

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1961 - 66

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT) SECOND SESSION OF 1961-66

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 16th February, 1965.

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (Speaker); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Mr. E. ST.A, HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries) Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; His Honour F. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., (Deputy Speaker); Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD and Ron. A. DaC, EDWARDS, (Minister -of Health, Housing, Local government and Community Development).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Minutes of the meeting of 2nd February, 1963, I have the honour to inform the House, have been circulated, and if there is no objection, they will be taken as read and confirmed.

There being no objection, those Minutes are declared confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay the following-

The Drawback of Duties (Constructional Equipment) Regulations, 1965.

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for ten months ended 31st January, 1965.

And on my own behalf, I am commanded to lay the following;-

Report of the Trades Training Committee.

Hon. C.E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following;-

The Electricity Regulations, 1965.

The Ninth Annual Report of the Transport Board.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

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

Resolution to place the sum of \$600 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1964-65, Part I current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1964-65, No. 57 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. W. A. CRAW FORD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 23/1964, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is ready, as are replies to Parliamentary Question No. 8/1964 asked by the hon. senior member for St. George and Parliamentary Question No. 18/1964, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to deal with the money Resolution of which notice was given today.

I also give notice of my intention to move the suspension of Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 for the remainder of today's Sitting.

QUESTIONS

Mr. CARMICHAEL:

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

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

1. Government aware that the periodical inspection in the parish of Saint Thomas of certain motor vehicles licensed in the parish of Saint James causes inconvenience to St. James\' residents and creates undue hardship?

2. In view of the existence of the Hometown Police Station, will Government give directions for such vehicles to be inspected in the parish of St. James?

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today\'s Sitting.

May I at the same time remind hon. members that this is merely to facilitate progress of Government matters in case no hon. member wants to do Private Members\' Business? I am quite willing to accede to any request for Private Members, Business during the normal allotted time, and Replies to Questions will be given at the normal Question Time in spite of the suspension.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the hon. member too clearly on this point, but did he say that if hon. members want to do Private Members\' Business, they can do so although the Standing Orders would have been suspended?

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is what I understood the Hon. Leader of the House to say.

The question that Standing Orders Nos.. 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 15 be now suspended was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 under Government Business be the first Order of the Day.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

12.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and that 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. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1964-65 No. 56

HEAD 10 - ACCOUNTANT GENERAL Head 10 - Accountant General - was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, this is, as you will know, one of the normal supplementary Resolutions to provide additional funds for various departments, the allocation in the Estimates having been expended before the end of the current financial year.

In the case of Head 10, this is for the Accountant General's Department, and the notes 1, 2, 3, explain why these additional amounts are being requested. You will see for Item 12, Incidentals; item 21, Safes; and Item 23, Crown Agents' Charges, that the amount of \$2,345 is to be voted. In the case of the first Item, you are asked to vote \$245 more to meet anticipatory increased expenditure for the remainder of the financial year. In the case of the next Item - Item 21 - it is stated that of the amount provided in the Estimates, \$300 has already been spent on the provision of safes and the balance of \$400 is committed for the purchase of safes required by various Government Departments. With regard to the next Item -

Crown Agents\' Charges - the sum was insufficient to meet the estimated increase in management charges on overseas loans and

Crown Agents\' Charges for the remainder of the financial year, and we are asked to vote the additional sum of \$lt600.

I beg to move that this Head stand part of the Resolution.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 1I - PENSIONS

Head 1I _ Pensions - was called,

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, the sum of \$16,000 is required for Teachers\' Pensions and Gratuities and under Item 14, Disability Pensions, the sum of \$35I is required to supplement the sum of \$2,500 which was voted for under this Item.

Sir, you will recall that according to Resolution No. 15/1964t a disability pension was recently granted and the sum of \$35I is required to make the payment for the remainder of the financial year.

I beg to move that this Head stand part of the Resolu-
tion.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. WEEKES:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw to the attention of the appropriate Minister the grave dissatisfaction over the payment of pensions to Casual Employees. I know, Sir, that this Resolution deals with pensions of the casual employees and I feel it is my duty to let the Hon. Minister know that some of these casual employees have resigned approximately a year or two ago and have not received their pensions.

I am quite sure that the Government is doing its utmost to solve this problem, but the delay in computing and paying of the pensions is causing financial embarrassment and in some cases domestic worry to those casual employees. Some of them were employed at, say 50 years plus, and were allowed to continue in work exceeding the age limit which is 60 years. These people have been told now that those years of service would not be considered.

It is the opinion, that if you allow those people to work, in some cases, until they were 68 years, and they entered the Service at 50 years of age, something should be done to help them. These people have rendered efficient service to this Government. The authorities allowed these people to work for approximately thirteen or fourteen years and then they are being told that they are not eligible for pensions. I feel something should be done to alleviate their hardship.

These people are coming to politicians daily and complaining concerning the service which they have rendered the Government without any sort of reward, I am appealing to the appropriate Minister to do something to help these unfortunate people. If they are not entitled to a pension, I would suggest that a gratuity should be given them now that they have reached old age. If something is not done to help these poor people, I am sure that they will have to appeal to the Poor Law Guardians for help. This course should never be taken because they have rendered service to the Central Government. These people should not be allowed, even at this particular age, to put a burden on Local Government.

In some cases, the people are entitled to pensions. They have put in the number of years and still they have to wait approximately one to two years before they receive a pension. The time has come when the appropriate Minister should investigate the matter and do his utmost to expedite the payment of these pensions to those people who

have served - and served well-the Central Government.

12.35 p.m.

I do hope that something will be done in the very near future so that these people will receive their pensions.

Mr. SMITH and Mr. MOTTLEY rose to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph caught my eye first.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I want to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister who is responsible for this matter, that now that the Government is getting somewhere in relation to paying these people their pensions, there is another hardship which is creeping in slowly on some of these retired casual labourers. Due to the inconsistency in the keeping of the record from time to time as to when these people entered the Service, they have to make out an affidavit and swear to it, and this affidavit has to be signed by the various supervisors under whom these people have worked so as to satisfy the authorities who have to pay these pensions. Some of these people have already made out as many as three of these affidavits, and they are already in the office. Now that the authorities are ready to pay these people, they are given new affidavits to be signed and to be sworn to. There is one case where a poor man succeeded in getting two out of three of the supervisors to sign these affidavits and he has been told that he must get the third. Well, Sir, the third person has refused to sign any more of these affidavits. He has said that he has signed too many of them already and he is not signing any more. This poor man has been left in the cold again.

It is a fact that this poor man will not be paid until this other man signs this affidavit. In the circumstances I am appealing to the Minister to see about this matter because I do not think that you can make this man sign this affidavit. Already two of these affidavits have been signed by the same man and I think they can check back and use one of those signatures so as not to keep back this poor man from getting his pension. I am appealing to the Hon. Minister to see that these things do not happen because poor people have to go over and over again in these matters. These people are quite willing to go and get these things signed, but if the responsible persons refuse to sign them, then what is going to happen? These people have been out in the cold and knocking at the Government's door for the last two or three years; now that the door has begun to be opened, do not let it happen that these people will still not be able to get their pensions, especially since the signature is already there.

I have drawn this matter to the attention of the Hon. Minister where a particular man was to sign an affidavit for another worker, and it is only because he had a grievance that he refused to sign it. I had to go in person to the same man and ask him to sign that affidavit for this particular man. No Justice of the Peace can sign these things in the absence of the people who are supposed to sign them. The responsible man says that he is not driving his car two yards to swear anything. A Justice of the peace would have to go; otherwise the affidavit will not be signed. In this case a Justice of the Peace did go, and the man got his affidavit signed. However, Sir, in this particular case the responsible person refused to sign this affidavit and I am asking the Hon. Minister to give instructions, if affidavits have been already signed, not to send back these people for anything more.

Mr. CORBIN and Mr. MOTTLEY rose to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition was about to speak Just now.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, we always welcome anything which aims at alleviating the plight of those persons who are not so fortunate as to be pensionable but who have rendered very valuable services to this island. There seems to be some conflict of understanding between the two speakers. The Hon. Minister is not now in his place, but I

hope that his colleagues will ask him to answer directly the questions which I have posed. I think that both hon. members who have spoken were referring to persons who have worked for the Councils which those hon. members have the honour to represent.

Mr. SMITH:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I was one of the last speakers, and I was not referring to any labourers employed by the Councils.

Mr. WEEKES:

On a point of order. I, too, would like the hon. senior member for the City to know that I was not referring to those who are entitled to pensions from the Councils. I was referring to Central Government workers.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I did not refer to those who were entitled to pensions at all. I am happy to know that those hon. members were not referring to the people to whom I thought they were referring. I think that those hon. members will support the answers to the questions I have asked because both hon. members represent District Councils in the North and the South respectively. They know that there are persons who have rendered very valuable services to the community and they, too, have grievances relating to their pensions. The question which I want to pose for the Hon. Minister to answer is this I believe that the Councils both in the North and in the South are in the same predicament in relation to the Casual Employees Pension Act affecting persons who have been employed by the Local Government. 12.45 p.m.

Recommendations have gone up, and I have seen a Draft Bill While there is this delay in this matter, I may add that the Barbados Workers Union, which represents the overwhelming majority of these employees in the municipality, is pressing us for a decision. In other words, there are a number of persons so employed, and this have been going on for the past four or five years, and we have made this representation. We have had various amendments and suggestions, and we have gone into them very carefully; yet we can get nothing done. Only yesterday we held a meeting on this matter, and we were told directly, flatly and plainly by representatives of the Union who had employees there with them that the patience which they have had for so long is now being spent. After seeing the correspondence between the City Council and the Government - and I think such correspondence also affects the other bodies - they are satisfied that nothing has been done over the two years during which the correspondence took place, and they are becoming very unsettled in this matter. They feel that there are people with 20 and 25 years' service who do not come under the schedule of the Pensions Act, but they have been rendering valuable service, and this matter should be settled very shortly.

I regret that the Minister is not in his place, but either the Minister of Social Services under whose portfolio this should come, or the Minister who introduced this Resolution should be able to give us some information before this Head is passed. We should be glad to see something done in this matter, because the Union has been pressing us in this matter, and we have done everything to satisfy these people that we have done our best. We now feel that the Government should expedite this matter to avoid any friction in the entire situation.

Mr. CORBIN:

Mr. Chairman, note 9 of this Resolution says that Supplementary provision is required under Head 24.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I should like to draw to the hon. member's attention that we are still dealing with Head 11. The hon. member will be allowed to speak when we arrive at the Head to which note 9 refers.

Mr. CORBIN:

I will wait on that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, I do agree with the former members who spoke on this Resolution, but there are a few things which I should like to draw to their attention of which they are not fully cognisant. The hon. junior member

for St. Joseph said that he has known of cases where people had affidavits signed, and when they went back to the Department they were given another affidavit, and have been turned around and so on. I agree that that might have happened. I am dealing with pensions now, and I have quite a number of people in my area who are entitled to a pension. But we are running up against a snag. Some of these people who have worked with the Department for so long, in the Northern Area, for instance, have now gone over to the Central Government, and the problem we are faced with now is that there is no Road Supervisor or Road Engineer alive who can testify to their length of service. Some of them started to work from 1926 and before that. We cannot find anybody living who can testify that these people worked with them during this time, except Mr. Streat, and he can only testify from 1946. There are men in the age bracket of 65, 68 and 73, and the problem is that we cannot get anybody to swear to these affidavits as we would like. I have known of a case where a person had a sworn affidavit that he was working during the time that was required, but now that they have checked, they can bring evidence to prove that during the time that he was said to be working on the signed affidavit, he was in prison.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that the man who signed the affidavit did it with any malice or attempt to defraud anybody. He did it in all sincerity, but it is rather difficult for a person in this day and age to remember every day that somebody worked from 1926; and that is where we get all these snags. I have discussed this matter with the Accountant General and the Auditor General, and I am awaiting a reply from the Auditor General dealing with some cases. What the hon. junior member for St. Philip has to take into consideration is that some of these people knew when they came on to work that they would not be eligible for pension, and said they only wanted to work because they were still strong. Now it happens that you must work at least ten years to be eligible for pension. It was found that some of these people were over 60 years and were called upon to stop working, but they may only have put in four or five years\' service. It is not that the Government is trying to frustrate these people, because this Government would be the last to do a thing like that, but we have to take into consideration that when you send these persons for pensions to the Auditor General, he is not going to allow them to draw money out of the Treasury unless they can give him conclusive proof that they are eligible.

Now the hon. Junior member for St. Joseph called on the Minister to do something to rectify this situation, but he has to take into account that the Hon. Minister cannot ask the Auditor General to contravene the law. We would have to come to this House with legislation....

Mr. SMITH:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I am not asking the Minister to contravene any law. If the hon. member was listening, he would not have used those remarks. I said that a particular man had at least two sets of affidavits already signed in the office, and they have now presented him with new ones. He succeeded in getting two of the persons to sign, but the other person refused to sign, and I have said that so long as there are some who have already signed and the other has refused on the grounds that he has signed too many already, he should instruct these people to accept one of those already there, since the signature of the person who has refused to sign is already there.

Mr. BOXILL:

Mr. Chairman, what hon. members must realise, because I fully realise it, is that the law states that workers must have completed ten years\' service before he reaches 60 years, and that is what a lot of people seem to be missing. I did not make the law and I can only abide by it. I would be glad, since I am

getting headaches over this, if we could find a way to alleviate these people of their suffering, because some of them may be members of my family.

12.55 p.m.

It is not that anybody wants to stand in these people's way as such. I have already suggested to the Heads of the Departments concerned that when they know of people who

would soon reach the age of 60 years and that person would have to go, not to wait until that person reaches 60 years but to see to it that his pension and gratuity is correctly computed so that when the particular month comes for that person to go, by the next month, that person would receive his pension.

The hon. Junior member for St. Philip stated that some of these people started to work when they were 50 years plus. As the law stands, if a person has not completed 10 years before he is 60 years, he is not entitled to a pension.

As regards the affidavit, what the hon. junior member for St. Joseph said may be true, and I do appreciate that something will have to be done. However, the point is this. Unless the affidavits have been certified in such a manner as to satisfy the Auditor General, he is not going to allow those persons to get a pension.

It is not the fault of the Government. It is true that the Government is always called upon to bear the responsibility but we must realise that these laws were laid down before this Government came into power. It is also true to say that we would like to help these people and we are doing all in our power to help them, but there is a snag in it. You must have somebody who can say that I know this man was working from such-and-such a time.

Sir, I am only warning hon. members what the true position is. It is not only the Ministers or the Civil Servants, but the law as it stands is that the worker must put in ten years' service before he reaches 60 years.

Mr. CORBIN:

Mr. Chairman, what I want to say is that there are a number of people who worked in the Government for many years, and although they worked for those years, they were not in a position to complete consecutive years of service because they did not put in the required number of days that a person has to work in a particular year. As the law stands, if you fail to put in so many days in a particular year, you would not be eligible for pension that year.

That is not the fault of the workman; that is the fault of the Department in which he worked because although he was ready to work at all times, yet owing to the finance on the particular project which this person was working on, he could not put in the required number of days in the particular year, and on account of that, his years of service did not accumulate. As I have said, it is not the person's fault that he did not put in the required number of days; it is because he had to go home because he was told that so much money was granted to the Department, and when the money was gone he had to be laid off. Therefore, they had to wait until the next year before they were re-employed. You hear a man saying that he was working in the Waterworks Department for 25 years and he has not received a pension. The

reason for that is that in many of the years which he had put in he did not work the required number of days to qualify him. If he had got sufficient work to do, he would have worked 25 years.

I think that Government is aware of all that is happening; so I am glad that this Resolution has come down today. As far as I understand, the Government is seeking ways and means of doing Justice to these people, but if according to the law, you cannot pay them a pension; you can give them a gratuity. The last Government did it and this Government can do it too. These people have worked for 25 years, but every year they did not complete the number of days which they should have put in. I hope that Government will try its best to find ways and means to help these poor destitute people.

Mr. WEEKES:

Mr. Chairman, I must thank the hon. Junior member for St. Thomas for the manner in which he has explained this matter to this honourable Committee, but I must let him know that I am conscious of all that he had mentioned.

The point at issue is this. In those days, the age limit was 65 years. Since then, it has changed to 60 years. People who entered the Service when the age limit was 65 years are told now that even though they have put in more than ten years, they have not qualified for pension because if they did not put in ten years before they were 60 years, they are not entitled to pension. I am saying, if they are not entitled to the pension, that the gratuity should be given them for their years of service. If a man was allowed to work in the Service for thirteen or fourteen years, and he then resigned and then was told \"Well, you are not entitled to a pension\", you can Imagine how he feels.

On the other hand, when it comes to the point which the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown has spoken about, that is, employees in the Local Government, I must substantiate his statement. There are people who should be given a pension, and we were told that legislation would be enacted so that they would be entitled to it. But what we find today is that some of those people have died and have not received one cent, while others are waiting for theirs and we cannot pay them because it is illegal. It is my opinion that this is a very serious matter, and regardless of the way in which you may try to put it to those former employees, they feel that an injustice has been done to them.

I am appealing to this Government to go into the matter carefully and do something to help those people. If you are not entitled to the pension and gratuity, well, Sir, consider their years of service and give them a gratuity.

1.05 p.m.

I repeat that people who have put in thirteen years service in the Government should be entitled to gratuities. It is not their fault if they entered the Service when the age limit was 65 years. You are saying today that the age limit is 60 years and all I am saying is that something should be done for these people. It is for the House to enact the necessary legislation.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I have listened very carefully to the hon. member and now the whole matter is being misrepresented. The age limit or the retiring age was 65 years when there was no pensions for casual employees or for public employees on the Unestablished Staff. There was no Public Employees Pension

Act 1961, nor was there any Casual Employees Pension Act 1961, which came into force in 1962. That being so, hon. members are only confusing the issue. It is only since 1961 that the Casual Employees were entitled to pension as of right. I think that the people whom the hon. member is trying to help would be better helped if he would give me a list of their names and not be talking at length in here.

Mr. WEEKES:

I quite appreciate what the Hon. Minister has said and I quite agree with him that the Casual Employees Pension Act was not enacted in those days. I am not criticising the Government in any way; I am merely appealing to the Government to do something to help these people. This is a matter which has been going on for years and this Government has come along and found it so. I am therefore appealing to this Government to do something about the matter. I am saying that if a man puts in 13 years in the Government Service, regardless of age he should be given some help. That is all I am saying today. If we have not got any legislation to help these people, then you should try and bring about legislation whereby something can be done to help these unfortunate people.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, I did not want to enter this debate but I would like to stop it. This thing is now becoming a hardy annual. I am appealing to the Government to stop these cheap political gibes. Because an election is coming up, everybody thinks that every man who is getting a pension is a voter. You have passed an Act in 1961, and therefore what are you going on talking about? Prior to 1961, nobody could raise this matter. I have told the Hon. Ministers some time ago and this is where the Government must take advice from people who know what they are talking about. What you want is a Committee set up to

investigate the operation of the 1961 Act, to make recommendations as to how you can deal with this matter and put an end to all of this stupidity. Hon. members are talking as if the Government owes a man a pension as of right if he has worked for 20 years. They do not know how long he was in Cuba, how many times he was in the Mental Hospital, how many times he was in goal or in the Almshouse. You do not know how long he was cutting canes since 1926, nor do you know how many people he has worked for. Because a man started to work for the Government in 1926, the Government does not defacto owe him a pension, unless he can satisfy the Government that he has worked for the Government for all of these years.

The Pension Act applies to people other than these persons. If you started to work in 1926 and did not put in 10 years' service - it is a question of your early days and not the evening of your days. It is not that you can come as a paragon of virtue and ask the Government to redeem you for your past years. This is not a Pentecostal organization in here where people can say that they have worked for you. Some of these people have committed offences against the State and are you going to write a blank cheque for some of the worst elements in the community on the ground that this is something which the Government should do? There are cases of hardship and there may be cases of exploitation too. The hon. member can find out, and in order to find out which cases are which, you should set up a Committee to examine the matter and then the Committee will say: "This is what we have found and we make such-and-such a recommendation." The Government will then pass the proper legislation and that will put an end to this sort of exercise which is too cheap.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the second part of the speech of the hon. member who was defending

these pensioners, and I have also listened to the remarks which have been made by the Hon. Minister. He referred to the Act as it applies to casual employees. I know that people who have worked for the Government have had some difficulty in securing their pensions, and I am wondering if a lot of people to whom the hon. junior member for St. Philip was referring, did not include even those who are outside the category of casual workers. If he includes people who would not ordinarily be deemed to be casual workers, if they began to work when the age limit was 65 years and were subsequently told that the age limit was reduced to 60 years, I think that something should be given to such workers. It may be that on examination it is discovered that people who are outside the rank of the casual workers do find difficulty in securing pensions. The 1961 Act is on the Statute Book, but I have a lingering suspicion that there are several workers who might not be regularly employed who are getting some difficulty, and it may be that such people have put in ten years' service when the age limit was 65 years. I am not talking at cross purpose with the hon. member who has just sat down, because I myself deem certain speeches to be electioneering speeches; but wherever there are people who are not casual employees and they have put in a number of years of work, their case should be taken into consideration.

1.15 p.m.

There are some people who have worked for several years in the Government Service. I know of one worker from the Waterworks Department who was a driver for many years who could not indeed be called a casual worker; yet that type of worker had considerable trouble, and when he thought he was pensionable, he was not. I do not remember directly what he was told, and I believe that among the workers whom the hon. member was seeking to represent, there can be found people in that category who are not casual workers at all, never went to prison, never left the island or went into hospital but remained in Barbados, and still the records are not there, and may be told that they are not eligible. We are here to bring to the attention of Government all those people who can claim to be deserving of a pension, and not the sole individual who, it is said, left the island, went to prison or worked wherever he liked and still wants a pension.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, I should just like to clear up a point for hon. members in connection with Local Government Casual employees. One hon. member said that representation was made on behalf of the employees and that some of them had since died without receiving pensions and gratuities, but that hon. member who had claim to being Chairman of one of the Councils should know that Regulations were drafted and sent to the Councils for comments. These comments were only sent back to the Ministry a short while ago, and only today I have been working on the Regulations for presentation to Cabinet, and I hope in a couple of weeks time to have these Regulations approved. The hon. member also knows that pensions could not be paid to these casual employees of Local Government until these Regulations have been approved; so it is unreasonable for him to state that these people have died or have experienced hardship when he knows that it was only recently that his Council commented on the Regulations. As a matter of fact, some of the people who were asked to comment on the Local Government Casual Employees Regulations have not even commented yet, but we could not wait any longer for any further comments and had to take action, and in a few weeks' time arrangements will be made whereby casual employees of Local Government will be entitled to gratuity and pension.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I think that most hon. members are satisfied with the explanations given by the hon.

senior member for St. Peter and the Parliamentary Secretary, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, but Just to set the record straight, I will add a few words.

The first point I would like to make is that this matter has come up from time to time and has been given thorough explanation by the Hon. Leader of the House who has explained this matter on several occasions in the past, and today I am grateful to the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the Parliamentary Secretary, the hon. Junior member for St. Thomas for adding their contribution.

Now the position, Sir, is that casual employees and members of the unestablished staff previously were not entitled as of right to pensions and gratuities, but after they had put in ten years' continuous service, it was thought fit to give them a honorarium and a Resolution was sent down normally in the past to give a gratuity. Today they are entitled as of right under the Casual Employees Pensions Act and the Public Employees Pensions Act of 1961 which came into effect and operation from 1962 giving a reduced pension and gratuity in most cases, provided they qualify. Now in order to qualify, you must put in ten years continuous service prior to attaining the age of 60 years; so that the Act under which they are entitled has come into effect since the age for retirement and pension has been reduced from 65 to 60 years. You cannot confine it and say that these workers have been working for thirty years and are now 65 years.

Another point, Mr. Chairman, is that many of them joined the Service at various ages. This Government feels as strongly as Hon. members who have spoken, and for that reason is doing everything possible on an individual basis by attending to individual cases daily. If hon. members wanted to assist these people, it is a question of supplying a list of the names and addresses and not Just merely making political speeches in here. If hon. members get down to pen and paper and supply the names, addresses and records roughly of the people they want dealt with, it would help the Government, because there are a few unfortunate cases where some Joined the Service when they were over 50 years, others have broken service, and for one reason or another, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has explained very clearly, some are Just not entitled. I had cases only this week where some Joined the Service after 60 yearst and I want to assure the House that I deal with each case individually, and each case is given proper attention and examination. These political speeches in here will probably get you a few more votes when the time comes, but if you really want to help these people, you can better serve them by giving me a list of the names, addresses and years of service and let them come or accompany them

to the Ministry if you are go zealous, and see that they get their deserts. This Government brought in the Casual Employees Act of 1961 and the Public Employees Act of 1961, and you can realise that we are ready and willing to help these people.

As far as the affidavits are concerned, it is only by virtue of the fact that they were not entitled when they were first taken on that proper books and records were not kept; but today proper records are kept, because all public employees, casual or unestablished, are entitled to pension as of right. Now I hardly think I need say anymore on this, but I do admit that there are a few unfortunate cases, and I appreciate the advice given by the hon. senior member for St. Peter that a committee should be set up to investigate cases of hardship. This Pension Act came into force in 1962, so that cases for 1962, 1963 and 1964 are still being examined, and the hard cases are receiving my personal attention and the attention of the Ministry. 1.25 p.m.

As the hon. senior member for Saint Andrew said, some did not secure sufficient employment throughout the year in order that they may qualify and some have not just qualified for many reasons. Does the hon. member realise that? Does the hon. member realise that there will be certain hard cases in which they would not be able to qualify? There are some cases in which some people started to work with the Department of Government after they were 50 years. There are some who worked until they were high up in the 70's. There are about 15 or 20 who went to work over 60 years. What I am simply drawing to hon. members is the fact that in such cases, they would be genuine cases of hardship in that they were persons who Joined the service after they were old and they did not secure continuous service. In some cases, it may be that the persons worked for over ten years, but some of the service was put in after they became fifty years of age; therefore, that part of the service would not be counted.

I want to tell hon. members who are not familiar with the Act, particularly those who are more anxious to make a speech than anything else, that they must realise that service after the person had become 60 years of age is not counted. After he or she has attained the age of 60 years, that service is not counted. I hope I have made that point clear, and having made it clear, I am asking those hon. members, when they get information from such persons, to find out first when such persons joined the Service and to be more responsible than to come here week after week when there is something to deal with pensions and criticise the Government.

The hon. member has brought certain cases to me and of the four cases which were heard, one is qualified and is entitled to pension. The other three cases are being examined very carefully in order to see what we can do. I must tell hon. members that this Government is not prepared to deprive anybody out of a pension because this Government has gone so far as to bring in a Bill to provide this class of people with a pension.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I will just say this finally to resolve this matter. I have listened to the speeches made by the hon. senior member for the City, the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, and my colleague, the hon. Junior member for St. Philip. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has tabled a question on this matter. He enquired;-

"Is the Government aware that workers who have been required to resign because of age two years or more ago from such Departments as the Highway and Transport and the Public Works, have not yet received their pension or gratuities?"

This question was given notice on the 6th October, last year.

The answer to the question is "No". No former employees in the Highways and Transport or in the Public

Works who retired more than two years ago and who if qualified to receive a pension, has not received it.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I want to know if the Hon. Minister is now replying to my

question and if this is Question Time, I want to know, because he has not yet replied to that question. I wonder if he is replying now.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

If the hon. member had waited until I was finished, he would see the point which I was about to make and would have seen that it was relevant to this debate. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph anticipated that by asking a question. He was told this morning that the reply is ready. Instead of wasting the time of the House, the hon. member could have sat and listened. Although the hon. member was told that the reply was ready, he still joined in the debate.

As I was saying, the answer to that part of the question is "no". Every single employee, who resigned within the last two years and who was entitled to a pension or gratuity, has received it. However, there are some people who resigned within the last two years who have not been paid a pension because under the law they were not entitled.

The information which I have is that there was something like 95 people who were not entitled under the provisions of the 1961 Act to a pension. Of this amount, 60 odd have received their pensions and gratuities and as far as I have it here, about 31 have not received any because they did not qualify. Since then, we proposed two amendments to the 1961 Act and the hon. member is aware of that. There were 30 odd persons who normally were not expected to benefit and we brought in an amendment to the Act in order to include as many of those persons as we could.

It is an absolute fabrication to state that there are any people at all who are entitled to any pension and/or gratuity who have not received it. Both the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, as well as the Hon. Minister have been at pains to explain the provisions of the Act as regards the resigning age. If you work for ten years after you have become 60 years, you still would not be entitled because the resigning age is 60 years. Therefore, Sir, we have particularly brought in an amendment to the Act in order that some of these people should be given some reward. I was provided with some names of those who were hard cases to deal with, but the copy of them is not here. I got the names of those people so as to prevent this repetition every time we have a Resolution or Bill of a similar nature before the House.

1.35 p.m.

Among the applications which were rejected was one from Samuel Vaughan. I think that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has raised this question already. (ASIDES).

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I would like to hear the Hon. Leader of the House who is addressing the Chair.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

There are the cases of Joseph Broome and Cecil Yarde. We considered them on compassionate grounds because they did not qualify for pensions. Then there were employees from the Department of Highways and Transport who were also hard cases and they were not entitled to anything under the Act at all. The fact is that pensionable services stop when people are at the age of 60 years. In the field of casual employees, some persons work until they are well over 60 years. There are public employees who

do not qualify because the length of service did not qualify them under the Act. We introduced two amendments to the Act so as to relieve some of the people from the Casual Employees Service because they would not otherwise have qualified. We amended the Casual Employees Pension Act, the Public Employees Public (Amendment) Act and we also dealt with the 1964 Regulations. With these amendments, further consideration was given to some of the bad cases, but it is not true to say that any public employee who has resigned since 1961 has not been given his pension.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, we have Standing Orders for the guidance of this House. You will notice that time is set out for the Business of the House. We have time for Government Business, we have Question Time, we have Private Members' Business and everything of the sort. A private member cannot enter upon Government's time so as to do his business except with the approval of this House, You have allowed the Hon. Minister to reply to my Question out of time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member was making an explanation, and in order to develop his point he referred to something which he felt would be appropriate.

Mr. SMITH. You have made it worse, Mr. Chairman. You should not have allowed the hon. member to develop that point in his favour in that way.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Are you questioning my authority?

Mr. SMITH:

No, Sir, I would not be so foolish as to question your authority. I want you to rule on hon. members if they are breaking the Standing Orders. The hon. senior member for St. Philip has broken the Standing Orders of this House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Not in the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. SMITH:

Well, then, I am very sorry; we could as well pack up and go.

Mr. CHAIRMAN; I agree with the hon. member.

Mr. SMITH:

There it is; we have Standing Orders here, but in the opinion of the Chair the Standing Orders are no longer Standing Orders.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

On a point of Order....

Mr. SMITH:

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but I cannot tell you how I feel. I will have to tell you that outside.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

On a point of order. The hon. member is certainly breaking the Standing Orders of this House by challenging the authority of the Chair. I gave notice earlier today that the Reply to his Question was ready, and I referred to this Reply because it is relevant to the debate. The hon. member referred to the same issue during the debate and all I had to do was to reply to this question. The same point the hon. member has raised now, he raised in his question.

Mr. SMITH:

That is not a point of order.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Do you know what is a point of order?

Mr. SMITH:

I am saying that the hon. senior member for St. Philip is wrong. He cannot reply to a question out of Question Time.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

On a point of order. The hon. member has not understood what I said. I have not replied to the question at all. When the time comes for the reply to be given I will give it. All I said was that the same point which the hon. member raised in the debate is the same point which he has raised in the question and I will give the same answer.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I did not raise any question at all.

I drew the attention of the Minister to what has happened with one of these particular employees who had carried three affidavits, two of which had already been given in, to get one signed. I said nothing at all relative to the question; I did not make any contribution to it; I only asked the Minister to see to the matter because it was a matter for the responsible person to accept one of the affidavits with the signature of the person who had signed before, but everybody wants to jump on my shoulders. They can come too because these shoulders are broad enough.

The hon. senior member for St. Philip could not get up to say anything to his colleague when he was straying far and wide from the Resolution, but he felt he could drive through Apes' Hill yard. He was so mad with his colleague for exposing him that he has tried to air it out on me, thereby breaking the Standing Orders of the House. He broke the Standing Orders by trying to build up a point in referring to one of my questions when it was not Question Time. 1.45 p.m.

The hon. member has broken the Rules of this House, and members of your Party, far from encouraging and helping you in the Chair, are trying their best to make the public look at you as they are looking.

The question that Head 11 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 17 - Premier _ Home Affairs, was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 17 - Premier - Home Affairs, stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Head 24 - Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries -was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 24 - Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries - stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. CORBIN:

Mr. Chairman, I am not speaking against this Head, but I just want to make a personal explanation. The Fishing Industry in this island is one of our greatest industries; yet it is not accorded the kind of facilities it should have; and I should like Government at the earliest opportunity to provide adequate means of protection for the industry. I feel that they should have bigger and better boats and a captain, and the boats should be fitted with radio equipment in case any boat gets into difficulty in the high seas,

Mr. Chairman, why don't you call for order? The Rules says that no other member's voice should be heard when another is speaking. When the others are speaking, I sit quietly.

What I am saying, however, Mr. Chairman, is that the Government should provide better facilities for the fishing industry. Boats drift from one side of the island to the other and also to neighbouring islands, and sometimes people perish when there are high seas. Those people go out in search of food for us, and along with agricultural workers are very important to the island. With all the gold and other materials which we have in the world, if we do not have food, we are nowhere. I am therefore asking Government either in this financial year or the next to provide larger boat! with bigger engines and well equipped with radio apparatus, and with a captain in charge, so that when fishermen leave their homeland and drift, the captain may be able to make contact with these poor fishermen. I hope the Government will make proper provision to assist these poor fishermen in the future.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I should like to say that it is not my intention to delay proceedings, but the hon. member who has just sat down speaks as some person who does not live in Barbados. He apparently fails to remember or happens not to know that the present Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries - I refer to the hon. Junior member for St. Michael - is himself an expert in fisheries, and is a master mariner, and has taken time off - as a matter of fact

he has been working overtime for the last year or thereabouts - to lecture to the fishermen island-wide,

with four others assisting him, including his son. He has been lecturing three times a week in all the fishing villages in Barbados, and he has not spared himself in any way in educating the fishermen and teaching them how to use the compass; and it is shocking to hear one of our own members get up and say that nothing is being done. We are going all out to uplift the fishermen and bring new light to them, apart from the United Nations Fishing Research Project which is coming here shortly, of which Barbados is a participating country and has been cited as headquarters for the operations.

The question that Head 24 - Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries - stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 38 - Ministry of Health, Housing, Local Government and Community Development - was called,

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 38 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, I should like on this matter to say that I compliment Government very much in its endeavour to enter into sport in a manner that would add to the quality of sporting life, health and in general athletics in Barbados, and I should like to take this opportunity to state that the Government should endeavour wherever it can to utilise the best talents there are. I have for some time mentioned that we have in our community a footballer who has done in his way for football what the cricketers have done, and he is a young man by the name of Reggie Haynes. He is the only player in Barbados to have got on a West Indian football team, and so far as Barbados is concerned, he is our Stanley Matthews.

Mr. Chairman, I do not subscribe to the view that because a young man did not go to Harrison College or Com-bermere or does not possess any of these academic qualifications, those are reasons why he cannot impart what he possesses to those who are capable of imbibing it. Apart from that, we must learn to dignify our stars. He is one of ours, and there is no point in looking upon him condescendingly or in a manner as if he is far removed from what he is contributing.

1.55 p.m.

When we have men who can make this contribution in their own field, we have to take note as to the sort of status in which they can maintain life, and that they do not have to go to other countries in order to eke out their existence as a bus driver or a conductor. We must learn that our star must be kept a live. I feel that I have been making this request too long and there is room in Barbados.

There are 126 elementary schools and there is a large school population. Football is an attractive game in Barbados. It is true to say that the enthusiasm in football is not as great as that in cricket because our football in the West Indies is not up to the same standard as cricket. However, I feel that what we have done to those in the cricketing sphere, should be done to those in the football sphere. As a matter of fact, I say quite humbly and forcibly that our community is small enough that whenever we have a star in any

field, we should not allow him to go out of the country. Some of the sportsmen whom we have would not be able to qualify educationally for the Job in which their position has put them, but when a man has reached the top of his form in a particular sport, he has exercised a discipline to put him in that field. Of course, when you reach a certain age, you are incapable of doing the things which you used to do when you were 17 years or 18 years.

I am a person who has strong objections to allowing talent of any form in a community to be wasted. I do not subscribe to the old time view. We had some famous cricketers In this country, and the powers-that-were in that

day did not regard sport as something to dignify a person. This Government has started on the road and I would like to see it continue. However, I would make this special plea because, in my humble opinion, Mr. Reggie Haynes is a young man who should have been a long time ago placed in this position. Mr. Mortimer is not coming now, and the Government spent \$2,000 last year on him Just to coach our youngsters in football for a month. Mr. Haynes' talent should be utilised now. I would implore the Hon. Minister to make the necessary Investigations now. Our talents are not utilised in such a way as you can get the maximum from the person concerned. Mr. Haynes can do more to the country from that field than he can do now in the present field in which he is engaged.

Mr. LYNCH:

Mr. Chairman, I wish to support the hon. senior member for St. Peter as to the possibilities of training the young man, Mr. Reggie Haynes, to be a football coach. It is my considered opinion that if he were given this training, he would be of great benefit to Barbados. We should not Just have this window-dressing attitude of bringing down here a man for one month every year to train our youngsters in football. I would say here now that the acquisition of Mr. Wedderburn to train our youngsters in athletics was a good one and he is doing a good Job.

However, Sir, I am going to sound a note of warning, This young man should be given more support. There was a fiasco when the venue for the start of the last athletic race had to be changed because there was no co-operation from Government to provide the transport for a lot of these youngsters to get to the point at the start of the race. That would do a great deal to lessen the enthusiasm of the young man who is now attached to the Department, As I have said, the venue had to be changed because at the new starting point the majority of them would have found it easy to get there. It had to be done; they had to go to the point where they could walk because there was no money to pay for transport for them. As good luck would have it, the race was a success: but I would like the Hon. Minister to know that this change in the starting point was not the best thing.

It seems as if the senior members in this Department have yet to be convinced that sport is of great value to the community. When you get this antiquated manner of thinking in this community, it cannot do the community any good. I would also like to point out that it is not a good idea of the Government of not consulting with anybody about what is going on and what you want to do. There have been considerable talk of building a stadium, and I know that there are several organisations which have not been consulted as to the site, the size and the allocation thereof or anything of that sort. I feel that these organisations should be consulted. I see no reason why they should not be consulted. It is handled in that manner in adjacent territories; it was done so in Jamaica and Trinidad. I am sounding a word of warning so that you will understand that that is the correct attitude especially, when there is this lack of expertise

and knowledge in the particular sport. This is a word of counsel,

Mn MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I am sure the Hon. Minister would let us know a little more of the Item, Medical Aid Scheme, because all that the note says is that the sum of \$1,720 is required to supplement Item 18, Medical Aid Scheme, to permit a patient to receive treatment which is obtainable at University Hospital, Jamaica, and to meet other commitments to the end of the financial year.

It has not been told to us what they are spending in this case for the person or whether it is aid. We do not know whether it is a question of the person returning the money, because we have not got the full particulars of the scheme on this particular point.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, in reply to the question raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, first of all, I would say that he made mention of the employment of Mr. Reggie Haynes as a coach on football. The hon. member who is supposed to be a member of the Football Association will well remember that I

attended a meeting of the Football Association and discussed with them the question of training for Mr. Haynes. As a matter of fact, when Mr. John Mortimore was here, I thought of asking that Mr. Haynes be released to work in co-operation with Mr. Mortimore so that he should get some training.

2.05 p.m.

We were to discuss the question of training in England with Mr. Mortimore for the same Mr. Reggie Haynes and the plan of the Ministry was to send a person abroad whereby he would be trained and would return to Barbados as a football coach. Subsequent to this meeting, it was stated that it was not possible for Mr. Mortimore to return to Barbados this year. We have not given up the possibility of getting this coaching for Mr. Haynes; we are still exploring that possibility with a view to having him in our Sports Department if and when his training is completed. The hon. Junior member for the City and the hon. senior member for St. Peter can rest assured that we are all on common ground when we speak of the training of Mr. Reggie Haynes. I hope that in the not too distant future we shall be able to provide the necessary funds for Mr. Haynes' training and thereby allow Barbados to benefit from his training in football.

In reply to the hon. Junior member for the City with reference to the co-operation which the Athletic Coach should be getting and is not getting from all or from some people who are concerned with athletics, I should like to allow the hon. member to know that I am aware of that. I quite agree with him that there are certain people who are not interested in sports and who would prefer to see the money spent in other directions. I suppose that the hon. member will agree with me that if we do not have some means of getting the youth of this country to utilise their energy in this direction, it must mean that there will be more delinquency, and perhaps some people would prefer to spend more money on curative measures rather than spend these funds on preventive measures. I do not want to say anything more on that matter. The position is that the money which was formally used in hiring buses in connection with our walking races was a group vote from Labour Welfare Funds. Recently, I have had to take the Sports Section of the Ministry from the Social Welfare Department and place it directly under the authority of the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry. This vote remains for Social Welfare, and when the time comes

for the money to be spent, it will be spent in another form of activity. There was therefore no more provision in the fund for the walking races. That was unfortunate, but I can assure the hon. member that this will not happen again. The promotion of sport will have its own vote, separate and distinct from other activities in the Department of Social Welfare.

On the question of the Stadium, I can say that the Jaycees are raising funds for this Stadium. They have had plans drawn up and sent in to the Ministry. We have not yet been able to arrange a fruitful discussion with the Jaycees; hence we are not in a position to consult with the Olympic Association of Barbados or with any other Association. However Sir, the hon. member can rest assured that, when we have had our discussion with the Jaycees, we will be in a position to discuss with any of the sports organisations this question of the construction of a Stadium.

In reply to the hon. senior member for the City, I should like to say that in the 1964-65 Estimates, there was a sum of \$3,000 provided for the Medical Aid Scheme. If anybody in the community becomes ill and the illness is such that it cannot be treated at the Hospital here - for instance, we do not have any Orthopaedic or Neuro-Surgeon in Barbados; but if these illnesses are such that we cannot treat them in Barbados, then we investigate whether the person who is suffering from the illness or his or her relatives are in a position to pay for the treatment abroad of the person who is suffering. This investigation is carried out by officers of the Social Welfare Department, and after careful scrutiny we decide whether people who are suffering are in a position to pay for their treatment or not. If they are not in a position to do so, then

we consult with Jamaica or Trinidad and payment for the treatment of these persons will be made from this vote. This year we had eight cases sent out to be paid for from this vote, and the average cost was \$600. You will find that the cost may go as high as \$1,000; it all depends on the length of illness or the length of stay of the persons in Trinidad in Jamaica or wherever we have sent those persons. We have found that we have had more cases than we anticipated. We cannot measure the life of any individual in dollars and cents. Recently a child was sent out and she came back here well and she may become one of the useful citizens of this community.

Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to hide this scheme because it will help those who cannot help themselves, and people who are helped will become useful citizens in the community. There are two other cases for which representation was made to the Hospital, and the persons concerned may be going out some time this month. If this vote were to be expended, it would mean that at any rate we would not get the bills until the next financial year. It was only during the last weekend that we had to take out a little child who was suffering from a brain tumour. We got short notice of it, and by Sunday the child was in Trinidad. We had to send down a Nurse with the child and that has cost us as yet \$600. I hope that the hon. member is satisfied with the information which I have given, and if he needs any further information I will give it to him.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I must thank the Hon. Minister for the information which he has given me. I hope he is not thinking that I wanted him to call anybody's name. I am satisfied that the investigations are carried out, and the Hon. Minister knows that I am one of those persons who will be always ready and willing to render assistance in these matters.

2.15 p.m.

The hon. member made one point here which must interest every member of this Cumber, and it is that where you have not got a particular Specialist at the hospital, arrangements are made for the person to receive treatment at a hospital either in Jamaica or Trinidad. I quite agree with that policy that if a person cannot pay, then the Government of Barbados under this Medical Aid Scheme should pay. A question has been occupying my mind in this Chamber, however, and if the Minister cannot answer me now, he can do so on another occasion. I can see your sending a person to Trinidad and paying, but I have always believed that those who can pay should pay for those who cannot. If you send somebody to Trinidad, you have to pay the passage and the surgeon's fee for the operation, but I want to know if when you send someone to Jamaica, after having satisfied yourself that he cannot pay and you pay the passage, you also pay the surgeon in spite of the contribution we are making to the West Indies University of which the University Hospital is part. I would be the first person to protest in the Estimates if after making that substantial contribution to the University which includes the teaching hospital and where you have training, Specialists and so on, you have to pay for Specialist services, in the case of Trinidad, I can see you paying the passage and for the hospital services, but in this case, the Minister should make the position clear.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, before the Minister answers, I should like to thank him for the reply he gave to the matter I raised. There is, however, one point I should like to make, and it is that I do not consider making this gentleman a coach as a pre-condition to appointing him if you consider his services can be useful. You can use his services and then at your convenience allow him to become a coach, because it depends on where you are going to send him and what kind of coaching you are going to provide him with, because you have undertaken some things already. Football is being played here on a wider scale than before all through the year. You have the soft-shoe football together with the B.A.F.A., and I should like to see this young man being appointed into your services and then you can utilise him for whatever needs you have, because if you send him on a training course, he would have to give up his present job, and I feel his services can be of use to this

Government in that department, even if you send him abroad to be a coach. He is not Spanish speaking, but I should like the hon. member to know that south of our border in Venezuela, Columbia and such places people play football at a higher standard than we in Barbados, and a Brazilian coach is used to train the teams to play against the English.

On this question of the Stadium, I should like to see a strong and powerful National Council of Sport appointed to deal with this question of national issues.

I do not intend to enter into this matter too much, but with regard to the point which the hon. member raised on medical aid, I should like to caution the Minister on what the Leader of the Opposition has attempted to draw him out. We contribute to the West Indies University as one of its participating territories, but we have no more right than anybody else. The hon. member enquired whether the surgeons are going to charge fees since we have a Medical Aid Scheme in Barbados. Is the hon. member suggesting because you have a Medical Aid Scheme here, that as such you have no obligation to pay fees to surgeons in Jamaica? If you are going to say that, you are not sending them to be experimented on; you are sending them to be treated; and if you send a person to a Neurologist in Jamaica and say that

the patient from Barbados should not pay because we are making a contribution to the University of the West Indies, I do not see how that can square off with your Medical Aid Scheme, because the Medical Aid Scheme is meant to assist persons to get medical attention where such attention is not available in Barbados. I understand medical aid to mean assistance in circumstances where a person cannot pay, and the medical aid which Barbados provides would assist him. If you can get the surgeons or anybody to perform the operation or provide treatment without accepting fees, you may encourage that; but do not set out, because you are contributing to the University of the West Indies that as a condition of accepting people for aid you need not pay the Specialist. You are giving aid to the University as a University to provide these things for the teaching section; but you are not giving aid to the University as a means that all the people who take sick in the West Indies should be accommodated there. From the point of view of the physical facilities, they would not be able to accommodate all even if they could pay.

The impression that is being given, Mr. Chairman, is that it is all right to pay when a person goes to Trinidad for this kind of treatment because you do not provide Trinidad with any kind of assistance, but that you should not pay the surgeons at the West Indies Hospital in Jamaica because you provide a contribution. If you carry that to its logical conclusion, it will mean that because you make a contribution to the University of the West Indies, every student would have the right to go to the University as long as he is bright enough to get in, and because we contribute 10 to the University, they should admit him whether or not he is bright. That seems to be logical because you are saying that because Barbados is providing a Medical Aid Scheme, there should be no charge by the surgeon at the University for these cases. What kind of condition is that? Is it a condition of contract that every doctor who is a Specialist at the teaching hospital has to accept cases on which he has to perform operations from any part of the West Indies, and no fee is to be paid to him because a Medical Aid Scheme is in operation? You would have to send that to the University authorities to know if this is going to be a free scheme.

2.25 p.m.

If fees are available, you cannot in one breath say, that they are entitled to fees, and in another breath tell them that they are not entitled to any fees. If you are to set up that as a condition of employment, you will have to set up your own standards. Other people contribute too; and if that is the situation, you will see then what would be the position. The people in the United Kingdom who make a contribution to the National Health Scheme have been supporting the University and they have a free scheme in London; therefore, if you say that you are transferring this to London, that is what really the hon. member can mean. If you say that you have a Medical Aid Scheme, you must try and get as much of that facility as can be granted to you.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, let us for argument say that at the West Indies University Hospital you have in one area two million people and you give aid to it. At this teaching Hospital it is expected that you would have a Specialist in every branch of medicine and surgery. What I am suggesting is that after you have made investigation and you are satisfied that the Orthopaedic Surgeon whom you cannot afford to carry here is needed, what is wrong with saying that a person from Antigua could go to the University hospital and benefit from a scheme like this? I feel that if the arrangements are made, the persons who benefit should pay whatever little he can pay, and the investigating officer here should be in a position to give you all the facts. I would like to suggest to him, without being considered to be unnecessarily offensive

to anybody, that the University Hospital should be given all the facts. All of these people who are Specialists in their particular field were people who were taught at these Universities and were able to reach the top of their profession. These places are usually used for the benefit of getting the knowledge so that they can be able to charge the people who can pay,

All I am suggesting to the hon. member is that there should be an investigation made first in order to find out if a person can pay. There may be only three cases which you will have for the entire year with the contribution which we make to the West Indies University College of which the University College Hospital is part of the University; therefore, if the professor in Orthopaedic Surgery - he is not really an Orthopaedic Surgeon, he is a Professor - has got to perform on a case from here why it cannot be done in the same way as if the person was in Jamaica? If in Jamaica, tomorrow, a person could not pay for the treatment done at the University College Hospital, they would still have the case done. As a matter of fact, doctors are only too glad to have such cases to deal with because in a population of two million people, cases of this sort are very rare indeed. The fees of an Orthopaedic Surgeon owing to that would be so much that you would hardly be able to pay them; therefore, I say these Specialists should be there for the benefit of all concerned.

I admire the Hon. Minister for giving the facts from the point of view of having investigated that the person could not pay. All I am saying is that, having made the technical arrangements, you pay the full fee; but I submit that of the fees which you pay the Orthopaedic Surgeon or any Specialist, part is paid from Barbados, and that part which is paid from Barbados should cover everybody in Barbados. That is the whole idea about a teaching Hospital or a University Hospital. What else do you think it is than a University Teaching Hospital? That is the reason for having a University Hospital. The hon. member knows that there are hospitals in the United States where you can pay a Specialist a tremendous amount of money, but the same Specialists go to other Hospitals where you can get the same care just because of their gaining the experience. They do that because the people whom they can kill there prevent them from killing possibly those who can pay \$500.

I would still like to hear the Hon. Minister's views on
this matter.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a lot of ado about nothing because we pay no fees to the Surgeon. What we pay is return air passage and we also pay the maintenance for the persons in the Hospital. In Jamaica, it is 72 cents a day. It depends on how many days you remain there, but the main cost is the return passage. What carries up the cost of this scheme is when you have to send a nurse along with a child. If the person is a child, you have to send a nurse along with the child. For example, we had to send along a nurse on an occasion, and this meant that you had to pay two return air passages.

Sir, there is just this one point which I want to mention in connection with the point made about sport. The hon. member mentioned something about academic qualifications. What difference is there between a person with academic qualifications and the same Reggie Haynes, Seymour Nurse or Charles Griffith? The mere fact that the

Government employed these two shows that we are not concerned with academic qualifications as we

are concerned about the amount of prowess which they have in the sport which we employed them to do.

2.35 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT:

The only difference is that none of the people in the past has been appointed permanently.

The question that Head 38 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 42 - PROBATION SERVICE Head 42 - Probation Service - was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$123,456 do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

The CH4RMAN reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for half an hour.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question that this sitting be now suspended for half an hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

On reassembling,

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum present and I ask that the bell be rung.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I thank the hon. member for drawing that matter to my attention. Let the bell be rung.

On the bell being rung, a quorum was obtained,

Mr. SPEAKER:

Immediately prior to the suspension of the sitting the House was in Committee of Supply.

FURTHER GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker. I am asking leave to give notice of two Money Resolutions at this stage.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member may give notice of those Resolutions according to his request.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to authorise the Government to waive the repayment by the Transport Board of the sum of

\$2,253,904.45 and to place the sum of \$600,000 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1964-65, Part II - Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1964-65, No. 58 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution,

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$1,800 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimate 1964-65, Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1964-65 No. 59 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER:

As I pointed out a moment ago, the House was in Committee of Supply immediately before the suspension of the sitting.

QUESTION TIME

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as I intimated earlier today, there are Replies to Questions ready and I propose to give the Replies to those Questions at this stage, if hon. members are in their places. Consequently, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is now Question Time. I am informed that answers are ready to Questions Nos. 8, 18 and 23. Question No. 8 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. George.

Mr. LOWE:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Health

Is the Government aware that Orderlies, Cooks Maids and Carpenters who have been employed at the General Hospital for over four years have now been subjected to educational tests?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Government state the reason? If not, will the Government issue a directive to cease this practice?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the Reply to the hon. member's Question is as follows-

No Orderlies, Cooks, Maids or Carpenters who have been employed at the General Hospital either on a temporary or permanent basis for over four years have been subjected to educational tests.

3.20 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Parliamentary Question No. 18 stands in the name of the hon. Junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I refuse to hear any reply from the Hon. Minister on this question, because when you were out of the Chamber, the Chairman of Committees allowed him to read the same question and give the reply in Committee, and since the Chairman has allowed him to break the Rules of this House, I refuse to take any reply from the Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I understand that the hon. Junior member for St. Joseph is not disposed to put the question.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I rose on a point of order before the hon. member was finished. I am objecting to the statement on the grounds that it was completely erroneous and unfounded that while the House was in Committee of Supply, I gave the House the answer to this question. What I did was this; During discussion in Committee of Supply, the issue of which this question is the subject matter arose, and in answer to this issue, since this question and reply were both relevant, I referred to the question and the reply since the hon. junior member for St. Joseph himself was a participant in the debate. Since.

as I said, the question at issue during the debate was the same as the subject matter, the only way I could give the Government's answer in the debate was by stating what was the reply to the question tabled by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph as he was in the debate. This is nothing at all to do with the formal reply to the question which will now be given during question time. There was not two issues; there was one issue in the debate, and it was purely a coincidence that we had the reply today, and whether or not we had the reply, that would be the only reply to give during the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Parliamentary Question No. 23/1964, stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. BATSON:

Mr. Speaker, the Question is as follows- To enquire of the Appropriate Minister-

Is Government aware of the fact that Mrs. Beryl Earle a domestic at the Saint Thomas' Almshouse, has, for upwards of 28 years, performed the duties of cleaning the Mortuary at the said Almshouse without ever having received remuneration therefor?

Will Government take appropriate action to compensate Beryl Earle for the said work?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows-

"The Government is aware that Mrs. Beryl Earle, a domestic servant employed at the St. Thomas Infirmary has for several years performed the duties of cleaning the Mortuary attached to the Infirmary without additional remuneration therefor. The case of Mrs. Earle is under consideration, and also similar cases in relation to the Mortuaries at other Infirmaries, and it is expected that a decision will shortly be made."

Mr. SPEAKER:

That concludes the Questions to which, I have been advised, Oral Replies are ready.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1964-65 No. 55

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

Mr. Chairman, the sum of \$4,000 was voted in the Estimates for 1964-65, part II- Capital. Head 7, Agriculture, Item 1. - Soil Conservation. This amount has proved inadequate to the end of the financial year and the sum of \$50,161 is now required to supplement this provision to meet expenses for work in the Scotland District for the remainder of the financial year.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to this Resolution, but I am only putting a point of view to the Minister. The Soil Conservation work is a very long term- project, and the Government has already voted \$400,000 and now requires \$50,000 more, and may be in our generation we might not get the benefit of this project. I have been informed that the Government would be well advised in a matter of this character to allow a team of people who do this work and have the equipment, do this

work and pay them for it, because this is the sort of thing that can go annually, and you may find yourself for the next ten years committed to the expenditure of \$1/2 million yearly. You should have some consultants in matters like this Instead of doing it departmentally. I am no expert on this, but I have been told that you can spend endless money on this, because if you are doing it departmentally, you cannot do it as a team of experts would, because your department has other things to deal with. I throw that out to know if this has been put to the Government. It is better to find out what it is really going to cost this Government for rehabilitating that area, and find out if it is not a job to give some land project company which deals with these things. If you travel to South America, you see large stretches of land where soil erosion has taken place, and one who has travelled from Colombia down to Mexico and to places like Nicaragua and other South American countries can see soil erosion taking place. You should get somebody who is more experienced in dealing with large areas of land and rehabilitating it; otherwise you may spend a small fortune in doing it and not get it done satisfactorily.

3.30 p.m.

I mention that because it was drawn to my attention. I am no expert on it. The person who drew it to my attention knows more about it than I do.

Mr. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I am not in a position to say if the Government is spending this money wisely or not, because I am not an expert in this matter. However, I still know that Government spends large sums of

money on an area and they continue to spend on it afterwards. I have also heard from more than one person as well as from experts that when you go into an area, you cannot leave it. My opinion is that that sounds like an "Obeah Man" advising his client because how is it that you can get in and cannot get out? The same road which carried you in should be able to bring you out.

Sir, I have been always talking about areas such as the Spa, St. Bernards Village and part of Mount Wilton. That is an area where life is involved and not only land, because it is an area where one may go to sleep tonight and tomorrow morning you may not see anybody there at all. They are at the brink of a breakaway and this area was so for a very long time.

All of the Ministers have visited this area and they are surprised to see the condition of it. I feel something should be done by now so as to conserve that land area. Instead of putting all your forces at one place, I feel that it should be divided into half, and if you have two or four bulldozers, you can make a start in this area. Let some of your experts go up there and do something too while the others continue the work in St. Andrew. I do not know the exact spot where they are working now, but I do know that no houses are there and there are no persons living there at all. In places like the Spa, St. Bernard's Village and the River, there are two schools, there is a church and other buildings. Soon and very soon, if nothing is done, everything there will go all the way down the gully, and I am sure if the Soil Conservation Officer does something there, there is the possibility of saving some, if not all, of the property there.

With your voting this large sum of money, I feel that the Government should take it upon itself to say what it wants to do; they should not take it from the authorities. These experts tell you things and they put them in such a nice way that you must be able to work your own common-sense in order to try and convince them that that is an area where there are no properties, and this is an area where there are properties, and there is the possibility that a morning will come and you will find all the people who live there down in the gully. Therefore, if you are going to do something and spend money on it, spend this money on making right the area where there are people and buildings there so as to save those people and their properties.

I am appealing to the Hon. Minister. I am sure the Minister in charge has visited the site already, and he will

be in sympathy with the position and will use his influence with those experts and bring down a sum of money so that they will soon be able to start to do something with that particular area - the Spa, St. Bernards Village and Mount Wilton.

Mr. COWARD:

Sir, as a representative of the parish of St. Joseph, I would just like to say that there are certain parts of the land in St. Joseph which happen to be in the Scotland area. I am supporting this Resolution with the hope that some work of this kind will be done in the parish of St. Joseph. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has mentioned certain parts of St. Joseph - the Spa, St. Bernards Village and part of Mount Wilton, - which needs to be done and I agree with him. The last Government in their interest put up a heavy wall school at St. Bernard's Village, and soon from now, if something is not done to protect it, you will find it somewhere down in the gully. I, myself, visited St. Andrew some time ago with the Soil Conservation Officer and I must say that he is doing a very good job; but I do feel that the

Government should do very much more to educate the people in this area as to the use of that department.

What I do feel, Mr. Chairman, is that during the Government's Programme, the Soil Conservation Officer or some qualified person should be able to enlighten the people in this Island of the work which is being done there. Failing to enlighten the people about what is being done would certainly cause adverse comment and so prejudice the minds of the general public. So with these remarks, I must appeal to the Government to do something, especially in so far as St. Bernard's area is concerned.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Hon. senior member for St. Peter, I would like to draw to his attention this is a very long term project and I quite agree with him that this project would cost in the vicinity of over \$60 million. This area contains one-seventh of the entire area of the Island of Barbados and if it is tackled, and if the money can be found to tackle it over a period of ten years, it would be a very good thing for the Island. Unfortunately, this Island is not in the position to spend that money because \$6 million a year is approximately one-fifth of the yearly revenue; therefore, we will have to look to outside sources for the money.

3.40 p.m.

We have got to look for sources of outside help, and this amount of money which we are spending here is just an amount to keep the temporary repairs going until some means can be found for financing this project.

With regard to the remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and his colleague, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, I should like to say that I have visited on more than one occasion some of the sites mentioned by them. We feel that there is need for certain houses to be removed from this particular area. It is a peculiar circumstance how these lands can slip and move away. There is a formation of water beneath the surface which will penetrate through tracks for as deep as 400 feet beneath the surface and form an underground collection, and the whole area of the land will move. The Soil Conversationist must find the sources of these drains and take away that water from certain areas. We would not be able actually to deal with these areas, and the houses will have to be reallocated and the entire area dealt with before any houses can be replaced there. We are doing everything possible because we realise that one-seventh of the land is involved and some of these houses are in a very dangerous position. The projects are not only carried out by the Soil Conservationist; there is also a Geologist, Dr. Manning, who will advise us on the soil conservation and Dr. Maelstrom has carried out surveys within this area.

We have now reached a satisfactory method of dealing with these areas. In the first stages, a fair amount of money was lost by way of carrying out experiments. The soil was removed and some of these places have not recovered from the changing over of the soil. We have to remove the top soil completely and replace it so that cultivation can take place. We have a system which will keep

this matter under control. The expenditure is in the vicinity of about \$10 million, and if we had to carry out all of this work it would mean the life span of two or three generations. Unless we can get a loan to help us with this project; we will not be able to carry out any extensive repairs on a large scale.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of two Resolutions in Committee.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE LEASE OF LAND
AT WATERFORD TO THE BARBADOS SUGAR
PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION**

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking that Order No. 7 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Hon. Minister is asking leave to take Order No. 7 as the next Order of the Day, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted. (PAUSE). There being no objection, leave is granted, Accordingly, Order No. 7 is the instant Order of the Day. It stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries and it is to move the passing of the following Resolution-

Resolution to approve the grant of a lease to the Barbados Sugar Producers' Association (Incorporated) of approximately four acres of land situate at Waterford for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a research unit in agronomy.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks the approval of the Legislature to enable the Government to grant a lease of approximately four acres of land situated at Waterford to the Barbados Sugar Producers' Association for the purpose of carrying out experiments.

3.50 p.m.

This land was previously used by the Irrigation Board. The Sugar Producers' Federation are prepared to carry out experiments in agronomy and pass on all information received not only to Government but to all people employed in agriculture. The amount of land is four acres and is set out there as 'all that certain parcel of land formerly occupied by the Irrigation Board for experimental purposes, containing by estimation four acres or thereabouts and situate at Waterford in the parish of Saint Michael in this

island for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a research unit in Agronomy.\"

The Addendum is clearly set out and reads as follows:-

In accordance with section 5(1) of the Executive Committee (Vesting of Property and Transfer of Functions) Act, 1964-12, this Resolution seeks to obtain the authority of the Legislature to enable the Government to grant a lease of approximately 4 acres of land at Waterford formerly used by the Irrigation Board for agronomical research work, to the Barbados Sugar Producers' Association Inc. for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a research unit in agronomy. This Association has for the

past 15 years maintained a Sugar Technological Research Unit and now wishes to extend its activities to agronomical research work in the field. The Association has given the assurance that they will work in close collaboration with the Ministry and make any of the results obtained from their work available to the Government and to all agriculturalists.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

THE INCOME TAX (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1955

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned member for St. John.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 8 be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER; It is hardly necessary to put the question, since it follows the last Order done which was Order No. 7.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member asking leave to take charge of this Item in the absence of the Hon. Premier?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

I am, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Hon. Leader of the House is seeking its indulgence to take charge of Order No. 8 which stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned member for St. John, and if there is no objection,

leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted,

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple amendment to the Income Tax Act, 1921, and it seeks to provide that a reduced rate of income tax of 12 1/2 per cent on interest paid to non-residents will apply only where the interest results from a transaction aimed at promoting industrial, commercial, scientific, educational or other development in the island. This restriction is necessary to enable relief from the normal rates of Income tax granted by section 4A in Bar-bados to qualify for relief from income tax in the United Kingdom under the arrangements made between Barbados and the United Kingdom for the avoidance of double taxation.

You are aware, Mr. Speaker, that a special reduction of 12 1/2 per cent on income tax was imposed in order to assist in the economic and other development of the island. Non-residents investing money for this purpose are enabled to pay income tax at the rate of 12 1/2 per cent as compared with the normal rates of 40 per cent, and it is hoped that this concession will attract additional capital investment in the island. In order to avoid the incidence of double taxation in special circumstance a, this amendment is necessary to the old 1921 Act to order to give relief from the normal rates of taxation granted by the Income Tax Act to qualify for relief from income tax in the United Kingdom. There is nothing complicated about it, and I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, while I appreciate what the Hon. Minister has said, I should like further enlightenment on this matter, because this Bill seeks to amend section 4A of the Income Tax Act, 1921, to give relief to nonresidents, and will apply only where the interest results

from a transaction aimed at promoting industrial, commercial, scientific, educational or other development in the island. I am not getting up merely to oppose the Bill, but I should like to be enlightened on this matter. Let us say that a resident in Barbados had \$1/2 million to invest in similar transactions; then since this concession is only for non-residents, this would have a tendency of preventing what we have been aiming at, and that is to get local people with capital to invest it in Barbados in developing industrial, scientific and other schemes rather than invest it abroad. The Hon. member is Minister of Trade and he must have made a study of this Bill before he brought it in. Although this Bill is in the name of the Hon. Minister of Finance, it certainly has a tremendous lot to do with the Hon. Minister of Trade who would be at fault with the number of applicants who want to invest money for the purpose of developing.

4.00 p.m.

I would like to hear the Hon. Minister on this, because I am not quite satisfied that he is right when he said that against the people in the Island who must pay 40%, nonresidents should pay 12 1/2% on interest. I want to hear something on this because there are people in this community who have money

and who will be willing to invest in projects. What would be the position? I do not want to call names, but I can call the name of a local firm. I would like the Minister to tell me mere on this,

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I would like the Hon. Minister to explain that to me.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I have the right to speak. Mr. MOTTLEY Let the Hon. Minister explain.

Mr. WALCOTT:

This is one of the things which people have been asking for ever since. All that the Objects and Reasons say is that this applies to non-residents. By the Income Laws of Barbados, they tell you that the person who is to pay the income tax should pay them where he resides. These people have nothing to do with Barbados a lone but if they come to Barbados you would tax the person in Barbados.

This is an inducement to a person who is non-resident. In other words, if you want them to come here, you offer them an inducement. The United States of America give you inducements. They sent a Minister to the United Kingdom to investigate the matter and they were told that they give non-residents concessions if they came there which they would not give to U.S. residents. Therefore, I consider that what is being done is just an incentive to these people. This does not militate against the local persons. You offer to a person outside of Barbados several other concessions which you do not offer to local persons. This does not militate against the Barbados investor. What you will find is that it will stimulate more investment in Barbados. The local investor would not be able to get the same concession, and every Barbadian knows that if he gets money coming in from outside, it is to the benefit of everybody concerned because industrial activity is created and there is more movement of money.

This Bill means that you are offering an inducement to foreign capital, so to speak, to invest here; therefore, it is an investment incentive. This is one of the pieces of incentive legislation which is necessary if we are going to follow the lead taken by other countries. As I have said, it does not militate against the Barbadian in that way, and if you were to say that it militated against Barbados, you will have to say that it militates against established industries. You give the textile manufacturer concessions which you do not give to Barbadians, but it does not mean that the Barbadians are not pioneers.

Moreover, I think what is being done by this Bill is what the House agreed to already. I think the proposals in this Bill were things which were enacted in the Budget Proposals; therefore, if there were objections to them, there

should have been objections to them then. That is as far as I remember. This is one of the things which was contained in the Budget Proposals to which the hon. member gave his approval.

Mr. GODOARD:

Mr. Speaker, this is quite sound legislation because there is no objection against a person bringing in capital, especially when it is capital for development purposes. Every country in the world today is

trying its best to get foreign capital into the country. This amendment, I believe, was asked of this Government some years ago because it would stimulate foreign capital into Barbados in any form, whether it was for industrial purposes or for any other purpose. If a foreign investor was offered 12 1/2 per cent against 40 per cent, he would be induced to come here.

I know of some companies which came here but had to leave because of the Government not having this exemption on the Statute Book. If you want more investment here, we must find foreign capital. If it is not found locally, it must be found elsewhere. I am very glad to see that this Government is prepared to welcome foreign capital.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, there are some local firms.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has already spoken. He should have known that.

If there is no other hon. member desirous of speaking, the Hon. Leader of the House can now reply.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, this legislation was designed to attract foreign investment in the country. The income tax deduction which you give to businesses in the Island is 40 per cent, but we are lowering this to 12 1/2 per cent to non-residents in order to offer them an inducement. There are certain anomalies in this double taxation. If you reduce the local taxation payable by nonresidents, at the same time you may frustrate the whole taxation level by making him liable to higher taxes where he lives.

4.10 p.m.

I do not know if the hon. member understands what I mean. There the United Kingdom itself, in an Act of 1961, made provision for relief in these cases of double taxation. All we are doing here now in this Bill is to ensure that nonresidents who invest money for the purposes specified in the Bill, are entitled to being relieved of double taxation. This does not apply to residents; it could not apply to them. As the hon. senior member for St. Peter has pointed out, it could only apply to non-residents whose point of payment of income tax is normally inside the country of residence.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

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

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 HO use went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BAT SON in the Chair.

Clauses I to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

PUBLIC LOANS (SUPPLEMENTARY SINKING FUND) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the honourable and learned senior member for St. John- To move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the establishment of a Supplementary Sinking Fund.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, what we are actually doing.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

I take it that the hon. senior member for St. Philip is asking leave to take charge of this Bill.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is seeking the leave of the House to take charge of this Bill which stands in the name of the honourable and learned senior member for St. John. If there is no objection, leave will be granted. (PAUSE). There being no objection, leave is granted and the hon. member may proceed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

What we are actually doing in this Bill is to make legal provision for the creation of

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT:

Has this Bill been circulated? I have not seen it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I will make an enquiry as to that.

After consulting with the Clerk.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am informed that this Bill has been circulated. Let the hon. member proceed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

What I was saying, Mr. Speaker, is what we are actually doing in this Bill is to create a Supplementary Sinking Fund. You will notice, Sir, from the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill that the authority for the creation of Sinking Funds for the redemption of loans raised by the Government has actually been provided in the various Loan Acts themselves. In other words, when we raise a loan under the Act which gives the authority to raise that loan, we provide for the Sinking Fund to redeem that loan. Where the Sinking Fund is in excess of the amount required to redeem a loan, the excess has, up to the present time, been paid into the General Revenues of the island, because there is no provision in the Act to use this excess for any other purpose. In view of the increase in the public debt of the island in recent years, it is considered desirable that excesses from specific Sinking Funds, instead of being put into General Revenue, should be paid into a Supplementary Sinking Fund and applied towards the redemption of other public loans.

The purpose of this Bill therefore is to make it possible that excesses from Sinking Funds for the redemption of loans be applied to other purposes and not to be placed into the General Revenue.

4.20 p.m.

In other words, Sir, the actual deposits to this Supplementary Sinking Fund will be made from the surpluses accruing from the Sinking Funds for the redemption of specific loans; so that Government will have the authority now to put these surpluses to the Supplementary Sinking Fund the establishment of which this Bill will authorise, and you will not have to pay them any longer to general revenue. Clause 3 sets out what I have already said, that is, the implementation of proposals contained in paragraph 2 and also to provide for the investment in approved securities of any sums standing to the credit of the Supplementary Sinking Fund but which are not immediately required for the purposes of the specific fund. It is merely a matter of

facilitating the redemption of additional loans from Sinking Funds authorised under specific Acts for special loans.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time. Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, this may look simple, but I would like to do some rethinking on this matter. This is not as simple as the hon. member says, and I would have liked the Minister of Finance to be present, because the Minister of Finance and his members were against Sir Alfred Savage when he introduced an Equalisation Fund in Barbados on the grounds that you were taking money out of circulation and putting it aside without any specific purpose. Now, unless there has been a new system of public financing to the age old method, the whole purpose of the Sinking Fund was for the future generations to pay for some of the things they have. Now there are two sides to that. If your Sinking Fund has exceeded your

requirements, there is nothing wrong with the money going back into General Revenue, because the Sinking Fund is a charge on General Revenue, since you take the charges for the redemption of loans out of the annual Estimates and put them into the Sinking Fund year by year; so if you borrow money on loan, the only way you can pay back is through the Sinking Fund method, and you only get the Sinking Fund by taking out so much money and putting it into the Sinking Fund annually.

If you say, Mr. Chairman, that you want to create a comprehensive Sinking Fund, we would have to go more into that, because it might induce the Government to borrow money more lavishly against a Sinking Fund than it was borrowing money against its real economy. Let us suppose you bought a water boat and intended to make a Sinking Fund of so much per annum to replace it, but you find that the boat lasts longer than you estimated; you will find therefore that you have more money in the Sinking Fund than will buy a new boat; so the excess money in the Sinking Fund to redeem your loan is paid back into General Revenue, and reduces the budgetary proposals you will need in the year; therefore your taxation policy would be reflected in one way or another. However you try to juggle public finances, it could come back in the same way; but as you are budgeting on an annual basis, I would like to know from the Minister what has been the general problem. The hon. member says that the idea is not to put the surpluses into General Revenue. I should like to ask why, because each loan has its own Sinking Fund. Even in future you would still have to set up a Sinking Fund for any loan or project since you cannot have it consolidated; you have to budget for it.

I am not clear, Mr. Speaker, as to the merits or demerits of having the Fund as such to be invested, because I have not had any explanation on that as against the present system. I have no particular objection one way or the other to public financing, but I want to know why you are doing this because you do not want to make a change just for the sake of having a change. If this goes into general revenue, what is going to be the effect of money in the General Revenue as against putting it in a Fund?

My only objection, Mr. Speaker, - and it would not be a serious one - is that following the thinking of the hon. member, this is an Equalisation Fund of a different character. This is an Equalisation Fund for your Sinking Fund arrangements, and I remember that the Premier was a bitter opponent to the Equalisation Fund. If you are now creating this Fund, I want to know what are the merits in it, because money from Sinking Funds goes back into General Revenue and nobody loses. As a matter of fact, the community gets the benefit of whatever it is, because it is reflected in what you budget for from year to year. All I would say is that it redeems any of the loans faster. I do not know if there is any particular merit in the financing methods that you use, because fundamentally it is all Government money and it is a question of how you utilise the money. The hon. member says that if you use it for investment purposes and not put it into General Revenue, you are not much less in General Revenue in budgeting from year to year than you would be if you had used it; so unless this is a new method of financing, I do not know that there is any

financial merit to be gained by doing it this way, or whether it is another convenient way. I hope, however, that it would not mean that this would be an open door for loans against the Sinking Fund as against loans against your general economy. I too feel that the hon. member should be able to tell us something more. It does not seem to me to be an urgent matter, and I would prefer to hear more on this as to what are the merits as compared with what has been done in the past, and whether these things have broken down. 4.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER:

When the hon. senior member for St. Peter arose Just now, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was on his feet almost simultaneously.

Mr. GODDARD:

Sir, I find this Bill to be a quite sound one. We have, as the Hon. Minister has said, a large public debt and it is a growing debt. If we can give the investors the assurance that Government is out to protect their interests by putting aside a Sinking Fund to meet services of their loans, it will mean a great impetus for investors to lend this Government money.

A Sinking Fund can provide for things other than loans. You can have a water boat Sinking Fund which may run for 20 years because when we have to replace a water boat or a tug, the sum required for that replacement is almost half as much as the provision which you made for it, because the value of money is falling and the cost of replacement is great. To put Sinking Fund money into the General Revenue can easily be considered to be bad business, and the establishment of a Supplementary Sinking Fund for any service that may be available is a quite sound thing to do. The investing public will have more confidence in the Government because they would realise that there are adequate funds available for the service of their loans. I think that this is a very conservative and sound arrangement to set aside investment money in its right place. I commend the Government for this. This is sound legislation.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, while I may agree with the hon. member who has just sat down, I need quite a lot more clarification on this - after. I listened to the Hon. Minister at the beginning his introductory remarks and I was thinking about the matter all the time. Of course, I could not exactly following, but reading the Objects and Reasons, especially when I read paragraph 2, it brought my mind to the fact that this is a Sinking Fund to other Sinking Funds. The Hon. Minister said that this was a Supplementary Sinking Fund, but this seems to me to be a sinking Fund to other Sinking Funds, or a Sinking Fund to a Sinking Fund.

It is anticipatory in paragraph two, which reads:

"However, in view of the increase in the Public Debt of the Island in recent years it is considered desirable that excesses from specific sinking funds, instead of being paid into General Revenue, should be paid into a Supplementary Sinking Fund and applied towards the redemption of other public loans."

The Government has now discovered that owing to the size of its public payments, a fund might now be borne into this Supplementary Sinking Fund.

I would have expected the Hon. Minister to expatiate a bit on this and to tell us how under the circumstances this can help; whether it is that the public debt is now so large that something must be done and it is now felt that you should have this Sinking Fund. Why it is now felt that this individual Sinking Fund is needed because of the excesses accruing to these other Sinking Funds?

I feel that hon. members of this Chamber should have received a little bit more information on this matter. Why did you put, in paragraph two, this little bit of information vouchsafed? I think the Hon. Minister would do us some service if he can tell us when he comes to reply something of the growing

size of our Sinking Funds, and would state something as regards all the other Sinking Funds. The Government should have given us a little more information than

the little bit which has been granted us at the hands of the Minister who finds himself in charge of this Bill. May be, when we know something of the size of our public debt and the rate at which this is increasing and when we know the picture concerning the extent of this Supplementary Sinking Fund, we would feel a little bit more at ease.

Sir, I do not have the exact feelings of the hon. junior member for Christ Church when he mentioned the scope of the Supplementary Sinking Fund. I do not think that this Sinking Fund will reduce so much the appreciable size of the Sinking Funds as he envisaged. I would normally think when Government has to replace something or Government wants to borrow that it would regard that the Sinking Fund is an appreciable slice. I may be wrong, but I venture my opinion. However, if these Sinking Funds do mean an appreciable sum of money, may be, the Government is wise to establish such a Fund for the use of these excess funds, but I think a little more information should be granted us.

I hope when the Hon. Minister comes to reply he would give us much more information as to the size and the rate at which these funds are increasing, the extent to which these Sinking Funds are accruing and how they can pool together these Sinking Funds to this Supplementary Sinking Fund, or if this is a Sinking Fund to a Sinking Fund, however you think of it if they can throw some light on the reason for the little information which is contained in paragraph two.

4.40 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If no other hon. member seeks to contribute to this debate, the hon. introducer may exercise his right of reply.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I must begin by conceding that paragraph 2 of the "Object and Reasons" of this Bill might give rise to some of the apprehensions which have been voiced by the hon. junior member for St. Peter. I am afraid that I have not got the figures to give him as to the extent of the public debt and the extent of the various Sinking Funds which have been established under the various loan Acts, but this information will be supplied in detail in the Three-year Development Plan which will be brought down to this House shortly. Hon. member will then be in a position, and will have the opportunity, if not before, to acquaint themselves more accurately with the situation as regards the island's public debt. However, Sir, I do want to point out to the hon. senior member for St. Peter that the conception behind the creation of this fund is entirely different from the conception behind the establishment of the Equalisation Fund to which he said the Hon. Minister of Finance took exception some years ago. The establishment of this Supplementary Sinking Fund is not basically to utilise any large accretions of public funds.

What is the position, Mr. Speaker? Normally if the amount of money in the Sinking Fund is too much for the redemption of the particular loan, the excess is paid into the General Revenue. If the amount is not enough to redeem the loan, then you have to come to the Legislature and get an additional vote for the purpose of redeeming the loan. What has happened, as has so well been described by the hon. Junior

member for St. Peter, is that the public debt has risen considerably, and the apprehension on the part of the Government is that the amounts provided by the various Sinking Funds will not be sufficient to redeem loans when they become due. Therefore, we are creating this special Supplementary Sinking Fund in order to provide more money to redeem these loans when they become due. Before the public debt became so relatively excessive, the amount provided in the various loan Acts would be sufficient to redeem the loans. The Government would be very shortsighted indeed as to appreciate the state of affairs that the provision is not enough to redeem loans, and then when the time comes, just to present the Legislature with legislation for the relative difference between the Sinking Fund and the amount provided for the loans. We have a specific instance where the amount provided in the Sinking Fund was more than enough to redeem a particular loan. That was in February, last year. The amount of \$20,000 issued under the act of 1914 was redeemed leaving the amount in the Sinking

Fund of \$12,000. There were further instances of that where the funds were in excess of the amount required, By putting these amounts into the fund, we are creating a Supplementary Sinking Fund into which we will put these excesses, We have not got to fear that the amounts provided in the Sinking Fund will not be enough to redeem the loans under the increasing public debt. It may happen that, in addition to providing this Supplementary Sinking Fund and the individual Sinking Funds, we may still have to come to the Legislature for the differences. That may be so; I do not know. Everything depends on the amounts required to redeem the public debt.

I am quite sure that the hon. member knows good housekeeping and sound financing so as not to allow excesses in the existing Sinking Fund to revert to General Revenue since they were established primarily for the purpose of redeeming the loans. If they are more than what we want, we will put them into our special Sinking Fund. If you do not want the money, well you do not want it; but at least you will have the satisfaction of knowing that you have been budgeting wisely and preparing against the day when your Sinking Fund's are insufficient to meet the demands, and that the redemptions themselves will come from excesses of the Sinking Fund and we have not got to go back to our General Revenue. I am sure that hon. member will agree that the Government is pursuing a sound financial policy. As a matter of fact, we are doing two things simultaneously. The first thing is that we are not failing to provide for the exceptional volume of the public debt, and the next thing is that we are not waiting until the last moment, we are not sitting down and waiting to present the public with the differential between the amount we have and the amount which we require for the purpose of redeeming the outstanding loans.

Without saying anything more, Sir, I think that hon. members will agree with me that this Measure will create no hardship. On the contrary it will facilitate the redemption of loans. According to the knowledge we have, the amount we have for our Sinking Funds will not be enough to meet the demands.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

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

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 on the Bill, Mr. BAT SON in the Chair. 4.50 p.m.

Clauses 1 to 6 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded in each case by Hon. G. G. F ERCUSSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House; to move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the making, in certain circumstances, of Severance Payments to workers displaced as the direct result of the permanent closing of any sugar factory or cane syrup plant.

LEAVE TO RENUMBER RESOLUTION

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I want to seek the approval of the House at this stage to correct an error in the actual numeration of a Resolution passed last week. I think the number was printed wrong, and in order to regularise it, we have to change the number.

The position is that we passed two Resolutions last week; one for the sum of \$34,000 and another for \$43, both Supplementary Estimates. Now apparently there was a printer's error and both of these Resolutions were numbered No. 52 which would naturally be incorrect. We must have a consecutive number, and I am therefore asking for leave to change the number on the Resolution for \$43 to "52 A" while the one for \$34,000 remains as No. 52.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Hon. Leader of the House is craving its indulgence to deal with the matter which he has explained, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Leader of the House to deal with the matter which he has just explained, needs rectification in connection with two Resolutions which were passed in this Chamber last Tuesday.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am merely asking for leave to leave the Resolution for \$34,000 as No. 52 and to renumber the Resolution for \$43 as "52 A".

Mr. SPEAKER:

I take it the Hon. Leader of the House would have to make a motion in accordance with what he desires.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

I do not agree, Mr. Speaker. The Resolutions have already been passed, and I am merely asking for leave to renumber one.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Hon. Leader of the House is asking for leave to renumber the Resolution as he has intimated, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted, and the Resolution is accordingly renumbered.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that Government proposes to proceed any further on the Order Paper today, and I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 23rd February, 1965, at 12 noon.

Hon. A E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 5.00 p.m.