

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 27th June, 1967

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.30 p.m. o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S., (Speaker); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (Minister of Education); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, (Minister of Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries); Mr. R. STC. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Sir G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., D.C.L. (Hon.) (Leader of the Opposition); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. H. B. ST. JOHN, L.L.B., and Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret that there are no Minutes available for confirmation at this meeting. I am advised by the Clerks at the Table that the fault is not that of either of them.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Hon. N. W. BOXILL, Messrs. HOPPIN and HOLDER entered the House and took their seats.

LETTER OF APPRECIATION

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a letter from Lady Chandler, dated 24th June, 1967, in which she requests Mr. Clerk kindly to convey to Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Assembly her deep appreciation of the Resolution of sympathy forwarded to her on the death of her husband, Sir John Chandler.

DOCUMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Accountant General the Accounts and Statements for the month of November, 1966, as prepared by him.

Mr. YEARWOOD entered the House and took his seat.

PAPER LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on the behalf of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I am commanded to lay the Economic Survey, 1967.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations, 1967.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I beg to give notice of the following Bills:-

A Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and to appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the year ended 31st March, 1967.

A Bill to make provision for matters arising out of the establishment of the Caribbean Free Trade Association or otherwise out of agreements relating to trade with members of the Association.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICE

SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

This House having learnt with dismay and disgust of a statement made to many persons by the Prime Minister on, being urged to take the question of Barbados' joining the Organisation of American states to the House of Assembly, that he would take it to a warehouse before he would take it to the House of Assembly.

Resolves that the attitude of the Prime Minister to Parliamentary Government as shown by these words - and their nature - are not only contemptuous of and utterly derogatory to the dignity of and respect due to this House, completely unworthy of any of its members and more so of a Prime Minister

but are in their implications undemocratic and unconstitutional and deserving of the utmost censure.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to comment on the text of the motion of which notice has just been given, but I would like to ask Your Honour for a ruling as to whether a motion can properly be introduced in this House, the subject matter of which, if it ever existed, was not any part of a debate or discussion in this Honourable House. I ask Your Honour's ruling on that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The matter will receive my consideration.
2.50 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is Government aware of the development taking place in the building and construction industry in this Island?

2. Would Government investigate with a view to finding out whether, or to what extent, the labour market of carpenters and masons, attendant labourers and clerks engaged in such building and construction is being exploited?

3. Is Government satisfied that overseas and other firms enjoying Government contracts in the said building and construction industry in this island, are paying adequate wages to workers employed and making conditions of work for these people such as to reflect the existence of human standards?

Mr. HINDS: To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is Government aware that a number of industrial firms established at Grazettes Estate and other sites with the financial assistance of the Barbados Development Board, are employing large numbers of female workers in the manufacture of their products both for the export market and for local consumption?

2. Is Government aware that the bulk of these firms employ a system of work-apportioning and price-calculating, which could constitute a wholesale robbery of the majority of these female workers?

3. Is Government satisfied to have industries established under Barbados Development Board auspices which insist on paying 90% and more of their female staff, a weekly wage of as low as \$5 and hardly more than \$10 for a five-day week?

4. Would Government see to it that the Barbados Development Board establish as a policy that no industry enjoying the Board's assistance should have a minimum basic weekly wage less than the present weekly wage of a female Shop Attendant?

5. Is Government aware that a number of the industries established under auspices of the Barbados Development Board are apt to employ tactics which would make employees fear having membership of a trade union?

REPORT OF BARBADOS FAMILY PLANNING ASSOCIATION LAID

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Report of the Committee appointed by this House to consider the Bill to incorporate the Barbados Family Planning Association.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is this the final Report?

Mr. St. JOHN: Yes, Sir.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and to appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the year ended 31st March, 1967, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to make provision for matters arising out of the establishment of the Caribbean Free Trade Association or otherwise out of agreements relating to trade with members of the Association, was read a first time.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders, 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 for the remainder of the day's Sitting.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

THE BARBADOS FAMILY PLANNING BILL, 1967

Mr. SPEAKER: Accordingly, I declare the instant Order of the day is Private Members' Business and the first Order of the day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon.

junior member for the City of Bridgetown. The hon. member is not now in his place.

The next Order of the day stands in the name of the hon. and learned senior member for Christ Church: Third reading of a Bill to incorporate the Barbados Family Planning Association.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the Report of the Committee appointed by this House to consider the Barbados Family Planning Association Bill is as follows:-

The Committee met on Friday 16th June, 1967, at 3.00 p.m., when Messrs. H. B. St. John, LL.B., J. M. G. M. Adams, M.A., R. St.C. Weekes, J.P., and C. A. E. Hoppin were present. The Committee met again on Monday 26th June, 1967, at 3.00 p.m., when the following members were present:-

The Hon. C. E. Talma, Messrs. H. B. St. John, LL.B., J. M. G. M. Adams, M.A., R. St.C. Weekes, J.P., and L. S. Craig.

The Committee recommended the passing of the Bill with the following amendments:-

Preamble

Line 1 - Delete "Lt. Col."

Line 2 - Delete "Sir" and "Mr."

Line 3 - Delete "Dr.", "Lady", "Dr."

Line 6 - Delete "Mrs."

Line 9 - Delete "Rev." and "M.B.E."

Line 11 - Delete "Dr."

so that the Preamble reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS Orville Frank Cardwell Walcott, Frank Challenor Hutson, Aubrey Gordon Leacock, Ralph Malone, Grace Adams, Gordon Theodore Martineau Cummins, John Stanley Bruce Dear, Gwendolyn Sheila Didier, William De Courtenay Forde, Kathleen Mae Gilmore, Elizabeth Elsie Ifill-Barrow, Charles McKenzie, Ilene Adorah Murray-Aynsley, Marisa Alix Peterkin, Walter Keith Perry-Gore, Olga Ramsay, Duncan Gittens Turney, Ivey Ellen Randall, Ronald Tree, Evelyn Walcott, Lenore Harney, Charles Griffith Alleyne, Charles Walter Alexander Pilgrim."
3.00 p.m.

No recommendation with respect to Clause 2. Clause 4 (1) at line 3 the insertion of the word "and" between the words "ordained" and "from". Clause 4 again, line 5, the deletion of the word "and" before the word "regulations" and substitute the word "or". Clause 4 (3) in line 5 the deletion of the word "and" between the words "Rules" and "regulations" and substitute the word "or". In line 10 of Clause 4

(3) the deletion of the word "enough" and the substitution of the word "lawful" between the words "by" and "for". In line 12 the deletion of the word "and" between the words "rules" and "regulations" and substitute the word "or". In Clause 5 line 2, the deletion of the words "by-laws, ordinances order". The committee recommended the balance of the Bill and Preamble and I beg to move that the Report be adopted.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Accordingly I declare that Report duly to have been adopted.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill be read a third time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Accordingly I declare this Bill duly to have been passed.

The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown but I do not observe that hon. member instantly to be in his place and that completes Private Members' Business.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. 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.

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is the instant Order of the Day.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that Order No. 4 be the first Item and I am also seeking permission for the Hon. Minister of Labour to take charge.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I declare the instant Order of the Day to be No. 4 standing in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House who is asking leave of the House

that this matter be taken care of by the Hon. Minister of Labour, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted the hon. senior member for St. Andrew to take charge of this Item.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, section 11 of the National Insurance and Social Security Act, 1966, reads as follows:-

"The Cabinet shall, by Order under Section 3 of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949, establish the offices which constitute the offices on the Board's establishment and they shall for the purposes be deemed to be offices in the Public Service of the Island."

It is proposed to amend this Section by substituting the word "all" for the word "the" where it appears immediately before the word "purposes". Section 21 (c) of the same Act provides for the payment of invalidity benefit which is defined in the same subsection as follows:-

"invalidity benefit, that is to say, a payment or periodical payments to an insured person who after exhaustion of sickness benefit is likely to remain permanently incapable of work;"

It is recognised that whilst payment of invalidity benefit will normally follow payment of sickness benefit, there will undoubtedly be cases where this will not arise or where the insured person can satisfy the contribution for invalidity benefit even when the same insured person does not satisfy contributions for sickness benefit. It is therefore considered necessary that such persons should not be denied the payment of invalidity benefit. I should like to point out that an insured person qualifies for an invalidity grant if he has paid in 50 contributions and for an invalidity pension if he has paid in 150 contributions but in order for a person to qualify for sickness benefits, he is only required to pay eight out of thirteen contributions. This is where the difficulty comes. The insured person might have been paying contributions for three years, he might have been out of work for three months. He becomes ill. While he does not qualify for sickness benefits because he has not been making contributions for 8 weeks prior to the thirteen weeks prior to his becoming ill, he has already paid in say 150 contributions and as a result of his illness, he becomes eligible for invalidity benefits.

3.10 p.m.

He has already paid in, say, 150 contributions and as a result of his illness, he becomes invalided. If his invalidity benefits were based on sickness benefits, if a person has paid 150 contributions before he becomes ill and he is out of work when he becomes ill, if his illness becomes chronic, he cannot qualify, according to the provisions of the Act, for invalidity benefits or grant. Therefore this amendment is introduced so as to assist such persons. One can qualify for an invalidity grant after paying 150 contributions.

If he paid 50 contributions ten years ago those contributions will remain to his credit. If he does not work after paying in 50 contributions but becomes invalid ten years after, he will receive an invalidity grant on the ground that he had ten years previously paid 50 contributions to the Scheme. If he made 150 contributions regardless of when those contributions were made, he qualifies for an invalidity pension, but one has got to be working when he becomes ill. As a matter of fact, if you base the invalidity benefits on the expiration of sickness benefits, a man will have qualified for invalidity benefit. That is the reason for amending section 21 (1) (c) of the Act.

Section 30 (1) of the Act reads as follows:-

"For the purposes of this Act, there shall be established, under the control and management of the Board, a fund called the National Insurance Fund into which shall be paid all contributions payable under this Act by employers and insured persons and out of which shall be paid all claims for benefits."

As this Section reads at present, it would appear that the only monies which can be paid in the Fund are National Insurance Contributions and that the only payments which can be made from the Fund are National Insurance benefits. It does not appear that in matters of the payment of administrative expenses, refunds of contributions and cases of errors - an employer or an employee could have made two contributions for one week when he should have made one contribution. As the Section now reads, there is no provision for the National Insurance Board to refund money to an employer or to an employee who has overpaid contributions. This Section now provides for payment of contributions into the Fund and payment of benefits, but it does not provide for the refunds of administrative expenses. It does not seem that receipts such as interest or investments or any other monies which become available to the Scheme can be paid into the National Insurance Fund. The National Insurance funds will not remain in the Bank without being turned over. There is the authority to invest funds which accrue to this Section, but there is no provision where the interest rates or any sort of income on the investment of the fund can be paid in the Fund; therefore this amendment is only for the purpose of regularising the position and to set out in greater detail the payments which will be made from and into the National Insurance Fund.

The Director of the National Insurance Scheme has reported that at the first meeting of the Board, members expressed the view that there was insufficient authority, or there was no authority under the Act, to permit the Board to appoint Inspectors. Hon. members will remember that when I dealt with the Civil Establishment Order here, we did not have any Inspectors in that Order, but we had a Civil Establishment Order for Executive Officers, thirteen of them, out of which the Inspectors will be appointed. It was pointed out that the Board should have the authority to appoint Inspectors so that if one Inspector did not measure up to the task which was expected of him he could be brought back in an Executive Office and an-

other Executive Officer used as an Inspector. Although it was the intention of the Government, that authority was not specifically mentioned or legislated for under the Act. This amendment takes care of that. There are four amendments to this Act with which we are dealing. I think I have tried to explain the reason for such amendments in detail and I therefore beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, speaking on this Bill which seeks to amend the National Insurance and Social Security Act, 1966, it brings to my mind a breakdown of the Act in that so soon the Government has found it necessary to come back with an amendment to the Act. I remember that when the Minister brought down the Bill he even reminded this House that he was under the impression that I would have spoken on the Bill on that occasion. I must confess that I could not do so because I was not really au fait with all the necessary facts surrounding the Bill. I am happy to know that I have the opportunity to express my views today.

Mr. SPEAKER: Of course, I will remind the hon. member that he may speak on this Bill which amends the Act in respect of the proposed amendment. He may not speak on the original Bill but only on the amendment as proposed in this amending Bill.

3.20 p.m.

Craig I remember, Sir, that the Hon. Minister reminded Parliament that the National Insurance Bill could not come down.

What I would like Government to bear in mind is that when there were bringing down such amendments to this Bill, I thought it was an ideal thing to bring down an amendment by the way of an amendment to assist an employed person. There is an amendment to the National Insurance and Social Security Act which is known as the National Railroad Security Act. It provides for people when there are unemployed. It is at unemployment agencies at which a man or woman out of work can go to this agency and collect an amount of money which is payable to them each week.

Looking at the amendment, I considered when I supported the National Insurance and Social Security Act that it provides also for accidents benefits and invalidity benefits. What I would like to draw to the attention of the Government is that even in this amendment which the Hon. Minister said just now that the Board had no authority to bring in inspectors and that there are now bringing in inspectors pending the approval of this Bill. I hope the Hon. Minister would make it possible to see that no political actions are brought into this.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point. The officers of the National Insurance and Social Security Board are Civil Servants. They can be no political interference so far as these officers are concerned.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I hope there would not be any interference. I feel any amendment to this Bill should provide for unemployment. It should provide for any man or woman when he or she is not working. That happens in the United States and Britain. There are quite a few people who after they have contributed their part to this Fund and the employers have contributed their part, these people find themselves unemployed. I have had quite a few people coming to me and asking me what is going to happen when they contribute part of their money to the National Insurance and Social Security Scheme. They ask what they are going to get out of it.

I hope that the Hon. Minister when he comes back with other amendments that one of them will be to provide us with an unemployment Act.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Sir, as the hon. senior member for St. James rightly pointed out, I was very dissatisfied when I dealt with this Bill and the hon. member did not speak on it, but having heard the hon. member's speech, I think that this House was really spared or given the chance of avoiding listening to - I would not say abysmal ignorance - I would say that I was disappointed after listening to what the hon. member had to say.

The hon. member has suggested that we bring down an act to provide for people when they are unemployed. I should like to explain to the hon. member that if every benefit under the Scheme were to be taken into account, this Scheme would not come off the ground. There are certain amounts paid by employers and the people under this Scheme for the benefits which they now get. It is not as the hon. member put it that this is a glorified Friendly Society. We have had Friendly Societies and those Societies have served their day. We in this day feel that we need something more than Friendly Societies.

In Barbados there is what is known as the out-of-crop season. There are 19,000 people who are unemployed during that period so at this stage one could not dream of introducing an unemployment Bill under this Scheme if the Scheme is ever to get off the ground. We do not rule out the idea of getting an unemployment Scheme worked out but I say, let us get the Scheme off the ground first.

Some people were wondering if we were mad when we started this Scheme. All over the world from the time National Insurance and Social Security was started by different countries they have not started it with all the benefits which we have in this Scheme. There is one in Jamaica which for you to receive sickness benefit, you have to contribute to it for thirteen weeks. If unemployment benefits were included under our Scheme from the beginning, it would not get off the ground.

The Hon. member must remember that provision for the unemployed is already made by the Local Government under Public Assistance. That is to say if a man is unemployed he can go there and get a little berry.

(A VOICE: We do not have Local Government any more).

Some of us get more than others. I do not think the hon. member for St. Peter would be satisfied with what people in his constituency get by way of Public Assistance as compared with what those in St. Michael get. Those in St. Michael get a bigger berry.

3.30 p.m.

The hon. member for St. James also said this was the complete breakdown because we are coming with amendments so quickly. He will also remember that when the Bill was brought to the Legislature we pointed out that amendments would be coming later as experienced in the scheme has been gained. This is not the last amendment. Others will be coming as we see it is necessary to make amendments. I hope that my reply satisfied the hon. member.

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I beg to second that.

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

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

The Schedule was called.

Mr. HINDS: Under the Schedule Sir, there is mention here that payments shall be paid out of the funds for all claims for benefits.

Mr. Chairman, I think at this stage I should draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister that the National Insurance Scheme was supposed to have been launched on the 5th June and in just sixteen days there has taken place in our midst action on the part of employers evidently to protect themselves, but you must admit that whenever these employers take action to protect themselves, it means that the employees must suffer and one would expect that the National Insurance Scheme would be sufficiently geared to take full care of any such situation as that to which I will refer now. The Barbados Shipping and Trading Company Limited, the group personnel officer of that organisation has circularised all the monthly paid and weekly paid employees of the group to the effect that in view of the recently enacted insurance legislation it has been decided that where an employee is eligible to claim sickness benefit under the provision of this Act, his salary will be reduced by the amount equivalent to the benefit to which he is entitled. It must be clearly understood by all employees

that the responsibility for claiming sickness benefits rest with the individual and not with the company. This is a matter to which I feel the Hon. Minister must address his point for the simple reason that there is a qualifying period to which he referred earlier that is that you have got to make your contributions to be able to get the benefit. You can submit your claim and receive the benefits but you have got to make your contributions for a number of weeks. You will see what has happened already. The employees of the Barbados Shipping and Trading Company, since the scheme started on the 5th of June, could not have made enough contributions to be able to qualify for these sickness benefits. No payment may be made from the National Insurance Scheme and this is a matter to which I think Government should be addressing their minds. You cannot for a single moment under this Schedule deny the employers the opportunity of seeking to protect themselves, but this is a case where we have to know that the employees of the Barbados Shipping and Trading Group have benefited in the past because two-thirds of their claims from hospitalisation fund and that type of thing amounted to more than \$480 and the Shipping and Trading Company paid up to \$360 out of that. What we are looking at is whilst under this scheme after a certain period you can make your claim and the National Insurance Scheme will measure up to your requirements in some respect, the Barbados Shipping and Trading Group have certainly taken advantage of the situation as presently obtains. Their employees are not yet qualified to get any benefits and they have cut loose, so to speak, so the Minister might be in a position to tell us what is the position now with these people if either of them happen to become sick.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, before you reply to the question posed by my colleague on my left, I should like this to be brought to the attention of the Minister. This matter concerns sugar workers, field and factory. Now that the National Insurance Scheme has come into operation, many sugar workers found themselves at the age of sixty-five and over and unable to be insured under this scheme. What is more they have been dismissed. Many have been sent home. I am talking from the individual reports brought to me at my home.

3.40 p.m.

These Sugar workers I have advised to contact the Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Labour, the Labour Commissioner and wherever applicable, the Secretary of the Trade Union, and they have done so. This is a strange situation. There is one of the factory managers telling a sugar worker who came to me that as far as he is advised, all monies had been paid into the Provident Fund concerning the individual worker and so, as he explained to that worker, they, as employers, have discharged their responsibility. The worker cannot be insured under National Insurance at all, having passed the age and the factory Manager says that, as far as he is concerned, all the necessary monies have been paid to the Provident Fund which can come to the assistance of the sugar workers at this particular time. Now I would like the

Minister to see to it that the whole situation is looked into. These people are living from hand to mouth at the present time; in fact, they are not even living from hand to mouth. This is a matter of urgency and I would like the Minister to go into this matter as soon as he possibly can. The individuals have come to me and I do hope that at the very earliest opportunity, those who have come to me for advice and what assistance I can render, will be assisted. I have discharged my responsibility.

I hope that the Minister will see to it that this money which the factory Managers say they have paid into the Provident Fund, will be taken care of, they having discharged their responsibility as they said. I hope that the Government will see to it that anything to the effect that these workers cannot get any money from the present Insurance Scheme be looked into at the very earliest opportunity. I hope that the Hon. Minister has been listening to me carefully because this is a very serious affair. A country is considered a country when it pays respect to its old people. I will soon be an old man myself. The Minister will soon be an old man, but Mr. Chairman, when you consider how many people are affected by this particular measure, I am perfectly sure that the Minister himself knows that he has got to take direct action in this matter very, very soon.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I have listened to those hon. members who have spoken quite attentively. The hon. senior member for St. Peter is worried about the plight of people and he refers specifically to those who have reached the age of sixty-five years and they retire from the Sugar Industry. I may point out that in another two week's time, the Provident Fund will be ready for distribution. The Committee which was appointed to work on the payment of benefits from the Provident Fund has reported to the Ministry and it has made certain recommendations which, we hope, will be put into effect in the near future. That will take care of them.

In reply to the hon. junior member for St. Peter as to the questions of benefits provided for employees by employers, the hon. member will remember that the Government specifically asked that these benefits be not denied the workers because of the limitations of the Social Security Scheme. I can very well appreciate the action of employers who decide not to pay full salaries to employees when they are sick and are receiving sickness benefits under the Scheme. That is the position. Any industry can die, even the Government Civil Service can die if workers in the Civil Service or in any establishment in the country, are paid a higher salary when they are ill than when they are well, because nobody would be well. Civil Servants will be receiving sickness benefits, but they will not be receiving more when they are ill than they receive when they are well and are working. Many offices would have to be closed in that case.

As to the point raised by the hon. junior member for St. Peter about the workers of the Barbados Shipping and Trading Company Limited or those of any other firm in Bridgetown not receiving the full

sickness benefits which they have been receiving from the various firms before - plus the benefits from the Social Security Scheme, the only difference there is that no employer will be satisfied to pay an employee sickness benefits for 26 weeks or 52 weeks, whereas a man who is ill can receive benefits under the Scheme in the first instance when a doctor certifies that he can go on for two years receiving sickness benefits under the Scheme.

3.50 p.m.

Now the position is that the people received letters that this action would be taken as long as they are eligible for sickness benefits under the National Insurance and Social Security Scheme. I promise the hon. member to have this taken up with that person and the Labour Department. The position as to how I understand that statement to read is that this firm pays its employees when they are sick their full salary or wage. That is why payments by this firm would be made reducing that amount if the person is eligible for sickness benefits under the Scheme.

Now, any person in this country can be eligible for sickness benefits under the National Insurance and Social Security Scheme after thirteen weeks after the fifth June last. For a person to be eligible, he must be insured for thirteen weeks and must have paid eight contributions to the scheme. This can be argued because eligibility does not come in until after thirteen weeks under the scheme so I do not see how employers can change the conditions of employees where sickness benefits are concerned. If the hon. member would like me to have it taken up, I would do so.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I gather from the speech of the Hon. Minister. I am speaking on the Schedule.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the hon. members to observe Rule 26 (13) which reads as follows:-

"A Member desiring to speak shall rise in his place and if called upon shall address his observations to the Chair."

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I apologise for my mistake. I am very glad to see that you are sticking to the Rules.

Am I to understand the Hon. Minister to say - I did not get him clearly - that the policy of the Government is to change the terms of the Civil Servants, or the employment of Civil Servants, whereby the Sickness Benefit which they enjoy would be changed to that under the National Insurance and Social Security Scheme?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The answer to that is "no". What I pointed out was that Government employees would not be receiving higher salaries when they are sick than when they are well, otherwise, we would have to close the Post Office and other Government Departments.

The position is that when a man receives his salary when he is sick and then sickness Benefits

according to the contribution which he pays to the National Insurance and Social Security Scheme, it can be higher than his salary. I made it clear that he would not be covered for sickness benefits under the scheme. It is possible for a Government employee, since sickness benefits under the scheme are made possible to every person and you get full pay when you are sick in the Government's employ for a certain time, up to I think two years, for you to draw more when you are sick than when you are well. The position is that when that happens, they would not be covered for sickness benefits under the National Insurance and Social Security Scheme.

The position is that a Civil Servant insured for sickness Benefits under the National Insurance Scheme is in a much less favourable position than he is under the Civil Service Scheme.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think hon. members will remember that I was very much in favour of the National Insurance and Social Security Scheme. I would draw to Your Honour's attention that I am speaking on the Schedule. Relative to what the hon. junior member for St. Peter said, it seems to me an important point which Government should take full cognisance of.

The Government is the largest employer in this country and the Barbados Shipping and Trading Company and its subsidiaries are the next. In view of the recently enacted National Insurance and Social Security Scheme, it has been decided to pay sickness benefits. As the law stands all employers must by law provide sickness benefits under the Scheme for their employees. Therefore, everybody will be eligible for sickness benefits after thirteen weeks that this scheme comes into operation.

The Hon. Prime Minister said at King George V Memorial Park on May Day that he was worried about Government employees. I think you will agree with me when I say that the Barbados Shipping and Trading Company provides for its employees a pension scheme.
4.00 p.m.

What they are saying in this letter is that where employees are eligible to claim sickness benefit under the provisions of the Act, the salaries will be reduced by the amounts equivalent to the benefits to which they are entitled. How can any sane Government sit down and pass the Bill that anybody can take advantage of? On the other hand let us take the employees of the Shipping and Trading Company or anybody making over \$100 a month. The argument is that we have to provide by contribution for the amount which would be provided to pay sickness benefit. If therefore you are getting the benefit and this is the position they are taking which I do not agree with, but I can quite see the view expressed by the Prime Minister at the King George Memorial Park on May Day has caused some worry in this respect. If you are compelling people to pay for their employees, you must do something to prevent the employers from

taking advantage of the situation. Do not take the hon. junior member for St. Peter at his word. Let him show you the letter and read it for yourself. If the Press would publish this, then you are bound to do something about it. I think you should postpone this Bill for this reason: you are not dealing with an employer of two or three people. You are dealing with the next biggest employer to Government in the Island. While I am on my feet, I would like the hon. member to know this: I have been asked several questions in this respect and I must say that the public officer who is in charge has been very courteous and very helpful in trying to explain this to me; but there are a number of people who are wondering with this great exodus of migration if and when we are compelled by law to subscribe - lest the vultures will say that I am opposed to it, I have already expressed my view on the floor of this House - what will be the true position after they have paid their contributions. No one can make the people happier than the Minister himself. Those of us who have servants must pay the contribution. There can be no doubt about that. On the other hand, there are employees who change jobs from day to day. What is the position with those master carpenters and master masons who work on one house this week and on another house next week and yet on another one for two days and so on? You are going to have thousands and thousands of them in this country. I suggest that in view of this letter the Hon. Minister would give very careful consideration to it because it says after thirteen weeks anybody can be sick, you will have to notify them and if you are going to get \$60 a month this is to be deducted from your salary. You should not pass legislation like this hastily and run off with it. You have the big companies, the Bulkeley group the same Shipping and Trading Company etc. After that speech that said Government was worried about what the position would be as far as Government employees are concerned, they will get possibly two weeks or six weeks full pay. I do not agree with it; it poses a tremendous problem. Solve it, not hastily, but by some sort of legislation that will settle the matter amicably.

Mr. St. JOHN: I do not know if I did not make myself as clear as can be, but what I am trying to enquire of the Hon. Minister is this: as I understand it, the present position is that there are certain sick leave conditions which civil servants and other employees of Government are entitled to and those conditions are more generous than the conditions as envisaged by the National Insurance Scheme. What I want to know is whether the Government intends to amend those regulations so as to ensure that people cannot make a profit out of sickness, so to speak, and draw double. I throw out for consideration the fact that it may be possible to amend it in such a manner as to ensure that employees in the future will not be deprived of the extent of the benefits which they may have received in the past, but that Government contributions to the benefits will be reduced namely and for example, if before they used to get 100 per cent of their salary committed in such a way that they would draw 60 per cent from the National Insurance Fund and the Government would put up the other 40 per

cent, I hope that is the same sort of scheme and the same sort of attitude which will be adopted by the employers who at the present moment and who at any instance prior to the National Insurance Scheme - because in checking these National Insurance Schemes in some of the other countries, it is possible for the Minister to allow what is known as contracting out of the National Insurance Scheme where he is satisfied as a result of Trade Union representation on terms and conditions of service that the provisions and benefits of the National Insurance Scheme are less than the benefits which industry applied at the present moment. I can understand that here in Barbados the number of employees is relatively small and the Government may find it difficult to allow contracting out but what I would seriously suggest is that no person will be deprived of the benefits which they used to get in the past and Government will not allow people to draw 100 per cent and 60 per cent from the National Insurance Scheme which means that they will get 160 per cent benefit. The Government will have to amend the regulations either the National Insurance Scheme regulations or more appropriately the Civil Servants Leave and Conditions of Service Regulations after negotiation with the relevant people.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, with relation to the question brought before this Committee by the hon. junior member for St. Peter, the appropriate Minister has made a reply in which he said that he hoped to contact the employers on this matter. Any insurance benefit enjoyed by the employees is a personal and private matter. These people were insured and they were not paying for it. That is a difficult thing. Government cannot make any restitution for that. That is personal insurance given by the company. The employees did not contribute one half penny to that. Since this law comes into effect and they have to enjoy certain allowances from the National Insurance Scheme, it will be less than what they normally enjoy under the insurance provided by their employers.

4.10 p.m.

The most I say is this: I ask that the former Insurance Schemes be retained and remain contributory or something to that effect. We cannot put these employees in a more enjoyable position than when they were being insured by employers. We cannot do that. Do not let us fool anybody. I do not want any cheap vote. I sympathise with these people now that they will get less benefits. From the Governor-General down to the scavenger has to pay his contribution and nobody pays more than a certain amount and nobody can enjoy more than a certain amount of benefits. One man can be insured for 20,000 another for 10,000, another for 5,000 and another for \$100; but how much you pay proportionately is how much you get. There is a ceiling; nobody is paying more than a certain amount of insurance. An employee who is getting \$500 a month is not contributing one half cent more than the Governor-General. It is impossible to have the same benefits accruing to employees in a reasonably high bracket if the insurance paid only by employers was 90 per cent, as would accrue in a lower bracket. As a former Trade Unionist I know quite a lot about this insurance business about Broad Street and around this city.

I do not think that the Government should feel itself embarrassed in this matter. The employers paid these premiums, the employees didn't. Now that you have a local National Insurance Scheme, it is for everybody. This is to show everybody that, according to the National economy, he will get something when he reaches old age. When the economy of this country goes up, the time will come when the benefits from the National Insurance Scheme will be much greater in 1970 than it is in 1967. That is looking into the future. We should ask for the retention by these companies of such an insurance scheme on a contributory basis. I will tell you this: I am much more experienced in this matter than the Minister. I do not see any embarrassment on the part of the Government in this matter. This is a big, noble scheme and if I were on those benches of the Government, I would not be embarrassed. If we, on this side, were in the Government, I do not think that we would be embarrassed. However, Sir, I think that we should retain some form of insurance which would re-instate all the big firms and garages so that they will not feel that they are affected personally. I think that the Minister should go forward in a very bold manner because the entire House is behind him in this matter. I am speaking in relation to the substance of the letter which was read in here today from the Barbados Shipping and Trading Company. I am speaking *vis-a-vis* that letter.

This matter of National Insurance was attempted in this island before the present Government was in power. It was the past Government which had initiated this business of National Insurance. Therefore there is no criticism of National Insurance as such. The Government can amend the regulations but they cannot amend the insurance proposals from a private company. Only a Soviet Government could do that. We have not got there yet. The most you can do is to let them know that, as the matter now stands, there will be some embarrassment for these particular workers. 4.20 p.m.

Therefore, if a man pays \$170 to the National Insurance Scheme, you must know how much you are likely to get as sick benefits. Some people pay \$1 a month, some \$3 a month and some pay even more than that. Therefore, Sir, if the Barbados Shipping and Trading company is paying out a better insurance than that, they are in a position to call the tune.

The Government says that there is the National Insurance Scheme for everybody. The Government is insuring these people upon a future scheme of insurance allowing its employees to enjoy such benefits which they have already but is saying that these employees should not get more than what they are getting as salary.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the position is that the Civil Servants will not be receiving any less benefit when they insure under the National Insurance and Social Security Scheme. They received sickness benefits before the Government embarked on this scheme. Therefore, it is better for a man who is ill because he will be receiving a better salary than when he is well.

I think that the hon. junior member for St. Peter has made the greatest contribution on that side to this debate. He has pointed out that the person is only insured up to a certain amount of his salary. If the Barbados Shipping and Trading Company or any other firm is making a contribution to its employees, the reason why we are asking them to retain the Scheme they had before is because we know that there is a ceiling to which they are insured. A man may be working for \$200 per month. He can receive 60% of \$200 a month therefore if the employers wish the status quo to remain, you can see that the employers would be only benefiting for a short time from that. What we have said to them is to let their conditions of service remain, let the status quo remain so that the employers will retain their short time benefits. As I have said, I think the hon. junior member for St. Peter has made the greatest contribution to this debate.

The only one who really saw the point was the hon. senior member for St. Peter. If a man is receiving 60% of the normal insurance which is taken out for him and that man is working for \$200 he would be receiving 60% of \$200. You can therefore well see if that person is sick for eleven to twelve months under the National Insurance Scheme what would happen is that the benefits he will receive will bring that man a larger amount than what he is normally receiving before he was ill.

I am satisfied that the employers are co-operating in this matter. We have to be realistic. We have to see these things in their true perspective. As I see it, I can have it clarified and I am going to discuss this matter with the Barbados Shipping and Trading Company so as to let the hon. members who are anxious over it to see that it is not detrimental.

The question that the Schedule stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On motion of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee.

4.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman has reported to me the passing in Committee of one Bill.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

THE MOTOR VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1967

Mr. SPEAKER: Accordingly I declare this Bill duly to have been passed.

The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, the Minister of Communications and Works, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the Objects and Reasons of this Bill are to remove the hardship caused from time to time to persons disqualified from holding driving licences under the provisions of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937 and of the Motor Vehicles Insurance (Third Party Risks) Act, 1952 and to make provision for persons so disqualified to apply to the Court which made the Order to remove the disqualification after the expiration of certain specified periods from the date of the Order by which the disqualification was imposed. I am sure every member on this side and on the other side has a copy, and if they did not go to school I am not going to teach them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Indeed, hon. members have read their copies with great care.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I hope so. This Act may be cited as the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Act, 1967. This sprung up as a result of what is done in England. Yes, Mr. Speaker this Act sprung up from a similar Act that takes place in England. We are not encouraging people to drive like madness, create accidents, get their licences suspended and then encourage them to get them back, but we do feel that sometimes a person can lose his licence, and though we are not questioning the Magistrate or the Judge who takes it away from him, there might be certain circumstances which after a later date the very Magistrate or Judge would be disposed somewhat passionately towards this person, but as the law now stands he cannot do it, so this Bill is asking the House of Assembly to make provision where if a licence has been taken away from a guilty driver or culprit, that this same person after six months of the suspension can make application to the same Court asking the Court to have compassion on him and restore his licence. If the Judge feels disposed to do so he does so, if he does not, it remains and that application - that person cannot make an application again before three months after that time has expired.

We do not intend to follow the British Government slavishly in everything they do, but we think this is a good piece of legislation and I am sure that the lawyers on the opposite side will feel quite happy - as the senior member for St. Thomas mentioned some time ago, and I told him that we are bringing down legislation - I have seen that the lawyers on the other side, including yourself, seem somewhat pleased.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am on neither side.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I said lawyers on that side and you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker the hon. member must remember that His Honour the Speaker must not be referred to in the debate to influence the debate.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the accusation was fair because the hon. member who just got up on a point of order knows I was not trying to influence the debate. I am very pleased with this piece of legislation, but I should also warn drivers that because we are sympathetic towards having some of the licences restored, this does not give them the licence to abuse the sympathy of a lenient Government and a more lenient Judge or Magistrate. I hope that it will be passed, and I am appealing to the general public not to abuse this privilege which is being granted to them, because I have been watching the sudden trend of road accidents and deaths that have been taking place. I am driving now with a bit of apprehension, because I see a lot of accidents looking for somewhere to happen, but I hope that the newspapers and radio in Barbados would take it upon themselves as a public duty to keep reminding people day in and day out - instead of printing the lot of nonsense they print sometimes, they could do something to see if they can put some fear in the people's hearts who go around like they have an appointment with the undertaker.

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, as the junior member for St. Thomas said when he was introducing this Bill, it follows something to which he had made reference in answer to a question of mine in an earlier debate, and many lawyers will be glad to see that the provisions for re-application for a driving licence after a period of disqualification are now to be introduced in Barbados, but I very much regret that the opportunity was not taken at the same time for doing something about the iniquitous section 31 (1) of the Road Traffic Act which permits the Commissioner of Police not to give a man a driving licence, unless he is satisfied that the man is of good character.

4.40 p.m.

I suggest to the Government that this Bill would have been the ideal place in which to correct this situation. I do not want to bore the House by repeating the experience of persons known to me and known to other members on this side who have been aggrieved by what they do sometimes see. In one case at least a Magistrate considered to be unreasonable the behaviour of a former Commissioner of Police in this respect. I would urge very strongly on the Minister that the tenor of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Laws of Barbados should be looking to see that only the Courts should have the power to take away a man's licence and that is only for an offence. When this Bill is passed - because I intend to vote for it, and that goes for other members of the Opposition - the position will be that where a Court has taken away a man's

licence for a traffic offence, the man first of all, has the right of appeal to another Court and then on a point of law, to appeal to yet another Court and possibly even then, to appeal to the Privy Council. Where a man's licence has been taken away by a qualified lawyer sitting on a Magisterial bench, the man can only appeal to a Police Magistrate by Section 31 of the Act. He cannot go any further and there is no provision for making other applications to get back his licence. That puts too much power in the hands of the Commissioner of Police in respect of something which may be a man's livelihood because, almost without exception, the cases I know in which the Commissioner of Police has refused to issue driving licences, the persons concerned have been professional drivers.

You have the situation that one man not bound by legal rules may decide that he is satisfied that a man is a particular character and should not have a driving licence. He can sentence him to an indefinite period of disqualification and it may be held that the decision of the Commissioner of Police is an administrative decision, and that man might therefore be deprived both of what he could put on record as his constitutional rights as well as the rights given to a person in a proper Court. From my own experience this year, I remember a case in which a driver was asking a Magistrate to give him back his licence. The Police Sergeant gave evidence that the applicant had once given him information leading to the recovery of stolen property, and it was argued that since he knew where the Police could get back stolen property, he was associated with thieves and therefore he was a bad character. Where situations like these will occur, I am quite sure that the Minister will join with me in deploring that there should not be statutory provisions for an appeal, that you cannot go the whole hog and repeal that part of Section 31 of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act. Anybody who looks at Section 31 (1) of the Act will see that it reads as follows:-

"The Commissioner of Police shall not issue a driving licence to any person unless he is satisfied that the vision, hearing and bodily and mental fitness of the applicant are such as to warrant the issue of a driving license and that the applicant is of good character."

You do not give a man a driving licence if you think that he cannot see or hear or act rapidly. The Commissioner of Police can ask for a Medical Certificate and say that the man is entitled to a licence. If this Act is put under Colonial Legislation in 1937 - and that year is significant - it is merely in my view a petty, repressive piece of legislation. If you are giving people a chance of getting back their licences when the Court has taken them away, why should you not give them a better chance to get them back when the Police have taken them away? I am supporting this Bill and I look forward to an amendment to this Act which will delete these words from this Section, namely, "and that the applicant is of good character," and put the matter in a proper way in respect of the qualification for a driver's licence or the disqualification for holding a driver's licence.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of speaking on this Bill, but after hearing that the Inspector of Police has more power in some cases than even the Magistrate, I am asking.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member has said that he has just learned that an Inspector of Police can take away a person's driving licence. I want to say that an Inspector of Police cannot take away anybody's driving licence any more than I can. The hon. member means the Commissioner of Police.

Mr. SPEAKER: Although I agree with what the hon. member has said, that is not a point of order.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is trying to learn. I should have said "the Commissioner of Police" instead of "the inspector of Police." However, Sir, I do not like so much power being put into the hands of any one man. Too much power corrupts. Let us get this straight and I hope that the Minister will try to get it straight. This particular Bill is crooked and I want to get it straight. The Minister has said that at times the Magistrate who disqualifies a particular driver from holding a licence, feels that the time has come when he should give him back his licence.

4.50 p.m.

If the Magistrate feels so, this Bill gives the Magistrate authority to look into the matter and qualify the driver again. When the Commissioner of Police says no, it means no.

If what I have heard just now is correct, and it must be correct because the hon. member was reading from Volume 5 - that is Volume 5 of the Laws of Barbados - this is to put up an argument in order not to give back a particular driver a licence. I say that that is not good enough today. It is unfair, it is ungrateful and everything that is bad. Just fancy that after one is trying to help the police, you find that the police is trying to help them down. It is unfair to the man only because a particular inspector does not want a particular driver again to be given a licence that this is done. It is a very serious thing and I am asking the particular Minister to look into it.

The hon. senior member for St. Thomas says that he is going to vote for it and I am going to vote for it too. However, you do not disqualify a driver only because he did not stop at a major road. You disqualify him because he did two wrongs. The Magistrate is willing to give him a chance to reapply in six months.

I hope the Hon. Minister will take up Section 31 of the Motor Vehicle and Road Traffic Act, 1937 where it says that the Commissioner of Police has the authority to disqualify a person from driving. Sir, you cannot blame me for my feelings. It can be termed as vote-catching. I say so. I hope the Cabinet feels that it is vote-catching. Let us get votes by amending the Act. Take out that section where the Commissioner of Police can do as he likes.

As I have said, I do not believe in giving any one man such power. Too much power is likely to corrupt and we are saying that it will.

I am appealing for the last time to the Hon. Minister. I am wondering if I am in order to ask the Hon. Minister to take back this Bill and bring back another Bill which is worthy of passing this Chamber by taking out that section.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill sets out as its object to remove the hardship caused from time to time to persons disqualified from holding driving licences under the provisions of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937 and of the Motor Vehicles Insurance (Third Party Risks) Act, 1952 and to make provision for persons so disqualified to apply to the Court which made the Order to remove the disqualification after the expiration of certain specified periods from the date of the Order by which the disqualification was imposed.

I have already said in this Hon. House that the whole question of drivers licences and the issuing of them in the first place, because a person must be the owner of a drivers licence before he can break the law or be disqualified, should be in the hands of a licensing authority to be set up. One would find that the Commissioner of Police finds himself in the position today in much the same way, as the hon. junior member for St. Joseph said, as a lot of magistrates.

Sir, I think that this is not beyond the knowledge of some hon. members. There was a case in which a learner was involved in an accident where a policeman died and it so happened that the Police were in a position to have withheld the issuing of a licence to that learner, at least during the inquiry into the death of that policeman.

5.00 p.m.

But Sir, it so happened, and that is why we feel that this matter of licences and the issuing of them and the renewal of them has got to be taken out of the hands of the Police at some stage; the time is now. That learner involved in an accident in which a policeman lost his life, but before the enquiry the police still proceeded to issue him with a licence. I should say at this stage that at the enquiry it so happened that the policeman who had been riding on the pillion with the victim could not remember the number of the vehicle which his brother policeman had become involved with, which this learner had been driving, but do not let us go into that particular aspect of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wondered if this matter could be *sub judice* or this is a matter in which finality has been arrived at in which the policeman said he had been riding on the wrong side of the road.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, we are concerning ourselves this evening with the question of licences and the disqualification and re-application for re-issue and the like, and as far as I know of that aspect of things, nothing in this Bill is *sub judice*, not to my

knowledge, so that we find ourselves in this position. The law ought to be made clear to remove the possibility of any question of currying favouring, so to speak - we have had it here that a former Commissioner of Police in Barbados, Major Stoute, he committed wilful acts, wilful breaches of the traffic act, and the same Commissioner of Police who has a total disregard for the traffic laws is then the Commissioner of Police to say I will not renew the licence of another person. It so happens that everybody cannot be a Commissioner of Police at the same time, that is the position with which we are faced and under those circumstances we feel that while some effort is now being made whereby a disqualified person can apply to have his licence returned to him, even here what you find is that a person's licence might have been taken away from them for a six month period, it might be a case of a person whose earnings, whose livelihood depended on their securing a job as a driver. He has got to wait and still live during the period of disqualification, but we have got to bear in mind that he must have committed some breach, done some wrong which brought about this disqualification period. Under this Bill, that period must pass and then the period during which he can re-apply for his re-issue has got to come up. But suppose that he applies, during the month of June of this year, there is nothing in this Bill which tells us that the presiding Magistrate is not in a position to say or does not have - as you would know, Sir, the term 'in his discretion' - the Magistrate in his discretion will say, you applied in June, we will consider your application in September or October or something of the kind. There is nothing to prevent that at all, nothing whatsoever, and there are things such as these to which we would like to draw the attention of the Minister.

On the whole, the Government evidently have seen the necessity for bringing about a Bill such as this sort, but from what has been said here this afternoon by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, he has given this House the benefit of his own experience of these matters. No doubt he has come into contact with cases which certainly should find some place with the Minister and sort of arm him for bringing down a more comprehensive Bill for dealing with the matter of licences in the future.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the many statements and requests that have been made, some time ago in this Chamber I said that there are some unscrupulous people in the world and some people said that I said unscrupulous lawyers. I never said any such thing, and some idiot said that I was trying to be sarcastic in a reply to him. What has happened is, I should like that idiot to know that Prophet is my name. I have been called that for the last 40 odd years, I am not ashamed of it as some people are ashamed of theirs.

I am going to use another term. Just as I said there are some unscrupulous people in the world, I am going to say that there are some very scrupulous people in the world. The senior member for St. Joseph said he does not like all of this power put into one person's hand, I wonder if he realises that the Catho-

lic has some 120 million followers and all of these people must take guidance from the Pope, the Pope is one man, he is not a twin. Furthermore, the Anglican Church, all of its followers must take directions from the Archbishop in England. He is the head, but we must always remember that just as you might find a policeman who might be indiscriminate in his approach to a certain matter, you might find another policeman who is discriminate in his approach to the same matter.

5.10 p.m.

Policemen are Barbadians and you do not find every Barbadian with sense. We must stop this picking at defenceless people. I would like to say that any statement I make in here I can make it on a political platform because I do not say anything for which anybody can put me in Court for defamation of character. I am prepared to say that what has been said in here is an attack on a person who cannot reply as effectively as he should. I do agree that you will find Commissioners of Police and people right down the ranks who have done things which, on reflection, we may find were not right. I do agree that people who have refused to re-issue driving licences can be a bit iniquitous, but you must remember that you cannot, in a community like this, give every Tom, Dick and Harry a driving licence. What is there to stop a man who has a driving licence from indulging in using a borrowed vehicle or a stolen vehicle for unsavoury purposes? We have to be more than careful. In the same way that we put the justice of the country into the hands of the Chief Justice and the signing of the laws into the hands of the Governor-General, you have to be content with the issue of licences being put into the hands of the Commissioner of Police. It could have been in the hands of the Minister or in the hands of the Court, but Magistrates are not divinely made and you can find a foolish Magistrate; however I am not saying that the Magistrates are foolish.

When the hon. junior member for St. Peter spoke about a Licensing Authority, I share his view, but taking the licensing authority out of the hands of the police will not solve any problems. I am just replying to hon. members who castigate people who cannot answer for themselves in here; you must always remember that we are Barbadians and all of us do not use all our judgment all the time. Some of us do not use our judgment at all; you may get some Commissioners of Police who are lenient at some time or you may get judges who are lenient all the time. I will tell the hon. junior member for St. Peter that as to the whole Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, we are now trying to get it re-written so as to bring the law up to the standard of advanced countries. Therefore hon. members need not get the idea that the Commissioner of Police is a tyrant. Whether Commissioners of Police are born here or not, there were Barbadians in the past and we should not try to run down our people too much.

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

On the motion of Hon. N. W. BOXILL, seconded by Mr. W. R. LOWE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair,

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Clause 3 was called. It reads as follows:-

3. An application may be made under section 63A of the principal Act for the removal of a disqualification imposed before the date on which this Act comes into operation as well as for the removal of a disqualification imposed after that date.

Mr. R. W. LOWE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I understand from the Minister that the Government is having a comprehensive Act on the whole Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic legislation, and I take it that this amendment would be included in the new edition of the Laws of Barbados and that they will be re-numbered. Whenever that happens, we still think that the new Laws which are coming into force will not be ready before January, 1969. There will still be at the time disqualifications which were imposed before the coming into force of the new edition of the laws, and therefore there will be some doubt. This whole Act will be incorporated in the new Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, and this section which merely gives the Court power to remove disqualifications whether they were imposed before the coming into force of this Act or after, will be lost in the consolidated Act. This is not the section which the Draftsman will put into the consolidated Act. There are people who, when they come to look at the new edition of the laws of Barbados, when they see the new Act, they will be unaware as to whether it applies to disqualification before the Act or after. That is merely a drafting point. 5.20 p.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: As the hon. member just said, this is a matter for the draftsmen and unless he expects to die tonight, I believe he will be around as well as the hon. senior member for Christ Church and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. They will remember this particular amendment and they will be able to tell their friends. I do not think it would cause any burden on them.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On this question.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is the hon. member speaking on?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I speak on a point of order. The Hon. Minister is out of order. How can the hon. member be addressing you now when another Hon. Minister has spoken.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I have seen it done here already.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It cannot be done so.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, when I am addressing you, can I have your undivided attention? I am sure that I am perfectly correct.

I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part.

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

On motion of Hon. N. W. BOXILL, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. H. W. BOXILL, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE LEASE TO TOWN AND COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES (BARBADOS) LIMITED

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House and it is to move the passing of the following Resolution: A Resolution to approve the lease to Town and Commercial Properties (Barbados) Ltd., of a parcel of land situate at Engineer's Pier, Aquatic Gap, in the parish of Saint Michael.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is to approve an arrangement pertaining to a piece of land to be leased to Town and Commercial Properties (Barbados) Limited. This company proposes to build a new hotel on the site of what was the old Aquatic Club and this land is adjacent to the old Aquatic Club.

The company is therefore applying to the Government for a lease of the said land from the Government. This is a little more than 20,000 square feet of land.

The proposed figures for the lease has been the subject of much discussion between the Government and Town and Commercial Properties (Barbados) Limited. There are several ways in which this matter can be dealt with.

5.30 p.m.

There could have been, for instance, a periodic review every 25 years with the rental of land settlement by arbitration, or there could have been this other alternative which is the one the Government has embarked upon, fixed increases for periods of 25 years, 5,000 per annum for the first term, \$7,500 for the second and \$10,000 for the third period.

It is considered, after careful consideration, that this proposal is more favourable to the Gov-

ernment and this one has been accepted. Hon. members will see again in the Schedule that the terms, as far as the rental, 25 year increases are concerned, have been set out in some detail. One thing I would like to stress, and I want to be very emphatic about this, that the proposal to lease this land to this body for the purpose of erecting this hotel will in no way modify the rights and privileges of the inhabitants of this island to use the beach facilities which exist in that area. This has to be stressed with the utmost emphasis because this is the sort of thing that would cause considerable concern if it were not made clear.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, what questions are likely to arise. However, if there are any, I need hardly say that they will be answered so far as the information is presently available. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, once again I must draw to the attention of the hon. Leader of the House the introducer of this Resolution, what I regard as paucity of information and the insult with which this House is being treated in the presentation of these matters. Here we have a Resolution to approve a lease of a parcel of land, we have no attachments to it setting out and showing us the relation of this parcel of land in relation to other land owned by the proposed lessee. We do not know whether it is on the beach itself or whether it is a piece of back land or not. All we know here is that it is bounded, according to this, on the lands of the vendor, on the sea, and on the Crown in right of its Government. If you are making an application to the Town Planner you have to give a rough sketch of the surrounding properties, you do not have to have an elaborate plan, you only have to show sufficient clarity, so that the person who is looking at it will be able to understand, but the House of Assembly in this country can be treated with all kinds of discourtesy.

The second point is we are asked to approve a lease as set out in the Schedule, and the only thing the schedule talks about is the rent. Are we to understand that a lease is to be drawn up with only the rent to be considered? I notice that this Government in particular in all of its financial dealings - I am saying so and I am not going to withdraw it - has a certain degree of concealment, they would not lay any documents for the scrutiny of the members of Parliament.

What we are dealing with now is a lease, and I cannot see how a House of Assembly can be asked to accept a lease unless something is put in the hands of the members. We in the House of Assembly are guardians of Government property in this country, and I want to say that the rent of \$2,500 per annum is too low. 22,000 sq.ft. of land next to the sea, if you value it at \$5,00 a foot, it is a conservative valuation that gives you a capital sum involved of \$10,000 at 8% interest, \$8,000 a year; cut that in half and you are more conservative in your valuation. You will still get \$50,000 at 8% is still \$4,000

a year. Cut it again and the Government suggested this land is worth \$25,000.

No wonder that I could detect a little tone of labouring in the hon. member's voice when he was introducing the Resolution, because there must be some other reason as to why you are going to lease for the first 25 years land next to the sea in Barbados, and I know this, that the Hon. Prime Minister has always been saying that when Government has to buy land the people want a pound and a crown for it, and the Government has been taken to the Court and arbitraries have been done, high prices had to be paid for land, but when Government comes to dispose of property, Government is prepared to dispose of it at ridiculous rates. \$2,500 a year is a low rate, and that is to go ahead for 25 years.

It may be argued that this is part of the inducement to get these people to build a hotel in Barbados, let us not be fooled in this respect. We have already given additional inducement by way of extending the period for hotels from 7 years to 10 years. In addition to that, large sums of money are being spent in Barbados to promote the development, via the Development Board and the Tourist Industry, we spent large sums of money to promote these things, and these shareholders do not have to pay any tax here in Barbados, and they get duty free raw materials. Do they want the whole world? Is the Government willing to give the whole of Barbados to them?

The Hilton Hotel which is next door is costing the Government money in this year's estimate of revenue; the taxpayers have got to make up the interest - 8 percent. per year. That is so, but this land next door, even at this stage can mean \$5 million in your projected revenue, and you are still going to be prepared to lease 22,000 sq.ft. of land at the Aquatic Club area at this low rate. As I say, you are concealing from us the true situation of this land in relation to the other pieces of land. It seems to me that the reason why they want to lease this land is because this land forms a wedge between two other pieces of land and the whole project would not be a feasible project without this piece of land.

5.40 p.m.

Could you be in a better bargaining position than that? All you are asking for is this: you are saying that the Barbados Government has to go on the London Market and borrow money, and you have to pay 7 3/4% interest and it works out at 8% interest eventually. You take your value and we take our value; we look at land sales in the area and strike an average. You are saying: "Give me 8% interest and I will work out the kind of rent I want." You have to wait for 75 years before you get an economic rent on the present-day proposals. This is a subsidy to this hotel. The lease is to be for 99 years at a rental of \$2,500 per annum for the first 25 years, \$5,000 for the second 25 years, \$7,500 per annum for the third 25 years and \$10,000 per annum for the final 25 years. When you consider the capital cost of the land, they are getting the use of it at these rates. They will be putting up this hotel and the capital cost will be about \$30 a square foot. These are smart business people. They propose to put up an hotel of 120 rooms for 2 1/2 million dollars whereas the Hilton Hotel cost 10 million dollars with 140 rooms.

These people are husbanding their financial resources. Their conduct will be sharply contrasted with the conduct of the Government. We cannot support this proposal in the way in which it has been brought forward today. In the first place, we do not have any plan annexed to the Resolution showing the representatives of the people where the land is situated, and secondly, we do not have a copy of the draft lease. This is what is set out in this Addendum:-

"Messrs. Town and Commerical Properties (Barbados) Limited have acquired the property formerly occupied by the Aquatic Club Limited and propose to erect an hotel of 120 rooms on the site. The Company has approached Government for a lease of the parcel of land in the Schedule and propose paying the rent set out therein. The use and enjoyment of the beach adjacent to the land to be leased will continue to be available to the general public."

I ask the Hon. Minister at what price per square foot did they buy the Aquatic Club? I would be willing to put my head to the block and lose it in contending that they paid more than \$5.00 per square foot for it. This firm proposes to erect an hotel of 120 rooms on the site. How do you know that if they do not erect the hotel in time, the lease will be forfeited? Those of us who have been following the development in the West Indian area know that there are large numbers of people who come down here and acquire property at economic values and thereby establish themselves. I do not know who these people are. I may say that the Government was also satisfied with the bona fides of the operation of the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake. These people promise to reform certain things and then they failed to carry out their obligations. There was a man who leased a hotel in St. Lucia and 10 years after not one piece of development had gone ahead and the Government of St. Lucia had to forfeit the lease. We know that these underdeveloped countries are regarded as fair gain for speculators and thereby they attract people to them. We want to share the benefit of our knowledge and experience with the people on the other side.

Let us have the information; why hide it? Why can't the Civil Servants or whoever prepared this Addendum prepare a proper Addendum? Their attitude seems to be: "Do not mind the people in the House of Assembly; we are in power and whatever we push down to them, they will accept." Mr. Speaker, we cannot vote for this Resolution by reason of the explanation which has been given. The Government is accustomed to using this House as a convenience and is hiding information from us.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, it will be difficult to improve on the argument which has just been used by the hon. member on my left. He has put the case extremely well. I will use a personal argument. What members of the Government owning this land would agree to a lease of this seaside land at a rental for 25 years? Nobody with any intelligence would have a lease for 25 years at a fixed rental. Of course, you can have a lease for 99 years that is normal: but you should review the market value of the

land in every 5 years. In other words, in 10 years' time the land will be worth ten times as much, but you will have to be contented with \$2,500. Imagine that they could agree to lease this piece of land at a fixed rent for 25 years! I was offered 5 acres of land at Trents for \$2,000. This land is in the vicinity of the Colony Club and land which Sir Edward Cunrad bought, and I shrugged my shoulders and passed it by. That is an example in Barbados. It is insulting to come to this House, as the hon. senior member for Christ Church has pointed out, without giving us a copy of the draft lease or making it possible for us to see the mistakes on the part of the Government. None of us will be so crude as to suggest that money is such that they can go down there and buy land cheaply.

5.50 p.m.

I do think that the Hon. Leader of the House should accept this proposal that this matter be taken back to the Cabinet and that the consideration of this Resolution be postponed. Even though you know that the Hon. Prime Minister should come in and introduce this matter, realising that this is a matter dealing with finance, we are not even asking that. He should come in to undo what two of the Hon. Ministers have done. This is so important a thing that hon. members should be told specifically what is done.

I do not agree to the hon. member leasing this land at the most christian attitude possible when any Government should be prepared to get the best it can for the taxpayers of the country and to give these people right to acquire it at a very low rent. If instead of their renting this land for a period of twenty-five years in the first instance, they were renting it out for a period of five years at market value, it will may do and if after that they have a review of the price every five years according to the market value. How can they rent land like that at a fixed price for twenty-five years?

I have often said that it is liable for men to make mistakes. Governments do make mistakes at some time or the other. We of the Opposition came into this House with the intention of trying to co-operate with the new Government on the face of anything which they brought forward which was reasonable. We said that we would consider this suggestion which the Government was bringing down and although it was contrary to our view we would say that possibly we made a mistake.

Mr. HUSBANDS and Mr. MOTTLEY rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter caught my eye first.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Did he catch your eye first?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, a fraction of a second before you.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, in these days of real estate business I do not concern myself with real estate business and I was really looking forward to hearing what the hon. senior member for the City of

Bridgetown had to say on this resolution, but as I was on my feet a little moment before the hon. member I am happy to have caught Your Honour's eye first.

Now, Sir, twenty-five years is a long time. This is 1967 and if I add twenty-five years to that it would come out to 1992. As one who is not yet in the real estate business, I observe things. I know how prices go especially to the prices asked for beach land, because there is beach land all around where I live. I do not want to say that they are not businessmen. Lots of people benefit from other people's mistakes. The hon. member is not the only person to make mistakes.

There was a piece of land which was known as Gibbes Woods and in early days the only use which was made of that was on Boxing Day when the salvation Army went north. You found the Bridgetown Branch and the Southern Units sailing to Speightstown by schooner and then marching to that place with their band. Now, today, you cannot buy that land. When I was a boy that land was a wide wild open strip of land. I was not a boy ninety-nine years ago. *(Laughter)*.

Now, I have the Hon. Ministers in a laughing mood I am going to tell them that in 1992 the rental value of this land would be much more than what they are going to collect. To tell you that makes it ridiculously absurd. When I was a small boy, I was doing three equations in mathematics.

Let us take 1967. Barbados is now benefitting out of Expo. 67. Rum is sold at \$1.80 a bottle in Barbados and we can reasonably expect that some people will pay much more than that. I understand that people are now looking at Heywoods trying to obtain it. I soon will be coming in here and talking of it because I keep my ears and nose down to the ground.
6.00 p.m.

The only thing I can say about this is that a postponement is reasonable. Like the Leader of the Opposition, I do not propose to make a long and tiring speech and to go over the same points that have been made, because I have said sufficient. I have only gone to the first 25 years, if I intended to make a speech I would go to the whole 99 years. To 1992 A.D. is quite long enough for me to make just a note of what this land is presumably worth.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope members of the Government will not be too anxious, do not get too anxious to play into these people's hands, why rush it? These people are far-seeing people businesswise, they see things far ahead. We are not accustomed to money. I have never seen anybody spending money in Barbados, yet I have seen a few middle income class people trying to see what a few places like Sandy Lane on Saturday nights look like. You do not see money in Barbados, you cannot talk money in this country, this is a poor country. You have sugar and a little rum, no oil. Do not let us be too anxious to fall for these offers, looking towards the end of the first 25 years, 1992. You have another 25 and a 25 and also a 25 to go again. I will be in Heaven by then.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the hon. Ministers on the other side to make haste slowly in this matter and not to bullrush it. More can result for this country if we wait. Sometimes a man knows you are poor, he rushes you with a goodlooking offer and he says to himself, that man never had money, he does not know the value of this, and as a poor man I fall for it when a richer man would have waited and a businessman would have waited and cashed in. We can cash in on this a lot more, therefore I urge the Government to seriously consider. Do not give away this land.

Mr. Speaker, I here and now formally move that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed. In moving the postponement that further consideration be given to this Resolution I am very serious and very mindful that we will be acting as businessmen, that we will be acting in the interest of the public welfare of this country, that we will be conscious of the value of our natural assets, and that we will not be acting as people who live from hand to mouth and hasten to part with the few possessions we find ourselves with. Mr. Speaker, I hope members on the other side would pay serious attention to the words of counsel that I am giving them on this particular matter. They have gone into this, they have spoken to those who have negotiated with them, it appears to them on the surface that the offer is a very good one, but I say a better offer will come. We know the area, we know the situation on this matter. From my schoolboy days I knew the area, it is still there, it is worth a lot more than this, and as time goes on and you go on progressively you will see that it will be worth very much more. You know, sometimes when you speak to people and do not tell them the things they would like you to tell them, they think you are hostile to them. I am not hostile to the Government in this, I am as cool as a cucumber, so Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, again I ask members on that side to go and have another look into this matter.

I will say no more, but I do hope that my motion will be appreciated by members of the Government. I sincerely hope that, because they know, as well as I know that beach lands in Barbados are our greatest assets, are looked upon with greedy eyes by the Canadians, by the English, by the Americans, even the Venezuelans, and they should not part with their first love for a mess of pottage.
6.10 p.m.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the motion made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I thought that the Hon. Leader of the House would have risen on a point of order during the speeches which were being made by the hon. members who spoke on this matter, to present us with a plan.

Mr. SPEAKER: That would be out of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Is that a ruling?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a statement.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Very well, Sir, I do not question a ruling, I question a statement. When you rule, I bow to it.

Mr. SPEAKER: It would be out of order for the hon. member to rise on a point of order to lay a statement, present a plan, lease or anything of that kind. I hope that no hon. member would attempt to do anything like that, because it would be out of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I hope that that will come into your ruling in future. I was saying, Sir, that I did not want Your Honour to get into the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not get into the debate. The hon. member has not been present with us for some time and he is therefore out of touch. We welcome his return. I have no intention of getting into the debate.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am glad to hear that. I am saying that I would be glad to hear the Hon. Leader of the House speak on the matter, because he would have enlightened us by passing around the plot after the speech made by the last speaker. The Hon. Leader of the House knows as well as ever that when we deal with these matters where the Government proposes to lease land which is vested in the Crown, a plan or plot is always passed around to members of this Assembly. That has been my 20 odd years experience in here. You know this from your experience; we have always been treated with that courtesy. In the absence of the plan, however, we would certainly have been entitled to have more facts. The Addendum to the Resolution tells us that there is a Limited Liability Company registered here which proposes to put up an hotel of 120 rooms. It says that the Company has approached the Government for a lease of the parcel of land in the Schedule and it proposes to pay the rent set out in the Schedule. Anybody would pay this kind of rent. You have two sides of bargaining when you are dealing with a lease or the purchase of property. This Company proposes to pay this rent and put up this hotel, but the Government does not say what it wants. The Addendum states this: "The use and enjoyment of the beach adjacent to the land to be leased will continue to be available to the general public."

That is the most redeeming feature of this Addendum, but the Addendum itself is faulty. Despite the fact that the Premier has said that I have no credentials or knowledge of real estate, I still had the knowledge to make a living. The reason why I want to see this plot, and any sensible person will want to see it, is this. You have this 22,738 square feet of land, which is slightly over half an acre. This land with a sea frontage of 40 feet would not be worth the same as 22,000 square feet of land with a frontage of 100 feet. We want to see how this land is wedged in. The Government does not tell us what they have asked for. Whether the frontage of this land is 100 feet or 40 feet we do not know. The value of this land would depend upon the price at which you leased it, and you would come to the conclusion as to the value of the land if you saw the plot. The members of the Government would know exactly what I am saying. If you went to

the sea coast and you wanted a stretch of land and it had a frontage of 100 feet on the beach, it would certainly be worth more than a frontage on the beach of only 40 feet. You cannot expect us to vote blindly for the lease of land which the Government owns here not knowing exactly what the situation is. We should be shown a copy of the plan and the area which you propose to lease.

Now, Sir, I will deal with the price. We all know that beach land in this area is worth more than \$5.00 a square foot. Your present price of land at the Deep Water Harbour in the Government area for industrial purposes works out at ten dollars a foot per annum. If you have this portion of land, 22,738 square feet, that would be \$2,273.80 per year at ten cents a foot. That would be alright for a bond house down at the Deep Water Harbour. Could I see the people at the Yacht Club accepting 10 cents a foot per annum for this land at the Yacht Club and with the frontage which I know they have?
6.20 p.m.

If perchance you have a 20,000 square feet of land up there, you are going to get a good price for it if you offer it at \$5.00 a square foot.

The Government cannot look lightly at land for the erection of a hotel - a hotel which would enjoy all the incentives offered by the Government - plus being the next best site for such a purpose in Barbados. At least, even eight percent on the value of that land at market price would be above what you are getting. This lease would fall below that. The Minister cannot argue that land is priced too high because when they bought Graeme Hall land they did not say so. I saw when the land was developed and they were selling it at one dollar per square foot.

I do not think any member on the Opposition benches would disagree that this land should be leased for the purpose of putting a 120 - room hotel on it. I have always had the encouragement of tourism at heart from when I first moved in this House of Assembly a question for the encouragement of tourist here.

If you have a place like where the Aquatic Club was standing near to the Royal Barbados Yacht Club, standing near to the Hotel Hilton, standing near to Bridgetown, what do you think it is worth? I know what was offered for that land. I cannot very well see how you can say that they offered you this and you agreed to it.

This is what they say:-

"The Company has approached Government for a lease of the parcel of land in the Schedule and propose paying the rent set out therein. The use and enjoyment of the beach adjacent to the land to be leased will continue to be available to the general public."

Tell the House what you propose to take for leasing this land. You go on to say that you will take

\$2,500 a year for 25 years for the 22,000 square feet of land. Nearly all of that land is beach land.

I feel these negotiations should be on the basis of the first twenty-five years only with the option of renewal after that at the then present market price. Twenty-five years from now, when tourism is built up in Barbados, if there is no Communism, you are bound to find this land worth five dollars a square foot. How can you negotiate to lease it for only \$2,500 a year for the next twenty-five years?

I think the hon. member can see the argument that is used here as regards this matter. We could only have made that decision if the Hon. Leader of the House had presented us with a plan. Not only should we be presented with a plan of the building but a sketch of the entire area of land so that we can see what is the true position.

The Hon. Leader of the House should get valuable information from the Hon. Minister of Health. I cannot see why we should lease land which is worth up to a minimum of \$100,000 at \$2,500 for the next twenty-five years when the present price, as the hon. junior member for Christ Church will tell them, for borrowing money is at the rate of eight percent.

I ask the Hon. Leader of the House to show us a plan and if there is no plan forthcoming to postpone it and bring it back again.

I am speaking on the Schedule to the Resolution. You say:-

"The lease is to be for a period of ninety-nine years at a rental of \$2,500 per annum for the first 25 years, \$5,000 per annum for the second 25 years, \$7,500 per annum for the third 25 years and \$10,000 per annum for the final 25 years period."

I happen to know leases of areas of land here in Bridgetown. How can you lease land next to a built-up area, at \$2,500 a year for the next twenty-five years to put a hotel on? I do not agree that it should be \$2,500 for the next twenty-five years. It should be negotiated for every five years with the option of renewal after twenty-five years at a negotiated price according to the prevailing price then.

The next thing is that a company can be registered here and then go to the United States. So you know that this is not telling us that this lease is not transferrable? You said that this Company has been formed and they have offered you this. If you rent to any local person, you will get much more than that. This is at the rate of \$200.00 a month. Start talking money.

I repeat, what is going to be the value if tourism goes on in Barbados? With my knowledge, I think this should start off at \$10,000 a year.

6.30 p.m.

What is going to be the price or the value if Tourism goes on in Barbados? I hope the hon. mem-

ber would realise that my knowledge in this respect which I have put at the Government's disposal is that this should start off at \$10,000 a year, 8% of \$100,000 is \$8,000 a year. If it is worth \$5 a foot, and this is money which you have to invest. The legal maximum you would want for it is 8%, this is exactly what happens all over the world. There can be no argument, but above all if you have a plan to show us we would be able to see, or you would be able to prove to us that this is a strip of land they can do nothing else with. This House is entitled to see a copy of that lease, then we will be in a position to say what we suggest. I think this is just fair to the inhabitants of this country.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution that we have before us today, which seeks permission to lease this land to these people, I think it is a very good one. The Sugar Industry is going down and we have the Tourist industry. We can see that hotels mean a lot to us here. Businessmen are coming into this country to erect a hotel, we have land here available, there is 22,738 sq.ft. of land adjoining the Aquatic Club towards the sea, towards the public road

Mr. MOTTLEY: How do you know?

Mr. CORBIN: Because this says so. You live in Bridgetown and you should know it, and I am saying, Mr. Speaker, I am saying this evening that I hope that Government will never let these opportunities pass us. If we do not have that hotel erected here we will lose the money. I just heard the senior member for the City say that he was going to put up a bond house down at the Deep Water Harbour at 10¢ per sq.ft. per annum. I want him to know that that would be a commercial business and that hotel would be a commercial business.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I never like to interrupt especially when I am in sympathy with my friends. I rose on a point of order, the hon. member is misquoting me. What I did say was the Government was renting land at the Deep Water Harbour at 10¢ a sq.ft. for years and it seems that is the way they arrived at this. This is a different matter.

Mr. CORBIN: Is that a point of order? I said you have said that the Government is renting the land at the Deep Water Harbour at 10¢ per sq.ft. per annum. I am saying now if they rented the land at the Deep Water Harbour to put up a bond house, that is commercial business, and a hotel is commercial business. If a hotel is erected in that location, I will assure you that it will employ hundreds of Barbadians, and I am sure that from time to time the taxation would help the country. We are not only looking for the money but we are looking for those people who will be employed from time to time. The time may come when you have all the millions and you might not be able to spend it. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, I do not see the necessity for postponing a Resolution like this. I do not see why it cannot be passed this afternoon, it will certainly be supported by me.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, before the hon. Minister replies, the Leader of the House, I should like at this stage to try to bring some sort of discipline as far as thinking is concerned. In the first place, there is a plan as such which can be passed around and pursued by hon. members, and I will do that probably here and now, or immediately after I sit down.

There are certain conditions subject to which this lease has been granted. The present Government enjoys the facility of having as many trained lawyers as any Government in the past and they are qualified to advise the Government as such. I want to tell you this, this parcel of land has been traditionally a parcel of land which has been leased, I must say on a very bad basis, because of grounds of colour prejudice and other grounds. It was granted on a yearly basis at a pepper corn rent. I just want to explain what the position really is. This land has been subject to a lease for a year on a yearly basis at a pepper corn rent for a long number of years with the result that we have not had a proper modern hotel built there over the years, and it is now for the first time in developing the tourist industry, that we are giving what is a reasonable rental basis.

6.40 p.m.

This is not a sale, it is a lease, and bearing in mind you have that, whatever is put there at the end of the period of the lease reverts back to the owner of the land. Let me refer to the absurdities which have been mentioned. Somebody says that this is not an economical rent. At the end of the 99-year period the rent based on \$2,500 will yield \$625,000. If this land were sold even at \$10,000 per square foot, it would only bring in \$227,000 roughly. This land will remain the property of the Government; the Government will acquire the buildings thereon and they are subject to certain conditions. (Mr. MOTTLEY: We want to see the plan.) The plan is there; there is no secret or collusion. This 22,738 square feet of land is being leased and not sold; it is at an economic rent and it will provide \$625,000 and the Government will still own the land and the hotel which will be built. That is subject to certain restrictive covenants.

The hon. junior member for St. Andrew has said that we are trying to improve the Tourist Industry, and that can only be done by providing suitable conditions. Before I sit down, I want to say that this lease is set out on suitable conditions, and if there are any changes in the hotel without the consent of the Government during the tenure of the lease, then the lease will be brought to a close. The Government will be seeing that a proper hotel is maintained there, and if it is not run and kept according to certain conditions, then the lease will be brought to a close. The Government is not granting the putting up of any fence or pailing on any part of the land which may obstruct the enjoyment of the beach. In other words, the public must be protected. The public is being protected not only price wise but also in so far as enjoying the facilities of the beach is concerned.

Mr. St. JOHN rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is entitled to speak on the amendment that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed. That applies to all hon. members who spoke before the amendment was proposed.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, now that I have seen the plan, I am more reinforced in my mind that this matter should be postponed. The plan discloses that there is frontage of 136 feet all along the sea. This land is sandwiched between the Aquatic Club and the Barbados Sailing and Cruising Club. It is 136 feet deep and has 136 feet of sea frontage. The Hon. Minister who has just spoken in his usual, superficial examination, has said that the Government is going to get \$650,000 over a 99-year period for this land.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member has a way of misquoting people. I said that \$625,000 would be secured by the Government in cash apart from the hotel of 120 bedrooms, which forms part of the reversion to the land.

Mr. ST. JOHN: The hon. member has not told this House if any part of the hotel will be erected on this 22,738 square feet of land. This may well be curtilage of the hotel. These people own all the land from the Aquatic Club. How do we know that they are only acquiring this place for a car park or dance floor, so that at the end of 99 years they can say to the Government: "You can have back your car park or dance Hall." Not one of them has had the decency to give the information to the House. Proper information would show the site in relation to the Government's land. I doubt whether they are going to put up a \$2. million hotel within the small confines of a space of 22,738 square feet. They are using the other land. They want this piece of land for their recreational facilities or restaurant or something like that, or they want to put aluminium umbrellas. Of course, the Government is getting \$625,000 in cash, but \$100,000 at 8% a year is \$8,000 per year. If you invested it and got \$8,000 a year, at the end of ten years you will be getting \$80,000 and if you multiply that by 9 you will get \$720,000, which is still more than what the hon. member is talking about. That is why I charge the hon. member with having a superficial understanding of this very complex issue.

I see that they are now passing around the plan. As a matter of principle, I would not agree that the Government should dispose of property without the assent of the Legislature of this Country, and my foundation for this as the efficiency of the conduct of the Premier of this country between 1956 and 1961 who demanded, fought for and got, the contract of Messrs Costain for building the Deep Water Harbour.

6.50 p.m.

I would never stay in this House and allow Government to dispose of good Government's property without their submitting a plan to this House. When they were in the Opposition and they called for and demanded the plan for Messrs. Costain to build the Deep Water Harbour, they got it.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon. member is certainly mistaken when he says that Costain's plan was made available to this House.

Mr. St. JOHN: If they were not strong enough to get it, I am strong enough to get it. They would never be able to do as they like for their own peculiar reasons. I am making sure of that. Why have we not got the plan pertaining to this lease for a period of ninety-nine years? A hotel would be built on the site.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: This rabble-rousing politician that you get here.....

(Laughter in the Gallery)

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get this perfectly straight. If there is any cheer or misbehaviour from the Gallery, the Gallery will be cleared. Let there be no mistake about that.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that remark.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was hoping that the hon. member would do so. Of course, the hon. member is an experienced parliamentarian.

Mr. St. JOHN: Sir, this is the thing which I must draw to the attention of the Hon. House. No member of the Government has so far categorically and unequivocally stated that on this land which is to be leased to this company any of the hotel which is providing this 120-bedroom will be built on it. The only information given is that the people who are buying the Aquatic Club next door which contains a larger area than this 22,000 square feet are experienced in property development. There are the people who formed the Town and Commercial Properties (Barbados) Limited. These people who have experience in property development, is the Government going to suggest that they are going to build their 120-bedroom hotel on the land next door which would mean at the end of the ninety-nine years lease, according to the law they would have to give up permanent structure? We can never believe that. There is no such stipulation on that side. Do not try to suggest in your argument that. It would be giving a wrong and erroneous impression. It does not contain a covenant that they build a hotel on this part.

You talk about giving inducement to the tourist industry. We are asking the Government to ensure Barbadians interests in giving inducements to the Tourist Industry. These people after operating the company for a ten-year period can liquidate it and do not pay a cent in income tax. Then, somebody else can come in and get another ten-year period of tax concessions and do the same thing.

We have the experience all around of what is happening. We do not object to the lease, only to the stipulations. Let us know the facts on this side. I am going further. You are bound to take into consideration the development which is going on around there.

There are shopping blocks going up around there. Inside the Hilton Hotel they have just begun to build some shopping area. If you go into the gap you will see shopping blocks. These are going to be larger and larger and business is going to be created around there, therefore the present value of property around there is going to be raised immensely.

You are leasing at 2,500 for twenty-five years. What I am concerned with is the Resolution before the House and what I am concerned with is the fact of what is taking place here in Barbados. Look around at what is happening as regards your property values. Why are they buying up everything they can get? They recognise that the effect of the inducements which they are getting here can enable them to borrow money at eight percent, pay it back and still get a large profit.

What is wrong, the Government does not have a qualified man to consider this sort of thing. In Trinidad, when Dr. Williams came into power, they did not have anybody to see into this sort of thing and the first thing he did was to get somebody. This Government has always said that they have to buy land and pay for it through their nose.

7.00 p.m.

The plot obviously provides the best piece of their frontage on the sea, the most attractive part, and not only this, it has 136 ft. on the sea. Even if you wanted to provide a dancing area, this is an ample area for it; it is essential to the provision of adequate amenities of this hotel. You should not sacrifice that bargaining provision because people come from abroad.

The Minister knows the tourist industry well, he has a parcel of land at Rockley, he knows the Rockley area, he has seen before his eyes the development that has taken place in the tourist industry in Barbados, it has been part and parcel of his life and he knows that for Rockley Beach land you have to pay a certain price, and the significant thing about this is anybody knows that people are looking for relatively small areas of land than for larger areas.

22,000 sq. ft. of land, they are paying 8 percent, and they are going to pay it at the end of 99 years, because at the end of the last 25 years they are going to pay \$10,000 per annum. That is the kind of rent they should be paying now for the first 25 years, but the suggestion made by the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown that even if you had leased for 25 years with an option to renew, which would be a binding option, in the event of a dispute you would have arbitration, but a 99 year lease is a long term lease. In that period of time - 99 years - the hotel might not contain the amenities and facilities which the people at that time would want, so do not think that at the end of 99 years you will have done anything, you may not be alive then.

Nobody from the other side has got up here and presented a plan or made a statement assuring this House that part of the main structure of this hotel will be on this land, because if all is not on the land

it means you would only have part. If you own the land next door you are not going to build half on this and half on the other, because at the end of the 99 years period of time you cannot saw it down and separate it.

As for the other hon. junior member for St. Andrew, whenever he contributes to a debate in this House he displays more and more his complete inability to grapple with the issues that are presented in this House; today's was no exception.

I reiterate it is unfair to this House for the hon. Minister just to read up a part of the lease. Sir, we had the experience here last week where we had one Hon. Minister saying one thing, and another hon. Minister from the same side saying something else, and when the Prime Minister came in here he said something different. That is the sort of thing that we have in here. If at this stage this agreement and the terms and conditions have been settled, why there is such a thing as the Solicitor for the lessee sending the document to the Crown Solicitor for perusal before hand. After the Crown Solicitor initials it it is then sent back, why can we not have a copy so that we can persue for ourselves. Are we entitled to see it? I think the House would probably be much better off if we could see this lease.

This Resolution as it stands seeks to conceal far too much and it is asking people to sign their hands upon the dotted line without giving them the opportunity of knowing fully all the implications of it and I cannot support it.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, Sir, after hearing the last member speak, I am at a loss to understand if he is not voting for this Resolution because he laments the thought that Mess Around and Marshall have been removed from running the black people off the beach at Graves End. What I cannot really understand is that from the time in the 1920's when the Aquatic Club was built, nobody raised one eyelid about the barbed wire fence they had stretched from the Club right out in the sea.

The first time, Mr. Speaker, in the last 20's and the early 30's there was a young lawyer who came to Barbados. At that time the Advocate Newspaper - this was before a lot of people were able to read - used to print a daily paper as well as a weekly paper, and this young lawyer used to write some fairly forceful articles in this weekly paper which appeared on Saturday, and used to be scooped up like hot cakes, and in one of his articles he mentioned about this barbed wire fence. The fence was cut down and this young lawyer, before you could say Jack Robinson, his mouth was silenced, he was given a civil service job, but I am surprised to think that not only the Aquatic Club was allowed to carry on this racial segregation practice, but also the Savannah Club.

7.10 p.m.

I know that a man was arrested for standing up in the track watching tenning being played. Today we have brought about the end of "Mess Around" and

those of us who used to frequent Greaves End Beach will know the atrocities which used to be carried on at the Aquatic Club. Hon. members on the Other Side are now asking us to charge an exorbitant price for this land in order to drive away our hotel industry so that the "Mess Arounds" can continue to perpetrate what was happening in the 1920's, the 1930's and the 1940's. Furthermore, I will say this, that the contract which is going to be drawn up is not going to be drawn up by anyone of the Ministers. The Government has better legal advisers today than they had in the 1930's or the 1940's. Let them tell some misguided nincompoop who is hiding behind the press and trying to be sarcastic; the worse person to be sarcastic is myself. I have been born and bred in it and therefore I know how to use it.

The hon. senior member for Christ Church is always trying to expostulate on how much law he knows. He knows more law than I know, but that does not mean that he knows all the law. After all, commonsense is not so common. When the hon. member is making accusations about malpractices, he could only be accusing his own legal friends in the profession. The contract will be drawn up by competent lawyers. If one were to follow the hon. member's statement, one would conclude that he seems to know more about this matter than we know. He says that these people will not be building any hotel. How does he know that? Does he think that the Legal Draftsmen and Crown Solicitors are Deputy Crown Solicitors? All of these people have studied law and they are qualified legal men. Does he think that they will allow the Government to be taken for a ride by some of these land sharks which he has mentioned? They will be doing their duty. The hon. member does not understand that these legal boys are Barbadians first and they are guiding us whether it is this Government or any other Government in power, and the Government will get the best deal for its money. (Mr. MOTTLEY: You are not getting the best deal in this.) What I would like to say here and now is that the hon. member brought up something in a debate to the effect that I said one thing and the Minister of Health said something else. I want to say that this House of Assembly is not a Court of Law where you say one thing all the time. I can say that a portion of land is 1/8 of an acre and another Minister might say that it is 1/4 of an acre, but there is nothing about that. You will get all of these innuendos from these so-called lawyers. (ASIDES). You ought to be ashamed; it is nothing to be proud of.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member is referring to me as "You" and things of that kind. There are no "You's" in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: No more than there are "people on the other side."

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, when it comes to a question of sarcasm, there is nobody who has a better retort in sarcasm than I. I can take sarcasm but when I give it, it gets under people's skin. The hon. senior member for Christ Church ought to be

ashamed of himself; the hon. member has a tendency to play to the gallery.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I object to that statement; the hon. member cannot make a statement like that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not regard that phrase as being unparliamentary.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: He wants to impress the people outside because he has been going out with the misguided idea

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister must not deal with the hon. member; let him deal with the point at issue.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The point at issue is the taking of the land at Greaves End Beach from the Aquatic Club and the ramifications which includes racial segregation and that sort of thing. As I said when I rose to speak, one was at a loss to understand if the hon. senior member for Christ Church is interested in seeing that the Government gets a good deal in this matter or in keeping the status quo of the 1920's.

7.20 p.m.

In my opinion the hon. member not only was trying to point out that a bunch of nit-wits is on this side of the House but that some land sharks can come down here and fool Barbadians. If land sharks can come down here and fool Barbadians, the hon. senior member for Christ Church can take it upon himself to draw it to the attention of the legal draftsman. Do not come in here and try and misrepresent the facts.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Sir, I object to that. I rise on a point of order. The hon. member has said that I come in here and try and misrepresent the facts. There is no greater misrepresentation of the facts than he. The hon. member is all muck and slime.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member did not say otherwise than this at the time. When I saw the hon. member getting up, I began to write the words down. The Minister said "do not come in this House and try and misrepresent the facts."

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker,

Mr. SPEAKER: At that time the hon. member said those words.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: You are drawing a distinction that does not exist.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a subtle distinction but that is no fault of mine.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, sometime ago I said that in 1960 when we were campaigning that the only people in opposition to the Government is the "Advocate" newspaper and the "Daily News".

Anyhow, Sir, I go back to the debate. Now, the hon. senior member for Christ Church said something about more muck and slime. I pass that by. Mr. Speaker, I did not say that he did it I asked him not to give the impression not only to this Honourable Chamber but to the general public that this Government is a fob pocket acting Government. Anything that this Government does, as far as I am concerned, is done in no clandestine manner, and I would exhort hon. members on the other side not to view this thing in any bad way not to try and make a read herring out of it.

Nobody on this side would be so stupid after getting rid of that monster which we had up there to allow another monster to be put there. The hon. senior member for Christ Church said, how do we know the people would not be building upon this site just for a car park. It is obvious that these things are drawn up by people who study them.

Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I shall remind hon. members and the general public that whatever this Government does, no matter how it may appear, and how much political canvassing is brought into these issues, do not accuse members on this side, as is so often done, of malpractices.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has said "do not accuse."

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I said no not come in here, as is so often the case, and accuse members on this side of acting in any underhand way. As I have said before, we on this side of the House do not do the people's business in any clandestine manner.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, when we came to this House I actually said that we are all human beings and I pointed out to the Government that we are willing to co-operate with the Government. We know that the Government is comprised of human beings just as the Opposition is comprised of human beings, therefore we all make mistakes. We should therefore discuss something which we do not think meets to our approval.

I would imagine that at least two members of the Government would have seen that our approach was not an approach of militancy, but that our approach was one where things may go wrong that we discuss it so that the differences would be solved. Luckily for us the Hon. Minister of Health saw the point and tendered information which the hon. member did not tender. What has got my dog is this attempt by hon. members on the other side of foolishly acting in this Assembly as if the Government is composed of people who think that all the people who have voted have sent them there. There are people who have voted who have sent us here so as to have their views expressed, just as the people who sent the Government there to express their views.

7.30 p.m.

The people who sent us here are entitled to have their views expressed just as much as the people who sent Government members to this Assembly, so the Government should not feel that they can ignore the House. I would expect that those two members would have seen the reasonableness and agreed to postpone. When the member for Christ Church and the senior member for Bridgetown - who is certainly as much an expert in real property as anybody else in this island - when he spoke, an expert spoke, and he told you how you might at least consider that possibly you were wrong and throwing away money. When I pointed out that to tie yourself down for 25 years, I said that having heard the view of the hon. member for Bridgetown, that after five years, considering the market value at that time, when I told hon. members that I personally could get the gold coast land 25 years ago for \$2,000 they probably thought I was crazy or something. A simple point put to the Government, do not tie yourself down for 25 years, we could almost go on all night to ask the Government to paint pictures for themselves; in this nuclear age what Barbados would be like in 50 years much less 99 years.

I noticed the faces of Government members when the Minister for Health was talking, they could have cut his throat by their looks because he was doing the very thing that the Government would not do when we asked for the facts. We are to sit down here and give away for little or nothing the little bit of land Barbados still has adjoining the sea; we are not entitled to see anything. The hon. members of the Government would say no matter what we say however right we may be they can always outvote us. That is the type of Parliamentary democracy they enjoy, this dictatorship spirit, this ignoring of the Opposition, this sitting even on your fellow members, your colleagues who might see reason.

We do not know the terms of this lease, we do not know what is binding in this, we may be signing, by the majority vote of this House, a lease the terms of which we know nothing, but we are told by the member who just sat down that they have Draughtsmen. How can a Draughtsman draft a lease unless he knows what the terms of the lease are to be? Not the cleverest lawyer in the world can do that, lawyers and draughtsmen are not policy makers. Suppose they do not build a hotel there. I am almost tempted, I would be treading on very very delicate ground, but I am almost tempted to tell the House what I know, things having been said in my presence because certain people wanted to gain my help as Leader of the Opposition, but I have been told of the possibility of erecting casinos, gambling dens, hotels, bedrooms, dancing, what have you. I say that with a profound sense of my responsibility to this House. I will never - I might say more than my conscience tells me I should say, but we do not know whether it is possible for these people to come here and do what they like, we do not know what the terms of the lease are.

I am perfectly sure some hon. members know I could call at least two sets of names who have been trying to buy land in this island to put up a hotel, far less than for the purpose of running a casino. We are

to

to be bound by the votes of the greater number not only to sell out Barbados for little or nothing, but to sell our very soul. We have not been told whether immorality might go on, but we are to be treated like children. What really gets my goat is the fact that Government members can get up and talk to us as if we were novices, then they talk of being white or black, we have been accused of being so favourable to white people in the past at the Aquatic Club. When the lease of the Aquatic Club was brought before the House - the hon. member decided to bring in the red herring saying that in the past coloured people could not go to the Aquatic Club, but now why blame us if we are asking about the building of this hotel and implicating that there will be no colour bar, tell us the terms of the lease, they are trying to make it appear as if they are putting an end to colour bars, is creating on the site of the Aquatic Club a different situation from what existed when the Aquatic Club was leased year after year, as the Minister of Health tells us, on a yearly contract.

7.40 p.m.

That is a red herring, and in accusing members he was merely saying that he was doing it. I said that I expected at least two members to see the light, but as to the distinguished member for St. Andrew, distinguished by his genuine love of the Bible and all its teachings, it takes a lot of courage to make modern men confess that they are guided by Scriptural Injunction. People have a habit of laughing at their fellowmen who think too much of their religion, but even the hon. senior member for St. Andrew in his speech defended this matter. I expected that both he and the Minister of Health would have been as courageous as they have been in a previous debate in this House. Now that the Minister of Health has done what he has done, I counsel the Hon. Leader of the Government to see that we do not ask for anything that we are not entitled to ask for. Perhaps I am opening their eyes more than I should, but they must see that these things are adding up. The people of this country will not be content to have the Opposition silenced by votes and silenced by hon. members when the Opposition ask for information.

Do not hon. members see that the Democratic Labour Party is already depleting? Dare any hon. member say otherwise. When we came in here and spoke about co-operation, one Minister said: "Let us forget the past and work in harmony," and the harmony is the sort of thing we are getting in here! Sometimes it is immaterial to us whether the Government agrees with us or not. When they do not agree with us, they just give us plenty of ammunition against them both now and whenever the Election takes place. I have ceased to promise what I promised when I first came into this House, that I would believe that Government members are as willing to co-operate with the Opposition as the Opposition is willing to co-operate with the Government; but when we are treated like little children with wicked pranks, when we ask for what is the parliamentary practice - what happened in the old days was that when the Attorney-General was doing a thing of this sort he would promptly pass down the line, the plot and sale or lease

and what not - all of that would be passed down the Table; but we are told that better lawyers are drafting these things than in the past without telling us what it is.

I handled the contract for the construction of the Deep Water Harbour. I will never forget sitting next to the hon. member for St. Andrew, the present Attorney-General, Senator Smith, who got up and said when the Government was being attacked over the contract for the Deep Water Harbour, that he had travelled on a ship with a person who had seen the contract and who knew what he was talking about, and he said that he had never seen a contract which was drawn up so much in favour of the Government and its people. I have to add to that that if a hurricane had destroyed all that Costain had done, all of that we would not have had to put back; so that to say that you do not put a contract on the Table when the present Attorney-General gave us that tribute a red herring like that - an argument which you put up like that - falls to the ground. I am no longer appealing to the Government on the ground of co-operation. The Minister of Health will always tell us, out of the amount of his experience, what he knows is parliamentary practice and he will give us what we ask for. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew, who made a slip this afternoon, will also use reasonableness of view; but as to the rest of those hon. members over there, God help Barbados.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I have listened this afternoon to many hon. members speaking on this Resolution. I heard what I consider an expert, or one of the experts, on real estate and his view. I heard the hon. junior member for St. Andrew and his expert thesis on the Bible; I also heard the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and a speech made by the hon. senior member for Christ Church, and I can safely say that any professor from any of the Inns which he attended, would be justly proud of him. I am quite sure that his colleagues and his constituents would be justified in him. I also heard the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, and his remarks were nothing short of a circus display. I consider his speech as being senseless and as useless as he is short, and he is very short.

7.50 p.m.

What are we on this side asking the Government to do in the interest of this country and with the tourist boom? We are asking the Government to seek a better rent per year for the land which they now plan to rent to the Town and Commercial Properties (Barbados) Limited. We are begging them, as they say, to provide for the inhabitants of this country a little more money.

Sir, I heard about a fence which was put up at the Aquatic Club and which was taken down. I also heard about a person called "Mess Around". I wonder if the hon. junior member for Christ Church knows that that fence only came down in 1961 or whether the people who are about to rent this land will be people who would want to put up a fence around it. I have also heard of the wall at the Aquatic Club. I heard that

even if I were drowning I could not go and hold on to it, therefore, when the hon. member said that the Government was renting these people this land, and they had stipulated that their policy would be one of not discriminating against anyone and that there will be no racial barriers, I wonder if all that has been written into the agreement.

Sir, I will not say very much on this because I am not really interested in matters of real estate but it is irksome to me to hear hon. members on the other side make accusations against the hon. senior member for Christ Church for his speech on this matter. I am sure that our children when they grow up will read the speech given in here by him and they will feel justly proud of the person who represented them in 1967.

Sir, I am going to support the postponement of this Resolution because I feel deep down within myself that the hon. junior member for the City, the hon. senior member for Christ Church and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition are au fait with the law and real estate in this country, particularly in St. Michael. We are not fighting the Government because they have the numbers. They have the power to outvote us but we are asking them instead of collecting this amount of \$250,000 in a period of ninety-nine years to collect \$1,500,000 over the same period. We are therefore asking you to take it back to the Cabinet.

With these few remarks, I only hope that the Hon. Minister will at least agree with us on this occasion and I am quite sure that the Government's policy will then be quite justified.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be fair to let the House know that we are not accepting the motion for the postponement. In rejecting this request, we are not doing this out of purely partisan feelings or because it has been said that we have the numbers. To hear some people on the other side talking.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should say some hon. members.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, Sir, you would suppose that they were the majority Government and that we on this side that have the Government are in the minority. I have been in the House long enough to hear the hon. senior member for St. Joseph say that the other people can talk all night, it does not matter because we have the numbers. So that if the numbers are on this side now, that is the luck of the game. The hon. member should reflect that they are the political party which has just lost two elections and we have won two, and the inference to be drawn from that is that the majority of the people who voted have more confidence in us because they have given us the Government twice.

Now, Sir, quite a lot has been said in the debate which needed not to have been said. They accused us of dereliction of duty but I was careful to say at the end of my introductory speech that I think there were

many questions which may be raised, I could not anticipate all of them so I invited hon. members on the other side to raise any question they may desire.

Quite frankly, I did not even recollect that the Government was going to be accused of refusing to circulate the plan because I was not conscious that it was here, therefore, all that was needed to be done was to circulate it and that would end the matter.

Arising out of some remarks made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, in his mentioning something about the amenities of the proposed hotel to be built he said he did not wish to be told every possible thing but certain things. He had overheard that it would be possible that people might wish to establish gambling casinos in this Island. He did not think this might be the desire of some interests.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I said that knowing of some people who wanted to get land here, I wanted to know who they were. I merely said that there were more than two lots of people who were interested in trying to get land here.

8.00 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member was listening carefully, I said that he said that from things he had overheard, things that had been spoken to him possibly in his capacity as Leader of the Opposition, there might be reason to suppose that some people would be interested in setting up gambling casinos. However, the point is, I wish to say that we have not been and are not now and are not likely to be interested in encouraging that form of tourist development and anybody who thinks this would be possible in raising that kind of matter with the Government is doomed to disappointment before they start.

Obviously there are some points of note which were made by the other side, one was made by the senior member for Christ Church, one by the hon. senior member for St. Peter and one by the hon. senior member for St. Peter and one by the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, all of them bearing on the same argument. One had to do with the location of the Hotel, one to do with the actual financial arrangements of the lease, and the other to do with the time before the lease finally expires. All of them are valid points, but they are not sufficient to warrant our accepting postponement. We are not so foolish as to rush into this kind of matter without fully considering it, nor are we so foolish as to give the impression that a lease could be drawn up before the House of Assembly had pronounced on the principle of it, and this is what is before the House. Obviously, as is always the case, whenever an important debate takes place in this House, I make it my business in preparing the report of the transaction to draw to the Cabinet's attention all of the important points raised in the debates, because of their importance, so that the Cabinet in finalising any matter has at its disposal the views of the Opposition, but transmitting the views, which I am in duty bound to do, is not the same as accepting those views.

Nothing has been raised on that side which warrants any postponement and therefore we are not accepting, and if we were inclined to think about it, it is alright for the hon. senior member for Christ Church to wax so warm on this matter, and he feels strongly on this matter, but I will say this to him, it is conceivably impertinent on my part, but I must take the chance. If he had been in this House longer than the few months that he had been in, there are a lot of things which we cannot accept from a political party who saw fit to close the road at Sandy Lane without telling us beforehand, the same thing nearly happened in St. Peter, they tried to divert the Heywoods Road, and had it not been for the vigilance of the then Opposition they would have succeeded. You cannot expect us on this side to take advice from a political party which more than 20 years ago, for reasons which even to this day have not been disclosed, paid some exorbitant sums, having regard to prices in those days, for the Central Foundry site which is not too far from here. The Barbados Labour Party does not have the kind of political record which would allow it to stand up and give advice to us, so we thank them for nothing.

I do not mean to be rude or impertinent, if this is how it is taken I am very sorry, but I must tell them quite frankly that while we accept their point of view on certain things, and while we do not think we are the sole depositors for all wisdom and therefore can be guided by their opinion in some instances, in this at least they are not competent from their political record to advise this Government, if we want advice from that quarter we will go to Mr. D'Arcy Scott.

We have to resist the call for a postponement, because I do not think that anything that has been said here justifies this. My colleague, the hon. Minister of Communications and Works made a point which some hon. members attempted to laugh at and to heap scorn on the fact that one of the rather strong advantages is that the amenities, whatever they are, will be available to the inhabitants of this island, and that no colour bar will be practised.

I can remember being in this island as a member of this House when a matter was not brought to the floor of the House. There was what amounted almost to the biggest scandal there ever has been, years ago when a water polo team was to be selected and they insisted that they should have no coloured people in it and there was considerable objection in this island as some people in this House probably remember, and Dr. Cummins - I am not calling his name to criticise him - but he asked that the matter not be brought out in the open because in his view, if the matter were aired and blown out of proportion it might have prevented Barbados from getting the Federal capital. Those are the things that hon. members of this House have been through and have experienced, so there was no reason therefore to laugh at the hon. member for St. Thomas for raising it in his way, because it is a fact, and one of the things we would insist on is that any tourist development which takes place in that area has conformed to the social outlook of Independent Barbados.

One last point. I notice in several debates the Leader of the Opposition attempts to, very clumsily I must say, divide this side by drawing out for special and particular reference the hon. junior member for St. Andrew and my colleague the Minister of Health. It is a clumsy way to divide us. If you want the Government of this country you can have it at the polls or assassinate us, they are the only two ways to get it, you cannot expect to get it by making reference to any two of us. The point is this, if you find that five years is too long you have to find some way of shortening the time. I just want to warn him that we are well aware of this trick, you cannot rule us by dividing us, so we are bound to come here by a political outlook which we do not share with the members of the other side, if the people of this country when the time comes change their minds and they give the Government to the other side, this is all well and good. When the hon. members opposite were complaining of the life of the lease, what sprang to my mind was this, in the next 25 years when you have the Government, change it and alter the terms. It is as simple as that.

8.10 p.m.

The question that the further consideration of this Resolution be now postponed was put and resolved in the negative.

A division was taken as follows:—

AYES: Messrs. HINDS, J. M. G. M. ADAMS, HOLDER, SMITH, ST. JOHN and Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS—6.

NOES: Mr. YEARWOOD, Hon'bles J. C. TUDOR, C. E. TALMA, A. DaC. EDWARDS, G. G. FERGUSON, N. W. BOXILL, Messrs. LOWE, SPRINGER, CORBIN, and HOPPIN—10.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, Mr. SPEAKER declaring "I think the 'AYES' have it."

DIPLOMATIC IMMUNITIES AND PRIVILEGES BILL

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 1, under Government Business, be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: This Order stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Order which stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to take charge of this Order which stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted. (After a pause.) There being no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Leader of the House to move the

Second reading of a Bill to confer immunities, powers and privileges on diplomatic and consular representatives and representatives of international organisations and certain other persons; and for purposes ancillary to or connected with matters aforesaid.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I want to say at the outset that I cannot anticipate all the questions which could conceivably be asked on this Bill, but I will answer any questions which arise as far as I can. The purpose of this Bill is to bring together in a single Act a number of provisions under the Diplomatic Privileges Act of 1947 and the amending Act of 1965. The purpose of the Bill is also to take the opportunity to bring up to date cognate matters which would affect this country as an Independent Sovereign State. The purpose of this Bill therefore is to enact into legislation the various provisions of international diplomatic practice which Barbados, as a Sovereign State, would, of course, be expected to subscribe to. The various Clauses, as hon. members would have seen, deal with the various matters. Part two of the Bill deals with diplomatic immunities and Rights and Privileges which accredited representatives of Foreign Governments would expect to receive in Barbados, the rights and privileges of International Organisations and people connected therewith, the members of Consular and Diplomatic Staff, their immunities and Privileges, exemptions from certain kinds of taxation and custom duties which diplomatic personnel are entitled to have, and, of course, the various Schedules set out the countries to which these privileges apply in addition to Barbados. Also set out in one of the Schedules are the provisions of the Vienna Convention of 1962 which regulates the diplomatic practice between the Sovereign States. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, it is clear that any Bill on Diplomatic Immunities is not likely to be a party question or a controversial Measure, and therefore we, in the Opposition, will content ourselves with asking the Hon. Leader of the House to emphasise to the Minister of External Affairs that in these modern times there is a general feeling that diplomatic immunities can be carried too far, and the members and staffs of diplomatic missions, their wives, children, servants and hangers-on, prove themselves to be nuisances.

8.20 p.m.

In lower matters, they sometimes constitute tiresome problems for the local police and you have some serious matters going on as what happened in London with a murder taking place and the murderer not brought to trial because of his diplomatic status.

We hope that the Government in its list would exercise as much care as it can. Already, there are complaints of undue favours which are made to a certain number of diplomatic people in the way of parking facilities. I presume there is no attempt to bribe anyone to break the laws to give them as much parking space as is possible. On the other side of these buildings these people have parking lots.

As regards Customs and Excise duty there needs to be some vigilance. Those who have some experience, know that one of the more subtle way of getting help to cheaper liquor is to know a diplomat. We hope that would be kept under control.

There is nothing we find in this Bill which offends against the practice of diplomatic representation and we do not intend to oppose it.

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

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

Clauses 1 to 6 were called separately and passed.

Clause 7 was called. It reads as follows:-

7. The Minister may from time to time, by order confer on the judges and registrars of the International Court of Justice established by the Charter of the United Nations, and of any other international judicial institution approved by the Minister, and on suitors to that Court or to any such institutions and their agents, counsel, and advocates, such immunities, privileges, and facilities as may be required to give effect to any resolution of, or convention approved by, the General Assembly of the United Nations or, in the case of any such institution as aforesaid, as the Minister may deem necessary for the proper discharge its functions.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that Clause 7 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: What is the position of Barbados in relation to the International Court of Justice?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I do not think that we are members. If the hon. member would like, I will give the hon. member a full answer on this later. I do not think we are full members.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: This is the International Court of Justice and we have immunity.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I think the point is that in international organizations these diplomats have to move around and they are entitled to immunity because they have to visit in their capacity. I do not know whether that would arise out of Clause 7.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that these immunities and privileges are conferred on those persons because they are members of international agencies. This is nothing at all to do with membership or otherwise of Barbados in international organizations. It is just people acting for us are entitled to the immunities which international people enjoy.

8.30 p.m.

This refers only to the Judges who serve on the international court; you are not asking to send somebody, the judges are appointed and they come from any part of the world.

The question that Clause 7 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 8 was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that Clause 8 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, as I say, this matter is not controversial, but clause 8 does contain certain things. We may envisage in Barbados a type of international conference such like a conference of the Caribbean Heads of State, sometimes we have meetings of Heads of Government of the independent countries of the Eastern Caribbean, there are some territories for whose international relations the United Kingdom Government is responsible. As I understand it their representatives may be given diplomatic immunity by virtue of clause 8 of this Bill. If these Heads of Government come here for a conference and their country is not represented here normally, but they come and they have immunity, Barbadian citizens are placed at a very rare disadvantage should anything happen which would involve them.

Those of us who saw the driving last time, I do not think anybody would blame us for our fears if we think that one of the taxis may very well find itself involved in an accident, if the Government is not represented here you may be in a very peculiar position, because a man comes here, the Head of a Government, he has diplomatic immunity, he is involved in a road accident, he goes away and there is nothing you can do about that. I would welcome assurance from the Minister that the Ministry of External Affairs is going to be responsible for carrying on such negotiations as may be necessary for Barbadian citizens who find themselves involved in what would be legal work with persons who had diplomatic immunity.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I can give the assurance that this point has been looked at; I cannot give the assurance that there will be any change of policy with respect to this matter. This is simply a courtesy which is already extended. Usually when Heads of Governments are visiting Barbados, whether Heads of Independent Governments or non-independent Governments, we do not as a general rule allow them to drive themselves, we do not prevent them but transport facilities are always placed at their disposal, so that the possibility of Mr. Bradshaw, for instance, running down a citizen of Barbados in Barbados is extremely remote, but a very interesting point was raised and I should certainly draw it to the attention of the Minister and officials of the Ministry because a very awkward circumstance would arise if a Head of Government visiting should break the law in some way which reflected to the disadvantage of a citizen of this country.

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

The first, second and third schedules were called and passed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

8.40 p.m.

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

On motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS CONCLUDED

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the consideration of that Bill concludes Government Business for today's sitting.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND BUDGETARY PROPOSALS — ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment of the House, which I will do in a few moments, I should like to say that I am requested by the Hon. Minister of Finance to say to Your Honour and the House, that he proposes to make his Financial Statement and lay the Budgetary proposals for the year 1967 on Friday next at 4 o'clock in the afternoon. That will mean, of course, that our adjournment will be shorter than for one week, and I shall have to move that this House do now adjourn until Friday. I also want to let the House know that it is conceivable that there might be certain Resolutions and Bills arising out of the Budgetary proposals which will have to be dealt with in all their stages on that day.

The assurance which I wish to give the House is that if that should happen, it will not in any way preclude and inhibit debate on the Budgetary proposals themselves, which will have to be at the convenience of the House, and, as I imagine, hon. members will wish to have in their possession printed or stencilled copies of the Prime Minister's speech. If we have to deal with certain provisions of the Budget immediately after the proposals have been made, this House will be asked to do; but this will not preclude debate on the whole Budget itself as a Document, because hon. members might get the impression that because individual Bills and Resolutions may have to be dealt with, that that, in some way or other, precludes any discussion arising out of the Prime Minister's Statement itself. That is not so. There will be opportunity given to hon. members to study the Financial Statement, and a separate time, to be appointed by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, for the discussion on the Budget proposals. I will hold myself free to be able

to dispatch any Government Business which needs to be dispatched on that same day. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Friday next, 30th June, 1967, at 3.30 o'clock in the afternoon.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member seconding the motion for the adjournment?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the House has not made himself clear. Does the hon. member mean that as soon as the Budget Proposals are made by the Minister of Finance, that he will select from the Budget what portions he feels he would like to get through before the debate is ended? Does he mean that the whole Budget will be dealt with by the Minister and then he will bring in Money Resolutions and so on, and then we will go on with the debate? Or does he mean that the whole debate on the Budget will take place before any Resolutions are taken out and discussed?

Mr. SPEAKER: I will invite the Hon. Leader of the House to reply with the understanding that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition may resume his speech.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The point is this. The custom has been in recent years for the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals to be given to the House. It very frequently happens that, arising out of these proposals, notices have to be given on the same day, of Bills and Resolutions which, according to the circumstances, may have to be dealt with on that day. Most hon. members are familiar with the procedure. If that is to be done, it depends upon what notices are given arising out of the Budget Speech.

8.50 p.m.

What I am saying was that this depends on what the Budget Speech points out. This depends on what notices are given arising out of the Budget Speech. The Hon. Prime Minister would say, "I beg to give notice of the following Bills and I would like those Bills to be dealt with in all their stages today."

As I wish to point out, after that has been done, the House deals with those Bills. This must not be taken to mean that we are preventing his making any contribution which he desires to a debate on the Budget arising out of a motion of his own.

The custom is for the Leader of the Opposition to table a motion on that, such as, "that the House agrees or disagrees, supports or does not support, the proposals in the Budget Speech." This is a separate motion which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition tables in order to implement a debate on the Budget but this has nothing at all to do with separate Bills or Resolutions which may or may not have to be dealt with in all their stages.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I know quite well that but the Hon. Leader of the House has not strictly speaking answered my point.

Mr. SPEAKER: Again, I would like the hon. member to give way.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker Budgetary Proposals are made within the context of a financial statement. According to the Rules of this House, there cannot be a debate on a statement. Any debate must be on a substantive motion. Therefore, a speech by the Opposition in reply does not arise.

It sometimes happens, according to the extent of the matters arising out of the Budget proposals that the Minister of Finance has to give notice of Bills or Resolutions to be dealt with in all their stages. The budgetary proposals are dealt with without debate. However, that does not mean that they are precluded from moving a substantive motion in reply to the proposals in the Budget Speech?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The Hon. Minister's statement is that the House will be asked to deal with the notice of Resolutions and Bills arising out of the Budget Speech on Friday, but is that the same thing,

as regards the other Resolutions and Bills not connected with the Budget?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I give the hon. member the assurance that only motions arising out of the Budget will be dealt with on that day. If we give notice of any other Resolutions or Bills that day, we would not be proceeding with them that day. If there is any other question, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is at liberty to ask it. I think the hon. member has dealt with this point already but I would re-emphasize that the Opposition may, and probably will, table a substantive motion in order to make a full reply to the Budget Proposals.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition may speak again if he so desires.

The question that the House adjourn until Friday, this week at 3.30 p.m. o'clock was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

9.00 p.m.