

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 4th February 1964.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 4.15 p.m. o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, (*Minister of Development, Trade Industry, Labour and Tourism*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. C. CODDARD; Mr. E. St.A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. W. R. LOWE; His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Mr. G.V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Social Services*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to say that the Minutes of our latest meeting are not yet printed and circulated.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following on behalf of the Hon. Premier:

Barbados Statistical Service — Selected Monthly Indicators, October, 1963;

And on my own behalf, the following:

Fifth Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Tourist Board for period 1st April, 1962 to 31st March, 1963.

Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Barbados Development Board for the period 1st April, 1962 to 31st March, 1963.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1964.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Resolution to place the sum of \$3,516 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1963-64, Part II — Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1963-64 No. 49, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, on behalf of the Hon. Premier:

Resolution to place the sum of \$174,154 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1963-64, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1963-64, No. 50, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Resolution to approve the "Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1964".

QUESTION

Mr. BATSON: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that the people living in Porey Spring and Shop Hill, St. Thomas, are in dire need of Bus Sheds?

2. Will the Minister make it possible to have same constructed in order to relieve those living in the said areas of such inconvenience?

STATEMENT BY HON. W. A. CRAWFORD re VISIT OF NAVAL SHIPS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House in Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to deal with the money Resolutions of which notice was given today.

I shall also ask your permission to make the following Statement on behalf of the Hon. Premier. It is in connection with the Resolution passed by this Assembly regarding the increased number of visits by American and Canadian Ships.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Minister.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The Statement is as follows:-

"The text of the Resolution which was passed by this House on 6th August, 1963, on the motion of the junior member for St. Thomas, requesting the Government to make representation to the American and Canadian Governments with a view to asking them to allow more of their Naval ships to visit this Island in order that the many crews may spend their shore leave in the Island, was communicated to the American Consulate General in Barbados and to the Secretary of State for External Affairs in Canada.

The American Consulate General has informed the Department of State of the United States of America of the contents of the Resolution.

The Government has been informed that the Royal Canadian Navy are pleased to learn that the Government of

Barbados would welcome visits of Royal Canadian Navy Ships, and that such visits will be scheduled as often as operational circumstances permit.

The Schedule for visits to Barbados by units of the U.S. Navy for January and February this year is:-

31st January, to 3rd February	U.S.S. Intrepid
" " " " "	U.S.S. Borie
" " " " "	U.S.S. Barton
15th to 18th February	U.S.S. Maloy."

4.40 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The First Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House:-

To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Colony:

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1963-64 No. 46

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING OFFICER

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, the first Resolution is a Resolution to place the sum of \$359 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1963-64, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1963-64, No. 46 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

This Resolution seeks the approval of the Legislature for the grant of this \$359.00 to supplement the Estimates 1963-64, Part I, Current, under Head 29 - Town and Country Planning, Item 1 - Town and Country Planning Officer. As has been set out in the Addendum to the Resolution, on account of an increase in the emoluments of the post of Town and Country Planning Officer from \$8,640.00 to \$9,715.00 per annum as from the 1st December, 1962, an amount of \$358.32 was overspent during 1962-63. Supplementary provision was not sought before as it was overlooked that the provision in the Estimates was not fixed by law. This supplementary provision of \$359.00 is now being sought to adjust the accounts for 1962-63. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1963-64 No. 47

PREMIER - HOME AFFAIRS - STATIONERY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to take charge of the next Resolution which stands in the name of the Hon. Premier.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Minister.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is a Resolution to place the sum of \$1,245 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1963-64, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1963-64, No. 47 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple matter. It involves the sum of \$1,245 as supplementary provision for additional stationery. It is really a matter of accounting. Bills to the extent of \$656.00 were submitted in February, 1963, when it was too late then to seek supplementary provision. This amount had therefore to be paid from this year's vote. It is estimated that the sum of \$1,245 will be required to meet expenditure for the remainder of the financial year.

In other words, Sir, this sum of \$656.00 was actually expended on Stationery in the last financial year, but the bills came in too late to be submitted to the Legislature before the end of the financial year which, as hon. members are aware, is the 31st March in any given year. In addition to this, we need another \$1,245 which is the estimated amount required to meet expenditure for the remainder of this financial year. If you were to add \$656 to the difference between \$1,245 and \$656, you will get the additional amount which is required to the end of the current financial year, which is a total of \$1,245. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I was wondering if the Hon. Minister would be willing to give us a little more detail of this matter. I think he will agree that while this supplementary amount of \$656 was due in February 1963, it is not common practice or usual procedure to pay this money or to spend this money out of the current year's vote. When the estimate was made, it is quite obvious that this amount was not known either to the Ministry or to any other Department. From February, 1963, to February, 1964, the Hon. Minister could have brought down a supplementary Resolution for this money. To say that you have decided to pay this \$656 amounting from the year previously to the one in which we are now discussing this matter, is contrary to financial practice anywhere in the world in Government procedure. This expenditure could have been held over for another two months, and then, by way of a special Resolution, the Hon. Minister could request this money. You are now asking us to vote this sum of \$656 and then you are asking for a supplementary provision provision of \$1,245 for stationery. I say that this is unusual and the Hon. Leader of the House would certainly want to say something more on this matter. Mr. Chairman, I need say no more. It is fortunate that we are in Committee and I will have another opportunity to say something more in connection with this matter; but, I repeat, it is not in accordance with financial practice.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I really do not understand what the hon. member is asking for.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, I do not know if the Hon. Minister in charge of this Resolution is really in trouble to understand what I am saying. You cannot come to the House near to the time for the Estimates and ask for "X" dollars and say that you want to finance stationery or anything else for the current year. There is a lot of care being taken in Estimates Committee, and there is a lot of cheese paring and cutting taking place, especially when the Government is in trouble for finance. What the hon. member says is not proper; you want this money to finance stationery for 1963-64; you received an unpaid bill probably in 1962-63 and you are not permitted to use money which has been voted in the Estimates during a specific year to pay an outstanding bill from the previous year. I do not know that the Hon. Leader of the House should be in any trouble to understand what I am saying. There is a back-dated bill for February, 1963, which is obviously from 1962 and you cannot use the money voted for this year for that purpose.
4.50 p.m.

You know, Mr. Chairman, that this is irregular and improper, but I suppose the Government can do anything whether it is right or wrong. You said that February last year was too late to come for the money to supplement, but this is February, 1964, and he is not only coming for this money, but in addition he is coming for a supplementary amount of \$1,245. What difference does it make now to the end of the financial year in March? Last year was too late

because it was too close to the end of the financial year, but he wants to make good the money spent from last year's allocation. I am sure he is not in any trouble to understand this, because it is so elementary that a little five year old boy would be able to understand it, as if he were toying with marbles. I want to be told whether or not it is correct that this money was paid, because you are asking for this money, and from what the Minister has said, it is an indication that this money was spent. I wonder if he would relieve me of my anxiety, because he said that February last year was too late, and in addition to asking for \$656 he is asking for \$1,245 just before the end of the financial year. I am sure the Minister would be able to relieve me of my anxiety as to the use or misuse of the taxpayers' money.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am always happy to relieve hon. members of any indigestion intellectually or otherwise. I really understood quite well what the hon. member said the first time, but I really could not take him seriously, and therefore I asked him to repeat it to be absolutely sure that I had heard him correctly. We have a vote for stationery every year included in the Estimates, and if you refer to the Estimates, you will see that every year without fail the vote is over-expended. For the year 1961-62, a certain amount was included for stationery. We used more than that — at least, they did. The bills from the Crown Agents came in the following year. What more natural thing than to pay those bills out of the current stationery vote? You are not spending it for horse feed, fertilisers or something; you are spending it on stationery. Normally the vote is expended anyhow; if you get \$1,200, you spend \$1,500. When the bills came in for the old expenditure, it was too near the end of the financial year to get the necessary Resolutions down to the Assembly, because you were close to the end of the financial year March, 31st. It is a most natural, ordinary and traditional thing that as soon as you get your vote for the next financial year, you pay off your outstanding bills, and then at some time during the current financial year you recoup the vote to meet the expenditure of your payment for last year's Bills as well as the estimated current expenditure.

As I said, Sir, every year, as the hon. member must remember, the vote never proves to be sufficient for one reason or another; so all we are doing now is to recoup the vote to the extent of the unpaid bills at the end of the previous financial year, plus what is estimated for additional expenditure to the end of the current financial year. I really could not believe that that is what the hon. member was asking me. This happens in almost any Department of the Government. It is a most natural thing, if you have a vote for a specific item and outstanding bills come in too late in that year, to pay for them out of your next year's vote, so long as the money is not expended on another item or under another Head, there is absolutely nothing unconstitutional about it. As a matter of fact, as the hon. member knows very well, the Accountant General would never pass a voucher involving expenditure under a given Head when the money to be expended is to be taken from another Head. The hon. member is in a very happy mood this afternoon apparently. He wanted to make a speech and he has made a speech, but he certainly knew the information before he asked the question.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I am so accustomed to the hon. member's sham, particularly when he is in an uncomfortable position. He repeated the same folly here, because I did not want to feel we were wasting time which could be used to better advantage. He says I knew of this Head 17 — Premier — Home Affairs, Item 14; but when we left the Government it was not necessary to have this undue expenditure embellished in the Premier's Department known as "Premier — Home Affairs". It entails, for instance, a Permanent Secretary, Assistant Secretary, filing Cabinets and all this. We did not have a Ministry or Department known as "Home Affairs"; so it would not occur. If this was operating for two years, it would not matter. This is incorrect and he knows it; so what is the point of trying to be clever and throw himself down to be criticised in an issue when he could save this? He said that last year it was too late and too close to the end of the financial year to come with a supplementary vote for \$656, but this is

February 4th, equally as close to the end of the financial year, and he is coming for the sum of \$656 which he says will recoup the vote.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I never said that. I said the bills came in in February, and even an infant would understand that if we have a Resolution before the House now, these Bills must have come in in December or January. It takes some time to process them and this is only 4th February; so these bills could not have come in in February. If they had, they could not be here now. They came in a couple of months ago, and in the case of the former matter those bills came in in February.

Mr. MILLER: I do not know how the Minister hopes to get out of this. Since February last year he knew about this matter. We have a responsibility to the people and I am simply requesting information. You said that February last year was too late. Why is February this year not too late, when it was known before February last year that you required this money? You are telling us that you will recoup this vote for stationery for a Department we knew nothing of. Probably the Minister is not familiar with finance and is not expected to discuss this with the knowledge of the Minister of Finance. Maybe if he had indicated that, I would be willing to sit down and say nothing about it; but here we are in February, one month before the end of the financial year, and asking for an additional \$1,245. Why not leave this alone and in a few months from now add all your bills together and come for a single vote for stationery and indicate what you are spending the money for? We are going to waste time on this Resolution when you know that this would not be released before the end of the financial year. He knows that this money could not be released through the second phase of our Legislature with all the paraphernalia.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong the House any more on this Resolution, but from a business point of view, this is either carelessness or negligence on somebody's part.
5.00 p.m.

Here it is, Sir, this amount of \$656 came in here during the month of February. During that month, the Estimates were not yet passed, and this small sum could have been moved in under the Head and the same explanation could have been given for the moving in of it. That is the first point.

The second point is this. I should like to know if the voucher and the bill were sent to the Auditor General asking him to O.K. this amount out of this year's vote for last year's; that is to say, the bill would be audited towards the end of December or up to the end of March, that is to say, up to the end of the Government's financial year. My question is this. Why wait for another year to bring this supplementary Resolution for this amount when other supplementary Resolutions were passed by this House during last year, and more especially supplementary Resolutions for the Premier's office? If I am not mistaken, not too long ago, a supplementary vote was passed for the Premier's office, and yet this sum of \$656 which came in so early was not provided for under that Head.

Sir, what is likely to create doubt in my mind is that it is for stationery, and you are still asking for a supplementary amount for that vote. This supplementary vote for the Premier's office is puzzling me. As I have said, this supplementary vote should have been before this Committee during the month of April so as to make this right. I cannot quite remember, but I think just around the time when the financial year is about to be closed, the various Government Departments publish a notice in the newspapers asking all those people who have accounts with the Government to send them in before the financial year is closed. As a matter of fact, the particular accountant of the particular Government Department always telephones the particular firms and asks them to make sure to send in their bills and also to draw the vouchers out of the Treasury before the end of the financial year. Sir, I cannot understand this amount for \$656 for the Premier's Office. It is puzzling me.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, honestly, I am amused sometimes in here, but I say that if you are really having fun, let us have fun and not folly. What are the two hon. members making a fuss about? Only they know. It has been a customary thing for this vote to be over-expended. The reason why supplementary provision was not asked for before was for the simple reason that there was no point in bringing two supplementary votes for this item, and it was better to wait until the end of the financial year to see what was required, to add the two together and bring down one vote.

The hon. member really must have wanted to make fun. We have already passed a supplementary Resolution, it is true, but certainly we have not passed any for stationery. If we passed a supplementary vote in July or August last year for additional staff, must we put stationery in that? We have brought this supplementary down now for the simple elementary reason that the people in the Ministry know what they are doing and they are not working by guess. The most rational thing to do was to wait until the end of the year, see what more they would want and then add the two together. If the hon. member did not want to make a speech, he would have never said a word on this. The Addendum to the Resolution explains that the bills were submitted in February, 1963, but it was too late to seek supplementary provision and the amount was met from the following year's vote. I say that this is customary; and if the hon. member, himself, wants further to amuse himself, he can refer to the Estimates of the last year his Party was in office, and he would discover that the amount of stationery was over-spent by \$500 of what was voted. It is an absolute waste of time and exhibition of folly to make a speech on some things when there is nothing on which to make a speech.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, the hon. member can say whatever he likes. If he does not want me to speak in here, let him come across here with his muzzle.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, I like to hear the hon. member speak; so please do not let him get up and say that I do not want him to speak. While I like to be entertained on matters on which he can really entertain and instruct us, on this matter, it is self-explanatory.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I want the hon. member to understand this. He was so sure that this vote was going to be over-spent that he kept this item back from February until now. The bill came in for it during the month of February last year, and he was so sure that it was going to be over-spent that he kept it back to add it on to a supplementary to this item. Why did he not budget for a little more then if he knew that what they were voting for would not die? Why did he not budget for a little more and save the time of the House? That is what I want to understand.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member has a copy of the Estimates and I am sure he has read it. If he read it, he would see that exactly what he said was done. We put \$150 more in this year's than last year's, but it so happened that the increase was not the amount which they had asked for.
5.10 p.m.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1963-64 No. 48

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is a Resolution to place the sum of \$38,600 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1963-64, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1963-64, No. 48.

This Resolution, Sir, is in respect of two Heads of the Estimates which will be taken separately.

HEAD 39 - MEDICAL (2) - GENERAL HOSPITAL

Head 39 - (2) - General Hospital - was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, in the Approved Estimates for 1963-64 provision of \$250,000 was voted for drugs and dressings at the General Hospital. After the beginning of the financial year - and I expect the hon. junior member for St. George and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to question this matter also - bills for outstanding commitments to the tune of \$68,000 were received by the Hospital authorities. That amount had to be paid from the amounts provided for drugs and dressings for the financial year 1963-64. I may point out, Mr. Chairman, that at the end of the financial year 1962-63 a certain sum of money had lapsed under this Head. When hon. members want to question this matter, they should understand that there was provision for these bills for these outstanding commitments, which bills did not come in until the financial year 1963-64, and it was therefore necessary to pay all outstanding bills from this year's provision.

I find it illogical for any hon. member to say that if a bill came in in 1963 for a commitment which was made in 1962, as long as there is money in the vote under the Head, that particular commitment should not be paid. I would like to point out that some of the drugs which were bought in 1962-63 are being used in the financial year 1963-64 and therefore it would be illogical to say that you cannot pay for orders made in 1962-63 out of the provision for 1963-64, when you have to use the items which were ordered in 1962-63, in 1963-64. Also necessitating the introduction of supplementary provision in this House is the fact that there has been a marked increase in the number of out-patients who attended the General Hospital in 1962-63. The estimated increase is 62,000 more this year than last year. I should like to point out to hon. members that of the entire provision for drugs and dressings at the Hospital, 44% is being used in the Out-Patients Department, and if there is an increase in the number of out-patients attending the Hospital then, inevitably, the demand for drugs and dressings would be greater. Hence, Mr. Chairman, this Supplementary Resolution for the sum of \$26,000.

Before I sit down, I should like to point out that, as a result of the settlement of a bill for equipment which amounted to \$26,000 in respect of orders placed in the financial year 1962-63 for the Hospital, the additional expenditure which we required under that Head was \$9,000. On the 31st October, 1963, the expenditure amounted to \$31,870 and the commitments were \$27,200. The sum which lapsed under this Head in 1962-63 was \$1,109.27. Under this Item 123 - Laboratory - the amount voted in the Estimates for the current year was \$8,000. There has been a great demand on the Laboratory and therefore, inasmuch as there was this increased demand on the Laboratory, it would be necessary to have an increased provision for this item. We are asking for an increased provision for the Laboratory to the tune of \$3,500, I beg to move that Head 39 stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister was at pains to relate all the details of this particular matter and I think that he went further than it was necessary for him to go in giving us the information. He used the figure \$260,000. Could he help me.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. What I said was that the provision in the Estimates in respect of this item "Drugs and dressings" was \$250,000, and that there was a supplementary provision of \$26,000 required.

Mr. MILLER: I thank the hon. member. There is nothing surprising about this matter. I think the Hon. Minister is aware of the fact that he has inherited a National Health Service. When we left the Government, the number of souls going through the Out-Patients Department was between 13,000 and 14,000 per month. There were very many people suffering in this country; and although education is important and it is provided for, we felt that we should make a loyal effort in order to relieve this untold suffering of between 13,000 and 14,000 people who were unable to pay for their services.

5.20 p.m.

I do not know if I need to ask him anything more, but I remember the Item "Drugs and Dressings". I was wondering if he had the figures at hand to give us an average over the last three months, or, if he cares, over the last six months, of what is the number of patients going through that Out-patients Department, Casualty or otherwise. It would throw some light on what I am thinking.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The number is about 15,000 per month.

Mr. MILLER: In another five years that figure would go to about 20,000; so I do not think there is any quibble about this. I think the Minister is rather relieved that he is not under pressure today.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Chairman, speaking under this Head, I feel there would be no member in this Chamber who would not support this Resolution, but what I should like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister who has brought this Resolution is the fact that much inconvenience is experienced by people who go there for aid. It is surprising to know that people after waiting for three parts of the day sometimes have to seek aid elsewhere. I am appealing to the Hon. Minister to do something in this matter to relieve these sufferers. We do know that the new Hospital will soon be in use, but we would like an effort made so that when the new Hospital is opened, the people would not meet suffering as they are meeting it today.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I could allow the Resolution to pass without saying a few words, and the Minister knows that any criticism I make, while there is no apology, it is because I have had to do with this matter of the Out-patients Department nearly every day; and I must preface my remarks by saying that on each occasion when I have had to make complaints, the Minister has given personal attention to remedy the situation. However, I still want to draw to his attention, lest he thinks I have been bringing all the complaints to him, that I have not.

There are some people -- and it is unfortunate that they are my people -- who, as soon as you give them a job in the Civil Service to which they can possibly go in a car, or go to work a little better than their brothers, or they are vested with a little authority, begin to treat their lesser brothers in such a way that you sometimes begin to feel sorry that you have had to put them in these positions. The Minister knows what I am saying is true. I am told it is the duty of every Minister to defend Civil Servants whatever happens, but I have also read in the highest constitutional authority that it is not the duty of any Minister to defend a Civil Servant when he is not acquainted with something which is done incorrectly, or when he disapproves of something which is done incorrectly and which brings his Ministry into disrepute. This Out-patients Department is nothing new, and I believe every visiting physician in this Island agrees that it is partly medical aid which you have inherited, and we, though small in number on this side, are very proud that we left you with this very great inheritance. What we would like to say is that we would prefer if we had to vote more money for this Department; but we would like the Minister not to let what I say or what other hon. members say fall on deaf ears, and to speak sometimes to those persons or try to grade such persons as you may have in this Department, letting them know that people come to the Out-patients Department even if they are not ill, but with a belief that they are ill, and it is for them to treat these people kindly and be courteous to them. The sooner a lot of people working for my money, your money and the people's money realise that they are paid by us, the better; and the sooner they learn to be courteous, the better it will be for the service and the Government altogether. Sometimes I wonder if some of them had to come out and make a living, if they could.

As I have said, Sir, I have had several complaints from this Department, and the Minister was very co-operative in

remedying quite a number of them. I believe that only last week he had to remedy one for me, because I find the difficulty is that people come from all parts of the Island and wend their way to the Bridgetown City Council to find the one name which seems to stand out in their minds. (Mr. BOXILL: This is not an election speech.) I can make any sort of speech.

Mr. Chairman, I do not listen to asides, but I could not help hearing. These people find the one man possibly with courage enough, because I have no social ambition, and therefore it makes no difference to me. I am no social climber either, but if you tell me I have other ambitions, I would be the first to bow and plead guilty. However, I am absolutely certain he could not deny that I am the first person to have drawn this matter to his attention. On the other hand, it would be foolhardy for me not to mention on this occasion what has happened at the Hospital, and whenever it happened, if this Minister did not have the courage from some of the explanations given to me personally, you would always find people coming down on the side of a particular doctor. Now I am not going to mince any matters here about it, because what I telephoned the Minister about in private conversation, and what he investigated is not enough for the public, and I think the public should know. It is not good enough for any doctor at the Hospital who is given an opportunity to use our Hospital or nurses, have assigned to him beds at our Hospital, and use our instruments, to come in as a stranger who was cutting our throats only yesterday, and then to take people who have given of their blood and sweat to this country -- I speak of people like the agricultural labourers -- and use them by way of connivance either with nurses or other Civil Servants by encouraging them to his private place or office or private hospital.
5.30 p.m.

In passing, I am saying here and now -- and I hope it is published -- that it is the duty of the Inland Revenue Officer to tax that type of person for running a business because it is more than professional service. Lest I stray from what I was saying, Sir, I want to make it clear that to take such people, although they are considered to be emergency cases or cases that should be worked upon immediately, and tell them that they must go on a waiting list, is not just. I hope that the Hon. Minister would not tell us that there is no waiting list.

Sir, I publicly on the floor of the House today commend the Hon. Minister of Social Services for the stand which he took quite recently in the case which involved an agricultural woman with her blind husband and eight children when she was charged -- and by some means of circumvention she was asked to pay -- something between \$20 and \$30 for a room so as to have that poor child of hers which was going deaf and dumb treated, when at the time she could not even find food for herself and family, far less bus fare. Even then, when she took that action, a vicious mercenary type still had the guts and courage, the brass and temerity to charge that poor old soul money for the operation. Sir, it is about time that you ship some of those people out of this country.

Not only that, Sir, but I have had the opportunity of meeting a young lady who told me that when she got to America, after one of those operations, at one of the big Hospitals where ambassadors and kings go, that one of the first questions which they asked her was if there were no lawyers from where she had come. It is about time that we prevent that sort of thing going on here. Sir, I will just say that anybody who is in public life cannot help having friends and enemies from the top to the bottom. I do appreciate that gratitude is something for history and not for politics. However, that never worries me; I discharge my duty as I see it.

We have always had an Out-patients Department at the General Hospital and there are always people who attend that Department who cannot pay. There are people like my hon. friend on my left who possibly, if they charged him \$300 or \$400 for a particular operation, it would make no difference to him. But there are people -- human life being

sweet — like those further on my immediate left who would not mind paying \$500 for that same type of operation, but I do say that there are also those to whom life is sweet also for whom we pay our taxes so to provide these services for them. People should not be turning them about — and I am going to use a word which they say is not quite English — "cafuffle" them into being led up to the corner of Beckles Road.

I will just ask this question. Is it fair to have a line of people for operations and you only take those out who can pay? That is not fair. That is all right if you are using your private hospital, private beds, and private nurses. Long before those type of doctors came to our country that was our hospital. At one time, it was considered one of the best run hospitals in the West Indies and I hope, when you have the new one in operation, that you will appoint a Board to run it. All the best run hospitals in the world, such as the Baltimore Hospital, Mayo, are run by Boards because members of Boards take a personal interest in them.

If I could not get to the Hon. Minister when I want to see him, if I were not who I am, and the Minister was the type of person who would say "I cannot see you today, see me tomorrow", it would be a different matter.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: If the hon. member would just give way, I would just say that it does not matter to me who it is, when they want to see this Minister, they see him.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I draw, therefore, to the Hon. Minister's attention that this is an important matter. We are going to vote for this \$26,000. Make no mistake about it. I am satisfied beyond a doubt; and if it is a doubt, let the Hon. Minister carry out an investigation. Somewhere along the line, after the investigation was made, my friend, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, seemed to be very interested in Local Government and he sat in and heard some of the evidence. Somewhere along the line, somebody is working something which is not altogether above board and they are working it on behalf of a doctor. I am not going to say much more on this today. I am not afraid to call names. There are some doctors here who cannot put their hands on me. There are some doctors here who could not operate on me. As a matter of fact, they could not operate on my bitch at home. (A VOICE: Do you mean Dr. Bostic?) No, I mean someone who is in the Civil List. Somewhere along the line, there is this graft and greed which is going on and I am asking you to stop it. Let it be known that you are the Minister and that the General Hospital is not for a particular class, it is there for all; and more especially, you should see that the poor and needy who go to this Hospital get the same justice and treatment as those who can pull their pockets and pay.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I am not speaking against the Resolution or the money which is to be voted for the purchase of equipment. But what I would like to know is this: am I to believe from what the last hon. member has said that citizens of this country have to pay for operations in the public institution?
5.40 p.m.

Do citizens have to pay for operations in a public institution? I understand that there are pay wards, but these Pay Wards belong to the citizens of this country. In all parts of the world, as far as I understand, you have not got citizens who have to pay for operations in public institutions. I understand that if you are at a private institution for any kind of operation or any kind of treatment, you have to pay; but I cannot see the necessity for the people of this Island, who have to work so hard and who have accumulated their money and the Government is taxing these people so as to be able to build the Hospital and pay nurses and buy all kinds of instruments, whether they be pay wards or not having to pay for operations. I do not see why any one should pay for any kind of operation or for any kind of treatment in a public institution at all. As I say Sir, we are paying for these services out of our own wealth.

I want to know, Sir, if it is true that doctors who are being paid for what they are doing are charging people for

operations at the General Hospital. I do not mind if it is a stranger who has come in to have an operation at the Hospital, but I say that anyone who is contributing to the Government funds should never have to pay for any operation in a public institution. I do not mind if the doctors are using the Hospital's instruments; they can use these instruments privately or in the institution itself because if anybody is ill any kind of treatment which a doctor might want to use to get him better he should be able to use; but I do not understand the people of this country having to pay for operations. I may be speaking under correction, but I would like to know if it is a fact that citizens of this country who go to the General Hospital in order to have operations, have to pay for those operations. If a doctor is carrying on his private practice outside the Hospital, then he should not be using the instruments of the Hospital because he is being paid for performing operations. Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly in support of this Resolution because it is a necessity; but I only want to draw to the attention of hon. members that I would not like to know that poor people who have to go to a public institution in order to have operations performed have to pay for such operations.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, there is an old saying that the last shall be first and the first last. Acting on that principle, I will deal with the question which has been raised by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew first. There are Pay Wards at the General Hospital, and people who go into those Pay Wards are required to pay fees. They are not required to pay any fees either by the Hospital authorities or by this Government if they have any services performed in any of the public Wards. I think that that answers the question raised by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, who apparently has missed the bus.

Mr. CORBIN: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I have heard it said that the higher a monkey climbs, the more you see his tail. (Laughter). The hon. member says that at the Hospital there are Pay Wards provided for people who undergo operations. The hon. member cannot stop at that, but he goes on to say that I am losing the last bus. I am saying that I may miss the last bus, but he will lose the first bus. (Laughter).

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, when I said that the hon. member has missed the bus, I meant that he has not understood what the hon. senior member for the City was saying. The hon. senior member for the City was referring to people being asked to leave the public places in the Hospital to go to somebody's private office and pay for treatment. That is quite clear. But it is not yet 7 o'clock and the hon. member can catch the 7 o'clock bus to St. Andrew.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order. (MEMBERS: Sit down!)

Mr. MILLER: You cannot tell me to sit down.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister is replying to the questions which have been asked.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I want to say, Sir, that we can settle these little things in here without using the kind of remarks as have been used by the Hon. Minister. We can very well get on without that sort of thing.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I really do not see where the hon. member's point of order arises. I have not ill-treated any of my colleagues; I have used an expression and it is obvious that the hon. junior member for St. George does not understand these expressions. I simply said that if my colleague had missed the bus, well, it is not 7 o'clock yet. I was really speaking figuratively. I have taken the hon. senior member for St. Andrew to St. Andrew on several occasions after he had missed the bus. As I say, Sir, the hon. junior member for St. George does not understand figurative language and that is why he got on his feet purporting to rise on a point of order.
5.50 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I really did not want to be rough with the hon. member. I wanted to be as easy as possible on this Resolution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. junior member for St. George speaking on a point of order?

Mr. MILLER: Yes, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening to the point of order.

Mr. MILLER: We were not in any trouble, Mr. Chairman. The Leader of the Opposition was at pains to praise him for something he did not deserve, and it is seldom in the House that he gets away with this feeling of bliss and happiness; but he wants to be a type of upstart, and I am not in the mood to be sympathetic any longer. If he carries on, I will be back on my feet and you can name me, because I will say some things with which you will not altogether agree. What on earth could fall out of his lips that I would not understand?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. member has made the point.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member should not make the statement that I praised the Minister for something he did not deserve.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the Leader of the Opposition speaking on a point of order?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Let us take it very quietly; we should not lose our tempers today. Why should I praise him for something that he does not deserve? I praised him for something which I have publicly said he took up and acted very promptly on; so I have nothing to gain by praising him.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I will now answer the questions raised by the hon. senior member for Bridgetown. The hon. member pointed out that there is a lack of courtesy and so on in the Out-patients Department. I may perhaps not be able to deny that that may be so, and I should just like to point out to the hon. member that if anything is drawn to my attention at any time as has been drawn by him, I will do all in my power to have the matter reach a satisfactory conclusion. I should like to point out however, that discipline or disciplinary action in the Public Service is not dealt with by the Minister, but by the Public Service Commission, and if there is a lack of discipline in any Department which is drawn to my attention, I will see that it reaches the proper authorities and is dealt with accordingly. The hon. member made certain complaints, but I am sure that within a few months he will see that these complaints have been favourably dealt with, and the conditions which led to his making these complaints will have changed.

In answer to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph who has explained that there has been very much inconvenience experienced by people who go for aid by having to wait three parts of the day, as I have pointed out in a Press Release and also on the floor of this Honourable Chamber, it is not easy to find doctors to fill all the vacancies which were established recently. In the Medical Officers Grade there were no fewer than six doctors short. In those circumstances it was necessary, therefore, for us even to add to the number of visiting Medical Officers who come in and assist us at the Casualty Department. I have already pointed out that there is provision for five Medical Officers who do private practice of their own to come in and assist in the Out-patients Department. I further pointed out that people who go for attention, which attention is not urgent, or people who have cases which cannot be considered emergency cases, should go to the hospital between 1 o'clock and 4 o'clock in the day. If there is a case at the Hospital that is considered an emergency case, a person can wait a couple of minutes, but not three parts of a day, because instructions are that all emergency cases must be dealt with as soon as possible.

Mr. COWARD: On a point of order, I was thinking specifically about accidents which can happen at any time, and if a person is involved in an accident and has to wait three quarters of a day, there is a lot of danger in the delay; so I am appealing to you to make some effort to remedy that situation.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: As I was pointing out, emergency cases, accidents and so on are dealt with as soon as possible after they arrive at the Hospital. As I said before, it is only recently when we were no fewer than six Medical Officers short that this difficulty arose. We have added to the Establishment, but the appointment of officers in the Public Service is not the duty of a Minister. There is a lot of screening to be done; and in as much as there has been this shortage of Medical Officers, the Casualty Department and other Departments of the Hospital were not as well equipped as in the first six months of this financial year. That has been responsible for the delay in attention being given to any person. The other thing is that the doctors who work at night in the Casualty Department are those who look after Wards and who have got their patients in the Wards, and if someone comes in at night, the nurse has to find that doctor on the Ward, because he may be treating another emergency case on the Ward, and there may be a little delay. These things are inevitable.

The question that Head 39 - Medical (2) - General Hospital - stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 41 - Social Welfare - was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the amount of \$390 was provided in the 1963-64 Estimates under Head 41 - Social Welfare, Item 11 - Incidentals. This covers postage, etc. It is to be appreciated that since we have recently had so many of our people in the United Kingdom, it has become the duty of the Social Welfare Officer to be the representative of people whose husbands are in the United Kingdom and who perhaps are a bit indifferent in so far as supporting their families is concerned.
6.00 p.m.

The work load of the Social Welfare Department has been increased tremendously on account of this. Inasmuch as there is so much correspondence between our folks in England and the Social Welfare Department in order to secure maintenance for families of men who are living in England, the expenditure under this Head has become greater. The more the correspondence, the greater the expenditure; therefore, it is necessary to increase this amount of \$390 by \$100, so as to carry out the programme of negotiations between husbands and wives and even in some cases, fathers and illegitimate children.

I, therefore, beg to move that Head 41 stand part.

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

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS in each case, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

ORDERS 2 AND 3 POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Premier: Third reading of a Bill to provide for the operation in the Island of a Company to be known as the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited.

My advice is that the Select Committee has not yet reported.

The next Order stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House and I am also advised that the Select Committee appointed to consider that Bill has not yet reported.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE MOTOR
VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAFFIC
REGULATIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing: To move the passing of the following Resolution: A Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled "The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Parking Places) (Deep Water Harbour) Regulations, 1964".

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: This Resolution seeks the approval of both Houses of the Legislature to the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Parking Places) (Deep Water Harbour) Regulations, 1964, made by the Director of Highways and Transport on the fifth day of January, 1964, under section 7 of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act 1937, as amended by section 41 of the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945 and approved and sanctioned by His Excellency the Governor on the twenty-second day of January, 1964.

Mr. Speaker, although we have a Deep Water Harbour, there are certain ships of very deep draught which still enter into Carlisle Bay and the passengers go ashore by boats to the Baggage Warehouse. These passengers and tourists go to the area outside of the Baggage Warehouse where taxis are parked to provide transportation for them to various parts of the Island. It is stated that the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Regulations give the police inadequate power to deal with this situation as nowhere is the power defined. There are powers to regulate and control the parking arrangement, the soliciting of fares and loitering, but there are non-existent so far as at the Pier Head is concerned.

This Regulation is to bring this area at the Pier Head under the Harbour's Regulations and it would thus give the police jurisdiction over the parking area there where control and order could be maintained. The behaviour at present there on occasions when tourists arrive is not what tourists would welcome in a country like this.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, while we are on this Resolution relative to parking places, I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister a matter concerning the restricted area along the side of the Wharf and the side of the Bank of Nova Scotia and Barclays Bank. That area is supposed to be a restricted area and no vehicles are to be parked there. However, it is very hard at times, especially when one has to deal with either the Bank of Nova Scotia or Barclays Bank to find a parking space where you can stop near at hand and go in and do business with any of those banks. You find that there are people who are always getting reported for stopping along there. Policemen do nothing but wait there until someone gets out of their motor car and goes into one of those banks, and when they come back out, they report them. If it is to be a restricted area, a "No Parking" sign should be put there. There is no sign for anyone to know that it is not a parking area and it is not fair to the public when no sign is put up that when one goes there and stops, one gets reported.

I do not see any reason why it should be a restricted area at all because it is a one-way traffic street and that street is very wide along there. As you know, Sir, parking in Bridgetown is more scarce than money at times, 6.10 p.m.

You have a big, wide open place there and you cannot park your car especially for the convenience of the business

people who have to use the two Banks, namely, the Bank of Nova Scotia and Barclays Bank. The door is just there whereby you can go into the Bank of Nova Scotia and you would not be causing any blockage. I believe that it is more a help to the people than anything else, because if the driver of a motor car or a bus were to make a sudden lock or if the steering of the vehicle should give way, the motor cars would be there and they would save that vehicle from going into the sea. I would say, Sir, that whoever is responsible for this matter should allow motor cars to be parked all along the wharf because they would provide a good barrier and would save a vehicle from going into the sea. What I mean is that a vehicle which is parked might go over into the sea but not the one which is carrying occupants. I am appealing to the Minister now to cause "No parking" signs to be erected in these places so that motorists will know not to park their cars in these places rather than the policemen stealing money out of the people's pockets by reporting them when these people do not know that the place in which they park their cars is a restricted area.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I do not understand how the hon. member could express the opinion that one does not know that behind the Bank is a restricted parking area when this area was included in the Schedule of the regulations away back in the 1930's. The hon. member has been a motorist for such a long time that he should know the regulations better than any one else. In the Schedule to the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937, you will find a list of the places which are restricted as to parking, and you will find all the signs, the shapes and the colours in the Schedule to the Act which I have just mentioned. Anybody who is getting a driving licence is supposed to be aware of the matters which are contained in the Schedule to the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act. If we were to put up signs on the wharf, it means that the whole of Bridgetown would be cluttered up with signs having been erected at the Government's expense.

What the hon. member has to do is this: he should move on as I do when the policemen says that he cannot park in such-and-such a place. I myself try to steal a parking place.....

Mr. SMITH: On a point of explanation.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can explain when I am finished speaking.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of explanation, Mr. Speaker, it is all well and good if the policemen would tell you to move off just as how he would tell the Hon. Premier to move off. What I am saying is that there are those policemen who wait until you park the car and leave and when you return to the car they will report you. The policemen will not do that to the Hon. Premier or he may not do it to me, either.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Personally, Mr. Speaker, I resent any implication by the hon. member that the police discriminate in favour of or against any particular members of the public. I am suggesting that the police treat me in the same way as they treat anybody else. I want to say, Sir, that long before I had anything to do with the Government of this country I found the Police reasonably polite. I do not know anything about going into the cells; what happens when you are detained in the cells may be quite different from what my limited experience is. (Laughter).

The hon. member will find that in the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Regulations all of these things have been set out; and if he wants to steer clear of the Act he should read the Regulations which were made under the Act of 1937. I do not think that the hon. member should suggest that the Police try to rob people of their money in the way in which he has stated.

There is another aspect of the matter and it is as to what part of the wharf is under the control of the Governor-in-Executive Committee and what comes under the regulations. However, Sir, if the hon. member wants legal advice on that matter, he can see Your Honour in another capacity with the necessary inducement and he will get all the advice that he needs.

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

THE ORDER PAPER

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, in fixing the Order Paper, the Money Resolutions of which notice was given today will come first, followed by the other matters notice of which was also given today.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 11th February, 1964, at 4.15 o'clock in the afternoon.

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

REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO GIVE NOTICE OF RESOLUTION

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question for the adjournment, I should like to say this. It was unfortunate that I happened not to be in my place at the time for the giving of Private Members' Notices today and I am therefore asking leave to give notice of a Resolution.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Has Your Honour seen the Resolution, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have seen the Resolution. As the Hon. Leader of the House well knows, I have no control over Notices of Resolutions as I have over Notices of Questions. The Resolution was shown me by the Clerk, but the hon. member was not in his place to give notice of that Resolution.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that notice be given of this Resolution at the proper time at the next meeting of this House. It is rather unusual for an hon. member to give notice of a Resolution at this time.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have just mentioned that the hon. junior member for St. George is asking leave to give notice of the Resolution; the Hon. Leader of the House is fully aware as to the manner in which leave has to be granted. 6.20 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the House indicated that the Government does not approve this unusual procedure at this time. The hon. member has a duty to his constituents and to the Island, and if he wants to give notice of something which he considers so important, he should be here at the proper time. If he finds the demands of industry and commerce so pressing that he cannot attend the House even when the House is meeting four hours late, and is not engaged in Government business or matters of urgent public importance like myself, the hon. member can avail himself of his Parliamentary rights on the next occasion the House meets. Clearly this is an indication that we do not approve of any such leave being given now, and it is not a question of putting any question to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not hear the last remarks made by the Hon. Leader of the House.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: He said he could give it at the appropriate time next Tuesday.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not hear that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I consider it a matter of profound discourtesy that the Leader of the House was not consulted about the Resolution. I know Your Honour was consulted; but if he treats this House with courtesy, he will get a little more than he deserves in courtesy as well.

Mr. SPEAKER: Leave of the House is accordingly not granted, because objection has been taken that it be granted, and as I pointed out in respect of another matter, the same principle of Parliamentary procedure applies. Even a single

vote is sufficient to preclude the leave of the House being granted. Accordingly, leave I deem not to have been granted.

The question is that this House now stands adjourned....

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the adjournment, I am objecting to the House being adjourned until 4.15 p.m. next Tuesday, because I cannot understand how the Government is running the people's business. As a matter of fact, about two or three Tuesdays ago we were told that the House would soon be prorogued and to be prepared for it, and I thought that after these short sessions at 4.15 p.m. they were coming to the end of the session and cleaning off the slate. But I can clearly see that there is no cleaning of the slate. Adjourning until 4.15 p.m. means that Private Members will not have a chance at any time to discuss their business on the Order Paper, and the session will run out at that rate. Under the Rules, I am sure that you, Sir, will soon strike these items off the Order Paper which were there longer than three months, and then we will have no chance to discuss the people's business at any time.

Now, if I use the word "trick", someone is going to get up and ask me to withdraw it; so I am not going to say it is a trick, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Parliamentary tactic!

Mr. SMITH: That is a good word, but I think that is too mild. Anyway, it is not fair to deprive hon. members of their time. If the Government has no business to do, they can adjourn until 2 o'clock next week so as to give Private Members a chance to do some work. You will notice that the Order Paper is full of Private Members' Business, and Tuesday after Tuesday, items are struck off according to the Rules. This session will end and Private Members will not be able to do any business at all, while the Government is doing theirs. What can one call that? I am sorry I cannot call it by its name, but the Government must not go on doing things like that. They were doing it too long; they did it with the electors before they got into power and they are doing it now with the members of the House. I know that whether they continue to do that or not, they are going to pay for it.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday, 11th February.

Mr. MILLER: I beg to second that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order.....

Mr. SMITH: Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has spoken sat down and the motion has been seconded.....

Mr. SMITH: I did not sit down.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: How could the hon. member say he did not sit down when the hon. junior member for St. George seconded his motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: Will both hon. members sit? I was of the opinion that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph had concluded, because I heard the hon. junior member for St. George say he seconded the motion. I did not know whether or not he seconded it prematurely. I understand it is recorded that the hon. junior member for St. George has seconded the motion.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The point I am making now is that the hon. member spoke on the motion for the adjournment; so how can the hon. member speak on the motion for adjournment and second the motion for the adjournment as well? The hon. junior member for St. George seconded the motion for the adjournment after he had already spoken. What kind of Parliamentary procedure that is all of a sudden?

Mr. MILLER: I did not get up and formally second the motion. I said it when the member was discussing the mo-

tion. I did not get out of my seat, and according to the Rules of the House, I would have to say that on my feet. The hon. member did not sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised that the records show that the hon. junior member for St. George had already spoken on the motion for the adjournment; therefore he is not in order as a seconder to the motion that the substantive motion be amended and that 12 o'clock noon be substituted for 4.15 o'clock p.m. That amendment is therefore not seconded.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, in all fairness to private members, I should like to move that this House do now adjourn until 2.30 p.m. on Tuesday, 11th February.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is an amendment, to the motion, which has been duly seconded to the effect that this House now stand adjourned until this day week, at 2.30 o'clock p.m.
6.30 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, I really want to say in answer to the fulminations of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph about its being parliamentary tactics which we are adopting, that this is merely the second time that we have come in here after 4.00 o'clock. Last Tuesday and today were the two occasions on which we came in at 4.30 and 4.15 respectively; therefore, it is not true to insinuate or state that we are trying to deny hon. members of time to do their private business. As a matter of fact, on the two occasions before that, hon. members very willingly conceded their time to the Government. It was for that reason that we decided to meet last Tuesday at 4.30 o'clock and today at 4.15 o'clock so that hon. members would be able to devote more time to their own private business. It is an exaggeration to state that we are making this a habit. Another important consideration when it comes to this is that with our meeting at 4.00 o'clock, we have not got to provide refreshments. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph would recall that he expressed some concern over this matter of refreshments; but with a thin Order Paper, there is no reason why we should extend the Sitting.

The time will come very soon — and the hon. member knows that — in another week or two when we will have to give consideration to the Estimates, and we will therefore meet at 12.00 o'clock and certainly time will be allowed to hon. members to discuss their private business.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on the motion of my colleague, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. Now, Sir, I am appealing to the Hon. Leader of the House, just as he used to say at some time, "I appeal to hon. members" and I would acquiesce, acquiesce to us over here now in our appeal. If he does not, he may find himself in hot water. Many Tuesdays, he asked us to refrain from doing Private Members' Business in order that the Government may carry on with their business, and we have acquiesced. Now we are asking him to allow us to do Private Members' Business next Tuesday, and I hope that he will be a man.

When the hon. member spoke about refreshments, I am surprised after the Hon. Minister because he has already asked for money for refreshments up to the end of the financial year. So he cannot get out of it. He is not running from it now; he is trying to cheese-pare it. Sir, I am going to teach the Hon. Minister how to make excuses — I mean, honest excuses. It is not fair to deprive us out of our time to deal with Private Members' Business. I do not think that there is anything on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business of which Government should be afraid.

There is a Resolution of "No Confidence" in the Government and that is the only one of which they should be afraid; but I think that a big, strong and honest Government would welcome a Resolution of that sort.

Sir, it is not fair and it really does not look right to see that we are meeting now at 4.15 p.m. and after. That looks funny. Why adjourn until a quarter past four — and not even 4.00 o'clock, so that hon. members on this side of the Table can put in fifteen minutes of debate? It seems to me that the Government is making sure that Private Members do not get a chance to speak at all, and they are only meeting at a time when the hon. senior member for St. Thomas can give notice of his Resolutions and questions.

I would like to clear the Order Paper of Private Members' Business. The Hon. Leader of this House promised us that they were going to prorogue soon, and he is now telling us that the Estimates would be coming down next week or week after. He promised us that there would be prorogation of the Assembly, and now he is telling us that the Estimates will be brought down soon. That means that the Government is not going to prorogue; and since he has told us to get ready for prorogation, he should be big enough to tell us whether the Government is going to prorogue the Assembly or not. The Estimates will take us another month for consideration; therefore, out of courtesy to the people he should tell us whether they are going to prorogue the Assembly this year or not. He told us that they were going to prorogue the Assembly soon and now he is telling us something else.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The answer to the hon. member to "Yes, we are going to prorogue."

Mr. SMITH: When?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That is the Government's business. The Government always informs the House on this matter, and it will inform the House in due course.

In so far as the Government being afraid of Private Members doing some of the items under their names, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph should know better than that. As a matter of fact, there is nothing under Private Members' Business in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph which he would like to discuss. We welcome the motion of "no confidence" in the Government. Nothing would please us more than that. I admire the optimism of the hon. member, but he said more than that in 1961 and look what has happened to him now. I welcome his optimism; but I challenge him on whatever he likes to wager that a worse thing would happen to him on the next occasion. The hon. member is hoping that the "windfall" would bring back the dark ages in this country again. We have passed the dark ages and will never get back to them.
6.40 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The amendment will be put first, that is to say, that the figures and symbols "2.30 o'clock p.m." be substituted for the figures and symbols "4.15 o'clock p.m.," Hon. members in favour of the amendment will please say "Aye", those of a contrary opinion will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

A VOICE: Divide. (Laughter)

Mr. SPEAKER: (After knocking the gavel). Did I hear a division called for? (After a pause). I declare that the "Ayes" have it. Accordingly this House stands adjourned until 2.30 p.m. of the clock on Tuesday, 11th February, 1964.

This House now stands adjourned.
6.43 p.m.