

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES*Tuesday, October 15, 1996*

The House met at 1.30 p.m.

PRAYERS[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]**SOUND SYSTEM
(MALFUNCTION)**

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members, I want to indicate that, apparently, there is a problem with the sound system and someone is working on it, so that if you are not hearing me properly it is because of this. I would ask that we continue with the sitting. If there is a problem, we would suspend for a time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members, I wish to indicate that I have received communication from the Hon. Member for San Fernando East (Mr. Patrick Manning) who has asked to be excused from today's sitting. I also received communication from the Member for La Brea (Mr. H. Bereaux) who is not too well, who has also asked to be excused from today's sitting.

PAPERS LAID

1. Report of the Auditor General on the accounts of the Institute of Marine Affairs for the year ended December 31, 1995. [*The Attorney General (Hon. Ramesh Lawrence Maharaj)*]

To be referred to the Public Accounts Committee.

2. The Elections and Boundaries Commission (Local Government) (Tobago House of Assembly) Draft Order, 1996. [*The Minister of Local Government (Hon. Dhanraj Singh)*]

ARRANGEMENT OF BUSINESS

The Attorney General (Hon. Ramesh Lawrence Maharaj): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the House proceed with Motion No. 1 and then the continuation of Bill No. 1.

Agreed to.

**Sound System
(Malfunction)**

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members, before the debate on the first Motion starts, I suggest that the sitting of the House be suspended for about 15 minutes because absolutely nothing is being picked up by the microphones. So we will suspend the sitting and attempt to have it rectified.

1.38 p.m.: *Sitting suspended.*

1.55 p.m.: *Sitting resumed.*

**ELECTIONS AND BOUNDARIES COMMISSION (LOCAL GOVERNMENT)
(TOBAGO HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY) ORDER**

The Minister of Local Government (Hon. Dhanraj Singh): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move,

Whereas it is provided by subsection (3) of section 4 of the Elections and Boundaries Commission (Local Government) Act, that as soon as may be after the Elections and Boundaries Commission (hereinafter referred to as “the Commission”) has submitted a report under paragraph (a) of subsection (1) of section 4 of the said Act, the Minister shall lay before the House of Representatives for its approval the draft of an Order by the President for giving effect, whether with or without modifications, to the recommendations contained in the report:

And Whereas, the Commission has submitted a report to the Minister in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (a) of subsection (1) of section 4:

And Whereas the draft of an Order entitled, ‘the Elections and Boundaries Commission (Local Government) (Tobago House of Assembly) Order, 1996’ giving effect to the recommendations of the Commission was laid before the House of Representatives on the 15th day of October, 1996.

Be it Resolved:

That the draft of the Elections and Boundaries Commission (Local Government) (Tobago House of Assembly) Order, 1996 be approved.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this draft Order is to obtain the House of Representatives’ approval of the recommendations contained in the Sixth Report of the Elections and Boundaries Commission on the boundaries in the electoral areas of Tobago 1996. The approval of the draft Order by the House of Representatives

would then enable the Minister to submit it to the President who shall then issue an Order pertaining to the approved draft, thereby giving effect to the recommendations of the Commission's Sixth Report on the boundaries of the electoral area of Tobago, 1996.

Members will recall that on Friday, October 11, 1996 the Bill was introduced in this House to validate the Sixth Report of the Elections and Boundaries Commission on the boundaries of the electoral districts in the electoral areas of Tobago. This Bill was unanimously approved. Similarly, the Bill was taken to the Senate on Monday, October 14, 1996 and also received unanimous support. The approved Bill has been assented to by the President.

Procedurally, it is provided for by subsection (3) of section 4 of the Elections and Boundaries Commission (Local Government) Act, that as soon as may be after the Commission has submitted its report under paragraph (a) of subsection (1) of the said section 4, the Minister shall lay before the House of Representatives for its approval the draft of an Order by the President for giving effect with or without modifications to the recommendations contained in the report.

Mr. Speaker, I will now deal with major recommendations as outlined in the Sixth Report and what this Order will put into effect and make law. I urge hon. Members of this honourable House to take full cognizance of the upward adjustments in the number of electors in the L'Anse Fourmi/Speyside, Roxborough and Delaford electoral districts in order to bring them within 25 per cent of the highest electorate as prescribed by the elections rule. Thus, the L'Anse Fourmi/Speyside electorate which stood at 2,322 was increased by 288 and it now stands at 2,610. That of Roxborough/Delaford which was 2,380 has been increased to 2,632.

Adjustments were also made to the Belle Garden/Goodwood district, Bacolet/Mount St. George district and the Scarborough/Signal Hill district. In the case of Belle Garden/Goodwood, one of its polling divisions No. 5045 with a registered electorate of 540 was transferred to Roxborough/Delaford. As a result, Belle Garden/Goodwood was reduced by a similar amount to 2,364 electors. In order to bring it above the permissible minimum, polling division No. 4930 with an electorate of 543 from Bacolet/Mount St. George was incorporated into the district. The electorate of Belle Garden/Goodwood was thus increased to 2,907 bringing it above the permissible minimum. The electorate of Bacolet/Mount St. George was reduced to 2,383 as a result of the transfer of polling division No. 4930 to Belle Garden/Goodwood.

In order to bring it above the permissible minimum, polling division No. 4915 with an electorate of 274 from Scarborough/Signal Hill was also incorporated. The removal of polling division No. 4915 with an electorate of 274 from Scarborough/Signal Hill reduced its number of electors to 2,649. Since the number of electors was above permissible minimum, no further adjustments were necessary.

Taken as a whole, the total number of registered electors in the electoral areas of Tobago grew from 31,287 in 1992 to 33,858 in 1996, an increase of 2,571 electors. Within the framework of such an increase, adjustments to the number of electors in certain districts were made in accordance with election rules. However, the number of electoral districts which stood at 12 in 1992 will remain the same.

This Government, being a guardian of the law and the Constitution, fully supports the recommendations of the Commission which is an independent body. We have given special consideration to the Commission's recommendations on page 2, item 6, pertaining to the amendment to section 4(2)(b) of the Act which prescribed that reports in reference to Tobago should be submitted not less than two nor more than four years from the date of submission of the Commission's last report. The necessary action would be taken in due course consequent upon the House of Representatives' approval of the draft Order.

The approval of the draft Order in this august House will pave the way for the Tobago House of Assembly elections when it is constitutionally due. As is well known, this Government cherishes, respects and upholds the principle of holding elections on their constitutionally due dates.

The approval of the draft Order at this time will allow the Commission sufficient time to put its administrative machinery in good order to ensure maximum efficiency and effectiveness during the course of the upcoming Tobago House of Assembly elections.

The citizens of Tobago will be accorded equality of treatment by this Government on any matter in the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago. I wish to remind the hon. Members of this House that our purpose is simply to approve the draft Order of the President to give effect to the recommendations contained in the Sixth Report of the Elections and Boundaries Commission on the boundaries in the electoral areas of Tobago 1996.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move.

Question proposed.

2.05 p.m.

Dr. Keith Rowley (*Diego Martin West*): Mr. Speaker, I just rise to—[*Desk thumping*]

Hon. Member: True Leader of the Opposition!

Dr. K. Rowley: Mr. Speaker, I might have to ask for your protection. I just rise to indicate to the honourable House, that we on this side fully endorse and support the Order as presented by the Minister. As you would have gathered it is pretty much routine. We are being asked to confirm the order of work done by the Elections and Boundaries Commission. This is an independent commission in which we still have faith and confidence and we accept the work of the commission.

As the Minister has pointed out there have been some shifts in polling divisions from the west to the east. We understand this is quite reasonable. It reflects the population growth in Tobago where there seems to have been an increase in the western end. To deal with that, under the rules which we also agree to operate under, there has been a slight shift of one polling division per electoral district going eastwards, resulting in shifts in Speyside. If I may indicate to the Minister, the name of that village is not “Spreside”. I could understand that, as he comes from Pointe-a-Pierre. We think that is very reasonable.

In terms of the maintenance of the 12 electoral districts, we do not believe as the Commission has indicated to us, that there was any basis to increase or reduce those districts. On that basis, we believe that the report warrants our full support and we so offer that support.

Thank you.

The Minister of Local Government (Hon. Dhanraj Singh): Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate the Member for Diego Martin West for his contribution, and the statesmanlike manner in which it was delivered.

I beg to move.

Question put and agreed to.

Resolved.

That the draft of the Elections and Boundaries Commission (Local Government) (Tobago House of Assembly) Order, 1996 be approved.

**MOTOR VEHICLES INSURANCE
(THIRD PARTY RISKS) (AMDT.) BILL
[THIRD DAY]**

Order read for resuming adjourned debate on question [September 20, 1996]

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question again proposed.

The Attorney General (Hon. Ramesh Lawrence Maharaj): Mr. Speaker, when this debate was adjourned hon. Members of the House would recall that I had indicated that I would consider some of the points raised by the Opposition, before I completed my contribution on this matter.

One of the points raised by the Opposition was the question of emergency medical treatment being inserted in clause 5 of the Bill, and that there should be some limit or definition of exactly what it means. In order to put this matter in perspective I think it would be important for us to recognize that the law as it stands, makes it unlawful for any person to use or cause or permit any other person to use a motor vehicle on a public road, unless the policy of insurance is enforced in respect of third party rights. It is an unlawful act, and in order to comply with the requirements of the Act, the policy of insurance must ensure persons specified in the policy in respect of liability for death, bodily injury or damage to property arising out of the use of a motor vehicle, and now including a trailer on a public road.

By including emergency treatment, clause 5 attempts to make it compulsory for the owner of the vehicle to insure it in order to cover sums to be paid for emergency treatment. The reason for inserting it in clause 5 is that it would be paid by the insurance company regardless of liability. The purpose of this matter is that when an accident occurs at a particular spot, there are times when it becomes necessary for the injured person, in the case of serious injury, in particular, to get medical treatment on the spot and on the way to the hospital.

2.15 p.m.

In respect of this matter, the Law Commission, and if I may mention, I had discussions with the Association of Insurance Companies (ATTIC) and they are in agreement that there should be some provision irrespective of whether the company is liable or not. Liability does not come into play. This is a measure where the company should be responsible to pay. The only question is that the

insurance industry wanted some limit on the amount that they would have to pay. One has to bear in mind that at times if one does not put a limit, the rule can be abused and people can claim high sums.

In discussions with the insurance industry yesterday, it was recognized that a limit should be put in the region of \$1,000 to \$1,500. It is in that context that the necessary drafting would be done to give effect to that matter. There would be a definition of emergency treatment so that we would know exactly what it is and there would be a limit.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point Members to the fact that this amount for emergency treatment would be separate and apart from the amount mentioned in section 4(6) of the Act. This section provides for the insurer or owner to pay expenses at a hospital. In those days it was “not in excess of \$120”. I have had discussions with the insurance industry and we will increase that to \$750. I hope that will satisfy Members on the other side. This is not special damages; it is not the amount of money which persons can claim for the other treatment that they have because that would form part and parcel of the claim for damages.

I also take the point—and it is a typographical error—that in clause 5, property damage was left out. We will therefore have to include that and there is an amendment which will be done at the committee stage to include it. So that point which the Opposition made is a valid one.

The Opposition’s concerns on ensuring that we take every step to protect the public in these matters gave me an opportunity to look at this Bill again and to deal with a matter which I think should be dealt with immediately. Mr. Speaker, you would have noticed from the provisions of this Bill that under section 10 of the existing law, where an owner is held liable for injury or damage to property, there is a right given to the injured party to file an action against the insurance company if the insured does not pay the claim. The existing law had put limits on the insurance company as to what extent it would be liable.

You would have noticed, Mr. Speaker, in section 4 of the Act that the existing limits in respect of one single claim—that is the maximum that an insurance company would have to pay in respect of personal injuries or death arising out of one accident—is \$200,000. The Bill had attempted to increase that to \$500,000. I should mention that the insurance companies and the Reinsurance Company of Trinidad and Tobago feel that even \$500,000 is too small a sum and we have looked at that matter again and have had the necessary discussions with the

insurance industry and the Supervisor of Insurance. The Ministry of Finance has also looked at the matter and the Government believes that the sum for any single claim should be increased to \$1 million. There would, therefore, be an amendment to that effect, namely, that an insurance company would now be liable for \$1 million at most, plus the cost and interest in any single claim. That does not prevent the injured party from getting the balance of the moneys from the owner of the vehicle against whom he has got the judgment.

In section 4(2)(e) of the Act where it says “liability in respect of any sum in excess of \$200,000 arising out of any one claim by any one person”, it will now be \$1 million. In respect of a series of claims arising out of one accident, the amendment will be to \$2 million. Members of the public will now have greater protection against insurance companies in respect of damages suffered as a result of personal injuries or even death. So, if there is a situation where a person who is injured gets a judgment in favour of \$1 million, he can now go against the insurance company and get that \$1 million, if the owner of the vehicle is a man of straw. If there is more than one claim arising out of the accident, the insurance company will have to pay and the extent of their liability would be \$2 million.

In respect of the clause dealing with property damage, the existing amount for property damage—that is if one has a vehicle which is damaged—the insurance company is now only liable in respect of third party risk to pay a maximum of \$50,000, and in respect of a series of claims in respect of property damage, the maximum is \$200,000.

The Government believes that this is totally inadequate and even the initial figure in the Bill of \$200,000 is also inadequate. The Government intends to amend it to increase the single claim in respect of property damage to \$500,000, and in respect of a series of claims in respect of property damage, to \$1 million. Mr. Speaker, one merely has to look at the value of motor vehicles to see how much they cost now and if they are damaged, one would certainly not be able to get a new vehicle for \$50,000.

There is a school of thought that the existing legislation only protects an injured third party to get redress against the insurance company in respect of personal injuries or injuries which have resulted in death as a result of personal injuries.

2.25 p.m.

That position was taken because of the way the Act has been drafted and because of the provisions of section 4(5) which say:

“Sections 8 and 12...”

which are the operative sections

“...shall not apply to damage to property.”

We are deleting section 4(5) which would make it absolutely clear that the protection for damage to third parties, whether the damage is as a result of personal injuries, death, or to property, would have protection under the Act. The protection would mean that if an injured person, a person who has suffered damage, gets a judgment against the owner and the owner cannot pay, he can go directly against the insurance company for them to pay.

In order to show the efforts which we are making and to answer some of the points mentioned, that we must ensure that the public must be protected at all costs under this piece of legislation, when one looks at the fact that we are also deleting section 4(2)(b), one sees that we are making it quite clear that people, even if they are alighting from a vehicle or getting into a vehicle, that there will be insurance coverage.

When one looks at section 4(2)(b) of the Act—and that is what we have deleted by this amendment—we see that under the law there was the situation if a person was alighting from a private motor vehicle and the vehicle drove off and the person was injured, it gave points to the insurance company to argue that the insurance coverage was not for that kind of injury. Therefore we have deleted that completely. So that what will happen is that one would have complete protection in all situations where the person is injured.

One of the points raised by the Opposition which I have looked at, has to do with clause 5(c) of the Bill which repeals section 4(3)(a) and replaces it with words contained in the Bill. The existing Act says:

“(3) For the purposes of this Act “property” does not include—

(a) property carried in or on a motor vehicle;”

We are deleting (a) and substituting it with the words:

“property carried in or on a motor vehicle or licensed trailer for hire for reward;”

The Act, as it is, removes from the ambit of compulsory insurance coverage the necessity to insure property which is being carried on a vehicle. The amendment now removes from the ambit of compulsory insurance coverage, the

necessity to insure goods being transported for hire or reward. The reason for that is that nothing would prevent a party interested in so doing from having separate insurance for the goods which are being transported for hire or reward. Therefore the person can take out separate insurance. However, the purpose of the Act is primarily to protect third parties at risk who are not in a position to protect themselves from the negligent operation of motor vehicles. As the law now stands, property carried in a motor vehicle—

Mr. Imbert: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Attorney General for giving way.

What about the case where a third party is in a vehicle that is for hire or reward and it is damaged by another vehicle? My property is being carried in a vehicle for hire or reward and it is damaged by another vehicle and he is liable, what is the position?

Hon. R. L. Maharaj: Mr. Speaker, the property carried in the vehicle was not really insured, even under the existing legislation. What the amendment does is to say that property carried in a vehicle for hire or reward does not fall within that ambit. Property would be covered in a private vehicle. In respect of vehicles for hire or reward, or trailers, they can have separate insurance for that. The reason for that is that the insurance industry feels that if they have to do that it will up the policies and it will, in effect, be a burden.

Mr. Imbert: Will they get separate insurance for that?

Hon. R. L. Maharaj: One can have a separate insurance for that. Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Member would also understand that in doing these things we also have to be careful that we do not raise insurance premiums and not give the insurance companies legitimate reasons to raise the insurance premiums.

I would like to deal, too, with the other point raised, that there should be deletion of the excess completely. That is to say in clause 5(b)(2) where it is increased from \$25 to \$1,000, that there should be no excess at all. I know that there are experts in insurance in this Parliament but I have been advised by some representatives of the insurance industry that if this is removed it can have the effect of increasing premiums. I prefer if we discuss that at the committee stage. Mr. Speaker, that is technical advice that the Government has received so far.

The other point raised about this matter in relation to the amendment which, in effect, tried to remedy the loophole in which insurance companies avoided liability, was where a maxi-taxi vehicle gets in an accident and the owner, and/or the

insurance company avoids on the basis that the person who was driving the vehicle at the time was not really employed by the owner; there was no master and servant relationship, he was not the servant and/or agent of the owner, and that there was a contractual relationship, therefore the person driving the vehicle was an independent contractor.

This Bill attempted to deal with that in order to have a statutory presumption that the person who is driving that vehicle, who has a motor vehicle licence to ply for hire and who is insured under the Act, is deemed to be the employee of the owner and that the owner is deemed to be the employer of the person driving. One of the points raised on the other side is: What happens if the maxi-taxi vehicle, at the material time, was being driven by a person who was stealing the maxi-taxi? Would it be fair to make such an owner liable for the acts of a person who is stealing the motor vehicle?

2.35 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, that point is a valid one and has been receiving consideration from the legal experts at the office of the Attorney General and the Law Commission and we are going to come up with an amendment in which we are hoping to be able to say that, "save and except where it is shown that the vehicle was the subject of a larceny."

Mr. Speaker, that seems to have answered all the points which have been made by the Opposition. The fact that we are passing this Bill is to make it quite clear that we recognize that the passage of this Bill would not deal with all of the problems which are confronting persons who were injured on the road. This Government has taken steps to have the office of the Supervisor of Insurance strengthened in order to make it play a more effective role in the insurance industry. The Government is awaiting certain reports and it is committed to having the office of the Supervisor of Insurance more effective.

The Government is also looking at a draft Bill which has been drafted since 1991, to amend the Insurance Act of 1980. We are looking at that Bill so that when it is brought to Parliament it would be more effective to regulate the insurance industry.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we should also mention that the last government, as a result of representations made by the Opposition, recognized that there was need for something equivalent to what is known as a motor insurance bureau in the United Kingdom. Although this Bill, when it is passed, would be able to provide

Motor Vehicles Insurance
[HON. R. L. MAHARAJ]

Tuesday, October 15, 1996

relief to persons who suffer damage as a result of the acts of insured owners, it would not provide relief for persons who suffer damage as a result of uninsured drivers of vehicles. There was similar legislation in the United Kingdom to what we had in the existing legislation, and they recognized that even though they had third party protection, something had to be done in order to protect persons and to give compensation to victims of uninsured drivers and owners.

In the United Kingdom, a motor insurance bureau was set up. It was financed mainly by the monthly contributions of all the insurers, who are required by law to be members of the bureau which, in effect, attends to any claim received in respect of a person who has suffered damage as a result of a motor vehicular accident. The motor insurance bureau would pay the claim and then recover it from the insurance company.

As a matter of fact, there is a similar scheme concept in Cyprus and South Africa, in Hong Kong, in the Seychelles, Uganda and Swaziland—those are the countries I have got—I have been told by the Opposition that there is one in Canada. What has happened in those countries, as in the United Kingdom, is as soon as someone gets a judgment in his favour for damages as a result of a motor vehicular accident, the bureau is informed and within seven days must pay that claim. The concept really is that the Government and the people recognized that when people get injured and are not compensated, severe consequences can flow to their lives and their children in respect of the whole human development in a society. The Opposition had recommended to the then government that such a scheme should be set up.

In November 1995, the last Cabinet took a decision that one-sixth of the sums collected as premiums under the Miscellaneous Taxes Act would be paid into a fund in order to have such a scheme set up. Since this Attorney General took office we have been trying to work out a system in which we would be able to do that. Mr. Speaker, may I mention that the Association of Insurance Companies in its last report—I have been having discussions with them and they seemed to be interested in having such a bureau in Trinidad and Tobago—at page 14 said:

“...a small committee has been preparing guidelines for the establishment of a motor insurance bureau and is awaiting a call from Government for that purpose.”

So, Mr. Speaker, we recognize that there should be such a scheme and we would hope to get the co-operation of the insurance industry, in order to do that. It is

something which cannot be done by the Government alone, because of the extent of the funds required.

Mr. Speaker, another aspect which we recognized is that something must be done about road accidents, in order to reduce it. Road accidents have increased over the years; every year there seems to be an increase. In Trinidad and Tobago for the period January 01, 1996 to October 14, 1996 there have been 114 road accidents, resulting in 124 persons who died. In comparison to the corresponding 10-month period in 1995, 81 persons died in 75 accidents. The figures for 1995 were 114 deaths from 106 road traffic accidents.

Mr. Speaker, the Government is aware of the increasing trend of road traffic accidents and is in the process of formulating extreme legislative reforms. These reforms, when properly established in our legal framework, will serve to toughen laws dealing with road traffic. It will provide a regime of stiffer penalties and punitive measures, and it will provide the traffic police with the necessary support system in order that traffic can be policed and monitored on a more efficient and accurate basis, thereby reducing the accident rate. These reforms include the following:

A traffic warden plan. The Government is at present considering the long overdue traffic warden system. It is a joint effort of the Ministry of Works and Transport and the Ministry of National Security.

2.45 p.m.

It is expected that traffic wardens shall address all matters relating to traffic flow and, therefore, shall address all matters regarding the use of public service vehicles and the directing of traffic, the Maxi-Taxi Act and all standing violations, example the breach of traffic signals. By concentrating on traffic regulations, the already over-burdened police service will be freed up to direct their energy and effort to fight crime on another front.

Mr. Speaker, it is also proposed and the Government is considering the introduction of a breathalyzer system. Under section 71 of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, it is an offence for a driver to drive a motor vehicle or trailer under the influence of alcohol. Under the current system of evaluating levels of intoxication, the system is slow and inefficient and drivers on the road who are drunk get away because there is a lack of an effective method for detection.

The Ministry of Works and Transport is exploring options with a view to imminent introduction of a breathalyzer system as part of the road traffic laws of

Motor Vehicles Insurance
[HON. R. L. MAHARAJ]

Tuesday, October 15, 1996

Trinidad and Tobago. Amendments to section 70 of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, as well as the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Enforcement and Administration) Act have been contemplated with a view towards the system finding its proper place in our legislative framework.

The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Enforcement and Administration) Act—I wonder if the last Minister of Works and Transport did any work?—has been the subject of recent scrutiny. Intensive consultation with various agencies such as the Licensing Authority, the Public Transport Service Corporation and the Assistant Commissioner of Police in charge of Traffic have been looking at the strengthening of the current ticket system for the establishment of a point system designed to prevent children and other pedestrians from accident prone, negligent or careless drivers and traffic offenders.

Under this system, traffic offences are allotted a specified number of points according to a prescribed schedule. Repeat offenders at the time of licence renewal will be subject to a check of their records as against their points schedule and should they exceed the requisite number of points at any particular time, their licences may be suspended for a stipulated period of time depending on the point level and the degree of severity of the offences.

This Government would like to make it quite clear that it recognizes that the law regarding third party risks insurance had to be reformed, but it also recognizes that much has to be done in order to really protect persons who suffer injury and death on the road. We have taken steps in order to have that situation under control and believe that with the planning of the dynamic Minister of Works and Transport and the Minister of National Security, that this would be achieved within a very short time.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to indicate that I would move the Bill, but will ask that the committee stage be taken on another day as the drafting of these matters are not completed. I beg to move.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time.

PROCEDURAL MOTION

The Attorney General (Hon. Ramesh Lawrence Maharaj): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the committee stage of this Bill be taken on another day.

Question put and agreed to.

Adjournment

Tuesday, October 15, 1996

ADJOURNMENT

The Attorney General (Hon. Ramesh Lawrence Maharaj): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the House do now adjourn to Friday, October 18, at 1.30 p.m when we will continue this Bill and also continue with the Motion on the Ombudsman's Report.

Mr. Speaker, there is Motion No. 2 under Government Business, the amendments to the Land Surveyors Bill. There is also Motion No. 3, the Ombudsman's Report, and there is Motion No. 4. We will also continue with this Bill on the next occasion. If time permits we can do Bills Nos. 2 and 4 on the Order Paper. We will not do the bill on the squatters on Friday.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members, before I take the question, I wish to indicate that leave was granted to the Member for Diego Martin Central who is at the sitting—

Mr. Valley: Mr. Speaker, I think we had agreement that we would want to do it on Friday, October 18, 1996, if you have no objections.

Hon. Member: I do not understand what went on there.

Question put and agreed to.

House adjourned accordingly.

Adjourned at 2.55 p.m.