

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1971 - 76

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT) FIRST SESSION OF 1971-76 HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 6th March, 1973.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 noon o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour N. G. A. MAXWELL, LL.B., (Speaker); Hon. C. E. TALMA, C.B.E., (Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House); Hon. G.G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Home Affairs); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W.R.LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. W. C. B HINDS; - His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, (Deputy Speaker); Mr.ELLIOTT D. MOTTLEY; Hon. F.G. SMITH, (S.C., B.A., (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon.

P. G. MORGAN, C.B.E., (Minister of Tourism, Information and Public Relations); Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Hon. P. M. GREAVES, B.A., (Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance); and Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Health and Welfare).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Minutes of this Honourable Chamber for Tuesday, 13th February, are now before you for confirmation, and if there are no amendments or alterations, the Minutes will be confirmed.

There being no objections, the Minutes are duly confirmed,

Mr. MORRISON and Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD entered the Chamber and took their seats.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Resolution to grant the sum of \$141,702 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1972-73, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1972-73 No. 33, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to deal with this Resolution at a later stage in this sitting. The fact is that we hope to lay the Estimates very shortly and I would like to get all these supplementaries out of the way. Copies are available and I am asking for leave to have them circulated and be dealt with at a later stage when members have become conversant with it.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, not having seen the Supplementary Estimates, at this stage I would not be in a position to say whether we would agree or object. Perhaps when it is circulated we would not object to being asked then.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

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

A Bill to repeal the Midwives and Nurses Registration Act, 1932 and make new provision for the registration of nurses and midwives and for the enrolment of nursing assistants and for connected purposes.

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, there are certain questions which I had placed with the Clerk and I will ask your permission to let me ask them at a later stage.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is seeking permission to give notice of questions at a later stage of the sitting, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted to the hon. member.

There being no objection, leave is granted.

REPORTS OF SELECT COMMITTEES

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to lay the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report to the Honourable the House of Assembly on a Bill to amend the Marriage Act, 1904.

The Report has been duly circulated, and if there is no objection, I am asking for leave to have the Report adopted at a later stage.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Leave is granted. BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, seconded by Hon. F. G. SMITH, a Bill to repeal the Midwives and Nurses Registration Act, 1932, and make new provision for the registration of nurses and midwives and for the enrolment of nursing assistants and for connected purposes, was read a first time.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 64, asked by the hon. member for St. Thomas, is now ready.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Before the motion is put, there is one thing I want to bring to the notice of that House and it is that as regards one of the items to be done under Government Business, Item No. 4, we on this side would be asking that this matter be postponed, because although some members on this side got their Order Paper on Saturday, some did not get theirs until late yesterday and as such did not have time to consider the intricacies of this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Can't we deal with this matter when we get to Item 4?

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I just wanted to intimate to the Leader of the House.

Hon.C.B. TALMA:

Before you put the Question, I just want to remind you that I had asked for leave to deal with the resolution for \$141,702. The Acting Leader of the Opposition has not intimated whether he will agree.

The question that the House go into Committee of Supply was put and resolved in the affirmative, and

Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. LOWE in the Chair. 12.10 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Messrs. GREAVES and WALCOTT entered the Chamber and took their seats.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 19/72-73 No. 30

A Resolution for the sum of \$62,000 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, this resolution is a request for supplementary provision under Part II - Capital, Head 108 - Ministry of Finance - (4) Central Bank of Barbados. The provision is that at a meeting of the Central Bank on 4th January, 1973 the Board of Directors of the Bank approved expenditure in the sum of \$401,784 in respect of the period January to June, 1973, but it is anticipated that the amount of \$210,980 will be incurred by the end of the financial year. Of the amount of \$420,000 provided in this year's estimates under this Head, there is a balance of \$149,000 which will be inadequate, and the sum of \$61,980 will therefore be necessary. It is therefore necessary to seek this supplementary of \$62,000 to enable the Bank to carry out its functions for the remainder of the financial year.

There is nothing controversial about it, the Bank has been put on a proper footing, we have recently acquired a property for the Governor of the Central Bank and this is by way of putting things straight. I beg to move that this resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1972-73 No. 32

A Resolution for the sum of \$65,219 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

This is an omnibus resolution, Mr. Chairman, which affects many Ministries; the Ministry of Finance, Establishments Division, the Ministry of External

Affairs, etc., and as usual we will deal with it Head by Head.

In moving the passing of Head 9 - Ministry of Finance (2) Valuation Division in the sum of \$6,022, I think the note is fairly explicit, but it may be just as well that I give some more information.

The position is that the Ministry of Finance is requesting this sum under Item 14

Staff. In the current estimates the sum of \$80,000 is provided to meet the expenses of temporary staff. At the end of January 1973 the amount spent has been totalled as \$79,885 leaving a balance of \$115 which is inadequate to meet payments to the end of the financial year. Under normal circumstances, this original vote would have been quite in order, but it was used to pay emoluments of 12 weekly and seven monthly temporary employees. It was decided in December that a crash programme should be initiated by the Data Processing Unit to complete the processing of land valuation and documents, so that the valuation lists and demand notices could have been issued between 31st January and 15th February, 1973. The programme resulted in the Key-punch, operators working outside of normal working hours, in other words, overtime, and a claim of \$3,022 was made by the Director of the Data Processing Unit and the Commissioner of Land Valuation who is now claiming this sum as a reimbursement.

The Commissioner of Land Valuation was charged with the responsibility of issuing valuation notices and demand notices totalling approximately 5,000, and these could not be undertaken by the present staff. Approval was given for the employment of 12 temporary officers. Since the issue of these notices should have been completed by 15th February, it was necessary for these officers to work outside normal working hours. I beg to move that Head 9 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, it would appear as has been explained by the note here that the entire exercise with regard to land valuation and all that has gone with it up to the moment has been conducted in a "crash programme" manner. I believe that is one of the reasons why we are having so much discontent arising therefrom. I very well recall having warned this Hon. House on more than one occasion when preparation was being made for sending out the valuation lists, that there were a number of people who had been engaged to carry out this valuation and that they were not as familiar with the type of work they were called upon to do as they ought to have been, bearing in mind the magnitude of the task that stood before them. In other words, it would appear to us up to the present that novices in some respects have been recruited to undertake this gigantic task of land valuation in this island. 12.20 p.m.

But that is not all, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member must realise that these officers, who dealt with this important task, were actually trained for the job. The Leader of the Opposition is aware of that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Minister means they have been given training. As proof of the point I am trying to make, up to the present time some of the people who were employed to work on these plots do not know anything about measuring plots of land that are sloping. As a consequence, there are numerous people who have received demand notes for plots with a much larger area or acreage than is really theirs. With regard to the training, some of these officers have received, some of them have gone about the districts and recruited what the Chief Valuation Officer refers to as "guides". This brings me to the point where we have to be very careful in the future with any sums of money that this Honourable House is going to vote to be spent by the Land Valuation Department.

Mr. Chairman, there are cases where money has been paid out to some of these guides, and I understand that not one penny can be properly accounted for in the Land Valuation Department. None of those people, who received money as guides, have had to go to the Land Valuation Department to receive their pay. The terms under which they were employed nobody seems to know, but it is a fact that guides have been recruited and in many cases they have misled Valuation Officers and the other field staff who recruited them.

There are instances on record that when Valuation Officers and other field staff returned to the Valuation Office they were told by other members of the staff that the information they had brought relating to Mr. X could not be right because they knew the particular area. Because the officers had the kind of training that the Leader of the House referred to, they did not want to go back and recheck, bearing in mind that we were going to have the situation that exists today.

Now, casual and temporary staff had to be employed, and that is understandable, but, in an exercise such as land valuation, it is not something for school children to be dealing with. This is not a case where you have to try and accommodate friends. This is serious business. This is the type of business that is now causing the poorest of taxpayers to employ Barristers and Solicitors to assist them. This is something that these poor people cannot afford to do.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member mentioned the accommodation of friends. I just want to draw to his attention that the recruitment of staff for the Public Service is done by the Public Service Commission, and that no Minister has anything to do with the appointment of temporary or permanent staff.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I never accused any Minister; I do not know what the Minister rose to defend.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I rose, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Government, lest what the hon. member said be misunderstood. I want to make it abundantly clear that the Ministers have nothing to do with the employment of Government Officers, whether permanent or temporary.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is only causing me to think much deeper than is really necessary. The Minister is now opening himself to certain questions. Would a member of the National Executive of his Party, or any such person, be considered as a member of the Government? I am not accusing the Ministers of recruiting friends.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, are we to take it that members of the Public Service Commission are giving jobs to their friends?

Mr. BOLDEN joined the meeting and took his seat

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, one officer was recruited by the Public Service Commission to do this temporary work, but the others were not appointed by the Public Service Commission.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Can the hon. member tell us by whom the people were appointed?

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, some were recruited by passing a test in a private home at Rockley owned and occupied by a high Executive Officer of the Land Valuation Division. I do not even want that to go on record. I want to get on with the debate.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, the Head of a Department can recommend to or advise the Public Service Commission on the type of person he wants. When it is a question of an officer moving from one Ministry to another, the Public Service Commission would ask the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry from which the officer is being transferred whether he can be released. The Head of a Department is consulted on the type of officer that should be recruited, but he does not recruit the officer. He can only recommend. 12.30 p.m.

Mr. HINDS:

The Minister knows what should happen, but what I am saying is that members of Staff are recruited and take up employment and the Public Service Commission knows about it later.

Mr. Chairman, we are asked to provide \$6,022 as the note says here to pay additional staff. We have a right now to examine as far as we can the type of work that this additional staff produces for the money we are asked to pay and we are saying that it is partly the manner in which some of these people were selected - I would prefer to say taken on - at this department that has led to the type of breakdown in the running of the whole show as we have seen so far. There is nothing, Mr. Chairman, that has caused more heartaches, more headaches and created more problems for the working class people and the poor old people who have made all sorts of sacrifices, and what is more, a few of the demand notes have gone out, but of the few that have gone out so far you will find that many of the people who have received them have had every cause to go in person or make contact with the Land Valuation Division for the correction of errors and all sorts of things connected thereto. This is what the Minister must now rise to defend that people who have been going to the Land Valuation Division during the past weeks and particularly since the demand notes have come out have had to go and have checks made because they have been billed for too large an area of land, much more than what they have. Let the Minister deny that some of these people have been treated like dogs at the Land Valuation Division. They have been treated as less than human beings by some of the human beings we are voting to pay here today.

Mr. Chairman, we agree that in an undertaking of this magnitude there are areas for errors, but you will find that the attitude adopted by those persons employed by the Land Valuation Division is that what they have sent out to an assumed, land owner or whom they believe to be a land owner is right, and that they have no right being queried by anybody at all. I told this Honourable House, Mr. Chairman, time and time again and if the Minister of Finance were in his place he could bear me out on this, that many people who never owned a plot of land in this Island were being assessed as being owners of land,

and in the face of all this, these people are being issued with demand notes to pay taxes for land which they do not own. Is it fair to these people?

Mr. ADAMS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, whilst what the hon. member is saying is quite in order, he knows that provision has been made to take care of these anomalies. It was explained by the Prime Minister and it was published in the Press, and even today there are various questionnaires and people are told that there are faults in the system and that appropriate bodies are established to deal with these anomalies and the manner in which they ought to be dealt with. What we should be doing today

Mr. HINDS:

Is that a point of order? Mr. CHAIRMAN No point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; I am just trying to help the hon. member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

You have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. HINDS:

; Mr. Chairman, I appreciate any help the hon. member has to offer when I seek it. I am dealing with the type of work that the staff and others turn out. I understand what the Minister is trying to say, and I believe that if he had not been checked he would go on to the question of old age pensioners and about what preparations have been made for dealing with those cases. What we are saying Mr. Chairman, is that if the advice given to the Government by this side had been adhered to, if it had listened and weighed it for what it was worth, many of the difficulties which taxpayers and members of the public find themselves having to contend with need not have existed at all. I am sure that the Minister must have laughed to his heart's content when he referred to the television broadcast, telecast and radio broadcast with respect to explaining the situation concerning these anomalies as he chooses to style them. 12.40 p.m.

Arising out of the work that this temporary staff and others did, we are told how people who are aggrieved can appeal to every court in the world, or nearly there, and it has been put over in such a way as if people can put their hands behind their backs so to speak and walk up to any court and say "I am aggrieved, this is my case", without telling the people that you cannot go to the Supreme Court without employing a barrister and a solicitor to look into these matters. That need not arise whatsoever. It is so unfair and so brutally cruel that one wonders what is going to come out of it all.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned, as I was saying, about money which we may vote from time to time for the Land Valuation Division. We know that the Heads of the various Government Departments and the Accountants are biting their thumb nails at the middle of each week in the desperate bid to find money to pay certain staff, but the situation at the Land Valuation Division calls for a very watchful eye at this very moment, because you will find upon examination that the Accounting Officer in this Department is prepared to go by the rules.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I would like to draw the attention of the hon. member to Standing Order 66(8). The allotted time for a member in Committee to speak on any one Head is 15 minutes. That time has expired.

Mr. HINDS:

How long did it expire, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

It has expired within the last three minutes and that is why I was looking for the appropriate Standing Order.

Mr. ADAMS:

If you please, Sir, seldom in the history of Barbados can a measure prove more controversial and indeed more unsatisfactory than the Land Valuation Act at the moment when it impinges on the consciousness of both hon. members and the public. It goes against the grain of the Opposition to lend any further support to the monstrous wickedness that has been perpetrated on the people of Barbados under the guise of the new land valuation, and I refer to the tax which is occupying us all at the present time.

Mr. WALCOTT:

On a point of order, I will draw to the attention of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that he cannot reflect on legislation that has been passed. The Land Valuation Act is an Act of Parliament.

Mr. ADAMS:

If you please, Sir, the Land Valuation Act is not an Act in this Session, it was passed in 1969, and I am not reflecting on the Act, I am reflecting on its operation. Not reflecting on a vote means just that, but it does not mean you cannot say that the policy is a bad policy. The hon. member knows that quite well, and I have heard him get up in here and criticise Acts of Parliament before now, and in any case it was not passed in this Session. If ignorance like that can be displayed by an hon. member - I mean he is ignorant of when it was passed, not that the hon. member is an ignorant person - if hon. members are unaware of when the Land Valuation Act was passed, can you blame the public for being confused? I want to know in any case how is it an Act passed in 1969 and there has had to be such a rush as there is at the present time to deal with its administration. Four years ago it was passed, and at the time - and unfortunately I did not refer hon. members to the debates, since for some reasons known or unknown those debates have never been published - at the time the former senior member for Christ Church and myself drew to the attention of the Prime Minister and to hon. members who were then present in the House that the new Land Valuation Act, while we would avoid opposing it, was going to mean very great increases in taxation, and at that time we said the public should be made aware and prepare for this. I remember indeed the hon. senior member for Christ Church, as he was then, working out for me in 1969 what he thought upon the basis of that old Act his taxes would be, and he was right within \$50, and that was before the Land Valuation Department had even been set up.

This was allowed to hang fire for four years and it now comes before an astonished and worried public, and it comes before the House by way of seeking an overtime supplementation. There are a lot of

questions which I would have to ask on this point about land valuation. I would like to know how complete the valuation is. It is stated, and it is said, that it has been completed throughout Barbados. A figure was quoted in the House, I understand, of some \$5 million - I was not present when the Land Valuation Act was passed - it would work out that all the land in Barbados if it was going to total five hundred million would be valued at slightly under \$5,000 per acre. This may or may not be true, but I do not know of land that is valued, according to the tax bills I have seen, under \$5,000 an acre. There are 106,000 acres in Barbados, around \$49.80 per acre would give you a figure of \$500 million- I would like to hear from the Minister what the true figure is. I heard parts, and the rest was reported to me, of a television broadcast purporting to be made by the Prime Minister in which he said that he had slightly understated the total amount to the House. I will not, especially in his absence, accuse him of misleading the House in order to procure the passage of the Land Tax Act. I could not do that, and I will not do it even though on an earlier occasion when he accused me of deliberately misleading the House it was held that this was the mere cut and thrust of debate. I will not return the compliment by accusing him of deliberately misleading the House as to the true total figure of valuation. 12.50 p.m.

There is something else I want to say about the Land Valuation Act and its operation. I am not reflecting on it, Sir, even though I could, but there is something else I would like to know. The Act says quite clearly that you refer to a site value of improved or unimproved land, but land is also defined in the Act as including houses. I want to know who told the Chief Valuation Officer that he could value unimproved land as not including houses. That is what I would like to know. I would also like to know who told the Chief Valuation Officer that he could send out valuations without putting an improved value on them, because only an affirmative Resolution of the House can give force to such a decision. If you will read the Land Valuation Act, you will see that an affirmative Resolution of this House is necessary before the valuations can be sent out without an improved value on them.

It is within my knowledge that opinion has been given that the valuations are bad for this reason and that the tax is not payable. (Asides.) I do not necessarily subscribe to it; I do not necessarily not subscribe to it, but I happen to know that it is intended that this will be tested before the courts. The entire validity of every valuation is intended to be tested. I know of this, and I know that advice has been given to persons on legal, not political grounds that they should not pay the land taxes at all and that they will not lose \i of discount or pay \i of penalty because the valuations are bad. I just happen to know that this advice has been given. (Asides.) I have not given that advice. All of these are outstanding questions.

The circumstances of how the Land Tax Act came to be brought in,. Sir, I have not even exposed them. I know of the circumstances how the Act came to be passed. I am suggesting that the whole operation has been rushed and we are not subscribing, apart from the principle - we do not want to be misrepresented any further, and I will deal with that before I finish - to the

believe that overtime was ever necessary in respect of this Land Valuation arrangement. The Land Tax Act, I seem to recall, was given a first reading one Tuesday. I met the Prime Minister in town a night later in the week, and he suggested to me....(Hon. F. G. SMITH: "At what hour?")

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I would like hon. members in the Chamber to adhere to the Standing Orders.

Mr. ADAMS:

The Prime Minister will speak to me after dark, Sir. I do not believe he will speak to the hon. member for St. Michael South Central in the same circumstances. He very kindly suggested to me that I could have an opportunity of visiting the Land Valuation Department and seeing its operation. Many hon. members on the front bench will recall that we visited it together. I was the most surprised man - and I do not believe I am governed by the Official Secrets Act - when I saw that, apparently and ostensibly, a differential taxation system was in preparation and had been prepared, by which poor people would be rated for residential occupation while others would be rated, perhaps more highly, for commercial or hotel operation.

The Leader of the House will remember that he and I looked at a certain parcel of land, and I congratulated him on having it rated for residential occupation and not hotel use. The congratulations were offered on the basis that there would be differential taxation; that people living in their own houses on land would be taxed at a lesser degree than persons carrying on business or hotel operations. Sir, I hope that every time I have to sit down I will not be losing some of my time.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I want to draw to your attention that the House, under Rule 28(4), passed a Bill dealing with Land Tax about three weeks ago. The Rule says

"It shall be out of order to reflect on any vote of the House or attempt to reconsider any specific matter upon which the House has come to a conclusion during the current session except upon a substantive motion for rescission.

Now, we have voted already on this Land Tax Bill. All we are dealing with now is a vote relating to money for the operation of the Department. You cannot allow the hon. member to debate this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Point well taken.

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, I made that one minute and a half. I trust that is not to be taken from my time, Sir - that foolishness. I would like the hon. member to say what vote am I now reflecting on.

Mr. WALCOTT:

I rise, again, to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Reflection can only mean reflection.

Mr. ADAMS:

On what?

Mr. WALCOTT:

On the Land Tax Bill which was passed already. Are you going to allow him to deal with this? Are you going to allow the hon. member to say that he met the Prime Minister and that members rushed through this Bill? How can you permit him to say that? He is speaking about this. This Land Tax Bill was passed by this House.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, I am not talking about the Land Tax Bill. The hon. member must listen more carefully. I am talking about going to the Land Valuation Department. It is a well-known fact that the taxes are being sent out on one form separated by perforations from the Land Valuation Department, and the two things cannot be separated. Reflect does not mean discuss. I think that instead of giving a Gideon Bible to hon. members, the Shorter Oxford Dictionary should have been given to the hon. member for St. Michael West. Reflect cannot mean discuss. You cannot talk about one without talking about the other. The land is valid for the purpose of tax. I do not believe that any hon. member, especially one with such experience, and one who 20 years ago was well, correctly and properly regarded as one of the outstanding members of the House - I find it hard to believe he would now try to come to deceive you, Sir, and to mislead the hon. members.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

No one is going to deceive the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Again, to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member has to withdraw the Word "deceive". He cannot refer to me as deceiving the House. That is improper, and it is unparliamentary to accuse any member of deceiving the House.

Mr. ADAMS:

I would say "mislead" and I withdraw "deceive".

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

"Deceive" must be withdrawn.

Mr. WALCOTT:

I object to withdrawing "deceive" and using "mislead".

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, I.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

"Mislead" as far as I know....

Mr. WALCOTT:

A member was chased out of the House for using less words than these.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Peradventure some hon. members will also be sent out for less words than these. I want hon. members to understand that when the Chair is ruling, I am ruling. In my opinion the word "mislead" is not unparliamentary. To deceive is unparliamentary, so therefore I ask that the word "deceive" be withdrawn.

Mr. ADAMS:

I have withdrawn that already, Sir. 1 p.m.

I withdraw the word. I am sorry I said it. Nobody would believe that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central is capable of deceiving anybody.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

At this point, fifteen minutes have expired. The hon. member will sit.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, it has always been held that interruptions do not count against an hon. member's speech otherwise he would not speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I quite agree but I yet rule that with all the interruptions fifteen minutes have gone.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was saying, there is no doubt that there is.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, the hon. member has already spoken on this particular Head.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I want the Hon. Leader of the House not only to read the Rules but to understand them.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the House is absolutely correct. I refer Your Honour to Standing Order No. 28 (15) which clearly states that -

"No Member may speak more than once on any proposition except in Committee, as provided in these Standing Orders."

The only Order provided by the Standing Orders for a member to speak more than once| is Standing Order No. 30(6) which says -

"In a debate on a Bill in Committee of the whose House, no member may speak more than once on a Clause or Schedule, and a speech shall not exceed fifteen minutes, provided that with leave of the Committee a member may again be heard on a Clause or Schedule for a period or periods not exceeding 15 minutes."

The position then, Mr. Chairman, is that no member may speak more than once on a matter such as we are now debating because this is not a Bill, and indeed may not speak more than once in Committee because the Standing Orders clearly provide that you must not speak more than once at all. There are four exceptions to speaking more than once in Committee and one exception when you are speaking on a Bill under Standing Order No. 30(6).

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I speak as the Leader of the Opposition. It is the first time the point has arisen in the Rules. We would not want any judgement to be made per incuriam as the judges say.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Under Standing Order No. 66(8) "A Member may speak for 15 minutes at any one time, provided that the time limit of the speech of the Minister when moving a Head of Expenditure, or replying to the debate on the Head, or of a Member when moving an amendment to reduce the sum to be allotted for any Head of Expenditure in respect of any subhead or item thereof or replying to the debate on the amendment, shall not exceed 30 minutes,"

Mr. ADAMS:

Before you rule I will really appeal that this matter be.....if necessary I will ask the hon. member to forego any right which, he may or may not have to speak again, and I myself would also so do if necessary so that the matter can be subjected with the greatest possible respect to a legal opinion. Excuse me putting it that way. I was a member of the Standing Orders Committee and I well remember what was said then. Sometimes I must speak as a lawyer and "at any one time" does not mean once. I tell you that as a lawyer. Hon. members can accept my opinion or not. "At any one time" means more than once and you can go and look it up in Burrowes' "Judicially Defined" I imagine and you will find it. I can't be sure of that. At any one time cannot mean once, and I would particularly ask that less there be a ruling per incuriam without taking the advice of the substantive Clerk or without seeking the advice of the legal draftsmen, that before such a ruling is made to create a precedent for the future, because these words are taken from other Parliaments where these things go on, let us take advice. I am appealing to you not to make a ruling. At any one time, I would stake my legal reputation on it, cannot mean once. (Hon. F. G. SMITH That does not mean much.) It might not mean much to the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, but I am still in practice and he is no longer the Attorney General. I am a practising barrister and I have some little idea of what goes on. At any one time can never mean once because you do not put in the words "at any one time" unless you contemplate that there will be more than one time. That is the entire point of using those words. "At any one time" is inserted to show that the member can speak more than once. He may not speak for 15 minutes at any one time, which means he can speak more than once, but only 15 minutes at a time. Sir, I would ask the Attorney General.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN rose, and both hon. members sat

Mr. WALCOTT:

On a point of order, the hon. member raised the point about being a lawyer. I think it is offensive for the hon. member to talk in here about being a lawyer. Nobody is elected in here professionally, and when you come in here as a lawyer, a doctor or whatever you are, you speak in here as a member; so you are not giving any legal opinion in here, because we cannot take any legal opinion from any lawyer even though he is a lawyer in here. If there is going to be a legal opinion it would have to be given outside. You speak in here as a member and all of us are equal. If a member who is a lawyer gives a point of view, we will listen to him because we feel he is trained in the law, but when it comes to the Rules now, these are not matters that only the lawyers would understand, but something that members would be able to appreciate. The Rules say that no member may speak more than once on any

proposition. You have many things to determine. What is the meaning of speaking more than once? What is a proposition? And then it gives the exceptions - "except in Committee, as provided in these Standing Orders; or (b) in explanation, as provided in paragraph 16 of this Standing Order; or (c) as provided in Standing Order No. 32; or (d) in the case of the mover of a substantive motion or the Member in charge of a Bill, in reply." So we have (a), (b), (c) and (d) that we have to determine.

Now all these are matters for this House to determine. Now if the hon. member who was a member of the Committee did this with his eyes wide open, he cannot come back here and plead he did not know what he was doing. He cannot say he agreed that they should speak once on any proposition and he did not mean once. If the motion is that Clause (d) stand part, this is a proposition. 1.10 p.m.

That is the proposition before the House, that this Head stand part, not that the whole resolution do now pass. When you are finished with the Heads then you move that the whole resolution do now pass, and the hon. member cannot say that this is not a proposition, if you have a crystal clear proposition that this part of the resolution stand part and we are speaking on this, we are confined to this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I must thank the hon. member but it was already in my mind to rule. That is why I stopped the Leader of the Opposition

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the main object of having these Standing Orders revised was primarily to create and impose time limits. For instance, the Leader of the Opposition made the biggest contribution of all, and he was the one who suggested a guillotine of five days as far as the Estimates are concerned. The whole object of the revision of these Standing Orders was to avoid the filibustering and nonsense which goes on in here and has been going on in here for too long.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, because the hon. member is now getting old he is now talking about wasting time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN; Absolutely no point of order.

Mr. HINDS:

I have made the point, nevertheless.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I will not be interrupted, except by Your Honour.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr, Chairman, on a point of order, I think the hon. member may well be annoyed with what goes on in here, but I have never heard that what goes on in this House is nonsense, and I do not think it is in order to refer to the proceedings of Parliament as nonsense.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, I referred to what went on at some time in the past, bad behaviour, etc., and I hope that everybody is quite clear that the time limits were imposed. In the case in

Committee of each Head, 15 minutes, any member may only speak once, except in the case of an amendment to reduce.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, my view is that this Hon. House cannot carry on its business with rules that are interpreted by the Chair one way and by every hon. member in a different way. I believe the best thing that could be done is to suspend the business of the House and a ruling be got for the benefit of everybody.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I think that when the Chair rules it rules.

\ Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, this is very new and this is the first day this has happened, but hon. members have, I think, perhaps forgotten that even supplementary estimates are guillotined. If hon. members speak six times on one Head all that will happen is that they will lose the right to speak on the other Heads.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I do not see it this way.

Mr. ADAMS:

With great respect, Sir, this debate now before the House must end in three hours and fifteen minutes from the start. Hon. members perhaps are not familiar with Order 72. The whole point is that everybody who was at the Committee knows, and I am ashamed to see members of the Committee seeking to say otherwise, everybody at the Committee knows that the original draft said that an hon. member may speak only once on each Head, and it was changed in return for a concession that a guillotine would be applied to supplementary estimates, and the Opposition allowed to choose which of the Heads it would deal with at length, and in return for that the words were changed to "at any one time". (Asides) Do not tell me it is not true, I went to almost every meeting of the Standing Orders Committee. Drafts will be found to that effect.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

With all due respect to the hon. member, I do not see that in this Standing Order here. In the Standing Order which I have before me it is stated that a member may speak for 15 minutes at any one time, and my interpretation is that on any particular Head or Item the hon. member is at liberty to speak for 15 minutes and after that he will take his seat.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, why I am urging on the House to consider this matter, the

Judges of the Supreme Court when they have to rule take time to consider, and I am only asking you to take time to consider it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

This is the highest court of the land, and since this is so my ruling stands in this instance.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong this debate but.....

Mr. ADAMS:

I am sorry, Sir, but I have to disrespect your ruling by leaving the House, and I am leaving the House because I think the ruling is wrong, I do not believe the Opposition has been treated fairly - we have only asked that Your Honour take time to consider the matter, that is all - we believe you have been misled by the interventions of hon. members on the other side who do not deserve the appellation "honourable", and I will leave the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I have already ruled.

Members of the Opposition walked out of the Chamber.

The question that Head 9 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 22 - Establishments Division - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 22 stand part.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

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

Head 24 - Ministry of External Affairs - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 24 stand part.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

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

Head 30 - Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 30 stand part.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

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

Head 42 - Ministry of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 42 stand part.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

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

Head 44 - Lands and Surveys Department -was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 44 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Head 45 - Ministry of Tourism, Information and Public Relations - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 45 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$65,219 do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that these Resolutions 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. 1.20 p.m.

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA , seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1972-73 No. 33

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I intimated earlier that the Government intended to ask for leave to move a motion that the sum of one hundred and forty-one thousand seven hundred and two dollars be granted from the Consolidated Fund and placed at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1972-73 Part I Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1972-73 No. 33 which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

Copies of this Resolution have been circulated to all hon. members. In view of the fact that this matter is urgent, and we would like to have it dealt with - the members of the Opposition have walked out, but nobody has asked them to leave - I am asking leave to deal with this Resolution at this stage. A quorum is present.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If there are no objections, leave will be granted. There being no objection leave is granted.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House resume in Committee of Supply.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

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 of Supply on the Resolution, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, this is an omnibus Resolution.

HEAD 31 - Meteorological Service - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 31 - Meteorological Service stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 34 - Electrical Inspection Department - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 34 - Electrical Inspection Department - stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Head 37 - Ministry of Health and Welfare (6) District Hospitals - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr, Chairman, I beg to move that Head 37 - Ministry of Health and Welfare (6) District Hospitals - stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

ANNEXED ESTIMATES - POST OFFICE was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Annexed Estimates - Post Office - stand part.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Resolution in

Committee of Supply.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved itself in the affirmative, and Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr.

SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On, the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

NATIONAL HOUSING CORPORATION ACT, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Seaker, the next item I propose to deal with is Item No. 4, which stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance, and it is to move the Second Reading of a bill to consolidate and revise the laws relating to housing and to provide the National Housing Corporation with responsibility for managing the development of areas designated as development areas and for connected purposes.

I beg to move that Item 4 be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, the Bill that is now before this Chamber is intended to effect a merger between the two arms of housing the Housing Authority and the Urban Development Corporation. When the House met during the consideration of the last Estimates, I alluded to the fact that at some time the Government would be bringing down some proposals for amalgamating the Housing Authority and the Urban Development Corporation. The reason is that we want to have greater control, and we can do this because there are certain common features that run through these two authorities. The common features are the sales of houses, the construction of houses and so on. This is primarily what both organisations are intended to provide.

Mr. Speaker, as is well known, these two organisations are catering to different income groups in our society. The Housing Authority is by Act required to cater to the working class who, obviously, by definition is a person whose income does not exceed \$60.00 a week. The Urban Development Corporation on the other hand, is intended to cater for middle-income groups which were said to have been the rest. In other words, persons who are earning more than \$60.00 a week were at that time considered to be middle-income earners.

Mr. Speaker, when both Acts were put into operation, as far as the Urban Development Corporation Act is concerned - this was about

four years after the enactment - it was then discovered that there was a gap not provided for between the maximum of the persons catered for by the Housing Authority and the minimum of persons catered for by the Urban Development Corporation which, when we applied the various mechanics for mortgage, insurance and took the ratio in relation to a person's earnings, it worked out that a person must be earning no less than about \$480.00 a month even when you take into consideration family income. Then and only then, Mr. Speaker, we discovered that persons in between the \$260 a month and the \$480 a month were not provided for in this legislation. We intend by this new Corporation, Mr. Speaker, to deal with housing - not middle-income housing and low-income housing - so that we will be able to cover the middle-income earners as envisaged by the Act, the low-income earners as provided for under the Housing Authority Act, as well as the group in between that no authority provided for hitherto. 1.30 p.m.

Under this Act, Mr. Speaker, all property will be vested in the new Corporation. The new Corporation will also inherit the rights, assets and liabilities of the two authorities. But what is of great significance under the new legislation is not merely the amalgamation or the fusion of the two segments of housing. What the Act in fact provides is a distribution of the functions -hitherto the sole prerogative of either the Housing Authority or the Urban Development Corporation between the Ministry on the one hand and the new Corporation on the other. The Ministry will be responsible for planning, policy and control; the Corporation will be responsible mainly for management, for tenancy arrangements, for sales, for mortgages and things of this nature, and the execution of the plans prepared by the Ministry. Within the Ministry will be set up a technical division and this technical division will be headed by a Chief Technical Officer who will have appropriate officers under him including architects, surveyors, sociologists and if necessary engineers.

Mr. Speaker, the Ministry intends in its planning processes to provide for a ten year development plan for housing. We find that not enough planning has gone into it in this regard and this is one reason why we have taken over planning in the Ministry, as we do not think it right for the Authority to wait until a development is nearly complete to look around for land to start another one. We feel that if we were to get a ten year development plan, we will know from now for the next five or six years

where we will be building. We will have the land at our disposal and would know exactly what we are after.

Mr. Speaker, this is in effect what this Bill is providing for. We are not saying that it is going to eliminate the problems that are in housing. We are not saying this is the cure-all to all the problems, but when we have done this we will then have to go into the organisation itself and look after the organisation of housing as far as the personnel and management are concerned. This is another function that we will have to undertake. However that may be, Mr. Speaker, we think we are on the right track,

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 10 inclusive were called and passed.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW entered the Chamber and took his seat.

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the remainder of Part III was passed.

Part IV was called and passed. Part V was called and passed. Part VI was called.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to move an amendment to Clause 22 in Part VI. The amendment has been circulated to hon. members and is with the Clerk of this Hon. Chamber.

I beg to move that Clause 22 (b) be deleted.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the new Clause 22(b) as circulated, be inserted.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

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

Part VI as amended was called and passed. The Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill with amendments in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly. 1.40 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders 6, 16, 18, 20, 21, 44 and 49 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 standing in the name of the Prime Minister be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE FINANCING OF EXPENDITURE UNDER THE SPECIAL LOAN ACT, 1968

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, by section 3 of the Special Loan Act, 1968 any money borrowed under the authority of that Act has to be appropriated and applied to the purposes which Parliament may approve from time to time by Resolution, and any money so appropriated of course is charged upon the general revenue and assets of Barbados. At 31st December, 1972 the amount outstanding under that Loan Act was \$1,312,500. When I say that the amount outstanding was this sum, it means that that was the amount of money which had not been appropriated for specific purposes or which had not been raised.

Under the Capital Estimates 1972-73 we budgeted for an expenditure of \$2.9 million, and of this amount some \$31,100,000 was anticipated as the amount which would have to be raised by way of loans. At 31st December, 1972 the actual expenditure as against the amount approved to be appropriated

was very close to \$14 million, and at 31st March, 1973, which is at the end of the financial year, we anticipate the expenditure will be in the vicinity of \$22 - \$23 million, whereas the loan in respect of capital expenditure for the financial year amounts to \$6.6 million.

The main purpose of the resolution which we have before us is to seek the approval of Parliament for the application of money borrowed under this Act of 1968 to the financing of any expenditure, including the Capital Estimates approved by Parliament from time to time. You may say that this is the purpose of the Act, but the purpose of the Act was to get specific approval for every loan which was raised for a particular object, and what we are seeking now is the general approval for borrowing up to \$20 million to meet any projects which may have already been approved by Parliament in the Capital Estimates. In other words, we are not raising the limit of the borrowing from \$20 million, neither are we asking that this money be appropriated for purposes other than that already approved by Parliament, but we are merely trying to avoid the repetition of applications for the approval of the House to loans being raised out of this total amount of \$20 million from time to time.

There is an Addendum to the Resolution and I hope that hon. members have read it. Since I must assume that everything has been done which ought to have been done, both rightly and solemnly, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The next Item stands in the name of the Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance.

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE LEASE OF
LAND AT REEF ROAD, FONTABELLE,
ST. MICHAEL**

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, the Government owns 6,350 square feet of land in the Fontabelle area. It is bounded on three sides by public roads and on one side by a private property. This land has been Government property for considerable time and it has not been particularly well kept, and indeed has earned Government nothing. The way the land is situated it is separated from other Government property by a main road and is really of use only to the adjoining property owner.

The proposal is to lease this land to the adjoining property owner on certain terms and conditions. The terms are that the land be landscaped and kept in a clean and tidy condition, that no permanent structure be erected on the property, there should be a rental fee of 12 cents per square foot per annum as is charged in the area, and of course permission is usually granted to sublet these properties. This is normal. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The next Item, Sir, is Item No. 5 standing in the name of the Prime Minister, and it is to move the House to consider the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report to the Hon. the House of Assembly on a Bill to amend the District Auctioneers Act, 1904. I happen to be a member of this Committee, and unless the Prime Minister wants to deal with it specifically I ask for leave to deal with it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Leave is granted.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON DISTRICT AUCTIONEERS BILL

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee which was appointed to consider and report on this Bill sat on several occasions as Your Honour will recall, being the Chairman of the Committee, and has handed in its report. 1.50 p.m.

The Report has been printed and circulated to hon. members. I think all of the main amendments, which were agreed to in the Select Committee, have been incorporated including certain suggestions made by the Prime Minister. The main amendments deal with increasing the fees and regularising things in accordance with the Financial Administration Act.

I beg to move that the Report be now adopted.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (VESTING OF PROPERTY AND TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the next item on the Order Paper is Item No. 7, which stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance, and it is to resume the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Executive Committee (Vesting of Property and Transfer of Functions) Act, 1964. Copies of the proposed amendments have been circulated to hon. members.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, a motion on this matter has already been made. An hon. member was speaking at the time the matter was last considered, but I no longer see the member present in this Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Someone may be able to speak on the amendment.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Certainly, Mr. Speaker. I have had circulated some amendments to this Bill at the time when we were considering the Bill. It was pointed out that we were purporting that this House was asked to agree to deprive itself and, indeed, the Minister of certain functions. That argument was advanced under the mistaken idea that the law was as it was first enacted in 1964. The law was amended in 1965,

so that what the Bill was requiring this House to do was not to deprive this Honourable Chamber of its powers of approving sales or lease of land, but it was intended to give it the power that I had, in my opening debate, requested the House to give, that is, to give the Minister the power to make certain Regulations to effect the proper control of Government lands.

Mr. Speaker, we did have another look at the Bill, and we decided to make certain amendments which will be moved in due course. These amendments, of course, have been circulated to all hon. members.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

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. LOWE in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed. Clause 2 was called.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, I move that Clause 2 be deleted, and that the new Clause 2 be as circulated to hon. members.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

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

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, I move that Clause 3 be deleted, and that the new Clause 3, as circulated, be inserted.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, I move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee with amendments.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Bill as amended, was read a third time and passed. 2. p.m.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government's Business for today's sitting.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 13th March, 1973, at 10 a.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 2.05 p.m.