THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1966 - 71

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

THIRD SESSION OF 1966-71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 12th May, 1970.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour Sir J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S., (Speaker); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, J.P., (Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology) ;Hon. J. C. TUDOR, C.M.G., M.A., (Leader of the House); Mivj. W. CORBIN, J.P., Hon G. G. FERGUSSON, (Minister of Trade and Tourism); Hon. R. ST. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. ;W. R. LOWE, J.P.; Hon. ;N. W. BOXILL, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Minister of Labour National Insurance and Housing); Mr. W. C, B. HINDS; His Honour G. E. SARGEANT, (Deputy Speaker); Mr. ;C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. ;J. B.

SPRINGER; Mr. H. B. ST. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B.; Mr. ;J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A. and Mr. ELLIOTI' D. MOTTLEY.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER:
The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 17th February, 1970, have been circulated. Unless there is any objection, they will be confirmed. Hearing no objection, these Minutes are hereby confirmed.

Also in respect of the Minutes of Tuesday, 24th February, 1970, which are instantly available for confirmation, unless there is any objection, I declare those Minutes now duly confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister, I am commanded to lay on the Table of the House

The Housing Authority (Pensionable Posts) Order, 1970.

The Agricultural Credit Bank (Pensionable Offices) Order, 1970.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve "The Housing Authority (Pensionable Posts) Order, 1970".

Also a Resolution to approve "The Agricultural Credit Bank (Pensionable Offices) Order, 1970.

Also to give notice of an Act to provide for the maintenance of Public Order with reference to public meetings, marches and processions and for matters connected therewith and incidental thereto.

Also to state that Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 69, 74, 83, 84, 85, 87 and 88 are ready.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Replies to the following Parliamentary Questions are ready

Reply to No. 22, asked by the senior member for St. James;

Reply to No. 23, asked by the junior member for St. James;

Reply to No. 79, asked by the junior member for St. James;

Reply to No. 89, asked by the junior member for St. George;

Reply to No. 90, asked by the junior member for St. George; and, on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology,

Reply to No. 75, asked by the junior member for St. Peter.

Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY entered the Chamber and took his seat.

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER:
The hon. senior member for St. James his Question re increase in the number of hydrants at Orange Hill.

Mr. CRAIG; Mr. Speaker. To enquire of the Appropriate Minister: -

Is the Minister aware that the number of hydrants in the district of Orange Hill, St. James is inadequate?

2. Will the Minister take steps to increase the num-ber of hydrants in the said district without delay?

Mr. SPEAKER:
The same hon. member his Question re Springhead Tenantry Road.

Mr. CRAIG; Mr. Speaker, To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

1. Will the Minister in accordance with Government's declared policy as to tenantry roads, give urgent priority to the repairs to Springhead Tenantry Road, St. James?

Mr. SPEAKER:
The same hon. member his Question re identification cards issued to voters.

Mr. CRAIG:
Mr. Speaker, To enquire of the Appropriate Minister -

1. Is the Minister aware that letters are being sent from the Chief Registering Office to voters requesting them to collect their identification cards?

2. Will the Minister give a directive for the discontinuance of this practice, and instruct the Chief Registering Officer to revert to the practice of having identification cards mailed to voters?

Mr. SPEAKER:
The same hon. member his Question re a Cultural Hall.

Mr. CRAIG:
Mr. Speaker, To enquire of the Appropriate Minister -

1. Is the Minister aware that there is dire need for a Central Cultural Hall in this Island?

2. Will the Minister take steps to provide for such a Hall immediately?

Mr. SPEAKER:
The same hon. member his Question re street lighting in Baywoods.

Mr. CRAIG:
Mr. Speaker, To enquire of the Appropriate Minister-

Is the Minister aware that the street lighting in Baywoods and Orange Hill, St. James leaves much to be desired?

2. Will the Minister remedy this defect immediately?

12.25 p.m.

Mr. J. M, G. M, ADAMS:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Questions-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

1, Is the Minister aware that the scale of costs which can be awarded in Magistrates' Courts has not been adjusted to take account of the very great increase in the Civil Jurisdiction of the said courts?

2. Will the Minister therefore invite the responsible authorities to promulgate a new scale of Magisterial costs as soon as possible?

To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:-

1. Will the Minister make a statement as to communications he has received from the Inter-Government Philatelic Corporation based in New York, soliciting a contract for the marketing of postage stamps for Barbados?

2. Will the Minister state what decision has been reached?

To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works :-

Will the Minister take steps to have a Post Office letter box placed at Fisherpond in the parish of St. Thomas as soon as possible?

To enquire of the Minister of Finance:-

Will the Minister state, in respect of each of the years 1967, 1968 and 1969 and for each person who has held Ministerial Office (including the Prime Minister) or has been a Parliamentary Secretary during that time, what sums have been paid out of Public Funds in each year by way of: -

1. Money paid to each of these persons from the Government Hospitality fund, stating whether those moneys were paid on a regular monthly or other basis or whether occasional;

2. Moneys paid to each of these persons in respect of subsistence allowances for attendance at Conferences or any other travelling whatsoever

3. Money paid from the Government Hospitality fund in respect of individual entertainment by each of these persons;

4. Moneys paid to hotels or other residential es-tablishments outside Barbados in respect of each of these persons;

5. Moneys paid as airline or other fares in respect of each of these persons;

6. Moneys paid as airline or other fares in respect of the wives or husbands of each of these persons.

To enquire of the Prime Minister:-

On how many occasions, on which occasions and for whom since January 1st, 1967 to date has the Government of Barbados defrayed the costs of travel and/or subsistence of the wife or husband of a person travelling out of Barbados at Government expense or on Government business, in the cases where that person was

1. The Prime Minister;

2. A Minister;

3. A Parliamentary Secretary;

4. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker or Mr. Chairman of Committees of this House;

5. Any member of Parliament not mentioned above ;

6. A Civil Servant ;

7. Any other person attending a conference or a meeting of an International Organisation as part of or an advisor to a delegation from Barbados.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. St. JOHN:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Re solution-

WHEREAS there is a pipe line leading from a Hotel at Accra Beach in the parish of Christ Church into the sea;

AND WHEREAS the said pipe line discharges matter into the sea;

AND WHEREAS this has caused grave disquiet in the public mind;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House calls on the Government to investigate this matter forthwith, and to take such steps as are necessary to protect the health of the inhabitants of the country.

Mr. CRAIG:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution-

WHEREAS there are many persons who have been tenants of land belonging to Trents Plantation, St. James, for over a period of thirty years and who are now in imminent danger of being dispossessed owing to the sale or proposed sale of the said plantation;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House urge Government to take such action as it may deem necessary so as to render the tenure of such persons secure.

Mr. SPEAKER:
There is another Resolution in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution-

WHEREAS there is wide spread concern in this Island as a result of the recent disturbance sin Trinidad and Tobago, and especially with regard to the in-troduction into Parliament of a Bill relating to Public Order, having as its object the control of public meetings, the speakers at such meeting, and the contents and duration of speeches at such meeting;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House express its confidence in the political stability and innate sense of good order of the inhabitants of this Island, and its disagreement with the introduction of any legislation designed to restrict the free expression of opinion, political or otherwise, in this Island.

Mr. SPEAKER:

As at present advised and in the light of a notice which has been given earlier today, I cannot accept that notice to go on the Order Paper.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, I am hoping you will look into this matter quite carefully.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I will look into it quite carefully.

Mr. CRAIG:

And if necessary, place it on the Order Paper as soon as possible because I personally feel that this Is a matter of great importance.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid the hon. member cannot discuss it now.

Mr. CRAIG:

I am not trying to discuss it. I am simply asking you to look into it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have given the House, and the hon. member, in particular, the assurance that I will look into it carefully.

SELECT COMMITTEE REPORT

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill to authorise a readjustment of parts of the roads and sidewalks forming the boundaries of the building known as No. 1 Broad Street.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, a Bill to provide for the main-tenance of Public Order with reference to public meetings, marches and processions and for matters connected there-with and incidental there to, was read a first time.

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.

I have had consultations with hon. members opposite, and in consequence of this I am now moving the suspension of the Standing Orders. The position is this: I believe it will be convenient for the other side to mike their reply to the Budget on Thursday afternoon, and I will so advise the Carib-bean

Broadcasting Corporation to make the proper arrangements. It may be necessary, therefore, for C.B.C. to come back here this afternoon and make preparations for the equipment to remain. 12.35 p.m.

Apart from this, I understand that a Private Member's Notice which has just been given is re-garded as being of some urgency, and the hon. senior member for Christ Church will appreciate doing this on Thursday afternoon as well. Perhaps I may put this to members; if they choose, we could come early enough on Thursday to do Questions and Private Members' Business, as well as the Budget Replies, in which case I will ask them to give it up this afternoon, because for a variety of reasons I would like to have a long luncheon adjournment. The idea therefore would be, Mr. Speaker, to continue this sitting, and whenever we finish this afternoon we would suspend it until Thursday at whatever the agreed time is, and carry on with Private Members' Business and Replies to Questions. Subject to all this, I beg to move the suspension of those Standing Orders.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:
Mr. Speaker, we have taken note of the Leader of the House's explanation as to the intention of Government to carry on on Thursday afternoon, but I would like, if the Leader of the Government does not mind speaking again, to give us a categorical assurance that we will have the same time on the air, including re-broadcasts on Government time on radio and television, for a reply as is being given for the Budget Statement itself. We did not claim it last year, as hon. members will recall, but this year perhaps the Budget and political situation is such that I am sure the Leader of the House will agree that both political parties need to have their voices heard as such a time as this. I would suggest that 5 o'clock for our reply would be a suitable time on Thursday.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Let me deal with the last part first. I appreciate the point about 5 o'clock being a suitable time, but I just want an indication as to whether hon. members would wish to come in before that to do the routine Questions and Private Mem-bers' Business; this is what I want to know on that point. On the second point, I would like to inform the House that on 8th May I despatched the following letter to the Leader of the Opposition. It reads as follows

"Dear Sir Grantley,

As I stated in the House at its last meeting, the Minister of Finance proposes to present to the House on Tuesday, 12th May, 1970, his Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals for 1970-71 and to give notice of such statutory instruments or other legislation as may be necessary in consequence of the Proposals. The Minister proposes to make his presentation at approximately 4.30 p.m.

His Honour the Speaker's permission has been sought for the Minister's speech to be broadcast direct from the Chamber by the Caribbean Broad-casting Corporation and Barbados Redlffusion Ser-vice.

In accordance with custom, equal time will be accorded to the Opposition to record, for subsequent broadcast, their collective replies to the speech,

I am sending copies of this letter to Mr. E. D. Mottley and to Mr. L. E. Smith, "

This letter was signed by me; the hon. member has the assurance therefore about equal time according to custom.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I would be in order to ask a question on that letter read by the Hon. Leader of the House, but I crave your indulgence.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member can make his point, but I think the Hon. Leader of the House has already exercised his right to a reply.

Mr. SMITH:

The Hon. Leader of the House is giving equal time to the Opposition; I am still a member of the Opposition. I cannot speak for the hon. senior member for the City, but he is also a member of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition may feel that that time is allotted to them alone, and I would like to know if this equal time will be for the Opposition and Government alone, or if they are pre-pared to give the hon. senior member for the City and myself a little time also, or if this time should be divided up between the three of us. I would only like to know that, and I would like to be assured that I would be

getting some time, whether it be Opposi-tion's time or the Government's time, on the air. I would like to know that for many reasons, because if I am not assured by the Leader of the Opposition that time will be available to me, I am not prepared to let one word go out; the same spirit that I showed a year or two before, I intend to show again. I would like the matter clarified.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, what I did not hear quite clearly from the Hon. Leader of the House when he read the letter is if he said the "official Opposition".

Mr. SPEAKER:

By the indulgence of the House, the Hon. Leader of the House may reply.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I said in my letter to Sir Grantley that in accordance with custom time will be accorded to the Opposition to record for subsequent broadcast their collective replies to the speech; this means, therefore, that the hon. members opposite may divide the time between them as they find it convenient.

The question that Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 be suspended was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; 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. 4 be taken as the first Order, and I am asking leave of the House for the Hon. Minister of Communications to take charge of the sold Order.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

12.45 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is not noted on the Order Paper who is to take charge of this Item.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, it is for this reason that I am asking leave of the House for permission for the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works to take charge of it. On my Order Paper, the Order is printed without any indication as to who is to take charge of it, but it properly belongs to the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I regret very much this omission; but, according to the Hon. Leader of the House, I will ask the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works to take charge of the item and to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Motor Vehicles Insurance (Third Party Risks) Act, 1952.

MOTOR VEHICLES INSURANCE (THIRD PARTY RISKS) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1970.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, I believe that hon. members on the opposite side have a copy of this Bill. This Bill is a somewhat far-reaching one.

"Section 2 of the Motor Vehicles Insurance (Third Party Risks) Act, 1952 hereinafter referred to as the principal Act is hereby amended by inserting imme-diately above the definition "driver" appearing the re-in the following definition -

"appropriate licensing authority" means the person for the time being having authority to issue licences under Part III of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937."

This came about, apparently, be cause the Insurance Companies here insured people, but their maximum liability was $1,000. Hon. members on the opposite side will remember that a year or two ago there was a debate on the floor of this House, and I said that there were some very unscrupulous people in this world. Some nincompoop rushed out and told Mr. Jack Dear, who thinks he is a power, that I was talking about lawyers and that I was very abusive to him. He, in turn, thought that he could be sarcastic towards me. It is a very stupid thing for anybody to try to be sarcastic to me, because my life is an open book and I have nothing to hide. People who have skeletons must not interfere with me. I met him and told him what I thought about the matter. I also told him that I am one of the worst people for Anybody to tangle with, because I do not have anything to hide. When I start telling people about some of the facts, they will start to cry.

Hon. members on the opposite side will remem-ber that there was a debate on the floor of this House when a postman by the name of Mr. Layne was in-volved in an accident. As a result of not reporting the accident to me, or to my Ministry, he was not fully represented, and he lost the case. The Insurance Company paid $ 1,000, but that was not the end of the case. The Judge awarded the claimant something like $16,000.1 think hon. members on the opposite side will agree to what we are endeavouring to do here to-day.

In the United Kingdom there is a gentlemen's agreement whereby Insurance Companies put money into a fund, and if an unauthorised person drives a vehicle and gets into an accident which results in the maiming or disfiguring of any person, then the Insurance Company will have to pay the person who is maimed or disfigured by the vehicle a certain amount of money. I understand that that sort of thing has already happened here, but the claimant in that particular case was of a different hue from the majority of us, and the Insurance Company did not have any qualms about paying out the money.

We think it is unfair for a man, who is not covered by insurance, to take up somebody's vehicle, drive it away and then get into an accident. The Insurance Company will not pay out money if the driver is not covered, and the poor person who is damaged has to suffer without receiving any compensation. We have asked the Insurance Companies to come around to this way of thinking.

Another aspect of this Bill deals with the property which is damaged. (Asides)

Mr. Speaker, there are some people who buy expensive cars and they take out Third Party Insurance which, in my opinion, is unsatisfactory. Some of them say that they do not get into accidents. You do not get into an accident, but an accident gets into you. You may be driving as carefully as possible and up comes a madman and damages a fender of your car. These things will happen. The reason why we did not carry up the amount for damage to property much higher is that it would create a burden on the poor man who has a small vehicle. The Insurance Companies are always very willing to increase their premiums, but they are not always willing to pay out i money. They will say that the cost of living, the accident rate and so on have gone up. There are two reasons why we did not go higher than $5,000: one is that we did not want the Insurance Companies to carry up the premiums on vehicles; and the other reason is that if we did this there was nothing to stop collusion from taking place. The owner of an old car could get in collusion with the owner of on old house; he could run his car into the old house, damage it, and they could collect money. (Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS You are now telling them what to do.)

One of the main things in this matter was to protect the people as much as possible. We cannot legislate for everything in passing legislation. We know, as the hon. member said sotto uoce, that certain things will still happen. I cannot account for everything that is going to happen. People will still take up cars and drive them without obtaining a licence. Every day you can see in the newspaper that somebody is reported for driving a car without having a licence, or for riding a motor cycle without having a licenee, and the fact that the Magistrates are imposing heavy fines on them does not deter others.

Despite the fact that the cat can be used on people who commit rape, some people still continue to commit rape. We hang people committing murder, but others continue to commit murder. When passing legislation we try to deter as many people as possible from doing certain things. That is the object of this bit of legislation which is before you. As hon. members will notice, Mr. Speaker, in the Objects and Reasons it is set out:

"(a) injury to persons shall be unlimited; and

(b) damage to certain types of property shall be limited to an amount not exceeding $5,000." 12.55 p.m.

This is the substance of this bit of legislation. This did not come directly because of ME Layne's accident, but it was expedited as a result of it. There is another Bill on Insurance Companies of which, I think, notice was given last Tuesday, but this will embody insurance Companies in general; but since this "Third Party Risks" comes under my Ministry, I am asking hon. members opposite to support this necessary piece of legislation. If there are any questions which hon. members opposite would like to ask, I would be glad to answer them.

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

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:
Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill which we in the Opposition welcome quite whole-heartedly. Members of the Opposition, and especially Opposition lawyers - and, more especially, those of us who have a fair practice in dealing with motor insurance claims, as well, indeed, as members of the Government of our profession who also deal in such matters - have for a long time been canvassing that the liability of L11,000 -$4,800 -first imposed in 1952 as the upper limit that Insurance Companies would have to pay in the case of personal injury, should be increased to bring it more into line with modern conditions. Well, Sir, I am glad that it has been made unlimited. Let there be no doubt in anybody's mind that car insurance premiums are going to go up from the day after the Governor-General brings this Bill into operation. I imagine that the premium for Third Party only may double. I do not think comprehensive premiums will go up quite so much, but let it be understood by all concerned that we are going to have to pay a lot more for insuring our motor cars. In fact there is no reason why comprehen-sive premiums should go up at all because compre-hensive premiums already cover everything intended to be covered by this Act. But, equally, let the Gov-ernment be assured that we are not going to be blaming them for putting up the cost of living in respect of motor car insurance, because it is part of our policy too. It cannot be helped. If you want to give pedestrians protection, you have to give them protection by a Bill such as this, and if the Bill costs more, that is the social price we are paying for greater safety and security on the roads. If it drives a few of the disgraceful drivers and the disgraceful old cars off the road, I for one will not be sorry. These things have to be said, and perhaps it is as well that Government

and Opposition can agree on saying them at a time such as this.

There is one thing on which the Minister who introduced the Bill dwelt for a moment that we on this side of the House regret. That deals with the con-sideration of a Motor Insurers' Bureau. At this very moment, this very week is the anniversary of a date when there was a most unpleasant and unfortunate accident in Parris Hill, St. Joseph with which the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and I are very familiar. The vehicles involved were trucks owned by a large plantation organisation in this Island. The driver of one truck became the worse for alcohol and asked a helper who does not have a driving licence to drive the; truck for him. That helper not only drove the truck, but raced the other truck up Parris Hill, crushed a poor, decent, innocent retired man against the wall at Parris Hill leaving him dead, and leaving a widow and numerous children, and nobody can pay anything. I have only last week despatched an opinion to English solicitors, acting on behalf of one of his children, to the effect that he is a man of such total straw that it would take perhaps one hundred years to collect any sensible judgment that could be given against him. I would never forget, Mr. Speaker, that it is always the costs that are paid first, and the substance of the judgment afterwards. I do hot believe that, in the ordinary way of earnings of that particular driver, he would ever even be able to pay the legal costs.

Now this Bill does nothing to stop that, and that is the most frequent sort of abuse that goes on. I am not blaming, for example, the former.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

On a point of order, I would like the hon. member to repeat what he said he wants us to stop.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

What I am asking the hon. member to do is to consider the introduction of a scheme such as the Motor Insurers' Bureau Scheme in England where all Insurance Companies in Britain which do motor business gather together and pay a certain amount of money into a fund each year. In all cases where unlicensed drivers or persons who have stolen motor cars.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of. elucidation, I started off by saying exactly what the hon. member is now saying, but apparently he did not hear me. What I said is that we cannot compel them to do such, but I have written to them already asking them to set up this pool. They tried to make me believe that it is difficult and is going to be ex-cessive, but I pointed out to them that it is strange that it is difficult here when the same people they represent are doing it in England. I will ask them again to do this, because when an unlicensed driver takes up a vehicle and damages some person, that person is not compensated.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

I heard the hon. member describe the scheme, but I thought perhaps that he did not understand what I was aiming at. I will go a bit further. I appreciate his saying that he has written to the Companies, and they have refused to do it. I do not think it is impossible to deal with it bv legislation.

The second point that can be dealt with by legislation in respect of these insurance claims is this. You not only get claims where totally unauthorised and unlicensed drivers pick up motor cars; you also get a claim where an unauthorised driver is said by the insurers to be acting in an unauthorised way, and this is why I was going to refer to an incident - I am sure it is nothing to do with him; it is his In-surance Company - with the former senior member for St. Michael who deals with the Belmont Taxi Company. On one occasion they destroyed a man's motor car and caused him damage, and they succeeded in avoiding paying him on the grounds that although the car was a Belmont Taxi and the driver was a Bel-mont Taxi driver, he had picked up some people at a wedding in St. John after doing a job without telephoning back to Belmont Road, and that therefore the insurers were not liable for what he was doing with the taxi at that time. I was on the receiving end of it and I personally believe judgment was wrong; but be that as it may, it was not appealed against, and it stands there. This is clearly something to be legislated for because you can deal with the law of Master and Servant. If necessary, you can amend the law of Master and Servant to make it clear that whenever an authorised servant is driving an authorised vehicle, the Insurance Company must finance that. They will not be able to get out of it by telling the driver to say that he just picked up these people on the road and he did not say anything to the office in Bridgetown about it. That is where you can get collusion. You get your driver, in consideration of keeping his job, to say that he was not really doing what you told him at the time; so you save your Insurance Company from paying. That is something that can be stopped by legislation, and I am sure that the Hon. Minister, once he is aware that this goes on, will deal with it.

1.05 p.m.

Sir, these Insurance Companies are no brides. I remember, when I first came back to the Bar and they still had inquests, observing that the same persons used to sit on Coroners' Inquests and in motor accident cases, and being told by a practitioner- not

Quite so eminent as yourself, Sir, - in the traffic jurisdiction, but at that time certainly a very active practitioner around the Courts; he said to me "Yes, you are bound to see the same people there all the time because they are not only on a retainer from the Government; they are on a retainer from the Insurance Companies as well to find 'accident' when they should find 'manslaughter'. It is a fact that one late lamented member of those juries - I have seen him in close confabulation with members and managers of Insurance Companies around the Court before now. If the Insurance Companies are

unwilling to assist with the Motor Insurance Bureau, the Government should consider ways and means of forcing it on them; they are going to double the premiums and they are going to make a lot of money out of Third Party Insurance. They have always made money out of that; it is comprehensive insurance that loses the money.

You only have to compare full Third Party with ordinary Third Party - full Third Party which covers material damage to the other side; you only have to compare the difference in these premiums and present Third Party premiums to see just how high insurance is going to go, and in those circumstances you have to make sure that the Insurance Companies do not take the public for any further ride than they are already being taken.

One final point before I sit down. There was a company here about which I have asked Questions in this Hon. Chamber before - the Guyana Mutual Insurance Company. It was allowed to advertise in Barbados. At least one garage in Bridgetown recommended car purchasers to Guyana Mutual, and I have had the answer here from the House that the bond required by the 1952 Act was never posted. It was never an authorised Insurance Company. Many people - again, Sir, more than one client of mine - have all gone to the Police at my request for cases in Court for which they had to pay out of their pockets. That is a fate many people have suffered. The Police have been unable to do anything about it, although they had numerous statements from people who were defrauded. This was a wicked, vile fraud - a case of manslaughter, in the case where people went and drove cars on a Guyana Mutual Insurance policy; a case of manslaughter, where people were killed on the road and they have paid out nothing. I would call on the Minister to make absolutely sure that nothing like this ever happens again; it is disgraceful; it should never have been allowed to happen. I am surprised you cannot extradite the people from Guyana to face trial and pay charges. That is my contribution.

Mr. St. JOHN:

Mr. Speaker, just two points. The question about the Motor Insurance Bureau and the amendment to the law; I feel that the Minister should adopt the same strategy as the Minister of Trans-port of England adopted in order to force the crea-tion of this Motor Insurance Bureau; it is simply this. You notify the Insurance Companies that, unless they are prepared to cover injuries that are received arising out of the use of the motor vehicle on the road, Parliament would amend the legislation to make such incidents subject to an approved policy - a policy, which covers any accident arising by the use of A par-ticular motor vehicle. In other words, you tell them quite straight "Either you comply and do it volun-tarily and see how it works; otherwise we will amend the law." That in how they managed to get it done in England, because they were afraid of the legislation as they could not work out premiums as a result of the unpredictability of the events.

Secondly, as far as avoiding the situation that a rose with Guyana Mutual is concerned, the simple

thing to do with that is to send a list to the Licensing Authority of all the Insurance Companies approved by the Government, and unless the policy is a policy issued by them, they cannot accept the renewal; that is the administrative method of dealing with it. I am perfectly prepared at this stage to agree with the existing wording of the Act on the understanding that if this Motor Insurance Bureau is not set up within a reasonable time, we will be asking for the amendment to cover any accident arising out of the use.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

Sir, I hope the House will pardon me if I seem to digress from the subject to say something that does not directly arise out of the wording of the Act itself. When you are a practising barrister you ought not to tell a Judge or a Magistrate what to do; but after you have left the practice at the Bar, it is your duty to tell them. I have been driving a car for about forty years and I have never seen such reckless driving as happens nowadays; you almost have to go down into the gutter to get away from people who drive in the middle of the road at 40, 50 and 60 miles an hour, and I appeal to every Magistrate to hit them hard-every case that goes before them. Some drivers that I have seen should go to jail; have you not noticed in the Press the number of fatal accidents that have been happening in recent years as compared with, say, 10 or 15 years ago? I take this opportunity of calling on every Magistrate and every Court in this Island to hit as hard as possible people guilty of exceeding the speed limit, let alone reckless driving. My wife tells me sometimes "For God's sake, do not go out; do you see what is happening today?" I therefore appeal to the Courts of this Island to put an end to the reckless driving that takes place in Barbados today.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, before the Minister replies, I note that the Objects and Reasons state; "(a) injury to persons shall be unlimited; and (b) damage to certain types of property shall be limited to an amount not exceeding $5,000." I would like the Minister to define "certain types" because the types that I would like to be put in may not be included.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what has taken place today, but it is a very unusual happening that the whole Opposition is agreeing with me; it has me somewhat annoyed because I am not accustomed to this happening; anyhow, I must thank them. I will deal with the points raised by the senior member for St. Thomas first. Everything he has said is quite true, but what happened was - I am one of those people who believe in law and order, but I do not believe in law and order at any price, and I always feel that if you can get people to come around - this is like the Land Acquisition Act; I like to go and persuade people to give up land peacefully, let us nego-tiate because some people think that when we use the Land Acquisition Act we are using a big stick to bully them, but that is not the case. I have called in the Insurance Companies - this has been going on from the time that Mr. Dear was in the Senate; this matter was raised either by himself or the senior member for Christ Church.

1.15 p.m.

We had a long dissertation with the Insurance Companies on this subject but, as I had to point out then I will say on the floor of this House now; wherever you get people who are phlegmatic in matters dealing with the general public, you will always get uprisings and violence. We could have had this matter settled amicably, but, since the Insurance Companies want to be stubborn in this matter, I have no hesitation in coming to the House with legislation to make this matter compulsory. That is what I will tell them; so the hon. senior member for Christ Church does not have to worry about bringing a Resolution here asking us to change the law. I will do that myself. Some of the laws of Barbados, in my opinion, are a bit antiquated, and it is time that we bring them up to date. (Asides)

For instance, the Motor Vehicle sand Road Traffic Act will soon be coming before this House. Also a comprehensive Insurance Bill will be brought be-fore the House shortly, and hon. members on the opposite side of the House will be able to make their suggestions. I think it is a very good Bill. Hon. members on the opposite side of the House may be able to make one or two points that we have not seen at the moment, but I know that it will be a comprehensive Bill to take care of the Insurance Companies.

With regard to the Guyana Mutual Insurance Company, that is a matter that must have slipped me because I do not understand how that Company could have operated here. When I came into office, the law was that any Insurance Company that wanted to operate insurance and Third Party Risks had to deposit $48,000 either in bonds or in cash. It is a small amount, in my opinion, because this is really an important matter. If ten people were involved in an accident or accidents, then there would be no money to pay them. The new Bill which will be brought to the House shortly will be brought by the Minister of Finance, and it will embody all of these things. The Insurance Companies will not be able to get away with murder as hitherto. The points made by the senior member for Christ Church are well taken.

In reply to the senior member for St. Joseph, who asked about damage to certain types of property, the reason why we said $5,000 is that we felt a chattel house or a guard wall could not cost more than $ 5,000. A new vehicle should be covered by insurance. (Asides) I discovered last night that some people would buy new vehicles for$ 5,000 or $ 6,000 and only insure them under Third Party Risks. Some of them say that they will not get into any accident. It was the view of the Cabinet, and my view, too, that anybody who has a car which is worth $7,000 or $8,000 and does not comprehensively Insure that car, must be a madman. This was done to help the man who owns a Hillman or a car in that bracket. A man with on old car may damage a new car.

As I pointed out earlier, the Insurance Com-panies are very eager to stretch out their hands to receive your premium, but if you get involved in an accident you will then find out how many things you did not

know of. As soon as we bring down the Bill to which I have referred, the fine writing on the insurance policies will become finer. You will then have get binoculars or a telescope to read the fine print. You need not worry because the new Bill will take care of everything, and we are not going to allow the Insurance Companies to get away with certain things. We know that a lot of advantage has been taken of people by some of these Insurance Companies.

It is very hard to pay an Insurance Company for your car every year; you cannot let a day go over: otherwise it will no longer be insured; then somebody gets into an accident with you, and you have to go through a lot of trouble to recover the money for your car. All of these things will be taken into consideration in the Bill. We felt that a car would scarcely be able to damage a bungalow in such a manner that it would cost more than $5,000 to repair it. Any time a car could do damage to a bungalow costing more than $5,000 to repair it, then it means that the bungalow was built out of sand and much cement was not used in the construction of the building. We also felt that a man who had a car valued at $7,000 or $8,000 would insure it comprehenively against damage risks, fire, theft and so on.

With regard to the point which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph raised, this is the price we have to pay for development. I fully agree with what he has said. I have said on the floor of this House already that I do not want the jurists to think that we in the Legislature want to direct them as to what they should do. We make laws, but we do not interpret laws in the Legislature. I could not agree with the junior member for St. Joseph more. Sometimes I am appalled at some of the fines imposed on drivers. I do not go out on bank holidays nowadays and I remain at home. If I am compelled to go out, I will drive to a spot, park my car, talk a little and endeavour to get home by evening. This appears to be the day when people seem to think that they should show off, drink more rum than their stomachs can carry or that their pocket can pay for, get behind the wheel of a vehicle and get into trouble. A vehicle is a dangerous weapon. Even if you are in charge of a mule cart and the mule gets unruly, you axe likely to lose a toe if you do not move your foot from under one of the wheels of the cart. When such drivers get behind the wheel of a vehicle they get an overdose of importance - there is something known as Dutch courage - and do a lot of things which they would not have done normally if they were not under the influence of alcohol. They take a lot of unnecessary chances, and it may be that the person who may be injured will be myself!

Sir, I would hate to know that I have to go out of this world in little pieces. I came into the world in one big piece, and I would like to go back out the same way. I would not like to go out in instalments. I agree with the hon. Junior member for St. Joseph, and I hope that the Press will print things in the light of what has been said here, and the Press will not give jurists the impression that we in the Legislature are criticising them. It is merely to give them a hint that it is a waste of time -Magistrate, Police and every-body else - when a man commits an offence with a vehicle, goes before a Magistrate and is fined $15 for speeding or something like that. He may be fined $20 for reckless driving and soon. That is making sport.

The time has come - and I hope when this Bill comes before the Legislature that we will get the full support of the Opposition-when police men should be allowed to give tickets for traffic offences instead of taking up a lot of time taking a man to Court. The man pleads not guilty today; he returns to the Court in a few days and asks for an adjournment and so on. If you do not want a policeman to give tickets, then we can authorise people to give tickets to drivers who park vehicles in the wrong places, those who drive recklessly and so on. I do not want anybody to get the impression that we want a Police State. The United States does not have a Police State; Great Britain does not have a Police State; Canada does not have a Police State, and I think it is time that we do something about this matter.

While I am dealing with this matter, I want to say that we will be bringing a new Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act before the Legislature very soon. On mornings, and particularly on evenings, you will find vehicles parked on Highways 5, 6 and 7, and the drivers of them will walk about leaving them there. They would not even look back to see that they are responsible for blocking a long line of traffic and preventing people from going to their homes.

Mr. J.M.G. M. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. member has given way. This is something that has occupied my attention for a very long time as it would have occupied the attention of anyone who has ever driven in England and seen the Law Courts there. In England, at all times, it is an offence if you park your car in such a manner as to make another car stop behind you, and you will be guilty of ob-struction if you are charged. That is the common law of England, and it is also the common law of Barbados. Will the Minister invite the Police to consider whether cars that are parked on Highway 1 on morn-ings, so that other cars have to stop behind them, are not obstructing the highway - a common law offence?

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is a very interesting non-point of order. 1.25 p.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Now people park their cars on the highway when there are so many byways on which they can park. People in Barbados have a tendency to be extremely lazy. These same people go to the United States, Canada and Great Britain and walk for miles; but as soon as they come to Bar-bados, they want the car to be driven straight on to the verandah. What we propose doing is to bring down a wrecker, and when you park your car and block the highway, we will tow it away and in order to get it back you will pay for it or we will sell it. I make no bones about this, nor am I afraid. If anybody in here doubts me, I invite him to go on Highway 1, 7, 6 or 5 this afternoon between 4 o'clock and 5 o'clock and see for himself, especially in Collymore Rock by the A.M.E. church. He can also go by the Police Station in Bay Street

where it is an offence to park on that road between the hours of 7 o'clock and 9 o'clock in the morning and 3 o'clock and 5 o'clock in the afternoon. People still park their cars on that road when they can park in Wellington Street, Combermere Street or one of the alleys, and allow people to drive comfortably along that road. This is not any threat. (Asides) Somebody asked me about Harry's. When legislation is being made, as far as I am concerned, it is made for all, including myself; so Harry, Tom or Dick will have to comply with the regulations and rules.

In all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come when we as Barbadians have to be more realistic in our approach to these matters. We must stop blocking the highways. First - the hon. senior member for Bridgetown does not drive now, but he would have been in it too. If you parked your car on the highway, you should be reported like anybody else. You are a representative of the people and therefore you are a leader, and you do not lead from behind. There are enough byways on which people can park - especially in the afternoon, and I hope that when this bit of legislation comes before this Chamber we will have the same unanimity as we are having today on this matter.

I do not think there is anything else that was asked that I have not answered. I did say to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, in respect to the question he raised about the type of house, that the $5,000 would cover the cost of a chattel house, because if a person had a car worth more than $5,000, it is natural that he should insure it Third Party and this would cover the amount.

Before I sit, I should like to get this on the record. This is for the benefit of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. This says: "To provide unlimited indemnity for Third Party liability relating to personal injury by removing provisions 5 and 6 of section 4 (1), it would probably be necessary to increase the standard premiums for Act liability insurance by between 16% and 25% according to the type of vehicle concerned. For example, it may be con-sidered appropriate to increase the premium for the average private car from $12.50 to $15".

This is for a year, and nothing to kill anybody. Why I am putting this in is because we do not control Insurance Companies with their premiums as such, but this is something we need to look into also. The Government cannot take on Third Party insurance, because if it did you would have all the accidents possible. I want this mentioned on the floor of the House in order that the Insurance Companies would be aware that I am also aware of the amount of premiums that they should be charging. Most likely they will say that the cost of living has gone up and therefore they have to increase them, but I do not consider an increase from $12, 50 to $15 to be extra-ordinary.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I am following the bad example of two or three previous members and rising on something that is not a point of order, but I am going to say it is a point of order. I would really like to know if today is the Hon. Minister's birthday.

Mr. SPEAKER:
No point of order. Of course the hon. member has spoken after the Minister.

Mr. SMITH:
Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister defined.....

Mr. SPEAKER:
The Minister has spoken in reply. I would suggest to the hon. member that he make his point in Committee.

Mr. SMITH:
I do not understand you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:
The Hon. Minister has just made his speech in reply.

Mr. SMITH:
I did not understand he was replying; I thought he was making a point. I got up and asked for a definition on the type of property. The Minister got up and replied extensively. I could not stop him. I was on my feet when I asked for a definition, and he defined everything. He was so nice and I did not know that today was his birthday.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Anyhow, I am afraid I have to remind the hon. member that the Minister was speaking in reply, but the hon. member may make his point as soon as we go into Committee - which I take it we will do now - and he will get a reply.

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

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:
I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

Clause I was called and passed. Clause 2 was called.

Hon. N. W. BOX1LL:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. SMITH:
Mr. Chairman, the Minister defined the type of property relating to guard wall, new vehicle and chattel house. Now I know that the Minister has forgotten that there are vehicles that cost a lot more than $5,000. Imagine a person has a car that is worth $50 that is running on the road and damages one worth $10,000, and both cars are a total loss. What protection is given to the owner of the $50 car? He has not got anything more than that car, but it takes him to and from work, and he does not have twelve cents to make up the remaining mount to $5,000. What will happen here? We have to try and protect these people from themselves.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
For the sake of the record. I would like the hon. member to address the Chair under Clause 3 rather than under Clause 2, because what the hon. member is now dealing with is relevant to Clause 3.

1.35 p.m.

Mr. SMITH:
Mr. Chairman, if I am wrong, I have been wrongly advised; that is what you get today even in the Law Courts, and you have to pay for this wrong advice.

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

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Hon. K. N. R. HUSBANDS:
I beg to second that.

Mr. SMITH:
Mr. Chairman, I was making the point that if you have a mason or a carpenter who has an "art", not a "cart" because the "c" has been completely worked off, which is valued at about $50 or $60, and he goes along and damages a car which cost about $10,000, and the Insurance Company pays no more than $5,000, what will become of this poor chap? He might have a home, and the Insurance Company that has to pay out the $10,000 is going to make the claims on this poor man's house and he will lose every thing. We must try to protect these people because the bus routes do not suit them and they try to get something to take them to work. I feel that the insurance should be such that the owner of the cart should pay the necessary premium so as to protect him all around; otherwise there is the possibility that this poor man will lose his cart, his home and everything else and will still have to work. I know of a case like that, where the man's home was sold out to pay the remainder. And that was not all; the Insurance Company, after the house was sold, put him in Court and he hod to pay $5 per month until the debt was cleared. He lost everything, but he still had to pay.

I hope the Minister will go into this point and give careful thought, so as to protect one from him-self that this will not happen again. The owner should be made to pay the necessary amount so as to protect him from himself.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, when I first introduced this Bill I said that you cannot legislate for all the people and that you have to legislate for the majority. I pointed out that the reason why we did not carry this insurance any higher was because of the working people who managed to raise a little vehicle to get them to and from work, and if we put this higher the premiums that would be asked of these people would be too much and we would be imposing a burden on them. We do not want to do this if it can be avoided. I went on to say that if a person bought a car for over $5,000, we are of the opinion that that person should be in a position to have that car comprehensively insured for their own protection, against not only accidents but against theft, fire and hurricane, because the only thing you do not get covered against is atomic fall-out. The people who can afford to buy a $10,000 car are the people who can afford to have the car comprehensively insured, but the little poor fellow, like the mason and the carpenter who managed to raise a little vehicle to get him to and from work and can only afford to give the family a drive on Sunday afternoons or on special occasions - you cannot really expect this man to have to pay a high premium. That is the problem; so we have to protect both sides, not only the man with his $10,000 car but also the man with his "art", as the hon. member has just said. There is no country in the world, I repeat, that can pass legislation to cover everybody.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, it appears to me as if the Minister misunderstood my point. I am not referring to the person who is able to buy a $10,000 car because that car has already been insured before it left the garage, whether he pays for it or not. I am speaking about the one with the "art" which is not worth very much, but it is worth as much as would damage the $10,000 car. It would be better to protect this particular person because this is his means of transportation to and from work; if he cannot get to work he cannot feed himself, and some morning when he is travelling to work it is quite possible that he may get himself into trouble, and serious trouble at that. In order to get out of it, his house will be sold out and then he will have to look for money monthly to clear his debt and also to maintain his family.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am sure that the Reporter is finding it very difficult to report correctly; let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. SMITH:

The Hon. Minister said that we cannot pass legislation for everybody; that is true; but this is a point to consider, that there is a possibility that you would get quite a few like the man I have been describing all along and so some provision should be made. I remember, when we were passing this same Third Party Legislation, we had a lot of opposition saying that the poor people would not be able to pay it, but I have not heard of one who wasun-able to pay the Third Party insurance. When a man is going to buy a car to take him to work, he knows before he starts that he will have to provide X dollars to comprehensively insure that car, the same way he knows he will have to provide the down payment to get the same car. If he does not have that, he will have to find ways and means to get it; he may have a good friend who is a politician who may be able to make a loan to him even if he does not pay it back, but the provision is made and he is protected and secured. That is what I am asking the Minister to go into -not hastily, but to call in the insurance people again and find out from them what can be done to help the man with a car that is not worth more than $500. 1.45 p.m.

The car is on the road and it can do the same damage as another car worth $10,000. We have to protect the man with a $500 car. Let the people know that they will have to make the necessary provision. If they are borrowing money from the Bank to purchase a car, then they will have to borrow more; if they are borrowing from Discount or taking the car from a garage they will have to get more money so that the insurance could be paid. If they had to pay $10 a month, then they may have to pay $10.50 a month in order to include the premium for the insurance. If that is done, it will protect the general public, the owner and everybody in case of an accident.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong this matter, but there is a point that the hon. member has omitted. The hon. member wants to know if a small-priced car hits a high-priced car, and the small-priced car is demolised, what will be the position. If the poor man's car is demolised and he has evidence to prove that he is right, then the owner of the $10,000 car, or his Insurance Company, will have to give him a car. That is logical. According to the law, he can take the man to Court and if he is found guilty he can then sue him and collect money for the days in which he was deprived of the use of his car. You cannot expect the Insurance Company to pay if the man is guilty of an offence. I cannot see how a $500 car can do $10,000 damage. (Mr. HINDS Cannot a bicycle do $10,000 damage?)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Members not addressing the Chair will please observe Standing Orders.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I was....

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:
Suppose it drives into a Gas Station and causes a fire which burns down Bay Street!

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:
I was talking about hitting another car.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:
The owner of the $10,000 car must lose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
Is the hon. member still addressing the Chair?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:
Yes, Mr. Chairman. I was explaining a point for the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. If the man is guilty of an offence, you could not expect the Insurance Company to pay when he was negligent on the road. If we were to do this it would be giving a licence to kill. People would then deliberately get their cars involved in accidents and expect the Insurance Company to pay. If the man with the $10,000 car was found guilty of negligence, he would have to pay the man with the small car. I could not ask the Insurance Companies to take on a thing like that because they would want to know whether I have gone mad. What would there be to stop people from deliberately getting themselves into accidents and then expect the Insurance Companies to pay for them?

Mr. SMITH:
Mr. Chairman, I shall try to be more explanatory to the Minister. A has a motor car which costs $10,000 and it is insured for $10,000. B has a motor car which is worth $500. B's car smashes the $10,000 car which is insured for $10,000, but B's car is only covered by Third Party insurance. Under this Bill the Insurance Company will pay the man $5,000 in accordance with this Bill, and the other $5,000 will be due and owing by the small man. The Insurance Company can then sue the small man for the extra $5,000 it had to pay out. The small man's car may have struck the big man's car so hard that both cars had to be written off. The small man will have nothing to carry him to work, but he will have to pay $5,000 plus his own losses. If the people at the Insurance Company know that he has a chattel house they will sue him, get judgment and take everything from him. That is the point I am trying to make.

Sir, I am saying that when the small man has a car for $500 he should make sure that comprehensive insurance is embodied in the price. He must get the bank or the garage to include the amount for insurance and protect himself. I wonder whether the Minister understands me now.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, I understand the hon. member quite well. To begin with, we are dealing with Third Party insurance as against comprehensive insurance. Garages or Insurance Companies will have to inspect the car before they will insure it comprehensively. The car must be of a certain age before they will insure it compre-hensively. The Insurance Companies also have to protect themselves. If a man gets into an accident and he is wrong, then you cannot expect the Insurance Company to pay for him.

Mr. SMITH:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Whether the man is right or wrong the Insurance Company will have to pay as long as he is insured. That is the purpose of insurance. Even if the man is right, the Insurance Company is not going to pay more than $5,000.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Point made.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is missing the point. If a man has his car insured for $7,000 or $10,000, that is a matter for the man and the Insurance Company. If the car gets into an accident, then the Insurance Company has to make things right. The man who is insured Third Party is in a differnt position, and that is the point I am drawing to the attention of the hon. member. Comprehensive insurance covers Third Party. but Third Party insurance does not cover a compre-hensive policy. You will have to pay a higher premium on comprehensive insurance. If you have a comprehensive policy and you become involved in an accident, whether you are right or wrong, the In-surance Company will have to pay. The Insurance Companies will insure new cars comprehensively, but I do not think that they will insure second hand cars comprehensively. (Asides) 1.55 p.m.

When you go to an Insurance Company and say that you want to have your car insured comprehen-sively, they ask you to bring it so that they can see it. If it is a new car from the garage, the garage has all this worked out for you; but Insurance Companies do not insure comprehensively cars such as the hon. member is speaking about.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
I am sure the Hon. Minister is still addressing the Chair.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:
Yes, Mr. Chairman, but you will get asides. What I am trying to point out to the hon. member is that Insurance Companies are like a close-knit society, and no matter which Insurance Company you go to you will notice that nearly all the premiums are the same, and nearly i all the fine writing is the same. This is one of those big concerns like the lawyers' equity. Nearly all the Insurance Companies are geared to Lloyds In-surance. If I put the suggestion which the hon. member made to them, they would not accept it. I had a second-hand car which I wanted insured compre-hensively, and they chased me out of the place. They wanted to know if I had gone mad. I would have had to get a new car so that if anything happened they garage would have had the first leaway. I under-stood what the hon. member was saying quite well, and if I imposed his suggestion on them by way of legislation, I could not impose the premiums they would charge; so they would be charging premiums that the person we are trying to protect would not be able to pay, since you do not pay insurance premiums for cars in instalments, and the premium for that type of car would cost more percentage - wise, than the car itself cost. This is what I was trying to point out to the hon. member all the time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
The question is.....

Mr. HINDS; Mr. Chairman, I have a point to make, and the hon. junior member for Bridgetown also has a point to make.

Hon. J. C, TUDOR:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. .SPEAKER resumed the Chair find reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 4.15 p.m.

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

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

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER:
When the sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee. To that it now reverts.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee on the Motor Vehicles Insurance (Third Party Riskd) (Amendment) Act, 1970.

THE MOTOR VEHICLES INSURANCE (THIRD PARTY RISKS) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1970

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
When the sitting was suspended, the hon. junior member for St. Peter was about to address the Chair. He may do so now, if he wishes.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I do not think you are altogether correct. It is only when you were about to put the question that the hon. junior member for St. Peter said he wanted to speak, but I was not finished. If you will remember, I gave way for the Hon. Leader of the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. senior member for St. Joseph may now proceed.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, are you right in telling the hon. junior member for St. Peter that he should proceed and now turning and telling the hon. senior member for St. Joseph that he should now proceed?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I saw a reluctance in the hon. junior member for St. Peter to rise.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, with due respect to the Chair, immediately you said what you had to say, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph jumped to his feet, and there was no point in my rushing against him. We are not competing one against the other at this stage. The point now is who is to proceed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN; The hon. junior member for St. Peter may proceed.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I give way to the hon. junior member for Bridgetown.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I think before the luncheon suspension was taken, the Minister who introduced this Bill seemed to have been labouring under some misapprehension as to what would happen in the case of a person who owned a motor vehicle which was valued at more than $5,000. The Minister may think in the circumstances that it is good to put a ceiling limit in respect of the damage to the personal property

of the third person, but although the principle of putting a ceiling limit is accepted, I myself would think these circumstances that a limit of $5,000 was too low. I say this because the property of a third person that may be involved here can well be a motor car, and a look at the value of motor cars today - and this is before the Budget Speech; I do not know what will happen after the Budget Speech - would show that even a medium -sized car in Barbados is going to cost more than $5,000, and if one thinks about a Triumph, Rover or even a Holden as the Minister himself possesses, then you will go away above the $5,000 limit. Let us, for example, take the case of a carworth $8,000 and the owner is not at fault. If the other party's insurance is limited by this Act to $5,000, if the car is completely destroyed, it means that the owner can sue the owner of the other car and get judgment for $8,000, but on the question of satisfying that judgment the Insurance Company would willingly pay to its limit under this Act of $5,000. Then it is incumbent upon the owner of the car, if he wants to recover the other"$3,000 loss which he suffered, to levy judgment either against the property of the other party or claim against his own Insurance Company. 4.20 p.m.

If he claims against his own Insurance Company then it will mean that he is going to lose his no-claim bonus, and therefore I would suggest to the Minister that he should consider the question of increasing the limit to $10,000. It is not only in cases of motor cars; if a man goes down the road and turns over and as a result of the accident there is a fire involved and a person's home is destroyed, it means, under this Act, that the owner of the house will only be entitled to recover from the Insurance Company $5,000 and will have to seek any sum over that from the owner himself. I therefore think that with the in-creased prices of cars and of materials as a whole, I would seriously suggest to the Minister that he should re-consider the ceiling limit and have it for a sum not exceeding $10,000. I grant you that it will increase the premiums slightly, but I believe that in the interest of the third party this should be done, and I would seriously suggest it to the Minister for his consideration.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that that this debate will come to an end prematurely, because I can go on and on because we have the pros and cons of this. The hon. member got up to speak under some sort of misapprehension; I am under no misapprehension or any apprehension whatsoever, and whenever you see me bring a Bill, Resolution of anything before this Chamber I am thoroughly au fait with the matter. One could go further than what the hon. member has just said; he has just accused me of being under a misapprehension and I can accuse him also for protecting the rich because this is all it sounds like to me. His argument is that if the insurance premium goes to $5,000 he would have to sue the Insurance Company; so he is more interested in the rich than the other man. As I said when I first introduced this Bill, one has to take into consideration various aspects of legislation; it is nothing that should be done in a hurry and it must be gone into very thoroughly. We have to protect all the people in the country; that is what we are here for. We have more poor people than rich ones in Barbados and we must protect all the people without imposing too heavy a burden on them. Throughout the entire world it is the rich who have to help the poor; so if we were to do what the hon. member has just suggested, the premiums would go up too high. They would be far out of proportion to what the same people we are trying to help will be able to pay, so that instead of helping them we will be creating a burden for them. Nobody goes out looking for an accident, but accidents go out looking for the people; sometimes you have your car

parked and somebody runs into it; these things happen and therefore we cannot always legislate to protect everybody. The prices of cars go up every year, and if we raise it up to $10,000, what will happen next year and the year after when these same cars cost $15,000? Will you expect me then to come and raise it again?

You must remember that the man to whom the senior member for St. Joseph referred is the workman who has to come to do your work, building a house for you or otherwise, and so he has his little automobile to get him to and from work; do you want to impose a condition on that man to prevent him from enjoying the standard which he wants to enjoy? The insurance is even more steep than the tax he pays for the car itself, because he can pay the tax in two instalments, but he cannot do this with the insurance premiums. This poor man will be in serious trouble; you have to remember that these people are what we call "day-to-day" workers, people who do not have any fixed income and who cannot go and withdraw money from the bank nor write cheques; so they have to get their little meeting-turn to pay their insurance. If I were to accept your suggestion, it would not be as easy as it seems to you; you must remember that running a Government is not as easy as one would think, and I would be imposing a condition on these people that they cannot manage.

We seem to have a little disagreement on the premium, but I cannot agree to raise the amount because raising the amount means that just now they will tell me that the man whom we are trying to protect would have to pay more. This is what we do not want to do; so I am hoping that the hon. member is satisfied with what I have pointed out to him and do not think that we us trying to be phlegmatic in this matter.

4.30 p.m.

I am not protecting anybody other than the man whom you yourself think you are representing.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, AS I have said before, the Minister is labouring under A misapprehension. Even when he accuses me of pro-tecting the rich, I still say that I am even strengthened in my argument in saying that the Minister is labouring.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. We do not need to quarrel over this matter, but I want the hon. member to quote what I have said correctly. I did not say that he is protecting the rich, and I did not imply that. He accused me of being under a misapprehension, and I said that if we were to carry the

matter to its logical conclusion I could have accused him of protecting the rich. I did not say that he was protecting the rich, but I said I could have accused him of protecting the rich. Let us get that straight. He knows the English Language and I know it, too, although I did not go to a College.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, whether he says that I am protecting the rich or he implies that I am protecting the rich, I still think that he conveys the same meaning. Let us start, first of all, with the taxi drivers. The Minister must realise that the majority of taxis operating in this country are large cars, and invariably the cars used as taxis must of necessity cost more than $5,000. Let us say that a taxi driver pays $6,000 or $7,000 for a Holden and that car is damaged. How much is he going to be paid? Will he recover $5,000 and lose the other $2,000? Certainly the Minister does not suggest that taxi drivers are rich people. By endeavouring to protect taxi drivers, it cannot be said that I am protecting rich people.

Secondly, let us look at the Police cars. Some of the most expensive cars in this country are used by the Police Department. What happens if a 3 Litre Austin, valued at $9,000, is damaged? Is the Government going to recover $5,000 and make the taxpayers pay the other $4,000 purely because under this Act the liability is limited to $5,000? Even the Minister and members on that side of the House own cars in excess of $6,000. Are they seriously going to suggest that, if a small man damages one of their cars which is covered by insurance, and the insurance policy says $5,000, they will be satisfied to recover only $5,000 for the car and suffer a loss of $13,000 or $15,000 by this? In order to show the fallacy of this argument, he says that if you make the premium too high you will put a burden on the poor man.

Mr. Chairman, the whole purpose of this legislation must be to protect the poor man. Using the same example which the senior member for St. Joseph used earlier today regarding a man who owned a car worth $500, let us say that he damages a motor car worth $8,000. The Insurance Company states that under the policy of insurance it will pay $5,000; so the owner of the damaged car must recover $3,000 more; there-fore, the owner of the motor car is going to levy against the small man's chattel house in an effort to recover that $3,000. That is why I say that the limit of liability should go up to $10,000. It means that if the poor man has no money of his own and can only pay $5,000, then the other man can recover judgment against him for $8,000. My purpose of saying that it should be raised to $10,000 is that it will protect the small man who gets into an accident and damages a very expensive car when he has no means of his own to pay for it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, to be perfectly frank, I wish to say that this matter has to be investigated more fully.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I should like to find out from the Minister what is the premium on this $5,000.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, I do not think the hon. member was listening to what I said, because I specifically said earlier that, according to the Actuarial Report from the Insurance Company it is stated

"To provide unlimited indemnity for Third Party liability relating to personal injury by removing provisos 5 and 6 of Section 4 (1) it would, probably, be necessary to increase the standard premiums for Act liability insurance by between 15% and 25% according to the type of vehicle concerned.

For example, it may be considered appropriate to increase the premium for the average private car from $12 to $15".

I mentioned that specifically. I went on to say that I am not an actuary. An actuary is a highly qualified person who works out for the Insurance Company how many people will die, how many people will steal, and so on.

I pointed out that if we were to ask the Insurance Companies to raise the amount to what has been mentioned here, the Companies would tell me that, as a result of my request, the premium will be $X. I could not argue with them because I do not know about it.

With regard to the point made by the junior member for the City, I should like to know whether he is asking me the same question asked by the senior member for St. Joseph. Does he want me to insist that all cars must be comprehensively insured? (Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY: I have not said that.) You are asking us to put the ceiling at $10,000. I gave an analogy that the cost of cars will be going up every year; the cost of living is going up and so on. The cost of cars has gone up by something like 20% or 25%. The car I am using costs $6, 190, but a similar new car now costs $8,000. Next year it will cost about $10,000, and in 1971 it will cost about $12,000 or $13,000, If you spend $13,000 on a car that amount of money will also give you at least two bedrooms and a kitchen in a bungalow, and the rest of the building can be built out of wood.

Are you expecting me to come back here in 1971 and raise the ceiling again? You have to remember that when you can change your car every year, you cannot expect a mason a carpenter, or an ordinary worker, to change his car. He has to wait and buy a second-hand car. If I called on the Insurance Companies to raise the ceiling, then what would happen in 1971, 1972 and 1973? That is the position with which we are faced.

4.40 p.m.

I could not introduce it because in 1971, 1972 or 1973 you could not expect me to come back in here and raise it again.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave for the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister to make a Statement re Police Pay.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Let the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister make that Statement.

STATEMENT BY RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER ON POLICE PAY

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, since 1961 when the Police rejected the Salaries Report of the Jacobs Commission, the salaries of the Force have largely been computed on a formula devised by the Field Committee on the basis of a similar formula recommended by a Royal Commission in Britain in 1961 for the British Police. The local formula consists of three factors as follows -

(1) Factor 'A' is the average annual earnings of categories V and VI of the Key Scales;

(2) Factor 'B' is calculated as 45% of factor 'A' and represents an estimated 20% for additional earnings from overtime of the workers at ' A' plus 25% for the weekly 'reserve' duty of the Police;

(3) Factor 'C' which is 20% of 'A' and 'B' combined, represents an assessment of the Constable's value to the community.

By this method the maximum of a Constable's pay is calculated and from that point all other rates of pay are calculated.

The Classification Commissioner took issue with some aspects of the formuls. He considered that the basis of factor 'A' was inappropriate and re-commended that instead of Key Scale employees, the salaries of comparable careers such as Messen-ger, Postman, Customs Guards, Clerical Officer and Unqualified Teacher should be used. He was unsatisfied that the appropriate percentage was applied in factor 'C' and recommended a figure of 12 1/2%, These arguments have been rejected by the Police and the outcome of the Classification Commissioner's rationalisation was unacceptable to them. Instead the Polled sought to improve the basis of factor 'A' by requesting that higher categories of the Key Scale - V1 and V11 - should be used and that factor 'C' be increased to 25% instead of 20%.

The sentiments of the Police were carefully examined by me and the Establishments section and in consultation with the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Prime Minister. However, because the Force did not accept the recommendations of the Classification Commissioner and because of the tight time schedule set for completing consideration of the Salaries Revision proposals, it was not possible to reconcile with the Police all the differing views on this matter before Salaries Revision and the pay structure of the Force continued to be based on Categories V and VI of the Key Scales.

The salary approved for Constable on the present basis of the formula accorded the grade of Constable an increase at commencement of 40% over the pre-revision scale in 1966. In other services - clerical, teaching etc. -the increase was 30% or less.

I should like to make that clear because it is a very important point, that in assessing the grade of Constable in the Salaries Revision, the increase at the bottom of the Constables' scale was inflated, if I may use that expression, to 40% which was in excess of the average increase for clerical grades and other branches of the Public Service.

Such is the effect of the formula which has been used to accord the Police a place in the pay structure of the Service which is commensurate with their value to the community and to the responsibilities of office. The following illustrate the point -

1961 1966 1969

(a) Constable $100 a month $120 (regraded $195 at $140)

It must also be remembered, of course, that the interval between the last two Salaries Re visions was a short period of less than three years whereas at no time in the history of Barbados, under this or any other Government, was a Salaries Revision undertaken in less than five years. The salary of a Constable at the bottom of the scale between 1966 and 1969 was $140. I should like to make it clear that this is a Constable going into the Regional Police Training School as what we call a raw recruit, a tenderfoot, a sprog, an irk and any other expression that you can think of. In the Air Force we used to call it 'the last form of animal life', but I do not apply that. This is what we called ourselves as re-cruits. That recruit today is getting $195 a month, but six months later when he leaves the Regional Police Training School as a full-fledged Constable, his pay immediately jumps by an Increment, and if he has one or two Certificates at Ordinary Level he gets an additional increment, and if he has any at "A" Level he can go right up to four increments which would make his salary after six months' service more than twice the salary of a clerical officer leaving a First Grade school in Barbados and entering the Public Service. Things have to be seen in that perspective. Now the Constable in 1961 started at the same salary level as the Long Grade clerical officer in the Public Service, but whereas a Constable went from $100 to $140 in 1966 at the bottom of the scale, the junior grades in the Civil Service went from $100 to $110; and whereas in 1969 a Constable went from $120 -regraded at $140 - to $195, if you entered the Civil Service today with your four Certificates at Ordinary Level, the Con-stable will be getting $195 and the clerical officer will be getting $140 a month.

In 1966 the Salaries Commissioner was not authorised to revise the wages of the casual and un-established staff, that is, the Key scales. For the first time in the history of the Public Service these wages were negotiated by the Trade Union representatives.

The 1966 Salaries Commissioner was not authorised to revise the wages of the casual and un-established staff - the Key scales. The Barbados Workers' Union had then for the first time been accepted as the accredited representative of these categories of employees and that Union was not disposed to treat with a Commissioner and therefore stuck to the method of collective bargaining in determining wages. 4.50 p.m.

This infection, of course, has spread now to all branches of the Public Service, including Permanent Secretaries and apparently Ministers as well; they all resort to collective bargaining, and I am the only person on the other side of the fence as the employer. Apparently the only people who draw money out of the Treasury who do not resort to collective bargaining is the Select Committee appointed by this Place to determine and send down a fiat on what wages they should get.

Police pay, like that of many other classes of officers - the entire subordinate services and the junior ranks of other services - is based on the Key Scales. When the Commissioner had reached the stage of writing his report, negotiations with the Barbados Workers' Union on the Key Scales had not been concluded and in order to determine the salary of the many posts which are graded on the Key Scales he made his own as sumption as to the possible rates of the Key Scales. In so doing he allowed a percentage increase as a margin of error. But Police pay, like that of the other ranks of the service had already been agreed. This matter was one of the planks on which the Civil Service Association based their argument for a classification committee and a proposal from that Union for an examination of the scales affected was not acceded to in 1967 because of the decision to set up the classification committee.

In the context of the classification exercise the Police requested an adjustment to their salary from 1st April 1966 to take into account the underestimation of factor 'A' of the formula re suiting from the circumstances rslated above. Such an adjustment would have given a Constable a commencing salary of $1, 680 per annum in respect of the 1966 salary scales as against $1, 440 which was implemented. It was, however, decided that any adjustments re suiting from classification should be effective from 1st April, 1969, the same date of salaries revision as the cost of going back to 1st April, 1966 would be phenomenal and would materially affect Government's capacity to meet the costs of the 1969 salaries revision. This has been explained to the Police who acknowledge that a financial problem might be created. I have never ignored the validity of their claim but I must faceup to the knotty financial

problem.

The whole question of Police pay has now been re-examined by the Minister of Home Affairs and myself at three separate meetings with representatives of the Police Association and the Gazetted Officers. Special note has been made of the fact that there has been a re classification and regrouping of workers falling within the categories on which the pay is based and it has therefore been agreed that the type of worker chosen as the basis of the formula should be in one category - Category VI. The effect of this is that a new salary structure will be devised for the Force which will provide for the maximum salary of a Constable, exclusive of the two long service increments, to be $4, 380 a year instead of the present $4, 140. The scale for Constable will therefore be $2, 520: 2,700 x 180 - 4, 140 x 240 -4, 380. This is a starting salary of $210 per month.

From this point there will be general upgrading of all scales above Constable by at least one increment. It has been agreed that these new scales should take effect from 1st January, 1970.

I should like to make it clear that much to the disappointment of the people who were trying to incite mutiny in the Force, the Police have accepted that the date will be 1st January, 1970, and it is to be clear that this is in settlement of all outstanding disputes as regards salaries, but not other conditions of service such as whether they should have Wellington boots or not. That is not a matter for me to decide; that will be decided elsewhere and I have made this clear to the representatives of the Police who appeared before me.

I will not now enumerate all the various in-creases, but they are set out in this Statement and start at $210 at the bottom and go right up to the Commissioner of Police who will be just slightly below a Permanent Secretary's salary.

For comparative purposes the pre-revision, the revised and the new scales are as follows:

Pre 1969 Revision Revised 1/4/69 Revised 1/1/70

Constable ' 1, 440:
1, 560x120-1,800 x180-3,0603, 240 3, 420 2, 3402, 520x180 -4, 1404, 320 4, 560 2, 5202,700x180-4,

140x240- 4, 3804, 620 4, 860

Corporal 3, 420x180-3, 780 4, 560x240-5,040 4, 860x240-5, 340

Sergeant 3, 960x180-4, 320 5, 280x240-5, 760 5, 580x240-6,060

Station

Sergeant 4,500 6,000 6,300x240-6, 780

Inspector 4, 680x180-5,400 6, 240x240-6, 960 7,020x240-7, 260 x300-7, 560

Assistant Superintendent 5, 580x180-6, 480 7,200x300-8,400 7, 860x300-8, 460: 8, 820

Superintendent 6, 660x240-7, 380 8, 760x360-9, 480 9, 180x360-9,900

Senior Superin-tendent 7, 680x240-7, 920 9, 840x480-10, 320 10, 380: 10, 860

Assistant Commissioner 8, 880 10,800 11, 760

Deputy Commissioner 9,600 12,000 12, 720

Commissioner 10, 560 13,200 13, 920

The increased cost of the regrading with effect from 1st January, 1970, will be in the vicinity of $275,000 a year when the Police scales are applied to other services (Fire and Prisons) which have all along been graded with the Police. For reasons of finance and in the light of this new decision to regrade Police pay with effect from 1st January, 1970, it has been agreed as I have said before, that any question of retroactive pay for the Police with effect from 1st April, 1966, is now closed, and will for ever be formally agreed and settled.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND BUDGETARY PROPOSALS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the next Order under Government Business be the presentation of the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals of this fiscal year by the Minister of Finance.

Hon. R. ST.C. WEEKES:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. Rt. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, It has been my practice to lay an annual economic survey before Parliament some time before I present my financial statement and budgetary proposals.

Last year due to difficulties in obtaining information from the various sectors of the ecomony upon which to lay the foundation for intelligent analysis I had to seek the indulgence of the House for the postponement of the presentation of the economic survey until some months subsequent to the budget. This year a similar situation compels me to seek again the indulgence of the House. The large deficit of over $12 1/2 million between our estimated expenditure and estimated revenue for the current financial year dictates a much earlier budget than usual in order to maximise the additional revenue which I expect will accrue from my proposals.

This.early presentation of the budget has compounded the difficulty of first laying the economic survey.

I propose however, Mr. Speaker, to examine the performance of the economy as briefly and as thoroughly as I can from the material available up to the end of last week so that members may at least not be in a situation any more unfavourable than the premises from which I have risen to speak.

General

Preliminary indications are that whereas the economy continued to grow there was a slackening in the rate of growth during 1969 as compared with 1968. Estimates of the gross domestic product for 1968 stand at $216.7 million in current prices.

5.00 p.m.

at $216.7 million in current prices. This represented an increase of 14.5% over the 1967 figure. Firm estimates for 1969 are not yet available, but data on the major sectors suggest a rate of growth lower than the previous year. Mainly accounting for this was a drastic reduction in the value of sugar production and a lower rate of increase in gross tourist receipts as compared with 1968. Available evidence suggests, however, that these two factors were partially offset by significant expansion in the Government, distribution and construction sectors.

Sugar

Receipts from the export of sugar totalled $22.1 million, a fall of $7.3 million (or 25%) from the 1968 figur. Although there have been decreases in the acreage and tonnage of cones reaped, as well as in the average yield of cane per acre and the average yield of sugar per acre, there can be little doubt that the continued high incidence of cane fires contributed to the very low level of sugar production in 1969. Total production fell to 138.5 thousand tons, the lowest for this decade, 1962 and 1963 being the next two lowest years, when 159,000 tons were recorded.

Tourism

Estimated tourist expenditure during 1969 rose by about $3 million from $53.9 million in 1968 to $56.8 million in 1969, representing a rate of increase of 5.4%. This moderate increase in earnings despite a 19% increase in the number of visitors from 115, 697 in 1968 to 137, 632 in 1969 can be attributed to the significant increase in the number of "short -stay" visitors, with a concomitant reduction in the number of "long-stay" visitors. During the year there was a considerable expansion in hotel accommodation as an estimated 870 beds were added to the industry. This compares with a growth in capacity in 1968 of 625 beds.

Prices

Our economy continues to face the problem of rising prices. The index of retail prices rose by 5.5 points between the end of December 1968 and the end of December 1969, representing a 4.7% increase which compares favourably with an increase in 1968 over 1967 of 9.3%. There is no doubt that the effects of devaluation continue to be felt, although the slower rate of price increase recorded last year suggests that these effects are becoming weaker. It is also tempting to attribute the rising price level, as some economists would have us do, to increased wages, or to increased monetary flows. However, while both of these have some influence, it is reasonable to state that in our situation the level of inflation which we have been facing is to a large extent, a function of the "openness" of our economy. Considering the high proportion of our imports to Gross Domestic Product (77.5% in 1968), it will be readily appreciated that there is a limit to the amount of influence which we are able to exert on the prices of several commodities which we consume.

This Government, however, is not indifferent to the problem, and the proposed Prices Commission is designed to protect unwary citizens against un-scrupulous traders and importers.

The Island continues to rely heavily upon imports to satisfy our consumption and investment requirements. The 1969 figures show a total import bill of $197.5 million, an increase of $29.5 million, or 17.6% over 1968. This represents a slower rate of growth of imports than in the previous year when imports rose in value by 25.3%. The categories of imports showing the greatest increases in absolute terms were: manufactured goods classified chiefly by materials ($8.6 million); miscellaneous manufactured articles ($6.3 million); machinery and transport equipment ($5.7 million and Food ($3.8 million.)

Although price increases inflated the value of imports, there was a considerable rise in volume as well. Rising imports are a function of the structure and stage of development of an economy such as ours. It reflects a situation to be faced by any small open economy hoping to achieve a diversified economic structure and higher standards of living for its people.

Total exports during 1969 declined by $8.3 million, that is by 11% to $71.4 million. Of this total domestic exports contributed $52 million and reexports $19.4 million both having fallen as compared with 1968. It is worthy of mention in this context, that while exports of some of the newer commodities, (e.g. manufactured articles) increased, this was insufficient to compensate for the large reduction in the value of sugar exports.

With a large increase in imports, and a significant decrease in exports, our visible trade deficit increased by $38 million from $88 million in 1968 to $126 million in 1969. This rather large gap in the current account has been financed by invisible exports and capital inflows. In fact, although the importance of tourism in this respect cannot be overlooked, it has already been noted that its contribution during the past year increased only moderately. In this context, there is evidence that the banking sector has been contributing to the financing of this deficit.

International Monetary Scene

The past year witnessed a considerable improvement in the United Kingdom external position. During the last 15 months the United Kingdom not only reduced outstanding debt by more than one half, but United Kingdom official reserves rose by several million pounds. The United Kingdom's balance of payments is in surplus and even though the surplus may fluctuate from quarter to quarter the United Kingdom estimates a very strong surplus on current account for the next 12 months. The British Bank Rate was reduced in two stages during this year from 8% to 7% and certain major banks in the United States of America have recently reduced their prime rate to 7%. While it appears that there may be efforts to reduce interest rates, there is no doubt that any reduction in this direction will be very gradual. Recent changes both in the United Kingdom Bank Rate and the United States prime rate have had no marked effect on market rates in London and it is not yet any cheaper for us to raise loans on the London market. 5.10 p.m.

I come now to Regional Economic Integration.

At this point, I shall briefly review relationships with our neighbours in the Caribbean. The Caribbean Free Trade Association ended its second year of operation at the end of April, 1970. Available data indicates significant increases in trade with our CARIFTA partners. The value of total imports from other CARIFTA states amounted to $21 million in

1969, an increase of $4 million (or 24%) over 1968. Total exports increased by $2.5 million (or 21.0%) over the 1968 figure to $14.2 million. However, although imports have shown a greater percentage increase, it may be observed that the rate of change of exports between 1968 and 1969 has been higher than that of imports during the same period. In 1968 imports had grown by 28.6% over 1967, whereas exports had grown by only 14.0%.

However, it is recognised that mere free trade in commodities is not enough. It is in this context that the Regional Development Bank has an important function to play in the channelling and allocation of development funds to the various member states. This institution is now a reality. Its board of governors held their inaugural meeting in January,

1970, and the Bank is now in the process of selecting its staff. It is hoped that it will be fully operational later this year, and that under the guidance of its distinguished President, Sir Arthur Lewis, the bank will play its role as the mainspring of Caribbean economic integration.

Barbados Development Bank

The Barbados Development Bank completed its first year of operations on the 31st March, 1970. As was to be expected the first year was a modest year but this Government is well aware of the function which the Bank is destined to perform in the development of agriculture, tourism and industry. Negotiations are in train with the Inter-American Development Bank to channel global loans for the development of the various sectors of the economy and it is expected that a small team from the Inter-American Development Bank will shortly visit Barbados to discuss with the management of the Bank the organisation which the Bank needs to establish in order to administer the funds which will be channelled through it. Preliminary indications are that they will be releasing $US 3 million to the Development Bank.

Commercial Banks

Commercial banking in Barbados continues to expand. At 31st March, 1970, total bank deposits stood at $174.8 million as compared with $138.1 million at the 31st March, 1969. The growth in bank deposits was $36.7 million or 26.5%. Total loans and advances at 31st March 1970 amounted to $141.6 million as compared with $91.1 million at the end of March, 1969.

Central Bank of Barbados

In my last budget speech Mr. Speaker, I announced my intention to establish a Central Bank for Barbados. Following this the Bank of England made available the services of an expert to undertake a study of and report on the implications of the establishment of a Central Bank of Barbados while maintaining the present association with the East Caribbean Currency Authority in respect of the issue of currency and also to advise on the possible association of Barbados with the International Monetary Fund. The Report has been delivered to me and I have spent some time studying its implications along with the officials in my Ministry, I have also had the benefit of further discussions with the Bank of England Experts who visited the Island in March of this year.

Greater priority will be given to the establishment of the Bank in the course of the next few months and it is my intention that the Bank should be established before the end of 1970.

I propose also to revitalise and find new premises for the Savings Bank, whose deposits have remained static at $17 million for a number of years.

Salaries Revision

On the 4th November, 1969. I informed the House that the Government was in process of a . general revision of salaries and wages of all public officers and employees from the 1st April, 1969. The revision has now been completed and the estimate of cost originally set at $8.5 million is closer to $12.5 million if one must judge from the increase in the cost of personal emoluments in 1970/71 as compared with the estimated cost for 1969/70 without the salaries revision.

I shall now deal with the revenue and expenditure for 1969/70. In reviewing this, I shall deal with the financing of expenditure for the financial year which has just past. The Approved Estimates of current expenditure for 1969/70 was $62.0 million which together with Supplementary Estimates of $11.2 million (mainly for salaries increases) made a total approved expenditure of $73.2 million. Actual expenditure amounted to $73.1 million. The budgeted revenue was $63.7 million whereas actual revenue for the year amounted to $75.3 million giving a surplus of $2.2 million. The revenue yields were as follows:

	$ million
Customs Duties and Internal Consumption Duties	31.47
Taxation	29.96
Other Revenue	13.94
Total	75.37

The main sources of additional revenue were -customs, excise and internal consumption duties $4 million, Taxation $5.9 million and Receipts of Government Departments $1.8 million.

Capital Expenditure 1969/70

Actual Capital Expenditure in 1969/70 amounted to $11.3 million whereas the approved Capital Estimates under the Development Plan was $18.2 million.

Mr. Speaker, you will remember that the Estimates for Capital Expenditure in the Development Plan was presented very late, so that expenditure fell short by some $7 million of the amount that had been outlined in the Plan.

The Capital Expenditure was financed as follows:

Loans raised $1.0 million C.D. & W. Grants .7 Borrowing Revenue Equalisation and Surplus Funds 1.4 Advances Joint Consolidated Fund 2.5 Cash resources 5.7

11.3 million Public Debt

At the 1st April, 1969, the funded Public Debt stood at $53.9 million while outstanding Treasury Bills amounted to $7.5 million. At the 31st March, 1970 the Public Debt had increased to $54.9 million while Treasury Bills outstanding had decreased to $5.3 million.

I shall now deal, Mr. Speaker, with the revenue and expenditure for 1970/71.

Revenue and Expenditure 1970/71

The approved Estimates for 1970/71 call for expenditure on the current and capital services of Government to the extent of $113.71 million as follows:

Current Expenditure $ 89.54 million

Capitol Expenditure 24.17

$113.71 million 5.20 p.m.

Both of these sums represent an all time record for this island.

Current revenue is estimated at $76.8 million and the deficit on current account is $12.7 million or approximately $13 million when we add the cost of the revised Police salaries which the Government has agreed to pay and which I mentioned earlier today. It will be necessary to raise by way of loans all the funds which are required to carry out the Capital Programme.

Budget Proposals

I now come to the fiscal measures which I propose for the year 1970/71 in order that the Government may meet its commitments. The 1969 Budget imposed one major new tax, the Land Transfer Tax but did not increase existing taxes. The Land Trans-fer Tax Act after initial difficulties worked quite smoothly and for the 9 months of 1969/70 for which the tax was payable collections amounted to $870,000 or $120,000 more than I anticipated when I introduced it.

This country is producing an increasing range of manufactured products and the Government continues to promote this development by the grant of duty free tax and other concessions to industry.

I cannot promise hon. members that I will again present a tax free budget in 1970 and I now advise them to prepare themselves for the take off.

Income Tax

The Ministry of Finance continues to receive representations for the separate assessment of husbands and working wives. Government is not unaware of the effect of the rates of tax on earned incomes whether such income is derived by one person or jointly by husband and wife. I regret that in 1970 I can make no concession in this respect but the posi-tion is being kept under review. I also regret that in a

year in which the current account of Government is heavily in deficit no concessions can be made in respect of the rates of tax in the scale of allowances. The position with regard to the incidence of income tax remains unchanged.

Management Fees

From year to year companies operating here with Head Offices abroad charge in their accounts and are allowed deductions for income tax purposes amounts paid in respect of management or administration fees and charges and Head Office expenses. Available statistics show that the sums leaving the island annually in respect of these charges exceed $2 million and I propose, as some other Governments have done, to levy a tax on such payments to non residents. The rate of tax I propose is 15% and the yield from this source is estimated at $300,000 a year.

Customs and Internal Consumption Duties

Seven years ago, to be precise on the 7th May, 1963, in my budget proposals for that year, I increased the road tax on gasolene and other petroleum distillates, except kerosene by 5 cents to 31 1/2 cents a gallon. This tax has remained at that level since then and I think the time is ripe for a further increase in this tax, and in view of the fact that the distributors have elected to close early - and it is now past their closing time - I can say that the road tax on motor spirit and other petroleum distillates except kerosene, will be increased by 5 1/2 cents making a total tax of 37 cents a gallon. That is not all.

I propose that the retail prices of motor spirit should be increased by 8 cents. The price of gasolene will therefore be - regular 80 cents a gallon, premium 88 cents a gallon.

It will be noted that of the 8 cents increase the road tax will absorb 51/2 cents and 31/2 cents will go to the trade. Please note that I said"to the trade"; I hope it goes to the distributors because I do not personally think that the International Oil Companies need any more money, and I hope that the traders will insist that they get the major proportion of it. I expect that the public will be no longer inconvenienced by the restriction in the service rendered by the Service Stations, and that they will pay the minimum wages that we have proposed.

I do not propose any changes in the customs tariff, but I propose to use the consumption tax device to obtain additional revenue.

I propose the following increase in the consumption duties at present payable -

Items of Goods Present Rate Proposed Rate Beer 61 pergallon 86 per gallon

Cement 6 per 100 lbs 10 per 100 lbs.

I propose to remove the import duties on raw materials used in the manufacture of beer.

I propose the following new consumption duties:

Item of Goods Rate

Fruit juices and vegetable juices 10% ad val

Surface-acting agents and washing preparations without soap (detergents) 5% ad val

Varnishes and lacquers 10 pergal.

Paints and enamels 10% ad val

Toilet soap in cake or tablet form including shaving soap 10% ad val

Imitation Jewellery 10% ad val

Jewellery of precious metals and stones 20% ad val

Perfumed spirits, including Eau de Cologne, Lavender Water, Florida Water, Shaving Lotions, Limacol and Bay Rum 10% ad val

Phonographs, radios, radiogramophones, tape recorders and other sound recorders and players 5% ad val

Television sets 5% ad val

Washing machines 5% ad vail

Water heaters 5% ad val

Air-conditioning equipment 5% ad val

5.30 p.m.

Malt Beverages

I also propose a consumption tax on Tiger Malt and other manufactured malt beverages whether manufactured locally or outside, to be levied on the same scale as consumption tax is levied on aerated mineral waters.

Package Tax

I propose that the present tax of 25 cents per 56 lbs. or part thereof be replaced by a charge of 25 cents per 50 lbs. or part thereof. The substitution of 50 lbs for 56 lbs will considerably ease the administration of the Act and at the same time will increase the yield from this source.

Licences to Distil Rum

I propose that the fee chargeable under Section 22 of the Rum Duty Act 1906-6 should be increased from $100 to $200.

Warehouse Rents

I propose that the warehouse rent at present charged in respect of spirits in bottles, rum in bottles and wine in bottles should be increased from 40 cents to 50 cents per case of one dozen reputed quarts for a period of 12 months or any shorter period.

Temporary Driving Licences

Driving Licences are issued to visitors free of charge. About 10,000 such licences are issued annually, and I propose that visitors should pay the fee of $5.00 which is payable by residents. The yield should be $50,000 a year.

Town Planning Applications

I propose to introduce a scale of fees for planning applications, approvals and certificates. The scale of fees is at present under study in the Ministry of Home Affairs and it is my intention that the charges should take place with effect from 1st July, 1970. The estimate of revenue from this source is $40,000 in a full year.

You will notice that there is a common feature about this Budget and this is a nationalistic Budget. It is a Budget for Barbadians. I am not discriminating against people from outside, neither am I suffering from xenophobia, but I feel the time is ripe to encourage Barbadian industry and enterprise and to discourage people from exploiting our economy.

Hotel Tax

Tourism continues to play a leading role in the economy of the Island. In 1968 the number of visitors reached the level of 115,600 or an increase of 26.4% over the figure for 1967. Tourist expenditure was estimated at $53.9 million or an increase of $19.1 million over the 1967 figure. In 1969 the number of visitors rose to 137,600 and tourist expenditure was estimated at $56.8 million.

Most of us share the view expressed by my friend the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth of the Bahamas that the Caribbean Hotel operators may well be pricing themselves out of business. My Government has issued repeated warnings that the Barbados based industry should not develop such a reputation.

From 1956 concessions have been granted to the hotel industry and the Government has contributed very significantly to the expansion which has taken place in this industry during the past fourteen years. The amount which hotel companies have contributed to the Treasury by way of tax on profits is very small in proportion to gross receipts of the industry. The total earnings of the hotel industry are in excess of the earnings of the sugar industry, and I consider the time has come for the industry to make a greater direct contribution to the cost of running the country. Various methods are used for taxing hotels. In some countries a tax is imposed on rooms above a certain value. In Barbados rates are normally quoted to include room and board, and I therefore propose to impose a levy on the gross receipts less commissions. The rate I propose is 4% and it will be calculated on gross receipts less 15%. This tax will be separate and apart from any income tax a hotel is liable to pay, but the hotel tax will be a deduction for the purpose of calculating the assessable income for the person or company. The effective rate of the tax will therefore be 2.4% since the company rate is 40%. I should like to make it clear that this is a tax on the hotels and not on the customers or guests. Any attempt by the hotel operators to increase room rates or prices over the existing levels will be met by drastic restrictions imposed by Government on my

recommendation.

General Rate

I propose that the general rate be levied at 25% of the rateable value, the same as for 1969/70.

Mr. Speaker, hon. members will remember that when we took over the Local Government there was quite a disparity between rates in the North and South :uis-a-uis the rates paid by people who live within the Corporate area of the Bridgetown City Council. We have rationalised this and reduced the rates of hereditaments in the outlying Local Government Districts to 25% from over 30%, and we have increased the rates for people like myself who live in the Bridgetown City Council area to 25%, so that you gain and we lose.

I do not propose any change; so when I referred to general rates, I was talking about what used to be Local Government rates. I think, perhaps, only two or three members of this House actually benefitted from that reduction.

Reasonable progress has been made in regard to the new valuation system based on the modified site value already explained to the House by me. It is expected that the new valuations will be ready towards the end of 1971.

Hospital Charges

The fees at present chargeable in respect of hospitalization are very low indeed. The charge for a private room is $15 per day, but some private rooms are $7.50 per day due to a misinterpretation of the regulations. A paying bed in a public ward is $3.00 per day. No payment for medicines is made by any in-patient, whether public or private, and though a fee of 25 cents is prescribed for medicines supplied to out-patients in practice no such fee is charged except recently in the case of private out-patients who have been required to pay the cost price of medicines supplied to them.

The hospital costs the taxpayers just over $7 million a year to run or $12,000 per bed. The average daily cost of a bed, whether in a private or public ward, is in the realm of $33.50.

In practice a patient admitted to hospital chooses the accommodation he desires. Many patients carry insurance aganst hospitalisation and medical fees and yet elect to enter a public ward where both accommodation and treatment are free benefiting not themselves but the foreign controlled insurance companies in the last analysis. The Government is very heavily subsidizing the cost of hospital care for patients who can well afford to meet, if not the whole, at least some portion of the cost of their treatment.

Since a considerable part of this budget was devised in the seclusion of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, it is only poetic justice that the hospital should benefit from the budget.

To reduce the very heavy subsidy now being met by Government and at the same time avoid hardship to persons unable to meet the cost of the treatment, I propose the following as far as accommodation is concerned: 5.40 p.m.

The fee for a private room will be $20 a day and if air conditioned with direct access to a bathroom 25 a day. The scale of doctors fees will be the same for all private rooms. Government is entitled to 25% of these.

Medicines

All fee-paying in-patients in private wards will be required to pay for medicines at cost price plus 10%. This is far below the cost plus 80% to 150% charged by pharmacists. The mark-up by pharmacists in Barbados is between 80% and 150%, and in some cases it is over 300%, but the average is between 80% and 150%.

There are a number of other matters which do not fall within the scope of a Budget Statement which will be reviewed when the Hospital Regulations are being amended.

Landing Charges - seawell Airport

In 1965 the scale of landing fees was revised and in 1967 an adjustment was made in respect of aircraft of over 105,000 lbs. in weight. At present landing charges are charged in accordance with a sliding scale which starts at $1.00 per 1,000 lbs. and varies in blocks of 10,000 lbs. until 100,000 when the price is stabilized at $1.00 per 1,000 lbs. for aircraft over 100,000 lbs.

The average jet, I might mention, that we have now is about 325,000 pounds and the average landing fee taken from jet aircraft on each landing is between $300 and $360.

In the intermediate stages the charge varies and with a weight of 20,001 lbs. the price is $2.15 per 1,000 lbs. and at 30,001 it is $1.66 per 1,000 lbs. The variation continues downward until at 90,001 lbs. the rate is $1.03.

In 1968 the Meteorological Office went into opera-tion, the new taxiway cost just over $1,000,000 and the proposed introduction of Radar will cost $240,000 a year. The new development programme for Seawell International Airport is estimated to cost in the region of $20 million.

In view of the considerable expenditure projected for the Airport I propose the following scale of charges with effect from 1st July, 1970:-

Light aircraft up to 6,000 lbs.

all up weight No charge

Aircraft between 6001 lbs. and

12500 all up weight $1.00 per 1,000 lbs.

Aircraft between 12501 lbs. and

60,000 lbs. all up weight $1.25 per 1,000 lbs.

Aircraft between 60001 lbs. and

120,000 lbs. all up weight $1.50 per 1,000 lbs.

Aircraft between 120,001 lbs. and

350,000 lbs. all up weight $1.75 per 1,000 1bs;

When we come now to the larger aircraft which we hope will be here within the next twelve months, such aircraft as the Boeing 747, the Jumbo Jets, the Lockheed 1011 and so on - the Boeing 747 will weigh probably in the vicinity of 700,000 pounds, and all aircraft over 350,000 pounds, that is, over the size of existing jets, will pay $612.50 plus 75 cents per 1,000 pounds in addition to the $612.50.

There will be certain exemptions -

(1) Test nights;

(2) Aircraft returning without an intermediate landing within one hour due to weather or mechanical or radio defects;

(3) State and military aircraft.

A reduction of 50% will be made in respect of approved training flights and helicopters.

Parking Charges

The charge for 24 hours or part there of in excess of the first six hours will be 20% of the landing charge. State and military aircraft will be exempt from parking charges and in the case of aircraft using South Park the fee will be 10% of the landing charge.

I should explain that there is a parking apron for aircraft under 60,000 pounds on the far side of the runway, and that is what we call South Park.

Airport Service Charge.

At present an airport service charge of $2.00 is made on all out-going passengers other than in-transit passengers and specially exempted persons. I propose that the charge should be increased to $3.00 in the case of persons travelling within the Caribbean area which shall include the Guianas and the Bahamas and in the case of persons travelling outside the Caribbean area the charge will be $5.00.

Property Transfer Tax

This is another department in which one may claim it is a Budget for nationals.

In 1969 I imposed a tax of 2 1/2% of the gross proceeds on the transfer of any land or interest in land or shares. This tax is payable by the vendor but where the purchaser is a non-national an equivalent

transfer tax of 2 1/2% is payable by the purchaser as well. The legislation came into force with effect from 1st July, 1969, and the yield from this tax to the end of the financial year 31st March, 1970 was $870,000. A conservative estimate of the value .Of the property transferred during the 9 month period would be $25 million.

I now propose that the rate of tax payable by the vendor remains unchanged at 2 1/2% but I propose that where the purchaser is a non-national the rate of transfer tax payable by the purchaser will be 7 1/2% of the consideration for the sale.

Applications for residence permits

Another nationalistic, I suppose, impost is in respect of residence permits.

It is proposed to impose a charge on applications to reside or to reside and work in Barbados. I propose that a fee of $10.00 for each such application should be charged.

Summary

I shall now summarize the main features of this Budget -

It is proposed -

(1) To tax amounts paid non residents in respect of management or administration fees and head office expenses.

(2) To increase the road tax on motor spirit and diesel fuel.

(3) To increase the consumption tax on beer and cement.

(4) To impose consumption duties on -

(a) Fruit and vegetable juices;

(b) Detergents and toilet soaps;

(c) Varnishes, lacquers, paints and enamels;

(d) Imitation jewellery and jewellery of precious metals and stones;

(e) Perfumed spirits, etc. which will include toilet water, cologne, limacol and bay rum;

(f) Phonographs, radios, radio-gramophones, tape recorders and other sound recorders and players;

(g) Television sets;

(h) Washing machines and water heaters;

(i) Air-conditioning equipment;

(j) Manufactured Malt Beverages, whether Tiger malt or Heineken or any other imported

manufactured malt, but it should not apply to things like Horlicks and Milo;

(5) To levy package tax at the rate of 25 cents per 50 Ibs. or part thereof.

(6) To increase the licence to distil rum.

(7) To increase warehouse rents in certain cases.

(8) To impose a fee for the grant of a temporary driving licence for visitors;

(9) To impose charges on Town Planning applications.

(10) To impose a hotel tax.

(11) To fix the General Rate on property at 25% of the rateable value which is the same as last year;

(12) To increase hospital charges in certain cases.

(13) To increase landing and parking charges at Seawell International Airport.

(14) To increase the airport service charge.

(15) To increase the rate of property transfer tax payable by non-nationals from 2 1/2% to 71/2%;

(16) To impose a charge for applications to reside or to reside and work in Barbados.

5.50 p.m.

The measures which I have outlined are expected to produce $4.789 million made up as follows:-

Road Tax $ 550,000

Consumption Duties 827,500

Package Tax 100,000

Income Tax on Management Fees 300,000

Licences and Rents 52,800

Hotel Tax 1,200,000

Landing Charges 1,000,000

Airport Service Charge 144,000

Property Transfer Tax 500,000

Residence Applications 25,000

Hospital Charges 50,000

Town Planning Applications 40,000

$4, 789,000

The estimates of revenue for the current year have been reviewed and additional revenue may be expected from some sources. The most significant source is the customs and excise department where the estimates of revenue have been revised upwards by $2 million. This is since we considered the Estimates in March I have done that revision. This brings to $6, 789 million the amount of additional revenue that may be expected. There has been a significant growth in revenue yields over the past five years as the following figures will illustrate:-

Year Revenue

1965/66 $40.097 million

1966/67 43.828 million

1967/68 50.374 million

1968/69 59.380 million

In 1969/70, without any additional taxation other than the land transfer tax which was only $870,000, it rose from that figure by $14 million to $75.365 million.

The approved estimate of revenue for 1970/71 is $76.818 million as compared with collections of $75.365 for 1969/70. This gives an increase of $1.453 million or less than 2% over 1969/70. From the growth pattern over the last five years I am of opinion that the natural increase which may be expected together with the additional taxation which has been imposed would be sufficient to meet the requirements of Government on current account for 1970/71. In effect only 50% of the deficit is being made up by taxation; $7 million as against just over $13 million deficit,

Conclusion

Mr. Speaker, the Approved Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for 1970/71 show a deficit of $12.7 million. In 1969/70 the estimated deficit was $4.293 million and despite the heavy additional expenditure arising out of the salaries revision the out-turn was a modest surplus of $2.2 million. I have never in my Budgetary Proposals attempted to produce by taxation the precise mathematical sum which will close the gap between estimated expenditure and estimated revenue. I have planned to raise additional revenue of $4.7 million by taxation and a revision of customs revenue shows that an additional $2 million may be expected. In pursuance of my policy to rely upon the principle of deficit budgeting to avoid a deflationary situation and to encourage consumer demand I do not seek to raise by further taxation the further sum of $6.0 million which would be necessary to eliminate the deficit altogether.

The proposals for raising additional revenue to meet the requirements of this country will come into effect as follows:-

Income Tax on management fees and Hotel tax-year of income 1970, and must be paid by the 31st March, 1971.

Landing charges, Airport Service Charge, Hospital Charges and fees for Town Planning Applications - from 1st July, 1970.

All other proposals come into effect immediately except in the case of the property transfer tax which, although coming into effect immediately, will not affect contracts for sale or transfer already signed by or on behalf of the parties thereto provided such transfers are concluded on or before the 30th June, 1970.

Mr. Speaker, the proposals which I have just made in the light of our past performances should go a long way towards maintaining our reputation as a solvent progressive and viable society. I have every reason to believe that my next budget based on our expected performance for this year of grace 1970 will go even further in improving not only our already improved standards but the very quality of life which we enjoy in this country.

PAPERS LAID

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:
Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following documents in connection with my Financial Statement and Budgetary Pro-posals-

The Consumption Tax (No. 2) Order, 1970. An Act to amend the Petroleum Act, 1882. An Act to amend the Package Tax Act, 1941.

An Act to amend the Property Transfer Tax Act, 1969,

BILLS READ A FIRSTIME

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Package Tax Act, 1941 be now read a first time.

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

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Petroleum Act, 1882 be now read a first time.

Hon. R. StC. WEEKES:
I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 6.00 p.m.

PROPERTY TRANSFER TAX

(AMENDMENT NO. 2)

BILL, 1970

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Property Transfer (Amendment No. 2) Bill, 1970, be read the first time.

Hon. R. StC. WEEKES:
I beg to second that.

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

MOTOR VEHICLES INSURANCE (THIRD PARTY RISKS) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1970

Hon. J. C. TUROR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House resume Committee on the Motor Vehicles Insurance (Third Party Risks) (Amendment) Act, 1970.

Hon. R. St. C. WEEKES:

I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

IN COMMITTEE

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister told us that the premium on a $5,000 car would be about $15.00. If that is the case, then I cannot see why something could not be done by way of increasing it to $20.00. In my opinion $20.00 per year for insurance is not too much. Look at the protection you will be getting. Even if it were $40.00 per year it would not be too much, when one thinks in terms of saving the owner of a car, protecting his house, and so on from being sold out in order to cover the remainder of the claim if he were to damage any-body's car or property. If that will be the position, I will not go any further. I do not think the Minister will object to giving us an assurance that he will recall the insurance representatives and discuss the matter with them. In other words, the matter should be properly investigated even if it were necessary to appoint a small Committee to discuss the matter with insurance representatives in order to help the small car owners who may be penalised at any time. We have to think in terms of the small man.

Mr. Chairman, this Bill is to help the small car owner, but it is only doing so to a point and it is leaving them hanging on a limb. I feel that $15 is a reasonable amount, and we can even go as far as $20.00 and see how far it would protect the people. The Minister cannot understand my point even up to now, but I know that there are people who are liable to lose everything and they will still have to go to work. I hope

that he will give us an assurance that something will be done about this matter. (Asides)

Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister is carrying on a conversation with the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, and I may as well stop. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas is breaking the Rules of this House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
I see two hon. members on their feet!

Mr. SMITH:
Mr. Chairman, I am sure that there are ordinary people - not rich people - who pay as much as $600.00 a year for comprehensive insurance policies on same cars. Others pay as much as $400.00 or $500.00 per year. If a man has to pay $40.00 per year for his own protection, then I do not think it would be asking too much of him.

As I have already said, if a man is buying a car, the cost of the insurance premium could be added, so that when he is paying his instalments he can pay about $5.00 a month extra for insurance for his own protection. If the premium on $10,000 is $15.00, then the premium on $20,000 will be $30.00, and the higher you go the cheaper the premium may be.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot make the Minister listen to me. The Minister is carrying on a conversation with another member instead of listening to me. I do not think it is good manners on the part of either of them. I should like the Minister to listen to my argument.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:
Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. junior member for St. Thomas has risen on a point of order.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member says that I am carrying on a conversation and I am not listening to him. I want the hon. member to understand that, I have two ears instead of one and I can hear out of one and I can hear out of both of them.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, is that a point of order? This is a very important matter that I am trying to draw to the attention of this hon. Committee and the Minister. I am thinking in terms of those people that the Minister will have to ask for a vote. The people in St. Thomas have motor cars and they are poor people. He does not know how smart and clever his colleague is. He will prevent him from listening to me so that when he goes to St. Thomas he will tell the people that the Minister cared BO much about the point I was making that he would not listen to me. (Asides)

Anyway, the hon. member has not grown up yet, and he does not know how certain things are done. (Asides) I mean "grown up" politically, and I am referring to the hon. junior member for St. Thomas. This is a matter for poor people - people that he may have to be sorry for at some time or other; he may even have to assist some of these people financially. He may have to do that, but I do not know. 6.10 p.m.

As I have said, the Minister just does not care; he is not making any effort to come to a compromise and see what can be done in a case of this sort. It is all right to pass this, but if in the next five or six months he hears that a next door neighbour of his gets into serious trouble, he will want to do something about it. There are more cars on the road today, and everyday you get more accidents, and there are some people who are not able to put water in their cars, and when trouble comes everybody has to try and help them out of it. Even the lawyers have to help them although they do not credit; they have to give them free representation. We should try to protect these people. I have told the Minister of a case in Hillaby, St. Andrew, in which a man smashed another man's car, and the expenses were greater than what the insurance would be by way of hire purchase, and the Insurance Company put the man in court for the remainder of the money. He did not have the money and his house was sold out, and he has to pay money by the month until he settles the debt. This is an ordinary man, a carpenter. I want to save these people. When I get up, I am trying to help those people who cannot help themselves. We are not creating a charge on Government when we ask for this. It is merely trying to protect people from having to go out in the cold or rent a home for themselves and family after their home shave been sold to pay expenses. It would not cost $40 for the insurance of $10,000, but $40 is not too much. According to the Minister's figures, it would only cost $30 and in some cases less, I believe. Why should you think it is trying to make it difficult for a person when we know that it is not difficult? We are not penalising them; we are not asking them to pay too much, because when he pays $30 a year he may be saving his life; but if he pays $15 he may lose his life and his family too. Let us think of it in that way.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister may be trying to shield himself or get away by saying that we are asking too much and that the companies would charge too much. How can they charge too much? If it is $15 coverage for $5,000, can they charge $100 for. $10,000?

Mr. Chairman, without any further ado, I beg to, move that the the figures "$5,000*' be deleted and the figures "$10,000" be substituted.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:
I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:
Mr. Chairman, I think, in the light of what has been said and the information which the Minister has been able to glean from all that has gone on here, that it would be in the interest of those poor people, whom it is said that the Bill is Intended to serve, if the amendment is adopted, or if at this stage the Minister himself were to consider postponing further consideration for the simple reason that points have arisen which in themselves show that the Minister could do justice to the occasion if he were to carry out further investigation into the cost. The point which has been made by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is that we have learned from the mouth of the Minister that what is now $12.50 per annum is likely to go to $15 per annum, because of the limit of liability being tagged at $5,000; but we on this side of the House are supporting the limit going to $10,000, and would certainly like to have from the Minister exactly what it is likely to cost, because we are certain that if the first $5,000 will now cost another $15 per annum. It may be another $7.50 or $8.00 per annum. You might find that the liability of a car could be covered to the extent of an extra $5,000 for another $7.50 or $8.00 per annum, and that is the type of thing we want the Minister to investigate.

Mr. Chairman, I am in total agreement that the amount of liability should be increased to $10,000 instead of the $5,000 as proposed in the Bill, and there are abundant reasons that have been advanced here during the course of the day which certainly should hearten the Minister to accept what has been put before him if he really intends that the Bill should be a means of protecting the poor people whom he has referred to during the course of his speech.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:
Mr. Chairman, I believe that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph was most forceful in his argument as to why the limit should be raised to $10,000. The Minister seems to think that in asking for the limit to be raised to $10,000, one is having regard only for the owner of the particular motor car. One has

regard for the owner of the motor car who suffers damage in excess of $5,000, but it is also out of genuine concern for the person who does damage to the property of a person in excess of $5,000 that we are asking the Minister to accept this amendment and to increase the ceiling to $10,000. 6.20 p.m.

This section does not mean that you may only recover $5,000; this section only means that the Insurance Company is going to be responsible for $5,000, but any money which must be paid in excess of $5,000, then that worker - the carpenter who has a car for $800 or $900 - who goes around a corner one morning and smashes the Minister's Holden or the senior member for St. Philip's Vauxhall, which are motor cars in excess of $5,000 - it means that having obtained a judgment before the Courts, the Insurance Company is going to pay the $5,000, and then you are left to go against that particular carpenter to satisfy your Judgment. If the Judgment is for $8,000, you must then go against the individual himself for $3,000, and the first thing you are going to do is to levy on that man's house, and therefore it is in order to protect that man. You should not create the situation whereby a person who recovers $8,000 receives $5,000 from the Insurance Company and then has to go against the chattel house of that man; that is why we are asking to increase the ceiling limit.

As I pointed out earlier, take the taxi men who goes to the bank and buys a Vauxhall or Holden for $7,000 on a hire-purchase basis; his car is parked and somebody comes along and smashes that car and it cannot be repaired; he gets judgment for $7fOOO. The Insurance Company is going to give him the $5,000; must the taxi man suffer the loss of $2,000? This is what it is going to boil down to. If he is comprehensively insured, he has to suffer the loss of a no-claim bonus; if he is not comprehensively insured he must suffer the loss of $2,000, and this is what we are asking you to guard against. It is not a question of trying to protect people with $10,000 cars; it is a question of trying to protect the man who might be at fault from having his house sold out. You must be realistic. The price 0f cars is going up. What happens if a man turns over, goes into a gas station, knocks down a gas tank and starts a fire? Do you mean the Insurance Company pays $5,000 and the person whose property is damaged must bear the loss? First of all, I do not believe the information the Minister is giving the House is correct about the increased premiums; this is a lot of rubbish, and whoever gave the Minister that information is fooling him. I cannot see how an Insurance Company can say at one stage that if the liability is $4,800 the premium is one thing, and now the liability is unlimited, the premiums are only $12 more; I think it is only fair for the insurance to protect not only the people who drive the cars, but to protect people who do not drive cars, and it must of necessity help to protect the person himself. This argument is not new to the Minister because the very reason that the Bill is before the House, and the first object of the Bill is to remove the limitation of insurance coverage in respect of injury to persons. I myself am not in favour of the ceiling of $5,000; the Leader of the House has a new Holden which, I believe, cost over $7,000; if he goes along the road and somebody runs into the back of his car and damages it, he goes to Court and gets $7,000 judgment; do you think he is going to feel pleased with the Insurance Company giving him a cheque for $5,000 and telling him to go and get the other $2,000? If it is a poor agricultural worker or carpenter, it means that he must levy against his house. I believe everybody else on that side appreciates the point except the Minister.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I will see if I can get the Minister to understand this. When the poor fellow has to pay this extra $2,000 for damages, he then has to look for another car as well in order that he can get to work. What happens if two or three people were injured and he has to pay damages to these people as well? I wonder if the Minister will take this into consideration.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS; Mr. Chairman, I hope I will not give the impression that i am in the clouds and talking down to mere mortals, but it is difficult to see any Justification for fixing any sort of limit. The argument that I hear is that the Insurance Companies will make the premiums higher; what are you a Government for? Control the Insurance Companies by fixing the premiums the same way you are fixing the $5,000. The principle of fixing is not foreign to you or wrong; although the Insurance Company has millions at its disposal, you fix its liability at $5,000. 6.30 p.m.

Are you opposed to telling them: "You cannot change a man more than $X per thousand dollars"? Fix the premiums as well as fixing the liability.

I went home today after lunch, and in coming back here I tried to estimate at what speed a motor cycle passed me. Certainly not less than 80 m.p.h. I looked at my speedometer and it indicated 30 to 35 at the most, and the man passed my car on a cheap motor cycle as if I were standing or going backwards. The motor cycle was ridden by a man, apparently, not well off. Now, if he runs into a small house in Hindsbury Road, starts a fire, and before the Fire Brigade can get there all of the furniture in the house and the house next door are burnt; then are you telling an Insurance Company, with probably million of dollars in it, that it need not pay more than $5,000? Tell the Insurance Companies that they must not charge a poor man more than $5.00 or $10.00, if you like.

Mr. Chairman, a jury gives a man, who is badly injured, say, $10,000 and the Insurance Company has to pay it. Now, a man's house is burnt, he loses everything, and are you saying that the Company need not pay more than $5,000? I say, with great respect to the members of the Government, that the argument is hideous. It is ridiculous to say: "I can stop you from paying more for all of a man's property which has been burnt, but you must pay everything that a jury gives in damages". How did this ever pass the Cabinet? I am not saying that the Cabinet are the only malefactors in this respect, but there are other people who do not see that it is not logic and it is not sense. The only argument I have heard and purports to be a reasonable argument against abolishing the $5,000 limit is that the Insurance Companies will increase the premiums.

What are the members of the Government here for? You can pass legislation to stop that. Suppose a jury gives $50,000 damages, then you can say that when the Insurance Company has to pay out that $50,000 and the premium the Company has been charging is only 10% and you feel it should be more, them they will pay out the $50,000 minus the difference between a premium of 10% and say what you think it should be and so on. You have the Attorney General; even the Prime Minister is a lawyer, and you have other lawyers in the Government. It is not Impossible to draft proper legislation regarding this matter, You have just drafted some-thing foolish in the Public Order Act, and you can draft something sensible to protect people who may get injured and lose their property and not have the means of finding money to replace it.

As the hon. member who has Just sat down said, you can accept this now and do something later on. I have already said that this matter needs more consideration. Anyway, either accept the $10,000 now, or postpone the matter, giving us a promise that you are going to revise this section along the lines suggested by members on this side. I appeal to hon. members. This is not politics; this is just common sense. Why, if a man loses a limb he can get $10,000 or $20,000 if a jury says so, but if he loses his house, his motor car or motor cycle he can only get $5,000? It does not make sense. I appeal to hon. members to get something done straightaway; accept this $10,000 now, or if they think the matter needs further consideration, the whole of that section should be drafted in a way that you do not soak the Insurance Companies, or rather you do not accept this argument that a man will have to pay a higher premium and we should not raise the $5,000. You can get over that. A lawyer who is worth his salt can draft something to cover that difficulty. I do suggest that you cannot defend the $5,000.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I want to be more direct and specific to the Minister at this stage, because it does not seem as though what we are saying is getting home to the Minister. The Minister says that if we increase the amount of money the premium will be increased. That is basic common sense. I would like to know from the Minister by what yardstick he has arrived at the $5,000. Was this amount based upon the liability which a person gets under the Act? By putting it at $5,000, what premiums would an individual have to pay? Did you investigate to see, if the amount were put at $10,000, what premium would have to be paid? This is the only way in which the matter could be proved. I believe that it was decided that $5,000 was a good figure and the amount was inserted.

Mr. Chairman, $5,000 cannot cover the cost of a Singer Vogue, and the senior member for St. Michael can testify to that. I do not think that amount can cover the cost of a Cortina, an Escort or even a small Vauxhall. I believe that the senior member for St. Joseph feels so strongly about this matter that he may even be prepared to withdraw his amendment provided the Minister accepts the amendment that further consideration be postponed. The Minister should go back and check things, because he must have used some yardstick in arriving at the amount.

Mr. Chairman, by inserting $5,000 in the Bill the Minister ought to know what the premium would be. If the Minister is in possession of information that if the Amount is increased to $10,000 the premiums would go up by $60 or $70, then he should let us know and, perhaps, we may be able to see his argument. Everybody knows that if you have greater insurance coverage the premiums will be higher. That is com-monsense, but let us know how much more in pre-mium you will have to pay. Will it be 20%, 30%, or 100%? I think the whole bugbear in the Minister's mind is that we are trying to protect people who have money, because only people who have money will buy cars for over $5,000.I see at least 7 members on the Government benches who have cars worth over $7,000.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to know what would happen if somebody damaged one of the buses at the Transport Board. The Minister knows the cost of a bus at the Transport Board. The Minister does not seem to believe that a car worth $5,000 can do damage to something worth $10,000 or $20,000. I should like to know what will happen if a poor man comes down the road driving a vehicle recklessly and forces a bus owned by the Transport Board off the road. Who will repair the bus? Must the taxpayers pay for it? What happens if somebodycauses a Fire Engine to run off the road? Must the taxpayers pay for that? What happens if one of the 3 Litre Austins in the Police Force, valued at $9,400, is damaged? Must the taxpayers pay for it? Even for the protection of the Government something should be done about this matter. A bus will cost more than $6,000. I would like the Minister to give serious consideration to this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to know by what yardstick the Minister arrived at the figure of $5,000. I should also like to know what premium a person who wants to buy a car and who wants to have unlimited cover for personal injuries and cover up to $5,000 will have to pay. If it is exorbitant and you call yourselves a Socialist Government, then fix the insurance policies and the premiums, and protect the people. Do not just say that the premiums will be too high and you cannot give the people proper coverage. The whole purpose of Third Party insurance is to pro-tect third parties: injury to the person of the third party, and injury to the property of the third party. It is as simple as that. 6.40 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
The question is.....

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:
Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister certain questions and I think I am entitled to an answer.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

It is not everyquestion that you ask that I have to answer.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

If that is the case, I will now start to talk. Was it the Minister who earlier today said he was surprised that the Opposition agreed with him? Was it this same Minister who today spoke of the co-operation he got from the Opposition? I do not believe so. Was it not the Leader of the Opposition who got up and said that today must have been the birthday of the Hon. Minister because of the manner in which he conducted himself? Must we now depart from that behaviour? I think we are entitled to know, How can we be asked to agree to a Bill fixing the liability at $5,000 unless we know on what yardstick that is based? What would be the cost of the premium as stated in the Bill, and by how much would the premium be increased if you increase the limit to $10fOOO? Did the Minister ever consider $10,000 as a ceiling? If the Minister cannot answer the questions, let us postpone it and come back and do it later.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, I really do not intend getting up like a yo-yo answering questions that people ask all the time. The hon. member is stressing carrying the limit of the policy to $10,000 to protect somebody who buys a car, and he talks about the Austin 3-Litre and so on. I asked him what would be the position in 1971/72 if we do this. Would we have to come back and change the Act again? The hon. member does not seem to understand. Somebody on the opposite side mentioned a man getting into an accident and damaging a $7,000 car and the insurance company only pays $5,000, and therefore he is burdened with a $2,000 commitment. Let us for argu-ment's sake, say that a man gets into an argument with someone and, representing himself, strikes this man who falls and hits the back of his head and is as a result paralysed. They go to Court, and the man loses his case because the man is maimed for life. What is the position here? Are we to expect that the Insurance Company is to pay the man for life because he is maimed? You cannot take these things out of context as hon. members on the opposite side are doing. If they feel so strongly about this Bill, I do not want anybody to think that I am representing anybody. I brought this Bill with all simplicity, and everybody on the other side agreed with it. I told the hon. senior member for St. Thomas when he was here that I believe the Insurance Company made a mistake when they talked about 15% and 25%, because we worked it out here that even if they were paying $20, this could not be right. I am sure the Insurance Companies pay out more than $200,000 in claims every year; so there would have to be some mistake. We must not forget that this Bill was gone into thoroughly.

Mr. Chairman, when I hear hon. members talking about an investigation, I must say that this business started from since 1965. If hon. members want the Bill postponed, I have no objection; but when I come back it will be the same thing. When the hon. senior member for St. Joseph talks about imposing legislation on the Insurance Companies, this is a tricky matter, and that is why I said we are bringing down a comprehensive Bill on Insurance Companies. The hon. member must know that of the various Insurance Companies operating in Barbados, not one belongs to the people of Barbados. If you look at the fine print you will notice that all these companies originate from outside Barbados. (Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: All the more reason why you should not be soft-hearted.) The hon. member is

talking about soft-hearted. The debate was going very nicely all along, and I do not want to bring in any generalisations, but the hon. member should not tell me this because he must remember that as far as politics are concerned, AS a matter of fact, as far as representation is con-cerned, - because I have been in politics from 1934 I am a Junior to the hon. member and I have never yet been a leader of any Government. I have been the leader of a football team, but that only has eleven people; but the hon. member has been a leader of a Party. Do you mean that only today a Solomon has come to judgment or a Daniel? I do not want to carry the debate on the wrong side. (Asides.J

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Hon. members not addressing the Chair.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, the way hon. members on the other side are talking, you would believe that Insurance Companies came to Barbados last week. For all the years that Insurance Companies have been in this country, they have been fleecing the community in my opinion. They insure you for sickness, and people become ill and go to the Hospital and they do not get a cent, and nobody says a word about this. Now that I am trying to do something for the man in the street, I am being criticised, after being lauded. I am now labelled as stubborn and it is said that I do not understand. Apparently in the way lawyers think, the only persons who seem to understand anything are lawyers. God must have been a lawyer! I want the lawyers to understand that there is nothing original about law. Lawyers do not invent anything; they deal with a subject matter that some Judge in the Thirteenth Century gave a decision on and he expects a Judge in the 21st Century to give a decision based thereon. There is nothing original about law.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I would ask the hon. member to deal with the Bill which is before the House.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

I will show hon. members on the other side that I am different from them. The hon. member has asked that further consideration be postponed.

I beg to move that further consideration of this Bill be postponed.

Hon. R. St. C. WEEKES:

I beg to second that.

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

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. R.StC. WEEKES, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported pro-gress and asked for leave to sit again, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly. 6.50 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 be taken as the next Order.

Hon. R. St. C. WEEKES:
I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirma tive without division.

A BILL TO AMEND THE PENSIONS ACT, 1947

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER:
The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to take charge of this Bill, and if there is no objection, the Hon. Leader of the House may pro-ceed. There being no objection, leave is granted.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, this is one of these Bills which come before Parliament from time to time whenever

there are any changes either in Commonwealth Countires or in certain organisations or institutions within Commonwealth Countries, and where service in the Commonwealth Countries or institutions within the Commonwealth Countries has to be computed for pensions eligibility. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. R. St. C. WEEKES:
I beg to second that.

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

Clause 1 to 3 were called and passed.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon.R.StC.WEEKRS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, secon-ded by R.StC. WEEKES, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, I think we have finished for the day. In agreement with the other side, the replies to the Budget will be done on Thursday afternoon; I understand that 5 o'clock is convenient to hon. members opposite. We have Questions and Private Members' Business, and we would like by that time to conclude this Bill and the one we postponed. I beg to move that this sitting be now sus-pended until 4 o'clock in the afternoon on Thursday, May 14.

Hon. R. St. C. WEEKES:

I beg to second that.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:
I understand that that does not mean we are not doing Private Member's Business first.

The question that this sitting be suspended until 4 o'clock p.m. on Thursday, May 14 was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. Speaker suspended the sitting accordingly.

7.00 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER; Let the Hon. Leader of the House indicate what he proposes to deal with.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Order No. 1, Mr. Speaker. THE AIRPORTS ACT, 1970

Mr. SPEAKER:
Order No. I is the instant Order of the Day, and it stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House to move the second reading of a Bill to repeal the Seawell Airport Act, 1950, and to make new provision for the management, control and supervision of airports in Barbados and for matters connected therewith.

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

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

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

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

Clauses 1 to 7 was called and passed.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, secon-ded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

QUESTION TIME

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, I observe that hon. members to whose Questions Replies have been tabled are not now present. I therefore beg to move that all those Replies, with the exception of Nos. 87 and 88 asked by the

hon. senior member for St. Joseph and Nos. 89 and 90 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. George be laid, and the others taken.

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

QUESTION re REMUNERATION TO BURSARY ASSISTANTS

Mr. SPEAKER:
Question No. 87 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH:
Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows -

To enquire of the appropriate Minister: -

Is the Minister aware that the remuneration paid to those Bursary Assistants and the persons enjoying technical training through the good offices of Govern-ment, has proved inadequate due to the increase in the cost of living and bus fares?

2. Would the Minister consider increasing this remuneration?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows-

"No representations have been made to the Ministry of Education to the effect that the amount payable to Apprenticeship Bursaries Act is inadequate. However, the entire Apprenticeship Scheme is under review."

QUESTION re SCHOOL MEALS SERVICE

Mr. SPEAKER:
Question No. 88 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH:
Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister :-

Will the Minister inform this House of the method by which all workers with the School Meals Service are employed?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows-

"Appointments to the School Meals Service are made by the Chief Personnel Officer acting on behalf of the Governor-General from names submitted by the Minister of Education after consultation with an interviewing committee".

Mr. St. JOHN:
Will the Minister state by way of a supplementary the composition of this interviewing Committee?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
So far as I can see, Mr. Speaker, the Committee consists of five people headed by the Senior Education Officer and includes other Education Officers, as well as the Nutrition Adviser to the Ministry. It is a Committee, really, of Civil Servants.

QUESTION re FUMES FROM DIESEL BUSES AND TRUCKS

Mr. SPEAKER:
Question No. 89 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. George.

Mr. HOP PIN; Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works;-

1, Is the Minister aware of the great Inconvenience caused to both pedestrian and vehicular traffic by the fumes and soot emanating from the exhausts of Diesel buses and trucks operated by both Government and private concessionaires?

2. Will the Minister take steps to alleviate this inconvenience by having the mechanical construction of these buses and trucks so changed that the exhaust fumes would be discharged from pipes jutting into the air above the said vehicles, thereby ceasing to pollute the atmosphere?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:
Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows-

"1. Yes, Sir.

2. The solution proposed would not remove the nuisance. The emission of smoke from a vehicle indicates a lack of efficiency in its maintenance and is in contravention of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Regulations 1952. It is proposed to require all concessionaires and owners of vehi-cles to comply with the relevant provisions of the Regulations."

QUESTION re WALKERS-JORDANS HIGHWAY

Mr. SPEAKER:
Question No. 90 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. George.

Mr. HOPPIN:
Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is the Minister aware of the fact that more than one fatal accident has recently occurred at the junction of the Walkers-Jordans highway near Upright Street in the parish of Saint George?

2. Will the Minister take steps to have the highway so reconstructed at the point abovementioned as to lessen the bend in the road near the said junction and thereby render the corner less dangerous to both pedestrians and vehicular traffic using the said highway?

4.10 p.m.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:
Mr. Speaker, the Replies are as follows

"1. No, Sir. An investigation has revealed that there has been no occurence of fatal accidents at the Walkers/Jordans junction within the past three years.

2. The project will be included for consideration in the Ministry's Highway Improvements Programme."

PRIVATE MEMBERS BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is a Private Members' Bill which has been reported on by the Select Committee, and I also understand the hon. member who sponsored it would like to comment on it, I therefore beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken for ten minutes.

Hon. R. St. C. WEEKES:
I beg to second that.

Mr. St. JOHN:
Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee Report has been presented; I therefore beg to move that the Report be adopted.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
I beg to second that.

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

On separate motions of Mr. ST. JOHN, seconded by Hon. J. C. TUDOR, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION re PIPE LINE AT ACCRA BEACH

Mr. St. JOHN:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the next Item be a Resolution which was tabled last Tuesday in connection with a pipe line at Accra Beach.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is asking leave of the House to deal now with the Resolution of which he gave notice last Tuesday, and of which copies, I have been informed, have been duly circulated. There being no objection, the member may proceed.

Mr. St. JOHN:

Mr. Speaker, ...

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

If the hon. member would just give way, I would just like to draw to the attention of the House that that Resolution has not been circulated as far as we on this side know, but we have no objection to it being done at this stage. I just want him to understand that in spite of its not being circulated we will allow him to do it, and I hope that if we should find ourselves in a similar position at some time in the future, he will not accuse us of any disrespect.

Mr. St. JOHN:

Mr. Speaker, the text of the Resolution is

WHEREAS there is a pipe line leading from a Hotel at Accra Beach in the parish of Christ Church into the sea;

AND WHEREAS the said pipe line discharges matter into the sea;

AND WHEREAS this has caused grave disquiet in the public mind;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House calls on the Government to investigate this matter forthwith, and to take such steps as is necessary to protect the health of the inhabitants of the country.

Sir, I regard this Resolution as one which would receive the unanimous support of the House and would provoke quick action by the relevant authorities. There can be no doubt about it, that Acrra Beach is a beach which is used by a very considerable portion of the residents of this Island; it is one of the beaches which the public have been guaranteed access to because of the fact that Government owns some ninety to one hundred thousand square feet of land there. It was therefore with shock and consternation that I discovered that a hotel company in this country had decided, without the authority of any Ministry in Barbados - because I have checked Ministry after Ministry in Barbados, and I have also taken the trouble to go through the laws of Barbados, and this matter is vested in the Ministry of Home Affairs by virtue of the fact that the Executive Committee Act of this country, as consequentially amended permits licences and easements of a certain kind to be granted without reference to the House, and for the information of hon. members also, where those licences and easements are granted every financial year, a Statement must be laid upon the Table of this House saying what the licences were.

Two weeks ago such a Statement was laid in this House, and nowhere in that Statement is to be found any permission granted to this hotel group. Now, Sir, I regard this as a very serious matter, and I feel that the full rigours of the law should be invoked to deal with this matter. I feel, and I have confirmed, that this is a matter of being a danger to health, because I have spoken with the relevant Medical Officer of Health under whose area and jurisdication this matter comes, and I have been informed that notwithstanding the fact that letters have been written to the management of this company in connection with the unsatisfactory state of affairs about this pipe line, no action has been taken by the company at all to comply with the health directives given by the Medical Officer of Health. This is a very clear case that there are some people in this country who believe that they are above the law, and this is something that we in this House must express our abhorrence to immediately because that hotel should be closed down immediately, and no matter should be discharged into the sea. I am not saying what kind of matter is discharged into the sea, because as I understand it there is some difficulty determining what kind it is; at least, it is a fact that some matter from the urinals is being discharged into the sea.

I did ask the acting Minister, and I hope that Ministers on the other side would be in a position to state what steps have been taken since this Resolu-tion was given notice of because this is not the only hotel - there are other hotels between Hastins and Worthing that are offending the Public Health Laws of this country and are discharging matter in the sea to the detriment of the inhabitants of this country who use the sea. We want to make it clear that no hotel is above the law in Barbados. Naturally, everybody here knows the importance of the tourist industry, but the tourist industry must take second place to the health and amenities of the people of Barbados; it must not take first place, We do not have any psycho-logical inferiority complex in believing that unless you allow the hoteliers to do as they like in this country it will damage tourism; the people of Barbados are more important than the glamour of the American dollar or the Trinidad dollar or whatever dollar there is, and something should be done immediately in respect of this.

I also want to point out that some authority in relation to this matter will now be vested in the Beach Control Authority. A lot of trouble is going to come in this country if people are given permission to erect works on the sea without proper steps being taken to ensure that not only the health authorities but people who have traditional rights in relation to the sea shore are protected. 4.20 p.m.

I feel that, in future, whether it is the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Beach Control Authority, or whatever Government Institution or Department is responsible for granting permission for an important matter like this, an advertisement should be inserted in the newspaper so that the public can become aware of it and put in their objections. This used to be the provision before the Executive Committee Act was amended in 1965 and subsequently amended. No person could have done this before without advertising a Private Bill which came before the House so that the public would know about it. I hope that immediate action will be taken and drastic steps taken to make people, who are living along the sea shore of this country, aware that the sea is not a place for them to empty their sewerage tanks or anything else. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, in seconding this Motion, all I need say is that we are confident that all hon. members on that side of the House are satisfied as to the importance of the Resolution. We are certain that there is no hon. member who would be willing, in the remotest manner, to have himself associated with the nuisance that the Resolution seeks to draw to the attention of this honourable House. In such a case, we feel that all that is necessary to be done at this moment is for members to support the passing of the Resolution in its entirety so that we may have this nuisance corrected with as little delay as possible. I do not believe that it is necessary, at this stage, for any hon. member to lay any further emphasis on the importance of the health of the community, because we know that Rockley Beach is about the most densely inhabited beach in this Island.

I beg to second the Resolution.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I should like the hon. member, who introduced this Resolution, to get it clear in his mind that we on this side of the House feel just as strongly, or more strongly than he does about this matter. There are a few points I should like to get straight for the record. I do not think there are many people in this Chamber who have suffered the indignities of having to go to the beach and be told which side of the beach to bathe as often as I have been told when I was a child. I remember "Mess Around" running me from Graves End! At Harts Gap Beach there were two white holes and if I went into one to bathe, I would suddenly hear somebody clapping, and if I did not come out, a Policeman would be sent for. I know what is meant by encroaching on people's rights.

As a child I used to live in the area where the Hilton Hotel is now standing. I can remember that on several mornings I came out to bathe and could not get back home early because people were shooting on the beach. I had to wait until whenever the "Lords" felt that it was time to stop shooting. Sometimes they would start shooting at six o'clock in the morning and stop at ten o'clock; so you can understand what was the position in those days.

I am glad that, when the Introducer of this Resolution opened his remarks, he said that he had made a check with all the Ministries and he was convinced that all of the Ministries were absolved from any blame in this matter. I am going to shock him now. Only today I have been told that there is a particular officer operating from one of the Ministries who has been telling these hoteliers that they cannot dispose of their sewerage water in soak-away pits as they were doing before - that is strange to me because all of my life they were doing that - and that they must put this pipeline into the sea to dispose of the sewerage water, and that if they did not comply with this directive the hotels would be closed down. You can see, therefore, how far things have gone.

Further to that, he has told the hoteliers who is the most suitable person to put the pipe into the sea. I am not going to call any names on the floor of this House. The hon. member was decent enough to come me when he first had the Resolution, because he inought the matter was affecting me, and he showed me the Resolution. I know that the hon. member has carried out his own investigations; but I will tell the hon. member, when he leaves this Chamber, to make a further check and he will find out who laid the pipes in the sea. I wonder whether he knows the price that was charged for the job. I have been told that the people were charged something like $2,000.

Now, the hon. member will remember that when the Minister of Trade was moving into the Old Eye Hospital at Bay Street, we spent something like

$35,000 to put down a septic tank to make sure that the water was not contaminated. He would know that we on this side of the House would not get ourselves involved in this kind of business. I believe the reason the hon. member rushed here with this Resolution is that he, too, WAS of the misguided opinion that, be-cause certain people now own this particular hotel, the matter was dealt with arbitrarily.

I want the hon. member to understand that there is nobody who is going to fight for the preservation of beaches for the masses in this country more than I intend to do, I have told him about the indignities I have suffered as a child. You will remember that the Aquatic Club had a big barbed wire stretched

across the beach into the sea. I went there one Bank Holiday to swim, and a Policeman asked me why black people wanted to come up there to interfere with the white people. You can understand how I feel about this matter. That was the type of thing I experienced in the days of "Mess Around" and such people. Thank God that they have gone and we have seen a different day! We do not intend to allow people to desecrate our beaches.

I remember, as a child, when I was living where the Hilton Hotel is now standing, that I went out near the Lighthouse to bathe, and a gentleman with a .303 rifle came and ran me off the beach. I ran because I could have been shot. People would have heard that a black boy was shot on the beach, and some of them would have said that it was an accident. Whenever I see this gentleman nowadays we have a big joke about the matter. I want the hon. member to understand that we intend to investigate this matter further. What I am appalled at is that, whoever saw the pipeline, instead of calling me or the Minister of Home Affairs to investigate the matter, called the Press. 4.30 p.m.

It is the people's right for the Press to bring these wrongs to the eyes of those in authority; but at the same time that they bring this to give the gene-ral public the impression that this wicked, sinful Government is encroaching on the people's rights, they could at least have called one of us and inquired about it and asked what we intended to do about it. I was also appalled when I saw this pipe line and I wondered whether my Ministry had given permission for this to happen; but after investigation I found that we were absolved from any blame. What I will tell the hon. member is that we on this side support him 100 percent. What we intend to do is to have this matter thoroughly investigated, and to make sure that, not only the pipeline, but a lot of other encumbrances on the beaches are removed. When I was a boy, the people's rights were encroached upon so drastically that in order to get from Harts Gap to the back of the Drill Hall, one had to walk through high water. These things took place, and no one said a word in our defence. The hon. member will remember places like the Paradise Beach Club. One thing I will say about that is that I see a lot of coloured children running on the beach without being molested.

I remember, when I was a backbencher, and the hon. member was not yet a member of this Chamber, permission was sought in this Chamber for somebody to put up a groyne, and I objected to it strenuously on the floor of the House and stated why I did, because, no matter what impression is given about groynes saving the land, they become barriers. Look at the Hilton Hotell How many people besides the hon. member and myself have the gumption to walk over these groynes? I know there are times when we have to put up groynes to save the land, but I am always skeptical when people ask for permission put up groynes, because while they save the land, at the same time people are creating private beaches, and these are the things we have to watch. We have come from too far in a short space of time to allow anybody to come and take away our rights.

I remember that some years ago the Labour Party brought a Resolution here giving the Electric

Company permission to put up that monstrosity they have at Graves End Beach. I was not a member of the House, and I remember the now Prime Minister arguing against it, and saying that if they wanted this thing to improve their system, there is nothing wrong in carrying it on the southern side of the beach; that is coming through by the Iron Barracks where there was a sewage pipe and where there is a reef and taking it far enough out to sea. It was my opinion that it was allowed to be put out in order to discommode black people like myself from going on the beach, because a law was passed that you could not undress on the beach. There was a 'stink house' they called a 'bath house' for people to undress in, but you had to wear a gas mask when you entered it. This was removed and carried to the 400 yard range in order to prevent black people from bathing near to the Aquatic Club. Thank God! I have lived to see people like Marshall, Parravicino and Goodridge, who thought they must have exclusive beaches, go! I am not satisfied with the St. James coast either, because in order for people to get a seabath, they have to go through Folkestone, the small passage provided near Sandy Lane and another small access below the Colony Club. In my opinion there are not enough facilities around the St. James coast, and here is where we have to be more than careful in not allowing these people to encroach on the people's right in this country.

The hon. member made a very pertinent point when he said that we cannot do these things for the tourist dollar to the detriment of the people in Barbados. I am one person who is willing to welcome tourists. By all means, let them come because they can spend money more freely than I can; but I want them to understand that they have to abide by our rules and regulations, and if they do not like our music, they are not supposed to dance. When we go to their country we have to abide by their rules and regulations, and when they come here, they have to do likewise. If they come here and see black people on the beaches and feel that they can chase them off, they are making a sad mistake as long as this Government is in power.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the Resolution and to give the assurance to the hon. member that we on this side have had absolutely nothing to do with this.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Does the hon. senior member for Christ Church seek to exercise his right of final reply?

Mr. St. JOHN:
In view of the unanimity, I do not seek to speak again.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for fifteen minutes to enable certain technical arrangements to be made for broadcasting.

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

Mr. SMITH:
Before the question is put, Mr. Speaker, I am appealing to the Hon. Leader of the House to allow me to do a Resolution which would only take two minutes.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
Mr. Speaker, there are certain technical preparations which have to be made which necessitates the technician coming beyond the Bar of the House.

Mr. SMITH:
I will admit that; but those technicalities should have been done before. I do not see why hon. members should be prevented from doing their business so as to allow certain technicalities to be done.

The question that this sitting be now suspended for fifteen minutes was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 4.40 p.m.

On resumption

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding from the other side that they proposed to make their reply for broadcast to the Budget at 5 o'clock this afternoon. The time, I believe, is 59 minutes past 4 o'clock p.m. and the House is now at their disposal.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to reply to the Budget but merely to inform the House that the senior member for St. Thomas who intends to reply to the Budget on behalf of the Oppo-sition - that is, the Barbados Labour Party - has been delayed and will be here shortly. I believe that the Leader of the House on Tuesday told us that the Minister of Finance would have delivered his Budget Speech at 4.30 p.m., and I believe I am right in saying that that Budget Speech did not start until 5 o'clock. I believe, if the House had to wait on that occasion half an hour on the Minister of Finance, that it is not too much to ask the House at this stage to wait at least fifteen minutes until such time as the senior member for St. Thomas arrives in this Chamber. I would therefore, under the circumstances, ask that the House be further suspended for 15 minutes; that is, unless the Government has anything they would like to proceed with or if there is any Private Members. Business.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that there are some Questions standing in my name which might well be asked at this time, and I think there is also some other item standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph which he intimated earlier would not take much time, and I feel we should fill in the time with any of those matters.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I intimated to the hon. junior member for St. Peter that, before this meeting is adjourned, I would let him put certain Questions which should have been put, had they been completely processed last Tuesday, and the hon. member for St. Peter may now put his Question in connection to passengers travelling from Bridgetown by a Transport Board bus.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister

Is Government aware that passengers travelling from Bridgetown by a bus owned by the Transport Board and leaving Bridgetown at 11 o'clock nightly are charged full fare to Speightstown, St. Peter, but the said bus ends its journey at the Mullins Road junction, leaving the passengers stranded at this point?

Will Government seek to remedy the situation without delay, by causing the said bus to end its journey at the Sand Street Bus terminus?

Mr. SPEAKER:
The same hon. member his Question re fishermen at Speightstown.

Mr. HINDS:
Mr. Speaker,

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware of the inconvenience caused to fishermen, fish-vendors and others using the Speightstown Fish Market through the absence of a Telephone Service there?

If the answer to the above is in the affirmative will Government seek to remedy the situation without delay?

Mr. SPEAKER:
And the last query, in connection with Local Government pensions.

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

How many Local Government Pensioners have not been paid the $25.00 increase made available to Government Pensioners re a recent Resolution passed by this Hon. House:

Why has such a situation arisen?

What steps does Government propose taking to remedy the situation?

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I was not in the House Just now to hear what had happened, but I heard one of the hon. members on my right speaking, and I would like to know now what is the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER:

As the Standing Orders had been suspended, would the Hon. Leader of the House intimate that which he now seeks to proceed with?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, with great respect I must dissent from that. The House is now in Private Members' Business, and it is for hon. members opposite to dispose of the time at their disposal.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Did the hon. senior member for St. Joseph intimate that he had a very short matter which he could have disposed of before the suspension?

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, No. 2 under Private Members' Business is in order, because No. 1 has already been disposed of.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member seek to proceed now with No. 2 standing in his name?

Mr. SMITH:

I do not know how much time I have, but I would prefer to deal with No.3.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Unless there is any objection, No. 3 is now the instant Order of the Day. There being no objection, the hon. member may proceed.

Mr. HOPPIN:

Mr. Speaker, Sir, when this was last discussed in the House under Private Members' Business, as recorded here, I was speaking. I am in agreement with the views expressed by the senior member for St. Jospeh. But there is a point I would like to know; which is, whether it was a term under which these Inspectors were appointed to do this work, that when they were called out they would have to come out for duty. The point made that these men have been called out at all hours of the night is valid, and I want to know if it is a term of duty. It is really a very hard task that they have to travel all over the island and inspect these accidents and make their reports, and I am in agreement that they should be adequately paid; therefore, as the time is running out, I do feel that the Government should look into this and pay them adequately, or increase the number of Inspectors which would take some burden off the present number who do this work. I the refore second this Resolution which has been ably moved by the senior member for St. Joseph.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution came before this House on more than one occa-sion, and I have told the hon. member.....

Mr. Speaker, I see that the shadow Minister of Finance has just appeared, and I am wondering if I can give way and reserve my right to speak on this matter when the time comes.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am perfectly prepared so to agree. May I have an intimation from the hon. senior member for St. Thomas whether he is about to rise to give notice of a Resolution to the Financial Proposals?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to rise to give that notice, but I thought that some other hon. member would have done this already and moved, that the Resolution be taken at this stage.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No such Resolution has been moved.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution

BE IT RESOLVED that this House notes the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals of the Minister of Finance for the fiscal year 1970-71 laid before this Honourable House on the 12th May, 1970, but deplores the taxation proposals mentioned there-in: and especially

(a) the increased cost arising there from to the building industry;

(b) the increase in the cost of motoring;

(c) the fact that a more considered approach to the taxation of the tourists industry has not been adopted.

5.10 p.m.

I beg to give notice of this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Copies of the Resolution have been duly circulated. Does the hon. member propose to ask for leave to move the passing of the Resolution?

Mr. SMITH:
Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with the Resolution, I should like to find out from either the Leader of the House or the hon. Leader of the Opposition if a portion of the time allotted for the debate on this matter will be given to me in order that I may reply. I am a member of this Honourable Chamber, and I

feel that it is my democratic right to

.....(Asides., I want to know if any time will be given

to me. On certain occasions, any member can speak 'forever and ever, Amen, ' but on this occasion the time is limited to, I believe, one hour for the live broadcast. There is a possibility that one member can get up and speak for the entire hour, and then the voice of nobody else will be heard by the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking whether I will be given 5 minutes or 10 minutes so that my voice may be heard by the people in this country. That is all I am asking. I want to find out whether I will get any time at all on the air. I am appealing to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and I want to find out whether it is his intention to give me time to speak. If no time is given to me, then no person will be heard. I am going to interrupt everybody and no voices will be heard,

You will remember that, year before last, I had to Interrupt the Hon. Prime Minister many times, and I prevented him from broadcasting anything until he gave the Leader of the Opposition the assurance that he would give us the same amount of time he took to deliver his speech. I am now asking for a portion of the time to which the members of the Opposition are entitled to get. I was responsible for the Opposition getting the same amount of time that the Prime Minister took to deliver his Budgetary Proposals. If I am deprived of my time now, then it will clearly be seen that no one wants me to be heard. I was responsible for getting this time. The Opposition had no trouble to get time now, because I asked for it, I fought for it, and I got it. I am now asking the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to let me know if I am going to get any of the time set aside for the broadcast; otherwise I am not going to allow anything to go over the air, regardless of the consequences. I am quite ready to go along to Hindsbury. You can come and handcuff me at once. I know that it is my democratic right to get time to speak.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, what in the name of Heavens has the Opposition got to do with this? Radio Broadcasting is a Government matter; whether they will give time is a Government matter. If the hon. member had spoken to me yesterday or on Tuesday, I could have taken up the matter with the people in charge of the Radio or with the Govern-ment How can the Opposition have anything to do with it? Sometimes it is an excellent thing for some people to make public speeches, because the public will so laugh at those speeches that it does not do the speaker any good. I would not be opposed to any member of this House, especially one or two members I see on the other side, talking and letting the members of the public know whom they have put in the House. This is nothing to do with this side of the House.

If the hon. member will appeal to the Prime Minister or to the Leader of the House and say that we want to have a broadcast for a duration of 24 hours, or 2 hours or 3 hours, do you think any of us on this side would object? We would rejoice at it. I can think of, at least, four members on the Government side that I would like the public to hear over the radio.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just sat down said that if I had approached him yesterday, or some other time, he would have gone into the matter. He was not in the House yesterday when I hinted it to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and asked him for time. If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition did not ask the Chairman of his Party about it, or did not tell him of my request, I cannot be responsible for that. You know, Sir, that I mentioned the matter and said that I wanted time to speak.

In my opening remarks I said I was appealing to the Leader of the Government, you, Sir, and the Leader of the Opposition. I do not know who is responsible for giving me the time, but I am appealing to all three of you. I would like whoever is responsible to give me some assurance, because it is my democratic right to speak on the matter. Do not mind if the people do not want to hear me, or if I may talk such foolishness that I may drop from the presence of members here this afternoon; but I still want to have my time. I will not be asking for time in this Honourable Chamber after now, because there will be no broadcast.

Mr. Speaker, we have a limited time. In other words, if every member wanted a portion of the time, he should have it. If it calls for an extension of time, then it is our democratic right that all of us should have a portion of the time. I appeal to the three top men in this House. If I do not get an assurance, then nobody will be able to speak over the air. 5.20 p.m.

I am not asking anymore. If I am not allowed to speak, then the broadcast will not take place this afternoon. 1 threatened the Hon. Prime Minister when he first started, and he saw the wisdom of agreeing - and I think anybody else should try and walk in the same footsteps as the Hon. Prime Minister and do the same thing that he did. I asked for an assur-ance that we would get the same time and he gave it, and I do not think that I should be deprived of my time. It is my democratic right, as long as I am in here. Regardless of how ridiculous I may make myself through my speech, this would be the first time that I would be making myself ridiculous, and I would be satisfied; but I want the assurance - otherwise I am not going to allow the speeches to be broadcast. I am quite willing to be locked up this afternoon.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, there are certain facts which I think we must set on record in a debate of this sort. The hon. member who has just sat down has recounted, in part, the incident of 1968. What I think he forgot to say was that on that occasion he was given part of the allotted time. It was not sufficient because he came in at the end of the time; he had spoken for, I believe, five minutes and was given an extra ten or fifteen minutes. Those are he facts of that occasion. Last year when there was no broadcast Opposition reply, I did, as I have done on this occasion - which I shall remind the House of in a few minutes - communicate to the Leader of the Opposition exactly as I had done last week to the effect that equal time would be accorded to the Opposition to record their speeches. This year I wrote the following to the Leader of the Opposition dated May 8th.

"Dear Sir Grantley,

As I stated to the House at its last meeting, the Minister of Finance proposes to present to the House on Tuesday, 12th May, 1970 his Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals for 1970-71, and to give notice of such Statutory Instruments or other legislation as may be necessary in consequence of the proposals. The Minister proposes to make his presentation at approximately 4, 30 p.m.

His Honour the Speaker's permission has been sought for the Minister's speech to be broadcast direct from the Chamber by the Caribbean Broad-casting Corporation and Barbados Rediffusion Ser-vice, In accordance with custom equal time will be accorded to the Opposition to record for subsequent broadcast their collective replies to the speech.

I am sending copies of this letter to Mr. E. D. Mottley and to Mr. L. E. Smith."

The letter was signed by me. The only comment I would make on this is that the appeal which the hon. member is directing to the Leader of the Opposition, to Mr. Speaker, and to my self is only in part properly directed. It should not be directed either to me or to Mr. Speaker, but to the Leader of the Opposition, because the letter which I wrote to the Leader of the Opposition was copied both to the hon. senior member for Bridgetown and the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. It is therefore incumbent upon them and the Leader of the Opposition to decide between them upon what basis the time will be allocated to the collective Opposition.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

I believe neither even the Government - although it could if it wanted to -nor the Opposition have the slightest control over the Radio people. There is nothing in the world to prevent the Radio people from coming in here and listening to every single word we say and broadcasting it if they want to. We do not have to give leave. I am certain the Opposition does not have to give leave. Some private people have these apparatuses; they are sufficiently well off to own these things. Anybody can come in here and sit down at the back or anywhere and broadcast every single word that is said in this House; therefore it is not a matter for the Leader of the Opposition or any of us to have a talk with the Leader of the House, who has just sat down, and arrange this, that or the other thing. It is absolutely childish to raise this point. Anything we say in here can be broadcast live, if the Radio people feel like it. We have got to keep our eyes and our ears open, but the Advocate Newspaper does not even publish anything we say, although it should, as the one big daily news-paper. But you cannot blame the Opposition because that does not happen. It is because the Advocate management ought to be -I almost said damned - well ashamed of themselves for acting in the way they act. Similarly, when it comes to broadcasting our reply, or when it comes to broadcasting the speech two days ago, it is a matter for them. It was their duty to the public of Barbados to broadcast everything that was said on Tuesday, and it is their duty to broadcast everything that is said in reply today. Do not blame us. If anybody is to be blamed, it is the Government who can pass any law compelling them to do it if they don't; but do not say anything which suggests that we are doing anything to hurt the hon. senior member for St. Joseph or to hurt the Opposition or anything. You should publish everything. What have we got to conceal? Therefore, I should Just like to say to the Leader of the House that I thank him for having read that letter which he wrote to me, be-cause-again- I am saying it supports what I am saying that I am not blaming the Government from the point of view of speaking to this side of the House, What I am blaming them for is for allowing anything to be said which gives the impression that we can control the time. We cannot.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker; I thank you for allowing me to speak again, though really I should not.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, there is only one major problem which is facing us at this moment. I believe that we in the Opposition were under the impression that the reply by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas would have been broadcast live. Now we come here to learn that it is not being done so. Sir, in view of the fact that people are now quarrelling as to how much time should be given, we do not think it is fair to have our reply recorded and then re-broadcast at some time convenient to the Government. We do not accept the word of the Government that they would broadcast the entire speech of the Opposition if it is critical of the Government. I have no doubt that they would not broadcast the whole speech, if it is critical of the Government. I have every faith that they will cut out certain parts of it that are extremely critical of them.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I must challenge this. It has never happened since we have been broad-casting budget

speeches.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:
What has the hon. member risen on?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
On a point of order. It has never happened that any speeches made in this House on that sort of occasion or any other have been edited. It certainly is not true and the hon. member is quite wrong to say it.

Mr. HINDS:
Is the Leader of the House saying that the Government Information Office is going to put out a broadcast that is not edited? He does not know the functions of the Government Information Service.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:
On a point of order, I am saying it because the Government Information Officer has no authority to tamper with the proceedings of this House. 5.30 p.m.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:
How can he say that when we see the Government Information Officer sitting down next to the technician from C.B.C. taping the proceedings of the House? (Asides.)

Mr. SPEAKER:
I would remind the hon. members not addressing the Chair.....

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:
Mr. Speaker, we know the members of the Government; we know what they are capable of, and I say that I have every confidence that if anything is said in this debate that is too critical of them, it will be edited. (Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW You are a blasted liar).

Mr. HINDS:
Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister just sat in his chair and called the hon. member a blasted liar.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Two hon. members are on their feet. There is grave disorder. I was listening to the hon. junior member for Bridgetown. (Mr. ERNEST MOTTLEY And did you not hear the Prime Minister?) Will he continue his speech?

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:
I do not know what Your Honour heard; but if Your Honour heard what I heard, surely the dignity of the House calls on the Prime Minister to withdraw a rude, obscene statement like that. The dignity of the House calls on Your Honour to ask the Prime Minister, the Minister of St. Andrew or anybody else to withdraw, and apologise for a statement like that.

Mr. CRAIG:
Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER:
The hon. junior member for Bridgetown was addressing the Chair.

Mr. CRAIG:
On a point of order.....

Mr. SPEAKER:
Has the hon. member for Bridge-town given way?

Mr. CRAIG:
I rose on a point of order; what is this at all? He has to give way. I would like to draw to the hon. Leader of the Opposition's attention that I would support the Hon. Prime Minister, if he has to withdraw, not to withdraw because, as long as you are in the Chair, anything like that would go on. If I have to repeat what I said, I shall; you can always send me out because I am not afraid to go out, and I will be back again.

Mr. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for St. James must withdraw the remark he made about the Chair.

Mr. CRAIG:
When you call on the House to be silent, then I will hear you; the Speaker must be heard in silence and I can hear noise in the gallery.

Mr. SPEAKER:
If the hon. member is drawing my attention to noise in the gallery, I will have no alternative but to have the gallery cleared; I am asking the hon. member to withdraw the remark which he made about the Chair.

Mr. CRAIG:
Mr. Speaker, may I hear the remark?

Mr. SPEAKER:
The words which have been recorded and which I am asking the hon. senior member for St. James to withdraw are"I would like to draw to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition's attention that I would support the Hon. Prime Minister, if he has to withdraw, not to withdraw because as long as you are in the Chair anything like that would go on. If I have to repeat what I said, I shall;". I am asking the hon. senior member for St. James to withdraw the remarks particularly the words"because AS long as you are in the Chair anything like that would go on. If I have to repeat what I said, I shall, " 5, 40 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER:
I regard that remark as being derogatory to the Chair - (Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS What part of the remark?) The remark as a whole, and in particularly that part which reads

", , , , ..because as long as you are in the Chair, anything like that would go on. If I have to repeat it, I will repeat it." I am asking the hon. member to withdraw that.

Mr. CRAIG:

Sir, I have a deep respect for the Chair; it is regrettable - not for the occupant of the Chair. I withdraw the remark.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member may notwith-draw by saying he has respect for the Chair, but not for the occupant, because the Chair is simply a piece of the furniture wherein an occupant sits. I would ask the hon. member to withdraw that unreservedly and let us proceed.

Mr. CRAIG:

What remark am I to withdraw, Sir? The remark that I respect the Chair and not the occupant, or the remark which you have already complained of? (Asides.) Mr. Speaker gave a ruling in this Hon. House that any person using the word "you" could not have been addressing the Chair. I used the word "you"; so whom was I addressing then?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member was on his feet.

Mr. CRAIG:

I remember that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas said "You are an idiot." Objection was taken of the remark, and Mr. Speaker said that as long as the word "you" was used, he could not have been addressing the Chair. Whom am I addressing now?

Mr. SPEAKER:

When an hon. member is on his feet.....

Mr. CRAIG:

You can conveniently remember.....

Mr. SPEAKER; The hon. member may not say that the Speaker will conveniently remember. I will ask the hon. member to withdraw that*

Mr. CRAIG; In the interest of this Hon. House and the proceedings thereof, I withdraw the remarks complained of by Mr. Speaker, but I am still convinced that I am right,

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has withdrawn everything of which I have complained, I cannot help the hon. member feeling he is right, however wrong he is; but he has withdrawn the remarks, as I understand him to say.

Mr. ELLIOTT MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister made certain remarks very audibly whereby he called me a blasted liar.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I will ask Mr. Clerk to obtain the record as to that. (Mr. HINDS I have a picture here with the Prime Minister wearing a hearing aid, but you do not wear one!)

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

Is Your Honour ruling that, although half dozen people here heard this remark, but the lady Shorthand Writer may not have written it down, you are not going by what we are saying? (Asides.)

Mr. SPEAKER:

I will go only by what has been taken down by the Official Reporter. I have sent for it. (Asides.)

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:

Is Your Honour really ruling that way? Are you going on like that always? (Asides.) If everybody over here says that he heard so-and-so, will Your Honour say that we are liars?

Mr. SPEAKER:

There is an official record.....

(Asides.l

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS:
Mr. Speaker, ...

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPEAKER:
I am afraid that there is such grave disorder that I have no alternative than to adjourn this sitting until Tuesday of next week at twelve noon.

5.50 p.m.