

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 25th May, 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); Hon. C. E. TALMA, (Minister of Health and Community Development); 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. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, (Chairman of Committees); Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid there are no Minutes available for confirmation today.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Mr. St. JOHN and Mr. HINDS entered the Chamber and took their seats.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a question standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph whom I observe is not in his place. There is also a question standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph whom also I do not observe in his place.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL and Mr. HUSBANDS entered the Chamber and took their seats.

QUESTION re PLOTTING GRAPHS AND PRODUCTION RECORDS

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following question:-

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is Government aware of the importance of plotting graphs and keeping production-records in a well regulated dairy or milk-producing farm?

2. Is the Government's Livestock Farm at the Pine, St. Michael or part thereof, operated as a dairy as described at 1?

3. If No. 2 is in the affirmative have figures supplied for records of milk-production or other purposes at the said Livestock Station been found at all times to be based on absolute accuracy, or have they been found to be fictitious?

4. If fictitious figures have been supplied, what attempts have been made to determine the cause for inaccuracies?

QUESTION re EXAMINATION RESULTS

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following question:-

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. How many pupils from Harrison College? Queen's College, Lodge School and Combermere School were successful in no fewer than five (5) subjects at "O" level in the year (a) 1965, (b) 1966?

2. How many pupils from the remaining Government Secondary or other schools were successful in no fewer than five (5) subjects at "O" level in the year (a) 1965, (b) 1966?

3. How many pupils from Independent Secondary Schools were successful in no fewer than five (5) subjects at "O" level in the year (a) 1965, (b) 1966?

Mr. SMITH and Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS entered the Chamber and took their seats.

QUESTION RE INCONVENIENCE TO INVITEES AT GARRISON

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

1. Is Government aware of the inconvenience and embarrassment caused to some of the invitees at the Garrison Pasture on the occasion of the Official celebration of the Birthday of Her Majesty the Queen on the 24th day of April, 1967, by causing them to sit on the very cold and cemented seats without something to sit on by way of a cushion to cushion the cold?

2. Does Government know that such cushions were provided and placed on the said cemented seats for the convenience of Senators and other dignitaries, and not for members of the Honourable House of Assembly or others?

3. If the answers to the above are in the affirmative will Government state the reasons for such discriminatory and unfair treatment?

Mr. SPEAKER: There is another question standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter which he may put if he so desires.

QUESTION re RATIO OF GRADUATES TO PUPILS

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following question:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

What is the ratio of graduates to pupils in Harrison College, Queen's, Lodge and Combermere?

2. What is the ratio of graduates to pupils in (a) the remaining Government Secondary or other Schools, (b) Independent Schools?

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a question in the name of the Hon. and Learned member for St. Joseph.

QUESTION re GOVERNMENT'S POLICY TOWARDS ALIGNMENT

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

To enquire of the Hon. Prime Minister:

What is the Government's policy towards (a) alignment (b) non-alignment with the countries commonly called East and West in the current cold war between them?

QUESTION re GOVERNMENT'S POLICY TOWARDS I.L.O.

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

What is the Government's policy towards membership in the International Labour Organisation?

Is the Government aware that its annual conference takes place next month?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no record of any other queries which have been tabled.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure that hon. members will not think it amiss if on behalf of myself and themselves I welcome back the Chairman of Committees as well as the representatives of this House of the C.P.A. Mission to Grand Cayman Islands, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and the hon. senior member for St. Philip.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, you will remember that when last we met I had given the undertaking to the hon. senior member for Christ Church that Private Members Business would be done, and I am adhering to this because I understand the Item which stands under his name can be disposed of. I would suggest that we do the three Items of Government Business first, and then proceed to Private Members' Business.

Under the circumstances 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.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 3 be the first item of the day under Government Business.

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

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

2.55 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO GIVE EFFECT TO MOTOR VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS, 1967

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:-

A Resolution to give effect to the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1967.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, as the Addendum to this Resolution sets out, the Regulations entitled the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1967 have been laid in the Legislature. The Regulations provide for the following increases in the fees payable in respect of licences, driving tests and inspections of vehicles. As hon. members will see, the fee for a driving test before was \$2.00 and we propose to bring it up to \$5.00. A driving licence and conductor's licence fee was \$1.20 and we are bringing that also up to \$5.00. The fee for a duplicate licence is to be increased from 24c to \$1.00; the fee for a duplicate badge from 60c to \$1.00; the fee for inspection of a vehicle from \$2.40 to \$5.00; and for the re-inspection if rejected and for a certificate of fitness, the fee is to be increased from \$1.20 to \$2.00.

As hon. members on the other side are quite aware, these Regulations were in effect for quite a long time and everything has gone up. The standard of living has gone up. Everybody gets more wages and sometimes irresponsible people get hold of licences. This is not to deter youngsters, but we, on this side of the House, feel that the time has come when people who want to have the facility of driving cars or other vehicles should pay something more tangible than what they are paying now. For instance, formerly the licence fee was \$1.20. Now a man has a licence and, as I have always said, this fee is giving him a licence for a whole year to kill people. I say that because if the driver of a vehicle gets into an accident, he may kill somebody or something like that, and the first thing the police will ask him is this: "Have you got a driver's licence?" He will produce his licence, it is in order and it is quite all right; but if he has not got a licence, people will say: "Imagine he has killed somebody and he has not got a licence." That completely puts the case against him from the beginning. A licence fee was \$1.20 before. I have been trying to work it out and it comes to one cent for a few days. We are now asking that that licence fee be \$5.00. If you were to divide \$5.00 by 365, you will get 1 something. We are giving a man the option to drive a vehicle for a whole year at less than a penny a day. You go to any of the other small islands and you will find that you have to pay a fee of \$5.00. In Trinidad, you have to pay a lot more for these tests. We, on this side of the House, do not feel that, as will be said or suggested by the other side, because we have the numbers that is why we do so and so. Almost everybody in the country - I am sure that the members of the Opposition - even if they say anything against the Resolution - I am sure that they themselves feel that this is a measure which is long overdue. It is not fair that people should be allowed to pay this fee of \$1.20 nowadays. That is nothing nowadays. All the members of the Opposition are licenced drivers and sometimes the way in which some of these youngsters, who got their licences this morning try to show off to their girlfriends how pretty they can drive, take any number of unnecessary chances. This fee will not deter them from taking these chances but it will make it harder for these young people to acquire this \$5.00 then they can acquire \$1.20.

Mr. Speaker, you can almost beg for a dollar. We are faced with serious problems of road accidents and if you were to look at the number of people who are getting into these accidents, you will find that these are people who have acquired licences within less than five years ago. A lot of youngsters get motor cycle licences and they seem

to think that these motor cycles are jet planes, but even the jet planes must slow down. These youngsters succeed in getting their licences and they start at once to prove how pretty they can ride. As a result of that, many people get some pangs because when they hear that there is an accident, they think that a member of their family is involved. I am quite willing to answer any question which the hon. member may ask, but the object of this increased fee of \$5.00 is not to deter people from driving. We have some of the finest roads in the West Indies. Every day I am getting requests from members of the Opposition asking when we will repair this road and when we will put a light here and a road there.

3.05 p.m.

The members of the Opposition must know that you must have money to run the country and, therefore, if you must have a road here and a road there, you must have money to pay for it. You are also getting more life out of your car. All the members of the Opposition who have been to the United States, particularly those who have been to New York know that if they drive in a taxi from New York to Brooklyn, when you get to Brooklyn, the taxi driver ask if you have a 25 cents piece because they have to pay a toll of 25 cents to pass over the bridge. You have to pay a nickel as a toll to pass over the bridge.

We are aware that there is a number of people who are desirous of driving and it is a good thing. We do not want to stop anybody from driving. We have increased the cost of a permit from \$2 to \$5 as well as the cost of a driving licence. We are asking you to pay less than 2 cents per day to drive.

Mr. Speaker, I know members on the opposite side want to say something and I shall give them a chance to say how long it is that this increase was overdue.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I know the members on the other side of the House want us to join with them in saying that this matter is long overdue. It appears to me that he has to talk of being long overdue to members over here because he is afraid of members over here. Almost everything he said he referred to members over here. Why is he afraid today of members over here and not before?

I would agree with him that we have got today better and we want more roads. We have to spend more today and we have to get more money but, Sir, I want him also to understand that we can spend the money too lavishly. If we spend it too badly, it is better that we do not have it. In other words, if we waste it, it is better that we do not have it at all.

Now, Sir, you paid \$2 for a driving test and it is proposed now that you pay \$5. I passed those days already when you had to learn to drive. In those days we did not have to pay. I did not have to pay. Today we have to pay as high as \$60 and \$70 to learn to drive. As I have said, in my day I did not have to pay to learn to drive. Perhaps, it may be that the people of that day had more brains. You did not have to ask people to teach you how to learn to drive.

Sir, these things sound small, but little things mean a lot to some people. When you are increasing taxation, you must have some method. You have to arrive at a percentage basis; you cannot just say that there are 365 days in a year and this increase is less than two cents a day. You have to arrive at a percentage basis. You cannot say that it has been increased from \$2 to \$5. You have to leave that for people who did not go to school. At the head of your Government you have an Economist. This Government is more fortunate than the one before. This Government now has someone who can get seven cents out of six cents. That is the difference between the two Governments. You just cannot come here and say that you have increased this tax from \$2 to \$5 and that is less than 2 cents a day. It is not fair to the people

whom you are calling upon now to pay this increase just to say that this tax is now put at \$5 and that is less than 2 cents a day. It looks as if the Minister is now guessing.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I never said in my speech anything about guessing.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a point of elucidation, that is not a point of order.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, that is something small. The Hon. Minister spoke something about driving licence increased from \$1.20 to \$5.00 and said something about there are 365 days in a year and that means that you pay something less than 2 cents a day for a licence. That is why I said that he must have been guessing. I do not want to say things which he did not say, I believe that he should have some sort of figures dealing with this matter in front of him. I dare suppose that it has been worked out. Of course, he cannot be blamed for this, all these things should be given to him.

3.15 p.m.

I feel that the Minister should have in front of him the figures which the people worked out; so he is not to blame if he does not have them. This was given to him just as it was given to me on this bit of paper, but he should not accept it in this way knowing that his good friend on this side would ask these questions. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: It is simple.) The hon. member says it is simple, and I would not go any further; but some people call a gun simple too. However, I am still saying that it is not fair to the people who have been called upon to pay this large increase at the moment. I am not saying that it is too much, but I am saying it is not fair when the Minister cannot point out what the extra revenue will be when we make the increase from \$2.00 to \$5.00. That is how I would have expected the Minister to put it before the House. The same thing would apply to driving tests increased from \$2.00 to \$5.00 and driving licences and conductors' licences increased from \$1.20 to \$5.00. The Minister has left me in the dark as I do not know what will be the revenue from these increases. Comparatively speaking, they may be fleecing these people although I am not in a position to say that now. I know that the Minister will agree with me that we should have figures in front of us giving the estimated revenue and not just setting out the increases.

The Minister knows that I do not have one ignorant elector in St. Joseph; every one of them has sense and brains and they pose these questions at me, and they are not going to treat me like an idiot when I am in here. I should therefore have my facts to be able to answer them as they expect; but in this case I cannot say one word. That is not good enough. I do not know who is responsible for preparing this, but I can only blame the Minister at this moment because he is an intelligent man. In fact, I believe so; and if I were a Minister, no Permanent Secretary would put this in front of me and ask me to put this before the House of Assembly in this condition. I would ask him to let me know how much would be the increase and what the Government stood to benefit from the increases. First of all, I should know how many driving tests were made for the last five years or the last year, how many driving licences were issued, how many duplicate licences and duplicate badges had been issued and the number of inspections of vehicles made. All this could be obtained quite easily and should be before us. The people in St. Thomas have brains too, and I hope they will pose these questions to the Minister when he goes there, although he knows how to make his replies up there. When he makes a reply it goes down with a laugh, but there will not be all laughing this time. We are out for business and you cannot be fleecing people. I do not know if we are asking these people to pay too much or too little, but taking it on its face value, any intelligent person looking at this paper would tell you that the increases look too large. They may not be but we have not been told anything.

Mr. Speaker, I would not be surprised if when the Minister gets up to reply he has the figures, but it would be unfair to me to allow me to be on my legs all the time

talking rather than getting up and asking me to give way and give the figures. There is slackness and negligence somewhere. I do not know where to lay the blame, but it is not good enough for the Opposition. It is not good enough for me to be given these figures without being in a position to know what will be the estimated increase in revenue. In the absence of that, you leave it to me to tell this Government or the people that it is too much. In the absence of these figures I am saying that to increase a licence from \$1.20 to \$5.00 is too much, because the Minister must understand that there are some chauffeurs who only work for three or four months during the crop, and after what the Hon. Prime Minister of this country wants to eliminate is finished, the lorries are put in garages and the drivers have to walk up and down and cannot get a job. Some of them do not get a job until the crop starts again, and we have to take all these things into consideration. The increase from \$1.20 to \$5.00 is only \$3.80 cents, but that can throw some big men down about twelve times to get at a certain time of the year. After the canes have been cut, they are out of work. What do you think will happen when there are no canes? The bills will have to be used on something else.

3.25 p.m.

We have got to take everything into consideration. I am not criticising this Resolution just because I have a mouth. As I have already said, we have got to run the country and we have to get money to do that, and everything is going up. When you are independent you have to pay for it. When you are dependent people will have sympathy for you, but when you are independent you have to pay for it particularly when you are still dependent. That is where independence is starting and this is only the smoke. I am telling the Hon. Minister that the people are very unhappy today in wanting to know what is going to happen. I stopped at my gasoline station just now and a man asked me if the cost of gasoline is going up. I said: I do not know, wait and see. The people are very unhappy about this taxation. When they hear about the increase in the Highway Licence, in fact a man told me yesterday that the tax on that will be \$400. I am only saying what is going around. You cannot stop people from saying that, but I hope that when the Government is coming - I said last time that the Black Box had death in it, but I hope it will be free from anything like that; I hope they will not bring murder in it this time.

I know that we have to pay for independence but in this Resolution, I am not satisfied with the way in which it has been presented here today without letting us know the facts. That has been done purposely. The Government had time enough to bring it down if it is straight forward. We do not know what is the estimated amount that we are passing here today. I do not know if, in agreeing to this, I will be killing my people or saving them financially. The majority of these people are middle-class people although I may say that there are no middle-class people today; if you are not rich, then you are poor. However, the majority of people can hardly stand these increases. Although the people may not be able to measure up to these things, the country will have to be run. I would not like it to go altogether. Hearing how this money is being frittered away, and what is happening, how much one cheque is going into one's pocket from the taxpayer's money, we are bound to be unhappy. We may be levying this tax today to go into somebody else's pocket or to reimburse what has already gone into other people's pockets. Do not misunderstand me, Mr. Speaker; we may be trying to save ourselves now to stave off what has been done already, or we may be trying to get back home before the detective catches us. I do not know what is happening, but all is not well. I sincerely hope that this Government will see to it that when they come down with these tax proposals, the money is rightly spent. I hope they will try and put in charge people whom they can really trust with the taxpayers money. Do not let them put people to get one vote and then that vote costs the Island \$3,000 or \$4,000.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that the hon. member is going somewhat far beyond the confines of this Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Sir, it may be so, but you want to try to make things plain. This is a money Resolution. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: No, it is not.)

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not a money Resolution in the sense of a money Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: I would not argue with Your Honour for one moment. When this Resolution is passed, it will be money going into the Treasury.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not a money Resolution in the Parliamentary sense; it is a money Resolution in the restricted sense. (AN ASIDE) I hear a voice. I wonder where it is coming from. I hope that the hon. member's colleagues are not thinking aloud.

Mr. SMITH: The Hon. Minister has referred to the road accidents which are taking place and he makes me believe that it is because of the young sauce-boxes as the old people would say, but we will say the teenagers. The Hon. Minister said that the young people are responsible for these accidents, but he also said that making the licence fee \$5.00 will not prevent these accidents. That is true. If you make the licence fee £1,000, that would not prevent these accidents. The Hon. Minister also said that the people who got licences less than five years ago are the ones who are giving trouble. He also said that the motor car springs do not break as they used to break before, and the car tyres do not wear out as before. That may happen with the Minister because he does not keep his car for so long that the tyres wear out. That will not happen to me. I have to wait until people are finished with their cars and try to make new ones out of them. I will tell the Minister that the car tyres are still going and the springs are still being broken. The Government is doing its part by providing good roads but the owners of the cars do not have the money to put on the tyres, and they are still running on paper bags. To supply four tyres for an ordinary car today will cost not less than \$100.00 and with the tubes you may run into \$200.00. Imagine a man having to pay house rent and school fees for his children! Because all the children are not yet getting free education.

3.35 p.m.

The ones that have to pay have to pay for other things and they are paying through their noses. The school fees which they have to pay for their children are very high, something between thirty and forty dollars a term. Now they have to pay an extra \$3.00 for drivers' licence so you can clearly see what is going to happen with them now. There are some people walking the road today and when you ask them how they feel, they say that they are feeling alright but in truth and in fact, they are catching H.E. two sticks. It must cost them more.

Mr. Speaker, I would move that this Resolution be postponed only because the Hon. Minister should come in here next Tuesday and tell us something about it. He should let us know what is the estimated revenue that Government expects to get from these increases. I know, however, that it would be a waste of time to do this because numbers mean a lot. If the Minister wants to do justice to himself, he would agree to the motion for the postponement so that he would be able to let us know what this increased taxation means. Let us know the amount of revenue you expect to get from it. By doing it this way, we are sailing on the deep blue sea. You should not just leave us in the dark because I personally cannot answer anybody now. This is only a small one but the big one is left behind; the big one is left back for the last.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the speech by the Hon. Minister on this Resolution and what most interested me was his reference to irresponsible youngsters who can still get licences. What does the Hon. Minister mean by irresponsible youngsters? I hope he understands that these irresponsible youngsters get these licences from the Police, therefore his remark is an indictment against the Police.

What I really think is necessary is that you need to have a Licensing Authority so as to relieve the Police from the duties of having to issue these licences. At the present moment we have quite a number of accidents and

they have reached an alarming proportion. That is why we feel that the available policemen should be placed in a position where they can assist wherever possible persons who are driving along the streets and let the licensing authority see to it about people who want licences and things of that sort. It would relieve at least 30 policemen that deal with renewal of driving licences and the like. This is the type of thing we need.

Now, Sir, we have before us these rates. A driving test presently costing \$2 is to cost \$5 in June. I am saying that no driver's licence which is going to cost \$5.00 is going to hinder anybody from having a test. I think I heard the Hon. Minister state that they do not intend to hinder anybody from having a driving licence, but what we say is that when the Government has stepped up a driving test from \$2 to \$5, it has caused us to feel that the Government is in a desperate need for money. We feel that something between \$2 and \$5 should have been fixed.

We are aware that there are increases in the living cost in everything under the sun but that does not justify the Government in coming here today to ask us to increase this licence from \$2 to \$5.

They have increased a Driver and Conductor licence fee from \$1.20 to \$5. We have many a conductor and many a driver in this Island who have been walking up and down and going from place to place trying his best to do all sorts of odd jobs in order to raise the money to buy a licence. They are trying their hands at everything so that they can get enough to get this licence. The increase in this fee means that the concessionaires would have to pay more because these drivers and conductors are going to ask for increased wages. When they get increased wages, it means that bus fares would have to go up and in the end it means that the people who drive in the buses would have to pay something more.

3.45 p.m.

When you pay these increases, it means that bus fares will eventually have to go up, and the people who drive on the buses will be the ones who in the long run will be paying the increase which we are asked to vote for today. As soon as you have to step up the price of a driver's licence from \$1.20 to \$5.00, it is going to end in increased bus fares. There are other increases which can be and ought to be criticised, but there is not much criticism which will answer the test here this afternoon.

Getting back to this question of the test which cost \$2 and will now go to \$5, I would say that what we do need in this Island are competent instructors to teach people how to drive. We see quite a number of people who hold licences which are issued by the Police, and as soon as a person holds a licence, he feels that he possesses a certain competence to teach somebody else to drive. It ought to be so, but teaching somebody to drive requires a special aptitude, some special knowledge, and above all, a knowledge of the Highway Code and an appreciation for other persons using the road. There is a lot that can be said on this, but we see the plight of the Hon. Minister in this matter.

To come to the question of a conductor or driver who might lose his badge, formerly he got a duplicate licence for twenty-four cents, but he has to find \$1.00 now. The duplicate badge was formerly 60 cents and is now \$1.00. We are willing to admit that there is a piece of metal involved in the case of the badge, and it must cost something, but we feel that in view of the fact that these badges are ordered in bulk, the Minister cannot make out a case to justify the increase from 60 cents to \$1.00 just to have the small numerals painted thereon.

With respect to the inspection of vehicles, I do not think that it entails any more today to inspect the vehicle than it did one, two or three years ago. The Department of Highways might have installed better equipment to facilitate and expedite inspections, but the Department has got to be equipped whether you had 1,000 or 10,000 vehicles to inspect. It had to be equipped as the year 1967 would require; so when vehicle owners are now being told that

they will have to pay a 50 percent increase on present inspection rates, it is nothing of the kind. You are taking them from \$2.40 to \$5.00, and I am sure that there is somewhere in between \$2.40 and \$5.00 that the Minister ought to have found that he could safely have anchored himself and get his increase and still have all the vehicle owners feeling a little more comfortable in mind.

In conclusion, I will say that we have got to do all we can to reduce accidents, but I see nothing in this Resolution this afternoon which tells me that it has as its object, purpose or reason anything to assist in reducing the number of accidents we are presently having in Barbados.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I regret I did not hear all that the Minister said in his opening remarks relative to this Resolution, but what I did hear him say really did not convince me that I should vote in favour of it. The Minister was at pains to make references to the young and irresponsible drivers of today who are the main cause of the majority of accidents on the road. I cannot see how by increasing these schedules that is going to minimize the number of road accidents, nor do I seriously think that the Minister believes that himself.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation, I specifically said that the \$5.00 will not deter the youngsters from getting a driver's licence, but I said it would make it a little bit more difficult than the \$1.20.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point duly elucidated.

Mr. HUSBANDS: The Minister said that he only said that it will make it a bit more difficult for the irresponsible drivers who are the main causes of the high number of accidents. Now I am in a difficult position today. I am being asked to give my assent or dissent to certain regulations and the amendment to Bills, all purely having the same reason, taxation, and I am going to make a modest speech now, and I do not think I am going to speak again for the rest of the day, because after what I am going to say now, if I speak on two subsequent occasions on the two amendments to Bills, I will be repeating myself and it would be a waste of time. What the Minister wanted to say is that we have good roads in Barbados, we have a lot of roads to maintain, we have to provide access roads and the Minister knows also that I put some questions to him on that score not so very long ago. The access roads in the rural districts are not provided, and when provided, are unkempt. It is true at least in St. Peter.

3.55 p.m.

If the Minister says we need money, of course we need money and in order to get money you have to pay taxes, and it may be you have to pay increased taxes. However, this is what I foresee. I will not talk on the amendments to the other Bills now. Anybody will see that when the Schedules to the other Bills are read, a lot more money will be raised than what I think is necessary. A lot of money is being asked for and it will be asked for subsequently very soon from now. A lot of five-dollar increases will be asked for. It is my opinion that we are asking for too much now. We are asking for much more than is necessary. We will collect a lot of money when these Measures are passed.

Mr. Speaker, let me deal with this Resolution which is before us now. The fee for a driving test is being increased from \$2.00 to \$5.00. The fee for a driving licence or a conductor's licence is being increased from \$1.20 to \$5.00. The fee for a duplicate badge is increased from 60 cents to \$1.00. For the inspection of a vehicle, the fee has been increased from \$2.40 to \$5.00 and for re-inspection if rejected and certificate of fitness the fee has been increased from \$1.20 to \$2.00.

On paper these increases do not look extravagant. To some people, an increase of \$3.00 will be a lot of money when they apply for licences; to some people whom I know well, it will mean quite a lot. We have been told that the fees for these licences are long outstanding, that this Schedule has been so long outstanding that it is time to come for a move up, but at least there must be some proportion.

In my opinion, looking at the matter from the whole point of view, the grand total collected will be a lot of money. I look forward to having my tenantry roads repaired, and other hon. members are looking forward to that as well. As to the number of people who apply for licences, well, I would be out of order to include what I can include in a subsequent speech. However, sir, as I have said, a lot more money is going to be extracted from those who own and drive motor vehicles than is necessary. That is my small observation on this Bill.

Mr. HOPPIN: Mr. Speaker, these new proposed fees are in conformity with rates obtaining in other countries. At present it would appear, or we would expect the Opposition to put up a big debate and say that the Government has increased these fees tremendously. I know that in some countries, especially the one in which I have lived for ten years, in order to obtain a driver's licence, you have to pay much more than \$5.00 for a test and every time you fail the test, the fee is also increased. I do not see anything wrong in the Government bringing these fees up to standard. Everybody has realised that the fee for the renewal of licences stood at \$1.20 for years. Since the fee has been raised to \$5.00, I have heard the hon. senior member for St. Joseph complain about the chauffeurs, but we all know that these chauffeurs are in some kind of affiliation with the Union and year by year they are demanding increases. I do not see that if their licence is regarded as their hoe and basket, why they cannot pay this increased fee for their licence. There is no reason why the hon. senior member for St. Joseph wanted to know how many licences they are and how much money the Government is going to receive from this increase.

Mr. Speaker, there is a need for money. As the Hon. Minister has said, we have good roads, we want to give better roads, and as the last speaker has just said, the access roads in the rural districts are expected to be done and maintained. In order to get these things done, I do not see that these increases are extravagant at all. As regards, making a point about the driving test, I do feel that it should be a bit more rigid. I realise that recently accidents have been on the increase daily, involving youngsters as well as old people, and I do feel that if more rigid tests had been meted out to some of these people who are desirous of getting these licences, they would at all times try to drive a bit safer.
4.05 p.m.

We are in the hope that Barbados having become a nation would live up to the standard as is expected of all the young nations and I believe that this increase in taxation would in no way cause the people to make any fuss because they are demanding increased standards from the Government so that they can have better roads and if the Government has taken it for granted that there should be an increase in these things, if the Government has increased the rates this tax from \$2 to \$5, I do not think that it is extravagant. Do not expect that the rates which were in existence would continue for all times.

With these few remarks, I wish to say that I do agree to these new proposed rates.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker,

Mr. SPEAKER: My eye caught the Hon. Leader of the Opposition first.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I shall be short in my speech because what I intended to say has really been said by other speakers. Along with that the Hon. Minister concerned is not at present in his place. By a recent measure which was passed by the House, the Government has shown that the paying out of money from the Treasury may be done and then they can come here and have it regularised.

What I want to say is this. In previous years, the police accepted applications for the renewal of licences during the month of May during the particular year and there is nothing

to prevent a man from renewing his licence from the 1st May. I hope this statement would not cause offence to anybody but it is not unknown that people took opportunity to purchase motor cars before the Consumption Tax on motor cars was put on. If people can take out a renewal licence from the first of May, there is nothing to prevent people who have an annual licence from having their licence renewed before today. I say nothing more. I know that in some instances, policemen have compelled people who have got valid passports to have new passports. This has happened in my own case. It is not unknown for people to purchase motor cars before a tax had been put on and if people can take advantage of that, surely there is nothing to prevent people who had inside knowledge from having their licences renewed before.

Apparently, the answer to this is that you have better roads and you need more money to build more roads. It may be something like that. It may be that we are in for phenomenal taxes so as to get money for ways and means of bringing down the rate of accidents but we have not been told anything of this before. We have not been told that we need to raise such and such a sum of money for such and such a purpose. It may be that we propose to spend some money on something particular and this is how we propose to raise it.

I see that the Hon. Minister does not seem to reply to some questions. All I suggest is that it may be that we have to spend more money on a certain thing and because of that we want more money. Surely, this is one way of raising it. There was a statement by the Hon. Minister that it was a question of our having better roads. Surely, you are entitled to be told what revenue you propose to get from these additional rates and what these additional roads would cost and such and such a thing is the reason for this additional increase.

Apparently, we are not taxing people with any consideration of how this tax would affect other things. We know that there are many people who now enjoy luxuries which they could not enjoy. I would simply ask: Why we do not tax bachelors? You find that married men are being heavily taxed but you find that bachelors enjoy any luxury which they want because they do not have any family.

The question about the payment of a dog tax is just a question of the Government getting money. When it comes to the owner of a dog having to take out a licence for the keeping of a dog, it is just a question of raising revenue. I think there is something more in favour of having a dog licence than raising these taxes.
4.15 p.m.

Most human beings do keep dogs and would be only too glad to pay a tax rather than deprive them of the pleasure, advantage and the companionship of the dogs they have been keeping. I had intended to raise this point or in any event would have asked an hon. member on this side to raise it, but I have been through Police speed traps, and I have never seen a specific one for motor-cyclists. I have driven at forty miles an hour and have been passed by motor cycles making me feel that I was not moving. Some hon. members who may know of cases of motor cyclists being prosecuted for exceeding the speed limit might correct me, but I have never heard of any, and I am preaching what everybody knows. The hon. senior member for St. Peter raised the point of speed traps and the use of policemen, but if a few were prosecuted and heavy fines put on them, they would ride like human beings instead of forgetting that they were riding on earth and were not riding in the sky.

Those are the points I want to make, and I suggest quite seriously that the Government instead of making these increases for people who cannot afford them should look to other sources of taxation that do not fall heavily on people on which they fall. If I seem to labour the question, it is simply because some time or other in other countries in which the question of getting extra taxation arises, somebody or other thinks of the question of a bachelor tax, because it seems such a fair tax. When you tax a bachelor

he drinks less rum and smokes less cigarettes. (*An Aside.*) I wish, although he may be out of order, I could understand what the Hon. Minister across the Table said.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution which is before us today is to give effect to the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations and to increase the fee on vehicles which I think is necessary. Now before I go further, I should like to say that I have listened to all the arguments, and on looking at the Order Paper I see questions from members of the Opposition asking about roads, water, land for housing at Lammings and other things. These members know that we cannot get these things without money, and this Government must seek ways and means to raise the money to get these things for the inhabitants of this country. This is what they would do if they were in Government. These are vehicles and luxuries you are taxing; it is not cornmeal, rice or clothing or land. I do not see therefore why the Opposition should criticise this at all, because if they were in Government they would have to find ways and means to raise money to provide these facilities. Here you have bicycles which have not been increased from the time I knew about tax, and they are going from sixty cents to \$1.00.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid we are not now dealing with that.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, we now have Barber Green roads for the vehicles to run on, and a vehicle which would have lasted ten years can now last twenty years, because driving on these Barber Green roads is like a boat sailing on water, and tyres last twice as long. It is a waste of time to criticise a Resolution of this nature. If the Opposition sees the Government going astray and off the right latitude, they should bring us back, but when we are going right, do not say we are going wrong, because that would be misleading the people who are watching to see what we are doing, how we are doing it and what we are providing for them. Come let us reason together. I know that some of our sins are red as scarlet, but they shall be as white as snow. If this Resolution is to find money to provide facilities for the people of the Island, I do not see that it needs any more criticism. It should be supported by both sides of the House.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the speech of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works and the speeches by members on this side of the House, to the speech of the hon. junior member for St. George and indeed with interest to the speech of the hon. junior member for St. Andrew. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is my view that everybody who has spoken here today has spoken exclusively of driving licences as if the raising of driving licences is a normal or legitimate way of raising taxation. I think perhaps we are suffering today, and I mean genuinely suffering, from the absence of the Minister of Finance, because I am sure that he would be the person to explain to the Minister of Communications and Works that it is not in his place to say that more money is needed, so we are raising the cost of driving licences.

The whole point about these taxation matters and justifying them is that either you treat them as financial matters or you treat them as Departmental matters. If they are treated as financial matters, it is proper and correct to say we need more money, therefore we must raise this, that and the other, and the correct way for doing that is in a Budget. The correct person to do that is the Minister of Finance.
4.25 p.m.

I must confess that when I saw this Resolution and when I appreciated that the person introducing it would be the Minister of Communications and Works, I felt that the difference between taxation and licences should be observed in this House. Mr. Speaker, you do not tax a bicycle or a driver for the purpose of raising revenue; that is not the normal concept of what a driving licence or bicycle licence is there for. I will not deal with the question of the licences, because I intend to speak again when that matter comes up. We heard a discussion as to other countries, and anybody

who understands taxation, would know that a difference is drawn between licences and taxation. Licences and licence fees are calculated on a basis which would cover the cost of collecting them and administering the services which they represent, and they are fixed on that basis. As to the speech of the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, if I understood him correctly, if you are saying that a man earns a living from driving, then he should be glad to earn a licence. On that basis, people earn their living from practising medicine and there are those who earn their living from being at the Bar. The argument that people should be glad to pay this licence because it is their livelihood is an argument which should be dismissed with contempt. If you charge a driver \$5.00 for a licence, then you should charge a doctor \$500.

Mr. Speaker, a very good point was made by the hon. junior member for St. Peter; it is a point which I myself would have made if I did not hear it, as to the collection of fees for driving licences. We are paying a high but concealed cost for the collection of licence fees and the administration of driving tests. We are paying the cost of training the Police in Police duties and then we give them a job which any clerk who is drawing a lesser salary could do even better. We pay a high social cost as well as a high financial cost. What I expected to hear from the Hon. Minister is what is the estimated cost of collecting driving licences and renewals of driving licences.

I would like to deal with the speech of the honourable junior member for St. George. He remarked that in other countries the fees for these licences are much higher. In some other countries I know that the fee is five shillings. In England I renewed my licence and I paid a fee of fifteen shillings for three years. There is a deep fundamental difference in this Resolution between a driving test and a driving licence. A driving test is, in fact, something which can be regarded as an asset to a man; perhaps you can say that it is not unreasonable that a man should pay more for a driving test which involves a policeman's time in driving around the country. That is an expenditure on a man's time. Nobody should argue that a driving licence should be worth \$5.00 if a driving test is worth \$5.00, because it takes the policeman a good part of the morning to take out a man for a driving test. There is a great difference between a driving test and a driving licence where it takes just five minutes to renew a licence. We can imagine that they should have a higher standard of driving test. I find that a driving test here is very hard and it may be that a driving test may warrant a higher charge judging from what the word connotes. Because in England there is a higher charge for a driving test, I do not see that it should be so automatically in Barbados. In England if they can still manage to renew a driving licence for five shillings, I think that we should give some consideration as to whether in Barbados \$5.00 is a fit and proper charge for a driving licence.

Mr. Speaker, the first hon. member who spoke on this side said that it is quite inconceivable that the Minister should talk about raising taxation without saying how much money would be raised from it. We were unable to debate this matter on the basis of knowledge. We do not know if there are 20,000 40,000 or 50,000 drivers and we do not know if they will raise \$60,000, \$70,000 or \$80,000. As to the talk about the roads, the entire road programme voted for in the Estimates will not reach \$1 million. I see in the Estimates that mention is made of bridges, parking systems drainage and so on. I see that they are mentioned separately from the road programme but the total vote is only \$2 million odd. The Minister has taken upon himself the responsibility for introducing what he has described as a raise in taxation and therefore we must expect some financial consideration in these matters. Suppose we were to say that this increase will bring in \$80,000. That is the equivalent of borrowing \$1 million, so that an increase in the driving licences may locate that \$80,000. The Government would have to advance the Communications and Works programme under the Head, road works, highway improvement and so on. It may seem small but it could reflect the release of Government resources of \$1 million. Before we

talk about the cost of one cent per day - of course the Minister of Communications and Works is not the person to talk about expenditure and taxation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few suggestions. The question of an annual licence should be reconsidered. If you issue a licence for more than one year, whatever the basic licence fee is, you benefit by what is earned over the period for which it comes.
4.35 p.m.

If you examine a three-year licence you will find that over the tax period you are bringing in an amount of money which normally is taken in three years. The same time is required to charge a man for a three years tax as it takes to charge him for one year. What you find is that in a one-year tax, you will only occupy all his time. As I remember the London County Council has a system of your paying three years in advance and there are many advantages to be gained from that.

I need not expect the Hon. Minister of Communications to believe in that.

We are missing the Hon. Minister of Finance. What a situation you have in this House that in a matter dealing with Finance, the Hon. Minister of Finance is not present? If this matter is treated as a taxation matter, it is the duty of the Hon. Minister of Finance to tell us about it before the Resolution is brought in.

One point made by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is enough to make me vote against this Resolution. It seems as if the Hon. Minister of Finance sends the other Ministers in the House to introduce something to increase the taxation of the people of this Island. I take it that the increases would have some relevance to the increased expenditure in the Estimates.

The Hon. Prime Minister as Minister for Finance is the person constituted to deal with all financial matters in this House of Assembly. We in Barbados have gone further because we state that the Minister of Finance is the person legally required to come into the House of Assembly and introduce the Estimates.

When an increase of taxation is mooted and money is needed to increase the finances of this Island, we expect that to be introduced by the Hon. Minister of Finance when he is introducing the Annual Estimates. What do you find now? The Hon. Minister of Communications is querying something with the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if provision will be made for an increase in the tax for keeping a revolver.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas has gone very far indeed from the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I have strayed. When I came in here today, I did catch the Hon. Minister saying that I had been given that authority to speak for the Hon. Minister of Finance.

Any absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance is sufficient insult to members of this House to cause them to vote against this Resolution. There is no one person in this House who can constitutionally say that to this House unless the Hon. Minister of Finance. Mr. Speaker, I do not know, unless the Hon. Minister of Finance is asking us to vote for this to meet the losses by the Barbados Marketing Association.

Mr. SPEAKER: That does not arise either directly or indirectly in this Resolution. I would ask the hon. member to deal with the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: There are other Bills before the House which deal with financial matters and there was a Bill which was passed by this House two days ago which I think I have referred to. Certainly, these other Bills would come before the House in due course.

Certainly, nobody would object if I deal with a point which was raised by an hon. member on the other side. The Hon. Minister of Communications said something about irresponsible youngsters getting Driving Licences. I can assure him that the remark will follow him until he retires in 1971 or earlier to whatever place he is going to retire.

It is not a question of irresponsible youngsters getting Driving Licences; it is certainly a question of irresponsible Ministers. The Hon. Minister of Finance who is responsible for dealing with financial matters in this House is irresponsible by allowing the Hon. Minister of Communications to deal with this matter and the Hon. Minister of Communications is irresponsible in accepting this kind of portfolio.

We have no fear of irresponsible youngsters. Mr. Speaker, you are aware that we have several good youngsters who have been granted Driving Licences. If you were talking about irresponsible Ministers, I can quite well see what you are talking about. I can quite well see the ground for an increase in the fee for keeping firearms.

Mr. SPEAKER: But we are not talking about that.

Mr. ADAMS: We are talking about an increase in fees.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are talking about Driving Tests especially.

Mr. ADAMS: I am suggesting about firearms and therefore we should raise this licence.

Mr. SPEAKER: That may be said on a different subject matter.

Mr. ADAMS: I assume that you are saying that my point has been made.
4.45 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, there is another point which I had noted. I do not know unfortunately which hon. member made it, but I think perhaps at least it should be drawn to the notice of the people of the constituency of the hon. member who suggested that because something cost \$1.20 in 1937, therefore it should cost \$5.00 today. I have always regarded the functions of Government as including things other than raising every conceivable tax price and cost to a level to which they can stand up. I have never thought, Mr. Speaker, that it is automatic that taxes must always go up for no other reason but that they were low in 1937. We might as well introduce a Resolution to have a sliding scale to fix taxes that as the cost of living goes up the taxes go up. Some countries have wage agreements by which raises in cost of living are automatically matched by raises in wage rates. The hon. member who suggested that because something cost \$1.20 in 1937 it should be increased today is perhaps applying the cost of living to all taxes, because as you try to get more money, the cost of living goes up automatically, and you give the Government more taxes to waste in such activities as the Barbados Marketing Corporation and other money making rackets which appear to be the unfortunate feature of some quasi-Governmental activities at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of being in Court this morning hearing a great deal of praise being showered to the hon. junior member for St. Andrew by some of his constituents, and it was gratifying to note that he inspired such a feeling of confidence in the residents of the East Coast Road, St. Andrew, that they would fight or otherwise go to war with many words and many stones upon the said East Coast Road. Would that the said litigants were present to hear the speech of the hon. junior member for St. Andrew. I would hope that it would inspire them with the same confidence which the speeches which they perhaps heard at election time inspired them. Certainly I cannot say that his speech inspired me, Mr. Speaker, with any feeling other than one of total bewilderment. I tried hard to understand. I understood him to say that a driving licence is a luxury, and I hope he will hold a public meeting by the Rocklyn Bus Company and tell the conductors and drivers that they should be glad to pay more for their licences, because a driving licence is a luxury that rich people like

them have, and can afford an increase just like that. I understood him to say also that motoring is less expensive today. It is less expensive today because motor car tyres last longer. Other such sentiments were expressed to persuade those of us who have been car owners for some time that the Bills which we see and which convince our pockets that the lot of the motorist is more and more costly, are not really expensive and that we are mistaken. Going back to the days when a motorcar could be bought for perhaps \$100 and gasoline cost 15 cents or 10 cents a gallon, in the days when the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was first a motorist, I would be glad to hear the arguments especially when we think that driving is more expensive today.

Mr. SPEAKER, we have heard that we should be so proud about the number of Barber Green roads; that it should be a privilege not to pay a toll, and it should be a privilege to have a driving licence. I do not want to deal with this on the basis of ridicule; the hon. junior member for St. Thomas already thinks it is ridiculous. The hon. junior member for St. Thomas at times has a lot of sense. On the question of Barber Green roads, if these roads were really super highways and the question of a toll or no toll could be considered, it should not be considered in terms of the drivers, it should be considered in terms of the vehicles. You do not tell a man he should be proud to drive on a Barber Green road; so pay an increased licence.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, although I have the right to reply, and I do not intend to interrupt the hon. member, I did specifically say that cars would last longer as a result of Barber Green roads.

Mr. SPEAKER: That was not a point of order, but however, it was a point of elucidation.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, he was not explaining anything to me because I heard him say it and I was trying in my humble way to say that he said it and to say that he was going to say it again, and I was proved right sooner than I thought; but that is not an argument in favour of raising driving licences. A man may be driving a bus; is he interested in whether the buses have better tyres and last longer because of Barber Green roads. It is not everybody who drives his own car. Indeed if we had the figures I think they might reveal that at least half of the licenced drivers in Barbados do not own a vehicle, but the figures are being kept under a cloud. That argument applies to a different portion of the Hon. Minister's brief altogether. It is no argument for driving licences, driving tests and duplicate badges. Do you mean we have to pay more for duplicate badges because Barber Green roads make vehicles last longer and you have to pay more for inspection of vehicles because Barber Green roads make them last longer, and more for conductors' licences? What is a conductor to do with having Barber Green Roads? This argument tends to be suspicious. When you go into Court with a bad argument, automatically the judge knows even if he has not looked at the law himself. If you sound funny or unreal, the judge knows he does not have to worry, because clearly you have a bad case. Equally, Mr. Speaker, when you come into the House of Assembly, it is a bad argument and they are speeches about Barber Green roads and a lot of talk about what driving test cost in other countries, and there are a lot of assertions about driving licences being luxuries, you have to look at the whole thing in doubt.
4.55 p.m.

To sum up, this whole matter has been introduced into this House as a taxation project and the person to do that is the Minister of Finance. The person to say when money is needed is the Minister of Finance. The person who is to say what money is to be raised and what place it would have in his budget is the Minister of Finance.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. member means the hon. Minister.

Mr. ADAMS: I am obliged to Your Honour. The Hon. Minister who should be telling us these things cannot see fit to come to the House. That is slapping us in our faces but, as far as we are concerned on this side of the House, we will slap him in his face. He may not feel the blows now

because of the pats on the back; the pats on the back at the moment outnumber the slaps on the face. The corner stones have not yet crumbled but the edifice is crumbling. I see that hon. members have their heads buried in their hands. They can testify to the truth and the justification of what I say here today. I advise the Ministers and even the Minister of Education to beware for their days will come.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must really try and realise what the matter before the House is. How many more times must I draw this to his attention?

Mr. ADAMS: The Minister of Finance cannot come to the House to introduce a taxation matter. There are those who do not come to the House and therefore he need not come. But hon. members on this side of the House cannot support this Resolution and my sympathy is with the Minister who introduced it.

Mr. SPEAKER: If no other member desires to speak on the motion which is before the House, the Hon. Minister may, if he thinks fit, exercise his right of final reply.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, last year in November when we were campaigning, there was a rumour going around to the effect that there was room for a strong opposition, but after hearing what is supposed to be a strong opposition this afternoon, I have come to the conclusion that the only opposition that we, on this side get, is from the "Advocate" and the "Daily News". After listening to the rantings of the last speaker

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. If, as the last Speaker, the Hon. Minister is referring to me, I was not ranting.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I object to the use of the word "ranting".

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not deem that word to be unparliamentary.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, what I would say is this: if the last Speaker had a bit more intelligence you could almost risk to call him a half wit, I do not think it is ..

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member is saying of another hon. member that he is a half wit, I do deem that to be unparliamentary.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I said if he had a bit more intelligence, but if you think that that is unparliamentary

Mr. SPEAKER: That would make it even stronger.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I withdraw the word. What I was saying is that I am surprised at the hon. member who has just spoken. It is true that it is the duty of the Opposition to make the Government in power uncomfortable, but it is not the duty of the Opposition to make themselves nuisances and uncomfortable. I expect to hear something worth while in this matter of saving road accidents and so on, but all I have heard for the entire day since I have introduced this Resolution is almost a vilification of the Government in the implementation of this Resolution. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph said that all this Government is doing is spending money fast. Yes, we are spending it fast, but on the taxpayers who are paying. We are not sending the money out to South and West Africa; we are spending it on the people who pay the taxes.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I did not say that they were spending the money fast; I said that they are spending it badly.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. That is a matter of explanation in conformity with Standing Order 28.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: He really said that we were spending the money fast but if he meant that we were spending it badly, I would ask him if in buying Lammings we were

spending it badly. The hon. member went on to say that people are running to him daily and asking him if it is true that the price of gasoline will be increased to \$1.00 and he is worried about that. I will let him know that despite the twenty years during which he has been in this House, he does not seem to realise that that would be a matter for the Minister of Finance. None of us will know that until the time comes. I am asking him if he knows that some of these matters which are put to him are not true, what is he doing to dispel the fears of the people? The hon. member went on to say that it may be so and he tried to take it back. Well, they are always looking for a crisis. That is a Barbadian and a Barbadian is inciting Barbadians to rise up against his own country.

Mr. Speaker, there is a man called Cardinal Bowen who demolishes buildings but I have never seen him, while he is demolishing a building, pull it down when he is inside the building. He always makes sure that he is out of the building when he is pulling it down. When you bring down your country, you are bringing it down on your own head. Let us leave out this intimidation and this threat of violence (ASIDES) I am not speaking to you; I am speaking to men of intelligence. I am saying, let us leave out this intimidation and this continual trying to incite people. Some of us can still remember the year 1937, I have a good recollection of that year when there were those who incited the people. A man called "Menzies" was sent to prison for saying that today will be a funny night.
5.05 p.m.

When the hon. member spoke of 1937, I have come to the understanding that he is speaking of the last time the fees were raised.

The hon. senior member for St. Joseph went on to speak about his car springs. The only thing which a man should keep forever is his wife. Everything else wears out as a result of wear and tear. However, I do not know of many car springs broken as a result of our roads. It is likely that the hon. member's car springs would be broken because of the out-of-the-way places where the hon. member goes. There are not many complaints received by the Department from people getting their car springs broken.

The hon. senior member for St. Joseph and the hon. senior member for St. Thomas said that an hon. member had said that quite a number of these accidents had been caused by irresponsible youngsters. I did say so. The hon. members know this quite as well as I do. The hon. member knows that quite a lot of youngsters do not act as responsible when driving a vehicle as other people. You have nowadays on the roads quite a number of motor cycles particularly "Hondas" and "Suzukis" and it is quite easy to own these things. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas said that the remark of irresponsible youngsters will follow my path until 1971 when I retire, I would like to tell him that my seat is always secure.

The hon. senior member for St. Thomas really and truly seems to think that at all times when you come in here to decide these issues that he is in a law court. I have warned him repeatedly that when he comes in here, this is the House of Assembly, not a Magistrate's Court.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, I rise on a point of order. Is it in order to make a reference which may be taken to mean that I do not know what to say in a Magistrate's Court and what to say in the House of Assembly?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not regard that as a point of order. All I heard chiefly was a Magistrate's Court. I do not regard that as referring to anybody.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I have warned the hon. member that if he asks a question which is rational, I will answer that question rationally, but he comes in here with the belief that after seven years training to be a lawyer, that law entitles him to bully his way in this Chamber. I would like the hon. member to leave out Dayrells Road.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was about to say that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas said that he is not going to vote for this Resolution because the Hon. Minister of Finance has a right to come in here when we are debating a resolution like this. How does he know if the Hon. Minister of Finance is sick or if he has gone out of the Island? There is no rule to say that the Hon. Prime Minister has to be here.

As regards the remark about slaps on the back turning into slaps in the face

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the hon. junior member for St. Thomas to desist from that and to deal with the Resolution.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I have been trying to stick to the Resolution, but it is difficult to reply to the hon. senior member for St. Thomas when he refers to things which he should leave out.

The hon. junior member for St. Peter referred to having a licensing Authority to deal with licensing. He said that the Police was just allowing people to drive like that. If the Driving Test is made even more rigid, you will still get accidents and more people will be applying for licences. As long as you must issue a licence to a man for driving a vehicle and there is no law to prevent him having a licence, you are going to have accidents from driving.

I remember the case of a very experienced licensed driver in the United States. He was driving a vehicle for many years without being involved in an accident and he was on his way to receive a certificate of recommendation for his driving. While on his way to receive this commendation, he got in a serious accident. When you are on your way to work, you can see nothing else but accidents.
5.15 p.m.

There is nothing in the law which says that when a man has reached a certain age you cannot give him a licence. You cannot say you will not give him because he is too old. I agree with the hon. member that we should set up a Licensing Authority and all these things will be under consideration. One cannot say that the Police are at fault because I do not see that issuing somebody with a licence can cause somebody to get into an accident. Only yesterday after coming from the Court I was travelling along the Pine East West Road and there was a man on a bicycle in front of me. The man saw the car but for some reason or other he waited until I got to him and swung across the road. This man is not a juvenile, but you get irresponsibility in all walks of life, but more so with youngsters, because all of us were young, and when you are young you get this idea of being adventurous; but the chances you take when you are young, you do not take when you get in the late thirties unless you are mad.

The hon. senior member for St. Thomas said he did not see \$1 million in the Estimates, and then he mentioned land acquisition. What I would like to ask the hon. member is whether he thinks the Government is going to acquire land and set up fly-sticks. When we acquire land we acquire it for road improvement. I do not expect hon. members who are supposed to be responsible and to have intelligence - I am not saying that they have - to come in here and for the sake of playing to the Gallery raise the arguments which they have raised.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph asked if the Government had prevented people from paying their licence fees during the month of May, and if certain people had got away by paying their licence early, this would mean one thing. It would mean that some people did not pay their licence, if at all, because it was on the radio, in the Press and on TV that licences would not have been renewed at the end of April. The answer to that is that the Government did stop people paying their licence and nobody has got an advantage as far as I know. The second question he asked was whether any instructions had been given to the Police to withhold the issuing of licences during the month of May. As far as I know, the answer to that is "yes". On the question about the number of driving licences, I have not got

the information here, but I will let the hon. member know in due course. When a question is asked, I am prepared to answer, but when you are trying to play

Mr. SPEAKER: To whom is the hon. member speaking?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: That is an aside and not meant for your ears. I will get the information and pass it on to the hon. member. I think I have answered all the questions.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:

AYES: Mr. YEARWOOD; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. LOWE; Mr. CORBIN; Mr. WEEKES and Mr. HOPPIN • 10

NOES: Mr. HINDS; Mr. J. G. M. ADAMS; Mr. SMITH; Mr. ST. JOHN and Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS • 5.

THE MOTOR VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1937

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking that Order No. 6 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking that Order No. 6 be the next Order of the Day, and unless there is any objection, that Order I will next call.

There being no objection, I declare Order No. 6 to be the next Order of the Day, and it 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 in the absence of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to proceed with this Bill in the absence of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Leader of the House to proceed to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill to amend the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act. Its various sections cover the matters mentioned in the Schedule attached to the Bill, and they deal in detail with such matters as driving licences, the authorisation issued by the Commissioner of Police with respect to Learners, some consequential amendments having to do with the powers given to the Courts to suspend driving licences pending determination of certain charges, 5.25 p.m.

The Bill also seeks to amend the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937, in respect of motor vehicles and the rates which embody this Amendment are set out in the various Schedules. Mr. Speaker, perhaps it would be just as well if the House were settled in its mind as to the sort of exercise with which we are engaged this evening. There has been considerable confusion arising out of the last debate and no little irrelevance from the other side. Obviously, the three matters which we are discussing this afternoon - one we have just done, one we are doing now and the one which we will do later - are matters which do have financial implications but that does not make them budgetary matters. If that were the case, then every conceivable issue which is raised in this House and which had financial implications would probably be regarded as a budgetary matter. It is true that in this Bill, reference is made to the tax or the rate of tax which is payable in respect of motor vehicles. That is because these matters for the sake of convenience are to be enshrined in a particular

Act. The Measure is certainly not a financial one as such but the financial act to be administered.

Nobody is saying on this side of the House that certain fiscal and financial implications do not arise. What we are saying is that the contention on the other side that by doing what we are doing this afternoon, we are doing the Budget in a piece-meal manner cannot be supported by the facts. There is no other way in which this administration and these adjustments could be made except by repealing the substantive Acts and, as in the case of the last matter which was dealt with, by bringing in a separate Resolution. Everyone knows that, at least since this Government has been in power, there has been a definite form in which the Budget was presented. As a matter of fact, there was not, or there never had been, a Budget as such until 1962 because there had never been a Minister of Finance. That is a matter of fact. What used to happen in the old days since I have been in this House, and I have been in here from 1954, and Your Honour and other honourable members who have been in this House as long as I have been in here, will recall the fashion in which the financial arrangements were done. At Estimates time, that is to say, sometime in February or March, the custom of the Premier or the Leader of the Government, as the case may be, was to make a statement on the Estimates and say in that statement what it was proposed to enact by way of fiscal legislation to deal with the particular financial adjustments to be made in that year. There was never any thought in those days until 1962 of separating the exercise on the Estimates which is purely expenditure, from expenditure and revenue. There had never been a Minister of Finance until 1962, and I repeat that. The matter of finance was one of the divisions of the Prime Minister's or Premier's Ministry and it never until 1962 had been a separate Ministry of Government by Instrument issued to a Minister to be the Minister of Finance. The Prime Minister is now the Minister of Finance because, he, from time to time, has a separate and distinct Ministry of Finance appointed as such. That must be understood otherwise we will make a lot of unnecessary mistakes.

Mr. Speaker, the second point which I want to make is this: certainly in the last five years we have grown accustomed to a particular manner of presenting the Budget and it has never yet happened since this Government has been in power, that we have separated things from the Budget and brought them down, as the tenor of the arguments on the other side would seem to suggest. Whenever Budget time comes around in any year, all the proposals which are properly to be there, all the fiscal proposals - are presented *en bloc* and that would be done again this year when the time comes. What we have therefore are administrative Regulations and I do not think that we should generate a lot of heat on what is enshrined in two acts of the legislature. It is not just a question of reducing or increasing the rates of tax payable on motor vehicles or on bicycles but whatever you wanted to do, you would have to do it in the way in which we are doing it now - by amending the Act which regulates these matters; so that even if by the time these were passed and it was thought convenient to do what we are now doing, say, at the end of the current year and not now, we would still have had to amend the Act. And all this is well known and I need not labour this point. We would still be open to the argument: "Why you did not do all this when the Budget was before the House?" Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize that if you have measures which are more or less administrative and these are enshrined in an Act of Parliament, the time to make adjustments, to amend or repeal Acts, is the time when you are normally required to collect the fees payable from this exercise. Therefore Sir, if it is in the month of May or June, that you have a licence period and you are going to amend the Act, you cannot wait until the licensing period had started to bring up the Bill. You would have to do that before and give the necessary instructions not to proceed to issue or renew licences at a certain date, but at a date later. You would give a longer notice by saying that you propose to do it in the middle of the financial year or, at the end of it. However, in any case, it would be more convenient to do this at the time when you are going to collect fees than at any other time. The point does not rest on the fact that fees are to be collected or that the fees to be collected are going up or down. The salient point is that this

is the time of the year when it is most conveniently done, therefore when hon. members argue that we are nibbling at the Budget and making two or three bites at it, that is completely outside the point; we are not dealing with a Budgetary matter at all.
5.35 p.m.

Secondly, when they say that the proposed amendment contains financial implications, we admit that this is true. A provision for the payment of fees, or the issuing of licenses, or the payment of taxes, as the case may be, does contain financial implication, and the Statutory Book is crowded with provisions which contain financial implications.

I have never seriously held out that every conceivable provision for the payment of a licence which repeals the former fee paid is a charge on the budget and, therefore, becomes exclusively a financial matter. That is why I say that the point of the hon. member has no substance.

There is another matter on which I would like to say something. The question of increased fees or such things have always been used by opposition parties as a good matter to attack the Government on. When we were in the Opposition, this is the kind of thing which you would attack the Government on, but you attacked them on it because you feel it would more easily appeal to the people. It contained no involved political issue and anything which would cause him to pay more money is something which you would attack the Government on because it was easy for you to make a man believe that the Government is doing something wrong if the Government is asking him to pay more money for something. So from the political point of view, if they do not choose to take a responsible attitude to this matter, we cannot make them, it is left to them.

When the Bills are before us, particularly this one, you become aware that the reference to what is proposed to be done is clearly set out. The first part of the Schedule deals in detail with Motor Cars, Motor Cabs and Motor Cycles. The end of the Schedule refers to Vans, Omnibuses and Lorries, those with four tyres only, those with dual tyres at each end of the rear axle, and four-wheeled two axle tyres which are not pneumatic tyres.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, we are dealing with the Motor Vehicle and Road Traffic Act. You have heard quite a lot of argument today. Because a thing was done in 1937 is no reason why it should not be increased today. You are dealing with a different community, it must be relevant if thirty years have passed that cognizance be taken of what was done and how it relates to things today. If the Opposition when they were in the Government did not think of doing it in the way we are doing it, we think we should have been doing it long ago. If the Opposition had argued that we should not be doing it now, we should have done it long ago and if they had raised that point, it would have been hard to beat.

If you look at the Order Paper of this House and look at the number of questions asked by hon. members that certain matters should be dealt with all over this Island in all categories, if any Government were able to do all those things, then the Capital cost would probably be near four million dollars and the recurrent cost for the extraordinary period would probably be near \$800,000.

The Opposition Party is quite entitled to ask questions for the improvement of anything. When this is pointed out, you must draw the argument that because you are not doing it then, you are not necessarily saying that it should not be done, what you are saying is that the money to do it is needed for other purposes.

You have a situation where nothing has been done for thirty years in this line. It is a situation where a whole generation has grown up and a situation where a whole atmosphere as regards life has improved commensurably since then and I think hon. members had better understand that because you can explain it better to people.

The people of Barbados are in a better position if it is told them and they are made to understand that these improvement of public works have to be paid for.
5.45 p.m.

After all, as the hon. senior member for St. Thomas reminded us, there is great reason for saying or for thinking that for the sake of administrative departmental tidiness, these things can be necessary, and it is our policy. We do not take it from him, but we take it as a point that has been mentioned, and it is a sensible point. It is certainly true that this kind of amendment is more administrative than it is fiscal, but it has fiscal implications in the sense that if you are charging more for a service or for permission to do something now than you charged ten, twenty or thirty years ago, arithmetically more money is coming in, but you are not saying that you are doing this merely because you want more money. You may even wish as in this case to provide more reasonable and more sensible facilities along the highways and among the traffic; so hon. members on the opposite side had better first decide whether this is the kind of issue that it is safe to attack the Government on merely because they are in opposition, or whether it is the kind of issue which is so fair and reasonable that it can commend itself to both sides of the House.

One last point I want to make at this stage. I know that for obvious reasons some hon. members opposite do not like the Prime Minister, and naturally they would lose no opportunity of trying to present the "may say's" or "does" or "does not do" or "does not say" in the worst possible light. This they probably regard as fair game and part of the system of political opposition. Two comments I wish to make on this: first on this specific matter of his not being here to deal with matters now before the House, I would like to say this: this is not Budget time and we are certainly not dealing with budget. We are dealing with two amendments to two Acts and a Resolution arising out of them. If it were budget time or if specific fiscal proposals were before the House, the Minister of Finance would certainly have been here, but there is no need whatever for him to appear, because nothing that is specifically financial is before us; nothing that is specifically fiscal is before us.

Secondly I would add to that point too that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition well understands this, although he may not care to say that he agrees with me, because he himself has done something here today which proves my point. He has given notice of a question specifically addressed to the Prime Minister, and when the time comes for that to be answered, or for any other question addressed to the Prime Minister to be answered, the Prime Minister will be present, and the House will have no fear of his not being present to answer any question or take part in any debate which specifically concerns him, and therefore the question of his being present here on a matter which is, a routine repeal of two Bills just does not arise.

I do not think the Prime Minister minds what they think about him or what they say about him, but in fairness to themselves and to make everybody understand that they understand the customs and functions of Parliament, I think they should desist from this unfortunate reference which they make which is not based on any Parliamentary fact. Long before the hon. senior member for St. Thomas came into this House, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph in 1964, I think, raised this matter, and not only did you, Mr. Speaker, answer the hon. member then, pointing out what the practice was not only in the United Kingdom Parliament but in every Parliament in respect of the attendance of the Prime Minister and senior Ministers, but a then member of the House who is no longer with us, the recent hon. senior member for St. Philip, Mr. Crawford, on this side as he was then, answered the point made by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph as he was then.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I would like the hon. member to be more specific. He said I asked some question, but up to now he has not said what question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps the Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition would repeat that.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The hon. member has made reference to me, but he has not said what he was referring to. I heard the year 1964; I was not here in this House in 1964. What is the point he is making? What is he accusing me of?

Mr. SPEAKER: Surely the hon. member has not yet stated on what point of interruption he has risen.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order, the hon. member said I asked something to which Your Honour gave me an answer, yet up to now he has not said what that something was, because he has put me in a position where I had to be corrected apparently. If I did something wrong, surely I am entitled to be told what that something is.

Mr. SPEAKER: All of us have to be corrected from time to time, but what I understood the Hon. Leader of the House to say was that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph apropos 1964. I heard him call no name, and I take it he referred to whomsoever was in 1964 the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I can set the hon. member's mind at rest. I did make mention of him in the first part of what I said. I said today in reference to him that he did put a question addressed to the Prime Minister, and quite probably the Prime Minister, when the time comes for the question to be answered, will appear and answer. He will answer any question addressed to him or take part in any debate in which his Ministry or Ministries are personally involved. I then went on to say that in 1964 before the hon. senior member for St. Thomas was a member of this House, the then junior member for St. Joseph in the last House which is of course the now senior member, raised after a Budget Speech the same sort of question about the absence of the Minister of Finance which has been raised today, and that Your Honour from the Chair and the recent hon. senior member for St. Philip both answered the point effectively. That is all I said.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is anything more to say. If specific questions are asked, naturally I shall be pleased to answer them. I will draw hon. members' attention to the Schedule, where the amendments are set out, because I suppose it is on that you will make most comment.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.
5.55 p.m.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS and Mr. ST. JOHN rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Thomas caught my eye first. Is the hon. member giving way to the hon. senior member for Christ Church?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I was about to give way to the hon. senior member for Christ Church.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member can give way to the hon. senior member for Christ Church if he so wishes.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am going to make my speech at this stage, especially as I want to make a very brief reply to the Hon. Minister who has just sat down. I want to start off by replying to the last part of the Minister's speech that I heard dealing with the behaviour of the Prime Minister as regards this House. I will just remind the Minister that quite apart from the constitutional niceties in a Parliament with 625 members which administer great world-wide important matters - there are departmental bodies which administer the affairs of a country part of which is equivalent to the whole of the Budget of Barbados for ten years. There are Governments in which officials administer Budgets of four to five million pounds, quite apart from the call on the Ministers' time. One of the points which I have made was a particular instance and I regret that the Hon. Leader of the House has not taken the

opportunity to answer that. I particularised that the Financial Administration and Audit Act requires the attendance of the Minister of Finance on the presentation of the Estimates. That is a matter of law, and if we say that he is acting unconstitutionally and illegally, we have some basis for that. If the Hon. Leader of the House had answered that point, then I think he would have achieved something.

I am going to say this now even if it surprises the Minister. I quite appreciate what he said about bringing things up to date since 1937. If that is honest and straightforward - I am not suggesting that there is any dishonesty, but if that is a straightforward reason given by the Minister, then the matter might be looked at in a different light; but if it is going to be treated as a taxation matter, then my objection to a former Resolution is in force where this Bill is concerned. This Bill deals with regularising the position with respect to learner drivers. This is a matter of great difficulty as anybody who practices in the Law Courts will know. Barbados has several things in the Act which do not exist in other places that I have seen in respect of the issue of driving licences. I refer to Section 31 of the Act which sets out certain restrictions and on the grant of driving licences. In Barbados there is a little Addendum at the end of Section 31 (1) which says this: Perhaps I should read the whole Section. This is what it says:-

"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 licence and that the applicant is of good character."

I am making a strong appeal to the Minister responsible to consider the implications of that Section. I refer to the words occurring at the end of the Sub-section: "And that the applicant is of good character." This Act is being amended at this time and I take it that the entire Act comes under the ambit of parliamentary discussion. I am suggesting that while Sections 28 and 31 are being amended, the Minister responsible should give careful consideration to this matter. In an Act which requires the fitness of an applicant, you have a coach and horse driving through it and permission is given to the Commissioner of Police to usurp the functions of Courts in deciding if and when a person's record entitles him to be given a driving licence. We are being asked today to agree to this iniquitous position that the Commissioner of Police can exercise his authority in respect of a person who is going to learn to drive a motor vehicle. If the Commissioner of Police does not want a particular person to learn to drive a motor vehicle he can say: "you stole a goat when you were a boy and therefore you cannot have a licence to drive." I have deliberately said that. The Commissioner of Police can say that that person stole a goat when he was a boy and therefore we will not give him permission to learn to drive. I understood that that is the only case where a man was not given permission to drive. I was there and I heard it. This House is being asked not only to continue a state of affairs in which a man can be punished by the Police after the punishment of the Court has expired, but we are asked to put it into the hands of the Commissioner of Police to stop a man from getting a licence to drive if he has some reason for penalising him. That is not power to be put into the hands of the Commissioner of Police and it is not power by reference to the Minister. This is a straightforward usurpation of the power of the Court.

A man may have a conviction against him and he tries to go straight; he learns to drive. Perhaps he has a driving conviction and he gets another. It is clearly observed that the Police have never exercised this power - perhaps I should say that they should hardly exercise this power except after a man has been disqualified from driving. The Court imposes some period of disqualification against a driver and when he goes back for his licence, the Commissioner of Police says: "I will not give you back any licence." In some cases I have heard the Commissioner of Police or somebody in authority say that he took into account the applicant's driving conviction when he decided not to give him back his licence. Some Commissioners of Police have refused to permit people to learn to drive because of what

they describe as their past record, but there has never been any statutory authority for that.
6.05 p.m.

In another case, a man was given permission to learn to drive a bus but the inspector told him that the Commissioner is not going to give you a licence to drive. I have known the case of a man who took the trouble of travelling to St. Lucia from where he obtained a licence. I see the man driving now.

In these provisions, you give a man the right to appeal from the Commissioner of Police to a Police Magistrate but an appeal from the Commissioner of Police to a Police Magistrate is no more than an appeal from Caesar to Caesar.

I would ask the Hon. Minister to consider very seriously whether in the Barbados of 1967, the Police should have power to decide who should have a driving licence and to prevent a man from having a driving licence.

It is done no doubt to keep drivers in line. But, a man who has gone over the line may become reformed. This is a threat. I will defy anybody that the provisions are administered in a democratic way. There is a man who had over one hundred convictions who was given a driving licence and a short time after, he found himself defending a case in a court of law. I understand that he has a driving licence again. I was questioned whether he is the person who drives the Democratic Labour Party's van.

It is clear from a true analysis of Section 31 that it is really done to give the Commissioner of Police the right to stop certain people from getting a licence.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works has indicated that he has something to say but I think that he has the opportunity to speak later. I thought that he would give the assurance that he was going to take out the words "especially for licence drivers".

Now, Sir, there is too much patch-work legislation coming to this House nowadays. There is a right way and a wrong way. There is evidence of confusion at the top. We had an amendment to the Motor Vehicle and Road Traffic Regulation already this year and the same regulation has to be amended at the same point so as to increase the fees for learners. If a comprehensive look was taken at certain statutes with a view of effecting all the changes which you have in mind at one time, and in this case if they had thought on the last occasion that they should make charges for learners, the Hon. Minister of Communications would have had a much easier time on the last occasion this Act was amended than what he has today.

Mr. Speaker, I had come to the House with the feeling that this would be dealt with as a taxation measure but I see that a lot of the argument is that it is only a proposal to increase the rates payable on motor cars, taxis, motor cycles and other motor vehicles.

I hope that this Government or any succeeding Government would never do what has been done today in bringing in a Bill to increase the rates of taxes on Motor Vehicles without setting out the reason for the increase or stating that it is for the purpose of improvement of roads. I know that in Britain in 1930 or 1931, they set up a Road Fund for the improvement of roads and within a few years the fund had reached many million pounds.
6.15 p.m.

I hope if the Ministers have in mind to encourage us to vote for the Bill on the grounds of getting better roads or paying a bit more for the cars, that they will not treat motorists as cows to be milked forever, that they will keep increases at a level where they can say that motor car taxation is meeting the expenditure on the roads, because it is recognised that in modern days to possess a motor car, the hon. Junior member for St. Andrew notwithstanding, is not a luxury, but it is something at which every family should aim, it is a part of the standard of living to which we hope everybody will aspire, and if it was a luxury in the past, it has ceased to be a luxury, and once it is recognised to be one of the amenities of life like a house, elec-

tricity, water and so on, I hope we will get expenditure on the roads which will match the receipts coming in from the vehicle licences.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, there are a few matters that I would like to draw to the attention of the House in dealing with this Bill. It has been said on the other side that there is a serious confusion in the minds of members on this side of the House as to whether this is a budgetary matter or a matter of such financial consequence as to regard it as such. I think, Sir, that a casual look at the Order Paper today will show in whose name this Bill was to be introduced together with a look at the Bill itself, and a comparison of a Bill and the proposed amendments to the general provisions of the Road Traffic Act would be sufficient to clarify the mind of any person at all that the main object and purport of this Bill is to increase the revenue of Government which is now being derived from the ownership and the use of a motor vehicle.

Now, Sir, why I say that is because even in the Objects and Reasons themselves it is pointed out that at the present moment there is no charge for the issue of "learners" permits, and it is considered desirable to impose such a charge. It is also pointed out in the amendment to the Schedule that it is considered desirable that there should be increases with effect from 1st June, 1967, and that the rates have remained unchanged since 1937. Now why is it considered desirable? It has been argued on the other side in a similar Bill that roads have been improved, that costs have gone up and that these fees had been fixed since thirty years ago. While it may be true to say that this is so, let us not forget that this is only a part of the total taxation which falls upon the ownership and use of a motor vehicle. Perhaps the most onerous part of the taxation on the ownership and use of a motor vehicle, comes from the tax on petroleum and petroleum products which are used in the operation. Let us not also forget that there has been a tremendous increase in the number of vehicles which are in Barbados today in the several parishes as opposed to those that were there previously; so that the administrative cost of collecting any revenue will in my submission be bound to be reduced considerably, because the greater turnover in the number of vehicles, the greater amount of tax at the existing rate which would be derived to the Treasury. I may say, Sir, that it is positively clear that when one takes into account these factors, it is nothing but a piecemeal attempt by the Government to introduce part of their budget in here today; and any suggestion that we on this side of the House do not understand what we are talking about can only be treated with the contempt which it deserves.

Sir, the point has been made in here that since this is not a financial matter the Minister of Finance does not have to be here, but as was pointed out by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, such is the manner in which the Minister of Finance regards this House, that he is prepared not only not to come in here to deal with financial matters, he is prepared to treat this House in a contemptuous manner. It is not only a breach of the Finance and Audit Act, but it is a breach of Section 109 of the Constitution which is the fundamental law of Barbados which says that the Minister responsible for finance shall in respect of each financial year at the earliest convenient moment before the commencement of the financial year introduce in the House of Assembly an Appropriation Bill containing under proper heads for the several services required the estimated aggregate sums which are proposed to be expended otherwise than by way of statutory expenditure during that financial year. It is positively clear that the whole spirit and intent in the Constitution is that the Minister of Finance must come before the House and introduce an Appropriation Bill in all its stages. That is the position as it is there in the Constitution. That is why we have to adopt the attitude that we are adopting on this side, because we know that there is a gap between the expenditure and the revenue as explained in the Estimates, and that gap has got to be met. How is it being met? It is being met in this piecemeal fashion instead of having a comprehensive finance Bill, and this is where I am going to deal with the customarily misleading speech of the Introducer of this

customarily misleading speech of the Introducer of this matter.

In the House of Commons in England, before an Appropriation Bill is passed, a budget is presented and in addition there is a comprehensive Bill called the Finance Bill, and we do not have anything like that here in Barbados, and that is why in the past when the Appropriation Bill was being dealt with, as commonsense would dictate to any person, at that time you said this is what we propose to spend, existing taxation raises this, and we propose to make up the deficit by introducing subsequently before this Legislature various Bills which will in our opinion make up the difference, or we propose to have a deficit. That is why it is done so; so to suggest that it is only since 1962 we have had a Minister of Finance and therefore we have had a Budget is in my humble opinion the essence of confusion and misunderstanding of the situation as existing today. What we have had since 1962 is a contempt for the public and the people of this Island as to the true state of the financial affairs of this country. We have had mis-information being given, we have had misuse of votes and none of us can check these things accurately.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member must realise that he is well outside the bounds of Parliamentary propriety. Not only is what he is saying not fact, but the hon. member to whom he is referring is not now in his place, and to say therefore that there has been mis-use of votes is a very serious charge which I deny categorically. Furthermore, Sir, I should like to say that it ill becomes members of the Opposition to talk about this, because we have had experience, factual experience in former Parliaments of the very thing he is accusing us of and of which we are innocent.

6.25 p.m.

Surely if they feel that there is anything wrong with the financial position, they must investigate. There is a Public Accounts Committee of which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is the Chairman, and whenever he thinks fit he can set it to work.

Mr. St. JOHN: I was saying, Sir, that there has been mispending and misuse of votes for purposes which were not clearly explained when they were brought down here in this House. I am glad that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy has seen fit to introduce the Public Accounts Committee in this House because the Auditor General has written a letter to Your Honour saying that he is unable to present the Report for the last financial year because the Departments of Government have not sent in their Reports. The Minister should regard that as a breach of financial integrity in this country and he should see that these Departments send in those Reports immediately. The Minister's own Ministry, the Ministry of Education, is one of the financial ones, and the Ministry of Communications and Works is also one of the financial ones. The letter which was written by the Auditor General sets out that the law requires that this Report is to be presented not later than December in each financial year. I see that the Minister of Agriculture is nodding his head. The hon. member will understand exactly what I am talking about - the combination of laxity in financial matters which is taking place in this country. That is why we must raise these things in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am at a great disadvantage in this debate because I have not been provided with a copy of the Bill which is before the House. My information is that only 23 copies were provided - none for the Clerk and none for the Speaker. I am not in a position to say whether the hon. member is going outside the bounds of this Bill or not. I have never been so greatly handicapped as I am now.

Mr. St. JOHN: Your Honour's handicap shows the grave financial position in which the island is. The island is so broke and so short of money that Your Honour cannot have a copy of the Bill with which we are now dealing.

Mr. SPEAKER: That will also account for the absence of Minutes and other things. That is another reason why things are not up to date as I hope they will soon become.

Mr. St. JOHN: What we on this side of the House want to know quite clearly is this: It is of no use saying that this is an administrative matter, because it is more than that. It is part and parcel of the amounts which the Government intend to use to close the gap between the projected expenditure for this year and the projected revenue on the existing rates of taxation. Sir, I feel that it would be incumbent upon the Introducer of this Resolution to tell us what the existing state of revenue is under the existing charges which they now seek to amend, and what is the projected revenue under the amended charges when they are brought into effect. I feel that this is a piece of information which, out of common courtesy, should be given to the House. Then and only then can we be able in our minds to exercise our duty towards the several people whom we, on this side, represent and see whether the totality of the burden of taxation is too great or too little.

Some hon. members have raised the question about the existing Road Traffic Act but this is not an attempt by the Government to consider the Road Traffic Act in its entirety. I do not believe that the relevant Ministry has seen much of this legislation at all. This was done purely by the Financial Ministry and the Legal Draughtsman. I do not believe that the Minister of Communications had anything to do with the principle of the Bill otherwise they would have thought of bringing down a comprehensive Amendment to the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act to deal with the points raised in particular by the Minister of Communications, the problems of accidents which arise today as a result of the traffic on the highways and things of that kind. They would have introduced an Amendment which was found necessary in most of the other Commonwealth countries by creating a specific offence which causes death by careless driving. In these countries if a person is killed, the police bring a case of manslaughter but the jurors are killers themselves and they adopt the attitude that today is for you, tomorrow is for me and they are too haphazard as regards charges of manslaughter. The penalty should be increased and that has been proved to be an effective means of dealing with the situation where a person loses his life as a result of an accident because of the bad use of a motor vehicle. That is what the Minister of Communications would have put up if he had had the opportunity of looking at this Bill. He would have seen that the penalty for driving dangerously in Barbados today, a penalty which was fixed as long ago as 1937, is a fine of £10 or 3 months' imprisonment. (Mr. SPEAKER: £10 and/or 3 months' imprisonment). It is a case of low penalties in respect of serious accidents which appear to be on the rise in Barbados and I believe it is a case for concern on the other side.

We had thought that in this exercise we would have had our attention engaged with such allied matters as insurance for third parties. The taxation aspect of the matter is purely a budgetary matter. That, in my submission, is the only way in which we can look at this matter - it is part and parcel of the Government's budgetary means, it is part and parcel of the fiscal step which the Government will take to meet that gap which is missing from the losses of the Treasury which have come from the operation of the Barbados Marketing Corporation, the Hilton Hotel and the high cost of overseas representation which is far in excess of what was anticipated.

6.35 p.m.

The Hon. Minister said that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas talked about their spending \$2 million on roads. Let us not forget this. How much money the taxes on Motor Vehicles bring in? I am in a position to show that two of the provisions of these taxes are far in excess of the amount of money which they spend on roads.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I shall be fairly brief. The hon. senior member for Christ Church and other members of the Opposition have dealt with most of the points that should have been raised.

It is amazing that the Hon. Leader of the House should say that the mere fact of raising this money is because the fees have been raised since 1967 and it is not a financial matter. I am speaking of the implications. This is a direct enactment to raise money.

The trouble in this debate and the previous one is that the Ministers are not agreed in saying that this is a measure brought in for general taxation. I ask the Hon. Leader of the House not to continue to make a very rash statement which have no foundation of fact. Look how you are asking for better roads! The hon. member must not do that, he must not make these rash statements. It does not matter to us what sort of reputation he gets for doing that. However it is not fair to Barbados. The Hon. Prime Minister came in here and said 'here is my lieutenant'. The people are looking to it that the Hon. Leader of the House, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, is the Prime Minister's lieutenant.

Apart from the pronouncements of the Minister, there are other inaccuracies. I would say that a child in a school for backward children would not use that statement. He said that the Government had offered the Church a sum greater than that offered by the B.L.P. Government. He did not know if they did that because there was no Minister of Education. Can anybody make a more illogical statement than that? The only way this could impress its members is if he was talking to people who could not think.

Let the hon. member stop that and I am thinking not only of his colleagues sitting down around there, I am appealing to him to stop it for the sake of the Government and for the sake of the country.

He did not know that the Prime Minister was in here but in speaking, he went on making excuses.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, what is the Hon. Leader of the Opposition speaking on?

Mr. SPEAKER: What the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is saying is not relevant to the matter under discussion. I have allowed passing reference to certain things but the hon. member should not go into something which happened sometime ago and which has nothing to do with the motion under discussion.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am making a reply to the speech made by the Hon. Leader of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is perfectly in order to explain something but it is out of order to refer to a previous debate that has nothing to do with the debate which is now under discussion.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that they do not reply to things to which they should reply. I am pointing out that we do not have any time for matters extraneous to what we are doing in the House. We do not attack for the sake of attacking.

But when the hon. member comes in this House with matters like this that is so plainly matters of finance and try to defend it in this way, it is not doing this Government any good. Is it a fact that the hon. member does these things just because he is always anxious to score off the Opposition? I do not want to go too far, therefore, I would not say more than that.
6.45 p.m.

The hon. member was at pains to mention the Leader of the Opposition being Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. So as not to go too far at this point, I would not say more on this. The hon. member at any rate can answer this; why did the Public Accounts Committee not meet in the previous Session? As far as trying to put me on the spot is concerned, does not the hon. member know that I rejoice at the fact that precedence was there that the Leader of the Opposition was Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee? Does he think that any prize has fallen into my lap greater than that for years and years? Does he think I would not investigate and do not intend to investigate everything? I have been told by the Accountant General that I cannot summon a meeting. I even tried before 31st March, but I was told nothing will be ready; this year's accounts will not be ready yet, and like the previous member who spoke, I was reminded that Your Honour had a letter about the

Departments which had not done anything. Do not think for one half-second I am not going into public accounts as scrupulously and carefully as any human being ever went into accounts. I wonder if I am going to get from the Public Accounts Committee the Hilton Hotel Accounts. I realise, Mr. Speaker, as I said that, that I should not go any further.

Mr. SPEAKER: I heard the Hon. Leader of the Opposition say he wondered, but unfortunately he wondered aloud and we all heard.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I apologise. I will say no more than that. Trying to suggest that we are not doing our duty, and specifically referring to me as being Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee is something you ought to be sorry about and not try to throw at me that I am not doing my duty. You will see when I do my duty what will happen.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I should like to reply on behalf of the Government just for the information of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. He raised, I think, two or three pertinent points about people going for licences at the discretion of the Commissioner of Police. As he would know, this is an old relic of the horse and buggy days. I do agree that something has to be done about that, and the Government is seriously considering bringing legislation to the House. I think the hon. member understands what I am saying.

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

On the 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 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this be the Schedule.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, under this Schedule, there are a few things which come to my notice. One thing we know is that part of the taxes from motor vehicles is used for registration purposes to ensure that a perfect record is kept of the vehicles, and part of it is also used for Highways, Police and the like, but we see here in this Schedule that for weight unladen, the owner of a motor car not exceeding 15 cwt. will now pay \$21.50, and in the case of a motor cab he will be called upon to pay \$33.00. What I would like to draw to the attention of the House is that it is not merely \$21.50 for a motorcar and \$33.00 for a motorcab; it is the increase that has brought this figure about. In the case of a private motor car not exceeding 15 cwt, the present rate or tax is \$18.00. That now goes to \$21.50, and a motor cab which was \$27.00 now goes to \$33.00. In the case of a motor car exceeding 15 cwt, but not exceeding 16 cwt, the tax goes from \$19.20 to \$23.00, while a motor cab goes from \$28.80 to \$35. Similarly for a vehicle exceeding 16 cwt, but not exceeding 17 cwt, it is increased from \$20.40 to \$24.50 in the case of a car, and from \$30.80 to \$37.00 in the case of a motor cab.
6.55 p.m.

Let us go a little further down the line and you will see a motor car exceeding 22 cwt but not exceeding 23 cwt, \$35.00. The motor car owner is now paying \$28.80 per year. This Schedule does not give us these figures which I have been able to read out in this House. It only tells us what these persons are now going to pay, but I am in a position to bring hon. members up to date so that they can understand what is the true position. If your motor car does not exceed 23 cwt, you were required to pay \$28.80 but you are now asked to pay \$35.00. In the case of a taxi owner who has been paying \$43.20, on the principle of this new rate, he has got to pay \$51.00. That is the poor taxi driver whom you see down there in the stand. I want to tell the introducer of this Bill that the taxi driver is already saddled with paying comprehensive insurance. He has to pay his

inspection fee and that has already been increased. The fee for his driving licence has been increased. The tax on the vehicle is now increased and very soon we will not be surprised if the price of the gasoline is increased. That is the trouble with the poor taxi driver. We know that some of them have to ply day in and day out, night in and night out except when a tourist boat comes in and we know who gets the bulk of the trade. Where the owner of the vehicle was paying \$43.20 he has now got to pay \$51.00. Some of these vehicles are in the heavy weight class.

As you know, Sir, the taxi driver must have a vehicle on the road and it must bear a certain attraction. The taxi driver is in a very highly competitive field and he has to have a posh car on the road. You will find that if his vehicle happens to fall in a weight not exceeding 32 cwt., where he has been paying \$63.00 in the past, he has now got to pay \$73.00, which is an increase of \$10.00. That is what is done with the poor taxi owner. In the case of a private vehicle not exceeding 32 cwt. he now pays \$42.00 but he will now be called upon to pay \$51.50. Sir, all along the Schedule it goes and the taxi driver whose vehicle is in a weight not exceeding 40 cwt. and who now finds himself paying \$63.00, he goes to \$73.00 and there is a general increase of \$10.00 per vehicle from the time it approaches a weight not exceeding 32 cwt. For the private motor car not exceeding 32 cwt. it goes from \$42.00 to \$51.50. Not exceeding 34 cwt it goes from \$44.40 to \$54.50. In the case of a private motor vehicle not exceeding 36 cwt. it goes from \$48.00 to \$59.00 and if it falls under 39 cwt where the owner now pays \$51.60 he has to look for \$63.50. It goes from \$57.60 to \$11.00 where the private motor car does not exceed 40 cwt.

The hon. Introducer of this Bill knows very well that this is an attempt to run the taxi owners off the road, at least, quite a number of them. The big garages can take care of themselves. The small taxi owners have been finding it very difficult in the past. If this Government had any real sense of business all they needed to do, and we would support them, would be to have allowed the taxes to remain as they were except in the case of administrative Boards. The cost of printing records, books, certificates and the like, has been increased, and because of that we would be quite willing to support a small increase for that purpose; but this is an attempt at raising money for what purpose? Sir, not even the introducer of this Bill can really say; he just does not know. However, Sir, we are warning them that they must bear in mind the injury which they are doing not only to the private motor car owner and even in the case of the private motor car owner, there are some young men and women who have just taken up jobs but there is the question of the difficulty which they have in getting to and from their work by the transport which is provided by the Government. Because of the long hours of waiting at the bus stops and the difficulty in returning to their homes these people find that they have got to strain themselves and purchase little vehicles in order to get them going to and fro.
7.05 p.m.

What do you find now, Sir? You find that the poor car owner, the small income man, has run himself into debt in order to get a car. He has a wife and himself and probably children. Now, he has put himself in debt and now he finds that instead of his budgeting to pay \$28.80 for the car licence he has to pay \$36.00. Where a man was paying \$36.00, he has to pay now \$44.

We had always thought that the increase in taxes would have been levied on gasoline because it is thought that that is a more equitable way of financing road building or whatever project it is to be done because if a person owns a car or a motor vehicle, according to this Schedule whether a car goes on the highways or not, the owner has to pay taxes on it. That is why we feel that there should be a nominal fee but if a person uses his car, it would mean that it would consume more gasoline than a car that is kept in the garage and the more you use it, the more gasoline it would consume, whether you use it for leisure or pleasure the more gasoline you would consume, so the more you would have to pay.

Instead of that, they come here and as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said when he was speaking on another Resolution, they are going to collect more money from the people than what they are going to do by way of constructing more roads or what ever project they have in mind.

The Hon. Minister said that there is a type of vehicle called "Honda". He did not say that the "Honda" is a killer but what we gather is that when you ride a "Honda" anything can happen. The tax on a motor cycle was \$7.20 but it is now raised to \$9.00. Let us see whether the Hon. Minister is really serious about these motor cycles and reducing accidents or doing anything about it at all in any respect. All he says is that there is a type of vehicle called "Honda" which is on the road now, and you find that the tax on these motor cycles which used to be \$7.20 before is now \$9.00. The raise in tax of \$1.80 on a motor cycle is nothing to prevent anybody from getting one.

If these motor cyclists were causing this lot of trouble, if they were being involved in a lot of accidents and causing a lot of road deaths, you would have thought that they would have said that they need more money to conduct a special type of vigilance campaign run against them for let us say three or six months and because of that there was going to be advertising about it in newspapers and by other means. But we have heard nothing of the sort.

The Hon. Minister referred to irresponsible youngsters and their riding looking for something to happen. I know from my own experience that there are a lot of cheap motor cycles on the road. If you are really serious and want to do something to keep these people who ride motor cycles in check, if you are using the money from this tax as a means of keeping down the rate of accidents, you would have raised the fee on motor cycles much more than that. The Hon. Minister said that we are using this money from these taxes as a means of stamping out some of these accidents.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I never in my speech said anything about taxes being a means of stamping out accidents as the hon. member has said.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I think where the Hon. Minister and I may differ is that while the Minister was making his speech he laid emphasis on taxes but by the time the Resolution was ready to go to the vote, the Hon. Minister changed his tongue and talked of collecting fees.
7.15 p.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I never laid any emphasis on taxes, because taxation is a matter for the Minister of Finance.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, as far as I can gather, it does not matter what the Minister is driving at.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to remind the hon. member that in my opinion a second reading speech is now being made by him, and he is not confining himself to the Schedule. I will therefore ask him to confine himself to the Schedule.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I said that there was a difference between the hon. member and myself as to the understanding of what was collecting fees, and what were taxes as mentioned in his speech, and he is going to bring me to the point of other hon. members not understanding what is meant by the word "Schedule".

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If you were to look at the Schedule, you will see that it defines the amount you have to pay. You had an opportunity to deal with whatever you needed to deal with in the second reading speech.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I know you are just back from England. Under the Heading "motor cycles" I see that an owner who paid \$7.20 will now pay \$9.00, and for those with a car attached when not used for industrial

purposes the increase is from \$9.60 to \$12.00. If a car is going to be used for industrial purposes the increase is from \$21.60 to \$26.00. I will say, Mr. Chairman, that if one of the compelling reasons for seeking to have this increase was to reduce the number of road deaths involving motor cycles, the tax should have been increased to such a figure as to bear some relation to the seriousness of the offences or the number of road accidents they cause.

With respect to vans, omnibuses and lorries, I had to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works some time in the past that there were certain qualifications applied by the Department of Highways and Transport, more so by the Department of Transport, to vehicles using the highways of this Island, but that such qualifications were illegal. In other words, these qualifications were nowhere to be found in any of the Statutes relating to the Motor vehicles and road traffic in this Island. With respect to four wheeled (2 axle) vehicles equipped for purposes of propulsion with four tyres only, I am going to be ultra-cautious in making mention under this part of the Schedule, for the simple reason that I do not intend to say anything that would cause the Minister or his Ministry to set about doing any research and so cause a number of people to suffer. The Minister undoubtedly knows what section of the public I am referring to. Let us turn now to six wheeled (3 axle) vehicles. The motor Vehicle and Road Traffic Act, 1937 (1937-16) made provision for vehicles up to 7 1/2 tons and not exceeding 8 tons to pay \$76.80, but today they have to pay \$9500.

Now there are plans to mechanise the sugar industry. You know the good old cane-blade talk. Provision is now being made for a vehicle exceeding 8 tons but not exceeding 8 1/2 tons to pay \$101, and for 8 1/2 tons but not exceeding 9 tons it is \$107.
7.25 p.m.

Vehicles exceeding 8 1/2 tons but not exceeding 9 tons the fee is now \$107.00. My view is this. If you are in the sugar industry where you are getting the canes burnt or otherwise, with this excessive number of cane fires or whatever it might be, whatever the position is, if you own this type of vehicle and you are called upon to pay \$107, it is alright where we are concerned. You have these heavy commercial vehicles and the opportunity is being seized to get some money in. But, Sir, let us come down to the last item in the Schedule on page four of this Bill. That item deals with plantation carts. I think I am correct in saying that my information is, and I would like the hon. member to correct me if I am wrong, that they pay \$7.20. I do not know if it is because some people seem to hate to see cane blades and they hate to see plantation carts; but they now have to pay \$30.00 coming from \$7.20. Surely there should be some explanation about this matter. We are not saying that \$7.20 might have been too little, but we hope that in arriving at \$30.00 they were not motivated by any attempt at removing the cane blades in the sugar industry or anything else.

SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS: How in the name of Heavens, Sir, can we sit down and consider this matter without the knowledge of what the present rates are? What is the good of saying what the present rates are? What is the good of saying what you propose to do except we know what the present rates are? I am suggesting to the hon. member that he postpone this matter until next Tuesday. How can any of us say that this is too high an increase or too great an increase or not? If we postpone the consideration of this matter until Tuesday, we will still be in the financial year. I am not blaming the hon. member who introduced this Bill; probably it was pushed into his hands just because he is the Minister of Communications. Whoever prepared this Bill was in a wonderland atmosphere. Imagine telling us about increased rates without telling us what they were originally? If we postpone this matter until Tuesday, then we will get the figures through another authority from which we can get them, and then we will be in a position to speak on the matter. The hon. member who has just sat down is the only hon. member who is in a position to speak on this matter as having the figures.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I do not want to prolong the debate. I told the hon. member who has just sat down that I only received my copy of this Bill late yesterday afternoon and I took it home to read it and while perusing it I fell asleep. This morning I woke up and forgot it at home and I had to borrow this copy. When I telephoned the office to see if I could get a copy of the Bill I was informed that there were no copies down here. I, too, would appeal to the Minister that he should postpone this matter until Tuesday. If he cannot do that, I do not know what to say. I will wait to hear what the Minister has to say. If the Minister will not postpone it, then I will have to talk. The Hon. Minister and his colleagues may have been dealing with this matter since last year, but hon. members on this side of the House only had it from yesterday. If the Hon. Minister will accept a postponement of this matter then I will take my seat; if he cannot do that, then I will have to talk. (A MEMBER: You can talk). It does not appear as if the Minister will take me on so I will have to take him on.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Schedule stand part

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I was just awaiting the Minister and you are not prepared to give me a chance. If hon. members down there will not behave themselves I will behave badly.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am appealing to the hon. member to address the Chair.

Mr. SMITH: Appeal to those hon. members first. In this Schedule, Sir, you will notice that in one column you have the words "Exceeding Cwt.", and in the next column you have the words "not exceeding Cwt." You have in the third column the words "Motor car", \$21.50; and in the fourth column you have the words "Motor cab", \$33.00, and it goes right down the line like that. Again, the same argument will arise. The preparation of this Schedule is only to throw sand in our eyes because I, personally, do not know what are the present rates. I did not have any time to check on it so as to know the necessary increases.
7.35 p.m.

That is a fact; it is not good enough and if we have to vote against it, it would be on those grounds. It should be clearly pointed out to us.

First of all, we should know how many vehicles there are and what is the estimated increase and things of that sort. We cannot sit here and vote for a document of this kind without knowing the facts. I doubt if the hon. introducer of this Resolution knows how many vehicles there are. We should know how many vehicles there are as well as we should know what this increase is expected to bring in. As a matter of fact you should know how many vehicles there are in each parish. It would be good information for everybody, the Press and all people. Instead of that all that we are told is that a motor car not exceeding 15 cwt will have to pay \$21.50 and a motor cab of that weight will have to pay \$33.00. A motor car not exceeding 16 cwt will have to pay \$23.00 and a motor cab of that weight will have to pay \$35.00. We should be told how this money from this tax would be used. The public should be told. It is not good enough.

One of the speakers referred to taxi drivers and tried to plead the taxi drivers case. I do not think the case of the taxi drivers needs any support. As a matter of fact I do not think the hon. member knows that 95% of these taxi drivers are supporters of the D.L.P. Around independence time you could have seen how many of these taxi drivers were members of the D.L.P. from the number plates on their taxis. As one driver told me, if I were in your Government, nothing of this sort could happen. I know that the Government wants a lot of money. These taxi drivers only got two weeks work with the Government at that time but the Government has to get back all this money. They have all this time to get it back, at least, for another four or five years until we get back into power.

I do not have to plead the taxi drivers' case. They had the Government's nice money for about two weeks so the Government must get back something out of it. Whenever the Government put on money on the wages or salaries of people, they have to get back something out of it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, from the way in which this document is prepared, I cannot support it. I am not in a position to know how much would be the resultant revenue.

The last time this Government increased the price of a gill of rum by four cents

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I see nothing here about a gill of rum.

Mr. SMITH: Now, Sir, when this Government carried the price of rum up, you had to pay four cents more for half gill of rum. That is why I am of the opinion that the way in which these increases are made today, the Government is fleecing these people in order to collect more taxes. They say that it would be for this purpose and then they would spend it another way.

Now, Sir, that is why I brought an example. It happened already and it can happen again. I do not know what I would be voting for if I vote for this in this way. I do not know if hon. members on the other side know the reason. Just now some blind-eyed puppy talked about.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Chairman, I will ask the hon. member to withdraw that remark. I was the person who made that statement.

Mr. SMITH: To whom am I referring, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You were referring to the Hon. Minister. I am asking the hon. member to withdraw the words "blind-eyed puppy".

Mr. SMITH: Whom did I call a "blind eyed puppy"?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. member to withdraw the words "blind-eyed puppy".

Mr. SMITH: I have not called any person a "blind-eyed puppy".

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Objection has been taken to the use of the words "blind-eyed puppy", and I am asking you to withdraw those words.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: On a point of order. Name him.

Mr. SMITH: When I get named, I am going up to Fix-it-Right.

However, Sir, when you want me to withdraw the words "blind-eyed puppy" I respectfully do so but at the same time I do not live out of being a pilot. I do not have to go around to take out anybody.
7.45 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Now, Sir, as I was saying, I can afford to stand up here or anywhere and talk, because no one has any secrets for me. You can tell me anything honestly, thank heavens for it. Sir, I am supposed to be unhappy about Resolutions and Bills of this nature coming at this time of the year which make increases without any kind of explanation. We were told that if these were taxes, the Minister of Finance would have been here. If I am not mistaken, this is No. 6 Order standing in the name of Hon. E. W. Barrow: Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act. Now, Sir, if it is not his concern, why did the Hon. Introducer ask for leave to deal with it? What is the difference between fees and taxes? Are you telling me that when fees are collected they will be carried down the Harbour Road and thrown away at the Barbados Marketing Corporation, but when taxes are collected they go to the Treasury? I know that all the money collected whether as fees or as taxes goes into the Treasury, but the Hon.

Minister wants to teach a dog to suck eggs by saying these are fees.

I have to be careful as on the last occasion when four cents was put on each half gill of rum. I suppose it would have been eight cents for a 'bishop'; and we have to be very careful in dealing with bishops because it seems to me that you have to be a good rum drinker to become a bishop. I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that this is too much of a blow. I know we must get taxes to run the country, but as this document is prepared, I am not in a position to say whether this increase is too much or too little. I should be told that there are so many vehicles in St. Michael and the increased fees would bring in so much extra revenue, and similarly for each parish.

I always say, Mr. Chairman, that a Government is like a housewife who stays at home and does her work while the breadwinner has to go out and get money for her to spend. You should not therefore go wildly into anything and levy taxes because you have the big stick in the corner or the numbers and the law behind you. It is not fair to them and they should know before hand what they are being taxed for and how much is being collected. The servant should never be greater than the master, and that is the mistake that this Government and most Governments make. You should learn to respect those who do the work and from whom you get the taxes. I forgot to pay my income tax the other day, and when a reminder did come there was an extra \$63 added because that is the law which I think I helped to pass. I have to work to get it; so don't you think I will have to talk? Whenever it comes to money, I have a grievance. I am different from those who do not pay taxes; so do not blame or curse me when I am talking, because I am doing so for myself and for my brother taxpayer.

7.55 p.m.

I am not satisfied when I hear that this is going down the drain and then I cannot prove it. When I hear that one man could hold on to such a big cheque and they called him back and he came back with it, I cannot feel good. If you tax me, I will pay it but you must see to it that the money is spent in the right direction. The old lady says: "You hurt me, you burn me and make me cry." This Bill will be passed but not with my support. It is not fair to me, to this House or to the Opposition. It is not fair to the electorate of Barbados to pass a Bill of this sort. We know the reasons or we feel we know the reasons for this Bill, but we should know how much the increases are. No Manager can come down to Bridgetown on Friday with a book from an owner or attorney or with a document to draw money in a way like this. He just could not do that. The owner or Attorney would never sign that cheque or, if he did sign it, the manager would have to reply to every question asked by the Attorney or the owner. That being so, why should we sign this cheque in this condition to-night? We cannot do that. Of course, the Government can do most things; the only thing that this Government cannot do is to turn a man into a woman or a woman into a man; therefore they can do as they please, but I am saying that it is not fair to the people of Barbados.

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

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee.

MR. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: 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, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: MR. YEARWOOD, HONOURABLES J. C. TUDOR, C. E. TALMA, A. DaC. EDWARDS, G. G. FERGUSSON,

N. W. BOXILL, Messrs. CORBIN, LOWE, WEEKES and HOPPIN—10.

NOES: Messrs HINDS, ADAMS, SMITH and Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS—4.

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

HIGHWAYS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1967

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day 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 Bill which stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of what Order the Hon. Minister is dealing with.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Orders go in sequence.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Therefore we should go on to Order No. 1 now.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry the hon. member was unaware of the fact that we were dealing with Order No. 7 which comes immediately after Order No. 6. It is ordinary, mathematical sequence for Order No. 7 to come after Order No. 6. Order No. 7 is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Highways Act, 1900.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Does it mean, Mr. Speaker, that when an Order is taken out of its place, the next Order is the one which follows it? Do you take Order No. 22 and then the next Order is Order No. 1?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order 23 comes after Order 22.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: That was not done with the Estimates. (Laughter)

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will explain what happened in the Estimates from his own personal explanation.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a Bill to amend the Highways Act, 1900. It deals with the increase of the tax payable for cycles to 50¢ for each wheel, the increase being in effect from the 1st June, 1967. 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, I will start straight off by saying that we, on this side of the House, are opposed to there being any tax on bicycles at all. 8.05 p.m.

There is no point in imposing a tax on bicycles from the point of view of bringing in money like the tax which we were dealing with in the Bill which has just become an Act. Sir, the tax on bicycles is a tax which is collected by the various councils. I am sure that that tax is not a true licence tax.

I think this tax was brought up not so much to get anything out of it but so that some mark be given to the owner so that he could place upon the bicycle. That was decided upon in the distant past because no hon. member made a speech on this. I hope the Hon. Leader of the House would be amenable to reason and postpone this. I would like him to know that this tax was collected from time to time even though the cost of collecting it is more than the amount it brings in.

Nobody wants to deprive the plate painters out of business, with the Local Government. I see a former Chairman

of the District Council shaking his hands. If the former Chairman is amenable, he would not be hard to reason.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did I understand the hon. member to say by implication that if he was hard headed he would not understand.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: That word was used in a metaphorical sense. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, there is something more to a bicycle licence than what the plate painters get. The tax for a bicycle is sixty-four cents for two wheels. It is not more than a nuisance tax. It is a source of amusement to some small boys who want to get a particular number. However, it is a nuisance tax, it is not a worthwhile tax.

I am willing to submit that it is a mark of identification to put on a bicycle to be held by the owner. The answer to this is to have a licence plate to be held by the owner. If the owner of a bicycle has reason to part with it, or he sells it to someone else, the only thing that is necessary is to go in to the Licensing Officer and get the name changed to the person to whom it was sold.

As I have said, the tax on a bicycle is only sixty-four cents now. It is proposed to increase this tax to one dollar. This tax would bring in less than \$9,000 a year. I hope new arrangements would be found so that the officer who is dealing with these licences would have other things to deal with. The collection of this tax is going to absorb most of this nine thousand dollars. It is going to cause more trouble than the \$24,000 it brings in all together.

St. Philip is the most bicycle minded parish of all the rural parishes. It has twice as many bicycles as St. George. I do not know the number in Christ Church. I hope it will not be thought that members on this side are worried about the few bicycles in St. Thomas and St. Andrew. It may be a question of the hills that there are so few bicycles in these parishes.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that nobody took proper notice of the taxes received from the Licensing of bicycles. If that were so, this amendment to the Act would not be put before the House. Let it be that bicycle owners be charged once for all. 8.15 p.m.

I should say, Mr. Speaker, that the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party specifically mentioned bicycle taxes as one of the things they would have abolished. You are indeed getting no great financial relief because the amount is so small. This is only a nuisance tax and you spend \$9,000 and the time of this House to collect it. What is the point of having somebody in St. Andrew going down to the St. Andrew Sub-Treasurer to collect 260 bicycle licences, somebody going from St. Joseph to the Sub-Treasurer for 278 bicycle licences and so on? If it were centralised you could say that one person was dealing with it, but you have eleven authorities collecting bicycle taxes and only four of them have 1,000 to collect. St. Michael has just over half, and Christ Church, St. Philip and St. George have 3,000, 2,000 and 1,000 respectively. This is just a little nuisance tax, and I ask the Minister to consider this point seriously, and seriously to consider a postponement to take advice on this matter from the Minister of Local Government as to whether the new Local Government arrangement will make it sensible to go on with a little petty tax. Take advice from tax experts as to whether it is worthwhile. My figures are 14 cents for each licence plate - that is what I have been informed by the Treasurer of the District Council - and a certain amount of the Clerks' salary has to be taken into account, the time and trouble of an auditor have to be taken into account, paying it over to whatever new funds of Local Government it is going to be administered by will involved more trouble; work it out and see whether it does not add up to \$24,814.

Mr. Speaker, you may observe that fortunately on this Bill we are not having to request the Minister to give us the figures. Since I have been informed by a District Council that they do not supply figures to the Hon. Minister, I imagine he may not know, and therefore we would be able

to supply any figures with regard to bicycle licences which the Hon. Minister would like to have.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I will not keep the House long, but I would like to know what is included in the term "cycle". I can understand the term "motor cycle", but I myself can find no definition. I take it a cycle would include motor cycle, tri-cycle and would include children's bicycles and tri-cycles which may be used on the road, since I have seen children not only with bicycles but with younger children on them.

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

On the 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.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:

"As from June 1st, 1967, the tax payable in respect of cycles in accordance with section 45 of the Highways Act 1900, shall be fifty cents for each wheel of each cycle and the said section 45 shall be deemed to have been amended accordingly."

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the Clause which we are amending is of course a very ancient Clause, but this Clause to some degree is making amendments as far as one can judge to certain parts of the Road Traffic Act. For example, we have just raised the fees on plantation carts to \$30 a year, and Clause 45 of the Highways Act imposes on each wheel of each vehicle a tax of three shillings and four pence. I wonder if the Minister can tell us if in fact Local Government bodies do levy a wheel tax in addition to the Road Traffic tax on plantation carts and other vehicles which are not mechanically propelled.

Also, Mr. Chairman, this Section deals with the tax on horses, mules and asses and perhaps they should be dealt with in a separate way. Nevertheless I would suggest to the Minister that the tax on asses can safely be removed. It would be interesting, Mr. Chairman, to hear exactly why for example they are not raising the tax on mules. What is being done about the tax on horses? There is certain information which I must confess I do not have. I have information relative to bicycles and cycles; I have no information relative to asses, and I have to use my own judgment as to how many taxes were levied on asses in the former Southern District Council. Perhaps we could hear this from hon. members or from the Minister who introduced this Bill. I see it stands in the name of the Minister of Finance. I would be glad to hear the statistics about horses, mules and asses, and why is it that the standard of living has gone up since 1900 - because these were fixed in 1900 - for people who ride cycles, but those who ride or use horses, mules or asses are immune. Is there any significance, Mr. Chairman, that the tax on asses is not being raised by the Democratic Labour Party?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I have a question to ask, even if the Hon. Minister does not answer it. That is the way they run the Government, keeping silent, forgetting they are not paying any honour to the Opposition. You have a duty. Why can't you answer a simple question put in proper language and with no double meaning behind it? What I am asking the hon. member, if he cares to answer, is whether it is

intended that in the case of a child's cycle or tricycle the same tax will be paid as in the case of a person who is using an ordinary bicycle riding sometimes furiously. It is a simple question. Any child's cycle that comes on the road has to be paid for.
8.25 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I really was trying to think of a serious answer to the hon. member's question.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I asked a serious question.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I have never known of tricycles, which are only regarded as toys, being subject to bicycle tax. The ordinary two-wheeled bicycle is what we are talking about. Certainly it would be regarded as amazing for an infant to be subject to this tax. I thought that that would have been known.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member does not know, a child's cycle, which is smaller than a bicycle, if it goes on the road, the owner has to pay a tax. Invalid chairs and wheeled chairs rank as cycles. Why does the hon. member who is in charge of Bills like this, not occasionally go to the Attorney General and ask him questions?

The question that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of HON. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by HON. C. E. TALMA, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee.

MR. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the Government's Opposition to this Bill is not facetious. We are trying to increase the amount of this taxation by \$9,000. I am saying that this entire Bill should be shelved until the financial proposals for Local Government as a whole are being examined, and then you can see what is the proper thing to do about this bicycle licence. This is not a serious tax; it is not a serious licence fee even. If hon. members on the opposite side of the House are tired, they can only thank the Hon. Leader of the House for that, because he should have predicted safely that this session would have lasted until now and he should have made proper provision for it. What I had been suggesting is in our Manifesto and we gave our reasons in our Manifesto for it. I believe that the arguments which were put forward here have been put forward by at least one District Council. I sympathise with the Hon. Leader of the House. He knows nothing about bicycle taxes. I say that in the best possible sense and I am sure that the hon. member cares even less.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I point out to the hon. member that on the motion for the third reading of a Bill, amendments may be proposed - none has been proposed - to the question that the Bill be now read a third time. There being no amendments and no amendments for the correction of errors or oversights which may, with the Speaker's permission, be made before the question of the third reading of the Bill is put from the Chair - such amendments may be made, but no amendments of a material character shall be proposed. The hon. member has spoken in extenso.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I was following an earlier reference of Sir Erskine May in which that is permissible rather than contradictory.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I assure the hon. member that Sir Erskine May is not infallible? I remember hearing it said in Court when I was a young barrister, - it was said by the then Mr. G. H. Adams of Archbold that Archbold, like Homer, has nodded.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I perhaps have not seen that I could not be out of order in speaking as long as I speak within the principles of the Bill which has reached the stage of the third reading. Apart from dilatory amendments I could indeed comment on what happened to the Bill in Committee. Perhaps I am taking Your Honour to be ruling that I cannot continue shortly with a speech on what has happened in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: There could be no repetition of what took place on the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am advising the Minister during these few short moments while Your Honour allows me to remain on my feet, to think over this matter and give our plea for postponement of the Bill some consideration.
8.35 p.m.

I am moving the amendment that the word "now" be omitted in order to add the words "this day six months."

Mr. St. JOHN: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the negative, nine hon. members voting "No" and five hon. members voting "Aye".

AYES: Mr. HINDS, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. SMITH, Mr. ST. JOHN and Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS. 5.

NOES: Mr. YEARWOOD, Hon. J. C. TUDOR, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Hon. N. W. BOXILL, Mr. LOWE, Mr. CORBIN, Mr. WEEKES and Mr. HOPPIN - 9.

The question that the Bill be now read a third time was put and decided in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

AYES: Mr. YEARWOOD, Hon. J. C. TUDOR, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Hon. N. W. BOXILL, Mr. LOWE, Mr. CORBIN, Mr. WEEKES and Mr. HOPPIN - 9.

NOES: Mr. HINDS, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. SMITH, Mr. ST. JOHN, Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS - 5.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was passed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today. I understand that the hon. senior member for Christ Church is not desirous of proceeding now with his Item of Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is also the question that I wish to vacate the Chair now as I have to attend another function, and the Deputy Speaker is not here to take my place.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I just rise to suggest that in the House of Commons, the Deputy Speaker is the Chairman of Committees and we can appoint the Chairman of Committees to act as Deputy Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a matter which can be well considered. We cannot do so now.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I repeat that in the House of Commons the Chairman of Committees is the Deputy Speaker and I suggest that the Chairman of Committees be appointed Deputy Speaker for now.

Mr. SPEAKER: That cannot happen now. It may be that the position can be regularised on a future occasion.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now stand adjourn until Tuesday, 30th May, 1967, at 2.30 o'clock p.m.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
8.43 p.m.