

# THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1955—56

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

*Tuesday 13th March, 1956.*

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 3 o'clock p.m. today.

*Present:*

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER; Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*); His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E.; Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Mr. T. O. BRYAN; Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN and Mrs. E. E. BOURNE.

*Prayers were read.*

### MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready for confirmation.

### GOVERNMENT NOTICES

*Government Notices were given as follows:—*

Hon'ble Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: (for the Premier): Resolution to place the sum of \$540 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955-56, No. 75 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon'ble R. G. MAPP: Resolution to sanction the "Exportation (Drawback of Duties on Cylinders containing locally manufactured Gases) Regulations, 1955"

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to consider the money Resolution of which I have just given notice.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO MR. TUDOR

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for five weeks' leave of absence on behalf of my col-

league, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, as from today.

*There being no objection, the leave asked for was granted.*

### ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, before you call the Orders of the Day, I should like to submit a motion which I submitted on the last occasion, and I sincerely hope that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph will not take exception to it on such grounds. I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph be appointed Chairman of Committees of this House.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. Michael be appointed Chairman of Committees for today's sitting.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am moving an amendment to that motion; it is that the hon. junior member for St. Michael be Chairman of Committees for the remainder of the Session. The reason why I am doing that is this: there is no point in this House making light of the offices of the House. The offices of this House carry with them certain emoluments, and how are you going to assess what emoluments are going to be paid in respect of these offices if you appoint somebody to act for one portion of the day? I make the amendment that the hon. junior member for St. Michael be Chairman of Committees for the remainder of the Session, otherwise we have no Chairman.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I find myself today in the same unfortunate position as that in which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph found himself at the last sitting of this House. Unfortunately for me, I am sitting beside the hon. junior member for St. Peter; but I would like to make the point, for the sake of the record that my sitting here has absolutely nothing to do with the motion which the hon. junior member for St. Peter has made. As a matter of fact, the making of that motion is a great surprise to me. I just want to place that position on record for the sake of clarity.

*The question that the hon. junior member for St. Michael be appointed Chairman of Committees for today's sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

## COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

*On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.*  
3.25 p.m.

## LEAVE TO TAKE MONEY RESOLUTIONS

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Acting Chairman, I am asking leave to be allowed to take charge of two Money Resolutions standing in the name of the Hon. Premier.

*There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. member.*

Supplementary Estimates 1955—56  
No. 53.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Acting Chairman, this Resolution is for Supplementary Estimates for the sum of \$8,012 and the Items are out in the Schedule to the Resolution.

## Police

The first Head is Police and the Notes to the Items set them out clearly. As regards the first Item, Clothing and Equipment, the Note reads as follows:—

“Certain items of clothing ordered from the Crown Agents for which there was provision in the 1954-55 Estimates, did not arrive before the end of that financial year. Consequently the sum of \$5,650 which had been earmarked to pay for this clothing remained unspent. The order has since arrived and its cost cannot be borne by the current year's vote. A revote of the unexpended balance mentioned above is now required.”

It is the usual thing we have been getting from time to time. Needless to say, we all deplore that a thing of this sort should occur but we have no other alternative except one or two things, either to pass it or reject it; and I am sure hon. members will not be in favour of rejecting it especially when we have received the goods.

Dealing with Item 34, Cleaning, Water and Light, the Note to it reads as follows:—

“Claims against this item, for which there was provision in the 1954-55 Estimates, were submitted too late for payment before the close of the financial year. The sum of \$1,627 remained unspent under this vote. These claims were subsequently charged against the current year's vote, but a revote of \$1,000 being part of the unexpended balance at 31st March, 1955 is required to meet necessary expenditure during the balance of this financial year.”

The next Item is 40, Incidentals. That has been found necessary owing to the bringing of two witnesses to the Island to give evidence at the Court of Grand Sessions for which no provision has been made. The expenditure was charged to the Police vote for incidentals in the current Estimates. This vote cannot bear this expenditure in addition to its normal commitments without being overspent. Supplementary provision of \$192 is now required to meet the normal commitments against this vote.

The next is Item 49, Subsistence allowance to N.C.O's and men on special duty and attending Courts. The note reads as follows:—

“The unforeseen costs in connection with the posting of members of the Police Force at Seawell for guard duty during the visit of four Canberras and one Hastings aircraft to Barbados from the 22nd to 25th August, 1955, amounting to \$145 were charged to this vote. As there was no provision for such expenditure this sum is needed to meet the normal commitments of this vote.”

Item 50 is Motor Transport. The note reads as follows:—

“Expenditure vouchers in respect of cost of upkeep of motor vehicles, for which there was provision in the 1954-55 Estimates, were submitted too late for payment within that financial year. At the 31st March, 1955, there was an unexpended balance of \$1,046 in the vote. The vouchers were subsequently charged to the current year's vote. A revote of \$800 being part of the amount which lapsed is now required to meet current costs under this item to the end of this financial year.”

In regards to Item 55, Fees and Expenses for instruction in First Aid, the note reads as follows:—

“The number of N.C.O's and men undergoing examinations in First Aid has increased during the year. The provision under this item is inadequate to meet the costs to the end of the financial year. A further \$25 is required.”

Then as regards the last Item under this Head—Item 62, Newspapers,—the note sets it out clearly. It is stated:—

“Certain claims under this item, for which there was provision in the 1954-55 Estimates, were received too late for payment before the close of the financial year. There remained an unexpended balance of \$160 in this vote. The claims were subsequently charged against the current year's vote. A revote of the unexpended balance mentioned above is now required to meet current commitments.”

## Barbados Regiment

The next Head to be dealt with is Head XXIV—Barbados Regiment, and the Item for which provision of \$40 is to be voted is for Insurance of Motor Transport. The note says:—

“An accident involving a motor lorry belonging to the Barbados Regiment has resulted in the loss of the “no-claim bonus” amounting to \$35.00 on the yearly premium paid for the insurance of the lorry. In addition the sum of \$24 has had to be paid towards the cost of repairs to the vehicle. These two amounts, which had not been budgeted for in this year's Estimates of Expenditure, have already been paid and the balance available under Item 25 is not sufficient to meet commitments to the end of the year.”

Mr. Acting Chairman, you will see all, more or less, are unforeseen except in one or two Items. Such as the Police arriving from overseas and the goods from Crown Agents arriving too late and the money has to be revoted. I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$8,012 do now pass.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Acting Chairman, I do not know who is responsible for the circulation of these Order Papers but whoever is responsible might have heard that I have resigned from the Chair but surely not from the House; therefore I should have received a copy of these papers. I will be glad if there would be an instruction to those persons who are responsible for the issuing of these papers that I am still a

member of this House and that I should be circulated with my Order Paper and the other accompanying papers.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Acting Chairman, I sympathise with the Government for having to bring forward such an old bill and ask for a revote for it. However, I doubt very much that you can altogether go more than one set of Estimates ahead and ask for a revote. You are talking about a revote when there is another set of Estimates already passed for 1956-57. This is for money which was voted in the 1954-55 Estimates.

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

**Supplementary Estimates 1955—56  
No. 74.**

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Acting Chairman, the next Resolution is for the sum of \$209 and it is for Refund to the St. Michael's Almshouse of Customs Duty and Package Tax on certain Items imported into the Island. It is quite customary to grant this refund. The goods comprise of nine bedsteads, two pairs of portable side rails and eight commode chairs with enamel pans and lids.

It is in accordance with the law and I beg to move that this Resolution for \$209 do now pass.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

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

*On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS; seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*

*On separate motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX the Resolutions were read a first, and second time and agreed to.*

**EXPIRING LAWS BILL**

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS granted Leave to take charge of Orders standing in the name of the Hon. Premier.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge not only of Order No. 2, but of all the Orders standing in the name of the Hon. Premier who is absent.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day now stands in the name of the Hon. Minister for Social Services: Second reading of a Bill to continue various expiring laws.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Order No. 2 is the usual Bill that comes before us at this time of the year to continue various expiring laws. They are in the Schedule as set out below. The most recent is the Anglican Church (Partial Suspension) Act, 1955; otherwise the others we are familiar with.

I beg to move the Bill be now read a second time.  
Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

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

*On motion of Hon. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN in the Chair.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the Preamble be postponed.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

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

*Clauses 1 & 2 were called and passed.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the Schedule stand part of the Bill.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

*The question was put and agreed to.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the Preamble do now stand part.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

*The question was put and agreed to.*

*On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*

*On separate motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Bill was read a third time and passed.*

**CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL)  
(AMENDMENT) ORDER NO. 5, 1956**

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day now stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services, to move the passing of the following Resolution: "Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 5 Order, 1956."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, there are a series of Orders on the Order Paper—Nos. 3 to 9, and 19 and 25 which were given notice of by the Premier before dealing with the Estimates.

The first is a brief Order entitled Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 5 Order, 1956. I think it was explained on that occasion and members are fully well acquainted with it. I do not think we need go over it.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I think I am entitled to get an explanation as to why there are so many Orders. Why should there be so many Orders of one nature? General Amendment from No. 5 to 9. Could not all these Orders be made as of one? The ones I have been able to find have all been made on the 6th March, so what is the object of complicating this matter? They should be consolidated to assist members. I would like the Hon. Minister to tell me why it is we have so many Orders, why it could not be one Order since notice was given by one member.  
3.45 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This first one, Sir, is to do with Erdiston. In consequence of the development of Erdiston College more pupils are taught there—there are more teachers from the Leeward and Windward Islands—and of course more staff is necessary. In addition to that there is the increase in salary to the Principal, Vice-Principal and Housekeeper.

These are all, more or less, contributed to by the various Governments of the Windward and Leeward Islands, and this is the Order which is to establish these posts. Generally speaking, this is the Order in respect of Erdiston, and there are some other Orders which have to deal with increased staff at the Government Offices in consequence of the extension there.

As will be seen, there will be different Heads and different Offices. There is Education, the Fire Brigade and others, and I do not think that they could be very well be dealt with under one Head, conveniently.

Mr. LEWIS: I should like to let the Hon. Minister know that if you are revising the salaries of all the Civil Servants, you bring in one Order. It is the same amendment Order; it is only that you have different dates on which these things come into operation.

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

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE "THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) NO. 6 ORDER, 1956"**

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to move the passing of the following Resolution:—Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 6 Order, 1956."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This Order is in connection with the Fire Brigade. It has been proposed and accepted that the Fire Officer should take over the care of the Fire Service at Seawell Airport rather than this service being looked after by the Establishment which we now have. That proposal calls for increased staff at the Airport, and the salaries for the increased staff are already included in the Estimates. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

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

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE "THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) NO. 7 ORDER, 1956"**

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to move the passing of the following resolution:—Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 7 Order, 1956."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This Order provides for the establishment of separate posts of Principal of the Evening Institute and the Principal of the Evening and Technical Institutes, and Deputy Principal and Chief Technical Instructor of the Evening Institutes. In consequence of the resignation of the office held by one person, it has been decided to separate these posts and let them be held by two different people. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: As we go along, I suppose it will dawn upon the Hon. Minister how laborious it is for His Honour the Speaker to call these Orders in order to get through something for which money has already been provided. The only reason for dealing with these Orders in this manner is that the Government might feel that hon. members would not agree to the establishment of all these posts with these emoluments, and they would have an opportunity of throwing out any particular one of them. I certainly do not see the sense of bringing down all of these Orders when we could have had one Resolution to approve all of these Orders.

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

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE "THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) NO. 8 ORDER, 1956."**

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to move the passing of the following Resolution. Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 8 Order, 1956."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This Order deals with certain additional staff in connection with the Department of Science and Agriculture. It provides for the establishment of the following posts:—Accountant, *vice* one post of Senior Clerk, Assistant Accountant, *vice* one post of Long Grade Clerk, Senior Entomological Assistant, Fishing Boat Inspector, two Long Grade Clerks, one new and one *vice* temporary post, and Secretary, *vice* one post of Stencigrapher-typist. These posts have all been included in the Estimates. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

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

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE "THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) NO. 9 ORDER, 1956"**

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to move the passing of the following Resolution: A Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment" (General) (Amendment) No. 9 Order, 1956."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The next Resolution is in connection with the Government taking over and running the Eagle Hall Market as has been proposed; this Resolution is to provide the additional staff which will be required. There will be one Supervisor and one Assistant Keeper. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

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

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE "THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) NO. 10 ORDER, 1956"**

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to move the passing of the following Resolution:—Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 10 Order, 1956."

3.55 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This Resolution deals with the establishment of certain posts. The amendments to the Order provide for —

- (a) The reduction of the number of Overseers at the Government Industrial Schools from ten to eight.

The Interim Advisory Board and the Board of Visitors of the Government Industrial Schools have recommended that from time to time posts of Overseer at the Schools should be replaced by posts of teacher so as to ensure that better qualified personnel are available to undertake duties relating to the after-care of delinquents. One post of Overseer is at present vacant and the opportunity is being taken to replace this post by an Assistant Teacher. A

corresponding amendment to the Civil Establishment (Teachers) Order is being submitted to the Legislature separately. Another post of Overseer which was retained on the Establishment in order to preserve the pension rights of the holder who was seconded to Government Plantation at Dodds has now become redundant in consequence of this officer's retirement.

- (b) Provision of additional posts of one Senior Clerk, nine long Grade Clerks and two Stenographer-Typists.

These posts will be allocated as follows:

*Senior Clerk Highway and Transport—1*

The officer will assist in the management of the office duties as personal and confidential Clerk to the Director and will take charge of the correspondence section.

*Long Grade Clerks Highways and Transport—1*

Number of Long Grade Clerks in the Department increased as a result of the expansion in the volume of accounts, correspondence and statistics arising from the increased operations and activities of the Department.

The provision of the Senior Clerk post and the additional post of Long Grade Clerk will permit of the discontinuance of the services of two temporary clerks at present employed in the Department.

*Customs—7*

Increase in the number of Customs Clerks from 33 to 40 to enable the Department to cope efficiently with the all round increase in customs work e.g. supervision of six Garment Factories which are allowed duty free entry of certain articles used in the manufacture of garments, increase in statistical detail as a result of the adoption of Standard International Trade Classification and in the general demand for statistical information, and the examination in steamers' warehouses of a fixed percentage of imported goods.

The four temporary posts of Clerk for which provision has been included in the Estimates during the past six years, will be abolished.

*Harbour and Shipping Master's Department—1*

The steady rise in the recruitment of seamen (1,200 on Register in 1954 as compared with 2,100 in 1955) has led to an increase in clerical work relating to the issue of Discharge Certificates and Certificates of Nationality and Identity and has created the number of clerical posts in the Department up to 5.

The overall establishment of Long Grade Clerks will only be increased by eight since the opportunity has been taken to abolish the post of Long Grade Clerk formerly allocated to the Currency Department.

*Stenographer-Typists*

*General Hospital* — 1 to be allocated to the X-Ray Department.

The work in this section has increased enormously over the past seven years as may be gauged by the fact that the number of

patients treated by the department in 1948 was 2,000 as compared with 7,000 in 1954, and is beyond the capacity of the sole typist in the X-Ray Department.

*Social Welfare—1*

The services of an additional typist are required to cope with the volume of typing work which has been greatly increased by the expansion of Welfare Services in the Island.

*Control Officer*

Increase in the number of Control Officers, Seawell Airport, from four to five.

The present management and air traffic control personnel consist of —

- 1 Director of Civil Aviation (\$4,800)
- 1 Assistant Director of Civil Aviation (\$1,920-3,456)
- 4 Control Officers (\$1,920-2,520)
- 2 Air Traffic Control Assistants (\$864-1,344)

Since the introduction of the British West Indian Airways Viscount Service between Barbados and New York on 15th December, 1955, Seawell Airport has been required to maintain a minimum of five 24-hour watches a week instead of four 24-hour watches a week previously. The existing establishment is inadequate to cope with the increased traffic and considerable embarrassment is created when a Control Officer is on leave or undergoing training in Trinidad.

It has been necessary recently for both the Director of Civil Aviation and the Assistant Director of Civil Aviation to man the Control Tower for long and regular spells to the detriment of their administrative duties.

With the provision of an additional post those difficulties would disappear and it would be possible for the Airport to operate on a round-the-clock basis and to avoid the danger of requiring a Control Officer to be on duty for excessively long hours.

I beg to move that this Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 10 Order, 1956 do now pass.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

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

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT)  
NO. 11 ORDER, 1956**

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day now stands under the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: To move the passing of the following Resolution:—"Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 11 Order, 1956."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 11 Order, 1956 is rather expensive. It provides for the creation of posts at the Health Centres which is consequent upon the World Health Organisation coming to assist in such establishments. This organisation has called for more staff at the Health Centres at Speightstown and St. Michael. Opportunity will also be taken to establish a staff for the St. Philip Health Centre at Six Cross Roads which is expected to be ready for business in the half of the financial year, as soon as the building is erected. The following new posts are needed:—

**St. Michael**

- 1 *Laboratory Supervisor*—\$4,128—5,760  
 1 *Female Clerk*—\$624—1,440  
 1 *Staff Nurse*—\$528—864

**Speightstown**

- 1 *Staff Nurse*—\$528—864

**Six Cross Roads**

- 1 *Laboratory Assistant*—\$600—2,280  
 1 *Messenger*—\$480—816

The post of Laboratory Supervisor is required in order that the Laboratory Service which it is proposed to set up at Enmore will be in the hands of a capable and well qualified Laboratory Technician. Dr. J. D. Glismann, the Chief Field Officer for the Caribbean Zone 1, and Dr. Marion Bevis, the World Health Organisation Laboratory Specialist, who is at present on a two year attachment to this Government, have both emphasised the need for the establishment of this post.

The services of a Staff Nurse at the St Michael's Health Centre and at the Speightstown Health Centre are required in order to relieve the Health Nurses at these Centres of clinical duties and to allow them to devote greater attention to health visiting and health education.

Provision for the construction of the Health Centre at Six Cross Roads has been included in the Draft Estimates for 1956-57 and it is desirable that provision should be made for the post of Laboratory Assistant in order that the training of an officer may be undertaken before the Centre is opened.

The Female Clerk will perform clerical and typing duties at Enmore.

The abolition of the post of Head Cook, Mental Hospital, (\$960) and the establishment of the following posts:—

- 1 *Storekeeper and Head Supervisor* — \$1,512—1,800  
 1 *Supervisor* .. .. \$ 720— 960  
 1 *Driver* .. .. \$ 720— 864

The proposals will ensure that proper supervision of the kitchen staff and control of the receipt and distribution of supplies at the Mental Hospital are maintained.

No Officer is at present responsible for the care and maintenance of the Mental Hospital ambulance which is driven, when required, by Male Attendants who are licenced drivers. This practice has proved most unsatisfactory and it is considered essential that a post of Driver be created.

I beg to move that this Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 11 Order, 1956 do now pass.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

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

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT), NO. 11, ORDER 1956**

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of Orders nos. 19 and 25 which are Civil Establishment Orders standing in the name of the Hon. Premier as the next Orders of the Day.

*There being no objection leave was granted the hon. member.*

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day now stands in the name of the Minister of Social Services to move the passing of the following Reso-

lution: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 4 Order, 1956."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This Resolution seeks to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 4 Order 1956 which provides for additional staff for the Secretariat and the Ministries when they are moved into the new building. The new posts are:

|                           |         |               |
|---------------------------|---------|---------------|
| Assistant Chief Secretary | .. 1    | \$5,760       |
| Senior Clerk              | .. .. 2 | \$2,280—3,000 |
| Long Grade Clerk          | .. .. 5 | \$ 600—2,280  |
| Stenographer-typist       | .. .. 1 | \$ 624—1,200  |
| Receptionist-typist       | .. .. 1 | \$ 624—1,200  |
| Telephone Operator        | .. .. 1 | \$ 528— 912   |
| Messenger                 | .. .. 1 | \$ 480— 816   |

The Addendum to the Resolution sets that out clearly. They were all included in the Estimates for 1956-57 and I beg to move that this Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 4 Order, 1956 do now pass.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

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

**ESTABLISHMENT (TEACHERS) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1956**

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day now stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1956."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This Resolution seeks to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1956. I will briefly state the position as regards this matter. Some time ago it was decided by the Interim Advisory Board and the Board of Visitors of the Government Industrial Schools that in order to improve the teaching and supervision at those Schools that when the people who are there employed as overseers resign, and their posts become vacant, these posts be filled by teachers who will be able to give the children a better knowledge of life both morally, culturally and otherwise. One Overseer who was there for a number of years is about to resign and in accordance with that decision the Government proposes to put a school teacher there in order that there should be better supervision and instruction in the cultural, moral and otherwise life of these delinquents. I beg to move that this Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1956 do now pass.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

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

**RESOLUTION TO AUTHORISE AGREEMENT WITH CHIEF ENGINEER WATERWORKS**

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take as the next Order of the Day, Order No. 24, which stands in the name of the Hon. Premier.

*There being no objection, leave was granted the honourable member.*

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day now stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to authorise the Governor to enter into an agreement with a person to serve for a period

of not more than two years as Chief Engineer, Waterworks Department, at a salary of \$11,520 per annum.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This Resolution is for the purpose of authorising His Excellency the Governor to enter into an Agreement with a person to serve for a period of not more than two years as Chief Engineer, Waterworks Department, at a salary of \$11,520 per annum. Mr. Garrod who has been employed on agreement by this Government as Chief Engineer, Waterworks Department, since 20th December, 1949, has his tenure of office coming to an end in May, and this Government wants to make a further engagement with him in May. It is necessary to come to the House with this Resolution in order to regularise this matter. Mr. Garrod has performed useful service to the island and I am sure that this House will not hesitate in extending his services for another year.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

4.05 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I am really amazed that the Government should be so misinformed as to what is taking place at the Waterworks Department in this island as to extend or to seek to extend the time of service of the Chief Engineer. The entire Waterworks is an absolute scandal in this country, and the fact that the Government can come here to-day to seek to extend Mr. Garrod's term of office demonstrates that they are completely ignorant of what is happening in Barbados with regard to the Waterworks Department. We do not need an official of the high price of Mr. Garrod to do what he is doing, because all he is doing is laying pipes; and it does not require any special engineering genius to lay pipes—laying pipes and no water to put in them. I mean it is unbelievable that we can have a Minister in charge of this Department and the state of affairs which exists should be allowed to continue; and on the back of it the Government comes here and asks for money to extend the term of office for the Engineer for another year. He should have been gone three years ago, and if we had a Government and a Minister of the Department who knew what it was all about, he would have been gone. We got down some new electric pumps for the Waterworks Department since Mr. Garrod assumed control of the Department. These pumps have never given any service; and if the men in the Waterworks Department were not afraid of their jobs, the whole Department would have blown up long ago. We have spent more money in repairing these pumps, in freight to and from England—and the Barbados Foundry doing what they can—than the pumps cost entirely. Every time you ask about water in the constituencies you represent, because we have voted a lot of money for extending the Department, you hear you cannot get the water. I believe there are no less than five of these pumps in England to-day. These pumps move to and back from England like how the Minister moves around, and they do not cost a cent, Mr. Speaker; they cost a lot of money. They are expensive pumps and they do not remain in operation for six months. Mr. Garrod himself condemned the old steam pumps that were working when he started; he said they should have been scrapped, but it is the same old pumps that are pumping the water we are using now. I am sure if the Minister knew anything about this Department, he should be in a position to confirm that no less than five of these pumps are again in England for repairs, and when they come back, Mr. Speaker, they would not stay up six months. As soon as you start to operate them they break down again,

so what are we paying Mr. Garrod to do? If the pumps are not working as they should, condemn them. Refer to the Estimates and you will find out the amount of money we have spent on extension of the Department the amount of money we have spent on these pumps, and let the Minister get up here and tell the House to-day or whenever he likes the amount of money that the Government has spent locally at the Foundry and in England for repairs and for freight up and down since the last six years. The House and the public will be amazed at the scandalous state of affairs existing at the Waterworks Department. If we had anybody in the Government who was mindful of these things, Mr. Garrod would have been called upon long ago to make a proper Report on the machinery he controls since he has been Chief Engineer, and whether or not that machinery is giving the service we are entitled to expect from the money we spent on it. No private concern could have run its business the way we are running the Waterworks Department; but we have been finding the money in the Public Treasury and from the taxpayers whom they milk in all fashions to provide the money for an incompetent Minister and a Waterworks Department to throw away. Any one of the engineers at the Waterworks Department can lay pipes. They appointed Mr. Garrod at a salary of \$11,520 a year; now we are giving him Leave Passage apart from other passages for himself and his wife. In other words, we have handsomely improved the terms and conditions of employment over and above those under which he was engaged. What for, Mr. Speaker? I have nothing personally against him, but what I am opposed to is the incompetent way in which the Department is run, and the scandalous way in which we are throwing away the taxpayers' money in the Waterworks Department: because in my opinion we brought him here for the special purpose of organising and extending the Department. We had already completed all the surveys, and we had all the data necessary with regard to the availability and the location of the island's water supply. We had splendid Reports from Dr. Senn and others; so his duty was not to concern himself with telling us where the water was or how to get it. He was merely responsible for the Department while he extended the machinery to bring the water to the surface. That is all he had to do and I am saying that what he has done we could have had done for far less money; and apart from that, Mr. Speaker, it was Mr. Garrod's duty first and foremost to acquaint himself with the day-to-day operation of the Department under his control, and periodically to report to the House and the country and let us know what was happening. Now obviously he has not done that. If he had done that, we could not have renewed Mr. Garrod's term of office as we did a few years ago, nor could we have come back to-day with this Resolution seeking to extend his term of office. I do not know a single person in the public service or any part of the island who could endorse the Government's decision in this matter.

4.15 p.m.

People are amazed that there should be such misfits at the head of affairs, that there is this scandal going on, and nobody knows about it, or is concerned about it. These old engines at Bowmanston and Warleigh have been working for years; we have makeshift contraptions bringing water to the surface today because the steam engines have outworn their period of service, the new pumps are absolutely of no use, and the water is brought to the surface merely by the work of the men at the Pumping Stations and

by God Almighty. As soon as a pump breaks down, they send it to the Barbados Foundry who will send them back a bill and on the next day or two, it is shipped back to England. I speak under correction, but there are at least five of them back in England today.

This House must be told something of the condition of these pumps and whether they should be scrapped or not; and there is no necessity for having at the head of the Water Works Department, an Officer at this price. If you refer to the debates, when we appointed this Officer under special terms for a limited period, you will find that the Government itself stated that this Officer would be employed for a stated period to re-organise the Department under special terms, because we needed a man of this type at the time. They remunerated this Officer over and above the remuneration of a Waterworks Engineer for a special period, to do a special job. Must that go on forever? I am sure that the Government itself felt when this Officer was appointed — and they may have said so too — that the first three year term would have finalised the water extension programme. Then he had another period of three years.

My impression was that this Officer himself wanted to leave us sometime ago, and I am sure I heard it said in more than one circle, that he was prepared to leave; I think it was in May, when his present term would expire. I suppose he felt that before then a pump would have burst, and therefore they may appoint somebody in the Government to carry on what he was doing; but I suppose he sees what the position is and he has discovered that he can get away with this murder. Therefore, he does not mind remaining with us for a little longer.

The Minister of a Department like that has a whole time job. His responsibility includes the supervision of the operations of that Department, no less than formulating the policy of the Department. Long before now the Minister should have been asking Mr. Garrod, "Why is it that these electric pumps hardly ever work for more than six weeks? Why should they be going back to England all the time." Let the Government go into the matter with the manufacturers and discover whether these pumps are completely faulty or whether they should be dumped, and try and get a rebate and install new pumps, or something or the other. I challenge the Hon. Minister to come in here next Tuesday and present the bills paid to the Barbados Foundry for the repairs of these pumps since they were installed. These pumps are new ones, and the money which we have spent on them is more than we have spent on the steam pumps which have been in existence for all these years, exclusive of the money which has been paid to install them otherwise. The position is not like that of a little dynamo which you can put in a packet and send to England for 20c. I counsel this House not to renew Mr. Garrod's contract until the Hon. Minister can furnish this House with a satisfactory statement to the effect that the new machinery which has been installed at the Waterworks is in operation, or that the Government is satisfied that the money which has been spent on these pumps has not been completely wasted.

Mr. Garrod must be the most surprised man in the West Indies not to have heard this matter raised long before. The very fact that we are asked to extend his term of office denotes that the Government is completely satisfied with everything that is going on at the Waterworks Department, or is

ignorant of what is taking place there. There cannot be any excuse whatever for ignorance in a matter of this sort. I repeat that this House is entitled to a statement from the Government with regard to the cost of these pumps, the cost of repairs here, the cost of repairs in the United Kingdom together with the expenditure of getting them backwards and forwards and, finally, what the Government intends to do about this whole matter. I therefore beg to move that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am sure that no other hon. member of this House is so uncharitable to an Officer who has given —

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Minister seeking the permission of the House to speak? The Hon. Minister seconded the motion for the passing of the Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: The Hon. Minister of Trade seconded the motion. [Mr. LEWIS: In any case the Minister will be given some latitude].

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister may continue.  
4.25 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: As I was saying, Sir, I am sure that no other hon. member is so uncharitable and unkind to an Officer who has given unstintingly of his service to this country for the last five or six years, in so far as the development of our water resources is concerned. [Mr. CRAWFORD: That is not true].

Perhaps I should remind this House that sometime ago (I think it was in 1946) this House agreed to a re-organisation programme of the Waterworks costing thousands of pounds and I think it is the very honourable senior member for St. Philip who just sat down, who introduced the Resolution to this House. He told the House at that time how difficult it was to recruit a qualified person to carry out this work. That programme remained undeveloped until 1949 although the money was available. I think it was in December, 1949 when we were able to acquire the present holder of the Office.

The holder of the office has been able more or less to gain the respect of every intelligent, decent, understanding citizen of this country because not only is he a first-class qualified man but because of his tact in handling working people and of his sympathy and willingness to give an ear to all complaints, whether they are well founded or not. This House has placed on record speeches made by honourable members that this Engineer has done a wonderful job in this island, a job which in other circumstances we would have to pay three or four times as much. I say that although the honourable member who sat down feels that the salary is a handsome one.

I think I mentioned that when the present Engineer accepted the contract to come to this island for £2,000 per annum he was offered a post of £3,000 elsewhere; but as he had already decided to come here he kept his promise.

Now, I should make it clear that the Government intended to retain, so far as possible, the services of this gentleman for another two years but it was the gentleman in question who refused to agree to remain for another two years. He felt that we could, if we so desired, retain his services for another year. I want it to be crystal clear that it is because of this Government's sense of responsibility to the people that we are trying to get as much as we can of the services of this qualified gentleman now he is on the spot, that the Government has decided, and partly against his wish, to keep him for another year. The honourable senior

member for St. Philip let loose with a lot of abuse and cheap stuff.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I object strongly to the honourable member saying that I let loose with a lot of abuse and cheap stuff. I said nothing abusive of Mr. Garrod. What the honourable senior member for St. Michael said, I said, and it is that Mr. Garrod did not want to stay. I have nothing against the Officer, but I did say that I was amazed at the manner in which he was running the Department. If the honourable member heard the word "abuse" let him explain the meaning of it. At no time did I abuse Mr. Garrod. I referred to the unsatisfactory manner in which the Department is operating.

Hon. M. E. COX: If the honourable member said that the man was no use and should have gone three years ago, what does he mean?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I said that his contract should not be renewed.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no abuse.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member went on to say that the gentleman in question was laying pipes in this island without having any water to put in them. I challenge him to state the village or district into which mains have been laid that water has not been put into them. It is all well and good to come on the floor of the House to vent your spleen on decent, honest people but—

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I object to these unnecessary personal and stupid remarks by the honourable senior member for St. Michael. The honourable member only knows of venting spleen on people; therefore, he is incapable of knowing the meaning of my remarks. I am an elected representative of the people; therefore I am entitled to criticise any person. Sir, I am not going to have him coming in here and saying that it is all well and good to come in here and vent your spleen on decent, honest people. I repeat, I made remarks as to the unsatisfactory manner in which the new pumps were installed by Mr. Garrod. That is not a question of venting your spleen on somebody.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Philip objects to the honourable senior member for St. Michael saying he has come in here and vented his spleen on anybody. It is a rather harsh statement; I think it is unbecoming.

Hon. M. E. COX: Yes, Sir. The honourable senior member for St. Philip went on to say that we have spent on these few pumps within recent years as much as will run a Hospital for more than 40 years.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable member for St. Michael seems to have been suffering from a difficulty in his hearing. I said that the money we have spent in repairs on the new pumps is more than what we have spent in repairing the old steam engines we have been using for 40 years.  
4.35 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, what is the position? I do not want to waste the time of the House but it is on record how he speaks.

Now, Sir, if you remember, the Roddam Report in 1948 said it would take at least seven years to reorganise and develop the water resources of this island. Now, the honourable member would have this House believe that all that is left to be done now is to put a few pipes in the ground and put some water in them, and that any unskilled labourer could do that. Now, Sir, if he was a responsible individual in the community, he would know that the Chief Engineer has sunk a well in the Sweet Vale area recently which gives half million gallons of water to-day. He would also know that he is sinking another one in the same area and he would also know that he proposes to sink

a third well; and the reason for that is to try as far as possible to do away with the Bowmanston Stream which is disturbed when heavy rains fall, and which has to be shut off for some time due to a sort of fissure which admits mud and so on which makes the water contaminated and as a result unfit for consumption. That, Mr. Speaker, must take some time. These wells have to be sunk, they have to be cleaned out at a certain period, I think around July and August, before you can begin to lift water, and then that water has to be pumped into the Golden Ridge Reservoir. In addition, he proposes to shut down the old steam plant at Everton which is very costly and takes about \$70,000 a year to run it. So from that members can see that it could not be quite as simple as the honourable member states. Now, Sir, as regards the question of pumps, Mr. Garrod, as you will know and appreciate, is not a manufacturer of any pumps, and as far as I have been able to ascertain is not interested in any firm which manufactures pumps. It is on record that the 35 and 45 h.p. pumps have given ample service for many years. It is true that the makers have recommended that these pumps must be removed at least every couple of years and cleaned, which I understand takes between ten to twelve hours, but the pumps to which he is referring which are the 96 and 115 horsepower have given fairly good service from 1952 to last year when the trouble started. These pumps cannot be repaired in this island. They said the Chief Engineer sent the pumps to the Foundry and the Foundry pulled them down and made a big bill and then they had to be sent to the United Kingdom to be repaired, but this is not stating the facts of the case.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I said the Foundry has tried on more than one occasion to repair some of these pumps, they have done what they could and charged the Government handsomely for them and then the pumps had to be sent to England; and I have told him sometimes they are here five or six weeks before they are sent to England. These are the facts I want him to deny.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, the pumps ordered were the Beresford Submersible Pumps which were being used for many years at various pumping stations. In order to lift a greater amount of water we had to import a higher horsepower—96 and 115 h.p. These two types have not been satisfactory and recommendations have been made for improvement. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that these pumps have to be sent to the United Kingdom to be repaired which undoubtedly takes approximately six months, but the cost is no more than \$150 a pump. I will however check on that to make sure and report to the House the correct figure; but as I said, it is no fault of the Chief Engineer if the pumps go bad. The fact remains that the inhabitants of this island have never been without water. Whenever there is a breakdown and the honourable member is in his bed sleeping or perhaps some place else...

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, maybe the Hon. Minister does not get in his bed to sleep and I object to his saying that. I am rising on a point of order to say that I never said the pipes break down and we have no water, so there is no reason for him to say when I am in my bed, the Chief Engineer and his men are out working. What I said is that they have to fall back on the old steam engines which have been condemned by Mr. Garrod. Mr. Garrod said they should be scrapped.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, he is just interrupting me. The fact remains that whenever there is a break-down, Mr. Garrod and the other technical people and also the labourers get on the site and keep

the community supplied with water. These pumps, Mr. Speaker, having given trouble, it has been recommended that in so far as that type is concerned we should change over to another type of pump. But Sir, that pump will take approximately eighteen months before it gets here, and that is the situation as it stands to-day. I want to emphasise before I sit down again that that gentleman has done a tremendous good for this country in that he knows his work and does it unflinchingly night and day; and I am sure that the community despite the attacks made on him by the honourable senior member for St. Philip—who is famous for attacking people and slander and things of that sort—is grateful to him and will ever be grateful to him for the tremendous task which he has undertaken and which he has successfully put through and, as I said, he will be remembered in this island for many years. I think the honourable junior member for St. Andrew will bear me out on that.

4.45 p.m.

At a later date I intend not only to give the House a comprehensive picture of the development of the water resources of this Island under the hands of the Chief Engineer, but also to give the Island, by means of publication and broadcasting, the development of these resources over at least the last five or six years. Of course, when you lay a pipe, you have to give it a little time before you turn on the water permanently; but I contend that there has been a false statement made by the hon. senior member for St. Philip; there is not a pipe which has been laid, in which you will not find water, even in the parish of St. Philip where very many pipes have been installed within recent years.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I really did not intend saying anything in this debate, but it has reached a stage where I will say a word or two. I personally think that Barbados is fortunate in having a man of Mr. Garrod's type, a man who has given able service and who has brought hundreds and thousands of dollars to this Island through his knowledge. It is very regrettable that on account of having first-class or first-hand information, hon. members should be criticising officials; but that has its back lash. What is happening today is that many a good official in high offices will refuse to come to Barbados, not because of the salary which is offered, but because of the treatment they get from the House of Assembly unfairly.

From my knowledge of Mr. Garrod, I can say that I have lived for over 60 years in the parishes of St. Joseph and St. Andrew, and it is only about three years ago that water was turned into my home. When you only paid meter rent, if you paid today when you awoke in the morning you might get a little water; but nowadays the pipes have a pressure of 200 pounds up there. [Cheers]. Mr. Garrod, with his vast knowledge, changed the course of the pipes. We have had in this Colony, men like Mr. Peck and others who were failures, who wasted our money right and left, and we got no value from it. I am speaking behind a member of the Other Place who used to be a member of this House, who was in charge of the Water Works Department, and who took a keen interest in the matter when he was a member of the Executive Committee. Hon. members will know to whom I am referring; he has stated in the Other Place that we have a water system second to none in any part of the world. [Mr. CRAWFORD: In St. Andrew]. I do not live in St. Andrew now and I get water. I have only got up to correct some of these false impressions which have been made.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: As far as I am concerned, let me begin by saying that I am heartily in agreement with the Government in trying to secure

the services of Mr. Garrod for a longer period. [Cheers]. I want no cheers for that. When Mr. Garrod's salary was to be increased, I was among those in this Chamber who said that we have an excellent man, and I watched him on his work. It is not a question of Mr. Garrod's favour or treatment to me; it is a question of his duty and consideration of this job. Therefore, I am one hundred per cent in favour of the Government in trying to retain his services for another year, and let us pray that his health keeps up. However, let me regret that the hon. junior member for St. Andrew has spoken along the lines along which he has spoken. I am sorry that the hon. member is not in his place. Who could have been a greater critic of officials than the hon. senior member for St. Michael, the now Minister of Communications, Works and Housing?

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of Order. The only official whom I used to criticise was the previous Head of the Department of Highways and Transport.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That shows that the hon. member had something against Mr. Skinner. I will criticise any official in this House if he warrants criticism. Let me say in answer to the hon. junior member for St. Andrew that it is because of the criticism of the third-rate, no-good, third-class type of Englishmen who were coming out here to hold jobs, that we have been getting people who know their jobs to come out here. There are those of us who have nothing but the highest praise for Captain Tomlin; I do not ask anybody in this House to give any job to Captain Tomlin. I say, it is because we have been critics of Englishmen coming to this Country, that we have been able to get good men out here; it is not because we criticise these officials that they have kept away.

Are you telling me that if you have a man who is absolutely of no good, whether he be a West Indian, Barbadian, or what not, we should not criticise him?

4.55 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, what I object to is for any Minister, or any member of any Government for that matter, paying lip service to any official just because it is part of a Minister's duty to defend an official even though that official may not be of any good. Do you think we should pay tribute to Mr. Garner who was at one time a master at Harrison College and another 'no-good' that was at one time at Combermere? Do you think if you bring a radiologist who is of no good at the General Hospital that I would not get up in here and say that the radiologist is no good? It is because honourable members can criticise officials that you get decent people.

Let me say that I am with the Government in its retaining the services of Mr. Garrod. He is a gentleman who takes his job seriously and he is not a wheelchair man like the average officials whom you bring down here. You are retaining the services of a good man when you retain the services of Mr. Garrod. He is not like some of those whom you have here that are corrupting the youth of this country. The honourable junior member for St. Andrew said that it is a pity that honourable members should criticise officials. Let me ask him, whom must we criticise? I will say that the only people whom the Ministers can find to criticise are the local people. I am going to criticise all if they need criticising and I am going to praise all who are in need of praise. Let the Ministers make no mistake about that.

However, Sir, I am speaking *ex-cathedra* on this matter. I understand before I came in here that the honourable senior member for St. Philip had spoken on the type of machinery which we have at the Water-works Department. I will say that Mr. Garrod was so

correct on that that he could not be wrong. It is because of that, that I have the greatest respect for Mr. Garrod. He is absolutely correct in what he said of the machinery at the Belle Pumping Station. As I have said, I did not hear what the honourable senior member for St. Philip said of Mr. Garrod. Let me remind this House that the machinery imported here from Crown Agents is machinery which is made in England. Although this machinery was made by a big manufacturing firm in England, although Mr. Garrod is an Englishman, because the machinery proved no good, Mr. Garrod did not say that it was good. He told the Government that it should get good machinery. I can tell this House that he told this Government so not once nor twice; he went as far as to tell the manufacturers that they should either pay this Government back the money that was paid for the machinery or that they should send him better goods. That is a fact; therefore I am wholeheartedly in agreement with Government retaining the services of this gentleman.

I will challenge the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing to deny what I said just now. It is very rare that you get that decent type of engineer or even that decent type of English Official. Mr. Garrod was man enough to say although the machinery was of English manufacture that it was no good. Far from that, everybody in this country remembers the time when we had an engineer at the Waterworks Department who insisted in having articles from a particular manufacturing firm in England. He said that you could not put in a sanitary unit unless that sanitary unit was imported from a certain manufacturing firm in England. I am always suspicious of any official who wants you to use a particular brand of manufactured article and who tells you that you cannot use this or that. I call that what you call it in Trinidad "bu-ball," and what you call it in England, "passing back." When they tell you that you can only use "Twyford" or such and such a brand of article, they are getting a drawback. I sniff and smile at all these things.

Let me say that these are the members of the Government but I have my friends. There is not a Department in this country of which I am not *persona grata* with three quarters of the people in them; therefore I will know things. Certain members of the Government have reached the stage of thinking that officials have no right to tell a politician anything.

Mr. Speaker, I am appealing to the Government to retain this gentleman, not because he is a gentleman but because he has shown us during the period he was here that he is worthy of our highest appreciation and consideration and because he is doing an excellent job. That is my feeling about this matter. However, I must say that I cannot agree with the honourable junior member for St. Andrew who said that we should not criticise Government officials.

Mr. SPEAKER: That was not the main point of his address.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That was not the main point, but some Ministers feel that way. I am not one of those people who just criticise a person for the sake of criticising. Individually, I might dislike a person if there is not much good in that person; but if that person is doing a good job, I am man enough to see that he is doing a good job and will say so. That applies to the Engineer of the Waterworks Department. He is doing a very good job and I was wondering whether he would not be able to carry on for another two years. As I was saying, Sir, he is not an office man; he is not a wheel-chair man. When I received my House papers the other night seeing what the

Government was about to do as regards retaining the services of this gentleman, I thought it was a wise step and I hope he will be spared to carry on. Let me repeat, when that machinery came here and he saw that it was no good and was not guaranteed, he demanded that the replacements and what not should be sent without further cost. That showed that he was working in the interest of the Barbados Government and not in the interest of the manufacturer.

5.05 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I did not want to say anything after the Hon. Minister had replied, but I gathered from his remarks that somewhere in 1946 or 1948, owing to a Report received, this House including the hon. senior member for St. Philip agreed to the confirmation of Mr. Garrod's appointment.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is hopelessly misinformed. Mr. Garrod came here in 1949.

Mr. SMITH: I will withdraw those remarks. Anyway the hon. member was here when the Government brought down the Resolution. Now, Sir, Mr. Garrod is one of those officials that I am sure Barbados will never be able to replace or repay. I am sure that there are certain places in this country that never had water or could get water—I know of a number of people particularly in my parish who applied for water, but they never received it until Mr. Garrod came and laid the pipes in the right places and at the right time. The hon. senior member for St. Philips wants this House to believe that Mr. Garrod only laid pipes, but how and where did he lay those pipes? And he did so successfully. There were other Waterworks Engineers who laid pipes too, but where has the water gone? It never got where it should go, and then for the hon. senior member for St. Philip to say he should have gone three years ago! Now imagine a responsible member of this community.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member apparently does not understand what I said. My complaint was that you had engines come from England breaking down every six weeks and having to send them back to England.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not speaking with reference to the fact that the engineer should have gone three years ago.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I said Mr. Garrod should have made a Report to the Government as to the failure of the machines to stand up.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Philip cannot tell the hon. junior member for St. Joseph how to debate. The hon. member will have to sit.

Mr. SMITH: You will see, Mr. Speaker, he wants to throw his faults on me. He said that Mr. Garrod should have gone long ago, and I am saying he should not have; he should have been here long ago. Take, for instance, the people in the Northern part of this country suffered immensely. There is a woman in the parish that you represent who lost her life through lack of water and there are people in St. Joseph who suffered materially for water. The hon. junior member for St. Andrew spoke the truth when he told us we could not get a better official than Mr. Garrod. I have said already we will never be able to repay him. He is doing some first-class work, in this country. But, Sir, here it is that you have the hon. member getting up on the floor of this House and trying to make out that officials that are worthwhile staying should clear out. It is alright for the hon. senior member for St. Philip to talk because he is in Christ Church where everything is alright as far as water is concerned. But I hope that some time he will be able to remember those poor people who

used to suffer materially in the Northern part of this country for the sake of water. I do not know if you are getting but you look as if you are!

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member addressing the Chair? The hon. member has spoken in the second person.

MR. SMITH: I only rise on my feet so that the drinking public, the water users of this country, can see the mistakes and blunders that the hon. senior member for St. Philip made this afternoon when he referred to Mr. Garrod saying that he should have gone three years ago. He has done some good work and we will never be able to repay him. Relative to the repairs of machinery and so on, Mr. Garrod could never be responsible for the machinery breaking down. I do not know who is responsible for making them, but manufacturers make machines and as soon as they get to this country they would not make a move. The experts come and they cannot get them to move. He is not responsible for it. He is not to be blamed if the machinery imported to this country has to go back and forth and also to the Foundry. If the Foundry is called to check up on the machines and find they are no use, they still have to be paid. You may call a doctor to one of your beloved ones and no quicker than the doctor turns away, the person dies; you still have to pay the doctor. So I cannot see the justification for the hon. member to use the remarks he has relative to that gentleman Mr. Garrod. He has not proved his case against Mr. Garrod for going three years ago. It is only because he can get up and say he should have gone, and that it is a scandal and waste of public funds. Well, Sir, that is the hon. senior member for St. Philip; and I am surprised that I did not hear him say the people of this country would have to draw their belts.

MR. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, If we have reached the stage where no Civil Servant regardless of his efficiency or his inefficiency can be criticised, where are we getting? [A VOICE: Who said that?] I did not say the hon. senior member for St. Michael said it. If I were the Minister, I would cause the hon. senior member for St. Philip to feel that in spite of what he expressed I would investigate the matter and if they were based on facts, I would try to remedy them. That is what I would have done if I were the Minister in charge of such a Department. What is more, I would say that Mr. Speaker, because of the knowledge that it is not everything that the Head of a Department can know.

5.15 p.m.

Therefore there are greater possibilities for statements and complaints to be made by members who are not directly attached to the Government, which would not reach the ears of the Hon. Minister, or even the Head of the Department. We can be too ready to criticise members for explaining to this House things which might have been brought to the notice of hon. members. I, too, can say that members of the staffs of the Pumping Stations have told me on numerous occasions about the hardships which they experience in having to repair boilers, sometimes every two weeks, sometimes every three weeks or every couple of months. That is something which the Hon. Minister should know. There is one thing I can say, and it is that I was one of the members of the Committee which considered the question of bringing Mr. Garrod out here. I was one of those who agreed to the salary to be paid to Mr. Garrod, and since then I agreed that this officer has merited that \$800 per month, although the salary should not have been increased to the amount to which it has been increased now. No one is saying that Mr. Garrod is not an efficient man. Most hon. members at some time or other have expressed their apprecia-

tion of the extensions which he has carried out; but the hon. senior member for St. Philip is trying to point out that Mr. Garrod has recommended our having machinery which in recent years, has had to be repaired every now and again, which should not have taken place.

No one wants to blame Mr. Garrod for the faulty construction of an engine, but if an hon. member knows that the Department is being asked to spend more money than it should normally spend, what must he do but put the matter before this House so that the Hon. Minister can take action on it? Nobody is blaming Mr. Garrod in this matter. When we were sent the Message from the Head of the Administration about Mr. Garrod's appointment, we were told that the re-organisation of the water system of the Island would have been completed in three years' time. [Hon. M. E. COX: By whom?] That was suggested by the then members of the Executive Committee and some other hon. members. If we did not feel so, we would not have contracted to have Mr. Garrod here for three years. If they thought that this re-organisation of the water system would have taken ten years, then they would have said so. If they thought that it would have taken two years to be completed, they would have sent down the Message accordingly. If Mr. Garrod's contract had expired in three years' time, an assistant would have been promoted to carry on the work. We have extended the contract for another three years, and now we propose to extend it for another year. Certainly, any hon. member has the right to question why we should extend his contract from year to year, after we have been given the impression that the contract would have expired in three years. We do not know if, when this year is out, we will not be asked to continue this contract for another year. If a man—

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member is not right in his statement. We engaged Mr. Garrod for a period of three years, we renewed his contract for an additional two years, and now we are asking to renew it for another year.

MR. ALLDER: I am sorry that I said three years instead of two years. The hon. member should have made that clear when he was speaking.

Hon. M. E. COX: You were a member of the House then.

MR. ALLDER: Anyhow, hon. members are justified in questioning this matter. We compromised on \$800 a month, because we were told that Mr. Garrod would be here for three years, and the matter would be completed because his assistant would have taken over. Since then, his salary has been increased. I am not saying that Mr. Garrod should not be paid this salary, but we want to see results. Again, I am not saying that we are not seeing results; I am saying that you cannot bring out an Officer on contract and prolong it without anybody querying it, because somebody else would want to prolong this contract for about 15 years, especially after listening to certain hon. members' remarks.

I am saying that criticism must be levelled at any officer, if such criticism is due to him. The hon. senior member for St. Philip has said that the position with regard to these pumps is not as it should be; according to the hon. member, these engines have to be sent back to the manufacturers for repairs every now and then. I think that this matter should be taken up with the Engineer and allow other recommendations to be made. The Hon. Minister must understand that when an hon. member brings anything to his notice, he should express some appreciation of that, rather than express the rancour which he expresses. It is by our raising the matter

in this House that we are able to find where the fault lies; that helps the Hon. Minister to put his fingers on the spot. I presume that the hon. senior member for St. Philip only wanted to bring to the notice of the Hon. Minister what, I believe, has been told to him, and some of it has been told to me as well. The expressions of some people in the Water Works Department are different from the expressions of those who actually do the work in this Department that is what the Hon. Minister does not understand.

Mr. Garrod is a good man. A technical man might start off quite well, and he impresses you, but there are periods when he falls down; and the Hon. Minister should always have his eyes open to see when a technical man falls down, and deal with the matter. I should like to know that the Hon. Minister is taking steps to see that if these engines which come from England are not in order, they are sent back. It is no use having these engines if they have to be repaired every now and then. I am quite sure that the manufacturers could not send down engines which cost the Government what they are costing the Government without giving some satisfaction. Let them rebuild these engines or send us new engines in their place. Do not let the hon. member fear explaining anything in the House, if reports have come to him; if you tell him anything which you might know relative to a Department under his control, he is willing to jump into your neck.

That is bad; he should appreciate hon. members' willingness to listen to the public and their complaints and save him the trouble from so doing.  
5.25 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, this is a very happy occasion for me. I remember coming into this House and appealing to the Government to consider one of the kind people who gave them water in the northern parishes. That person was Dr. Senn. He was a man who worked hard in trying to find water in this country. He has died since, leaving a widow and children and this Government has refused to give him a cent. He showed this Government the places where it could get water and they were places where we never had water. I think it is ungratefulness in us that we could not find it possible to send a few pence to the widow of Dr. Senn to show our appreciation of the work he did for the water resources of this island.

However, Sir, it is a habit nowadays of this present Government to say that any person who comes out here, especially if he comes out from England, is the greatest living authority on anything. This Government said that Sir John Maude was the greatest authority on Local Government, yet it got Mr. Lightburn to tell us about the Bills which we could have to bring in to put in into effect. The Hon. Premier has said that Mr. Lightburn has come out and shown us where we have a heartburn.

Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that hon. members of this House will take their responsibilities seriously and do not pay overdue attention to the remarks of the hon. junior member for St. Andrew. The day that this House of Assembly feels that it should go lightly in criticising Civil Servants, from that day the Civil Service will start to go down hill and start to wreck this country. Let me say that there is ample opportunity for Civil Servants to put their cases in the newspapers, in the House of Assembly, and elsewhere, unless the Government does not want to do it. Do you know that Civil Servants can be covered from a lot of things by its being laid down that they cannot write or say things? It is an excellent way for a man who cannot do his work that he cannot answer criticism.

Sir, there is one thing for which we have to thank the hon. senior member for St. Philip and it is this: would the Government have told us what it told us if he did not make the remarks he did? I am surprised to see that we have just passed the Annual Estimates with the Head, Waterworks Department, without hearing from the Minister in charge of that Department that the conditions were as he himself put it in that subdued way. No, hon. member of this House was authoritatively told that those pumps were not giving satisfaction. The Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department writes a quarterly report. I do not know if hon. members saw that in any of the Reports. It is a fact that the Engineers who came out here to put them down could not get them to work. We have no right to condone this sort of thing in the Department. If they cannot make proper machinery in England, let us get it from somewhere else. If the Engineer of the Waterworks Department, no matter how good he is, never said that these pumps were giving trouble, he was dishonest to the Government and the Government was dishonest to this House in not making a statement.

This is a serious matter. Are you afraid to criticise the machinery that comes down here? Do not let us fool ourselves. You have some good officials over here throwing away quite a lot of money. Let them know that the Treasury is not always going to be filled with money for them to correct the mistakes which they are making. Even some of the good ones are spending too much money on the bridges which they have to do. Of course, we do not have to look around for money for them; they can get any amount.  
5.35 p.m.

I have warned Government about this Water Works Department. Take up the Estimates and you will see the amount put down for pumping and other things. I have told them to make use of the excellent man in that Department to tell them how to generate their own electricity. People are searching for oil and they say they have found gas. The Premier thought it should be piped but now that he is Premier the people of this island are faced with a colossal bill for pumping water. However we increase the rates of water, we cannot satisfy the Electric Company; and here we are recommending these electric pumps and not making use of the Godgiven fuel we have. Not only are the machines a failure as far as pumping is concerned, but I have heard it stated that the pipes laid down cannot stand the pressure. The same engineer should know how to test them; if not he is not entirely the type of engineer we want. He might have his genius in one particular direction. The pressure of the water put through the pipes laid down has burst them. Is that right? Something is wrong! Mr. Speaker, in the Debate that took place on the appointment of Mr. Garrod,—reading from page 56 of the House Debates of January 25th, 1949, one member said:

"After three or four years the matter could be reopened because we may not then need a person of such high calibre and skill. The House has decided that the water services should be brought up to date and this is more or less a means of implementing that decision."

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is a little discrepancy in the information given by the Minister of Works. Is Mr. Garrod's contract out already?

Hon. M. E. COX: It will be out in May this year.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, in this Addendum it is stated that he has been employed since 20th December, 1949. The contract must cover the Leave. If you re-employ him it is continuous and if he was

here from 20th December, 1949, on the 20th December, 1955, he would have been here six years, and if he were employed in the first place for three years there must have been some extension of three years. It seems as if the hon. member for St. John was perfectly right. You re-engaged him after the holidays. If he took up the appointment since 20th December, 1949, on the 20th December, 1955 he has been with this Government for six years, and if the period was three years, six years is already up. So that it must have been for a period more than three years because it expires sometime in May. This needs an explanation. I know he went on holiday, but do you mean to tell me he was disengaged during that time? The next thing is if we give permission for someone to enter into Agreement to serve for a period of not more than two years, can the Government make it two different agreements? Can they make one Agreement and then extend it? We have given them permission to make it for a period of not more than two years or whatever period they make it, it comes to an end and they have to come back again; so I hope they do not think they can make it a year and then extend it. As soon as they make an Agreement for a year, this Resolution has no effect. We are not giving them permission to make two Agreements or an Agreement for two years. They are getting one Resolution for one Agreement. And I see in the second paragraph that they are paying certain passages and so on. I hope they do not go and put themselves in trouble because after we make an Agreement for a period of time and that time expires, they must come back and get the House to confirm it as another Agreement. I mention that because they do as they like with these things; nobody keeps any check on them.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot too often condemn the drawing up of Addendums and Resolutions coming to this House. You mean to tell me, Sir, that the Civil Servant that drew this up had any right saying that Mr. Garrod who has been employed by the Government as Chief Engineer, Waterworks Department since 20th December, 1949, has signified his willingness to go on? The facts of the case should have been set out properly. Whoever drew this up must have had the facts before him. The facts should have been set out that he was on contract for three years from 20th December, 1949, what took place in the interim, and what you want to do now and that the present Agreement expires in May, 1956. That is the type of information that should be given. This is not the type of information they should be allowed to bring in here and then to supplement it they say it is six years. From 1949 could it be anything else than six or more years? But none of the facts are set out and the Minister is saying it is an extension of two years. Set out the facts, and let the Civil Servants know they must respect the Legislature. When this is introduced in the Other Place, they will tell them the day he was born and everything else. That is the information they are going to get; but for us this Government can bring in this insulting piece of information and cannot supplement it with facts. It is only about two or three days ago that we were told the whole story of the pumps going up and down. This is the way they carry on their business.

Mr. Speaker, a very sad and serious state of affairs has been revealed to this House this afternoon and it is incumbent upon the Government to make a report to this House. It involves expenditure of considerable funds from the Public Treasury for a very necessary service to the people; no matter how many pipes and how many pumping stations you

have, it is likely that if the pumps will not work, the people will not get water. They have had to go back and bring the old steam engines into work. There is some conflict of opinion. The hon. senior member St. Philip says he knows for a fact that the old steam engines at the Belle and Warleigh have been put back into use. Do you mean to tell me a thing does not give satisfaction, but you order 15 and then you have to send them back to England just as you send your shirts to be washed? Do you mean the people who made them knew they would break down so they recommended buying a dozen? Well, Sir, that is a very serious state of affairs and it needs explanation.

5.45 p.m.

The Government cannot expect that because it might have sufficient members to vote for it, it can be careless about these things, especially when it is a question of water. There is a serious state of affairs, and the Government cannot claim that they have been honest to this House about it, because they have not opened their mouths and said one word until it has been dragged out of them. I should like to say that in this Department years ago there was a gentleman by the name of Mr. Lingwood who had to send back some back pay or bribe which people sent out here to him. I give the Government that warning. After Mr. Lingwood had imported some engines, the usual thing happened, and he had to send back those engines. I warned this Government not to put the importation of the fire-fighting apparatus into the hands of one person. If you hit upon the right type of apparatus, you are alright, but if it is otherwise, then you will lose money.

If a man is willing to recommend that you pin your faith in electrical equipment and scrap something which has given you good service, even if it is a little expensive, he must be prepared to guarantee his recommendations. He must be prepared to stand by his recommendations because it is a question of the life and death of the people. This House should be given information, not that it should be dragged out of the Ministers. This is too serious a state of affairs for me to treat it lightly. I am seconding the motion that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed at least for a week; let hon. members go to the Belle and Warleigh and let us see if we have heard the truth. I will be prepared to come here and say that hon. members have no right to mislead the House.

When we heard the word "retrenchment" being used in the introduction of the last Estimates, that is a serious matter. I am seconding the motion for the postponement of this Resolution in the hope that the Government will gracefully accept it and do not let them make any statement on which there cannot be any debate. Let them deal with this matter in a way in which people can retract what they have said, and offer praise where praise is due.

The fact remains that Mr. Garrod brought to light circumstances which have been confirmed by the Government for which we are grateful; however, it is on these engines that we have to rely to give the people water.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am asking leave to speak again.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: No other hon. member having attempted to speak, I therefore have to put forward the Government's point of view. I should like the hon. junior member for the City to know that the Chief Engineer, after thoroughly examining the position with regard to these pumps, made a proposal. That proposal was not mentioned in the Estimates,

because we were not ready with the facts to place them before the House. In the near future, I will be asking the House to grant a token vote in respect of this Department, because these pumps take about 18 months or so to get here; in that connection, I am prepared to give all the facts as regards this machinery.

The hon. senior member for St. Philip is right in saying that these pumps went back to England to be repaired. These pumps cannot be repaired in Barbados. The highest horse-power pump has been giving trouble and Mr. Garrod has been investigating the matter; he has insisted upon the Firm that they must repair these pumps and improve on them to his satisfaction. As he has pointed out, it is a question of design; the 45 horse-power engine does not give any trouble, but the 96 to 115 horse-power engines give trouble.

6.05 p.m.

Now, Sir, the hon. senior member for St. Philip further stated that the old steam engine had to be brought into use at Warleigh and the Belle. That is not true. Warleigh has never had a steam engine. Warleigh got its water from the Golden Ridge Reservoir and it never had any steam engine there to pump water. Two or three years ago, electrical equipment was fitted to a well there which pumps water from Heywoods into Warleigh Reservoir from which it enters a sluice valve in Indian Ground which allows the water to go direct over to Boscobelle instead of running into Warleigh.

The hon. member is talking of something which he knows absolutely nothing about. We still have pumps working; as a matter of fact, we are still getting a full supply of water to the community in general, even to those in Boscobelle. As I have said, I will be coming to the House at a later date (I believe in a week or two) to ask this House to agree to a token vote in this respect because we have to order these pumps in another day or two.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, since new information has been introduced. I am asking leave of the House to make a statement in reply to the remarks just made by the Hon. Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Philip is asking leave to speak again. If there is no objection—

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I object.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will have to put the question to the vote. May I inform the House that the question of speaking more than once has absolutely nothing to do with Ministerial set up.

*The question that leave be granted the honourable member for St. Philip to speak was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—*

*Ayes:* Mr. BRYAN, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. VAUGHAN, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY and Mr. HAYNES—10.

*Noes:* Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. SMITH and Mr. F. L. WALCOTT—3.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I want this House to understand carefully that these pumps are faulty in construction. That has been well authenticated. That is different from faulty in design. The Belle Pumping Station has faulty electric pumps and as a result three of them are now in England. Because of that, the Belle is pumping water with the old contraptions which Mr. Garrod himself said should have been scrapped.

With regard to the new Pumping Station, Warleigh, that has two electric pumps. I want this House to believe me when I say that both of those pumps are now in England. In other words, there are five pumps now in England. However Warleigh gets

its water does not concern me; whether it gets it from Heywoods or any other place is a matter for the Department.

In addition, Sir, it is not as the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing tried to impress the House that because the pumps cannot be repaired here that they will have to be sent to England. The point is that the pumps did not stay up at all. It is known that a pump has come back from England to work for six weeks and then it had to be sent back there again for repairs. Of course it would only be he who would buy such a pump; I am not one of those people who would spend the taxpayers money in such a fashion. Let the hon. member find out how many hours of service each of them gave since they were out here. Let him find out how many times one pump had to be returned to England. The fact of the matter is that what he said today should have been said when we had the Estimates before us. Imagine that he intends to present the House a Resolution calling for a token vote with regards to the expenditure for new pumping equipment. In other words, Sir, they have been condemning the pumps—all six—and waiting until now to tell us that we have to order new pumping equipment.

I say here now what I said earlier and it is that from the time these pumps came here, Mr. Garrod knew they were faulty and could not stand up to work. In his position as Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department, Mr. Garrod could have told us that the pumps were not working and that they were not giving service; therefore he should have reported that we would have to scrap them and get new pumping equipment, because sending them back to England for repairs was a waste of the public money. Furthermore, what I said earlier was that these pumps did not cost a penny, they cost several hundred dollars; and from the time they began to break down, Mr. Garrod should have written a proper memorandum on them so that we would be in a position to claim from the manufacturers some of the money we paid for them. It is not a dynamo for a refrigerator that we have to repair. Every time that those pumps are sent to England for repairs, we have to pay for the repairs. [A VOICE: Have we got to pay?] Surely; whenever the manufacturers repair them! We send them to the Foundry first. They tinker with them and send in a bill and then we have to send them to England.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member has said quite enough.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am saying that if the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department had made out a case earlier, we would have been in a better position to reclaim from the manufacturers either what we paid for them or new equipment. There were members here in this House who took their duties seriously; they could come in here like the honourable junior member for St. Andrew, who has joined with Mr. Robinson, and Mr. Walcott and others and make the engineer resign from the Waterworks. If the honourable junior member for St. Andrew had a man employed at Newcastle who was not serving to the best of his ability he would fire him overnight, but apparently because he meets Mr. Garrod over cocktails or at the Bridgetown Club or they are friendly.

Mr. HAYNES: The honourable senior member has absolutely misinterpreted my remarks. I said, when we have good officials from England you will never get other good ones to come. You get many bad ones and he knows I use my words against them very often; and I often made them resign in my younger days; but I used the words "good officials."

Mr. CRAWFORD: "Good" is a relative term and as a matter of opinion he may be good to him and bad to somebody else. Some thought Mr. Peek was good and others that he was bad: and a few hours after members criticised him in this House he resigned. What happened at Seawell Airport when they put up a new Terminal Building? Mr. James Murray came here, laughed at the construction and honourable members criticised it and he resigned; but because the Minister of Communications who does not know a turn-cock from a meter can come here with this Resolution, they are going to keep him on at the Waterworks. I am telling you at this stage after sending machines to England we have less chance of having proper service than we have had three or four years ago.

*The question that further consideration of the Resolution be postponed was put and resolved in the negative the House dividing as follows:—*

*Ayes:* Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY.—4.

*Noes:* Mr. BRYAN, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. SMITH, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. HAYNES.—8.

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

### ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

*The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.*

6.10 p.m.

### Rates of Income Tax

*On re-assembling,*

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day now stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: to move the second reading of a Bill to settle the rates of Income Tax for the year one thousand nine hundred and fifty-six, and to make provision for certain other matters in connection with the levying of the said tax.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill deals with the rates of Income Tax to be levied for this year; they are the same as they were for last year. Honourable members will want to ask something about the exemptions which have been promised and I will say that these exemptions will be dealt with in the next Order of the Day. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether the Government has come to the conclusion that these rates are such that it cannot interfere with them. I know that the Estimates have been made up on the basis that the Government would introduce these rates, and it would be a dangerous thing for the House to interfere with them, merely feeling that they will collect a surplus; but I am wondering if this 3% is a good figure with which to start off, and if relief cannot be given in these beginning brackets so as to assist those people who do not get too far in these brackets, if they get into them at all. It has been thought that if you give relief to these people, you give it to everybody. However, it is not a question of relieving everybody; it is your method of dealing with the matter, but it might be a good thing to reconsider these rates at some time.

For instance, when you get to 30%, you will notice that this 30% is on \$1,000; perhaps they could in-

troduce something there, and have a 35%, and give relief a little higher up. You will have to know the statistics so as to know what relief you are giving and how you could recoup yourself from this big bracket from \$1,000 to \$3,000. It might be necessary at some time or other to carry this rate beyond 75%. This is not a business in which you can say that you have to leave back something; and after a certain period it may be necessary to regulate nearly all of these rates. You are leaving people with their source of income and I am hoping that a revision of these rates will take place. These rates have been in existence, they have not been changed, and it is not a question of people not finding it difficult to pay their taxes.

Generally speaking, I understand that people are not taking advantage of the P.A.Y.E. system; it is regrettable, having regard to the way in which the system came in. I do not know whether you should ask the Income Tax Department if the arrears of taxes could not be avoided, if you make a regulation in respect of the collection under this system. I do not want people to think that because there is no debate on this Bill that the people in these lower brackets are finding it easy to contribute by way of Income Tax.

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

*On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.*

*Clause 1 was called and passed.*

*Clause 2 was called.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Something which I want to say here might sound selfish, but when you are a member of the House, there is nobody to speak for you, and therefore you have to speak for yourself. It is true that the Hon. Minister under whose portfolio this matter falls is not present, but I made a point during the consideration of the Budget that some examination should be made as regards the Income Tax rates and the allowances. I am not one of those persons who are opposed to Income Tax, but I feel that just as anybody else, you should examine any method of taxation to see whether it is keeping up to date. I contend that the present allowances are too low; for instance, if you take a rough and ready example, a man who is working for \$20 a week is an average workman to-day. Would anybody suggest that that is the type of salary or wage which you could regard as an amount from which Income Tax should operate? I go further; the general living standard is something which a Government must watch. There is a general tendency that if allowances are not liberal enough, that makes people who should pay avoid as much as they can the method of paying their fair share.

I feel that the time has come when the Income Tax allowances in Barbados and the allowances to members of this Chamber should be looked at in this light: let there be no doubt about it that no member of this House who draws a salary of £400 a year can claim that that salary is free of expenses. In this Island you are not even allowed your electioneering expenses to be deducted from your Income Tax; you are only allowed these expenses, but they are not deductible from your Income Tax. Any member of this House will realise for himself that the full income derived from being a member of this Chamber is taxable, and it does not make room for any of the

services which honourable members have to use. The Ministers of the Crown get \$50 per month for travelling expenses, and these travelling expenses are not taxable.

7.00 p.m.

I am maintaining with what a member has to do in regard to travelling in his constituency, that the same as you can regard travelling allowance as something which is not taxable that the amount payable to hon. members should be regarded in that light. I am frank enough to say it, Sir, because I know there are some hon. members of this House who were not in favour of receiving payment for their legislative duties but they did not refuse to take it from the Treasury. I am saying that taxable income should be related so to speak to a man's income. You should give a taxpayer enough off to free himself of his normal obligations and what he is called upon to pay should be what could be regarded as his dues to the community. I do feel that those of us who cannot hide our incomes and have to pay Income tax on what we earn, especially those of us who have families and have to support them, realise that the taxable amount for a married man of \$1,300 which is less than \$120 a month is not enough. Ask any hon. member of this House if a married man with a family really and truly can pay from a salary of \$120 per month house rent, buy food and all the necessities that normally are needed for a good life. I feel the time has come when the allowances for Income tax rate should be higher, an amount which could be regarded as just. I hope hon. members in the very near future will see that the rates of Income tax and the deductions are not related to the 1956 economy and that the financial implications on the whole should be reviewed. The Government is now getting more money from revenue. Of course it has to spend more money but the fact that the Government has to spend more money means that the individual also has to spend more money; therefore, he should be given more to spend. The allowances should be more liberal so as not to oppress people who have to pay income tax on low incomes.

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

*The Schedule was called and passed.*

*On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.*

*Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*

*On separate motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case the Bill was read a third time and passed.*

### THE INCOME TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL 1956

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day now stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: Second reading of a Bill to amend the law relating to income tax.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill deals with the amendments to the Income Tax Act of 1921. First of all, it changes some expressions which are in the Bill. The expressions "His Majesty's dominions" or "territories under His Majesty's protection," or "Empire" have been replaced by references to "the Commonwealth."

There is an amendment by way of a rebate in income tax for medical expenses.

This Bill also makes different provisions for the making of appeals. Instead of direct appeal to the Court of Common Pleas the Bill provides that there

be set up an Appeals Committee to which such appeals can be made in the first instance, and the persons making such appeals may still have further opportunity to the Court of Common Pleas. The object of that is to make the cost of appeals as reasonable as possible. It was considered that if a taxpayer had to appeal straight to the Court of Common Pleas that that would be rather expensive, so this Bill makes provision for the setting up of an Appeals Committee to whom complaints may be referred and if a taxpayer is still not satisfied, he can appeal further to the Court of Common Pleas.

Then there is the question of allowance for repairs for which an amendment is made. That is in view of the fact that the Vestries Act will be repealed in a short time, and as is known there will be a new system for collecting taxes which will be done on the advice of the Commissioner of Income Tax. This amendment therefore provides for the changeover as far as repairs to properties are concerned.

Then there is the old contention of the wear and tear allowances for which amendments in this Bill are included. The objects and reasons set it out clearly.

I repeat, provision is made in this Bill for Medical expenses, for appeals to be made to an Appeals Committee, then allowances will be given for repairs to houses for the purpose of Vestry rating as well as wear and tear allowances. Those are the main points which are included in this Bill.

Clause 3 deals with the abolition of the Vestries and the taking over of them by the new Council. There is also a new Schedule, called the second Schedule.

This Bill also seeks to abolish the "three year average" basis for calculating the allowances in respect of repairs to premises occupied otherwise than for the purpose of residence or enjoyment by or on behalf of the owner, and for implements, utensils or articles employed in acquiring the income; and in place provision is made for granting as such allowances the sums actually spent." I think that is somewhat different from the present Vestries Act.

7.10 p.m.

The present Vestry system as far as I remember does not take into consideration the owner or occupier of a House. Exemption is made under the present Vestry system for insurance, taxes, and things of that sort, but in this case, Sir, "owner occupier" repairs will be taken into consideration when computing one's income tax. As it is now, I think this is something additional. Of course, this will come into operation from this year. Dealing with the question of annual allowances, we have first of all initial allowance which is 20%; after initial allowance there are annual allowances which will be arranged at the consideration of the Income Tax Commissioner. There is also these balancing allowances and balancing charges which make provision that in case of a sale which might be considered as a "bogus sale"—that is, if I sell to some friend or relative at just a nominal price—if the sale realises more than the money paid back by way of income tax; if it is sold for less, there would be a rebate, and the Income Tax Commissioner can come in and claim what he thinks is a reasonable amount. These are the main points, Sir, besides wear and tear allowances. Sections 9 and 10, Sir, deal with the question of rebate on medical expenses which first of all must be in excess of \$20 and then you get \$100 in case of a married man, a rebate of \$50 in case of a single individual and \$25 in case of a child. I think these are the main points in this Bill and I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill of very far reaching importance. It was long in coming. Those of us on this side of the Table have been pressing Government in making certain allowances of income tax payers in respect of medical expenses thereby bringing the Income Tax Bill of Barbados up to date and in line with what happens in big and progressive countries. This Bill has taken that step, but it has gone somewhat further and amendments have been made as the Hon. Leader of the House has said relative to "owner occupier" and owner. It also makes allowances, Sir, relative to machinery. In short, this Bill will bring into effect certain Regulations that will normally come into operation with the Local Government Bill which is to bring into effect the new Local Government System. In other words, a lot of these provisions which now exist in the old Local Government System would have to be and they are being amended here to have the Local Government Act put into operation. As he rightly said, as to the question of allowances on insurance and taxes for the previous year—this notice will not allow any such deduction but will allow for repairs. I think it is a recognised thing that the standard system for repairs would usually be over a period of five years. I do not know how the Income Tax Commissioner will take it. Take the average man who pays \$60 a month whose previous year's taxes include bills, water and what not, which would amount, (depending upon the parish system which you know) at \$70 or \$80 a month: plus insurance which would bring it to roughly about \$100. This is what a man would be allowed if the present system operated as against this bill. It is not usual for a man to repair a house every year, but normally speaking if you are an "owner occupier" of a house and your income was £500 a year and you had to pay on say £100 than you would normally today be entitled to deduct the previous year's taxes of \$50 or \$60 plus your insurance plus any reasonable repairs and not any capital depreciation. Therefore, if your salary was \$500 and the value of your house was another £500, you would automatically be allowed to take off your previous year's taxes plus insurance plus any reasonable repairs. As the amendment stands, you are going to abolish reasonable repairs and not depreciation in capital so that if your income was £500 and you take off a roof or put in a terrazzo floor this would be reasonable repairs of not more than what the rental value would be. But to-day, you are to be allowed your repairs. I have had to discuss this on another occasion and I quite agree that unless it is going to be seen that your repairs here—it is not for a man who actually repairs every year; a man who owns a house to the value of £100 would hardly repair every year to get deduction on the £100. Therefore, Sir, if the practice is going to be to follow the practice of general repairs over a period of five years and take off that deduction after a period of five years, all well and good. It might sound complicated if members are not following. But if any man never puts his hand on sufficient money to do repairs, then while you may think of doing something here to benefit the income tax payer, you are really putting him at a disadvantage.

7.20 p.m.

However, when we get further on with this matter, the Hon. Minister will be able to explain it more fully.

There is one point I want to make here and on which I am directing my remarks to the Hon. Minister of Social Services who, like myself, will not boast of any extraordinary knowledge of this subject matter at all. At least, I do not think so: it only happens

that, as Hon. Leader of the House, it falls to his lot to introduce this Measure. This is a very technical matter. Let us take paragraph 2 of the "Objects and Reasons." It says this: "The deductions allowed are the aggregate of \$100 or \$50, depending upon whether the taxpayer is a married man or not, . . ." In other words, a single man is given deductions in the aggregate of \$50 a year for expenses incurred while a married man is given deductions in the aggregate of \$100 a year. I am the first to appreciate that a ceiling must be out in this matter. Mr. "X" can have his friend who is a Doctor to say that he has spent so much; and of course, that cuts both ways because the Doctor will have to return that amount when he is making his Income Tax return. But this paragraph in the "Objects and Reasons" goes further. It says: "For expenses incurred to the taxpayer, his wife and dependent relatives and \$25 in respect of each child up to a maximum of two."

I know that it is necessary to get through with this Bill, and that the Government will put it into operation for the present Income Tax year; but it is suggested here that they are allowing \$25 medical expenses in respect of each child for a man who has a family. In your Regulations, the maximum to which a Doctor can go for performing an operation for appendicitis is £100; but the average servant in Bridgetown who goes to the Hospital, and it is discovered that she is working for more than \$15 a month, she is charged \$25 for an operation. I am challenging the Hon. Minister to deny that; I am quite willing to sit now and let him deny it. Of course, you may think that some people who can very well pay, will fool people and do not pay; but how can you really and seriously talk about allowing \$25 for an operation? A person in this Country who is earning \$60 a month has to pay Income Tax. Let us say that a man who is working for \$100 a month or over, has a child or two children. He has to take a child to the Hospital for an operation for appendicitis; you are starting to give deductions from a certain bracket up. This man has to pay for an operation, and there is the operation and hospitalisation: do you think that an allowance of \$25 is sufficient in this case? I repeat that you must have a ceiling in this matter, but I appeal to the Hon. Minister to see that \$25 is not sufficient. I am suggesting that if you are doing anything in this matter of deductions for medical expenses, you should not deal with it in this way. We are now dealing with an Income Tax Bill and therefore we are dealing with people who pay a certain amount.

My serious plea which I am making to the Hon. Minister is this: this is a matter which will affect every honourable member of this House, and I am therefore asking honourable members to listen to me carefully. One out of every five families must need hospitalisation or medical expenses every year in this country. If the members of the Government have not got the figures, let them go to the Civic Friendly Society and get them. I know that they would like to bring this Bill into operation so that people can get off these medical expenses; that is alright, but let us deal with this matter in the correct way.

7.30 p.m.

Now, Sir, very often when these Bills come in here we are told that they are drafted by the Legal Draughtsmen in the Attorney General's Office and taken from similar Bills in other colonies. I have always contended that while that is so we must amend them so as to suit local conditions. We have been told time and time again, "No, let it go through," only to find out later that the Bill was not workable in that way.

I will give you an instance and it is in connection with the Local Government Bill. None of the

amendments which I suggested on the floor of the House was put in although I had no intention of holding up the Bill. It was rushed through this House and then sent to the Other Place. You then brought down a gentleman who really knows his job and he has told the Government that the Bill was not workable as it was.

Of course, members on this side of the table are not lawyers. I know that parts of other similar legislations are put into this Bill. I have a suggestion to make and I am giving my reasons for doing so. I know the Hon. Minister of Social Services is going to tell me that he cannot accept an amendment on the spur of the moment but I have seen an amendment made on the spur of the moment on the floor of the House—one that created a charge.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will interrupt the hon. member to say that that was done in Committee.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Yes Sir, that was so; however, any hon. member can make an amendment on the floor of this House.

A VOICE: You are wrong.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: We can make an amendment to this Bill. Section 10 states that Section 20 of the principal Act is hereby amended with the proviso that the amount so allowed shall not exceed the aggregate of \$25 for each child up to a maximum of two children. We should increase that sum. If that is amended to say "not exceeding the amount" it would mean that the claimant would have to satisfy the Income Tax Commissioner that with respect to illness on the part of his wife or children that was treated at the General Hospital, say by the Surgeon General, that he has spent up to that amount for which you must have a ceiling. I am suggesting that amendment to the Hon. Minister of Social Services.

I will further suggest that we postpone the passing of this Bill and allow a small Committee to go into it. It is far reaching. I suggested that because I did not expect the Hon. Minister to say "Yes" off hand to this amendment. Bear in mind, I am not arguing that you should leave the ceiling amount open so as to say that a man can spend any amount on his children. I am saying that Government must have a ceiling price. I know the Hon. Minister deep down in his heart knows that to some of us it might not matter if one spends \$100 and only gets off \$25 but I am thinking of those persons in the small income bracket such as waterfront workers, clerks, postmen and policemen. You should amend it to read, say "not exceeding £25." You have here not exceeding \$25 in the case of a child up to two children. Will the Hon. Minister say that that is only for the money which you are going to pay to the doctor? Why I ask that is because actually if one wanted medical attention and had to be hospitalised and, say, was paying 5/- a day for five or six weeks, will that amount for his hospitalisation be taken into account? The Hon. Minister of Social Services knows that if one is suffering from a stomach ailment and the doctor cannot find it out and he merely said that the person will have to get a photograph of a portion of the lower intestines, that would cost in the vicinity of \$40. The question of "not exceeding \$25" is out of the question and I am sure that the Hon. Minister of Social Services on his part will agree with me. Now, let us take a case in which a person has a daughter who needs treatment for a breast disease. What would that cost? I am sure it would not cost \$25; it will cost more than that. I am saying that you should amend it to say not exceeding *so much* but the person will have to produce bills to certify what he spends. You must keep your bills for the Income Tax Commissioner. Let us

not think of ourselves because some of us might have an income of £400 a year; others can augment what they get in here by what they do outside; therefore "not exceeding \$25" might mean nothing to us; but think of the postmen and the poor clerk who gets between \$80 and \$90 a month.

7.40 p.m.

When illness suddenly strikes a child and you have to go to Hospital, that is where the bills come in, and I have seen a man in the Income Tax group of £600 a year with six children who had three sick in one year. What do you do with them? I appeal to the Hon. Minister that while I appreciate the Bill and it has attempted to help, as neither of us can boast any superior knowledge about it, I am making a suggestion to him that as soon as the principle is passed that it be postponed so that we can have a committee and get one of the legal officers to come in and discuss certain aspects and see what can be amended relative to children and married men, and I do not agree to \$50 for a single man. Do not think of the man paying \$2 for six weeks. We want to get settled whether it covers Hospital bills and so on, so much a day for Hospital, so much for X-Ray and so on. That is not good enough. I am saying, let the man satisfy the Income Tax Commissioner with his bills.

What would have been all right 15 years ago cannot be to-day, and above all the Bill seeks to abolish the three year average basis on calculating allowances and expenses. I know a lot of members do not appreciate it. I have already explained how it applies to the local Government. This amendment comes in to fit in with the local Government Bill which is to be amended to deal with the system of taxation. In other words, the Local Government Bill as amended so far is to be further amended. You brought it in, you passed it and when members said, "let us go and discuss it," you said it was drafted by the Attorney General. No man can take it up now and say, "cut out this and put in that." In this respect I submit that members agreed with the principle, but if they must be just and fair to their constituents, they will say, "let me understand what this means." Let it go to a Committee and let us consult the Attorney General. This is no reflection upon the Minister of Health. If it were dealing with something along his line I would ask him every possible question I could about it, but it is not fair to ask certain things because it has fallen on him as Leader of the House. Therefore, I suggest, Sir, that while we agree to the principle of the second reading, when it is passed I would suggest to the Minister that he accept the idea of a Select Committee. You will still get it in time for the Income Tax allowances; and may I say this, Sir, even if he does not get it, it could be so worked that the allowances could be made; it is better to do it and do it well. I am going to say this with the greatest respect to the Minister: when this Bill goes to the Other Place they will go to a Select Committee and go into it. Well, give us the opportunity because it is very important that every honourable member should know.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, it seems difficult to interfere with at least the Barbados Income Tax Bill without giving great concessions to rich people and making it more difficult for the poor man. In this Bill we are not only giving people who can spend large sums of money on machinery and buildings initial allowances which is something new, but the annual allowances are to be revised and balancing allowances are to be introduced so that the rich people are getting something that way. When it comes to allowances for medical expenses, the rich people will get it off 75% and the poor man will get it off 3%. My opinion, Sir, is that the Government has made a ges-

ture. I am not saying that these other things are not quite in order; you eventually give people something off machinery, so that you can look at that that way. But if you take out an insurance premium to-day, Sir, the Government has changed the method to restrict the deduction of 24%. It does not interfere with the existing policy. I think, Sir, that something along those lines should be given in respect of medical expenses. What I mean is this. Do you mean to tell me that if a man is paying in the 40% bracket and he gets off \$100 he gets off \$50 out of it. If you give a poor man the same \$100 in the 3% bracket he gets off \$3. You make one man a present of \$3 out of \$100 and another man \$50 out of \$100. The man that is least able to lose it gets off only \$3.00. That is something, Sir, that I think we should go into. I would prefer the Government to give the Income Tax payer a certain amount of money off. However, Sir, that is something I would like the Hon. Minister to consider, if he has not considered it from that angle.

7.50 p.m.

If a man is now paying in the 20% bracket, give him 20% of the expenses; do not tell him to take it off. If he takes his off, and does not have to pay any Income Tax at all, he gets only \$3; if a rich man gets off any 50% or 60%, you are giving him \$50 or \$60 out of \$100. This Bill was introduced on 19th January this year when we were all looking forward to the consideration of the Estimates, and it is unfortunate that a Bill like this had not been brought forward after last year's Estimates, where you have justification for the appointment of a small Committee to meet the Income Tax Commissioner and one or two other persons. I know that the Government cannot just collect taxes and give them away; but it is of no use saying that you will catch the Doctors if you make the deduction small. It is when you make it big that you will catch the Doctors. A Doctor can charge you \$500 for his services and give you a receipt for \$150. The very thing that people have been complaining about in respect of hurricane Insurance, is that they have to stand the first \$120. In this case, if you spend a certain amount you will get back \$3.

In the "Objects and Reasons" of this Bill, it is stated that you want to save people an expensive method of appeal, but do not force people not to pay the Court of Common Pleas. Let us have an Appeals Committee, by all means, but let those people who want to appeal directly to the Court of Common Pleas have the privilege of doing so. I strongly object to your coming in here and saying that you want to cut down somebody else's expense, that you feel that the greatest justice will be done by going to the Appeals Committee, and if people are not satisfied, then they can go before the Chief Justice in the Court of Common Pleas. [Hon. M. E. COX: You can go direct to the Court.] The Bill does not say so; it says that if you are not satisfied with the decision of the Appeals Committee, then you can go to the Chief Justice.

You may have to go before three or four people and disclose your private business. Do you mean to say that you will hand-pick four people to whom I must disclose my business and say that it is secret? [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Four people cannot keep a secret.] My colleague says that four people cannot keep a secret; however, that is by the way. I am always in agreement with giving a little more study to Bills; if I agree to this Bill being referred to a Select Committee, I am hoping that a small Committee will be chosen and let it meet. The history of Select Committees will certainly give the Government cause of being afraid of these Committees but

the appointment of a Select Committee to consider a matter is a most useful course to adopt.

In the old days people came in here with a knowledge of what they were discussing; nowadays, the other people must be kept out, and the politician must come in here and represent people in every phase. I say that a small Select Committee should be chosen, but the members of that Committee should accommodate the Government by attending the meetings.

There are one or two typographical errors in this Bill for which we must look, because the members of the Other Place will say that we are not careful enough in dealing with these Bills. I say in conclusion that this is a Bill which does not come to the adequate assistance of the ones who need it most. The principle of going before an Appeals Committee is an excellent one for me, because I may not be able to go before the Court of Common Pleas. There are those who are willing to support the method of going before an Appeals Committee, and I sincerely hope that members of the legal profession will be put on this Committee.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I should like to answer one or two questions. The question of the amount of these medical expenses to be allowed was raised by both hon. members for the City, but I do not think that it was ever intended that the full medical expenses should be allowed. It was only intended to assist people with these medical expenses, but not to give them a rebate of the whole amount. The hon. junior member for the City began by saying that the wealthy people will benefit from this Amendment by way of allowances on machinery and so on. As a matter of fact, these medical allowances apply to everybody; both rich and poor get the same. On the question of these allowances, I do not know if the hon. member has ever read the Hicks' Report, that Report was written by Mr. and Mrs. Hicks of Jamaica, and they say that these allowances are invariably nothing more than a postponement of liability.

8.00 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: I said that eventually you will give it off.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This is not as grand a thing as you think. They just describe it as interest from loan. This is no grand concession that the people think it is. The experts who have examined this thing have described this interest from loan as a postponement of liability.

Now there is a question of referring this Bill to a Select Committee. I believe from the expressions of opinion of the two hon. members that the main object of their referring this Bill to a Select Committee is for the purpose of dealing with the allowances. No Select Committee can alter allowances, so if that is the purpose of sending this Bill to a Select Committee, nothing can be gained by its being dealt with by a Select Committee. The Executive Committee has already seen and agreed to these figures and only the Executive Committee can alter them. I think it is the desire of the public that we should get on with this Bill.

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

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be sent to Select Committee. I have already given my reasons and I do not intend to repeat them. I just want to say in moving the motion that I do not think the Hon. Minister of Social Services was serious when he said that sending this Bill to Select Committee could serve no useful purpose. I am prepared to say if I am selected to

serve on that Committee that the Committee can meet this week and finalise matters. Surely the Hon. Minister could not be serious when he said that a Select Committee cannot amend these allowances. A Select Committee can do anything. It can study and make a report as regards the ceiling price but what you would allow would be a question for the Executive Committee.

The position is this: the Hon. Minister says that these are the recommendations of the Executive Committee. What will happen is that this Bill will go to the Other Place and they will make amendments there and send it back down here and the same Hon. Minister will come in here and ask us to agree with them; yet he cannot agree with its being sent to a Select Committee but the Other Place will say "send it to a Select Committee." I am saying that not only should we send it to Select Committee, but the Select Committee should meet on it this week and decide on it. The Select Committee can get the Income Tax Commissioner and the Attorney General to help. Of course, the Select Committee cannot make amendments, but it can make suggestions for amendments in a Report. The Executive Committee can agree or disagree with the amendments. Do not say that sending it to Select Committee can serve no useful purpose. I do not agree with you.

Sir, you have a law on the Statute Book which says that you must pay income tax. I can move that the whole thing be deleted; as a matter of fact, any member can make that motion. If the Attorney General says that you cannot do that, he is wrong. So long as you have the majority, you can amend anything.

8.10 p.m.

If I can get the majority I can amend anything. Am I not right, Sir?

I beg to move therefore, that this Bill be sent to a Select Committee. Do that, rather than to have it go to the Other Place and have us made a laughing stock of all the time, and then you will read the prepared speech of the learned Chief Secretary and see these explanations? Yet today this House must say it agrees. After all, you are in Government, and you represent a point of view. We are at one on the principle of the Bill, but there are certain amendments. Will the Hon. Minister enlighten us on Depreciation? I know of no firm in Bridgetown which made trade returns unless it lost money. They started the business and had machinery in the extent of \$40,000. You had a scale on depreciation allowed by the Income Tax Commissioner and one by the Vestry. Let us accept the one by the Income Tax. After a period of three years they decide that the machinery is inadequate for the business and they are going to scrap that machinery, but they have already written down that machinery at \$10,000. Somebody comes along and says we will give you \$12,000 for it, but they would not consider it, because it is not going to be any competition. [A VOICE: That is where balancing charges come in.] Yes, because you are not going to have any competition, and therefore, I say, Sir, the matters which my colleague and I have raised are sufficient to say, "Let us not pass things that way, let us send it to a Select Committee." It is not so voluminous, but it is a principle; and these matters which are of great importance should be attended to. What difference does it make? The Government has the majority, so put the majority on the Select Committee.

I beg to move that this Bill be sent to a Select Committee.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that motion, in recommendation of the Select Committee.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

*The question was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:—*

*Ayes:* Mr. BRYAN, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT; and Mr. VAUGHAN.—9.

*Noes:* Mr. ALLDER, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY—3.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN in the Chair.

*Clauses 1 to 9 were called.*

*Clause 10— was called.*

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, this is not the clause I intended to comment upon, but I am wondering whether the Government has considered the granting of a relief by the direct giving of some of the tax. Would they take something off a man's tax bill? What I mean is, if you are giving an allowance, say, to a married man in the \$500 bracket, you are giving him \$3 out of what he is actually spending. It is a dangerous thing for these allowances to be taken off the gross income because it means that you get off at the rate of what the maximum tax would pay.

8.20 p.m.

Mr. Acting Chairman, if you have a taxable income of \$100, and you are entitled to this maximum of \$100, you still pay 3%. A man who is paying in the 50% bracket, gets \$50 off the same \$100 that he paid for an operation for himself or his wife. If you give him off \$100 of taxable income, in any case the Government is making him a present of the tax of \$100. Therefore if I pay 3% on the first \$500, I get \$3, whereas another man gets \$60; have they considered giving something off the tax? let us confine this matter to the 20% bracket, and give \$20 off \$100, and make some adjustment in the case of persons in the \$500 taxable bracket. I am sorry that I not feeling so well tonight to be able to speak on this matter. I do not care what anybody says, this method is something which will assist rich people. I would even say that you should have increases where income does not go as far as 20%, and abolish the \$20 which you are going to make a man pay. Let us give these people something more. A man who has taken \$100 out of his pocket and paid it in medical expenses, has to pay \$120 before he gets \$100 and then you tell him that he will get \$3 out of it. Perhaps the Income Tax Commissioner might be able to assist these people; you want to assist the poor man, and if you are taking this deduction off the gross income, you cannot assist people proportionately.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I see the hon. member's point, but at this stage I can only promise him that I will draw the matter to the attention of the Executive Committee.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I would ask the hon. member to read sub-paragraph (c) of Clause 10 which deals with allowances; it says:—"Any relative in respect of whom he may make a deduction under paragraph (iii) of this subsection for the year in which the expense was incurred." I am submitting that this is a strong claim for allowing this Bill to be referred to a Select Committee. The paragraph goes on to say this:—"If payment of the expenses is proved to the satisfaction of the Commissioner: provided that the amount so allowed shall not exceed the aggregate of—(a) one hundred dollars in the case of a married man who is entitled to a deduc-

tion of thirteen hundred dollars under paragraph (i) of this subsection or fifty dollars in the case of any other individual; of (b) twenty-five dollars for each child up to a maximum of two children."

Will the Hon. Minister in charge of this Bill tell me how that \$100 applies, whether it is a deduction of \$100 for the man or for his wife? In other words, a married man is entitled to a deduction of \$1,300; that is the allowance before he starts to pay Income Tax. I ask again, does this sub-paragraph mean that this \$100 is a deduction for the man or for his wife? I will go a little further; this paragraph states: "Or \$50 in case of any other individual." I can quite see that an individual means a single man or a single woman. Then you have "Twenty-five dollars for each child up to a maximum of two children." The Hon. Minister is a Doctor of 30 years' standing; if a man is paying Income Tax at all, he is allowed \$50 for medical expenses, but if he has children, he is allowed \$25 for each child up to a maximum of two children. I want to ask the Hon. Minister this; is a Doctor going to take less fees for attending to a child? I want to say that legislation must be so worded as not to be in any way ambiguous; it must be worded not merely for the legal luminaries or judges to interpret but also for the ordinary layman to understand.

8.30 p.m.

Will the Hon. Minister explain that for me?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: The Hon. Minister of Social Services can answer the points raised by the honourable senior member for the City. What I rose to answer is the point raised by the honourable junior member for the City about medical expenses and I hope what he said will not influence unduly this Committee. I take it that his argument is that we are wrong because we are taking off for medical expenses a sum from the assessable income rather than the taxable income, therefore we are coming down heavily on the poor taxpayer rather than on the rich person. Let me say that all the Government proposes to do is to carry out the practice which is established in Canada. This is a step forward and I am sure the House welcomes it. We can only carry it out in this way, that is, by treating it as an expense just as you take off allowances for children and a wife. I maintain that this is the only way in which we can do it. Any other way would be a colossal burden which we cannot undertake. In no other country where there is tax concession for medical expenses do you take it off in taxes; you deduct it as an expense. We will be treating everybody in the same way. In whatever circumstances a taxpayer may be, he will get up to \$150 if he is a married man with two children; if he is single, he will get \$50; and if he is a married man with no children he will get up to \$100. I really cannot see how we can treat it in any other way save as an expense taxable from income.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I hope the honourable member is serious about what he said. This idea of giving every man off something for a child is alright because it works itself out in this way: what I have to spend on my children is not what a rich man has to spend on keeping his children. Why should a rich man get \$50 off \$100 which he pays out and I get off only \$3. You are giving him \$50 cash back off what he pays and you are giving me back \$3. [A VOICE: Who says that?] Any honourable member who cannot follow that should keep his mouth shut. We have just settled the rates of Income tax for this year and off every complete dollar of taxable income up to \$500 you pay 3% off every complete dollar of taxable income up to \$6,000, what do you pay? Look it up and see? If you are going to deduct it from taxable in-

come up to \$6,000 you cannot get away from what I say at all.

Mr. Chairman, this very Government when it first informed the House that it was going to give you off your Life Insurance policy at 75%, 60%, 45%, and 10%, varied its decision and said, "No, I am going to give you off at 24%." How can the Hon. Minister say that the Government cannot do this, that and the other? I am asking them to strike an average with me. Strike an average and give me \$20 off. If it prevents me from paying income tax I can lose something by it. It is very regrettable that one should have to argue this way with honourable members of this House.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said, that should be as plain as daylight. Do not let the Government fool the public that it is giving anybody back the \$100 which one may pay in medical expenses. To some taxpayers Government is giving off \$3 and to some \$75. The Government has just taken your insurance premium and said they cannot deduct it from your gross income. They are so English that they stop at 24% instead of 25% which is something you can divide by four so as to make it easy. They are saying that a poor person as well as a rich one must pay \$20 in expenses before he can start to count, so he has to pay \$120 in expenses before he can get off the \$100. So far as the argument of my colleague is concerned, the point he made about children should be worded differently.

8.40 p.m.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is no point about the children. This clause should be so worded that it should not be \$25 to a maximum of two children; it should be \$50 in respect of children. You see a man that has two children is going to get \$270. If a man with one child has had \$50 in expenses for that child, he should be allowed \$50 off for it, because if you have three children that might prevent you from getting into the income tax bracket, but if you have one and you have expenses for one you can only deduct \$270. Give \$50 off for one child or children. You are allowing \$50 off for a man, for his wife and for his children. Make it for one child or children. Not only that, Sir; it must be remembered that while you have to wait until you actually pay this money—after the payment of the expenses is proved to be satisfactory to the Income Tax Commissioner.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: In answer to the honourable junior member for the City as regards the \$50, the point is that the \$100 applies to the husband, plus \$100 for the wife. From what I read here:

"Provided that the amount so allowed shall not exceed the aggregate of \$100."

So I take it that the \$100 applies to his gross income. From that he gets \$100 whether it be for himself or his wife, but he cannot ask for more than \$100, and if he has a child or two children \$150.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: On a point of explanation, does that \$100 apply to a married man who is entitled to a deduction of thirteen hundred dollars? Does that apply to him? Suppose that man alone is sick during that year, is he entitled to the \$100 as a married man?

Hon. M. E. COX: The answer is yes, because it is known that with a married man's income his wife's has to be included.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Minister of Communications has really thrown himself in deep water; you cannot swim in this. His answer is yes, I say he cannot swim in this. Listen to what I asked. Is the \$100 allowed in the case of a married man who is getting \$1,300? This is a simple question. A married man lives in a house with his wife; I am asking

if the man alone is sick during the year if he receives the allowance. As a matter of fact, you cannot merely say that; you have to prove it, according to this. As a married man he is not entitled to anything unless he is sick. What I am asking is this: a single man is entitled to \$50 but suppose during the year a married man alone is sick, is he entitled to \$100?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Yes.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: A married man and his wife are living together. He pays in the \$1,300 bracket. This Bill says in the case of a married man who is entitled to a deduction of \$1,300; what I am asking is this: if a married man is living with his wife and he alone is sick and presents a bill for \$100, is he entitled to the deduction?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Yes.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That is one of the reasons why it should have been given more explanation. I am prepared to take on every member of the Government ten to one, that the Attorney General will tell them that the answer is wrong, that that \$100 can only apply to that married man if he and his wife were sick. What you have got here is \$50 for a married man, \$50 for his wife, \$50 to another man and \$25 each to children, but the Minister means to say that if that man alone is sick during the year that he can go to the Income Tax Commissioner and say: "I spent \$100," and get it off. It is ambiguously stated. Let any legal member of the House tell you. The reason why I asked that is because it can be interpreted the way the Minister answered; that is why I say it wants amending.

"Provided the amount so allowed shall not exceed the aggregate of (a) one hundred dollars in the case of a married man who is entitled to a deduction of thirteen hundred dollars under paragraph (i) . . .

This is for a married man provided he is living with his wife. What this means is, that \$50 is allowed to a person, that is, \$50 a man \$50 to his wife and \$25 for each child. I raise that question, because I fully realise that at a glance it is bound to be interpreted the way the Minister answered it.

I say that that point needs clarification. I see that the Ministers are laughing. It is amazing; I do not mind the other two Ministers, but the Hon. Minister of Health will discuss this matter with the Income Tax Commissioner, and we will be told that no individual can get more than \$50. If their interpretation of this Clause is correct, then all you have to do is to get married, get sick and get this allowance of \$50. [Hon. M. E. COX: A man's income is included.] A man's income is included in what? If you get \$100 as a deduction, what does your wife get? [Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Do not let her get sick in the same year!] [Laughter]. Oh! you must control the sickness during the year; that is a good one.

Mr. LEWIS: Suppose a man is so unfortunate that in the very year that he is sick his wife has a child; what will happen then? This section of this Bill compels a man to pay his expenses in the particular year; that again is penalising a man who has to defer payment. He may not have a taxable income in the year in which he paid his expenses.

*The question that Clause 10 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative on the following division—*

*Ayes:* Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. M. E. BOURNE, Mr. SMITH, Mr. HOLDER and Mr. LEWIS—7.

*Noes:* Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY.—1.

*Clauses 11 and 12 were called and passed.*

*Clause 13 was called.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 13 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I think that in speaking on the second reading of this Bill, I gave hon. members of the Government sufficient time to give consideration to this suggestion of mine. I know it is a suggestion which will be accepted; this amendment says:

"May appeal against the assessment to the Appeals Committee and the Commissioner or any such person if aggrieved by the decision of that Committee may appeal to the Court of Common Pleas."

If I can produce an amendment to allow people to go straight to the Court of Common Pleas, will the hon. member accept that amendment?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: That is why you have to set up this Appeals Committee; an appeal to this Committee will cost you nothing. There is no expense involved in this Appeals Committee, but there is an expense involved in going to the Court of Common Pleas. You have to pass from the Court of Appeal to go to the Court of Error and then to the West Indian Court of Appeal. You cannot bypass the one in order to go to the other; the point is, that this Appeals Committee will be a free Court, and if you have to go further, you can do so.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Does the hon. member suffer under the impression that the lodging of a case in the Court of Common Pleas will cost you \$100?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The Appeals Committee will cost you nothing.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: You can go before the Chief Justice in Chambers. What my colleague is saying is that you should be entitled to elect either course; a man should be entitled to say that rather than go to the Appeals Committee, he will go to the Court of Common Pleas. You have not got to go from one Court to the other. What my colleague is saying is that you should be able to appeal either to the Appeals Committee or to the Court of Common Pleas. I quite agree with the hon. member.

Mr. LEWIS: The hon. member in charge of this Bill might be reluctant to accept an amendment, and if I were in his position, I would be reluctant to accept it too. However, I would not like the members of the Other Place to introduce any such amendment; my object is to have an easy means of appeal, but I do not think you should compel people to accept your cheapness. We want to preserve the secrecy which is attached to the Office; let us give a man the opportunity of going before the Court. One man can employ Counsel to go before this Appeals Committee, and many people may prefer to go before the Court of Common Pleas.

8.50 p.m.

I agree. Do not compel anybody to accept your cheapness. I will say that this is "may appeal against the assessment" which can be made either to the Court of Common Pleas or the Appeals Committee." Then there is the proviso: "Provided that if the Commissioner or any such person is aggrieved by the decision of the Appeals Committee, then the Commissioner or any such person may appeal to the Court of Common Pleas."

If the Hon. Minister of Social Services intends to meet on Tuesday next week, we can leave for further consideration this Clause about Appeals in Committee. Let us report progress and ask for leave to sit again. I really would not like to leave the House without a quorum but I feel strongly on this matter. Probably, the Acting Attorney General can help you on it.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: If you feel strongly on this Clause, what we can do is to pass the other clauses and postpone this one. I will report it to the Executive Committee at the meeting

Thursday and come back with something on it next Tuesday.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that further consideration of this Clause be now postponed.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I accept that motion.

*Clauses 14 to 22 were called separately and passed.*

*The Schedule was called.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the Schedule stand part of the Bill.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: What is the number of this Schedule? I have an idea that this is to be the Second Schedule.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: It is the Second Schedule; the first is in the original Act.

*The question that the Schedule stand part of the Bill was put and agreed to.*

*On motion of Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave for the Committee to sit again.*

*Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*

#### ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until this day week, Tuesday, 20th March, 1956, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

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

# THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1955—56

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

*Tuesday, 20th March, 1956.*

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 3 o'clock p.m. today.

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*), His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*), Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P. (*Chairman of Committees*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Mr. F. C. GODDARD, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. E. ST.A. HOLDER, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*), and Mrs. E. E. BOURNE.

*Prayers were read.*

### MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready for circulation.

### DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following:—

Plantations' Building,  
Bridgetown,  
Barbados, B.W.I.  
16th March, 1956.

His Honour, K. N. R. Husbands,  
Speaker,  
The House of Assembly,  
The Members,  
The House of Assembly.  
Gentlemen,

I wish to advise you that I am leaving for England shortly and that Mr. James Francis Gormly will be taking over the management of this Office.

I should be glad if you would accept my resignation as Auditor of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank, and I suggest that Mr. Gormly should be appointed in my place.

I have the honour to be,

Yours faithfully,

P. D. Mc. DERMOTT,  
Auditor.

## NOTICES

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:

Resolution to place the sum of \$1 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part II, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955-56, No. 76, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of \$127,554 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part II, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955-56, No. 77, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of this House is asking that these two Resolutions be considered to-day inasmuch as they are very urgent. Copies have been printed and deposited with the Clerk for circulation amongst hon. members. I am appealing to the House that they are very urgent.

One of them, Sir, is a token vote for the approval of ordering electrical parts for the Belle Pumping Station and the other is in connection with the buses which were taken over by the Government.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:—

Resolution to place the sum of \$526 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955-56, No. 78, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Sir, it is also proposed to ask leave to proceed with this Resolution today. It is in connection with Items which are needed for the Legislature.

I therefore beg to give notice of my intention to ask leave for the postponement of Rules 88 & 89 in order to proceed with these Resolutions today.

### SUSPENSION OF RULES

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Rules 88 & 89 be now suspended in order to proceed with these three Money Resolutions of which notice was just given.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.  
8.25 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, this is really not the time that urgency of a Resolution should be pressed. So far I have only just heard that something is wanted for the Legislature. I think we should

have heard something about them during the Estimates; it must mean something to the House of Assembly and I would like to hear something more particularly pertaining to the Resolution. The Resolution about the Waterworks we heard about last Tuesday, but this is a Resolution for \$127,554, and I do not know if any honourable member has heard what it is about. One member said he has heard it is in connection with the bus service.

Well, Sir, I really feel that we should have had the opportunity of having these things circulated before the actual moving of them. They are of very urgent necessity, I do not know why; but certainly it is great slackness on the part of somebody that we should have the Estimates and then have private members draw attention to the Waterworks and then at the next meeting it is regarded as urgent. Members have been asking for information about the bus question for some time and it is not fair to them. The first Item of the Day is Committee of Supply and the Order Paper circulated has given members the impression that \$540 would be voted. At least these should have been circulated over the week-end so that members of the House could come today knowing that something like this would be done. This money involves a serious principle; so does the Resolution *re* Waterworks. This is not the way to deal with principles of nationalisation and a serious thing like a breakdown of the Waterworks at a moment's notice when members make an effort to get here early. I hope Government will see to it that these urgent matters—I know that printing is difficult—get some attention. These urgent matters have never been printed. They could have been circulated. We have heard about one of them since last Tuesday. Hon. members know this is not the private business of the five Ministers or anybody else; it is the most serious public business that we can come here to discuss. How can we come here and ask intelligent questions or assist Government in any way if this is the way it is going to be done? It leaves too much to be desired.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I am not a party to anything that is not fair and just. So far as taking over the buses is concerned, I agree. I do not however agree with the method the Minister wants to adopt today. They are not frank enough. When I was coming in here I heard about proroguing the House—that somebody wants to prorogue the House, so you come here with a Resolution for \$127,544. Can you really seriously ask the Legislature to consider at this stage \$127,544 for taking over the buses, not having given members who want to know something about it an opportunity to be here, but to spring a thing like this on people and tell them you are dealing with it today? Government would not expect private members to come here with any important measure and to ask them to do the same thing. I gave notice of a Bill, but they are not printing it as you know; it is as urgent as this, and I could have had it cyclo-styled since this was done; and if it is passed I am giving notice that I will circulate my Bill and have it debated today, and the second reading passed because it is as urgent as the buses and the buses are owned by the Government already. But I do not like the idea of passing \$127,544 to deal with this. So far as I am concerned I agree to the taking over of the buses, but I do not agree that other members should not have the opportunity of knowing that it is going to be discussed today, and I do not like the idea of putting forward this today and asking that the vote be done on the spot. It is not fair to the public, and those members who represent the public should be given the opportunity

of knowing that you are going to discuss this important Resolution. It is not fair to an hon. member who is not here now.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, all that the hon. members on the Other Side have said is true, as far as earlier circulation of these Resolutions are concerned, but we will ask hon. members to realise first of all that there is the difficulty of printing, and secondly, the Government Offices have been removed from where they were down here and all this has upset the schedule. It is only this morning they were done. First of all there is no printing and secondly the whole schedule has been upset and it is only at a late hour these were printed. You said, I did not ask leave to move the suspension of Rules 88 & 89. I do now formally withdraw the motion I made.

I am asking leave to move the suspension of Rules 88 & 89.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Do I understand that he is going to proceed with this today?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Rules 88 & 89 be suspended. It has been said, Sir, that no reasons were given why these Resolutions should be proceeded with today. One is the question of the Waterworks and the pumps which were discussed at great length at the last meeting and the general public and the House were acquainted with the position of the pumps. It is necessary to place the order, I understand, as soon as possible because it takes about eighteen months to get the pumps, and the earlier you place your order naturally the sooner you get them. As far as the second Resolution is concerned, the hon. member in charge of that considers it urgent because of the voting of that money; I think the hon. member will be best able to handle that.

As far as the third Resolution is concerned, this is for money owed by this House to several persons and firms and we would like to pay it before the end of the financial year which ends in a few days time.

3.35 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: In seconding that motion, I would like to refer to a few remarks which were made by the hon. junior member for St. Peter. I do not know to whom he was referring when he said that we were trying to deal with this Resolution in the absence of other hon. members; but when this House is summoned for a meeting, all hon. members should be here. There is no attempt whatsoever being made to do anything behind anybody's back. As a matter of fact, I take it that we will be discussing other items, during which time the absent members to whom the hon. junior member for St. Peter was referring, might arrive. The hon. member should know that it is not the Government's intention to try to force anything down the throat of anybody; it is because of our knowledge of the situation as it stands today, that we are asking the House to agree to allow these things to be passed. I am sure that when we get into Committee and hon. members receive information, they will be justified as to the action which we are taking in the matter.

Mr. GODDARD: I am pointing out to the Government the danger of giving us information and asking us to deal with the matter at the same time. They can give us whatever information they like and withhold whatever information they like. We are therefore at a disadvantage. We represent the public; and a lot of this information will be gathered if and when this Resolution becomes public property. Notice has been given of this Resolution today, and when it is printed and cir-

culated we will know what questions to ask. As the position is now, we do not know where we are going and after we have passed the Resolution then we might find that a lot of information could have been given, but the Resolution or Bill would have been passed.

I am saying that we are always willing to accommodate the Government but this state of affairs is becoming much too frequent. I do not accept the excuse about the Ministerial Offices having been removed to Bay Street; this Resolution should have been got to us at least yesterday afternoon. I do not think it is asking too much of the Government to have given us this information before today; we could have come here in a better position to discuss this matter today. For the reasons which I have given, I am opposed to this matter being dealt with today.

Mr. MILLER: In connection with this Resolution for \$90,000 in connection with the Waterworks, there is some measure of urgency. I would like to know if this is something to do with augmenting the existing supply by two million gallons as seems to be indicated by these pumps, or if it is a question of dealing with the existing machinery, and the urgency is to put back this equipment. I would like to have the matter settled as to whether there is some regard being paid to the Bore Hole Pumps.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is not speaking on the motion which is before the House; the honourable member cannot speak on any motion other than that one. The honourable member will have to speak on whether the matter should be discussed to-day; he has waited just too long.

Mr. MILLER: My unswerving respect to the dictates of the Chair is as it always has been.

*The question that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended was put and resolved in the affirmative.*

*A division was taken as follows:—*

*Ayes:* Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE, Messrs. HOLDER, SMITH, BRYAN, MILLER, J. C. MOTTLEY and VAUGHAN—11.

*Noes:* Messrs. F. L. WALCOTT, BRANCKER, HAYNES, LEWIS and GODDARD—5.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the affirmative, eleven honourable members voting "Aye", and five honourable members voting "No," but in accordance with Rule 93, twelve honourable members not having consented to the suspension of these Rules, I cannot allow the suspension of the Rules.

Mr. LEWIS: On a point of Order. I am seeking your assistance, Mr. Speaker, as to whether this Resolution for \$127,000 can be introduced into this House at all. So far as I know, the buses are now being run by a Transport Board, which has been established by law as a Corporation. If this were money being asked for as a loan to the Transport Board, it might be competent that such a Resolution could be introduced here; but having set up an Authority for the purpose of running the Transport in this Island, and without being in possession of these buses, I question whether it is competent for us to give the Governor-in-Executive Committee money to buy these buses. The proper thing for the Government to do is to give a loan to the Transport Board for the purpose of acquiring these buses. I am not saying that it is so, but I put forward this question for Your Honour's consideration; I am questioning whether a Transport Board, by law established as a Corporation and empowered to borrow money, to buy buses, pay salaries, and buy gasoline for the purpose of the Transport services of this Island—I am questioning whether it is competent for this House to give the Governor-in-Executive Com-

mittee money to buy these buses. I do not know what the legal position is, but I am asking Your Honour to take some advice and give some consideration to this matter as to whether it is competent for us now to entertain such a Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no necessity for me to make any ruling in this matter to-day, because the matter is not now being dealt with. I would give my ruling when the Resolution comes up for consideration. 3.45 p.m.

#### CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES REAPPOINTED

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to appoint a Chairman of Committees. I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph be appointed Chairman of Committees for the remainder of this Session.

Mr. MILLER: I beg to second that.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I wish to say that I quite clearly see that it is the wish of the House that I should go back into the Chair; and I would not like the public as well as hon. members who are in favour of my resuming the Office to feel that I want to shirk the duties. I will go back into the Chair but at the same time I will appeal to those hon. members who feel that because they are men and that the Chairman of Committees cannot lash them with a whip or try to stop their meals by way of punishment, when they disobey the Chair, to view the matter in a broader light by way of helping the Chair and to maintain the dignity of the House by obeying the rulings of the Chair.

*The question that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph be appointed Chairman of Committees for the remainder of this Session was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

*On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.*

#### Supplementary Estimate 1955-56, No. 75

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to take charge of this Resolution in the absence of the Hon. Premier.

*There being no objection, leave was granted the hon. member.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of \$540 to pay for Vicars under Head XIX Ecclesiastical. It is well known that after a vacancy occurring under Section 15 of the Anglican Church Act, 1911 remains unfilled for six months, the salary lapses in the Treasury until a permanent appointment is made. There was an amendment to this Act during last year which made provision for temporary appointments as no new permanent appointments may be made. This temporary appointment has now been filled and this money is required to pay the salary of the Vicar of St. Patrick (a) in respect of a *locum tenens* as from 1st January to 6th February, 1956; and (b) the salary of a temporary incumbent as from 7th February, to 31st March, 1956.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I will like to get a little more information. Is this one of those Cures which have been vacant for six months, or has it been partially filled by a temporary appointment?

What I am getting at is this. We passed an Act sometime last year which terminated the making of permanent appointments to these Cures. If this Cure were vacant for six months and you made a temporary appointment last month, where will the salary come from? Do you have to wait for six months to get the money? If a Vicar was filling this post all that time, has he drawn any money from the Treasury? Has any money been voted for him? Or, is he drawing a salary as a temporary man whereas he is a permanent man without pension rights? It appears to me as if this is something which Government has done without proper study and it has caught up with them. The business with the filling of the Cure at Boscobelle was an entirely different thing. I understand that. You must tell me how, if a Cure is vacant in January and you fill it in February, somebody can go into the Treasury and draw money.

This is a new situation. You passed an Act amending the Anglican Church Act saying that you cannot make a permanent appointment. This is not a case of an appointment which is the subject of another appointment. I do not understand this case at all. I am wondering if this has caught up with the Government. I would like to know exactly what is the position. It seems to me as if it would be better to put a sum of money in the Estimates to cover this contingency.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: As a result of the passing of an amendment last year to the Anglican Church Act, as soon as a Cure becomes vacant the appointment of an incumbent is a new transaction; that is to say, the new incumbent is not eligible for pension. In the case of this Cure it was vacant from the 1st July 1955, until the 6th February, this year, when this reverend gentleman appeared on the scene and was appointed. This \$540 is required to pay him as from the 7th February until 31st March, this year, which is the end of this financial year. I am not quite clear, but it does appear to me that he was only appointed as from the 7th February, this year. As a result of that, I think we will have to come back to the Legislature for money to pay him.

3.55 p.m.

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

*On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of a Resolution in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*

*On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.*

### INCOME TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1956

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day, is to resume debate in Committee on the Bill to amend the law relating to Income Tax.

*Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this is to resume Committee on this Income Tax (Amendment) Bill, which was deferred from last Tuesday for one or two reasons.

One reason was that it was passed with the exception of Section 13. That section was postponed and I asked the Clerk to circulate copies of these Amendments. I will proceed with Section 13 and at the same time ask leave to recommit one or two sections already passed as well as to introduce new Amendments. I will ask to recommit Section 4, for which the same amendment is required. The honour-

able junior member for the City drew the attention of the Committee to the introduction of this new Clause whereby the Committee might be referred to in some cases and by which the Court of Common Pleas could be further appealed to in cases of no settlement with the Appeals Committee and it was postponed. His point was that a member of the public should be able to by-pass the Appeals Committee and go straight to the Court of Common Pleas and that has been upheld. It will be seen on page 2 what this Amendment suggests.

In other words, Sir, this amended clause under the provision hereby seeks to carry out what the honourable member had in mind.

I beg to move that Clause 13 as amended stand part.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am going to ask leave for the same purpose to recommit Clause 4, because as I said, Sir, the same provision that I have just referred to in Section 13 is set out in Section 4 with regard to the Police Department and the amendment therefore applies to Section 4.

I beg to move that Clause 4, as amended, stand part.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am asking leave to recommit Clause 8.

*There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: As far as Clause 8 is concerned on the question of repairs, you will remember the Clause before provides for a three-year average in connection with the repairs of an owner-occupier of a house. What was proposed was this: in a three-year average an owner of a house may occupy his house for a year, he could probably rent it out the next year and probably at the end of that year go back into it himself; and as far as repairs were concerned, the three-year average of the owner-occupier might be broken by his renting it out for a year, and as a matter of fact, the taxes in consequence thereof; because an owner occupier when his house is rented has to make his whole declaration of the repairs done for the year, and when it is rented it has a three-year average. The rent may cause no confusion, but he might get the three-year average plus the amount he spent for the year it was rented. That will cause some hardship, or he will be getting too much: and it was felt in the best interest of the community generally to do away with the three-year average and in any case where an owner-occupier would be able to claim relief for repairs every year. 4.05 p.m.

This is a bit tricky; honourable members will have to follow the matter very closely. First of all, we are asking leave that sub-Clauses (a) and (b) of Clause 8 of the Bill as printed be deleted in order to substitute the following paragraph:—

“(a) by deleting paragraph (d) of subsection (1) thereof and substituting therefor the following new paragraph:

“(d) any sum expended for repairs of premises occupied or for the supply, repairs or alterations of any implements, utensils or articles employed for the purpose of acquiring the income beyond the sum actually expended for any of these purposes during the income year:

Provided that for the year of assessment one thousand nine hun-

dred and fifty-six any person who prior to the coming into operation of the Income Tax (Amendment) Act, 1956, was, in fact, given as a deduction for those purposes the sum usually expended for those purposes according to an average of three years immediately preceding the year of assessment, may, by giving notice in writing to the Commissioner within six months of the date of coming into operation of that Act, claim in respect of those purposes a sum so computed in lieu of the sum actually expended during the income year one thousand nine hundred and fifty-five;";

Then paragraphs (c), (d) and (e) of Clause 8 will be re-numbered "(b)", "(c)" and "(d)" respectively. That means that as far as last year is concerned, this amendment will not affect the returns; this amendment will come into effect so far as this year is concerned. It will come into effect from this year, so that persons who are claiming deductions up to 1956 will be exempted from the provisions of this amendment.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I now beg to move that Clause 8 as amended stand part of the Bill.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: This is a Clause which takes up 6¼ pages of the printed Bill, and I really cannot be of any assistance with it. However, I would just like to refer to Clause 8 of the Bill as printed. That Clause says this: "Section twelve of the principal Act is hereby amended—

(a) by renumbering paragraphs "(e)" to "(k)" inclusive, of sub-section (1) thereof "(f)" respectively; then we have sub paragraphs (b), (d), (e) and so on. I am afraid that I cannot help in the matter, but this renumbering does not seem to be right to me. The first sub-Clause of this Clause has no number; let the Hon. Minister see that the numbering of this Bill is correct, because I cannot follow it at all. [Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: It is a bit difficult to follow.] There are a dozen of these sub-Clauses, but the first one has no number.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: It appears to me as if there is just an omission. However, I am assured by the Clerk that the position is alright.

*The question that Clause 8 as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

4.15 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr Chairman, I am asking leave to re-commit. Clause 10.

*There being no objection leave was granted the hon. member.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am taking this opportunity to make an amendment to Clause 10. I am sorry the hon. senior member for the City is not in here but he raised the question of whether this allowance of \$100 should apply to both a man and his wife. I want to assure him that this means what it means and nothing more. The charges will go to the husband's return whether it is one person or his wife or both.

The amendment which I want to make now is with respect to the last word appearing at the end of paragraph (a) in the proviso to the amendment to be made to section 20 (1) of the Income Tax Act, 1921. I am asking that that word "or" be deleted

and the word "and" be substituted in its place. It will mean that he will get the allowance of \$100 and that of \$25.

I beg to move that Clause 10 as amended stand part.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Chairman, on the last occasion when this Clause was passed I was deputising for you. Now, it is recommitted—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You were not deputising for me.

Mr. BRYAN: Be that as it may, on that occasion there was quite a lot of argument concentrated around this proviso which deals with the allowance of \$100 in case of a married man or his wife and an allowance of \$25 for each child up to maximum of two children. My question is why has the Government set this limit of two children? As I understand it, this allowance of \$25 does not represent the amount of medical expenses, it represents the amount deducted. I would like the Government to give me some explanation of this. Does this mean that there will be no deduction for other children? What I am wondering about is those illegitimate children who are under the care of both parents. I really would like this point cleared up in this Bill. So far as these children are concerned, it is my feeling that a man who has them in his home under his care should be allowed this \$25 deduction for each child for medical attention.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I really intended to ask today for the recommitment of this Clause whether or not the Government had brought down an amendment to it. I have some further information on the points I was making on the last occasion. I agreed with the last hon. member who spoke when he referred to an allowance for illegitimate children. I feel that you should get off medical expenses for such children; as a matter of fact, it should apply to everybody for whom you get allowances. If the child is over the age for which you get allowances; it would not apply, but if you get an allowance for a wife and you get medical expenses taken into consideration for her it should be taken off for everybody for whom you get allowances and that will cover the point with respect to illegitimate children.

While I know that you have put the allowance of \$1,300 for a married man in other Acts, I think you should not mention the \$1,300 under this Act. My reason for saying so is that if at any future time Government thinks fit to increase or reduce that amount, it will have to amend this Act as well. I think it is unnecessary for the amount to be mentioned at all in this Act. As I have said, I know it is put in another Act but in the same way that the Government has found it necessary to introduce other amendments to this Bill because hon. members ask that the Bill be postponed for further consideration, I hope that Government has seen that it was a good thing to do so because some of the amendments which were brought in today would have been put in by the Other Place. Personally I am not proud of sitting in a place where somebody else has to do the work.

The hon. senior member for St. Thomas who is Minister of Trade, is not in his place, but Mr. Chairman, you took an interest in the debate on this Clause, and I wonder if I am correct in saying that on the last occasion the Hon. Minister of Trade said that this was the manner of dealing with these allowances outside of Barbados. He might have meant taking it off the gross income. If that is what he meant, he was perfectly right. However, when I made the point that here it is the Government of Barbados is asking me a poor man to stand the first \$25 and ask-

ing a very rich man the same \$25, would he consider that that was fair, he made that reply. I pointed out that it was terribly unfair to the poor man. Since then I have actually seen an American who is on a visit to this Island and who visited this House on the same day that we discussed this Bill and he explained to me that the method of dealing with an allowance for medical expenses for income tax in the United States is the same as in Canada. The information from Canada was made available to the Government because a member of the Executive Committee told me that he has a copy of the relative Canadian Act. Since then I have got two copies of the Canadian Act, one of 1950 and one with an amendment to that Act. The method of dealing with medical expenses in U.S.A. and Canada is this: the net income of the taxpayer is taken into consideration and the taxpayer has to stand the first 3%, an amount equivalent to 3% of his net income.

4.25 p.m.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you will readily see that this is a method that this Government could have accepted and acted upon. I will go further and say that in 1950 in Canada it was 4% and after working it for some years they discovered it was quite all right to make it 3%. If they found that, can't you see there is some substance in this method? Let us say a man with \$1,000 a year is asked to stand the first \$30 of his medical expenses; a man with \$10,000, \$15,000 or \$20,000 a year is not asked to stand the same 3%. They are asked not to go and claim any expenses unless they go over \$200 or \$300. Isn't that fair? You don't want to give back rich people these expenses and you don't want to go and make a show, because that is all we are making in this Bill. It is inequitable; as a matter of fact, so far as poor people are concerned Government can tear this up; it is not worth anything. It is helping the rich man who can say "well, I have over \$120 and I have got back \$40 or \$50 or \$60." So you are making him a present. But this Government is afraid to work this method and give a reasonable amount of medical expenses because it might prevent some people from paying taxes at all; but what is the object? You collect something in the vicinity of \$1 million or more than you budget for in income tax. Do you mean to tell me if you cut out a thousand people that pay five shillings that would mean anything? That could be the only justification for taking it off the gross income. That is to let the poor man stand his first \$5 and let a rich man stand the proportionate amount; but to take a rich man and a poor man and say you can only give after the first \$20 is terribly unfair and it is not giving consideration to the question at all.

Mr. Chairman, I know you will not let me read from it, but these people have tried it and discovered they can do it. After all, if you give a man off \$100 or \$200 and you have a receipt from the doctor and the doctor adds it to his income, this man is paying 3% which is added to the doctor getting 40%; don't you see the Government is going to gain? You give a man off \$5 or \$6 and you collect \$40 from another man. I am going to make an appeal to the hon. member for St. Thomas not to let another week pass and to appoint unofficially a small Committee to meet the Crown Law Officers and if necessary the Income Tax Commissioner and let us see what we can do about it. Not only that; the people started off in Canada to make it for expenses incurred in the particular year. Take me for instance; I am a man with a child and pay my medical bill on the 31st December; if I paid it on the 30th January I would not get a cent off. They have worked it out for the first twelve months. We have a medical man in this House that must know that the people of Barbados

cannot pay spot cash for their medical expenses; some cannot pay at all, and how can you say that a man who gets sick in December must pay for it in December or not get it off at all? That is wrong to my way of thinking. Somebody tried it, so let us try to get hold of the most up-to-date method. Government is not going to lose one cent by it. Not only that; do you mean to tell me that a man who has to get a set of false teeth cannot get any relief at all? Do you mean to tell me that if I cut my finger and went to a doctor and he puts in a stitch and charges \$10, or if I took a tooth out, you cannot consider that at all? Can a man without glasses do work? Even if that is something new can't we consider that? I do not know where this Legislation came from at all. Anything coming from the Law Offices is entirely for the rich people of this country and the poor ones get penalised. As I said, this Bill deals with a man buying machinery who gets an allowance and if the rates go up or down, the man who gets an initial allowance on machinery stands to gain. I do not like to call names, but can you imagine comparing a man with my income with a man like Mr. H. O. Emtage and telling me that over \$20 Mr. Emtage gets considered and me too? Multiply his income by 3% and make him stand there. He is quite capable of standing that. There are many others who would have to owe a doctor for years and have to ask him as a favour to attend to them.

Mr. Chairman, Government should acquire this Act I have, not because of my reading it today, but they should acquire it and I am surprised to find that with the up to date legislation we have on this medical attention the Law Officers of Barbados do not know anything of it at all; maybe they have been asked by the Government to draft a Bill for political reasons in the year 1956. It is no use to a poor man. Tear it up. Another thing, Sir. Can't we give people something off for teeth? Don't they pay a dentist? If you are going to put a limit on the amount, some people may not have to go to the doctor this year, they may have other expenses. I am sure, Sir, that if further consideration is given to this Bill the Government is bound to gain by it. They cannot lose. If they can get hold of the receipts from the doctors they could collect more money in the brackets that the doctors pay in. Give the people some relief, but do not give them relief in name. I cannot imagine the five Ministers that represent the common people of Barbados saying to every man that he must stand the first \$20 and let him take it off the gross income and give one man \$75 to put in his pocket and telling the other not to worry to pay \$3.

4.35 p.m.

By what means can anybody in Barbados come to the conclusion that this is fair and equitable? Why bother with it at all? What would anybody in the Attorney General's Office spend his time in drafting this Clause for at all? It is a waste of time. I say: if you are going to prevent a few people from paying the 5/-, let us get rid of that; it costs you more to send out a form and pay a Clerk to write a receipt for the 5/-. This is all nonsense. However, Mr. Chairman, it is all set out very clearly here, and this particular Clause could be very easily re-drafted so as to afford people a little relief. As a matter of fact if you work the Canadian method today, you could raise the maximum to anything like \$250 or \$300, and you do not lose anything by it. A rich man will get off from the first \$300; you are getting the tax, but you are giving another man 5/- and he still has to pay the Doctor. I do not know who has conceived of this idea, but it is not equitable; it is sheer, undiluted nonsense in so far as poor people are concerned. The best thing to do is to delete this Clause

altogether, rather than cause people to go around getting receipts from Doctors.

Consider people having been taken sick in December and you insist that that is the year in which these medical expenses have been incurred and are paid. You would believe that anybody doing that would feel sure that every Barbadian in every class is able to send his wife to the Hospital, or go himself and put down \$200 or \$100 cash for his medical expenses, so that he could go and get it off! You would not imagine that people in Barbados live on the credit system; you would not believe that the people who conceived of this idea in this Clause ever lived in Barbados at all. The people in Canada found that they could reduce the amount to 3% and still they are getting on quite well with it; they have agreed that if the amount is paid within the 12 months, it can be taken off. They have agreed that anything which you pay to a dentist can be taken into consideration. My contention is that we want to deal with the matter equitably, so that people are able to stand the initial amount. The next thing is, that this amount should not be incurred and paid in the same year. Again, you should include what you have to pay a dentist, and perhaps what you have paid an Oculist. Mr. Chairman, it may interest you to know that these things are going too far. As far as chiropractors and other people are concerned so long as it is permissible for them to practise, they can be locally registered, and what you pay them you should get off. I am saying this: to tell me that this is of any use to the people who need it most is to say you do not understand anything about it, and therefore it is of no use discussing it.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I think that without any show of immodesty, I could claim to be the first person to suggest to the Government this idea of deleting from the assessment for Income Tax, the amount for medical expenses which anyone has incurred in any one year. I quite agree with a lot of what the hon. junior member for the City has said, and I suspect that the Bill is not full enough. If a man has to wear glasses, the amount paid for the glasses should be considered. The expense of a dental plate and so on should be considered, and if these things are not in the Bill, they should be in the Bill. Of course, the Government can have the excuse that this is its first attempt in this direction, but there is one thing which I cannot appreciate about the hon. member's speech. This question of Income Tax all over the world is a very intricate question, and I do not pretend to understand the more intricate Clauses and Sections of Income Tax Legislation. However, the hon. member seems to imply in one particular remark which he has stressed over and over again that because a man is rich, therefore the rate of relief should not be in the same proportion as that of the poor man.

I do not know if the hon. member realises that that is a fundamental challenge to the principle of fairness. In other words, it boils down to this: if you make the proportion for the rich at the lowest rate, you are penalising the rich man for being ill. That is not fair. I am not defending the rich people, but it is not fair, in my opinion, to make a man, because he is better off than another, pay more for his illness; that is to say that if there is an certain rate of relief for one person in respect of illness, there should be the same rate of relief for everybody. You have to pay Income Tax in different grades; the man who earns \$10,000 a year has to pay more than a man who earns \$2,000; but I do not see that if both are ill, the rate of relief for the \$10,000 man should be less because of his illness. That amounts to penalising a rich man for being ill.

Mr. LEWIS: I wonder if the hon. member

really realised what he said just before he sat down. I quite agree with him that the same rate at which you give the rich man off you should give the poor man. That is all I am saying; if the rich man is paying in the 75% bracket give him off the right amount. The difference is that one gets 75% and the other gets 3%. So long as you make it that everybody gets off the same thing, I quite agree with that; but as regards people in the 75% bracket you will find that instead of these people paying taxes, you will have to give them money.

4.45 p.m.

I am saying that sometimes you will find a poor man who will get an operation for \$25 which will cost a rich man \$25,000. That is alright because a rich man can stand that charge. Doctors charge him that because he can stand it; therefore, when you calculate 3% of his income and 3% of mine it will work out to the same thing. Is it fair to tell a man that has barely got into the income tax bracket that he should stand the first \$25 for medical expenses and you also tell Mr. Douglas Pile or Mr. H. O. Emtage that they should stand the same \$25? That will not be right at all, but that is in the Bill.

For the benefit of the hon. member I am going to tell him what happens. Suppose he gets sick and his illness cost him \$120 in medical expenses he takes off the first \$20 and the Government will also take off \$100. Now take another man whose medical expenses comes to \$150. He will have to be taxed on \$30. Now take the case of a rich man whose medical expenses amount to \$120 which is the same as that of the hon. member. He will pay the first \$20 just as that hon. member and the Government will give him off the other \$100. That is not the way in which it should be worked; I am asking the Government to work it on the percentage basis and what they save on the rich man they will be able to give in relief to the poor man. [A VOICE: Would that be fair?] Well, do not have so much money and you will get off the same as the poor man.

Mr. Chairman, there is another point which I wish to make. The Government of this country must remember that it does not take extra tax on unearned income. Other countries do that. A lot of people in Barbados get a lot of their income from unearned income, so if you add earned and unearned income together and give a taxpayer off an allowance on a percentage basis, you can start off like Canada with it at 4%. It is equitable to do it on a percentage basis and it does not entail any trouble at all. There is a draft here which can be kept and I am waiting to hear if the Hon. Minister of Social Services will accept a motion for the further postponement of consideration of this Bill, so that in the meantime in a calmer atmosphere, if he wants this matter to be less public, we can get together and see what can be done. Of course, if it is his desire that the Bill should be sent to a Select Committee, he should do so. Let me remind the Hon. Minister that hon. members asked on the last occasion that this Bill be postponed for a week. The Government then searched it and brought in amendments which might have been inevitably introduced in the Other Place. There may be still other things which might want amending and I am asking the Government in its own interest to postpone the Bill. The whole principle to which I have referred of the relative Canadian Act is available to members of the Government. It is an equitable way of doing it and they do not lose anything by it. They can raise the maximum to \$200 or \$300 without doing themselves any harm at all. Before I make a motion for the further postponement of consideration of this Bill I will wait for a lead from them.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I am glad that this Clause has been recommitted. I was not

here on the last occasion and I would like to hear what is Government's answer to those hon. members who enquired why provision for dental treatment was not included in this Bill. To me, it is very necessary. In this enlightened era, dental treatment is considered by Governments so essential to a person's health that I cannot understand why allowances for that treatment have been excluded. Surely medical expenses should cover dental treatment as well.

Another hon. member has said that medical expenses should cover treatment by an Oculist. It is a fact that some children of necessity must wear glasses and you do not know what income group they fall into. I think allowances for such medical expenses are long overdue; it should be considered that the head of the family has that burden to bear. He is given allowances for his home, whether it is for a wife, one child or himself and if you are going to give a maximum of \$150 allowance, stick to whatever amount it is, but if any single member of a man's family whose medical expenses ran to \$150, that man should be given that \$150 free; he should be allowed to deduct it. Do not say who must be sick, and how they must be sick to get off the \$150. Bear in mind that it is the income winner who has to pay the bill and if he has ten children or one child and he has medical expenses to the amount of \$150 he should be given that free.

I do not agree that a taxpayer should bear the first \$20. As has been already explained, that would affect those of low income groups more. What doctors charge for medical treatment today, they charge according to the income of the person. They would charge a Clerk \$50 or \$60 for an operation and would charge somebody else for the same operation \$200 or \$300. That is the principle on which medical practitioners work.

I claim that it should be made as simple as possible. Decide on the figure you can allow for medical expenses. If you say \$150 and over that the head of the family has medical expenses in that year, whether it is one child, a wife or himself, he should be allowed to deduct that money.

Take off the whole lot. You can afford to do it, and I would like to know because I believe you went back to Executive Committee since the last occasion and that must have been discussed. What is Government's reaction to those members who brought them up on that occasion, because to me it is so simple I cannot understand why you did not. If you have not discussed it, take the suggestion of the honourable junior member for the City, discuss it and come back and have a better income tax rate allowance for medical and dental expenses.

4.55 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I was not following all of this debate, but I do not agree with the hon. junior member for the City or the honourable junior member for Christ Church because there is absolutely no rightness about this contention. It is purely a matter of opinion. Very seldom I agree with the honourable junior member for St. John for obvious reasons; but I would say this: I do not subscribe to the view that medical expenses should be based on the percentage of the income or anything like that. You cannot tell a rich man you are going to give him a different allowance from the poor man, and if you are all in the income tax bracket, I agree you make allowance for allowance. What I do not agree with in the Bill is that I do not see the idea for the first \$20, because \$20 would mean to some income tax payers more than it would mean to others, and I feel if you are giving medical expenses you should give medical expenses and not make any sort of means test or removing any amount. Put it this way.

You are giving an unmarried man \$720 as an income tax payer; this is \$15 a week or \$2.50 a day. You are not taking into account what the labourers pay. Take the case of a man who gets \$3 a day and therefore comes in for income tax. Now if that man goes to hospital and is charged \$20 for an operation he has to pay that \$20. Are you suggesting that that man should not be relieved of that \$20 because it is \$20? It is a lot of money to that man because he is in the income tax bracket. If a fellow goes to a doctor, the doctor will charge him \$20 for an injection. Now what I cannot understand about this is: you give a bus driver \$3 a day; one working for \$18 a week and is unmarried is an income taxpayer. If he goes for an injection, or glasses at Dr. Spira and they cost \$20, do you mean he can afford to pay that? That is where I say the whole idea is unrelated to what is happening in Barbados today, because you realise a single man working for \$18 a week has to pay. That is why I say as soon as you exclude him on the basis of \$20 I come to the conclusion you have put this medical expenses in here for people that are rich and not for poor people. As soon as you exclude \$20 you are suggesting the poor man can pay \$20 and forget it. If a poor man lost \$5 today, it would be hell about town! That is not a bad word, Sir; it would be heaven about town. I am saying that because I do not know if the members of the Government are aware that we have people like stevedores and so on who never pay income tax, and please do not think that they have big Bank accounts. Whenever they have to pay income tax they have to borrow the money, so why are you excluding \$20? The first \$20 suggests that you are dealing with people who have money. I agree with the honourable junior member for the City that income tax legislation is very intricate, and I go further and say that some of the clauses we bring here were clauses dealt with when I was on a Committee four years ago dealing with some of these income tax allowances for machinery and these sort of adjustments when Mr. Finch was here, and it shows that it has taken three years for this to reach down here, which shows it was not a fool proof thing, and I agree with the honourable junior member for the City that all the Clauses are not straightened out. It is not a legislation to buy buses or for waterworks; it is taking money from the people's pockets and there is no urgency unless it is clear, because when it goes to the Other Place where every member has not got to scramble at the Income Tax, they are not going to pass it because Government wants it passed; they are going to pass it in the way they feel it should be passed. The thing that worries me seriously is why members of the Socialist Government would want to exclude the first \$20. Do they believe that the community has got so rich that \$20 does not make any difference to the poor income taxpayer? Do they feel that a man paying income tax is rich? No man working for \$20 a week is rich, so do not get the idea that when you are paying income tax you are rich. So I want to say these rates are the same because I argue that a man working for \$2.50 a day today is equivalent to 10 years ago working for five shillings a week. It is just like when we had to amend the Act for people living in 18ft. x 9ft. houses and the value went up. They had to pay direct taxation to the local Government because a man living in an 18ft. by 9ft. is never regarded as being able to pay income tax with his coal pot in the yard. Similarly, a man working for \$2.50 a week, which is a carpenter's or mason's wages, is he rich, can he afford to go and pay a doctor and not get that off? It does not seem fair to the economic position of the income taxpayer. A man working for \$25 a week must pay income tax if

he is single, and this is no princely wage; and if these are the people to pay direct taxation, you are making some employees believe that \$25 a week is something princely. I will say to the honourable junior member for Christ Church and the honourable junior member for St. Andrew that their drivers should now be getting \$3 a day. Now, imagine these rates that some of us have agreed upon. I am suggesting that there should be further amendments. 5.05 p.m.

I am suggesting that this idea of the first \$20 should be removed. Tomorrow if I have to pay a doctor \$20, I would like that amount to be taken off my tax bill. I do not see why that should not be taken off; the funeral expenses should also be taken off. You have to bury the dead and if these funeral expenses were to be taken off, that would relieve me of people who are now running me down. [Laughter.] I say that when it comes to this first \$20 that amount should be taken off; I say that when it comes to this first \$20 that amount should be taken off; I cannot understand how hon. members of the Government could have agreed to put on this first \$20. I can understand certain members of the Government agreeing to that because they are so far up that it does not matter with this first \$20; but \$20 means something to the poor man when he has to pay that to a doctor. Some people get rich too quickly, and they forget all about poverty.

I cannot understand honourable members bringing down this Bill with this first \$20 in it, and telling people that they are helping the poor man. I am connected with an Organisation in which both the poor and the rich people have to pay Income Tax; they are paying their Income Tax, but I would like to know what justification there is in putting on this first \$20. I come in the bracket where I would like to be relieved of the first \$20, and I would like to know what is the good reason for not relieving the taxpayer of the first \$20.

Mr. LEWIS: I congratulate the hon. member on pegging his own clock. [Laughter.] The next thing is this: having regard to this first \$120, if you make it on a different percentage basis, the poor man has no kick. The poor man, like the rich man, will be able to insure himself and get back something in the case of sickness or whatever it might be. What I would like the hon. member to regard is this: there is no question of penalising the rich man in the matter of sickness. I will draw this illustration; let us take an instance like this—

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Before the honourable member links me up with the honourable junior member for St. John, let me say that I agree with the hon. junior member for St. John, not with the words he used; but on the basis that if you are giving a man an allowance for sickness, whether it is \$10 or \$20, you should not make any distinction. Whether you are rich or not, you get a deduction of so much for a child and so much for your wife. I feel that if you are giving allowances for medical expenses, and if the amount is going to be "X", it will be "X" for whoever it is. This is purely a matter of opinion; what I said was that it should be on the basis that if it is an allowance of \$100, that amount should be taken off whether you are rich or poor.

Mr. LEWIS: The hon. member is comparing the allowance for medical expenses with the allowance for a child, but he must remember that all of the allowances are arbitrary. Some people will get \$1,300 a year and they are married and have children. The Government has allowed \$1,300 a year before they tax a man at all; but when you come to the medical allowance, you are giving him a definite amount of money. This House has already adopted

the principle that Insurance Premiums should be deducted from the gross income, but this House changed it on the recommendation of Mr. Finch. Insurance Premiums will come off at 20%; Mr. Finch pointed out that in the case of a rich man who is able to pay \$100 a year or \$1,000 a year in Insurance Premiums, the Government was making him a present of \$75 out of \$100. The other man who is paying a little Premium, pays \$20 and they tell him that he can get back 60c. There are some honourable members whose sons may be Doctors, and the Government will give them back \$75 out of \$100.

The hon. member is saying that here is a man who will have \$100 or \$200 in taxable income, and it means nothing to him having regard to the way in which you are dealing with the matter. Even if you give him \$6 out of every \$8, it means nothing to the Government; it might prevent him from giving the Income Tax Commissioner 5/-.

5.15 p.m.

There are a number of people who are paying 5/- because they have not the taxable income. What does it mean when you give him off \$100? He does not pay any tax at all but he still has to pay the doctor. If one honourable member tells me that he cannot follow that, it means that he is unfit to represent the people.

I say, do your best to help the poor man. Put it on equally, that is to say, you will give the taxpayer in those income brackets \$3.00 the next \$6.00, the next \$15 if that is represented of what it is for Mr. H. O. Emtage. I do not like to call names and I hope he does not mind my calling his name. It is 3% on your income, whatever it is. Three per cent is not an unreasonable amount for you to spend on your families' medical expenses; as a matter of fact, you can insure yourself against it. There are a number of people who get a taxable 5/- and a number who get \$20 or \$30. It does not matter if you take it off for every cent. This is not a thing which you single out people and give them. If a man, woman or his family is not sick, they do not have any medical expenses. If they have it, it means something to them; therefore, give them off the relief and give them on an equitable basis. If you deduct on the gross income, give them off 3%. I am one of those people who feel that it should not be taken off the gross income. I feel it should be dealt with as that of the insurance premium.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask leave for the Committee to sit again.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to second that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is—

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: No, Sir, you cannot put the question. I was on my feet before you started to put the question.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Tell the honourable member to take his seat.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Tell them to get in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable member take his seat?

[Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY took his seat].

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the honourable senior member for St. Michael began to speak, I did not hear the voice of the honourable senior member for the City. Knowing the honourable senior member for St. Michael was about to move the motion that I do now report progress, which I thought it was right to do, I allowed him to speak. Of course, I did hear his voice first. I also heard the voice of the honourable senior member for the City.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am not challenging your statement. You said that your eyes were on the

honourable member who moved the motion. I am saying that when the motion was being seconded, I was addressing the Chair.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Make the member sit down.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: What I am saying, Sir, is that since the Honourable Minister of Communications caught your eye first that is alright, but I was interrupted by somebody on that side who got up and seconded the motion. I am saying that it is out of order. I was on my feet when that honourable member rose.

*The question that Mr. Chairman report progress and ask leave for the Committee to sit again was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

### ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

*The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.*

*On re-assembling.*

### INCOME TAX BILL (C'TD.)

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment the House was in Committee considering the Income Tax Bill.

*Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee on the Income Tax Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the adjournment the hon. senior member for the City was about to speak.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, so little is really known about the intricacies of Income tax by the layman that one wonders at times when a Bill of this nature comes up, how any one who really has not been given an opportunity to do some extra study on it can really give of the best. Last week my colleague and I held the matter for sometime before the Committee discussing the *pros* and *cons*, and I think everybody will agree that we attempted to show right away our own limitations in the matter.

However, Sir, what I am saying today is not in any boastful manner, but it is a matter of appreciation in some respect for the manner in which the Leader of the House, the Minister of Social Services, has actually carried out the promise that when views expressed here by the Opposition are not fully understood, he would put them in the proper quarters and see what could be done on their behalf. I think all concerned will agree that income tax is a very intricate matter; that is why last week I said that it was one of those things I would prefer to see go to a Select Committee for the reasons which I gave then, and which I do not want to waste the time of the Committee with again today. First of all, I think we all argued last week as to the question of anybody in Barbados standing the first \$20. My colleague also put up the argument as to how he thought income tax should be based. Let us come down to what I consider to be the best course from the point of view of commonsense. It was suggested then, Sir, that I had no authority to make certain amendments on the floor of the House, but I believe the Hon. Minister listened to all the views expressed relative to the persons standing the first \$20 and whether everybody who came in this group should not be given \$20 off. I am wondering whether under the circumstances as the honourable junior member for St. Peter and I

said last Tuesday that one must never forget what \$20 mean to a person who comes under the income tax group, because anybody who gets over \$15 a week comes under this bracket and has to pay income tax; and as we see it today everybody is going to be roped in, and I think it is very hard for any Government to say they must stand the first \$20. When I say, Mr. Chairman we should go to a Select Committee, I admit my limitations as to the knowledge and intricacies of income tax. As a matter of fact, I was reading a book on income tax and the author who is a chartered accountant himself admitted his limitations because he was citing cases where people had received gifts. A man received a gift of £10,000 from a wealthy friend who wanted him to get married. He bought a farm and had every possible thing, got married and his benefactor died within a certain period and the man became taxable; so instead of getting £10,000 from his friend he had to look for money to pay the Government. Nobody can boast so much about income tax to say it is this or that. If you bring anybody to Barbados, be he an expert upon anything at all, I am prepared to submit from a commonsense point of view—and I am glad the honourable member who has now come must submit it for the consideration of the Government that he would agree that to stand the first \$20 is absurd; and in fact, you are not giving these persons any relief, because I said—and I think the Honourable Minister must have got statistics to prove—that every four in five families must need some medical treatment every year; but maybe you will find some person in the Government service, whether he is Financial Secretary or not who would say that he does not understand about income tax. They know as much about income tax as I know about flying aeroplanes. That is why I suggested last week that you go to Committee. I do not expect Government to know everything about income tax; the Bill was drafted and put in their hands. The honourable junior member for the City and myself raised every possible point that was raised again today: for instance, Sir, the point raised by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition about dental treatment.

6.00 p.m.

You take the Bill and read it. If you are taken ill and you can produce the Bill from a Registered Medical Practitioner, you are entitled to that relief. I am asking the Government to view the matter in this way: if you go into a nursing home where there is a Registered Nurse, you are entitled to that relief. However, although you have a Dental Registration Act in this Country, you cannot extract teeth unless you are a Graduate of a University in the United Kingdom or the United States of America, and a person cannot get any allowance in respect of expenses for dental treatment. As I say, on the other hand, if you can produce a bill from a Nurse-Midwife who is registered under the Act and opens a Clinic you can get off an allowance. You cannot get off anything in the case of dental expenses what sort of thing is this?

It has been drawn to my attention that in an attempt by the late Director of Medical Services to get a friend on the Roll, there was the interpretation that a Registered Medical Practitioner could practice as a Dental Surgeon. However, you can get off an allowance from a Registered Nurse at a Clinic as long as you can produce the bill; but if you went to Dr. Storey, you could not get off anything. The success of some people in this world lies in the fact that they have studied everything for some time and they expect to ask you to give a decision at once. When I suggested that we should go to a Select Committee with this Bill, that was

not to tell the Attorney General that he must draft the Bill in such and such a way. I feel that when I get before any Select Committee, I guarantee that I will be among those who will ask any expert a question. My tongue never gets tied up in my cheek when I go before anybody.

The Hon. Leader of the House has seen fit to come back here with certain amendments to this Bill. That is, I admit, a token of his willingness to listen to the views which has been put forward by the Opposition. The Hon. Leader of the House is unlike the Hon. Premier. Often appeals are before this House as to how Bills should apply and sometimes those appeals are never heard. They say that these Bills have been considered already: that was the case with the "Maude" Bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The "Maude" Bill is not before us now; I am asking the hon. member to keep to the Bill which is now before the House.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I know that the "Maude" Bill is not before us.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Then you referred to that Bill purposely.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am not speaking on the Bill; I have only made reference to it. Can you not refer to anything now? The Hon. Minister of Social Services has put into our hands certain amendments. I must apologise in respect of an explanation which he gave before I came into the House. Seeing that they were only two of us in the Opposition, who were hammering certain points, the Hon. Leader of the House has given an indication that he is quite willing to listen to us. I will say that the Opposition will also record its appreciation of such an attitude. However, I am asking the Hon. Minister of Social Services if, after listening to us today, he will say that Income Tax must start at \$15 or \$20? That is unreasonable. Today a member of his own party, the Secretary of a Trade Union has raised the question of removing the first \$20, and do you not think it is worthy of some consideration that this \$20 should be allowed? That is the first point.

The next point is this: the Hon. Minister who is in charge of this Bill, is unlike the Hon. Premier. He is a Medical Practitioner, and he himself knows that one of the first things he will do to any patient who comes before him, is to ask that patient to open his mouth. As soon as he sees that that patient has bad teeth, he will send him to a Dentist. That is either a fact, or it is not a fact. As soon as a Doctor cannot find out what is wrong with you, he will ask you to see about your teeth. But in this Bill you allow Mr. "X" to go into a Registered Nursing Home where he will get his back rubbed and he can get relief for medical expenses; but when a person is suffering from bad teeth and gets dental treatment, he cannot get back one cent by way of allowance. What sort of thing is that? I can understand the Hon. Premier bringing forward this Bill, but I cannot understand the Hon. Minister of Social Services, who is a Doctor bringing forward this Bill.

I am submitting to this Chamber that this particular Clause of this Bill should be amended. You can go and get what is called a Turkish Bath at a Clinic; you can come away feeling smart and you get off an allowance for that expense. On the other hand, you cannot get off one cent in respect of dental expenses! If we suggest that the further consideration of this Bill or any other Bill be postponed, it is not that we are just letting off hot air.

I notice that since our discussion on this Bill last week, the Hon. Minister of Social Services has made certain amendments. Here is a Bill, Mr. Chair-

man, which the Honourable Minister of Social Services has postponed because of our discussion last week and because he was considerate. The amendments which are before us today are in respect of Clauses 4, 8, 10, 13 and 15. Let us deal with Clause 6 which Clause 4 of this Bill amends. This Clause is a very important one. I do appreciate that we are reverting back to what the position was originally. Clause 13 is three-quarters of the Bill; it deals with every phase of development, and what not. I should like to say that we had no opportunity of making any proper assessment of these further amendments. Some honourable members will feel that this is an Income Tax Bill and you must put it into operation, otherwise you cannot get off these allowances this year. I submit that we should either deal with this in the right way or do not deal with it at all.

6.10 p.m.

I am glad to see that the Hon. Minister has had some discussion with somebody and he has come back to make the suggestion he did because the tendency in Barbados is for everybody to try to own the place he lives in. You will find more owners-occupiers in Barbados than in any other West Indian Colony. I am glad to see that he has decided on that; you must have things to apply to suit local conditions.

What I consider to be an important amendment is that the word "or" has been changed. I am wondering if the Hon. Minister can tell us whether the two points raised by my colleague and myself have been raised. You will remember that those points were supported by other hon. members. One of the points was with respect to the inclusion of allowance for medical attention by a registered dental surgeon. The other point was with respect to whether or not the Government will waive the \$20 which is stated in the Bill that a person will have to spend before he can be considered for allowance. I submit to this Government that with the actual prices charged by doctors today and the screening which is done at the Hospital, very few persons can get away without paying for hospitalisation. Therefore, with persons who are working for, say \$60, \$80 or \$100 per month, or \$15 or \$20 a week, when you say to him that during the year he spends \$30 or \$40 on medical attention to himself or his wife that he must stand the first \$20; therefore, if he spends \$20 the Government is not going to allow anything for that, I cannot agree with you. That is not the action of a Socialist Government I cannot agree with you. You must give relief where it is most necessary.

While I am not going into the intricacies of what my colleagues submitted, I must say that for some people the \$20 which they must stand first would mean more to them for some people who pay \$2,000 for medical attention. It is for that reason that I am appealing to the Government. While you might collect your greatest amount of taxes from those people in the highest brackets, you must bear in mind that the greatest number of your taxpayers is in the middle and lower brackets. It is those people who will suffer when you say you are not allowing anything until they stand the first \$20.

While this Bill is not under the portfolio of the Minister in charge of it, it is for him alone as Minister of Health to put up an appeal for allowance to the Government. No. Minister of Government can appreciate the situation as he can. If the Honourable Premier was in charge of this Bill I would ask the Hon. Minister of Health if what I said is not a fact. It is a fact that in seven out of ten cases a doctor will tell his patients that they must see a dental surgeon. I am going to say no more now on this Clause; I will wait and see what is the attitude of the

Hon. Minister of Social Services. Although on the last occasion he did not agree that this Bill should be sent to a Select Committee, yet by his agreeing to the postponement of a Clause for further consideration and his coming back here today with amendments to Clauses of the Bill show that some of the suggestions which honourable members made on that occasion were worthy of consideration. I am now making a further appeal to him to see that it is necessary that he postpones this Clause for further consideration. He should see by now that this \$20 which a man must stand before he can get allowance off for medical attention should be cut out. The Hon. Minister of Social Services has to advise the Barbados Government on matters of health and it is for him to say whether or not we should insert in this Clause "and registered dental surgeon". I want to hear what he has to say on this point.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: We have heard all that honourable members have had to say about these allowances; as a matter of fact, there has been a lot of talk on medical allowances as regards the effect of the initial amount which the taxpayer has to pay. I do not accept the argument that this \$100 should be increased. It has been argued quite correctly on the other side that all these allowances are arbitrary. In the same way that you allow a taxpayer to claim \$1,300 if he has a wife to support and \$270 for each child, it has been argued by the honourable junior member for the City that this \$100 should be considered in the same way. I am saying that they are all allowances and I think that the same principle runs through them.

6.20 p.m.

I think the same principle runs through them all even including medical allowances. As far as \$20 is concerned I suppose that might also be arbitrary. You do not take the \$20 into consideration. In short, the Government may feel that you deserve some consideration from medical expenses, but on the other hand I do not feel you should get every dollar off. We begin at somewhere and fix a certain figure above which you have to return for medical expenses. It has been argued that this income tax hits the poor man harder than the rich man; that applies to all allowances. The \$1,300 you give off for a married man living with his wife hits the poor man harder than the rich man, that is, the man working for \$25 or \$30 a week. I do not see any difference in principle. The same principle applies to his children. Why fix it at \$270? Nobody knows. There was some point made as regards dental and optical treatment and I will take them into consideration. By that I mean, if this Bill is passed we could consider these two including dental and optical expenses which would come as an amendment to this, but as regards the other contentions about the \$20 and expenses in general, as I said, I really do not see any difference between expenses for \$100 for medical expenses and the \$20 if all that applies to the other allowances as regards wife and children.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, one point which the Hon. Minister raised was that the \$20 might be arbitrary.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I said in my opinion. This is really not my Bill and I am not saying that I am acquainted with it.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am not accusing the honourable member of anything. He knows no more about the intricacies of income tax than anybody else. He said the \$20 might be arbitrary. Government feel a man is deserving of something off his medical expenses, but not all. You forgot to say you are not entitled to all and you must stand some of the expenses, but you must remember that today as soon

as he starts off you are saying: "we can only give you up to \$50." The Hon. Minister has said that is his view, but I am here submitting that I cannot see this is dealing with the legal technicalities and the intricacies of income tax. Therefore, I cannot see a Government with a medical man on their side who would not take his advice on a matter of that sort. I am submitting here tonight that, with your experience, you know that if you have 1,000 people in the lower bracket and not one of these people is getting off anything, it is doing them no service. Not one member of the Government has the experience better than the Minister of Health. I go further than other members, over the point raised about optical and dental treatment. I know the answer. There is no answer to dental treatment, but you are going to give people who walk into an optician's office and buy a pair of glasses and put on their eyes; but where it is proved, before you take the allowance purely from the oculist you have to have registration which is long overdue for oculists. The time has come when opticians should be registered and pay a fee. The Minister knows that well enough. Where the person is qualified in the business I submit that they should be registered and made to pay a fee. Just imagine having to guide the Minister on that! Let us say we are going to pass it today! Well, he says to this House that you can advise the Government that this can be put in. There is no argument that this can be put in. A registered dental practitioner is not any man who turns up and puts in teeth, and I submit that he should be put in.

6.30 p.m.

Will the Hon. Minister say that between the passing of this Bill here and the Bill going to the Other Place, he will discuss the matter and put in the word "Dental?" I hope that the Hon. Minister will not adopt the attitude of some members of the Government; they bring down a Measure; we on this side, oppose it, and they pass it as it is. I submit that on reflection and on re-consideration, the Hon. Minister is bound to see with us. I put it in this way; will the hon. member find out how many people are paying Income Tax in this country? Let him look at the various grades and if what I am saying is not true, then do not worry with it. Let them get these facts from the Income Tax Commissioner. I am submitting that this \$20 should be allowed a man in the lower bracket; I am saying that the Hon. Minister's personal opinion in this matter should weigh heavily with his Executive, because of his thirty odd years' experience as a Doctor. His opinion is not expert on Income Tax; he is dealing with this matter as a Registered Medical Practitioner, seeing people and knowing what the position is. The Hon. Minister should see that this \$20 should be taken off. You can bring anybody you like to bring, may be; whenever he is finished, I will have my say. I do not think anybody would say that this argument for the removal of this \$20 is not right; if it is your intention to help the poor people in any way, then this first \$20 should be allowed; otherwise you do not intend to help poor people.

Mr. LEWIS: If the Hon. Minister in charge of this Bill feels that an allowance for medical expenses and Insurance Premiums are the same as the allowance for a wife and a child, that is his opinion, and nobody can change it. It is strange that in every Country they have had experience over years and years and years with regard to Income Tax and we have not had it here. There are certain aspects of this matter which should appeal to the honourable member, because they have been amply demonstrated, and he must know something from his own experience.

To give every man in this Country, from the lowest paid person to the richest person, the same personal allowance must be arbitrary. There are many people who have not got the \$1,300 which you allow as the entire amount which they have to spend on themselves and their families for a whole year; but there are people who make that amount in the course of a day or a half day. I say it is arbitrary because it does not work any hardship on people who are able to stand it; but when it comes to this amount which is to be allowed for medical expenses, you know what these expenses are.

I am putting forward these points to the Hon. Minister, and I am asking him if he does not think that this matter is worth a little further consideration. Look at how many Doctors there are at the Hospital; you have the Director of Science and Agriculture and others, and there are people occupying Government houses, and what does the Government say? They say that it is worth 5% of your income to pay house rent. If that is so, is there anything wrong in saying that 3% is for your medical expenses? Let them ask the people to stand that amount. I ask the Hon. Minister to see that if a rich man is paying in the 75% bracket, and he has an operation at the Hospital, and the Surgeon charges him \$100, he pays nothing more than if you go to the Hospital and the Surgeon charges you \$45 for an operation. The Government gives him back an amount to bring it back to \$45. Look at how many people are bordering on paying Income Tax and who will have to pay \$100. The poor man pays \$45 for his operation and the rich man has really paid the same thing for his operation.

The hon. member says that he will amend the Act. If that is his object, let us get something rather than nothing; but it is so unfortunate that we have this position when, in another week or two, you could get the Attorney General, the Finance Commissioner, together with members of this House, and they may be able to work out what the scheme would cost you. Although the Income Tax law is very complicated, Mr. Chairman, it is wrong to think that this is a complicated part of it. If there is one thing about the Income Tax law which is simple, it is the deduction for these medical expenses. It is there for a child to read and understand it. I am very sorry to see that I am forced to make the motion which I am going to make, and it is that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed.

3.40 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX. Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for the City would have this Committee to believe that this Bill has been drafted for the benefit of the rich people.

Now, Sir, he said that as regards a man who is in the higher brackets, if he is in the \$6,000 brackets, he pays 75% of that to the Income Tax Department and equally so if he spends \$100 he gets off 75%; whereas a man in the \$500 brackets only gets off 3% or 75 cents because his tax will only be \$15 and when that is taken off he only pays \$14.25. If the hon. member will look at the rate of taxation under the Act, he will see that it is not a question of helping any rich man, neither is it a question of doing any small man an injustice. The rates before us are as follows:

On the first \$500 of taxable income the rate is 3%.

On the next \$500 of taxable income the rate is 6%.

On the first \$1,000 of taxable income the rate is 12%.

On the next \$1,000 of taxable income the rate is 18%.

On the next \$1,000 of taxable income the rate is 24%.

On the next \$1,000 of taxable income the rate is 30%.

When you get to \$3,000 taxable income the rate is 40%.

When you get to \$4,000 taxable income the rate is 50%.

When you get to \$6,000 taxable income the rate is 60%.

When you get to the next \$6,000 taxable income the rate is 70% and thereafter the rate is 75%.

You must have some basis on which you calculate your rate of income tax. It is logical: if a man, for example, who has to pay income tax on taxable income of \$12,000 at the rate of 70%, he is paying to the Income Tax Commissioner a sum of \$4,200 out of that amount, whereas if a man only is rateable on \$500 taxable income he is only paying \$15. If, for example, he has to pay medical expenses and \$25 is deducted from the \$500, he will be paying to the Income Tax Commissioner \$14.25. As I pointed out, the 25 cents will be taken off. For a man who has a taxable income of \$6,000, of the \$25 which he is allowed for medicine, when you deduct it he will get off \$14.25 whereas the man who pays in the \$500 brackets will only get off 75 cents. There must be some basis on which you must work. The hon. junior member for the City must know that whereas in the first case with a taxpayer in the lower brackets the rate is only 3%, with a taxpayer in the higher brackets the rate is 70%. Therefore to say that this was done to help any rich man is beside the point. Again, I will say that a rich man pays as high as 70% when he reaches a certain bracket whereas a man in the lower brackets only pays 3%.

The hon. junior member for the City said that you should give up to a taxpayer 3% of his income for medical expenses. In other words, he said that if you spend money on medical expenses, you should be given it rather than it be taken from assessable income. It should be given as a lump sum to the person. That argument might be all very well in theory but one can never tell what expenses one would create. For example, there are people who can spend quite a lot of money by going out of the colony to get medical treatment and they will be able to say that they have spent so much on medical expenses, therefore they must get it back. They will be able to go into any private hospital or nursing home and spend whatever they want and get it back on the honourable member's suggestion. In this case, we are trying to reduce the burden as far as possible and are still trying to maintain our financial position in order that we might be able to carry out the many things which we have to do on our programme.

I should also make this point: if \$100 is taken off for medical expenses, it is likely to push the individual taxpayer into a lower bracket in which case he will pay a lower income tax. In other words, a taxpayer who pays on a taxable income of \$1,000, as I pointed out just now, pays at the rate of 12%. If \$100 is taken off that taxable income, it is likely to push him in the \$500 taxable income bracket, so instead of his paying 12%, he will only pay 6%. Similarly, if \$100 is taken off a taxpayer who pays taxes in the 18% bracket, it is likely to push him in the 12% bracket, therefore he will pay less income tax. That is a point which the hon. junior member for the City failed to mention. He did not mention that point. He may not have mentioned it for obvious reasons.

6.50 p.m.

It is a fact that as soon as you take off—I am not saying that every income will be one, two or three thousand dollars, but I am quoting a case if the man has an income of \$1,000 and pays in that bracket, if part is taken off to put him back in a lower bracket. Quite a lot has been said, Mr. Chairman, about dental treatment and so on, but while it is true, I do not want to make the same mistake as other members who debated the principle of the Bill in detail, because I would have thought, the principle of the Bill having been accepted, we would only deal with the particular section, but the whole Bill has been debated. However, as the Hon. Leader of the House, the Minister of Social Services has said, that point can be raised elsewhere and discussed, and I think it was gone into very thoroughly before it came to the House, and I do not think at this stage that it is likely to be changed. Much speculation has been made about smaller men in the lower bracket and so on, but Mr. Chairman, if you remember, I think it was last year when the allowances were increased, the honourable senior member for the City spoke about the man earning \$60, \$80, \$90, \$100. If I remember correctly the allowance for married people is \$1,300, so even if a man works for \$100 a month he would not have any taxes to pay at all.

Mr. LEWIS: What Bill are you debating now?

Hon. M. E. COX: I am debating the principle of this income tax Bill, and I am saying that no married person who works for \$100 a month has any income tax to pay because a taxable income only starts after an individual works for \$1,300. It starts from \$1 after \$1,300 and not \$1,200, so a single man would pay and even if he pays on the first \$500 it is only 3% which means something like \$15 a year. The honourable junior member for St. Michael, my colleague, referred to allowances. He said that allowances should be given to people who have seven or eight children, but on that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind him that with the allowance of \$270 per child, you can multiply that and see how much that means plus the \$1,300, plus if the individual has an insurance allowance for premiums, and that would carry the individual up to \$4,000 before he has to pay anything at all; and then when his taxable income starts, he pays on \$500 which brings him back down to just \$15.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, it would have been better if some honourable members did not speak in this debate, and the Hon. Minister is one of them. The sort of argument he puts down is what I would have expected from a person like Sir Harold Austin, but certainly not from the honourable member. I do not know where he got his figures from, but he thinks he is smart enough in pushing out people out of one bracket into another. He does not know how to read the Income Tax Bill to fix the rates. He thinks when you have \$10,000 it is time you pay . . .

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I do not think. I know it is calculated at 3% on the first \$500, 6% on the next \$500, 12% on the next \$1,000 and so on, on a sliding scale. I would tell the honourable member that I am not so stupid as he thinks.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member is not as stupid as I think; he is more stupid. He said \$6,000 is at 70%. Mr. Chairman, there is a difference between the first \$500 and the next \$1,000. Do you mean to tell me that to give off \$100 would cause you to lose 4% or 6% on \$1,000? It is not true! If it is \$100 it is not the only thing that would put you in another bracket; the only thing you would lose is 6% on \$100 and to say what you said shows that you do not know what you are talking about. We have argued that you can start off with \$250 or \$300 and if you

work our system you can afford to do it, and it would not cost you as much as this is going to cost you, and it would not cost a poor man more. Do you think the people in the United States and Canada can afford not to collect income tax? And after many years they have discovered that they can go further; they allow a man to stand 4% of his income. Let us say you cut it down to 3%; they are experiencing that. They said you must pay for it in the year. It is unreasonable; and do you mean to tell me that after years and years you cannot take up an Income Tax Act now and try it out? Anybody who can pay for medical attention you can allow them that. These people could afford this: therefore make the amount so that they are to stand more. Make it 3% on the \$10,000 or \$15,000 that they are going to pay on, but let a man stand 3% of his smaller amount. They are asking a man to pay 5% of his salary as rent, 3% as medical expenses. What about people who do not pay income tax at all? Do you know that they have medical expenses and are not the type to get it free?

If the Hon. Minister understood me to say this is deliberately drafted to help rich people, I did not say that; but whenever you interfere with the Income Tax Act, you benefit rich people. I can bring all the amendments to the Income Tax Act for years, and show you that whether you intended it or not, it happened.

7.00 p.m.

Let us take the allowances which you are giving now; these are property owners, buyers of machinery and all of them get the benefit of this Act. And the rich man with his expenses, is getting the benefit of these allowances too! How many times am I to say that the Government is making the people who should pay, a present. In the case of a man who is paying in the 60% bracket, and you make him responsible for \$100 of his expenses, see what you will save; you will save \$60. That will give ten people off \$100, who are paying in the 60% bracket. Out of every \$100 you give \$60, not \$75. You can only go as far as the intelligence of people; if they are stupid or ignorant, that is the Government you have; but this is too fool-proof a thing to escape attention. I am sorry to see that in this year in which you will have Elections, this Government is so blind that they are putting forward something with which people can break their necks on the political platform.

I am not saying that they have drafted the Bill this way, but they are people whom you value. I know one of them who has said: "Lewis, you are just quibbling." I said: "I am not quibbling for you because you are paying in the 40% bracket, and the most that they will give me is \$6." Do you mean to say that you tell me that you can stand \$20, and I must stand the same \$20? Honestly, I am sure that if the members of the Government were willing to see my point of view and put it before their Officers, that point of view would be carried out in the space of 5 minutes.

All that the hon. senior member for St. Michael has said is wrong; the argument which he has used is the argument of the very rich, not even the nearly rich.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second the motion that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed.

*The question that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed was put and resolved in the negative, a division being taken as follows:—*

*Ayes:* Messrs. F. L. WALCOTT, E. K. WALCOTT, LEWIS, GODDARD and E. D. MOTTLEY—5.

*Noes:* Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE, Messrs. HOLDER, BRYAN, VAUGHAN and MILLER.—8.

*The question that Clause 10 as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman I am asking leave to re-commit Clause 15.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: There are two amendments which I am asking leave to insert in this Clause.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The first amendment is to delete paragraph (b) thereof and substitute therefor the following new paragraph—

(b) by deleting from sub-section (1) thereof all the words appearing therein immediately after the word "shall" in line four thereof to the end of that subsection and substituting therefor the words—

"in any case where an appeal is made to that Court without first appealing to the Appeals Committee be given to the Commissioner and in all other cases such seven days notice shall be given to the respondent."

That is in consequence of the amendment which has been made relative to the Appeals Committee. The other amendment is to insert immediately after paragraph (b) thereof the following new paragraphs

(c) by deleting from subsection (3) thereof the words "appellant demands that his" appearing therein and substituting therefor the words—

"taxpayer demands that the appeal";

(b) by deleting from subsection (4) thereof the word "assessment" where it first appears therein and substituting therefor the word —

"decision",

I beg to move that Clause 15 as amended stand part of the Bill.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I should just like to ask the Hon. Minister one question. There is a Bill on the Order Paper having for its object, the giving of relief for a legally adopted child. Could we not work that amendment in this Bill, and let one Bill be signed?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I will deal with that Bill.

Mr. LEWIS: If any further consideration is given to the Bill which is before us I would like to say that there is a case which has been brought to my attention. We have legalised divorce in this Country and in the case of a man who is given the custody of his children, no housekeeper allowance can be given in respect of these children. That is very bad.

7.10 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: If the hon. member can improve on that information, I will consider it.

Mr. LEWIS: To tell you the truth, Sir, if he will accept an amendment, I have it here for him. If he accepts the principle I will make an amendment.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Perhaps that would be better if it were made on the Bill which we are about to deal with. Let us deal with this Bill and finish with it.

Mr. LEWIS: For instance, Sir, Section 20 is one of the Sections which we are amending in this Bill. It is one which deals with legally adopted children. I do not see any reason for your having two amendments to one Section.

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

*On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.*

*Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*

*On separate motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.*

## CURRENCY NOTES BILL

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take charge of Order No. 2 which stands in the name of the Hon. Premier.

*There being no objection leave was granted the Hon. Premier.*

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day now stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: Second reading of a Bill to repeal the Acts of this Island which provide for the issue of currency notes issued by the Commissioners of Currency of the Colonies of British Guiana and Trinidad and Tobago, to effect amendments to the Currency Act, 1950, consequent upon the repeal of the aforementioned Acts, and to provide for matters incidental thereto or connected therewith.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill which deals with currency notes. The Objects and Reasons of the Bill reads as follows:—

The Currency Notes Act, 1950 and the Agreement in the First Schedule thereto provide for a uniform currency in the Eastern Group of the British Caribbean territories.

Now that steps have been taken by the Governments of the territories within that Group to demonetize and facilitate the withdrawal from circulation of currency notes issued by the Currency Commissioners of Barbados, British Guiana, and Trinidad and Tobago, clause two of this Bill seeks to give effect to the provision in that Agreement which requires this Government to repeal the Government Currency Notes Act, 1937.

The opportunity is taken to repeal the Currency Notes (Reciprocal Legal Tender) Act, 1941 as the demonetization of British Guianese and Trinidad and Tobago Currency notes deprives it of its purpose which was to afford recognition as legal tender to those currency notes.

Clause three of the Bill seeks to provide that the amount standing to the credit of the Note Security Fund established under the Government Currency Notes Act, 1937, shall be transferred to general revenue, and that any claims arising against that fund shall be met from general revenue.

Clause four of the Bill seeks to amend the Currency Act, 1950 so as to re-enact the provisions of the Government Currency Notes Act, 1937 dealing with offences in respect of currency notes.

In short, it means that since there is uniform currency throughout the British Caribbean, the time has come to amend certain Acts in order that this demonetization should proceed in order.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill which one should expect to get a little more information when it comes in here to be dealt with. I wonder if the Ministers of the Government have been reading a statement issued in the *Official Gazette* by the Currency Board. For instance, if I ask the question: can any honourable member or any honourable Minister tell me what is the value of our currency notes which are still in circulation; have any of the Ministers got that information on this Bill? That is

information which they should have. It is a very rare thing for anybody to see a Trinidad, Barbados, or British Guiana note.

7.20 p.m.

I have asked people in the other colonies and they told me that it is a most unusual sight. You, Mr. Speaker, must know that it is a most unusual sight in Barbados, but, Sir, if neither Minister knows, I can tell them that it is \$1¼ million in these notes that are still supposed to be in circulation this year. [A VOICE: It may be a little bit more.] One Minister said it may be a little bit more; he may have said it was a little less. They might have got in a few more dollars since then. He may be right, but he is wrong. If he knew how to guess he would have guessed right, but this is something that we must take some cognisance of. With \$1¼ million still in circulation, is this the time to have these withdrawn as legal tender. Can any of them say why that is so?

Mr. Speaker, it might interest honourable members to know that so far as Barbados is concerned, for many years or centuries we have been short now and again for currency; and when the Barbados people issued their own notes they caused confusion. They did not know what they were doing and therefore handed over to the Currency Board. They issued coins and they have to use the old ones because they did not know what they were doing. You cannot withdraw sixpences and threepences because the Currency Board does not know what it is doing, and if you go to the Bank for money they have to give you the old coins because the people we have doing this business know nothing of what they are doing. I will tell you a story of what happened with these notes. When the Caribbean Currency Notes came in, the people we have here allowed the Banks to send the notes back to Trinidad. How would they ever know how many notes are in circulation if they allow that to happen? They should have been collected by the Currency Board, and only after a very long time they did that. Not only that, our own Barbados Currency Board was so shortsighted that they allowed Trinidad and Demerara to come and augment. You will remember that Trinidad and British Guiana had more notes in circulation than Barbados for instance, and we had to support the invested funds of these other colonies to the extent to allow them to borrow and you cannot see a Barbados note in Trinidad or Demerara or the other islands. I would like to know, Sir, if this Bill is just to make it not legal tender for those people who still have this money and that is what you call demonetizing. They have given sufficient time for bringing them in, but it is over \$1¼ million and the Barbados amount is \$40,000 to \$50,000. If I knew that the Bill was coming up now, I would have brought along the last statement on the question, but in Barbados it is \$40,000 to \$50,000 alone, which is a small percentage of \$1¼ million in the three colonies. So I hope we are not passing legislation to deprive people of the value of any notes they are withholding. It is possible that of that \$40,000 still outstanding, \$30,000 may have been destroyed and that is what the Government is banking on. I have not had anybody to explain the force of this Act, but I hope we will see our way to assist people who might not exactly understand the purpose and the reason for these things; and if they do produce these notes after the Bill is passed, they will be given their \$1, \$2 or \$5 for them and not be liable to lose money because they did not understand what was happening.

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

*On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.*

7.30 p.m.

*On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Preamble was postponed.*

*Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.*

*Clause 3 was called.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Perhaps I should compliment the Government in trying to snatch as much as it can before Federation is agreed upon. This money would have gone that way if they had agreed on Federation; all of this money might have been included in the Federation.

*The question that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*Clause 4 was called and passed.*

*The Preamble was called and agreed to.*

*On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.*

*Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*

*On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.*

#### THE INCOME TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1956.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr Speaker, I ask leave to take Order No. 7 as the next Order of the Day, and also to take charge of that Order.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this is a short Bill which deals with the status of adopted children and also the claiming of relief in respect of Income Tax. The "Objects and Reasons" are as follows:

"As the law stands tax relief may be claimed in certain cases for children which expression is defined as including step-children and certain illegitimate children.

This Bill seeks to amend the Income Tax Act, 1921 so as to include in the definition of "children" a legally adopted child."

The object of this Bill is therefore to make provision in the Income Tax Act for legally adopted children. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I am glad to see this Bill. I think it meets the point raised by the hon. junior member for St. Michael earlier today; at least it is in the "Objects and Reasons" Now that we are amending Section 20 of the Income Tax Act, I should like to say that I have given the Hon. Minister in charge of the Bill an amendment which I understand is necessary. It is only something which has not been thought of, and no doubt any Income Tax Commissioner would feel himself obliged to consider the point for the simple reason that a divorced person is regarded for an allowance in the same way as a single person. If a man is divorced, and he is granted the custody of his children, and he has to work, he cannot claim an allowance for a housekeeper under the present Act. It is just that we have not provided for a divorced person, and that is why the relief for a housekeeper cannot be given.

I mention that point now so that when we go into Committee on this Bill, I will ask the Hon. Minis-

ter to accept an amendment. If it is a matter which he has to refer to the Governor-in-Executive Committee, I am sure that you would find about five or six cases in the Island. Therefore this means practically nothing as far as Income Tax is concerned.

I am not against the further consideration of the point. I do not like to spring surprises, because that is what I objected to earlier in the day. A particular case has been brought to my attention and I asked those persons who are interested in it to see and get an amendment drafted. I was presented with the amendment very late yesterday afternoon and that is why I have not been able to submit it to the Hon. Minister before. I thought that this amendment might have been considered in the Bill which has just been passed, but since it was not before us when the principle of the Bill was being considered, I have to make allowances for that. A person has to prove that he is a divorced person, and that he has children; in that case he should have an allowance for some sort of house-keeper or caretaker for his children.

7.40 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am in sympathy with what the hon. member has said, but it seems to me that the object of these two Bills is not on all-fours with what the hon. member has said. I cannot accept the amendment on my own responsibility; I will have to refer it to the Crown Law Officer in order to see how he will consider it. I will promise the hon. member to consider it, and may be, we will bring it down as a separate Bill for consideration. As he has said, if there are a few cases, probably they are so few that consideration was not given to them.

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

#### AMENDMENT TO SECTION 20 OF ACT 1921—6

*On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.*

*Clause 1 was called and passed.*

*Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:—*

2. Subsection (4) of section twenty of the Income Tax Act, 1921, is hereby amended by inserting immediately after the word "includes," where it appears therein the words—

*"a legally adopted child"*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I forgot to ask the Hon. Minister what progress has been made as regards the regulations to adopt children. What is the object of doing this and you cannot adopt a child?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: We know that the Regulations are overdue but the fact is that there has been, and still is, a shortage in the Crown Law Officers. The Legal Draughtsman is taken up in making amendments to the Local Government Act at the present moment but we hope in another week or two to finish that and one of the first things which will be done after that is to make regulations for such provision.

*The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and agreed to.*

*On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.*

*Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*

*On separate motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.*

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS BUSINESS

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, that finishes Government Business for this afternoon and I am asking to take Order No. 1 of Private Members Business now. It is a short Vestry Bill in connection with empowering the St. Thomas Vestry to borrow a sum of money not exceeding £500.

#### THE VESTRIES (AMENDMENT OF BORROWING POWER) BILL, 1955

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders No. 1 of Private Members Business stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Vestries Act, 1911-5.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is the usual one which has come before us in connection with the powers of the Vestries to borrow money in the early part of their financial year to carry on their business. It has happened before in connection with several other Vestries. Because of the high value of money they have been given authority to expend an amount over which they were previously authorised to borrow.

As the law stands, Vestries are authorised to borrow £500. We are asking that in the case of St. Thomas the amount be extended to £2,000. One may say, why do this when in a short time we may have to abolish Vestries; but the fact remains that until provision is made by the new Local Government Act, they will have to borrow. Especially so this year, this Vestry wants to borrow some more money.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

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

*On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill. Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.*

*The Preamble was called and postponed.*

*Clauses 1, 2 and 3 were called separately and passed.*

*The Preamble was then called and passed.*

*On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.*

*Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*

*On separate motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX the Bill was read a third time and passed.*

*The Order Paper having been fixed.*

#### ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week, Tuesday, 27th March, 1956, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

*The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.*

8.10 p.m.