for what he is saying and not bring the newspaper and make it a document of this House? That is the worst type of hearsay evidence you could have. 4.40 p.m.

The hon. member who is supposed to have been Speaker for nearly ten years is the person who breaks the Rules of this House more consistently than even the hon. junior member for St. Joseph or the hon. Junior member for St. George.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I have heard quite a number of members refer to what they read in the newspaper with-out the document being produced today.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not quote from any newspaper; I only made reference to the fact that I had read the newspaper, and nowhere in the Rules of this

Parliament or of any Parliament I have ever heard of is a member prevented from saying that. Continuing, Sir, again I say that I attach no improper motives to the introduction of this Bill by this Government. That is plain and simple English that even the Hon. Premier may understand; but as I will be asked to vote on this Bill, I have the right to speak on it and I will continue to do so. It is most emphatically not that sweeping piece of legislation as we have been told. It does give some form of security to those who live on tenancies, referring to conditions under which they may be ejected, and also concerning the increases of rents. It goes on further than that, and no person who has to interpret this Bill is going to see anything more in it than that. This Bill, it was hoped, would have been enacted into legislation in a rather hasty manner. Before any of us on this side of the horseshoe had the opportunity to read this Bill, we were asked to consent to it. Actual campaigning went on concerning this Bill before many of us were able to get into Parliament and speak on it; therefore those who are responsible for bringing this Bill into Legislation thought it to be a rather important piece of legislation, and I presume from their actual campaigning at that time they thought it would have met with a great measure of opposition; therefore they saw to it that the public became informed about the contents of the Bill.

Now I do not say that this Bill is as highly controvert-sial as the action of the Government might make it appear to some people, and it is not as highly controversial as the Government would want it to appear to the general public. Again I repeat it is for us to be convinced and to give it such praise or condemnation as we see in this measure to expedite the policy for protecting certain unfortunate citizens of this country. In as much as we become convinced of \"one, we give it its praise, and in like proportion as we become convinced of the other, we give it its condemnation. No one would oppose the principle of granting security to those who rent land in this country, but is this Bill the solu-tion to the continual embarrassment of Government by way of having now and again to resite people on lands that they have bought? I do not think so. A short-sighted view tells me to say \"yes\".

What is the position as has been outlined by the Premier? If I remember correctly, he said that in relation to one particular tenantry, when the tenants would have bought the land, the owners were able to inform them that they could get so much of a better price that they would not be able to buy, and I believe quite honestly that this is the general pattern of behaviour on behalf of certain land owners in this country, and especially in the metropolitan parish, and that is why at first this Bill came down with the right of Cabinet to have certain areas deemed \"pre-scribed areas\". You will remember that the original Bill before the amendments came down included \"prescribed areas\", but this right of prescription that was included in the original draft is now completely deleted-- which tells us now that it was some after-thought to extend the safeguards of this Bill to the rural areas, because the ex-perience not only of this Government but that of its pre-decessor brought it into conflict for the most part with landlords of the metropolitan parish and not so much in the far-flung rural areas. I do not think any Minister can dare deny that; I do not think the Hon. Premier, were he still in his seat, would attempt to deny that; so now that I see that this right of prescription is deleted from this Bill, it means that the protection offered by this Bill is now extended to the rural areas, and I feel that that was just an after-thought. Any time it becomes an after-thought, you tend to believe it was not a matter that really stemmed from policy, and you have reason to say that.

Now many of us in here represent rural areas. Many of the Government's backbenchers represent rural areas and they can see that the amendment came after, and they should be a little lukewarm now in their extensive or lavish praise of this Bill. 4.50 p.m.

It was not intended to be as widespread as some after-thought prompted the Government to make it by bringing down an amendment and giving protection to every tenant.

Now, Sir, we have the amendments with us today and I would like the Hon. Minister of Education who is acting Leader of the House to listen to me very carefully. Mr. Deputy Speaker, are you aware that after now, this Bill will yet need more amendments to be made to it? I have already seen one which would be needed to be made to section 8 subsection (1).

Relative to the amendments to be moved into the Bill, it is stated that the explanation of Clause 3 is deleted. When I read Clause 3 as it is in the Bill, it says:-

\"The Cabinet may by Order prescribe any area in the Island as an area to which the provisions of this Act shall apply.\"

Now, Clause 3 is deleted.

In the explanation to Clause 4 the words \"in a prescribed area\" are deleted and the figure is substituted for the figure 4.

The actual words in Clause 4 are as follows:-

(1) \"No owner or lessee of a tenantry or of any part thereof within a prescribed area which is now or shall hereafter be sub-divided into lots for the purpose of being let to tenants for housing shall, without the prior permission of the Town and Country Planning Officer signified in writing, divide or sell any lot or part of such tenantry.\"

Under Clause 2, the definition of \"prescribed area is deleted. If the definition is deleted then \"prescribed area\" in this Clause means nothing. Clause 3 is deleted; therefore there is no \"prescribed area\" now. As I see it, you will need another amendment.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker I rise on a point of order. I simply would like to draw to the attention of the hon. member that the main body of the Bill merely relates to one prescribed area and that is the whole island now. Whereas the former Bill would have become effective to a prescribed area, that has been taken out. There is no necessity now for the Cabinet to prescribe an area; it applies to the whole island. The hon. member is just wasting a valuable lot of time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I take that as a point of explanation.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

I know as I am known.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I am hearing voices louder than the hon. member who is addressing the Chair. For what reason, I do not know.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think you have heard what I said. Part of the amendments brought in state that there is no \"prescribed area\", yet in Clause 4 (1) there is a \"prescribed area\". The Clause \"The Cabinet may by Order prescribe any area in the Island as an area to which the provisions of this Act shall apply,\" is deleted. You do not have it any more. Some Hon. members may talk back.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It is very seldom that a Speaker has to say anything, but there is a misunderstanding on both sides of the House in view of the amendments. There is a little difficulty in defining \"prescribed area.\" As night follows day it would be strikingly strange if hon. members do not say that. The Hon. Minister can expect that hon. members will elucidate on this amendment. It is too elementary that something is wrong there.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

I think it is obvious to the Hon. Minister now. Before I had spoken it was not obvious, but it is now obvious. The entire wording is obvious.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I want to assure the hon. member that what he has said to make it clear is not out of order.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Let us deal now with the restricted clauses. I refer to clause 5, para-graph (a) It reads as follows-

"No order of ejectment shall be made on the application of the owner or lessee or of any agent of the owner or lessee of a tenantry or of any part thereof within a prescribed area against any tenant in such a tenantry unless it is proved to the satisfaction of a court of summary jurisdiction under the provisions of any law affecting the relationship of landlord and tenant that - 5.00 p.m.

(a) any part of the rent payable in respect of the tenancy is in arrears in the case of a monthly tenancy for a period of three months or more, or where the tenancy is a weekly tenancy for a period of thirteen weeks or more, or

To be reasonable, you can say that some form of security is there. That is written in the Bill; but if a tenant is in arrears and he is a monthly tenant, after a period of three months he may be proceeded against for ejection. What is the position now? This law comes into effect whenever this Bill is passed as from the 8th June 1965. Let us think of the position on the 7th June, 1965. On that date, the position is that notwithstanding the debt or the arrears of debts of six months or sixteen years, you cannot get any tenant off the land unless you give him six months' notice. Up to the 7th June, 1965, the law is that six months' notice must be given.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. Again the hon. member is becoming confused. He is referring to the Security of Tenure (Small Holdings) Act. The notice is for a period of six months expiring on the 31st May, in some cases. The hon. member is now dealing with the agricultural tenancies.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

This Bill with the prescriptive right now applies to the country and that includes agricultural holdings. Is the hon. member sure of what he is saying? Sometimes I hear hon. members say that there should be a school master in here, and I agree with that. If I must be a party to anything, I must go into it carefully. I listened well to the Hon. Premier and much of what he says I am in agreement with. I have been made to understand that some-times these Town and Country Planning people put obstruction in the way of the development of people - the development of some of these same tenants. I understand that on more than one occasion in the past when tenants would express their willingness to buy the land on which they have their lodgings, the conditions demanded by the Town and Country Planning Department were such as to put obstructions in the way of people, even the Government which is considering buying the land. I do not offer any criticism until I have examined both sides of the question. I will ask the Government to take a serious stand in all of these matters. I have nobody or no party or anything to defend and therefore I can talk straight. What is really the Solution to this problem? It is not just providing security of tenure

for those who are tenants and who may need more far-reaching legislation to be deemed to remain as tenants for life, and it may be that their children will remain tenants. The creation of such conditions which will enable these tenants to be able to buy this land, the sort of appraisal of this land which is not made to attract Canadians and Americans, the sort of valuation which is not attracting Canadians and Americans so as to prevent the small tenants from owning the land, is a step which has to be taken by the Government who wants to tell us that this is the most far-reaching piece of legislation which has been enacted by a Government. That is not true; this is not the entire solution, it could not hope to be. You cannot put me off the land if I do not create a nuisance; you cannot put me off the land if I do not do certain things; but that does not mean that I have the right to buy the land. 5.10 p.m.

There is still the possibility by this Act of selling a tenantry, though the Minister must be consulted; the Town

and Country Planning Officer must talk to him, but the Minister has the final word. All that is covered in this Act.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member mentioned that the Bill does not give the right to acquire a spot, but I should like to say that it does not deter a person from acquiring. He is making the point that the right should be given to acquire that plot, but what I am trying to point out is that it does not deny a tenant the privilege of acquiring the plot. I want him to get that point clearly.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

I would like to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that what the Hon. Minister has said is also a negative statement like mine. In other words, we both made negative statements which add nothing. This is not going as far as it should go. We do not intend to oppose the principle of this Bill or to deem it as having improper motives as the Hon. Premier wanted to impute to me; but because there is not that opposition to the Bill, it does not mean that we are satisfied with it. I would not attempt to besmirch the integrity and purpose of this Government; I do not have to get on from such a low foundation; never have I had to do that, and never will I have to do that. I would say, however, that with the very best motives, the position remains not as changed as I believe they want it to be. It is not as far-reaching as some people who cannot really discern would think, but it makes those of us who have looked at the Bill, and who can reflect upon the experience of two Governments and who of course keep their ears glued to the ground, think and think hard. I am not saying inside or outside of this Chamber that it is vote catching, but we will hear, more of it when we start to go back to the people. I will be saying that it did not go as far as we thought it would have, and that it is not a real solution to the problems of the Barbadian. Now every Barbadian loves his freehold; it is a pattern of life and you cannot get away from it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Government knows the difficulty it has to remove some people from slums and put them in better environments in their housing areas, because they do not like these apartment houses. The premier describes them as architecture, but I could not find such a grandiloquent word to describe the type of house the tourists call "doll houses."

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for five minutes.

Mr. LOWE:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

On Resumption:

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was at the point of saying before the suspension that lack of opposition to the Bill should not be construed to mean that the Bill has all the favour that we would like it to have, as I was careful to point out. When I compare the law which could be said to exist up to 7th June this year relative to the ejection of tenants on agricultural holdings or house-spots found on page 547 in Part II of the Security of Tenure (Smallholdings) Act, 1955, that includes the housespot, and not simply the agricultural holding as someone wants to make us believe. When I talk, I talk from foundation. These are the Laws of Barbados, 1955, Volume 8 Part II - Agricultural holdings or houses pots. Compare this with what has been existing and what will now cease to exist. In this you can be ejected if you owe three months' rent, while with the other Bill you could not be ejected if you owed fourteen years unless after notice of six months,

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill does not repeal the 1955 Land Tenure Act. That Act is still in operation, but what is pointed out in this Bill is

that you cannot be ejected, proceedings cannot be taken against a tenant unless the tenant commits a breach of the provisions of this Act, but it does not mean that you would not be entitled to six months' under the provisions of the 1955 Act.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no movement. The hon. member is a schoolmaster and not a Judge. I do not accept interpretations from lawyers in this place; I accept them from Judges on the Bench. The position is improved relative to a certain type of security, Sir; you cannot now eject unless for the reasons set out, and you cannot sell or attempt to sell for the purpose of ejectment anymore. That is the position that I know is not going to be given outside when we attempt to electioneer, but I am not electioneering. I do not carry out my electioneering in this Place, and even when I carry it outside the walls of this Place, I have a reputation of being faithful to the truth up to now.

Many amendments will have to follow this Bill, and when I say that I am not casting any aspersions on the present Government, because none of us will ever live long enough to see a perfect piece of legislation. Do not let us give the people of Barbados the impression that this will be the Land Tenure Act for all time. This Bill with its amendments has to be enacted today, and other amendments will follow - some only typographical, others more than typographical - before the Bill can even satisfy those who created it. 5.30 p.m.

This, I must come to the conclusion, has been conceived in undue haste, and that need not have been after the experience of this Government and that of its predecessor because they were faced and confronted with the doings of landlords. They could not hope to do what they thought to do. They could not hope to do what they are doing unless they were unmindful of the things that were left to be done vis-a-vis the security of landlord tenure.

The Hon. Premier gave a brilliant and historical background to the type of culture that developed in this island. Today it is not so; this Bill is coming somewhere as a modification - not as a salvation. The brunt of what I have been saying is that the people of this country must not be deceived or confused by this Bill; it is just what it is and no more. It gives, in a certain measure, security of land tenure and it appears - and I regret very much to say it appears - that after some reflection, the right of restriction had to be deleted and the privilege extended to the whole island. I do not think that any government can be tempted to say that this Bill, where rural housing - as far as plantation lands - is concerned, is more than just renting a house spot. The conditions that apply to tenants on rented plantation spots are different from those who occupy a tenantry spot, that is to say, the tenants in the metropolitan area. It is not a question of fear; it is a question of making my position clear on this matter and telling hon. members just what I see in the Bill; how it is precise and how it is not so precise and how you can tidy it with the tying-in of the policy of the Government. I hope that it is just a measure of expediency.

Sir, let me repeat in closing that I want this to go down in the record that I am not imputing any improper motives to the creators of this Bill. When I say that, and call the attention of the House to that, I want to let it be known that if I want to speak on it in another place, I know that I can speak on it. Having regard to the background and circumstances such as what has worried this Government and even the preceding Government, you can very well see that this is not just a push over. There is a sort of truce in the metropolitan area, but you must admit that it is just a check for now. This is not really what is wanted; this would stave off the rapacious landlord may be for a long, long time. No thinking member can hope that Government would be able to buy Harmony Hall Tenantry, Gibbons Tenantry and all the tenancies which we know about; but talking of control of land rent the Government has awakened and seen to it.

But when you are talking of control of land prices with respect to these rapacious real estate agents, let the Government see the conditions are such that these rapacious real estate agents would not have a half-penny. See that the conditions do not obtain that these real estate people or their touts can assist in the rise of land prices to the detriment of housing for the people of this country and the siting of people on house spots. That is getting to the source of the present trouble. As I was saying, this is only a truce. This says that you cannot turn off people just because you want to sell. This is just a truce; you stop them just for now; but this is not the aim or the objective of the policy of any Government. This is not just a push-over; it is not as easy as I can see it.

I have not heard any hon. member say what they would do with respect to land prices - not just rent. There was a time when a lot of people could live on the seaside, but it is not so now. They can live neither on the sea nor in the hinterland.

This Bill is just a respite. It has certain advantages. You may not be ejected except under certain conditions, but much bolder legislation must some day be brought down so that the people of Barbados

would be able to live without fear. You are just saying that a tenant cannot be ejected now; but some tenants would still find it difficult to own a piece of land anyhow. Some may own a piece in another part of the country. As it stands ' day, even if you go into St. Lucy you will find that land prices are up. You have now in St. Lucy at a central point a sort of resort, and in two or three years from now the people of the middle income groups would not be able to bathe there any longer. You have to struggle at the roots of this problem; you have not tackled the roots yet. We have something which would control rent prices.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I agree with the principle of this Bill, I see its limitation and I do hope that in the very near future I would be able to give my assent to a much bolder piece of legislation vis-a-vis. landholders and the position of landowners in this Island of Barbados. 5.40 p.m.

Mr. LOWE; Mr. Deputy Speaker, it always beats me in this ancient Assembly when I realise that parliamentarians have been in this Chamber for a number of years and they waste so much valuable time over this small piece of legislation. When you consider this Bill, what are we about to do? We are just about to secure the unfortunate tenants who live in certain tenancies in this island in which the owners at no time would live. That is the first point. The second point is that you will realise that the landlords realising the plight and conditions of the tenants, could not see any ways or means of victimising these tenants other than by taking the rents to unscrupulous heights. Even when the tenants fought their best to meet the demands which were made of them, we find that some land shark is prepared to exploit the unfortunate people, because those who are able to buy, the land would do so. You will find that the Government, who is interested in the plight of these unfortunate people, has brought forward a Bill of this sort.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the principal Clause with which I want to deal is Clause 9 of this Bill which reads as follows:-

9. (1) Any owner or lessee of a tenancy who shall demand or receive any rent in excess of the rent which is permissible under this Act, or who shall increase the rent otherwise than in accordance with the provisions of subsection (1) of section 8 of this Act shall be guilty of an offence under this Act, and shall be liable on summary conviction to a penalty not exceeding two hundred dollars or imprisonment for six months.

(2) Where a prosecution for an offence under subsection (1) of this section has been instituted, a Magistrate may, in addition to the fine or sentence, if any, imposed by him, order an owner or lessee convicted of such an offence to pay to the tenant any sum paid by him in excess of the permitted rent. Now, Sir, if this Act was on the Statute Book within the last six or seven years, I could argue that many unfortunate people in many tenancies in St. Michael who have lost what they ever possessed, would not have lost it. It is only last year from which I could give you an expression of some of the unscrupulous attitudes of landowners and managers in this island. That is why I compliment the Government in bringing forward this Bill and I will give this Bill my whole-hearted support, I will preach the gospel wherever I am with respect to this piece of legislation because I have chapter and verse for it.

Last year at a place like Drax Hall - I do not know if my colleague knows this - the management has seen fit to double the rent paid by the tenants and to tell them this: "If you do not like it, you must leave it". People who were paying \$32.00 per year rent are now being asked to pay \$64.00. I am sorry that this Bill was not made retroactive from January of this year instead of taking effect from June this year.

These unscrupulous landlords know that the unfortunate people cannot just take up their houses without having anywhere to place them. We cannot put people to float in space. The time which hon. members have spent in trying to nullify, disregard and do everything that is possible to delay the passing of this Bill - well, I would say that if the Government did not have the foresight to state that this Bill would become law from the 8th June, I quite realise what would have been the plight of most of these people in St. Michael today. I have had the experience and I have seen what has taken place.

The people in the Carrington's Village tenantry who had been living there for about fifty years, were denied the option of purchasing the land at first and when they were given an option to do so, the price of the land was too high. Again, that is why I am complimenting this Government on having brought down this legislation at this time. It is a well known fact that there are many people who live in these tenancies and who cannot afford to buy their house spots; but if the landlord were to fix the price of the land at a reasonable figure, I believe that the people would go out of their way to buy this land. As to the amount of social legislation which this Government has enacted over the past two years, you will discover that it is the sort of legislation from which the unfortunate people will benefit. Therefore, Sir, my direct feeling towards this measure is such that all hon. members, when the motion for the second reading of the Bill is put, must say "AYE" to it. Whenever people go around this island and observe certain tenancies, they will see that there is no water or roads or light installed, but you will find that this Government, out of the taxpayer's money, is deciding to place standpipes in those districts so that hon. members will see that the tenants will have the benefit of the installation of these facilities. 5.50 p.m.

The Government has called on them to assist these people in getting the roads passable whereby Doctors will be able to go in and attend to them. After the Government has seen it to do these things, is it fair to these people to ask them to quit, because some individual who is out to become rich overnight decides to charge exorbitant prices for his tenantry, then to destroy the source which has caused his land to be of such value?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, much has already been said about this Bill, and I do not think it is necessary to carry on any longer, because we are well aware of the conditions of the people who live in tenancies, and that is why this Bill is here to secure them. When the landlord realises that the Government has taken the step of telling him that he is unable to sell unless they say something about it or have a voice in it, or that he is unable to raise the rents for the same reasons, it is only then that the tenants will feel happy and at peace, and that is what any Socialist Government should do for the stability of the people.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have sat here for hours and listened with rapt attention to the numerous misstatements, mis-representations and mis-in-terpretations both of fact and law in so far as the provisions of this Bill-are concerned. All the empty misguided jargon

which one was subjected to for long hours on end was very boring and tedious to undergo. Now the Bill has been distorted in so many different ways that it is even difficult for us who have listened here to realise what the provisions of the Bill are really intended to do, because every attempt has been made to distort and misrepresent the plain une-quivalent words and ordinary clauses and provisons that one meets in the Bill. Every attempt has been made to distort and cause the Bill to appear as though it is no use to anyone. One hon. member said that the Bill is not worth the paper on which it is written, and I refer to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. He said that the Bill had nothing to commend it, and only

a monkey or idiot would oppose it.

Mr. SMITH:

On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I said I was in agreement with the principle of the Bill, and as he said, only an idiot would have voted against the principle of the Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Be that as it may, we have in some instances been entertained by comedians here this afternoon, and no matter what tactics are unfolded by means of trying to delay the passage of this Bill, the fact remains that the people of Barbados - and I refer to those in the tenancies - will be given some measures of relief in the passing of this Bill. Indeed I must say, Sir, that the Bill has come as such a great shock to certain members of the Opposition, more especially one or two members of the Barbados Party Opposition, that the reaction has been very great indeed, and they have subjected us to these insinuations, misinterpretations and misstatements of fact and law, and we have to take our minds back and try to clarify the position more especially for the purposes of the record, because I feel certain that the public of Barbados cannot be side-tracked into any of these rambling misstatements and irregular jargon which went on here this evening.

The object of this Bill is not to repeal the Security of Tenure (Small holdings) Act. That Act will continue in force and will apply to agricultural tenancies and tenancies of less than five lots. The Bill in the objects and Reasons, as you will see Mr. Deputy Speaker, seeks to control and stabilise all transactions by way of subdivision, rent or sale of land consisting of more than five lots. If there are less than five lots, the Security of Tenure (Small holdings) Act will apply and will continue to apply to agricultural tenancies as it has done in the past. We heard the hon. junior member for St. Peter make capital of the fact that in passing this Bill we are denying tenants up to 7th June. In other words, he referred to the Security of Tenure (Small Holdings) Act where tenants are entitled to six months' notice, but in this Act they must be in arrears for three months or thirteen weeks as the case may be. The hon. member is confusing two conceptions; one is a notice to quit served by the landlord, and the other provision made in this Bill is that no order for ejectment might be made by the Magistrate. I only quote that as an example of the confused state of affairs operating in some members' minds, because Clause 4 states that no order for ejectment can be made by a Magistrate except under the circumstances set out in (a), (b), (c) and (d). The hon. junior member for St. Peter is confusing an order for ejectment made by a Magistrate with a notice to quit in the case of houses where there are only four tenants and you have to give six months' notice. He still has to give six months' notice under this Bill if none of the conditions set out in paragraph 4 occur whether there are four, five or fifty lots. Under the Security of Tenure (Small holdings) Act, if the landlord wants to give notice, it has to be for six months whether it is an agricultural tenancy or a small tenancy for housing purposes, but the order for ejectment can only be issued by the Magistrate in these cases; in arrears for three months in the case of monthly tenancy, in arrears for thirteen weeks in the case of weekly tenancy, being a habitual nuisance to other tenants or the landlord himself, and other things as are set out in the Bill. I am sorry the hon. junior member for St. Peter is not here to at least understand that much, because he even started to confuse me and I had to look at the Bill again. Those are the sort of delaying tactics that came from hon. members who have been in here for long years and who are seasoned politicians and parliamentarians. 6.00 p.m.

This is the sort of Opposition which we have these days. I am not referring to the Official Opposition. The Official Opposition has proceeded only in the right way, but the splinter group ~ at least some of

them - tried to put up a concerted opposition, but not based on any real constructive criticism but based on its being a nuisance value.

Sir, this Bill has very much to commend it. This is one of the most revolutionary pieces of legislation which has ever come to this Chamber, and it will go a long way in relieving the tenants from the misdeeds of the owners of land. It goes farther than the Security of Tenure (Small holdings) Act in that it protects the tenants. In truth and in fact, the Government cannot spend thirty million dollars to buy land to site the people on because the last Government left the Treasury empty. They had the money invested in South Africa and in all sort of bonds which today are almost valueless. We do not have the money to provide thirty million dollars for tenancies, but we have done the next best thing. We are vesting in possession of the tenants in a great measure security of tenure. That is what the Security of Tenure (Small Holdings) Act did not do. Under that Act, a tenant was entitled to be served with a six-months' notice expiring on the 31st May of any year. What this Bill does is to control unscrupulous landlords. Before any landlord can sell out any tenancy, he has to get the permission of the Town and Country Planning Officer and the consent of the appropriate Minister. There again members of the Opposition tried to mislead the people. They gave the impression that we were preventing a small holder from purchasing his individual lot. All that we are doing is to prevent landlords from coming over the heads of tenants and dispossessing them altogether, and putting their houses alongside the road, as the last Government has done in many cases. This Government has spent over \$700,000.00 in resiting tenants.

As I was saying, Sir, it is not a fee simple, but it certifies possession to the tenant of that spot as long as he does not create a nuisance and as long as he pays his rent regularly. He has nothing to fear as long as he pays his rent regularly within three months or thirteen weeks.

This Bill has come with such shock to the B.L.P. members of the Opposition that they have gone all out to oppose it. They have tried to prove that it would not be of any use to anyone. I do not know if those hon. members tried those tactics because we are near election time or because they are just electioneering, but I think that the public of Barbados would extend a hearty welcome to the provisions of this Bill, and by it, they would know who their friends are.

Sir, while we are on the question of election, members of the Opposition asked; "Why did you not do it in three years as you promised?" They indicated that our promise was to take over all plantation tenancies. The question of taking over all plantation tenancies is a long drawn out process which requires a great deal of work to be done in the Revenue Department and from unnumerable sources. It would take up very much time by the Crown Solicitor in order to be completed in three years. It is something which was never attempted in the history of Barbados. In the meantime this measure has been brought down so that tenants island wide would have no fear of the taking over of the land on which they live. But the government is working on what it promised, and probably before the legal term of five years expires we would be ready with the information.

However, Sir, why should this Government which is doing constructive work leave office before its term expires? We should see to it that our programme is completed and that our promises are kept in every material step; therefore, those hon. members who are sitting around waiting for elections may find that they will fall by the wayside. They run around slandering this Government, but the legal term of office is five years. I repeat, why should this Government which is doing constructive work leave this job half done and leave matters - like social

security - undone, the taking over of plantation tenancies undone and other matters which we have already started? Why should we leave before the term ends when others may come and make a mess of what we are doing? We shall remain and see that our job is properly done; and I do not care who like it or not, the provision of this Bill will go a long way to assist the poor people who have been suffering for a long time, from time immemorable, in this island because of this hardship.

There are a lot of points which I would like to explain, but I cannot stay now to bring to light all the misstatements of fact and the like which have been attempted this afternoon. I can only say that it was just a lot of jargon.

As regards the Clause which states that the Cabinet may make regulations under the Act which will be laid in both Houses of the Legislature, the Hon. Premier explained very well that the regulations are just the machinery for fixing the rent, and those regulations would be laid in both Houses of the Legislature. As a matter of fact, in any important legislation as this, you cannot write in all the details of machinery. Under the Security of Tenure (Small Holdings) Act there are regulations. That Act was passed in 1955, and your humble servant was one who had something to do with the passing of that legislation. 6.10 p.m.

If I had a lot to do with the Security of Tenure (Small Holdings) Act, then I think I am fully qualified to speak on the provisions of this new Tenantry Bill which gives very much protection, and it gives a greater measure of security than any Tenantry Bill which we have had in this Chamber since its inception.

I have already touched on the question of the acquisition of tenancies. I have explained the legal tenure of the Legislature which is five years but which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph does not seem very anxious to hear. As to the question of what is a nuisance and what is not a nuisance that is ordinary every day parlance, but in this particular case it is a question for the Court to decide. You can have a public nuisance and you can have a private nuisance. A public nuisance refers to something affecting the public such as we have had exemplified here this afternoon; a private nuisance is where a tree overhangs a yard, for instance but we cannot control private nuisances in here.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, to come back to this Bill, there have been so many misconceptions which have been voiced here this afternoon that I think I should end up by stating that the Government's policy is to try and obliterate the howlers which we have had in here this afternoon. The Hon. Premier was very careful to go into all of the ramifications of the Bill, and in winding up I want to reiterate that the provisions and the policy of the Bill have all been enumerated by the Hon. Premier in his introduction of the Bill. Whether it be a question of tenant son the plantations or the tenants on the small lots in tenancies, wherever they are, the tenants will be provided for. The provisions of this Bill have been made to apply to the entire island; it gives the Cabinet the right to deal with a tenantry in St. John, Christ Church, St. Lucy or wherever it may be. The Cabinet has complete control over these tenantry matters in that the Bill extends to the whole island. That is the scope of this Bill; it applies to all the tenancies irrespective of which ever parish a tenantry may be in, in whatever gully it may be in, and so forth. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it is time for us to go through with this Bill in all of its stages.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The question is that this Bill..

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that I should exercise my prerogative to reply to the remarks of some hon. members in connection with this Bill. If the hour is late, it is through no fault of members on this side of the House. The Hon. Minister of Communications has replied to the specific points which were dealt with by hon. members on that side of the House, because I have not been able to stay here all the time, on the one hand, and per-

sonally, on the other hand, I have been working on some-thing which will be discussed later on this week in this House. In the third place I cannot exercise that inexhaustible patience which my colleagues seem to possess. I would like to congratulate the hon. senior member for Christ Church, the Hon. Minister of Communications, on the manner in which he has dealt with the so-called criticisms which have been made in this House, criticisms as a result of which you do not know where hon. members are. We want to set on the record how misleading the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, the hon. junior member for St. George and the hon. junior member for St. Peter were in their pronouncements about the legislation which exists. If I say what I have said and they still continue to mislead the people, we will know that they are persisting in being Public Enemies Nos. 1, 2 and 3.

One hon. member, who I think was the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, said that such legislation was introduced by a former Government in 1945 and at one stage he did not know which Government it was. As to the legislation which gives security to people where tenancies were sold out from 1638 until 1965, there has been no legislation similar to that which we introduced in here three weeks ago. What the hon. member was referring to were the provisions in the General Board of Health legislation which, in 1926, gave the General Board of Health authority to send in appraisers when anybody wanted to develop land and establish new tenancies. There are two or three hon. members including the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, who could set up and challenge - but I know they would not challenge - the veracity of what I am saying.

In 1945 there was a tenancy in St. Michael - the Carrington's Village tenancy to be exact - which was being sold out. No legislation was introduced to prevent those tenants who could not pay for their land from being evicted from that tenancy. There was no Labour Government or so-called Labour Government in power at that time. The Leader of the House was then responsible for Government matters. He was Mr. Edward Keith Walcott, Q.C, Attorney General of this Island and the senior member for the parish of St. James. 6.20 p.m.

Despite the fact that people like the former senior member for St. Joseph was in here and other hon. members who pledged to be the Socialist projectors, and the leftovers who sit on that side, in 1945 Mr. Edward Keith Walcott extended the provisions of the 1926 Act not only to new tenancies, but to pre-existing tenancies, places like the New Orleans and Carrington Village and so on. But what happened with that legislation? All it meant was that you did not refuse anybody permission to subdivide tenancies; all you did was to appoint appraisers to come in and put a maximum price at which tenancies should be sold, and in 99 per cent of the cases, the price which the appraisers fixed was higher than the landlord himself was asking. I do not think the hon. senior member for Bridgetown has ever been an appraiser, because he was a member of the Board of Health, but he has intimate knowledge of these things, and he can tell you that invariably the appraisers were able to fix a price higher, and he has

disclosed that when a place not far from where I live was being appraised by them he and I violently disagreed with the price the same appraisers fixer at \$1.20 a square foot for land which we thought was only worth half that. So this is the legislation to which the leftover from St. Joseph, the relic of an anti-diluvian age, is referring as legislation which was introduced by a former Government, and this was all that was done then. That was in 1945. But let us come down a bit further.

The hon. senior member for Christ Church has explained that he was responsible for the Security of Tenure (Small holdings) Act, and both the hon. senior member for Christ Church and I were member of the Government Party at that time, and we could only get them to go as far as to say that anyone on agricultural tenancies was to be given six months' notice, and that must terminate on 31st May in the next ensuing year, and that anyone living on housespots must also be given six months' notice which

I would terminate at any time at all. That is as far as the hon. member and I could persuade the Government Party to go and no further, and this legislation was at least, at that time, 75 years overdue, because it was based on the Security of Tenure (Small Holdings) Act, 1875 of the United Kingdom. Is that the progress that his Party is claiming credit for? Let us come to the third bit of legislation which they say is the equivalent of this. Let me tell you the sordid story about that. There was a mad scramble - and I will tell you why the Deep Water Harbour was built too - for the location of the Federal Capital, and foremost in the scrimmage were the leaders of the Barbados Labour Party for personal reasons, reasons which were in my opinion entirely justified because the leader realised that the misfits he had at that time could not run any country. He was ambitious about being the Federal prime Minister, but at the same time he did not want to leave Barbados; so on alternative weeks he would say that they could tie him up and throw him into the Careenage if he left Barbados to go to the Federal Capital, and then the next week he would come back and say that he had a duty to the West Indian people, and it was contingent upon Mr. Manley's pronouncements from time to time whether the atmosphere in Jamaica was that Mr. Manley should go or not go. There was this mad scramble for the Federal Capital and all that. They appointed three English Commissioners to come to the West Indies-two of the three I do not think had seen the West Indies'- to make recommendations for the Federal Capital. They assisted in trying to make Barbados successful by criticising the morality of Trinidadians, and all this was information with which they had been fed by the Leader of the Barbados Labour Party.

I am saying all this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because the Leader of the Opposition castigated the Government for giving them only one week's notice. But listen to this notice At five minutes to twelve on the 15th day of January, 1957, the following members were present in the House: the then junior member for St. Joseph who is sitting as No. 5 was sitting in the Chair; Mr. Orrie Bryan; Mr. M. E. Cox; where the hon. senior member for St. Michael is sitting sat the ex-Minister from St. Thomas, Mr. Mapp; next to him sat the Leader, the Chairman of the Party, the President, the aspiring Federal Prime Minister, Sir Grantley Adams.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to know where all this comes in.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Whom are you talking to from your seat, boy?

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I want always to remain the boy. I want to know what part of the Bill do we find anything about Sir Grantley Adams. We might as well sing \"God Save the Queen.\"

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, next to him the member to whom I refer as \"Faith, Hope and Charity,\" who sees no evil, hears no evil, speaks no evil, the hon. junior member for St. James; I cannot name him because he is in his place; then Mr. Bryan, Mr. D. D. Gamer who was Minister of Agriculture - nine Labour Party members. On this side were Mr. Frank Walcott, the hon. senior member for St. Peter, the Leader of the Opposition and the Minister of Education. Remember the time; it was close to the witches' hour of midnight after the House had been in session from 12 o'clock that day.

Sir Grantley Adams got up and asked for leave to give notice of a Resolution dealing with the freezing of land - not to protect small tenants - in case the Federal Capital was sited in Barbados. Now, Sir, you will find reference to this on page 5 of the Minutes of the meeting of 15th January, 1957, and I am giving chapter and verse of it. You will find it on page 103 of the Official Gazette of January 15th, 1957, on the right hand side - this is what happened, and I would like the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to listen carefully, because when they make out that the Leader of this Government is trying to railroad something through, I will give an example of what used to happen then. We had given notice the week before, but due to no fault of our own, the members claimed that the Bill was not circulated. Now this

is at five minutes to twelve when notice was being given at the same time. I am quoting from the Debates of this Chamber, and this is the legislation to which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph alluded.

There are two things that stick in my mind, the one is General Smuts ~- if I may digress for one moment - who said that the people up here have the patience of jackasses; and secondly the name Sir Grantley Adams saying that the people of this country have a short memory. This is the contempt with which they treat our people. 6.30 p.m.

Since the people here have a short memory, I have to remind them of what Mr. G. H. Adams said on a Resolution expressing willingness to freeze the price of land in a debate in this House on the 15th January, 1957, He said:-

\"I am asking leave at this stage to move a Resolution concerning the willingness of this House to pass Legislation designed to carry out the suggestion of the Fact Finding Commission, in case the Federal Capital is placed in Barbados, that this House will be willing to pass the necessary legislation to freeze the cost of land in whatever portion of the island it may be decided to site the Capital.\"

Mr. Walcott got up and said:

\"Mr. Speaker, I will have to object to that Resolution for more than one reason. I am speaking on leave being granted to proceed with it; I am not going into the merits of it. It is a most unfortunate thing at this stage, on a matter of such importance, for the Hon. Premier not to tell the Legislature earlier today that it was his intention to deal with this matter in order that the House would have known something about it. You do not wait until this stage to do a thing like this, and it is not going to do the Island any

credit. The Hon. Premier asked your permission to circulate other matters and the House has dealt with those matters. Now, a matter of such importance as asking this House to express its willingness to freeze the price of land is a very serious thing which he is asking us, and it is not fair to ask the Chair to do such a thing without hon. members having any previous knowledge of it."

Then the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown rose and said: "I am also voicing my objection."

The Speaker, at the time said: "Objection having been taken, I will have to put the question."

Do not forget that at the time we had an interregnum and we had the hon. junior member for St. Thomas in the Chair at the time; so anything could happen.

The hon. senior member for the City said; "What did you say?"

The Speaker said: "I said, that objection having been taken by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I will have to put the question of leave being granted."

The House divided as follows:-

Ayes: Mr. U E. Smith, Hon. G. H. Adams, Hon. D. D. Garner, Hon. R. G. Mapp, Mr. T. W. Miller, Mr. Holder, Mr. Thorne and Mr. Bryan,

Noes: Mr. Walcott, Mr. Tudor, and Mr. Mottley.

You will remember the hon. junior member for St. Joseph objected to having only a week's notice of this Bill.

There were only three members of the Opposition present in their places at the time and that is gathered from other people's recollection of what took place then. That the Speaker wrongly ruled is my opinion. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sure if you were there you would not have given a ruling like that. My understanding was that the three hon. members of the Opposition, whom I had mentioned, in their protest walked out. They walked out because it was their opinion that the Speaker gave a wrong

ruling and that it was most reprehensible that within 15 minutes off midnight, the Premier at that time should come in with a Resolution talking of freezing land.

Of course, this was done to satisfy the particular mind of the particular individual of a particular party. They had been manoeuvring for the Federal Capital. They had run down to the other islands and suggested that Barbados should be the Federal Capital. What they did then has only put the other people in the other islands against us now. They suggested to Mr. Adams that, in going to Jamaica where the Conference was held, he should go with something to show that the Barbados Legislature was freezing land if the Federal Capital was put there.

Sir, I will go on and conclude the debate which took place on this Resolution because it is interesting and it is not very long. I hope you will bear with me for a few minutes longer.

Mr. Walcott then challenged the ruling and the Speaker ruled that he had discovered the rule - Rule 75 dealt with the question. \"A motion may be made by leave of the House without previous notice.*\"

It is interesting. This is all the debate which took place on the Resolution. Mr. Adams got up and said:-

\"For obvious reasons we are hoping, as we must hope, to be able to use arguments to induce our fellow delegates in Jamaica to vote for Barbados. We must show a willingness to do as much, reasonably speaking, as anyone else. I say \"reasonably\" because we do not propose to follow other people in trying to buy the capital.

It seems to be the barest justice and common sense that no one should be allowed to profit by speculating on land values as a result of the Federal Capital being sited in a particular area. I have seen it stated in the Press that that will happen, I wish to make. It abundantly clear that it is the intention of this Government to introduce the necessary legislation if the Federal Capital is sited here. The Capital Commissioners have Intimated that it would be desirable and I think they have gone further and in effect suggested that the Federal Government should itself pass legislation to freeze the price of land. If the Federal Government does that, then, of course, no local legislation can upset it. If people in Christ Church or wherever the capital is sited have hopes of speculating on land values, they will find that either this Government or the Federal Government will freeze the price of land at January 1955.

I think that it will be valuable to us to go to Jamaica with an actual Resolution that the House has passed, saying that it would be willing to enact the necessary legislation. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move the passing of the following Resolution: \"Resolved that this House, in case the Federal Capital is sited in Barbados, will pass legislation to freeze the price of land in whatever part of the island the Federal Capital is sited, at the rate existing in January, 1955.\"

\"**Hon. M. E. COX:**

I beg to second the motion.\"

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

The adjournment was moved to the 22nd January, 1957 at 3.00 p.m. and the meeting came to an end at 11.50 p.m.

This is the whole debate which took place on that matter.

We have been in here three days on this Bill, and what I find completely unhappy and dishonest is that people who were in this House at the time and who are In the House now should go outside of this House and inside and give views to falsehoods that the former Government started the freezing of prices of land to the tenants.

I will go further and say that this Resolution which was introduced in 1957 was never implemented at all. It was conceived in wickedness because In Jamaica the Barbados dele-

gation got blown out. They did not get the Federal Capital: so nothing further was done. But this is the kind of modification that you get. The former Government had nothing to do with the security of the people who had put them there. 6.40 p.m.

From 1955 until they were got rid of in 1961 they never came in here with a single piece of legislation to give anybody in Barbados any kind of protection, socially or otherwise. How any one of them has the courage to come in here and talk on this legislation instead of hanging their heads in shame, is beyond all human understanding. They have the idea that they can go around this country confusing the people and slandering members of this House and those who are not members of this House, and think that the people in Barbados are less politically educated than they were in 1961. Mr. Deputy Speaker, they are bound to be more politically educated than they were, because their eyes have been opened. If people listen to them, it is because they have a remarkable amount of restraint and self-control. If they were in certain parts of Glasgow they would have been driven out of the country, far less than being on a political platform, long ago. (Mr. MILLER: You are inciting the people to riot.) The hon. member should know, because he is a self-confessed arsonist and he is talking about inciting people to riot because I said what I have said.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder if it is worthwhile to ask the Hon. Premier to withdraw that remark.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I do not think it is necessary to do so,

Mr. MILLER:

Very well Sir, we accept that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER; May I exhort hon. members to continue as they have been doing?

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will not say anything more because everybody knows what I am referring to. What I have said are the facts of the case. The hon. senior member for Christ Church has dealt with the individual arguments, if they can be called arguments. Those who do not like this Bill do not have to support it, and those who have constructive criticisms to make, can come in here and make them; but we have not heard any such criticisms. We are not agreeing to send this Bill to any Select Committee because there is no need to send it to any Select Committee. On the 15th January, 1957, at 10 minutes to midnight, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph did not suggest that we should go to any Select Committee in relation to the freezing of the price of land for purposes which would be extraneous to the people of this island. What the hon. member has suggested is exactly what I imagined he would have suggested, that is that this Bill be referred to Select Committee. Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the Civil Rights Movement in the United States of America there were two songs "We shall overcome" and "Go tell it on the Mountain, let my people go". Our slogan is "Go tell it on the mountain, let my people stay." (CHEERS!)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The question is that this Bill be now read a second time. Hon. members in favour of that will please

say \"AYE\", those against will please say \"No.\" I think the \"AYES\" have it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Divide!

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I heard all \"AYES\" on the Government side and I did not hear any \"NOES\" on the other side. I have made my pronouncement already that the House is unanimously in the affirmative,

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

But we can still call for a division. A division was taken as follows.*-

AYES:

Mr. BATSON, HON. BLES E. W. BARROW I. C. TUDOR; C. E. TALMA; G. G. FERGUSSON; A. DaC. EDWARDS, MESSRS BOXILL; LOWE; YEAR.

WOOD); HOLDER; SMITH; MILLER; (LAUGHTER) SEALEY; GODDARD and MOTTLEY - 15.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The question has been resolved in the affirmative. There are fifteen hon. members present and all fifteen hon. members have voted \"AYE\". I declare the \"AYES\" have it.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clause I was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, before we proceed to deal with Clause 1 of the Bill, I would like to move an amendment to the \"Objects and Reasons\". 6.50 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the Hon. Premier had at an earlier stage of this debate given notice of changes in the Bill, I should only just draw the House's attention now to the changes in the Objects and Reasons, because they are not part of the Bill, but would have to be changed nevertheless.

In paragraph (a) a full stop is to be placed after the word \"housing\", and all the words which come after must be deleted. The explanation of clause 3 is also to be deleted. Immediately after that where

Clause 4 appears, that becomes \"Clause 3; where Clause 5 appears that becomes Clause 4. That is as far as the Objects and Reasons go. There is a new Clause 6 to be inserted. We are dealing with the first page which sets out the Objects and Reasons of the Bill, and though this is not part of the Bill, I have to draw the House's attention to the changes that take place on that. So there is a new paragraph which reads as follows:

\"Clause 6 provides for the staying of executions where an order of ejectment has been made by a Court before the coming into operation of the Act.\"

We will now proceed to do the clauses one by one. Clause I was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause I stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows; 2. In this Act -

\"Minister\" means the Minister charged for the time being with responsibility for the subject of Lands and Surveys.

\"Prescribed area\" means an area prescribed by the Cabinet under Section 3 of this Act.

\"Tenantry\" means any area of land which is now or shall be hereafter subdivided into lots for the purpose of being let to tenants for housing purposes and which contains more than five lots.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, in Clause 2 the words \" \"Prescribed area\" means an area prescribed by the Cabinet under Section 3 of this Act\" are deleted.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 as amended stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Clause 3 was called,

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the original Clause 3 be deleted, and that the original Clause 4 be

renumbered Clause 3; and that the words \"within a prescribed area\" appearing in the new Clause 3 be also deleted.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, at this stage I have a further amendment which I would like to suggest. The reason why I am making this amendment is that in my speech on the second reading I lent support to the Bill, but I still felt that there should be no idea of creating what happened in France and other countries where there were restrictions which prevented persons from owning the land; and in view of the fact that the Government has decided that small people should own houses and land, I think there should be this amendment to cover this eventuality. I do not think the Government wants to prevent anybody from owning land, but they want to prevent people from buying at extravagant prices, or from being evicted to prevent them from owning,

I think I can speak ex cathedra on the matter of tenancies, because I do not think there is anybody in the Government to whom I can take second place on anything about tenancies, since I have dealt with them for over thirty years. I have sent around copies of the amendment which I would like to see inserted. The Bill protects tenants from the raising of rents and the like by extravagant landlords, but nowhere in this Bill does it say that the landlord really can sell. If we take the Town and Country Planning Act which replaces the Public Health Act, that is the Act under which permission must be had for persons to sell, and therefore I would like to see inserted in this Clause the following:

\"(4) Where the owner of a tenancy has obtained permission authorising him to sub-divide the tenancy and sell the same in lots, such owner shall before entering into any agreement for the sale of any part or parts of the tenancy, first make application to the Cabinet who shall within\" - whatever number of days the Cabinet may think fit -\" days of the said application appoint persons to appraise and value the tenancy and determine the maximum price at which the tenancy may be sold, provided always that in arriving at such valuation the said valuers shall take into account any costs already incurred or to be incurred in providing water, roads and any necessary sanitary arrangements as may be required, and the said valuers shall within.....\" - whatever number of days the Cabinet may think fit -\" days of their appointment make a return of their valuation of the tenancy to the Cabinet who shall within ?..?....\" - whatever number of days the Cabinet may think fit -\" days grant a licence in the form set out in the Schedule to this Act for the sale in lots of the tenancy at the price so fixed by the valuers or at such other price as to the Cabinet shall appear to be fair and reasonable.\"

In that section I am not thinking of outside valuers to which the Hon. Premier referred, but of the Cabinet appraisers. 7.00 p.m.

Now, Sir, - I wish that hon. members follow me carefully - the Hon. Minister referred to a tenancy which raised its rent within recent days - Brandons Tenancy.

Why should a person be allowed to sell the tenancy at Brandons at a greater price than the Government is selling their tenancy in the Bay Land? The Cabinet itself has stated that if they do not think it is a reasonable price, they would not issue a licence at all. The whole idea is that you do not

want people to pay a higher rent than what they should.

My experience has been, and still is, that there are people in this country who want to buy land, but they want to buy it at reasonable prices, particularly because of their increase in family and because of the standard of living. They are willing to have their house renovated; they are willing to erect wall instead of wood, and to have a water-borne system running throughout. That is still a measure of protection and guarantee to people of not being able to remove. There is still that proviso which has been referred to where children and people can cause a nuisance and so on.

This section which I propose to insert puts it right back into the hands of the Cabinet for the sale into lots at such price as shall appear to be fairly reasonable. In other words, it puts it right back into the hands of the Cabinet. When I say appraisers, I am thinking of a panel of apprais-ers of Government Officers. Bear in mind, the whole idea of this is not to prevent people from owning lands. This amendment gives it back to the Government for them to say whether you should sell at 60 cents, two shillings or 40 cents per square foot. Let us say that the landlord wants to sell at \$1.20 per square foot. That price would have been turned down by that amendment. The Cabinet would just say that you Just cannot sell at that price.

Your first step is to go to the Town and Country Planning Officer. He agrees and tells you that you must put in water, build roads, and so on, but you still could not do anything unless you apply to the Government. The Government would appoint such people as the Director of Highways and Transport, and so on, and they will look into the mat-ter; and if those people have gone too far over, the Cabinet is in a position to say, "Oh, no, we have the last word. We say that this price is too dear."

This is the section which I would like to commend to the Government for their consideration and I would like to hear that they have no objection to it. What I have said is on paragraph (5). It reads as follows:-

"Upon the receipt by the owner of a tenantry of a licence as aforesaid, such owner shall, before offering to sell any lot or lots of the tenantry to any person, first offer in writing to sell to the tenant of any lot the lot occupied by such tenant at a price no greater than the price fixed by the here in before mentioned licence and if the tenant shall not within one year from the date of the receipt of such offer exercise, by notice in writing to the owner of the tenantry, his option to purchase the lot so offered to him at the price stated in such notice, then the owner of the tenantry shall be at liberty to sell to any person the said lot so offered at a price greater than the price stated in the said license."

That license obviously would be sanctioned by the Cabinet. I am suggesting giving the tenant a whole year to exercise the right of refusal to buy this lot or any lot at the price so fixed by the Cabinet. My whole idea is to give the person the right to own. It would provide a greater measure of security of freehold. The Hon. Minister of Communications and Works mentioned that although a fee simple was not passed in this Bill, there was still a measure of security in this Bill. By this amendment, the person would pos-sess something which he can pass on to his children.

While I am on this, I think the Hon, Premier can clarify for me whether this deals with a tenant. Whereas a person may be the tenant of a particular land, can the Hon. Premier enlighten us as to whether that person to whom the land was actually rented, in the case that that person had passed on or anything

of the kind, and had left it in charge of, let us say, his daughter or son in law, whether they would be able to rent the land? This question was raised, and I heard that it was discussed by many law-

yers and there is a difference of opinion as to whether "A" renting land can pass it on to "B". I would like the Hon. Premier to explain that to us.

My experience in this line of business tells me that while the Bill is a very fine Bill because it gives a certain amount of protection to the tenant, it also cuts both ways. The Hon. Premier does not seem to agree with me. However, if you look at the amendments which I have made, you will notice that I have left out the number of days and other things for the Cabinet to insert the number as it thinks necessary. If the Cabinet feels that the price is not fair and reasonable, the Cabinet can refuse to issue a licence. 7.10 p.m.

If that is in a Bill, then there cannot be any mandamus brought by any solicitor or lawyer or legal luminary - none of them could bring any case against the Cabinet for not issuing a licence because my amendment says that the valuers shall within so many days of their appointment make a return of their valuation of the tenantry to the Cabinet who shall within so many days grant a licence in the form set out in the Schedule to this Act for the sale of the tenantry at the price so fixed by the valuers or at such other price as to the Cabinet shall appear to be fair and reasonable. It is a question of what the Cabinet feels is fair and reasonable. If any succeeding Government was selling land by the Parkinson School and the like, people may not like to go there.

Mr. Chairman, I have never owned any tenantry and I have no intention of investing any money in any tenantry. What I would do would be to invest money in building houses and thereby create work for the people. I am therefore suggesting that this amendment be sub clauses 4 and 5 of Clause 4.

Mr. GODDARD:

I beg to second that. This amendment provides the machinery with which we should be entirely in agreement. As to the protection of the tenant we have agreed in principle as to what we want. If this Bill is passed there should be some machinery for controlling the sale of private tenancies. The Government is selling the Bay Land, but this amendment is being introduced as the machinery for the sale of land to be approved by the Cabinet. The Cabinet has full control of this matter and this amendment is for the purpose of providing the machinery to deal with the sale of private tenancies, because we do not wish to freeze all the tenancies. There are certain areas which could well be divided with the approval of the Town and Country Planning Officer. If he wants a certain area to be laid out in a certain way with roads and water, when that is done, the Government can set up the machinery whereby the price of land can be fixed with their approval. Mr. Chairman, the matter is as simple as that. Protection is given to the person who is living on the land and if that person is able to purchase the land, he is offered it in the first place, and he has the option to decide for a year what he will do.

Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. Chairman, before the hon. member replies, I should just like to say that this is a Bill which does not allow any landlord to sell any three or four acre lot of land to any one person. That is absurd. If a land-owner had forty or fifty tenants in the area, and one of these tenants says that he wants to purchase a spot, the price has to be approved by the Cabinet. If 20 persons were to decide that they would exercise their option, then the landlord cannot sell the land to any one man at any big price. The landlord is bound to give the tenants a whole year for them to decide what they will do. If there is a

minimum of five persons and one person should decide that he will buy his spot, the landlord cannot sell the land to any one man as a lot. I am submitting that this amendment is in the interest of the tenants.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the amend-ment which has been moved by the Hon. Leader of the Oppo-sition, it does not say that the landowner can refuse to sell the land or that the Government can refuse to allow him to sell it. The amendment sets out that the price fixed by the

valuers must be a price which shall appear to be fair and reasonable to the Cabinet. This proposal cannot function without some sort of tribunal; otherwise people who are valuing agricultural land would be placed in a rather awkward position when you come to marginal lands in a commercial or built-up area. You cannot Just come here and talk about the Cabinet. The Cabinet might approve the work which has been done by any tribunal.

I am just wondering if the Hon. Leader of the Opposi-tion would be willing to make a little change in this amendment. It says here that the price of land shall be that which is fixed by the valuers or such other price as shall appear to the Cabinet to be fair and reasonable. You may have a price fixed by the members of the Cabinet who have no idea of the valuation of property and even if they did have some idea as to the valuation of property, what I am saying will still be in order. Mr. Chairman, we have had & lot of discussion in here on this Bill, and before we started to discuss the Bill it was a question that the land must be offered to the tenants in writing. You can make an order in respect of any land, but the matter has to be set out in writing. We are bound to agree with this amendment which has been moved by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. At first it would appear that this is something which is vote catching, but now you can see that it is something more than that. 7.20 p.m.

A couple of weeks ago in St. James the hon. member talking about single member constituencies said that he had torn up the Manifesto. However, I want to support the amendment with the changes. You must have in the Bill somewhere a tribunal to examine these things. I am wondering therefore whether the hon. member would change this section which is expected to control all the property in the entire island. If land is going to be sold, a person might locate his friend and get some money to own the land, and that is the germ of democracy as was discussed in here all day. You must have a tribunal inserted in this. We have had discussion where Sir Grantley Adams attempted to freeze the land.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

If the hon. junior member for St. George is willing to give way, the Hon. premier will reply , to the suggested amendment.

Mr. MILLER:

What does that mean? Is the member who is speaking to sit so that the Premier can reply? I am supporting the amendment by the Leader of the Opposition asking that the land should be made available to the tenants, that it should be offered to them in writing, and that they should be given a year to acquire it. There is all this old talk about Armageddon and this new-fangled dream, and yet they do not realise that at least in the Bill provision should be made for tenants to own the land if it was offered for sale. It would be difficult for them to get out of this amendment. The Minister of Health is a glutton for punishment. We are in agreement with the former amendments, but we would like the Government to say whether or not this should be done by a tribunal or by valuers who would know, rather than the

Cabinet Ministers who are on the way out and it does not matter. We would like to be assured that like any other country this would function through a tribunal to whom you can appeal.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I do not know if the hon. member misunderstood me. I did not say that the Cabinet should value, but that they should appoint valuers to say if the price is fair and reasonable.

Mr. MILLER:

The Cabinet in any Government in any country is not an agency through which you can approach any Minister. Everything must at least go through the various Ministers. The Cabinet is a group of Ministers with a single thought, working towards a single idea, and because they come together to discuss matters between the various Ministers of the Cabinet, all matters reaching the Cabinet must or should originate in a Ministry, and when you say \"as to the Cabinet shall appear to be fair and reasonable\", the Cabinet should only say so after they have accepted the advice of the tribunal or panel of valuers who would know.

We have had a case in here where land was bought from Mr. Haynes, and under the Land Acquisition Act he was paid less for the land than he could have got for it the day before. We have had the case where the Trafalgar Hotel was going to be valued by Government and it was like taking a bottle of milk out of a baby's hand in the cradle. The whole thing fell through, but they would have ended up by buying two ten-foot side-walks. No member of the House can treat the Cabinet as an agency through which it can write the Cabinet Secretary and ask to be given an audience. The rationale of all this is that they would seek advice from people with experience.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for Bridgetown has introduced an amendment to this Clause which is almost longer than the Bill itself. It is nearly thirty lines of fairly closely printed type on foolscap. an amendment to a single clause to completely emasculate and defeat the objects for which the Government introduced the Bill. I do not care how much they get up and say from now until ten minutes to twelve that they are trying to improve on the Bill, we are not impressed on this side, and I will give my reasons why we are not impressed with this amendment. I do not have any doubt that the first two speakers were sincere, but I am not convinced that the advisers they have, legal or otherwise, are sincere people in this island at all. It is true that we on this side of the House are not the fountain of all wisdom, but at the same time during the three weeks they have allowed us, we have turned this over and looked for all the loopholes. We have given very mature consideration to the Bill. It is true we should wait another five days when the fishing season ends but this big red herring which has been drawn in here to-night would never see the light of day. I do not want to be offensive, but this is the greatest red herring in the whole history of the Legislature.

I have no doubt that the hon. senior member for Bridgetown and the hon. junior member for Christ Church are sincere people, but the people who advise them, I know by experience, are not sincere people. Now this is not a Bill for selling land; so we do not see why we have to concern ourselves with the prices of land. This is to prevent land from being sold over the heads of the tenants; so we are not accepting any amendment that is going to set up an elaborate machinery. This therefore is not cassava

pone, and you come and call for corn pone. Whom are you fooling over here? 7.30 p.m.

This is not a Bill for selling land; this is a Bill to pre-vent land being sold. Why do we have to worry about the amendments by the hon. member? The particular clause says:-

"No owner or lessee of a tenantry or of any part thereof which is now or shall hereafter be subdivided into lots for the purpose of being let to tenants for housing shall, without the prior permission of the Town and Country Planning Officer signified in writing, divide or sell any lot or part of such tenantry."

Therefore right away if you want to sell a tenantry you will have to apply to the Town and Country Planning Officer.

Subsection (2) reads as follows:-

"For the purposes of this Act the provisions of section 4 of the Town and Country Planning Interim Control Act, 1959 shall apply to all applications for permission to sell any lot or lots in a tenantry."

Now, as to the granting of permission, you go on to subsection (3):-

"Before granting permission the Town and Country Planning Officer shall consult the Minister and shall not grant permission unless the Minister certifies in writing that he is satisfied that the grant of permission will not cause undue hardship to a tenant or tenants."

We have not dealt with Clause 4 yet, but Clause 3 deals with the question of selling a tenantry. You have to get permission from the Town and Country Planning Officer and

(2) you have to get certification from the Minister whether the Minister himself is satisfied that no undue hardship would be caused to any tenants.

That is to prevent land being sold above special rates. Mr. MOTTLEY rose to speak.

The hon. member had his chance to speak when he brought in his amendments.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not think that the Hon. Premier thinks that somebody has pushed these amendments in my hand to bring in here. I just want to draw your attention to the Bill which is entitled an Act to provide for the control and development of Tenancies.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I do not see how that can be a point of order, but I suppose we have to abide. The hon. member is psychologically incapable of accepting the principle of this Bill along with other hon. members of this Party; so they are trying to emasculate it and doing everything to whittle it down. The position is Sir, that it is a Bill to protect tenants from being ejected. The question of a sale of a tenantry would be normally immaterial to the tenant. He cannot be affected any longer. The prime object of this Bill is to give him security of tenure. That is more to him than whether he has land to sell or whether he can pass

it on as a deed of gift. A tenant is not concerned about that.

Now, the point which the hon. senior member for the City was making is that if the land is sold, firstly, there must be some machinery set up to offer the tenant the land: and secondly, that there should be some machinery for valuing the land. The hon. member said that the Cabinet would be the right person to decide these things. If the hon. member read the Town and Country Planning Act which has been mentioned in subclause (2) he would see under that section

"Where an application is made to the Town and Country Planning Officer, in accordance with the provisions of an Interim Control Order, for permission to carry out development or for any approval under this Act or any subsidiary legislation made thereunder, that officer may grant permission or give such approval either unconditionally or subject to such conditions as he thinks fit, or may refuse permission or approval."

Right there the Town and Country Planning Officer can give approval to sell or develop any land at all, but there is no way that land under these circumstances would be sold because nobody is going to buy an unremunerative tenancy unless the tenants make the requisition; therefore, the Minister and the Town and Country Planning Officer would have to take the time from the tenants; therefore, the real arbitrators would be the tenants themselves because all the tenants would have to say whether or not they have interest in it being sold. They will have to say: "We would like to buy it, but we cannot." What about the price? The price would have to be fixed by the tenants and they would have to decide whether the price is reasonable or not. (A VOICE Oh, No.) Under the Act, if they cannot agree as to the price, well, all they do is to go on renting.

The Government has about 300 tenants who have deposited money to buy houses. Some say they owe and they are trying to pay off the arrears. By paying off the arrears, they can get ownership. Because of all that, we have only three hundred of the two thousand houses sold. Those tenants are dictating the pace because some of them have said that they are not ready to buy. They say: "As soon as we are ready to buy, we will let you know." If the tenants have a reasonable prospect of buying that land at a reasonable price, the Minister is not going to give consent for that land to be sold to anybody else. As I was saying, the land would have to be sold to them as a whole; the landlord could not offer it to other landlords. If we accept the amendments which the hon. member suggested, they would defeat the whole object of this Bill. They would reintroduce the same system which we are trying to get rid of. If I can rent land until I die, why worry, why buy it? I would prefer to go and buy land somewhere else; if I had the money I would more invest that money somewhere else. 7.40 p.m.

The tenant is the person who has to decide in the first and in the last analysis. Nobody would introduce any legislation which they would amend by their so-called legal advisers. I know how their brains operate; they will come and tell us that they will split up the tenancies, and they try to send us from one thing to another. We will not have anything like that. Let them not try to persuade us any more. I believe that the hon. member is sincere with his amendment, but we are more than sincere. We are not even listening to them.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, the only reasonable thing which the hon. member has said is that he believes that we are sincere. I should like to say that nobody has guided us in the drafting of this amendment, and nobody

has tried to emasculate the Bill. I do not want to be personal in any of these arguments.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

What experience would a Socialist want from him?

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, at some times I wonder what experience I could have from the Socialists over there. I will speak and you need not listen to what I am saying. You must not lose your temper; in that way your blood pressure may go up and that is not necessary. You said that in this Bill it is purely a question of preventing people from having to remove from lands. What the hon. member has said about the Town and Country Planning Officer, I quite agree with. I started out in my amendment by saying this \"Where the owner of a tenantry has obtained permission authorising him to sub-divide the tenantry and sell the same in lots...\" We must presume that in the several tenancies which the hon. member has mentioned in the Municipality, everybody who is living in those tenancies would want to remain there and they would want to purchase the land. There are those who would prefer to purchase land if the price of the land is reasonable, I set out in my amendment that \"where the owner of a tenantry has obtained permission authorising him to subdivide the tenantry and sell the same in lots\".... and no owner can get that permission unless he gets it from the Town and Country Planning Department, Furthermore, that permission has to be granted by the Hon. Minister. As a matter of fact, this amendment does not prevent any particular individual who owns a tenantry from selling it, but, as the Hon. Premier has said, nobody is going to buy a tenantry at any fancy price because he knows that he cannot sell it at any fancy price.

The hon. member is the person who has to listen, and he will have to listen to what is being said. It may be a question of legatees who have an interest in some land and they may want to sell it. There is nothing in this amendment which says that permission for the sale of the land cannot be granted; but before it is granted, all of these things will have to be carried out. There are several tenancies in this Municipality and they will have to be controlled by this Bill. In the parish of St. Michael or in the parish of Christ Church there will be some time when a tenantry will have to be divided, and water and light will have to be installed, Even now with the Town and Country Planning Department, when application is made and permission is granted, it is for the purpose of development and not merely for the control of the tenantry. The Minister has to be satisfied that all the necessary things has been done. What I see in this Bill is that as soon as you abolish the appraisers and you allow the Government to have the last word in this matter, the Government can say: \"We will not issue any licence for the sale of this land\".

The Hon. Premier is saying that this amendment is for the purpose of emasculating the Bill, but I am submitting that that is far from being the truth. If the hon. member feels like underestimating me, well, he can do that; but I am saying, Sir, that we have solicitors in here and if I ask one of them to draft anything for me, he has to do it, because that is a part of his job. This is nothing which is against the Government. What we have tried to do is to introduce an amendment and I thank the hon. member for saying that we are sincere in this attempt. I know that there are numbers of tenants who live on rented land and who have been doing so for practically all of their lives. After they have raised their children and the children get into certain positions, one of the first things they will want to do is to prevent

their parents or relatives from walking across the yard at night for sanitary purposes. Every such child

or such children will want to install sanitary units and things like that. That is where people will want to know that they have a certain amount of security. Mr. Chairman, the hon. Premier seems to have got into a temper while we were discussing this matter, but what I want him to know is that he should realise that what I am saying are the facts. I ask the hon. member to enlighten me on this matter. 7.50 p.m.

If I were renting a spot and died leaving the house thereon for my grandson or daughter, is that person still a tenant? Those are things that come up all the time. In cases where we have had to sell chattel houses, one of the first things we have had to look out for was to see whether under the old Act the rent was paid, because the person is responsible for the rent even thirty days after the house is moved. I believe that both the Hon. Premier and the Minister of Communications and Works agree with that, but what I wanted to get in here was the fact that there are people who still want to purchase. You are selling Bay Land at a price which I think is reasonable, but if somebody comes along in a place similar to Beckles Road and decides to charge \$1.20 per square foot for land, what are you going to do? Are you going to say that the Government must be the only person who can sell land? I do not think it is fair to say that an amendment of this nature can emasculate the Bill, because there is nothing in the Bill to stop the sale of land except under the Town and Country Planning Act, and if the Town and Country Planning Officer and the Minister are satisfied, then you can sell, and that is why I started the amendment by saying 'where the owner of a tenantry has obtained permission authorising him to subdivide'.

I do not know, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member is suggesting that I am talking about taking 20 spots and dividing them into five, I am saying that my amendment would prevent a man, if he had a three-acre lot and wanted to sell to one person, from selling, because after permission was granted by the Town and Country Planning Officer and the Minister, and one person out of thirty or forty decides that he has one year to buy, you cannot get him to move. I know from experience that some of the prices paid for land are extravagant, but you are still going to find people who as they progress want to remove their houses and put them on land they have bought, I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, that nobody wants to run places like Da Costa's, but let us say you are buying a place of ten or fourteen acres and you want to develop it. I am sure that under the Act the Minister will say that this is causing nobody any harm, and therefore you apply to the Town and Country Planning Officer; but the land may be sold at a high price, and my argument is that this should be controlled by having the price fixed. I go so far as to say that you should have your appraisers comprised of the men whom you want to have, so that if you do not consider the price reasonable, then you can refuse to grant the licence. No one has suggested this to us, but after my Party discussed this we felt there was nothing to provide for the sale of land. Right now nobody can fix the price at so much per square foot, and that is what I am worried about. I felt it my duty to bring this amendment which my colleague has seconded, and we do it in good faith, and not with any idea of trying to emasculate the Bill. I want to assure the hon. member that nobody forced us into this, I got on to the Clerk and suggested I would like to make this amendment, and this is the wording of the amendment which we would like to see incorporated in the Bill. If the Government does not want to accept it, it has been moved and seconded, and it can go to the vote.

The question that the words proposed to be inserted stand part was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:

NOES:

Hon. E. W. BARROW; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. A.

DaC. EDWARDS; Mr\ BO KILL; Mr. LOWE, and Mr. YEARWOOD -8.

AYES:

Mr. HOLDER; Mr. SMITH, Mr. MILLER; Mr. SEALY; Mr. GODDARD and Mr. MOTTLEY - 6.

The question that Clause 3 as printed be deleted and that Clause 4 as printed be re-numbered Clause 3 and as amended, stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

8.00 p.m.

Clause 5 was called,

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I beg to move that Clause 5 be renumbered (4) and that the words \"within a prescribed area\", wherever they occur be deleted.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question that Clause 5 as amended stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 6 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I beg to move that Clause 6 be renumbered Clause 5 and stand part,

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question that Clause 6 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. The new Clause 6 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I beg to move that Clause 6 stand part. It reads as follows-

\" Any order of ejectment made by a court of competent Jurisdiction against a tenant which has not been executed before the 8th day of June, 1965 shall be stayed and no further proceedings shall be taken thereon.\"

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that,

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Clause 7 was called.

It reads as follows:-

7. (1) From and after the eight day of June, 1965 the rent exigible by an owner or lessee in respect of any lot in a tenantry within a prescribed area shall be the rent at which it was let at that date, and no increase shall be made in the rent payable in respect of that lot except in the manner and in accordance with regulations made under section 8 of this Act.

(2) An owner or lessee who desires to increase the rent of any lot or lots in a tenantry within a prescribed area shall make application to the Magistrate exercising jurisdiction under subsection (2) of paragraph (c) of section 4 of the Magistrates' Jurisdiction and Procedure Act, 1956 in the magisterial districts in which the tenantry or any part thereof in respect of which the application is made is situated.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, in Clause 7 where-ver the words \" within a prescribed area\" occur, I am ask-ing that they be deleted. With that amendment, I beg to move that Clause 7 stand part,

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirm-ative without division.

Clause 8 was called.

It reads as follows:-

8. (1) The Cabinet may make regulations for fixing the permitted increases in the rent of any lot or lots in a ten-antry in a prescribed area and generally for out the pur-poses of this Act.

(2) All regulations made under this Act shall be laid before both Houses of the Legislature as soon as may be after they are made and if within a period of forty days be ginning with the day on which such regulations are so laid before it, either House of the Legislature resolves that the regulations be annulled they shall therefore be void but without prejudice to the validity of anything previously

done thereunder or to the making of new regulations.

(3) In reckoning such period of forty days no account shall be taken of any time during which the Legislature is dissolved or prorogued.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Under Clause 8 there are two amendments. Wherever the words \"in a prescribed area\" occur, I am asking that they be deleted. I am also asking that the word \"carrying\" be inserted after the word \"for\" and before the word \"out\" in line 3 of subsection 1.

With those amendments I beg to move that Clause 8 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Chairman, there is a single request which I want to make. In subsection 1 it is stated

"The Cabinet may make regulations for fixing the permitted increases in the rent of any lot or lots in a tenantry in a prescribed area and generally for out the purposes of this Act."

From what we have heard, we understand that land is rented at a higher price than the Government's and one person has raised on their rents quite recently/Not only are the spots in some of these tenancies so small that there is only space for the house, but very few of them, if any, can expect to instal water. There is no provision made for that. As I see it, most of these tenancies must slip into slums. No man would ever be able to put a decent house in some of these tenancies because he would not be able to instal water without the permission of the landlord and that is where the investment would be lost. Why are we worrying about this?

We can make a regulation to reduce the rent because in section 8 (1) you state that you can increase the rent. I am only asking that you change the word "increases" in subsection 1 of this Clause. When these tenancies would have fallen into ugly slums, the spots would not worth the rent. I feel that the word "increases" should be changed. If you just change the word "increases" I think it would satisfy the people.

We are told that the Government is selling land along with the houses in the housing schemes of Government. The opinion is that tenancies have been added to in the last four years. The hon. member forget that the Lodge Hill Tenantry is the only one that was added to in the last four years.

Mr. MILLER:

We have just bought all the land at Husbands Plantation, Oxnards, and so on. We are now selling tenancies which we have. You say that the tenants have the opportunity of fixing the price.

Mr. Chairman, I am simply asking that Government consider the simple amendment of changing the word ' increases'. The original idea was that this Bill is a vote catching device. However, the Government may discover that some of the rents charged these tenants may be too high, and if you have this Bill drafted as it is, you cannot lower them.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how the Government feels about it, but the hon. junior member for St. George does not stand alone in his view. We were speaking of tenancies and the Hon. Minister mentioned one and said that he had gone through it and found that one tenant was paying something like \$12.00 per month. I have come across a lot of that.

I am only saying that the Government might not look at it in the way which we are looking at it, but I take it that what the hon. junior member for St. Thomas said today is something which we have found out. No spot in that area without water, light and road is worth any three dollars per month. I make no apology for saying that. As a matter of fact, when we called in all the tenants, this particular landlord

gave us most of the trouble. I would like to say that I heard people come and say that they have to pay rent at \$8.00 and \$10.00 per month, long before this came into operation. 8.10 p.m.

Sometimes you say that if the Devil brings something and it is good then you must accept it. You cannot take my word, but you may take the word of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas or the word of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture who has gone down to this area and discovered what the rents are - \$3.00 and \$4.00 per month. There are pensioners who have to pay that type of rent asked for by unscrupulous landlords. You cannot accept my word, but you can ask the Hon. Minister of Agriculture who went down to that area. According to this Bill, you cannot interfere with these tenants; you can only stop them from paying that sort of rent. You have the same thing in Philip's Land and Chapman's Lane and these small tenantry areas. I would have preferred to see the Bill worded in such a way so that you can make regulations in accordance with the true valuation of the tenantry. Before the year 1939 people were offering land at a price of \$3.00 a quarter. Then you went up to \$4.50 and further to \$5.00, but without any facilities at all being offered; and there was really less land than the little house could stand on. Mr. Chairman, if a thing is right, it is right and I feel that if you can lower these rents, that would be a good thing for the Cabinet to do.

The Hon. Premier read from the Report of the Professor of the Massachusetts Technological Institute and he said that a number of rents had been increased because the Bridgetown City Council had carried out the wording of the Act which says that you can call upon the owners of tenancies to repair such tenancies. I can tell you the price which a man was paid for land rent in respect of the 300 houses which were on his tenantry. If you go into Hanchell's Tenantry, you will agree with me that that is a model tenantry for Barbados. The tenants there are paying much less for their house spots than what those tenants at Holders Land are paying. If you do not want to lower the rent in some cases where the people are asking extravagant prices, then you are not doing anything. You go and ask Harewood what he is charging for rent in a tenantry where there are no roads.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we will try to set the record right in saying that there are a number of persons whom we called upon to put the areas right and the tenants were paying \$4.00 a month, and so on. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture has gone into this matter. A man is asking a rental of \$4.00 a month for his tenantry and his motor car cannot even get into the area. I see that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is shaking his head in acquiescence that what I am saying is correct; I also see the hon. junior member for St. Thomas nodding his head in his admission that what I am saying is correct. A man has 300 houses on his tenantry and you cannot get your motor car in there and you tell him that he cannot raise the rent. We have called upon people to repair the roads in Holder's Land, and people in other places as well, I am saying that the Government is doing something which I am watching very carefully.

You are repairing these roads and it is right that that should be done. Those roads will have ceased to be in private tenancies. I want to point out that where you repair a road, where one-half of the road is repaired and it belongs to some person, you have the right to charge him for carrying out such repairs. You cannot allow several dozen people who are going into that road to be suffering. This is nothing which is connected with the Hon. Minister in any way* but what I am saying is that where you have effected repairs to a road and the person who is on the other side owns the road, then he should be asked to repair it. What the hon. junior member for St. George has said is quite correct. You cannot leave the Bill as it is and say that you have the power to prevent people from increasing the rent for their

tenantries. 8.20 p.m.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Chairman, I want to make a formal motion of an amendment dealing with Clause 8, and I think it should read as follows

••The Cabinet may make regulations to alter the rent of any lot or lots". At the moment it reads that the Cabinet may make regulations for fixing the permitted increases in the rent. You cannot reduce the rates, you can only in-crease under the regulations; and since it is clear that

you will want to reduce rents in the case of unscrupulous landlords on a number of these tenantries, you should make provision in the Act for reducing them. I can see from the attitude of the members on the other side of the Table that this is quite a reasonable request and there should be no delay in this at all. The motion now is. Sir, that the Cabinet may make regulations to alter the rent of any lot or lots for the purposes of this Act. Here "to alter" means to increase, reduce or remove completely.

I beg to move that the proposed words stand part. Mr. SMITH: I beg to second that.

Mr. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I must say that it is a very ingenious argument by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition backed by the hon. junior member for St. George, and in reality it may be said that this is the first time they appear to be nearer to the point than probably before; but on closer scrutiny of this Section, you will see that provision has been made thoughin a general way. Now the Hon. Leader of the Oppo-sition has drawn to the attention of this Chamber the plight of certain tenants at Holder's Land, Brandons, which we have had the pleasure of visiting. We have also visited Peterkins Tenantry, and he has drawn to the attention of the House that the present rent is excessive and has asked what provision is being made in the Bill to reduce such refits which are considered excessive at present. That is a good point. There are one or two eases where the rents are considered excessive, and we have investigated matters like that on the spot. We have visited about eight or ten tenantries, and we intend visiting all at least in St. Michael within a week or so, and we shall put through the policy of visiting all the tenantries island wide in another month or so.

What I am drawing to the attention of hon. members who have spoken is that the Cabinet may make regulations for fixing the permitted increases. You will realise that rents are being increased from month to month and from year to year, and this is to permit the permitted increases in the rent of any lot or lots, and it goes on to say" and generally for carrying out the purposes of this Act". The purpose of this Act is to control and stabilise rents where they are exces-sive and deal with them generally; so it is "and generally" and not "or generally" in referring to the words which have gone before which deal with past cases of unscrupulous land lords wherever they are found and wherever the rents are excessive. Although the members are miking a good point, it is already covered in the body of this Bill.

Mr. MILLER and Mr. MOTTLEY rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

My eyes caught the horn junior mem-ber for St. George first.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Chairman, it may be just because the amendment comes from this side. The hon. member is a Solicitor; so how in the name of goodness can a Regulation supersede an Act? You are dealing with an Act which is to permit permitted increases, and you are told about and have witnessed tenancies in which rents need to be reduced.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order. The hon. member with his dense form of understanding has not been able to appreciate what I tried to point out specifically. I said "and generally for carrying out the provisions of the Act". Everybody knows that Regulations are made under an Act, and I am saying what the Regulations will also contain. They will contain measures for fixing the permitted increases in the rent, and also generally for carrying out the purposes of this Act which is to control rents, and wherever rents are excessive, they are to be controlled by Regulations.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Chairman, we will take a division on it. The Bill reads specifically and it is spelt out that a child on a trotting horse can understand. The hon. member is a solicitor whose business is the practice of law. The section reads as follows-

"The Cabinet may make regulations for fixing the permitted increases" which means that there will be a functional body, with the Cabinet in this case being the final arbiter. A panel of appraisers or a tribunal recommends to Cabinet, and this is how it is worded; "fixing the permitted increases in the rent of any lot or lots." You cannot make Regulations to decrease the rent when the Act says "increase" - and "increase" only.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. If the hon. member had a little knowledge or understanding of law, he would understand what I am trying to say. The words are "and generally for carrying out the provisions of the Act," which carry the provisions of the Act further than the words formally state.

Mr. MILLER:

Imagine him telling me over here about denseness. All I am saying to the Minister is that you cannot make an order to decrease the rent, and he can stay there and drop dead with all these hackneyed, worn out phrases. When I look at my friend and colleague and think of him on the platform in St. James

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I think the hon. member has been in this House long enough to raise the standard a little higher.

Mr. MILLER:

It looks as though they would drop dead. They are using the same argument in this for vote catching, but you cannot get votes out of this, and every night it is "licks like fire". 8.30 p.m.

You cannot get one vote by this. You are denying this simple amendment when you know that the people at Bran-dons cannot pay \$4.00 for their spots which is rab land. You tell me that you do not want to reduce the rent. Look at this! We are going to force a division on this.

I am making a final appeal. Who would sit here this afternoon and knowing of the exploitation of those tenants would not vote for this amendment? Do you mean to say that you are denying this simple amendment because it is requested by the Barbados Labour Party?

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Hon. Minister of Communications has been listening. I have never found him attempting to mislead the House. Look at Section 7 and you will see what I mean. "No increase shall be made in the rent payable in respect of that lot except in the manner and in accordance with regulations made under section 8 of this Act." Quite frankly I agree with the hon. Junior member for St. George. I can tell the Government that they can walk in every tenantry in Barbados and see this thing happening, but I am talking of this tenantry particularly because the people are overcharged. I see nothing wrong in putting in the amendment which the hon. member made. I really felt that the Hon. Minister would have accepted this. He is too good a politician to have this put over him. Let him consult the hon. junior member for St. Thomas. He knows that this is true. I am challenging the Hon. Minister of Agriculture to say that \$4.00 per month for 400 square feet of land is not too high. We are asking to make this clause so wide that you can have a thorough investigation into the matter. You can call on the owner and the tenants. You can do it in the same way as you have it under the Local Government Act.

You have 58,000 houses in this island of which 27,000 are in the Municipality. The houses in tenancies are very small. The hon. junior member for St. Thomas visited this area; so he can tell the Hon. Minister of Agriculture what is the situation there. Fifty minutes after he was there people phoned me and told me: "Do you know who has been down here? Mr. So and So." Ask the hon. junior member for St. Thomas if I have not told him about it today? He says that these people are paying too much rent. I am not saying this so as to get any filip; therefore I make the plea. Read section 7 and you will see.

Mr. SMITH rose to speak.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Sit down.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the remarks made by the hon. senior member for the City on the high cost of rents in this district, I would like to say that the hon. member himself drew this to the attention of the Cabinet and asked what could be done about this. I do agree that it is ridiculous to pay that price for such a piece of land. Not only Rotten Town which the hon. member referred to, but in certain other parts of other tenancies I have found that tenants pay \$4.00 for less than 800 square feet of land. I do agree that it is creating a great hardship on those tenants.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

We on this side are prepared to accept an amendment to this. All that we have to do is to delete the words "permitted increases" and say "The Cabinet may make regulations for fixing the rents..." You therefore leave it as a rent fixing tribunal. When it comes to sensible amendments, we are prepared to agree with them.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I am everglad to hear the Hon. Premier has accepted this amendment. Earlier today, he

was ready to put me on the floor when I raised this question and he said that the Cabinet has nothing to do about it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member was under the impression that the Cabinet itself was going to fix the increases of rent. I understand that the point raised now by the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown and supported by the hon. junior member for St. George is a different thing altogether. Therefore, it seems to be the opinion of what I have heard about certain tenancies that the rent should be reduced.

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make it clear that I accept that amendment. The amendment was mine and I accept it whether the Hon. Premier wants it or not.

The question that Clause 8 as amended stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

8.40 p.m.

Clauses 9 to 12 inclusive were called and passed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, there is a new Clause to be inserted which will be numbered 13. That Clause reads as follows-

"This Act shall be deemed to have come into force and always to have been in force as from the 8th day of June, 1965."

I beg to move that Clause 13 stands part of the Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee with amendments.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed. (Cheers!).

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE CHANGE IN RATES OF AIRMAIL POSTAGE

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 16 be taken as the next Order of the Day under Government Business.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Day under Government Business stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works-

To move the passing of the following Resolution:-

Resolution to approve the change in rates of airmail postage as set out in the Schedule attached to the Resolution

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution reads as follows-

"Resolved that with effect from the fifteenth day of July 1965, the airmail postage rates on letters, post cards, air letter forms and printed matter to the country of destination set out in Column 1 of the Schedule hereto shall be at the rate set out immediately opposite such destination in Columns 2, 3, 4 and 5 thereof."

The Addendum to the Resolution reads as follows:-

"It is intended to issue a new definitive issue of postage stamps with effect from 15th July, 1965. The denominations of this new issue conform with the decimal system of currency and it is considered advisable to round off air mail postage rates (either up or down) to conform with the revised denominations of stamps.

The Postmaster General has given many reasons for rounding off the cost of these stamps whether upwards or downwards, and among the reasons stated is that it would simplify the process of making change for persons purchasing stamps. Also it would make balancing at the end of the day easier, and it would reduce the units of time spent in dealing with members of the public. There are many other reasons which the Postmaster General has given for rounding off the cost of these stamps. In the case of

the United States of America, the rate will be 25 cents instead of 24, and in the case of Brazil it is 35 instead of 36. That facilitates the making of change and making the work easier generally. The Schedule to the Resolution sets out the various rates and hon. members are fully aware of the proposed rates. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE CHANGE IN RATES OF POSTAGE BY SURFACE MAIL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works- To move the passing of the following resolution-

Resolution to approve the change in the rates postage by surface mail as set of the one schedule attached to the Resolution.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution deals with the rates of postage in connection with per--els. It reads as follows-

"Resolved that with effect from the fifteenth day of July, 1965, the postage of parcels to the destination set out in column 1 of the Schedule hereto shall be at the rate of out immediately opposite such destination according to the poundage in columns 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 thereof."

In this case, the Addendum to the Resolution sets out the position more clearly. It says this:

It is intended to issue a new definitive issue of postage stamps with effect from 15th July, 1965. The denominations of this new issue conform with the decimal system of currency and it is considered advisable to round off surface parcel post rates (either up or down) to conform with the revised denominations of stamps.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reasons for the rounding off in the cost of these stamps are similar to the reasons which I have given when I was dealing with the Resolution relative to the airmail rates.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS I beg to second that.

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

8.50 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this concludes Government's Business for today's sitting. As has been announced earlier today, the House will meet on Thursday, at 4 o'clock, and the First Order of the day will be the Budgetary Statement and Financial Proposals by the Minister of Finance, then all unfinished business on today's Order Paper will take its place immediately after that in the same order in which it appears in today's Order Paper.

In accordance with a conversation today on this matter of the Budgetary Statement by the Minister of Finance on Thursday, I should like to tell the House, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I have received your permission for the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation to move in its equipment on Thursday afternoon for the purpose of carrying the Budgetary Statement and the Financial Proposals by the Minister of Finance.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday, 1st July, 1965, at 4 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Thursday next 1st July, 1965, at 4 p.m. o'clock was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

8.55 p.m.